

HINDUISM AND THE LAW OF ONE

INTRODUCTION

“As soon as a religion becomes fixed, static, crystallized, upon that foundation a corrupt priesthood is established, and at once the whole thing begins to decline into an inspired formalism. This is history. It is no theory.” [1]

Hinduism is in historical terms the oldest of what may be called the five most famous of the five great religious traditions of our present day world. The other four are chronologically Judaism; Buddhism (which arose as a reform movement within Hinduism but became a religious tradition and teaching in it's own right); Christianity (which likewise arose as a reform movement within Judaism but has also become a religious tradition in it's own right); and Islam. There are many others - for example Zoroastrianism or Sikhism - for, in the grandest sense, there simply is no end to religions being founded; flourishing for a time; and then ebbing away.

The opening quotation and the above paragraph use “religion” as a word and a concept in the sense of *a tradition of teachings*, but religion - to ‘re-ligiere’ or to reunite - has a far deeper and more important meaning. An inner meaning. A meaning that is infinite and eternal. Religion is the inner quest to become reunited with God. to become intimate with God.

This of course brings to the fore a perennial question. What is “God?” How many have the answers been. Hinduism, for it's part - as we have it today as an extremely rich and varied legacy - gives a quite serviceable perspective. ‘God’ is a condition of ineffable transcendence betokened by many, many faces or guises here in this present physical world we all inhabit. Thus God is mirrored in me; in you; in everyone else; in all the plants and animals of Earth and indeed is mirrored in the very Earth itself. To say nothing of the vast starry heavens above. And on and on. This pluralism within Hinduism appeals to me more than any other of the religious traditions.

[1] p 73 in “The Path of the Masters” by Dr. Julian Johnson (8th Ed., 1972, 5000 copies). [1st Ed.: 1939]. Radha Soami Satsang, Beas (District Amritsar), East Punjab, India, Publisher.]

General note. This present First Edition of “Hinduism and the Law of One” is a second complete version composed circa mid 2022 and onwards. A first version was assembled circa 2010 to about 2013, but much of it or at least some of it was destroyed in the 8/18/20 86,000-acre “CZU Lightning Complex Fire” in Santa Cruz County California, which consumed as well my home at Alta (a 62 acre property on Franklin Ridge on the northern edge of the county). At the present time a replacement of that home is nearly complete but on a different portion of that Alta property. Similarly some of the first version of this book may be retrievable from pages in the memory of this present computer that I’m using, for it survived whereas the one in my former home did not. While such a retrieval process has gotten underway today, 5/28/22, with five pages already found and printed out, showing parts of the prior version, it seems to me better to keep this present effort altogether fresh and new as a full second rewriting. It may mirror the prior version in some measure. But it gives me a chance to revisit the entire subject with something of a fresh perspective. And an enduring resolve.

“As Sat Nam [living ‘word’ or Current in *Sach Kand*; in Sufism/Islam *Mukams-e-haq* or home of truth; wherein THE ONE INFINITE CREATOR OF INTELLIGENT INFINITY first coalesces a personification; whereas, the two higher regions *Alakh Lok* or invisible place and then *Agam Lok* or inaccessible place - each congruent with deepening levels of Nirvana - and ultimately the fourth and highest spiritual-realms region termed *Anami Lok* or nameless region, to wit ‘consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject,’ divinity gets *so* subtle *so* intense in it’s ‘foreverness’ and it’s boundlessness that possibilities of description or evocation - however sincere and heartfelt - become increasingly nigh to impossible]...

“... There... [THE ONE INFINITE CREATOR OF INTELLIGENT INFINITY] becomes the fountain out of which the Audible Lifestream proceeds. ...It is more like a radio wave flowing out in every direction... In fact, it comes from the Supreme Creative center of the universe of universes.

“This Word is called *Nada* (pronounced Nad) in the Vedas. ...It is the primal music of the universe. It is the *Vadam* of the Sufis, and the *Shabd* of the Hindus. ...It is spoken of as the *Shabd Dhun*, the melodious sound. Again it is called *Akash Bani* (Heavenly utterance). Kabir Sahib speaks of it so beautifully as the ‘pure white music.’ All Muslim Saints generally refer to it as *Sultan-ul-Akar* - king of the ways - or *Ism-i-Azam*, and *Kalma* or *Kalam-i-Ilahi*. It is also called *Surat Shabd Yoga* or *Anand Yoga* or *Anahad Shabd*, and *Anahad Yoga*. So it has been called by many names in many languages. It is ‘the still small voice’ and the ‘Voice of the Silence’ .” [1]

My use of what some might call this very ambitious introductory quotation for starting a presentation concerning Hinduism is altogether not accidental. Hinduism deserves a baptism as a topic in the most reverent way possible. Nothing can be more reverent than the Audible Life Stream. A spiritual verity without boundary in time or space. Without boundaries whatsoever.

I dare to make such pronouncement owing to a personal introduction to The Current or The Audible Life Stream by way of unseen ‘angels’ or ‘wayshowers’ or ‘spiritual guides’ - perhaps most fittingly, wholly dedicated emissaries of THE ONE INFINITE CREATOR OF INTELLIGENT INFINITY - over the course of about fifty guided OOB’s (out-of-body experiences, or ‘imperiences,’ meaning inner consciousness experiences) between about 10/15/1981 and 4/15/1982. A fuller account is provided in Special Appendix A to this book. Briefly, however, I was ushered into a **dazzling dark** [H. Vaughan, 4/17/1621-4/23/1695] wherein - as I intuited it - unseen vast multitude were enraptured by a truly *voluptuous symphonic extravagance* we all were enchanted to be imbibing and witnessing. I was enraptured. These blessings ended when I ‘grokked,’ correctly, that I was hearing the power and the glory of THE ONE INFINITE CREATOR OF INTELLIGENT INFINITY.

[1] pp 477, 478 and 479 in “The Path of the Masters” by Dr. Julian Johnson (8th Ed., 1972, 5000 copies). [1st Ed.: 1939]. Radha Soami Satsang, Beas (District Amritsar), East Punjab, India, Pub.
Two [interpositions] added; the first [interposition] being somewhat lengthy.

As I see it today and understand it today, that power and that glory are altogether unbounded, and while the Audible Life Stream is surely an inward highway into and toward Intelligent Infinity, and my OOB's were an earnest of this, so too are many other inward spiritual practices (sadhanas) which any sadakha (spiritual seeker) can undertake, and surely *all* of them will provide some measure of building nearness in and within Intelligent Infinity. Prayer. Meditation. The cultivation of Global Compassion. Attempting to do all actions sacramentally. Attempting to be mindful of I.I. 24/7, 365, which the Gita enjoins as the one best sure route to gradually drawing nearer to I.I. Such effort at moment by moment mindfulness remains a central personal effort and it's one I recommend to everyone and anyone who truly seeks.

After all, we all are already in I.I. We all remain thus, from birth to death, and throughout our lives; and all lives before; all lives yet to come. That's just how things are. The challenge in growing toward a greater conscious awareness of this is what the great challenge is in life.

“Stated in the simplest words we can employ, the Audible Life Stream is the Supreme Creator ...vibrating through space. // Try now to get a picture of that Luminous Reality, the Grand Orchestra of the universe. Its heavenly strains are not only filling all interstellar space but they are ringing with far more enchanting music through all the higher worlds beyond the utmost bounds of the physical. The higher we go, the more enchanting the music. ...

“If you still think much of the word religion, then you may say that this Current is the only real religion. Or better, it is the giver of all genuine religion. It is the one and only thing in the world which actually binds men back to God. That is the meaning of our word religion - something which binds the soul back to God. Without this Stream, nothing could live for a single moment or even exist. All life and all power come from it.” [1] [*prana*, omnipresent energy: kindred term]

For cosmic reasons and as noted for personal reasons, I can think of no better way to open a general introduction to the ancient and intricate legacy of Hinduism - the Hindu religion that it is to say, for it's strands while plaited with the folkways of India as it's birthplace, are of many strands in terms of doctrine and practice and are spread past the shores of India to adherent worldwide - than to provide a sampling of Professor Johnson's remarks.

Those remarks echo in my view The Law of One, for this is a book about The Law of One: Hinduism and The Law of One. Stated with childlike simplicity? Everything is God. The Law of One says this. Hinduism says this. All genuine religions say this. Well, is that the end of the matter? Nay. “The devil is in the details.” How are we to *innerly realize* this verity?

[1] pp 482 and 483 in “The Path of the Masters” by Dr. Julian Johnson (8th Ed., 1972, 5000 copies). [1st Ed.: 1939]. Radha Soami Satsang, Beas (District Amritsar), East Punjab, India, Pub. One [interposition] added.

The inward realization of the everything-is-God verity is a matter of personal appetite. It won't do to just be idly curious. The thirst has to build toward a critical mass of sincerity and genuine seeking. I'm fond of invoking the rejoinder to the fellow who bemoaned the myriad differences that exist amongst peoples, divided into so many different religions and sub-sects within this-or-that religion, into so many different ethnic groups and nationalities, to say nothing of young-versus-old, rich-versus-poor, educated, uneducated; the myriad ways to categorize people.

"Well that may be," comes the rejoinder. "But there's a simpler way to sort out the matter. Firstly, there are those who genuinely seek after God. Then there's everyone else." In other words decide truly and sincerely where the bulk of your interest lies. Amongst the endless gazillions of worldly cares and woes and quests? Or the simplest one? The most mysterious one? If the weights go on the scales, does your focus on seeking God realization - also known as self-realization - tip the scales over-and-against all the myriads of worldly matters?

It is counter-productive to cajole and exhort listeners or readers to choose either way based upon fire and brimstone. That horrible consequences attend upon secular irreverence. Rudderlessness. Doom and gloom. Nightmare scenarios. No. *Scaring* people towards a seeking for God is glaringly counter-productive. It merely results in buried resentments, greater subornness, and - oftener than not - just redoubled worldliness.

* * *

The manyness for which Hinduism is justly famous is it's chief asset. Century after century has gone by. Scripture after scripture has been written. Teacher after teacher... school after school... doctrine after doctrine. When the British arrived (circa 1650) to begin their roughly three hundred years of colonization, it at first seemed to them that the "heathen" peoples of India were lost in a welter of polytheism and superstition and weird, obscure religious practices. Only gradually did the British - and other western colonizing powers such as Portugal and France - come to understand the extremely rich legacy of Hindu religious thought, which in fact is quite monotheistic: again, this idea of 'one God, but veiled behind myriad guises, myriad faces.'

Prior to the British, Hinduism was affected by - but persisted nonetheless in it's own special way - first the Buddhist reform movement which, under the great emperor Ashoka, Hindu India became at least nominally almost altogether Buddhist under his leadership; and then, the invading conquests of Muslim rulers. Each left their mark, and notably the friction between Hindu traditions and Islamic ferocity brought about a kind of synthesis in Sikhism. There were also the Jains. But what of the essence of Hinduism; that is, the issue of God-realization?

In general terms it's both unwise and truly impossible to say which great religious tradition more ably fosters God Realization on an overall, many-persons basis. There simply is no way to tell. To really tell. They all (again the famous five are chronologically Hinduism, Judaism, Buddhism, Christianity and Islam) have surely accomplished this at least for some; otherwise, these traditions would simply all have rattled off into the dustbin of history as useless husks. Occasional Realized mystics arise; some later given the honorific title of saint; or avatar (reincarnation of God); or, mahavatar: a rare or landmark God-infused soul. Christ clearly was and is the mahavatar and founding light in and within Christianity, however much his teachings have grown encrusted with myriad misunderstandings later on. Likewise with Gautama Buddha and Buddhism. And Mohammed and Islam ("*Islam*" essentially means submission to God or obedience to God).

Then of course Moses plays a central role in the development of Judaism / the Jewish religion, which is closest to Hinduism in both antiquity, and in arising from a constellation of spiritual wayshowers rather than just one. Albeit Moses does dominate in Jewish history. So it is fair to ask: is there any "Moses" figure dominating the historical landscape of Hinduism?

Two figures spring to mind as altogether formative for Hinduism as we have it today.

The first of these is Krishna, which most likely *was* a historical personage in great antiquity, but has become mythologized so enormously as to be well-nigh unrecognizable. Primarily, Krishna's enduring relevance is as the enunciator of God's all-encompassing nature in the great spiritual epic *The Bhagavad Gita* (the song of God), so honored by Hindus and Buddhists alike, where the figure "Krishna" explains, basically, Godly duty here in this world to the warrior Arjuna, who has turned to Krishna - his charioteer - for advice. [1]

I must add, of course, that I hold the Gita in the greatest esteem; as in my opinion greater than any other of the spiritual texts worldwide, from any religious tradition; and infused - again in my opinion - with more of what is best called a potency or a magical charge of remarkable intensity. For all of this, it is well to note that "Realization" abides not in any book; but in the earnest seeker.

The second of these is Shankara (alt. spelling Sankara, 680-720 A.D.). So great a theologian is Shankara that some even suggest he was Gautama Buddha reincarnate, endeavoring rapprochement between Hinduism with it's "Atma" doctrine (The Self) and Buddhism's anatma doctrine (no permanency as to any "self" whatsoever). This doctrinal schism is very important. It *does* have a resolution.

[1] See entry one in part A of the annotated bibliography hereto, where ninety-five translations are cited.

Without such resolution, the general public is left in a legitimate wonderment. Are both systems - that of Buddhism and Hinduism - just accretions of hypotheses and speculations, affording no sure path to the grail of all religions, which self-realization and God-realization? Luckily there *is* a reply. I must credit FMW (1887-1985) [1] as giving the most succinct formulation.

A lynchpin in Hinduism is the insight that Atman or The Supreme Self is an inward gateway summed in the idea, “I am That,” and that self-realization of Atman is, in fact, God-realization.

On the surface the alternate lynchpin in Buddhism - *anatman* or the impermanence of the Self, and of all else besides - would appear to be at absolute loggerheads with this doctrine, and it oftener than not leads to the pernicious view that Buddhism is an atheistic, ‘anything goes’ kind of catch-all for they wanting ‘religion light:’ lots of navel gazing and zen riddles but in truly ultimate terms *no way out*.

Not so. Buddhism - which remember began as a reform movement within Hinduism - merely sought to refine Hindu doctrines, which had become overburdened both with rigid ideas about caste or social status... and a predilection for asceticism, e.g., the classic image of a yogi meditating on a bed of nails. These pernicious tendencies were of a piece with a rigid formalism about what “Atman” or “Self” truly means. Shankara sought a correction to such formalism, and, properly understood, it amounts to simplicity itself. It can briefly be alluded to as follows.

The “Self” is so elusive and mysterious, arising from the simple fact that the “Self” is never - never! - an object *in* consciousness... but ever and always is the witness *to* consciousness: all arisings in ‘ordinary’ or ‘subject-object’ consciousness. Thus, the Self is - yes - bound up with a companion mystery: nirvana, or subject-only consciousness, where all objects both gross (perceived with the senses) and subtle (ideas) are absent; irrelevant. Nirvana is the “hinterland” near at hand as FMW calls it, but without careful and exacting practices, there’s no way to ‘there.’

But once ‘there’ - and let us for a moment assume the sadakha (the spiritual seeker) has attained to ‘there’ - what are we to make of the world or outward appearances; the entire realm of subject-object consciousness? Is it all a ‘dream,’ a ‘gossamer illusion?’ This is misapprehension in the opposite direction, but it colors all too much of orthodox philosophizing not just in Hinduism but in Buddhism and, indeed, in many other religious traditions as well. “Idealism” gets trapped in a yin-yang tussle with “materialism.” Both miss the mark. The mark is that Consciousness is quite equidistant, in it’s essence, from *both* ‘materialism’ *and* ‘idealism.’ Neither of them are ‘THERE.’

[1] See esp., “*The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object*” [*and without a subject*]. Entry Four in Part A of the Annotated Bibliography provides citation; other of the FMW philosophical writings can be seen via the FMW Fellowship’s Website, or write them via regular mail as their address is given.

The “THERE” referenced in the preceding remark is best termed - as FMW terms it - consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject. Moreover, even though “THERE” can be named in seemingly so breezy a fashion, it is altogether a very different thing to truly ascend into such a state or condition of reposing in so primordial a condition of consciousness.

There is also the issue of the gargantuan elasticity of the consciousness-states thusly equilibrated; e.g., that “THERE” represents a consciousness that is neither nirvana, nor the ordinary worldfield, but from which, *both* those realms of consciousness derive. Both are reliant upon “THERE” for their beingness. And both realms are unlimited in their respective depths and their respective enormity. The starry sky with billions of galaxies? Consider, also, a matching nirvana-realm rather similarly populated with gradients and levels of subject-only consciousness.

This understanding - this realm of consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject - is referenced in the Sanskrit term *nirvanda*: freedom from opposites; non-dualism.

It must be borne in mind that this intellectual construct which is so very helpful in a philosophical sense - the notion of subject-object or ‘ordinary’ consciousness, and the notion of subject-only consciousness or nirvana consciousness, with then a consciousness that’s a ‘subfloor’ to both - does not permit us to be so naive as to imagine that such namings can in any sense serve as the realness, the being-ness, of what’s being named. (e.g. the word “brick” is different from an actual brick).

Far from it. Far, far, from it. Language, after all, is predicated upon duality, for every word has it’s shadow: the field of everything that’s *not* being denoted by that word. In this manner a certain ease attaches to “nirvana,” for, clearly, nirvana alludes to a realm apart from ordinary, or subject-object consciousness. And, subject-object consciousness - the realm where words live and have their ordinary referents - cannot be expected to provide full intelligibility, so to say, when denoting a state of consciousness that’s “other;” that is nirvana-consciousness.

How much more so then, when, instead of referencing subject-only consciousness by the term nirvana, we reference a consciousness that is irrespective of such “nirvana” consciousness *and* subject-object consciousness: by the term consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject. An immediate reaction is puzzlement. What’s left? What’s being referred to seems bizarre.

It is just such bizarreness that leads me to employ the term, *Giantweirdness*. This term has the added advantage of implying something else. Something in addition to some State that is neither nirvana... nor subject-object consciousness; yet, comprehends them both and undergirds them both. That something is radical interconnectedness. And not just that everything is connected to every thing else. But that the epicenter of ‘everything’ is everywhere, all the time. Strange, indeed!

Thus far this Introduction has introduced a number of themes vis-a-vis Hinduism and its place amongst the pantheon of our present-day world's great religious traditions.

1. That it's the oldest of the 'famous five' (chronologically, Hinduism, Judaism, Buddhism, Christianity and Islam) and hence is the most richly plaited with all manner of traditions, customs and scriptures. Some are helpful. Some, less so.

2. That Hinduism - along with all other great religious traditions, and even the categories irreligiosity, as well as radical skepticism - bears inward relationship to the Audible Life Stream.

3. That Hinduism is justly famous for its 'many faces of God' flavor, where a whole pantheon of God-aspects have been elaborated. I personally find this quite resonant with truth.

4. That, like all great religious traditions many centuries old, Hinduism has been impacted by many historical elements of which three prominent elements have been, in reverse order, the British colonial era (and impacts from France and Portugal and others); the era of Muslim rule; and the failed effort at a synthesis with Buddhism: which, like Judaism's failure to assimilate the Christian reforms, has led to *four* religious traditions in the present day world rather than just *two*.

5. That two pivotal figures in Hindu history have been (a) the heavily mythologized figure of Krishna; and (b) the great Hindu mystic and philosopher and religious reformer, Shankara. There have been many others, of course, but these two personages deserve special mention.

6. That there is a sensible and intelligible reconciliation between the "Atman" doctrine of Hinduism, and the "anatman" doctrine of Buddhism; hence these two great traditions have a great kinship and ought not be seen as so 'yin yang' or antithetical, as some make them out to be.

These are all important elements in understanding the Hindu legacy. They will figure in various chapters in this book, alongside evincing the everywhere-ness of the Law of One.

* * *

I am happy to add a personal dimension to my discussion of Hinduism as it comes forth in this book. While I grew up in Protestant Christianity (Presbyterianism) and, like many, then journeyed into an almost radical skepticism and agnosticism before a personal encounter with mysticism (see Special Appendix A), from 1993 to 1995 (aged 46 to 48) I greatly benefited from a series of travels throughout the length and breadth of India, which even included brief visits to Pakistan and Nepal. As with all travels, these journeys were eye-opening. They deeply affect the sense of affinity that I have with Hinduism. While, as a freely avowed mystic, I do feel some respectful affinity with *all* religious traditions when viewed in terms of the objective to which they all aspire (aiding their congregants to deepened personal relationships with God), it's with India and her Hinduism that I have to confess a sense of a closest bond, owing chiefly to Hindu plurality and the great tradition of *bhakti* in Hinduism (devotion to God in emotional terms: striving after a love of God). After all, God is the inmost part of *each* of us. Hinduism strives to venerate this.

As with any account by any honest traveler, the mundane and the tedious are experienced alongside the remarkable and the stunning; the bad episodes alongside the specially good. I wish to enumerate some of these here starting with certain episodes that were personally very memorable and have remained so over time ever since.

It seems fitting to mention Ramana Maharshi first. [1] While I visited a number of ashrams - e.g. those of Ramakrishna, Shivapuri Baba, Poonjaji, Buddha (Bodh Gaya), Saatchi Sai Baba, Aurobindo (Auroville) and of course the Dalai Lama at his center in exile for Tibetan Buddhism - a certain memorable event, an imperience (inner experience) in fact, leads me to wish to single out the Ramana Maharshi Ashram in Tiruvanamali for, I feel, a deservedly special commendation

The day began most inauspiciously. The local hotel-keeper where I'd spent the night before venturing to the Ashram engaged in some pretty duplicitous mathematics to somewhat enlarge my hotel bill. In retrospect he was really somewhat pitiable and childlike in his rather clumsy greediness. Still, at the time, it got me quite annoyed. But to be quit of the place I finally paid the alleged extra monies I owed. (At the time of my visit in 1993-1994, travel in India was pretty much a bargain by USA standards and I'm told it still is; but I was trying to make my threadbare budget last absolutely as far as possible so as to see as much of India as I could possibly manage).

In all events I arrived at the ashram in quite an irritable and upset mood. All the more remarkable, then, was my imperience (inner experience) upon passing through the ashram gates. I felt an extremely distinct aura of Sanctity descending. The realm inside the gates distinctly felt to my inner sensibilities purified; elevated; truly sacred. The sensation - although very subtle - was quite pronounced and very impressive. Moreover in all honesty I never felt quite such a descent of subtle blessedness and sanctity - a mood of elevated spirituality in point of fact - at any of my other visits to ashrams all throughout India. Oh they were all quite impressive each in their own way, no doubt. (e.g. Shivapuri Baba in Kathmandu and Ramakrishna in Calcutta). But this was a distinct and inward sensation duplicated nowhere else. So I wish to mention it first and foremost.

[1] Certain topics seem deserving of a Chapter of their own and one of them is Ramana Maharshi (12/30/1879-4/14/1950). Other topics, touched upon already, likely will be addressed more fully in other Chapters later on: (1) the Audible Life Stream; (1) an overview on Hinduism's God and 'minor Gods' pantheon; (1) the era of Emperor Ashoka and efforts during his reign - and before and after - to meld Hinduism and Buddhism into one religion; (1) Shankara; (1) Krishna; (1) the Bhagavad Gita; (1) "Bhakti" as a theme in Hinduism; (1) further as to the "Atman" versus "anatman" alleged controversy; (1) ideal of avoidance of excessive asceticism as well as excessive worldliness / hedonism; (1) Shivapuri Baba; (1) Paramahansa Yoganand (1) Ramana Maharshi; (1) a brief account of different yogas; (1) Mahatma Gandhi; and, (1) other spiritual teachers. All **15** of these topics are marked "(1)" inasmuch as no final arrangement of these subjects as Chapters yet suggests itself, and this book - like the others in this series - basically grows as it goes along. [The final arrangement of Chapters: *Table of Contents* - LH, 5/6/23; omitted topics may be added later]

As a second point of meaningful reminiscence about the pervasive nature of Hindu piety in Indian culture I wish to single out a vignette at sundown in southern India, followed by a wholly unrelated pair of vignettes: one from Auroville; one from Goa.

It was growing to dark in the small southern Indian village and I was hurrying back to my hotel. A young girl was carrying some cut flowers back into her home, a small but dignified affair with a small front yard garden. The doors and windows were open for the cooler evening air. I saw with such innocent piety she was carrying the cut flowers to place on the home's altar: which was situated at the precise center of the home. This made a singular impression. The entire house of one story and not many rooms probably, had been carefully arranged so that the home's altar was at the very center. And a small candle glowed there. All else was dark. Somehow I found this very resonant of the religious feeling that truly does work as an undercurrent throughout India.

"Modern" India of course has social trends at war with such piety. Most ugly of all is the resurgence of a militant or intolerant form of Hinduism; even as this subcurrent exists in all other religious traditions. It is no rare thing, sad to say, to see religion hijacked by self-righteousness and, in a way, this has happened with Hinduism for millennia. "Caste-ism" while officially proscribed is rife everywhere, and I saw it's consequences at their worst in a "Brahmin" neighborhood in one small village. Again it was subtle but I detected the smug self-righteous feelings of superiority amongst all the folk there. They literally all seemed to be walking about with their noses aloft. What a downfall it is, to the religious journey, to have it hijacked by such egotism. This is a durable impediment in Hinduism, but such impediments afflict all other "religions" too when "religion" is taken in it's familiar form of custom; formal dogma; outer piety for show; etc.

The Goa vignette is the one I have the most fondness for (although the one from Auroville is one I cherish as well). I had visited a nearby beach with a European friend from our hotel who was riding on the back of my rented motor scooter. He was British, actually; about the same age as I and noticeably possessed of some budding spiritual sensitivities it seemed to me. Anyhow in all events our chitchat about being a "spiritual seeker" and not just a "tourist" had roamed amongst many casual anecdotes we each had. Then, as we were approaching the one dangerous traffic circle in all of the not-too-large village, on our way back to the hotel, it was *just then* that my friend finally saw fit to broach a far more meaningful query: "what is meditation?"

I was flummoxed. There was absolutely no way to answer. All my attention had to remain fixed on the busy intersection of motor scooters and donkey carts if we were not to easily wind up in some kind of crash. But as I struggled with reply, I 'groked' the cosmic serendipity of his query coming at just that time for, truly, it had launched me into a meditative state!

Mindful of ‘outer’ *and* ‘inner.’ Yet disengaged from both, in a sense... In all events it was and is an extremely resonant moment wherein I did experience - or innerly experience, “imperience” - a very subtle sense of a key concerning meditation. That meditation amounts to a disengagement from what is outward while remaining mindful or conscientious about outward things... whilst, also, finding disengagement from the thought-stream, either through necessity (as was the case at that moment) or through conscious effort at stilling the ordinary or ‘humdrum’ thought-stream. Yet still one is *conscious*.

Moreover this has led me to conceive of meditation as a practice that has multiple levels. There can be spontaneous and fleeting episodes (such as mine just then). Or carefully cultivated and lengthy episodes; indeed, meditation can be said to be a ‘mindfulness’ practice having myriad shades of emphasis and of depth. Recalling the mind to itself is in a sense unique each and every sadakha (spiritual seeker).

The episode in Pondicherry was very much different but retains a kinship in memory’s eye as having a quality of depth and meaning that transcends it’s outward particulars.

I was newly arrived at my hotel in that city, drawn there by the fame and the teachings of Aurobindo. The particulars are dim, but somehow I needed to wait until my own room became free or something like that, in two hours or so; and, rather than wait in the lobby, another visitor - an American like myself and of about the same age - invited me to wait in his room. Which would give us a chance to chat about things; especially about our shared interest in Aurobindo.

What I remember so fondly is that my newfound acquaintance - I’ll call him “James” [1] - was filled with a quite infectious enthusiasm about Aurobindo and his spiritual teachings. Unlike myself (intent on wandering about the whole of India), James had zeroed in on a visit just to Pondicherry, because of his enthusiasm for Aurobindo’s very unique and engaging way of examining “The Life Divine” (the title of one of Aurobindo’s books). This truly was resonant for James. So James had thrown aside his budding career - he was in some white collar kind of work with banks or insurance companies or something like that, in Marin County California; perhaps it was in real estate - at the age of about 36 or 38 or thereabouts... in order to rush off to here in Pondicherry. No doubt most of his professional colleagues thought him a trifle daft to do so. But James was without regrets. He was out to “*get it*.” James was so fired up about his spiritual journey and I found this extremely touching. Which allows me to insert a very meaningful parenthetical remark: in just such measure as we get fired up... Intelligent Infinity with tremendous deft and skill **responds**. *Adroitly* responds. So James - all excited about his quite expensive purchase of ‘The Complete Works,’ a stretch for his budget - has, I am *certain*, gained much from his loving studies. My certainty about this has but deepened over time.

[1] All of my travel diaries and notes burned when my whole house burned in the 86,000-acre “CZU Lightning Complex Fire” in Santa Cruz County Calif., on the evening of 8/18/2020.

CONCLUSION

Religions in general - in the sense of organized, coherent religious-practice traditions built around a spiritual teacher or teachers, with accreted customs and spiritual texts and some measure of dogma or ‘ex cathedra’ (‘from the seat’ or ‘from the pulpit’ in the sense of assertions coming from a priest or imam or rabbi vested with ecclesiastical authority) pronouncements one is expected to simply accept on faith - are, at best, somewhat pale echoes of the real thing.

The real thing is the inner journey of the sadakha (the spiritual seeker), regardless of his or her outer allegiance to this-or-that religious tradition... or no tradition at all. As was so ably said by a spiritual teacher once (copied from a source long ago and the particulars are lost): “if you cannot follow these practice advisories I am imparting to you... well (snort) you might as well just join a religion!” Meaning the term in it’s broad sense of one of the famous five (chronologically Hinduism, Judaism, Buddhism, Christianity and Islam) or some sub-sect of any of them; or, some other tradition like Sikhism, or the Parsis, or even a modern effort at synthesis like Theosophy.

* * *

The Law of One smiles upon all of these. That’s how I’ve come to see it. As many have so ably said, each person is a sort of microcosm of the entire outer universe. We are, within, filled with galaxies and nebulae and all of the many, many, deepening levels of consciousness: from idle daydreams, to the deepest states of epiphany obtained in meditation or prayer or precipitated by some crisis that’s outer (like a car crash), or inner (like the death of a loved one). During our lives here on ‘the physical plane’ so called, we are able to deepen our journey to God.

Some mock at the term, ‘cafeteria-style religionism,’ where one picks and chooses for one’s beliefs in a free and unfettered manner. Where one follows the dictum, ‘seek what the elders sought... not simply to slavishly follow in *the ways* of the elders.’ The grail is as ever. A sense of a deepening and unshakeable communion-with and affiliation-with, God. Moreover, the pivotal question is as ever: “what is God?” God can be notioned and understood in the most primitive terms imaginable (e.g. some white-bearded guy sitting on a cloud), or in a quite sophisticated manner (the FMW philosophical scaffolding addressing “consciousness-without-an-object-and-without -a-subject.”). The particulars are of secondary consequence. Do you *feel* you are in communion with God? In your reaching out to God, do you *feel* a loving responsiveness? If you do, then in my opinion you are on the right path. I am impelled to craft these books because of such a felt communion; because of a felt loving responsiveness. I understand now that I cannot directly impart this to others, as they are *inner* sensations. The reader must seek for his or her own *inner* sensations of gaining nearness with God; either via service-to-otherself; or, service-to-ownself.

CHAPTER ONE: THE FUNDAMENTAL PLURALISM OF INDIAN CULTURE AND ACTUAL HINDUISM

Actual Hinduism is the Hinduism that acknowledges that, (a), the *Pluralism* of Indian Culture - now and historically - has many degrees of interaction with, and variance from, 'main-stream' Hinduism, and by no means are all persons in India "Hindu" in even the broadest terms; and, (b) Hinduism in such very broad terms encompasses far more than what is popularized in thumbnail sketches of Hindu religious thought and practice. And official cant about Hinduism.

Alas, for shortsighted political purposes - where it is so convenient to set up some form of 'us versus them' cultural tension, so as to polarize the electorate to view as sanctified one group, while all who are other than that group are demonized - it is a treacherous short-cut to power to try this style of speechifying. This disease has been promulgated in the USA with dangerous consequences of late - a resurgence of what gets called "nativism" in historical terms - by an egomaniacal bully and pathological liar who's also a racist and a business world cheat, named D.J.T. (I prefer to use just his initials). DJT schemed and bullied his way to an actual term as President by baldly promoting racism and anti-immigrant stereotypes. His goal is a personal tyranny. He wishes to be an Authoritarian. A Tyrant. A 'Pharaoh' or 'Caesar' wholly dispensing with any democratic institutions except to hollow them out and use them as sham. "Worship ME!

This of course is a playbook that's as old as mankind itself. "X" is God! All who don't agree? Execute them. Burn them at the stake. Use means even more savage. No mercy.

Apologists for the vile liars of this ilk who stir up subliminal rages in their audiences in order to grab political power by any and all means fair or foul, are always wanting to throw some word salad of distraction from the fundamental evil of such a leader. Need I look far for evidence? Hardly. Consider the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi. Who led modern India to independence in 1947 and championed an end to caste-ism and religious bigotry. Well today there are actually belligerent nativists in India who champion that assassin as some sort of "saint," when in point of fact such a one did the work of the very devil himself, quite as much as Judas ever did or John Wilkes Booth. Still and all, aren't such bad actors part of the historical drama? Indeed they are. But they who would lionize such promoters of division - and, yes, fascism - are, unwittingly perhaps, signing their own death warrants. Unwitting? Perhaps. But doomed all the same to the karmic consequences of their opposition to compassion; to non-sectarianism; to forbearance.

Some might feel I am being over-harsh in my condemnation of India's current Prime Minister Narendra Modi and his so-called Modi government, which scapegoats Muslims as the easiest target so as to fortify a tyranny of Us versus Them; using all manner of sectarian buzz-words and stereotypes. Alas, I'm not being harsh enough. There can be no palaver with a war criminal like Putin. But Modi wants to say otherwise. He's no better than Gandhi's new assassin and the enemy of pluralism, tolerance and benevolence; his "neutrality" amounts to being Putin's ally. A sad chapter for a storied ancient religion. By no means the first such. *Hopefully* the last.

CHAPTER ONE: THE FUNDAMENTAL PLURALISM OF INDIAN CULTURE
AND ACTUAL HINDUISM

(continued, p2)

It is regrettable but necessary to start off with such uncompromising criticism of the current Indian national government: trying to hollow out the judiciary, as even as I write.

To be fair the governments that supervise Islam - Saudi Arabia, the Persian Gulf states, Iran, Pakistan, the minority Islamism of Indonesia plus minority Islamism elsewhere (plus the Islamic backsliding of “secular, modern” Turkey under it’s current dictator Erdogan) - are hardly paragons of tolerance and virtue either.

Iran and Pakistan in particular are a poster child for state sponsored terrorism; disdain toward and persecution of minority religions; and - all too often if not systemic - corruption; plus a general militarism that shows marked tendencies towards outright, full scale authoritarian totalitarianism. In other words as Modi and his ilk see it, India is in a rough neighborhood and is best off imitating the rough justice of it’s uncouth neighbors - notably Pakistan - among whom are also it’s borders shared with totalitarian CCP mainland China, *and* “...a [Ukraine-invading] Russia that’s drifted out into an Asiatic imperial [dictator-led] posture.” [1] Small wonder then, that Modi has come to current power. Yet - all-importantly - India remains a genuinely democratic nation; indeed, the most populous one in the world. Thus India has core values shared with the USA and western Europe, while remaining a proud and *very* idiosyncratic great world power.

In this case, “idiosyncratic” carries truly positive intimations. Whereas China is belligerently atheistic under it’s current CCP dictatorship; and so is Russia (despite fig leaf alignment with a fawning and toadying Russian Orthodox Church); India is proudly - almost defiantly - religious. Deeply so. I saw it firsthand. So, however much the current government wants to debase that religiosity in the name of convenient “us-them” sectarian tensions, the truth of the matter is that throughout it’s long history - which stretches back into the mists of little known prehistory - India has been a land of religious pluralism. And, all-in-all, religious tolerance. Even during the era when Buddhism sought to supplant Hinduism... and the era when the Muslim rulers sought to supplant Hinduism... Hinduism survived in all the nooks and crannies of a vast India, and oftener than not returned more of tolerance than some other religious traditions which sought so hard to supplant it. To render Hinduism but a dusty memory. Yet such was not to be.

Why was it not to be? The answer is that - like religious traditions worldwide - Hinduism remained refreshed by the twin wellsprings of great religious traditions everywhere. Firstly, the arising of sometimes *deeply* Realized mystics. Secondly, a sanctity accessible to the masses. Also, ever is it true that a tradition venerated across many generations - whether Hindu or Jewish or any other - becomes remarkably tenacious in the collective memory by reasons most obscure.

[1] diplomat Ian Lesser, head of German Marshall Fund, quoted on pA9 of the 6/13/22 NYT. Two [parentheticals] added.

CHAPTER ONE: THE FUNDAMENTAL PLURALISM OF INDIAN CULTURE

AND ACTUAL HINDUISM

(continued, p3)

A sanctity accessible to the masses - and the drip-drip of truly realized Mystics - are the twin wellsprings that keep a religious tradition afloat, and what serves to set apart the most impactful and widespread of these (again chronologically Hinduism, Judaism, Buddhism, Christianity and Islam) are the more numerous presence of their life-renewing-to-the-tradition Mystics; and, yes, forms of belief and sanctity which are indeed accessible, and which do appeal to a broad public. (As to the obscure-of-origin durability of tradition generally, there's more than inertia at work.)

In the case of Hinduism - whose birthplace is of course India but has spread elsewhere, notably throughout the archipelago of Indonesia - the signal element of such readily understood sanctity is numerous gods and goddesses. Roadside shrines to nature deities seen as inhabiting creeks and springs or nearby mountains, are a commonplace in India. Such shrines indeed attract veneration. I remember one just outside Chamba in Himachal Pradesh State at the site of a roadside spring. (Chamba became my adoptive home base while in India and I hope that the family of Mr Dev Barotra - who offered such kind hospitality - still prospers there).

Indeed recent archaeological research indicates that a constellation of nature gods venerated along the banks of the Indus River (now largely in the state of Pakistan) are the actual roots to, and precursors of, present day Hinduism. One such divinity was Shiva, very ancient statues of whom have recently been found, and Shiva later became absorbed into the Brahma-Vishnu-Shiva trinity as the principal gods-and-goddesses through whom the infinity of Bhraman is made manifest here in this physical world of planet Earth: which I feel should properly be called *the sacred planet*. We should name it thus in honor of our highest aspiration: soul growth.

So omnipresent is this pluralism of gods and goddesses that at the beginning of their colonizing inroads in the 1650's, the British were quite convinced that the natives, the "Hindoos," were altogether polytheistic. And it may well be that the precursors... the roots... of Hinduism are to be found amongst this-or-that nature god. (Shiva for example is associated with fire and is worshipped by way of *Shaiva-ratri*, or fire ceremonies). However, from an early date - precisely when is a matter of some historical and scholarly debate - the many gods-and-goddesses, whose total number are said to be in the thousands but can be deemed infinite in number, became woven into a teaching emphasizing Unity.

It is precisely in such teachings about a veiled, omnipresent Unity, that Hinduism articulated yet again - as has been done from truly ancient prehistoric times and throughout the world - the Law of One. The title of this book uses this term. While the answer to "what is the Law of One" can be couched in diverse ways, I favor Ra's: that infinity/unity are seeded everywhere, however incapable of detecting it we individually are; and that we each are essentially a vessel of that Unity; that we each are, in fact, the whole universe writ into microcosmic terms with massive skill, and so we each are not just *an echo* of Intelligent Infinity, but - in potentiation - *the whole* of Intelligent Infinity; like seeds.

CHAPTER ONE: THE FUNDAMENTAL PLURALISM OF INDIAN CULTURE

AND ACTUAL HINDUISM

(continued, p4)

Such a broad-stroke reference to The Law of One serves as fitting transition to the aliveness of what I feel is best called Actual Hinduism. Hinduism as genuinely reflective of the fundamental pluralism of Indian Culture. And what better way to signal such pluralism, than by way of brief references to some of India's storied mystics?

Other terms commonly used are *Guru*; *Holy Man* [or Holy Woman]; *Rishi* [Sage]; *Yogi*. *Saint*, *Avatar* [incarnation of God] and *Mahavatar* [very special incarnation of God] are also terms one finds invoked. Nuances of meaning attach to all such disparate terms. It's best not to get bogged down in any fussy classification of them all. Because speaking broadly India is veritably teeming with *sadhus* [renunciants] and among such wandering *holy men* or *yogis* - these three terms being the ones probably most often used - are every kind of person, from outright fraudsters and tricksters and phonies and fakes, to saintly *adepts* [another term] and truly remarkable *sadakhshas* [spiritual seekers; yet another term and the one I do personally prefer for its catholicity and inclusiveness]. Some are ordained monks of this-or-that order... most are not.

As noted already I visited a number of ashrams while in India, and met three personages whom I deem to be genuine spiritual wayshowers at three of those ashrams. Were they 'the real McCoy,' genuine holy men? In my opinion, *yes*. Moreover, all three were what I wish to specifically delineate as service-to-others spiritual wayshowers [1].

They each had different spheres of activity. One was (perhaps still is) of rather less public activity. But was in my impression the most saintly, the most ethereal, of the three. The next was of fairly pronounced public activity. Was an accessible and wise and loving teacher to a great many. The third was of very huge and dramatic public activity. But for all of that, Giantweirdness (my reverent name for God remember) permitted me a brief interaction with this teacher as well.

[1] As opposed to service-to-ownself spiritual wayshowers. The inevitability of moral polarization between these two is a sub-theme of this book, referenced repeatedly. While much nuance is involved, briefly, service to others is just that: the spiritual wayshower or teacher (or Guru if you like) is genuinely motivated by serving the seeker / the student... some, so selflessly, that they prefer being unseen, the better that all credit redounds to The Creator, rather than in any way to themselves. In service to ownself, the spiritual wayshower is *not* ultimately serving the seeker / the student, but rather himself / herself. In effect, such a one is after being worshipped. And regards the acolyte as property; as chattel; as in effect and actually, a captive, a slave. For some ('positive' service-to-ownself wayshowers) such slavery is all, or mostly, voluntary. For others ('negative' service-to-ownself wayshowers), such slavery is all or mostly *coerced* by way of trickery and misleading blandishments; in the sense of someone captured against their will. A prisoner. But enough of such reference to how service-to-ownself has degrees of naked self-dealing and self-inflation. Better to focus on how service to *others* has, likewise, degrees of genuine concern for the seeker, and sometimes to dramatically impactful degree. E.g., 'unseen' wayshowers who wish all credit to go to The Creator; Also, Christ of course: an exemplar of selflessness.

CHAPTER ONE: THE FUNDAMENTAL PLURALISM OF INDIAN CULTURE

AND ACTUAL HINDUISM

(continued, p5)

THE FIRST OF THREE SPIRITUAL WAYSHOWER ENCOUNTERS; A BRIEF REMINISCENCE

In memory's eye this Sadhu or Holy Man was by far the most 'presence-impactful' of the three. As I neared the forest clearing at the ashram of Shivapuri Baba [1] in about February 1995, I saw this astonishing figure sitting there. He seemed wreathed in multiple auras. He veritably exuded a great radiance of spiritual calm and serenity. Three of his disciples or students or followers were sitting cross-legged at his feet (he was seated on a chair). There may have been even five, but certainly not a crowd. Anyhow, I was of course drawn to join them, and soon discovered that one middle-aged Indian fellow - highly educated who spoke good English - was kind of the 'welcoming committee' for this Sadhu. If I answered his many searching queries to his liking that was one thing; luckily I did; but I'm sure if I'd betrayed clumsiness or oafishness or mere idle tourist curiosity, I probably would have been politely asked to depart their small company.

As it was this fellow decided that I would be welcomed, and he spoke briefly with the Sadhu, whose name I was never told - or if I was told I've forgotten - except that they were all from Benares in India where this Sadhu's ashram was located. (He bore a certain resemblance to Maharishi Mahesh Yogi [of TM or Transcendental Meditation, with whom the Beatles briefly studied] based on photos I've seen; but this Sadhu seemed rather a bit younger, so he was not that person I'm fairly sure, as I would have recognized the name; but, of course, I cannot be *absolutely* sure.)

In all events the encounter was quite fleeting. It ended with me being invited to visit their ashram in Benares. I explained I could not owing to visa difficulties, the effort to solve which had brought me to Kathmandu. So I took leave of their small forest-glen assembly. Still and all the radiance of that seated figure - his palpable otherworldliness and a felt spiritual beatitude - were, and are, quite indelible in memory's eye. Moreover it's interesting that he was there. It were as if he bore inward linkage to Shivapuri Baba; whom I fancied had come back to life in him! For surely had Shivapuri Baba been still alive, he would have had a kindred radiance.

[1] "A Hindu Sage Living in Nepal," 9/27/1826 to __/__/1963, aged 137 years. Shivapuri Baba's biography, "Long Pilgrimage - The Life and Teachings of the Shivapuri Baba" by John Godolphin Bennett (6/8/1897 - 12/13/1974, age 77) was based on Bennett's 1961 and 1963 visits to this ashram outside Kathmandu, Nepal. Shivapuri Baba passed away or 'transitioned to larger life' as I like to put it, shortly after approving Bennett's biography. My visits to the sylvan ashram grounds were most impactful. Gentle, subdued grace seemed to suffuse them. The staff there were most kind. I was even given certain materials in hopes I could assist in Shivapuri Baba's spiritual advice on "Swadharma," or right living, becoming better known in the west, but alas these materials were lost in a fire; albeit, prior, I had decided not to pour effort into their editing and publication, feeling that Bennett's biography was the best summary for readers worldwide, as to Shivapuri Babaji's teachings, and one that Shivapuri Babaji himself had personally approved.

CHAPTER ONE: THE FUNDAMENTAL PLURALISM OF INDIAN CULTURE

AND ACTUAL HINDUISM

(continued, p6)

THE SECOND OF THREE SPIRITUAL WAYSHOWER ENCOUNTERS; A BRIEF REMINISCENCE

In about November of 1994 (as noted my diary, etc., were all lost in the 8/18/20 fire), I traveled to Lucknow in India where Poonjaji [1] was then teaching publicly at regularly scheduled satsangs. He had gathered quite an enthusiastic assemblage of students, and had been mentioned in the 1992 Edition of the Lonely Planet guidebook on India, which I'd been using quite religiously as a way of selecting out a path for a grand tour of places in all the length and breadth of India.

I attended one of these meetings and was very much taken with Poonjaji's way of answering written queries from attendees, which were passed up to him after the "satsang" - a fairly formal spiritual-themed group meeting with a spiritual teacher/wayshower - had begun with a period of silent group meditation. My written query had been among those passed forward from the crowd of about two hundred persons, but had not been selected by Poonjaji from the tray of notes. I shrugged this off and left, thinking my train reservation was next day and I wouldn't return.

However I unexpectedly discovered I had an extra day, so I returned from my hotel to attend a second satsang, which began about 9am the following day. Where, to my surprise - after the obligatory group silent meditation which had begun the meeting - I heard Poonjaji reading my written question as the very first one he selected from the tray (evidently, queries from the previous day had been left in the tray). How I wish I could recall the exact wording of that query, but I do recall it's general import: "God as the universe, and God as The Self. Are these two the same?"

Poonjaji let out a jolly chuckle and laughed. "Why of course; that's how it is!" And asked that I come forward to sit in front (certain questioners whose written queries he liked were thus invited). The hall was quite crowded but I made my way to near him. Then all I do recall is a rather telling particular that applies I think to assemblages around teachers slightly or greatly famous. His earnest, well-meaning 'handlers' or assistants were whispering amongst themselves like hissing bees! I know they *meant* well. But it resonated: such adjutants can get "lost" in all the minutiae. Plus, the minor drama of who-decides-what; who has more say-so. Petty rivalries.

[1] the H.W.L. Poonja (/ / - / /) wikipedia article likely provides more particulars but from his 1940's visits onwards he was a disciple of Ramana Maharshi (12/30/1879-4/14/1950 aged 70) of Tiruvannamalai Ashram in the town of that name in Tamilnadu, India. The Wikipedia entry for R. Maharshi - "https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ramana_Maharshi" - gives his philosophy as "Self-enquiry (Jnana Yoga)" and runs to about fifty pages, reflective of R.M.'s widespread fame. (cf. viewing at 5:44 p.m. Wed 6/15/22). The R.M. Ashram has been cited already of course on p9 of the Introduction. While not consulted in writing the above, I'm fairly sure that the entry for Poonjaji, surmised to be "https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/_Poonjaji," will offer more particulars; as will be noted accordingly in any later re-writing of the above.

CHAPTER ONE: THE FUNDAMENTAL PLURALISM OF INDIAN CULTURE

AND ACTUAL HINDUISM

(continued, p7)

THE SECOND OF THREE SPIRITUAL WAYSHOWER ENCOUNTERS; A BRIEF REMINISCENCE

(continued, p2)

In other words while wrestling with diverse minutiae, bickering and factionalism is near to inevitable and that's in fact what I was witnessing. One of his devotees was hissing/whispering that Poonjaji shouldn't have so long a darshan today, as he'd been feeling tired (Poonjaji was then in his 70's); The other two were disagreeing somehow. I don't recall the details. Certainly they all were loving disciples and meant well. That's why they felt so strongly. Which led to all this hissing. Which distracted me from anything P. was saying. And certainly none of them were listening either. Was I getting to see in microcosm what assails religious movements built around this-or-that teacher/Guru? Distraction with minutiae? Factionalism? Is 'palace intrigue' something that inevitably swirls, inasmuch one is sort of 'near to power' with the burden of special duties, and then having to tussle with other officiants, who are just a tad jealous maybe, and who are jostling for higher / nearer authority themselves? Well, that's what I felt I was seeing. Human nature on display. At the time I regarded them all as foolish, but now I see this was all an expression of their love and concern for Poonjaji. They all cared. Their arguing was well meaning. Indeed, one can extend this insight to the arena of mystics who struggle to articulate the ineffable. I'm reminded of the interesting divergence that FMW felt from Aurobindo whom he greatly admired, over the issue of how 'high up' into cosmic consciousness a condition of lofty personhood, so to say, persists. Aurobindo felt such Singularity was all-pervasive. FMW demurred. While I think I understand the problem and see it from both sides, actually - Singularity *is* extremely subtle and moreover is quite capable of veiling Itself into utter invisibility - I do actually feel more in accord with Aurobindo. To put it crudely: even though we each are the ONE in The Law of One, a very discerning choreography of our individual natures is ever at play. Sometimes we sense this. Sometimes not. *But It's there.*

THE THIRD OF THREE SPIRITUAL WAYSHOWER ENCOUNTERS; A BRIEF REMINISCENCE

My third vignette concerns the briefest of encounters with Sathya Sai Baba (11/23/1926 - 4/24/2011) [1] at his main ashram, Prasanthi Nilayam in Puttarthi India, in about October 1994.

[1] In 1940 he stated he was the reincarnation of Shirdi Sai Baba, renowned for his manner of combining both Islamic and Hindu spiritual teachings. Commentators dispute whether his was "a new religious movement" or a "cult." Clearly, he sought a "living synthesis of world religious traditions" and advocated for "an interfaith movement." His motto was "*Love All, Serve All. Help Ever, Hurt Never.*" Interestingly, "The Vancouver Sun [newspaper] in 2001 reported that Sai Baba told his adherents not to browse the internet." Notwithstanding diverse controversies about this and other issues, I do feel S.B. was/is 'The Real McCoy.' See: "https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sathya_Sai_Baba" [my cites are from there per a viewing on the evening of Wednesday 6 / 15 / 22].

CHAPTER ONE: THE FUNDAMENTAL PLURALISM OF INDIAN CULTURE

AND ACTUAL HINDUISM

(continued, p8)

THE THIRD OF THREE SPIRITUAL WAYSHOWER ENCOUNTERS; A BRIEF REMINISCENCE

(continued, p2)

At the time I was told - and it certainly seemed true - that his was the largest ashram in all the world. It had it's own airport. It encompassed an entire valley. There was an upscale hotel; another hotel; and inexpensive barracks-style accommodations for the majority of the thousands upon thousands of devotees - mostly Indian but other nationalities too - who were there when I visited. Overall, the grounds seemed to encompass many thousands of acres. Moreover I had seen posters with Sai Baba's photograph just about everywhere in my travels throughout India. It certainly seemed that Sai Baba was by far the most popular of all the countless Gurus in all of India at the grassroots level and at other strata of society also, right up to top government officials.

Well to make a long story short I pretty much despaired of even catching a glimpse of Sai Baba, much less saying anything to him. But Giantweirdness - or if you prefer the more formal appellation, THE ONE INFINITE CREATOR OF INTELLIGENT INFINITY - had other plans. Unbeknownst to me. For it transpired that at the barracks-style tent-like housing, I ran into a friendly young Indian devotee - a policeman in point of fact as he explained to me proudly - who seemed to know all the latest wrinkles in Sai Baba's schedule, which had become somewhat more curtailed owing to a recent assassination attempt or so I was told. Moreover he spoke excellent English. (A language barrier often impeded me, but almost all Indians seemed to know at least a smattering of English words and quite a few were more literate still). Anyhow my newfound friend - I'll call him Anil - very patiently explained exactly what I had to do if I wished to catch a glimpse of Sai Baba. "Volunteer to be in the sunrise church chorus for tomorrow morning! Then, once you have all finished your devotional singing in the church, you will - on account of such service - be permitted to sit nearer the pathway between Sai Baba's personal quarters, and his short walk to the church. For this early morning short walk of his, nowadays, is his only public appearance every day."

Anil's advice proved to be spot on. I volunteered for the choir and after the singing and the church service - which was quite ecumenical in nature in keeping with the goal of a "living synthesis of world religious traditions" - we hundred or more choir volunteers were guided to more-or-less 'front row seats' next to the pathway Sai Baba would soon proceed along. Behind us spread - already at this early hour - row upon row of many thousands of other devotees. And the sun was just beginning to rise. We all sat, cross-legged, expectantly, on the vast lawn. Then - sure enough - Sai Baba emerged from the doorway of his private residence, in his familiar bright saffron robe with his familiar large Afro-style hair. And began to walk slowly along the pathway, on the left of which were all we devotees. Many handed him notes and letters which he passed to an aide just behind... *(continued on next page)*

CHAPTER ONE: THE FUNDAMENTAL PLURALISM OF INDIAN CULTURE

AND ACTUAL HINDUISM

(continued, p9)

THE THIRD OF THREE SPIRITUAL WAYSHOWER ENCOUNTERS; A BRIEF REMINISCENCE

(continued, p3)

him. Thusly he proceeded along the pathway, lined with devotees on it's one side (on the other side no-one was permitted and the walls of the church were nearby on that side as well), in a leisurely fashion; many just wanted to touch the hem of his garment, or to touch his feet, for in India it's a widespread belief that even to just touch the physical embodiment of a true God-devoted Sadhu (Holy Man), is a great boon and assist to one's spiritual journey of escape from the cruel wheel of karma; of entrapment in this woebegone physical realm. At least thus runs much of Indian / Hindu thinking as I've come to understand it. As I will comment on later.

Sai Baba was 67 at that time - almost 68 - but seemed tall and fit, and had a smiling demeanor. All in all, he seemed to be - and still seems to me - an altogether benign figure; a loving teacher. Finally he arrived to the devotees just in front of me (I was only three or four rows back). And - quite suddenly and without any premonition about it on my part - he lifted his gaze from the devotees along the front of the path who were handing him letters or notes or just touching at his garments or his feet... and stared directly at me. For the briefest of moments but most deliberately.

His gaze was quite calm and even. And seemed quite deliberate as I say and was fixed quite exactly just at me. I was altogether surprised and nonplussed. Such a gaze - a calm gaze by which I mean it had no over-shadowings either of any kind of too indulgent lovingness nor of any mean nor unfriendly tonalities - was, I felt at the time, and still feel, something of an unexpected boon. An honor of sorts. Some sort of altogether unanticipated recognition. (One that happened just one other similarly memorable time, as is recounted just after this vignette).

Well that was it. That sudden gaze. It transmitted nothing special in the sense of "shaktipat" (the ability of some to transmit by a gaze some sort of 'shakti energy' arising, and/or kindred inner phenomena). It simply was, well, an acknowledgement. Certainly it has led me to more closely examine what is nowadays being said about Sai Baba on the internet (see footnote one on page seven of this Chapter). Which confirms my impressions from back then. That he was and is a benign figure who did what he could, during his physical life (1926-2011), to foster harmony amongst all religions, *and to foster a service-to-others self's morality*. This last trait is all-important. It's a major sub-theme of this book. And it will be reviewed more closely in later Chapters.

A CONCLUDING VERY BRIEF REMINISCENCE

February 1995. I was at an assemblage near a temple complex just outside of Kathmandu, Nepal for shivaratri, an annual special night of honoring God's aspect as Shiva: destroyer/purifier and associated with fire and - usually - wild, almost insane-seeming degrees of asceticism.

CHAPTER ONE: THE FUNDAMENTAL PLURALISM OF INDIAN CULTURE

AND ACTUAL HINDUISM

(continued, p10)

A CONCLUDING VERY BRIEF REMINISCENCE

(continued, p2)

It is of course a vast subject in itself: the slow accretion of myriad nature gods into being seen as facets of one God - *Brahman* in formal Hindu thought as we have it today - who, in and of Itself, is ineffable, veiled; but *can* be seen and *is* seen in His/Its various aspects as fire, water, earth, air (often viewed as the primordial quartet) and, of course in plants, animals; and all of we humans in our experiences of third density consciousness as Ra terms it. [1] Among which, there's Shiva.

In sum *Shiva* is a very prominent aspect of God in the Hindu pantheon, usually denominated Brahma (Creator), Vishnu (Sustainer), Shiva (Destroyer / Purifier). Shiva is very much associated with fire. Also with asceticism. Hence, among renunciants or anchorites - both the holy men who live in caves or trees or forests, or who wander from city to city - an allegiance to Shiva is quite pronounced, if not almost universal. (Shiva's symbolic abode: on Mount Kailash).

Thus it was that at this Shivratri festival at this temple complex outside of Kathmandu a certain outdoor section of the grounds around the temple were kind of reserved exclusively for such renunciants: many of them naked or near naked and smeared with ceremonial ash and paint and others wearing loose orange robes or carrying a trident (usually seen as a symbol of Shiva). All in all, they formed a colorful assemblage. Perhaps twenty or thirty were there. I of course - along with others who were arriving to participate in this shivarati commemoration - felt shy of entering this lawn area where all these anchorites were. So I found a seat around the corner, facing the temple, and began my prayers / meditations. Whereupon, a most curious event transpired and it is a memory I cherish. One of the anchorites came near to where I was seated - about twenty or so seated pilgrims / meditators were between us - and waved and smiled directly at me in a most cheerful manner! He seemed quite happy about seeing me and his salutations were as if I were an 'incognito' associate of himself! E.g., an anchorite dressed in 'civvies'.

[1] By way of quick recapitulation as to the all-is-consciousness worldview espoused in this book I use the Ra schedule of seven "densities," wherein entities experience consciousness: **one** (chemistry, gases, etc) "raw BEINGNESS"; two (plants / animals) "growth, self-replication;" **three** (human-level) "dawn of self-awareness, then moral choosing or moral polarization;" **four** (accords with lower astral, sometimes termed angelic realms / demonic realms) service-to-ownself / service-to-otherselves entities in, respectively, emergent "social memory complexes" that are either service to others... or service to self (warlike, hierarchical); **five** (both sorts of social memory complexes balancing wisdom into their service-to-otherselves or service-to-ownself activities or 'raison d'être;') **six** (accords with lower causal, where service-to-ownself social memory complexes spontaneously reverse polarity to service to otherselves, if they wish to continue their journey into higher levels of indoddedness / exalted consciousness); **seven** (gateway density as to 'light beings' in upper causal realm), a gathering of soul-momentum towards fully and completely merging back into One Creator beingness: Intelligent Infinity and, fulsomely, *foreverness*.

CHAPTER ONE: THE FUNDAMENTAL PLURALISM OF INDIAN CULTURE

AND ACTUAL HINDUISM

(continued, p11)

In the preceding three encounters - with Unknown, Poonjaji and Sai Baba - briefly recounted, plus the concluding ‘very brief reminiscence,’ it must be emphasized throughout and as much as I can that the point is not to ‘toot my own horn.’ Far from it. Rather, to inventory just a sampling of the riches that begin to illuminate a life wherein - however feebly, however haltingly - the focus turns towards The Creator; irrespective of however simply/childishly or subtly/discerningly I’ve been able to conceive of It. Or that any of us becomes able to conceive of It.

“Subtler, far, than mind’s inmost subtlety.” That’s what God is. As to It’s nearness? “I am nearer than knowing.” Such phrases - they amount to meaningful koans actually - ought to be borne in mind as much as possible at all times. I certainly try to. Moreover, the koan of “knowledge through identity.” As in the classic phrase, “I am That.” I am That which I seek. For to be sure, at the very core and center of who we each are; we each are The Creator. Ra makes this exhortation even more impactful. Not only do we each *mirror* The Creator - like dewdrops each mirroring a sparkling reflection of the rising sun - we each *are* The Creator. In toto.

No more appropriate juncture than here, to re-emphasize ‘the job’ confronting we who are presently embodied as human-level consciousness or third density consciousness (see footnote one on the preceding page). According to Ra. Moreover, I’m keenly persuaded that Ra speaks correctly; so, according to “me,” too!

Moral polarization. That’s it in a nutshell. In the one direction? 52% or more, service to otherselves. In the other direction? 98% or more, service to ownself. Both are achieved only with effort, for *both* are 25% divergences in *opposite directions*, from the ‘default setting’ we each use if we don’t examine the matter, of 73% service to ownself / 27% service to otherselves. In other words we each are quite familiar with the rudiments of each polarization! The easy illustration I prefer, is sitting to lunch just mildly hungry and a needy beggar approaches. 27% of the pizza? Is that enough to give? Uncritically, most of us would say yes. But think. What about giving 52% of the pizza to the needy person? That’s what service to otherselves is all about.

Alternatively what about giving almost nothing but a few crumbs of the pizza to the needy person, and probably a scolding to boot? Such would be the action of the service-to-ownself polarized person. “Hooray for me and to hell with you.” At first glance such a ‘wicked’ polarization (as most of us would call it) seems to confer no ‘realization’ benefits to The Creator (in the sense that we each are a unique and unduplicable journey of The Creator in knowing of Itself). But pause to think. In the dungeon of such selfishness are not certain hard-bought truths about The Self to be discovered? I say yes. For The Self can be *either* a cornucopia of blessings; *or*, a dark gaol.

CHAPTER ONE: THE FUNDAMENTAL PLURALISM OF INDIAN CULTURE

AND ACTUAL HINDUISM

(p12: Conclusion)

In other words, when you admit the possibility of the one, it would be dishonest and capricious to somehow try and fence off the other. Nothing reveals the glaring possibilities of genuine wall-to-wall freedom so forcefully, as the willful *misuse* of that freedom. That The Creator thus countenances the misuse of freedom is - in a towering irony - a truly ironclad proof that that freedom exists. Exhibit A from recent world history would be Nazi Germany (3/1/1933 when the Enabling Act gave Adolf Hitler full power, to 5/7/1945 and Germany's unconditional surrender, seven days after Hitler's suicide on 4/30/45: ending WWII in Europe & the 12 year history of national Nazism in Germany) [1]

Ra goes even further. That the road not taken - the road which general ethics moving in the service-to-others direction would call pernicious or wicked or evil - is, actually, a road that the infinite freedom of The Universe does not preclude; and, while it's a road taken only by perhaps around ten percent of all entities who 'graduate' to fourth density consciousness (Ra's term), there are, in fact, social memory complexes on planets other than Earth, where, if you will, an analog to Nazism holds sway: which are dictatorial; hierarchical; built around "elites."

Does all this sound too far afield from Hinduism? Not actually. Recall that the modern word "thug" comes from the "thugees," a sect in Hindu India who regarded their strangulation of victims using colored scarves to be their pious offerings to goddess Kali - often portrayed as a devouring goddess, a kind of female arch-demon - and that it was only with some difficulty that British authorities in India at the time (1780's) squelched the sect. Moreover, there are still schools of thought in Hinduism which are unabashedly focused on sense enjoyments ("they think that life has but one purpose: gratification of the senses" - ch_v_Gita, Ish./Prab. 1947 trsl., see bibliog.).

At a still more sophisticated level of analysis, that which often gets called dark or wicked is part-and-parcel of the warp and woof of things. The challenge is whether to 'venerate' such darkness or to instead venerate its opposite: the light. In other words the entire idea of "me" versus "not me / the world" which is a salient conceptual construct always, can be either 'shrunk' to a secondary status in service-to-others moral polarization; or, 'exploded' to an enormity that in unwise hands becomes grotesque - the parade of tyrants in world history - and very destructive. Elites are always destructive not just of their 'inferiors' but of their own internal cohesion; thus does The Universe have a kind of built-in intelligence that forever erodes "that which is not."

In sum, the huge variety that is Hinduism is no stranger to the dark - most centrally in the distortion of social status as something hereditary (casteism) - but, also, is a wellspring of sweet generous piety shown by untold millions, toward God/the gods. Further Chapters will address both.

[1] pp 291-292 in "Hitler's Last Days" by Bill O'Reilly; 2015 pbk. First Edition; Macmillan; NYC, NY.

CHAPTER TWO: THE ALL IS CONSCIOUSNESS WORLDVIEW AND THE LAW OF ONE

As briefly recounted in Chapter One we each are - in some measure actualized and in some measure still in potentiation - the **entirety** of The Creator. THE ONE INFINITE CREATOR OF INTELLIGENT INFINITY. In terms of the All Is Consciousness Worldview - *consciousness is original, self-existent and constitutive of all things* - this means that you have the capacity to raise your consciousness or to lower your consciousness; to sharpen it or to dull it; to render it more acute or less acute; and so on. Consciousness (or Awareness) is whole. Without boundaries. Not now. Not ever.

To be sure, in ordinary thought, consciousness is considered something in *opposition* to ‘the object,’ or that which is *not* conscious. ‘I am aware, but surely the table is not aware.’ Thus runs conventional analysis which can be called an *uncritical* or a *dualistic* analysis. In order to sharpen such analysis into one acute and unitary worldview, in one direction lies the all-is-consciousness worldview; and in the other direction lies the ‘all-is-raw inert matter or object-ness’ worldview, usually referred to as the materialistic or the *all is matter* worldview. Which says in effect that we all used to be as unconscious as yonder table, but, by evolutionary processes, we at some point slowly gained awareness. Thus, awareness is held to be an *epiphenomenon* of dead, inert, un-alive, and unconscious ‘matter.’

Alternatively in the all-is-consciousness worldview ‘*matter*’ is held to be an epiphenomenon of *consciousness*. To render the assertion properly dramatic? This entire physical universe is arisen from, and reposes in, one primordial consciousness. So do I. So do you. And so does yonder table. *It* participates in the Originating Consciousness as much as you or I or yonder star.

In considering the clash of these two unitary worldviews - the all-is-consciousness worldview versus the all-is-matter worldview - there are profoundly important implications in each direction. In materialism (the all-is-matter worldview), Ultimate Reality is held to be inaccessible and permanently so, inasmuch as it is *unconscious* in every conceivable sense. Thus, we are all arisen from an unconscious substrate of ‘matter.’ From dust we have arisen and to dust we shall return. Sound gloomy? Yep. Anomie. Nihilism. A meaningless, infinite granularity. Suchlike ruminations.

The all-is-consciousness worldview leads to altogether more sunny ruminations but, when assembled over-hastily, they can fall prey to the criticism of being pollyanna-like. Childish. Dreamy. Pie-in-the-sky. Thus, ‘anomie’ (rootlessness) meets its opposite in an ‘over-rooted’ distortion the psychologists call referential mania. Nihilism meets its opposite in what Voltaire so witheringly criticized in “Candide” as the idea that everything’s peachy just as it is; that we live “in the best of all possible worlds.” Well we don’t. But rather than succumbing to this as a dreary prospect, why can it not be a wholly *meaningful* prospect? ‘Let there be peace on Earth and let it begin with me.’ Stated bluntly? Each of us - *each of us!* - has the potential to change the course of all of human history. How shall we use our inner potentials? To serve others? Or, to serve radical, “only me” selfishness?

CHAPTER TWO: THE ALL IS CONSCIOUSNESS WORLDVIEW

AND THE LAW OF ONE (continued, p2)

These dramatic alternatives which are at the very center of moral polarization - *service to otherselves* versus *service to ownself* - bring into sharp relief the central reason the all-is-consciousness worldview is not so easily and widely accepted as one might expect or hope.

Briefly it's this. The standoff between ideas about The Self and ideas about The Object. In an oversimple analysis in either direction the actual veracity of consciousness gets lost in the stampede. In ideas about The Object, we get materialism: “ ‘you’ are basically just a fleeting epiphenomenon from your objectness, and - soon enough - ‘you’/‘your consciousness’ will gutter out and vanish as your objectness / your body ceases viability & cremation or the grave arrives.”

Then in ideas about The Subject, we get the familiar - and easily critiqued - trope of Idealism as it's usually called. That *The Subject* is the be-all and end-all. This gets trumpeted quite as loudly and as uncritically as materialism deifies The Object. A matching uncritical ‘loopiness’ invades the thinking and argumentations of Idealism and its kindred flavor of Romanticism (as in the German Romantic philosophers) and *all other* iterations about The Self as “The” Answer.

What gets lost in this stampede in *either* direction? The ineffable subtlety of consciousness itself

In point of fact, consciousness is *not* something “The Self” manufactures. Similarly:

In point of fact, consciousness is *not* an epiphenomenon arisen from “matter” (materialism).

I must commend one philosopher in particular for rendering this entire issue accessible and clear instead of - as is more usually the case - obscure, murky, and so very difficult to disentangle Franklin Merrell-Wolff (1887-1985) usually referenced in this book as FMW, is the author of a very lucid exposition - his masterpiece as to his writings I would argue - whose trenchant title really says it all: “The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object [and Without a Subject].” [1]

I have come to frame the situation this way. An extrusion of Realness emanates from permanently undefinable Primordial Consciousness or Ground Consciousness, in two directions simultaneously. In the one direction is the familiar field of The Universe so to say, or *subject-object* consciousness with the infinite iterations thereof (chemicals, plants/animals, humans, fourth-fifth-sixth densities and so on). In the other direction is the less familiar field usually termed “Nirvana,” that is, *subject-only* consciousness; “the dazzling dark” [cf. mystic Henry Vaughan (4/17/1621-4/23/1695)].

[1] First Edition 1973, Julian Press (div. of Crown Publishing Group, 1 Park Av, NYC NY 10016) ; Copyright 1973; 1983 Edition also. The addition to the title, “[and Without a Subject]” is implicit, and was acknowledged as such by FMW during his lifetime. The papers and archives of FMW are soon to be housed at Stanford University. See entry number four in Part A of the Annotated Bibliography hereof as to further particulars

CHAPTER TWO: THE ALL IS CONSCIOUSNESS WORLDVIEW

AND THE LAW OF ONE (continued, p3)

In sum this extrusion of Realness - in point of fact *two derivative realities* which are more-over interdependent and which in point of fact *interact* with one another in what amounts to a perpetually ongoing, extremely dynamic equilibrium - constitutes what's ordinarily called All That Is. Except one ingredient is missing. *The* key ingredient. Consciousness-without-an-object and-without-a-subject. Why? Nothing betokens It.

Consider the consequence of this carefully. Nothing betokens It. Since It is “nothing” or “invisible” in and of itself, It's omnipresence is easily overlooked; indeed almost inevitably overlooked.

The now considered antiquated and un-necessary notion of “the Ether” is possibly the closest approximation in metaphysical terms to consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject, alongside the considerable confusion attendant upon Gautama Buddha's expository references to It: which somewhat misleadingly get referenced as the doctrine of “anatman” (no self).

Such a term - “anatman” meaning no self - leads to a classical dust-up between Hindu thought as classically propounded, and Buddhist thought as classically propounded. Remember, too, and it is by no means incidental, that Buddhism arose as a correction to and a refinement of, the Hinduism prevalent at the time of Gautama Buddha. Thereafter, Shankara (circa 580 - 620 A.D.) sought to bring clarification to the matter; indeed, some regard Shankara as a reincarnation of Gautama Buddha who sought - as Gautama Buddha did - a revival and reinvigoration of Hindu religiosity. The aim being to render Hindu metaphysics *more sophisticated*.

In brief a resolution of the dust-up is as follows; and moreover it is important to provide such resolution as, otherwise, general onlookers cannot be faulted for concluding that *both* Buddhism and Hinduism are built upon unsound and flawed precepts. Thus, on the one hand, Hinduism with it's teaching about “Atman” (the Self), extols a seeking for Atman as the gateway to Nirvana (the ‘blown out’ state usually characterized as Liberation in an inward and spiritual sense).

Buddhism *also* constitutes a teaching conducive to Liberation in an inward and spiritual sense but - seemingly in contradiction - a position is put forward that the Ultimate Real is “anatman” rather than “atman” (The Self). What is the reconciliation? Simply this. Nirvana - ‘self only’ consciousness or the “dazzling dark” (see Special Appendix A) - is a Liberation, yes, above which reposes a *still greater* Condition wherein there is *neither* Nirvana *nor* “Samsara”, (world-appearances or Maya or ‘the realm of objects’ and routine subject-object consciousness). Hence one can notion it thus: upon attaining Nirvana, Nirdvandva (to wit, consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject) is the yet further or “higher” Condition. Yet Nirdvandva is just as much “low” because in point of fact it's everywhere always and is the essence or *prana* (energy) in everything; yet it's forever un-discernible. Invisible. Secret. Subtle. Truly the treasure ‘hidden’ in plain view.

CHAPTER TWO: THE ALL IS CONSCIOUSNESS WORLDVIEW

AND THE LAW OF ONE (continued, p4)

In modern physics terms, something of an analog exists - or if you will a metaphor - for consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject. The so-called *Higgs-boson* particle as to subatomic physics - the realm of quantum physics - whose existence was recently confirmed after great experimental effort at CERN, the internationally-administered and funded linear accelerator in Switzerland. [1] Yet this subatomic particle and the elusive, all-important role it basically plays - 'holding everything together' - cannot be but an analog or a metaphor for consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject. For strictly speaking the Higgs-boson and all that it 'holds together' is of a piece with subject-object consciousness: the ordinary human-level consciousness we all use to be aware of the physical universe all around us that we usually denominate as an 'outside' actual reality, *albeit, we co-participate in it's being-ness*.

This selfsame physical universe is of course apprehended as well by plants and animals which in some respects may have more acute sensibilities (e.g. the olfactory discernment of a bloodhound or the sonar ability used by bats in flight), but are not focused upon the self-awareness development - and the moral-polarization development - which are so much Job One for we of the human consciousness spectrum, or "third density" awareness cf. Ra.

I use as my working hypothesis concerning the all-is-consciousness worldview I am espousing, Ra's presentation concerning *seven densities* of consciousness:

- One. Primordial chemicals consciousness. Experience of elemental, near-timeless Beingness.
- Two. Plant / animal consciousness. Growth and self-replication.
- Three. Human-level consciousness. Dawn of self awareness and then *the moral polarization*.
- Four. (akin to the lower astral). *Love* of morally polarized angel / demon social memory complexes.
- Five. (akin to the upper astral). A *wisdom* is gained to match the love abilities of fourth density.
- Six. (akin to the lower causal). Further balancing of love-with-wisdom of either "love" and then the spontaneous reversal of polarization of hitherto service-to-ownself entities, if they wish to journey further towards the Beingness of Intelligent Infinity / The Creator.
- Seven. (akin to the upper causal). A Gateway Density of consciousness wherein the entity or social-memory-complex (Ra's term), attains to so deep a comprehension of a very thick or 'dense' consciousness, that a re-mergence with the Allness of Intelligent Infinity / The Creator draws nigh, and both Nirvana *and* World Awareness are massive and acute.

[1] Named in honor of the Scottish physics professor, Prof. Higgs, who first put forward in theoretical form the argument that - if the modern quantum physics model about subatomic particles is correct - there should exist a very elusive subatomic particle - the *Higgs-boson* particle - that should be discernible as a byproduct of subatomic particles colliding at sufficiently high velocities, and whose role is briefly described as 'the glue that holds everything together.' [An addition to this footnote provides quote(s) from internet references, should time permit, prior to this the First Edition of "Hinduism and The Law of One." -LH, 5/16/23. See future pages for same.]

CHAPTER TWO: THE ALL IS CONSCIOUSNESS WORLDVIEW

AND THE LAW OF ONE (continued, p5)

The preceding schematic is with relation to ‘ordinary’ or ‘subject-object’ consciousness, where an entity - a plant or animal or human, or an entity of fourth, fifth, sixth or seventh density beingness / embodiment - is experiencing an embodiment or a reincarnation *in The Universe*. Each such embodiment is interleaved with a ‘death’ phase where the entity in effect takes a break from embodiment and undergoes a life review experience; wherein the lessons of the embodied life just experienced can be analyzed and digested, with a view toward ‘programming’ catalyst (Ra’s term) for a further or future life embodiment that will continue the soul maturation of the entity; in effect the ‘soul growth’ of the entity.

Now the preceding paragraph packs together a number of assumptions or working hypotheses about how the souls of individual entities - and then entities in social memory complexes (Ra’s term) - progress and develop, through densities one through seven as just summarized. They are my present assumptions. I cannot “prove” any of them in a conventional western-science sense, as to an experiment where one or more subjects are observed in a clinical setting by one or more scientific observers, who aspire to an objective, replicable-experimental, legitimacy. Does this mean my assumptions are will-o-the-wisp; sheer speculation? No. Albeit, some might choose to criticize them as such. But they are not.

My assumptions are, rather, the result of 43 years of imperiences (inward consciousness experiences) since on or about 8/15/1979 where at age 32 I discern my ‘career in mysticism’ commenced. Certain key developments in that career - which amount to a deepening sense of interaction with, and awareness of the presence of THE ONE INFINITE CREATOR OF INTELLIGENT INFINITY - are reprised in Special Appendix A to this book. They are suggestive. But cannot be definitive.

Reading of those experiences might be impactful for some readers. But it’s by no means my intention to ask any reader to simply accept the conclusions I’ve drawn based merely on my say-so. This would amount to the age-old trap of ‘acceptance upon authority.’ The creation of a dogma. While such is of the path commonly referenced as institutional religious tradition, and can be a helpful stepping-stone for some, it can be a definite impediment for others, and the whole enterprise in general can be criticized as: “religion is the acceptance of the experiences of others, whereas spirituality is the building of conviction from *personal* experiences.” These two forms, while not mutually exclusive, are akin to living ‘in someone else’s house,’ versus *your* house. The goal, quite obviously, is for you to live in your own house. Your own edifice of rock-solid conviction about the nearness and the reality of The Creator. As a Presence wholly interactive with *you*. ‘The Creation is The One Infinite Creator’s gift to Itself, so that It may experience an infinite number of pathways, for Itself, back to Itself.’ That’s the best summation I’ve been able to come up with. One of those pathways is the one I’ve found. Each reader will likewise journey upon his / her own personally discovered pathway. Some paths will wander

CHAPTER TWO: THE ALL IS CONSCIOUSNESS WORLDVIEW

AND THE LAW OF ONE (continued, p6)

this or that way, and will be slow in ripening; some will be direct and most impactful in personal terms regardless how well or poorly this is shared with others, and whether it's a path arisen out from a religious milieu, or from no 'traditional' milieu whatsoever.

Now while all this is indeed true it's undeniable that in overall terms each journey is impactful upon each and every *other* journey. This is a yet further working hypothesis. Part of this assumption is buttressed by evidence that's near at hand. That persons of one or the other faith group interact with - and are influenced by - one another. This is true even of groups that are viewed as iconoclastic and rebellious. [1] The other part of this assumption is so to say veiled; mysterious; transcendent of time and place. What I mean is that I suspect - and to some extent know - that there is a sort of fraternity of The Realized; that many souls long ago Awakened, mystically, are yet among us, and silently offer help and encouragement. Sometimes in ways surpassingly adroit and nuanced.

There are many, many ways to try and get a handle on what such a journey essentially includes. It is even possible to associate each of 'the famous five' with key motifs and advisories:

- Hinduism. Tremendous variety as to spiritual practices; an 'otherworldliness' for better or worse.
- Judaism. A focus upon The Creator as uppermost; the ties of religious community as intense.
- Buddhism. Quite dramatic in countenancing both service to ownself and service to otherselves.
- Christianity. Global compassion. Very distinct: service to otherselves as a true moral imperative.
- Islam. The "Sunni / Shiite" schism: yet *another* echo of schisms endemic in *all* traditions.

Even a casual inventory of all that's associated with the effort of any human consciousness to arise toward Cosmic Consciousness, Spiritual Consciousness, Nirvana, Samadhi - how many are the terms! - presents us with a seemingly bewildering array of choices and practices. How is one ever to make sense of it all? This is a challenge each must undertake on his or her own terms.

For my part I see fit to emphasize what I adduce to be the key directive in The Ra Material ("The Ra Contact: Teaching the Law of One;" see annotated bibliography). That one must *morally polarize* insofar as one wishes to journey from third density (human consciousness) to fourth density (a realm aligned with a so-called lower astral plane having both 'angelic' and 'demonic' regions).

[1] For example the so-called beats in the milieu of 1950's San Francisco and elsewhere, whose more famous figures are Allen Ginsberg (his landmark poem "Howl" plus many other writings), William Burroughs (the so-called Godfather of the beats, author of "Naked Lunch" and much else), Jack Kerouac ("On the Road"), Neal Cassady and a supporting cast of many others perhaps lesser known, but still of a piece with a struggle against crass materialism, conformity, and unadventurous / 'shallow' spirituality. The 1960's "hippy" era continued this struggle, and has similarly been misunderstood as without mystic depth. Well it had - and *does have* - mystic depth. Even if missed by some; and unrecognized by many.

CHAPTER TWO: THE ALL IS CONSCIOUSNESS WORLDVIEW

AND THE LAW OF ONE (continued, p7)

“In the mind complex the Matrix [No. 1 in the Major Arcana of the Tarot Cards images and shown on p 455 of Vol. II] may be described as consciousness. It has been called the Magician [e.g., magic as in ‘some thing out of nothing’]. **It is to be noted that, of itself, consciousness** [*meaning, truly, consciousness without-an-object-and-without-a-subject* cf FMW] **is unmoved.**”

“The Potentiator of consciousness is the unconscious [to wit, incipient or in-potential contents in consciousness that repose in The Self, or, deep in Nirvana Consciousness, Self-only Consciousness, still as yet absent from any thought-projection / will-projection manifestation into full subject-object consciousness]. This encompasses a vast realm of potential in the mind [before bifurcation *in a perpetual equilibrated optimum arousal* as betwixt *space/time* or subject-object consciousness, and *time/space* or subject-only predominant, ‘Nirvana Reality’ consciousness]. ...the original Potentiator was light in its sudden and fiery form ...lightning itself [betokening the Creative Power reposing in Self-only consciousness, Nirvana Consciousness; the entirety and totality of consciousness in *time/space* which can and does flow forth into subject-object manifestation in a perpetual and eternal sense].” 78:11 [1]

The above quotation - with my five [interpositions] - represents my best effort so far, in endeavoring to integrate the concepts and language of Ra with the concepts and language of FMW in his “The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object [and Without a Subject].” [see entry Number Four in Part A of the Annotated Bibliography hereto]. For, these two spiritual advisories as I regard them, are fixed in a pantheon of five spiritual advisories whose import I single out for special attention and, on a personal level, all five of them are rich with valuable advice:

The Bhagavad Gita. “The Lord is Everywhere and Always Perfect.” [ch_v_, Ish. / Prab. 1947 tr.]

The Law of One. “You are unity. You are infinity. You are love/light, light/love. You are.

This is The Law of One.” p. 16, Vol. I in “The Ra Contact: Teaching the

Law of One,” 2018, the ‘Third’ Edition [2]

Autobiography of a Yogi. The ‘weird’ everywhere-ness of God: here, and in all higher realms.

The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object (and Without a Subject). See quote above.

The Path of the Masters. The *audible life stream* or “bani” vibrations *emanate all of creation*.

I so esteem these five spiritual advisory texts that they constitute a PART A in my bibliography.

While I do thus recommend them each must - of course - choose his/ her *own* key set of texts.

[1] p. 198 in Vol. II of “The Ra Contact: Teaching the Law of One.” Publ. 2018. Six important interpretive [interpositions] added.

[2] Inasmuch as I reference “the big blue books” as the first edition and the Schiffer-as-publisher, the second edition, this is the ‘third’ edition; however (footnote one, p 258, Vol. II): “the original transcripts from the cassette recordings were published in four books under the title, “The Law of One” (the ‘big blue books’ or ‘first edition’).” ...then “years later in 1998” a “fifth book containing fragments omitted...” was published (Schiffer: part of ‘second edition’). “See ‘The Relistening Report’ in Vol. I [of this ‘third’ edition] for information about how the new transcriptions were produced and consequently this book, The Ra Contact, published.” Thus, the ‘third edition’ is an extremely reworked and massively improved edition; so much so, it deservedly can be termed more than a ‘third edition’ but rather, *a new first edition* in important respects. Further remark is at Entry Number Two in Part A of The Annotated Bibliography hereto.

CHAPTER TWO: THE ALL IS CONSCIOUSNESS WORLDVIEW

AND THE LAW OF ONE (continued, p8)

The reason for searching out correspondences between such disparate texts is twofold. Firstly it's important to effectively demonstrate correspondences, inasmuch as no effort to do so leaves the texts seemingly at loggerheads and invites the criticism that all of them are balderdash inasmuch as they do not agree. Well - once some degree of mystically-infused / spiritually-infused awareness has begun to dawn in the sadakha (the spiritual seeker) and these texts acquire a new-found degree of legitimacy for him/her - it's important *not* to leave an impression for the general public that all of them are, as it were, helter-skelter; but are to deeply important degrees correlated.

Secondly such efforts at establishing such correlations - for they are indeed there, upon enough careful examination - amount to a tremendous assist to the inward development of one's own spiritual attunement.

In other words there *is* a potency and an urgency to the spiritual quest, and, intelligent infinity *can* be communed with on an individual and private inward basis. Are there degrees as to how well this is accomplished? Yes no doubt. No two such inward communions will ever be exactly the same. Moreover - as all five of the just referenced texts make clear - there are degrees of depth as to such communion... what would popularly be called 'intimacy with God.' The legacy of all religious faith traditions are peppered with the biographies of saints and adepts and their sometimes dramatic displays of a gaining of power in a spiritual sense, and then displaying these compassionately: e.g., spontaneous or miraculous healings, helpful telekinesis, and many other phenomena. (Such displays done merely for boasting purposes are deleterious.)

For it's also the case that certain adepts can bend such spiritual power to personal self-aggrandizement to such a predominant, near-exclusive degree, that the moral polarization of service-to-ownself is the path being chosen. What's the elixir? Power. Power felt in personal terms. In the primordial and ultimately profoundly mysterious architecture of The Self. Hence the tales of a "Satan" figure at war with God as it were: the a result of hubris and jealousy.

Withal, the takeaway from my present analysis is this. Ra's use of "space/time" is in reference to *subject-object consciousness* cf. FMW (op cit) and the ordinary experience of all of us. Versus, "time/space," where *subject-only consciousness deepens and intensifies*; these two do indeed interact: "the indigo ['third eye'] ray is the ray of the adept. ...There is an identification between the crystallization of that energy center and the improvement of... the mind/body/spirit [complex, e.g., the entity] as it begins to transcend space/time balancing [of the personality] and to enter the combined realms of space/time and time/space [as to reaching toward Intelligent Infinity]" -74.8, p

163 V.II [1]

[1] The Index on p 506 of V. II (op cit), "Complex, Consciousness Complex" gives important references to Ra's discussion of consciousness as all-pervasive, ineluctable and mysterious, and fundamental: 61.2, 67.6, 67.13-15, 68.6-7, 74.4, 75.24, 78.11 (quoted on prev.p.), 78.33, 78.37, 79.20, 80.20, 82.7, 82.11-12, 84.8, 87.7 & 91.33

CHAPTER TWO: THE ALL IS CONSCIOUSNESS WORLDVIEW

AND THE LAW OF ONE (continued, p9)

All-pervasive. Ineluctable. Mysterious. These are the proper adjectives to apply to the fundamental condition of consciousness as provided in my present analysis, which endeavors to suggest important correspondences between the Ra presentation on consciousness, and the landmark clarity that FMW brings to the topic. Both of these clear away certain controversies that bedevil dualistic approaches to consciousness as it is usually considered. [1]

Of course fresh mysteries present themselves when we begin to accept the all-is-consciousness worldview ('consciousness is original; self-existent; and constitutive of all things'). They more or less amount to the inverse of the puzzlement of the materialists who wonder, 'how did consciousness arise from insentient primordial forces of matter and energy?' Instead, we as champions of the all-is-consciousness worldview need to wonder, 'why is it that custom and a sort of collective amnesia clouds the glaring reality that everything is of consciousness: not just you and I and yonder tree and cow... but the very planet itself, the sun itself, the starry heavens... everything!'

I suspect the central problem is the moral consequences of subjectivity.

This, precisely, is what Ra fingers as the great challenge of third density consciousness (the consciousness we as humans are exercising). Surely it cannot be so mysterious, that when we truly adopt service-to-others as our moral polarization objective, that The Universe kind of opens up to us! For, after all, have we not made resolve to morally polarize as service to other

[1] "Consciousness, at its simplest, is sentience or awareness of internal and external [*note that this partition implies / presupposes envelope or boundary, positing of 'the self'*] existence. Despite millennia of analyses, definitions, explanations and debates by philosophers and scientists, consciousness remains puzzling and controversial, being at once the most familiar and also the most mysterious aspect of our lives. Perhaps the only widely agreed notion about the topic is the intuition that consciousness exists. Opinions differ about what exactly needs to be studied and explained as consciousness. Sometimes, it is synonymous with the mind, and at other times, an aspect of mind. In the past, it was one's 'inner life,' the world of introspection, of private thought, imagination and volition. Today, it [*the term consciousness*] often includes any kind of cognitions, experience, feeling or perception. It may be awareness, awareness of awareness, or self-awareness: either continuously changing or not. There might be different levels or orders of consciousness, or different kinds of consciousness, or just one kind with different features [*which may or may not be discernible to one's personal consciousness*]. Other questions include whether only humans are conscious, all animals, or even the whole universe. The disparate range of research, notions and speculations raises doubts about whether the right questions are being asked. Examples of the range of descriptions, definitions or explanations are: simple wakefulness, one's sense of selfhood or soul explored by 'looking within'; being [*a*] metaphorical 'stream' of contents [FMW: *thoughts as the subtle objects in subject-object consciousness*]; mental state, mental processes [*in the*] brain; having phanera or qualia and [*the issue of*] subjectivity; being the 'something that it is like' to 'have' or be [*conscious*]; being the 'inner theatre' or the executive control system of the mind." As copied at 8-9am on 7/17/22 as to the Wikipedia article on Consciousness. Eight [interpositions] and one underlining added.

CHAPTER TWO: THE ALL IS CONSCIOUSNESS WORLDVIEW

AND THE LAW OF ONE (continued, p10)

selves? Wherefore, what in all the three worlds (the evocative phrase from the Gita - Isherwood/Prabhavananda 1947 tr. - referencing the physical realm, the larger astral realm, and the still larger causal realm) could be more of an “other self” than the self-Beingness of The Creator? Standing astride the greatest of all paradoxes it could be well argued, is ‘me,’ and, ‘not me.’ Two very elastic categories, but readily understandable by *everyone*, however primitive their comprehension of “me,” or however surpassingly sophisticated their comprehension of “me:” *selfness; self-awareness; ‘witness’ immediacy.*

I must speak personally of course about this matter. Moreover I take as a lynchpin insight one very well expressed by Ra: “...A very great deal of creation was manifested without the use of the concepts involved in consciousness, *as you know it.* **The creation itself is a form of consciousness which is unified** - the Logos [“love” *explosively and massively delineated as one extremely lofty and extremely powerful cosmic creative principle*] being the one great [creative] heart of creation.” [1]

In an important and somewhat subtle manner, the above quote hints at the grand ‘thesis / antithesis / synthesis’ so masterfully articulated by FMW: *subject-object* consciousness (the universe we all co-experience by our senses, alluded to by Ra as *space/time* awareness); in a fundamental equilibrium with *subject-only* consciousness (the ‘Nirvana Realm’ in all it’s sub-varieties and various depths and regions that, in overall terms, is alluded to by Ra as *time/space* awareness, the region we journey to upon cessation of the physical vehicle or ‘death’); then these two grand and interdependent categories of consciousness reposing in one changeless and eternal substrate consciousness: properly named as consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject. Thinner than thin air. Present right now. Everywhere. *Yet altogether invisible.*

Stated another way, the term “Logos” as used above means Apex or Capstone Nirvana.

Let me explain. The world-containing Space - wherein repose all space/time awarenesses - is clearly a Space where a lot is going on. The Spatial Void - wherein repose all subject-only awarenesses or adumbrations of ‘Nirvana’ in however slight a degree or in however deep a degree - is similarly a different kind of Space where a lot is *also* going on but in disembodied terms so to say; in as it were altogether *psychical* terms. I prefer the term “the dazzling dark.”

One could sketch the matter this way. Here in subject-object awareness the ‘ghost in the machine’ is the self. In subject-only awareness (Ra: the time/space realm), the implicit but unmanifest ‘ghost’ is, instead, *concreteness* or *the object*; embodiment. Ergo Nirvana has depth.

[1] 82.12 on p239, “The Ra Contact: Teaching the Law of One” Vol. II, op cit. Italics emphasis, and boldface emphasis, and two [interpositions] added.

CHAPTER TWO: THE ALL IS CONSCIOUSNESS WORLDVIEW

AND THE LAW OF ONE (continued, p11)

The preceding remarks about Nirvana [1], and some degree of congruence between ‘self only awareness’ / Nirvana awareness, and Ra’s use of the term “time/space,” must be clarified by use of the general idea of a *continuum*, as between subject/object or ‘ordinary’ awareness at it’s various densities (chemical, plant/animal, human, ‘angelic’/‘demonic,’ wisdom, wisdom/love/love/wisdom or sixth, and gateway or seventh density), and subject-only awareness: meaning *awareness trending to such purity*. When ‘nirvana void’ purity deepens, one is in more ‘psychical depth.’

To state the matter bluntly, the entire creation is a psychical production in consciousness. As is indicated by the term, *panentheism* - God, or psychical Presence, is in everything, whilst not being constrained thereby - rather than ‘pantheism,’ suggesting a simple congruence; that the universe as manifested is God, and God is the universe, and that that’s the end of story.

“Q. Could you tell me the difference between space/time and time/space? A. ...Using your words, the difference is that between the visible and invisible, or the physical and the metaphysical. Using mathematical terms... the difference is that between s/t [‘*at the same time many spaces*’ as we all usually *see things*] and t/s [‘*at the same psychical space many times* can be studied *as to a psychic deepening*’]

- 41.20, p241, Vol. I, “The Ra Contact: Teaching the Law of One,” op cit.

There is no denying that these are subtle matters. It is in the nature of the thing that no hard-and-fast ‘rules’ can be drawn. My efforts at clarification will I hope help others. They also represent my own effort at grasping the relationship between ‘Nirvana’ awareness or ‘Subject only’ awareness... and the ordinary flow of events we see all around us in ordinary or subject / object awareness. In the latter sort of awareness, some attempt to enthrone ‘objectivity.’ In the former, *The Self* is very much at the helm. The Self is very much *what creates. For good; for ‘ill’*:

”The negatively oriented being will be one who feels that it has found power [*viz., the creative power of The Self*] that gives meaning to its existence precisely as the positive polarization does feel. This negative entity will strive to offer these understandings to other-selves, most usually by the process of forming the elite, the disciples, and teaching the need and rightness of the enslavement of other-selves for their own good. These other-selves are conceived to be dependent upon the self and in need of the guidance and wisdom of the self [*who purports to be the leader; in effect a god surrogate*]. 50.6, p396, V II

[1] “...non-Buddhist and Buddhist traditions describe these terms... [liberation - *moksha* - from ignorance and suffering, and delight - *mukti* - in the loftiest sense] ...differently. In Hindu philosophy [Nirvana] is the union of or the realization of the identity of Atman [Self] with Brahman [The All-Self]. ...In the Buddhist context, nirvana refers to realization of non-self [*consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject*] and emptiness [*so called*], marking the end of rebirth by stilling the fires [as to desires or appetites] that keep the process of rebirth going.”

Excerpted from the “Nirvana” entry at the internet website “Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia,” as copied at 8-9 am Mon., 8/1/22. Seven [interpositions] added. Showing the dual referents: that recognizing the - yes - potency of The Self, is transcended in Realizing a *still greater* potency.

CHAPTER TWO: THE ALL IS CONSCIOUSNESS WORLDVIEW

AND THE LAW OF ONE (continued, p12)

Certain core issues about consciousness bear repeating. One. From the vantage point of human consciousness we discern affinity with animal consciousness - both wild and domesticated - and less so but faintly with plants (familiar garden flowers, lush tropical foliage, etc.); then, a considerable leap is necessary to grasp that *basic chemicals* are of consciousness... *even space itself*.

Two. It is possible to grasp a similar gulf that grows greater and greater, when from our human consciousness we consider the prospect of fourth density, which appears to be aligned with the concept of the lower astral plane, peopled with 'angels' as well as 'demons'; and, then, on to the fifth or wisdom density (upper astral); and, then, sixth or wisdom/love / love/wisdom (lower causal) and seventh (upper causal). Such upper regions entail a similarly considerable leap in understanding.

Three. Such understanding has to arise not only from familiar rational thought or conceptual thought - the 'subtle objects' which thoughts are - as we exercise this in waking consciousness; but from slightly less familiar *emotional* discernment, or 'feelings,' which are familiar all the same but just a bit less so. Also and in general feelings are less amenable to clear delineation.

Four. We need to grasp the *many categories* of even just our human 'third density' consciousness. FMW references the familiar categories of *percept* (discerning the outer world with the senses), *concept* (whereby in mental activity we try to order and make coherent our interaction with the outer world) and then *introcept*: a novel coinage denoting how our mental processes arise not just from jousting with the welter of stimuli from the outer world that we discern perceptually, but also from 'inner realms' stimuli, from an inward realm or world, that we discern *introceptively*: by looking within; the act, in short, of our consciousness attempting to become more aware of itself.

Five. In such a process of growing self-awareness - which perforce must address the categories of dreaming sleep, and deep dreamless sleep, and hints and flashes of Higher Awareness or Cosmic Consciousness, as well as stupefaction, and 'mental clutter,' and all the other aspects of our consciousness - the need for a *vivid moral compass* comes to be recognized as indispensable. Without such a compass, one but wanders in circles; again and again; in third (human) density reincarnations. This insight continues to resonate with me as so all-important.

Six. It is in precisely this issue of such a compass that Ra throws so much light on the subject That 73% selfish / 27% selfless is the 'default setting.' That a struggle towards 48% selfish / 52% service to otherselfs constitutes *service to otherselfs* moral polarization. And, that a similar difficult struggle towards 98% selfishness constitutes a *service to ownself* moral polarization. Voila. 'The devil' is unmasked. It is simply natural self-interest cultivated riotously to - ultimately - ruinous degree. Conversely, in 'angels' self-interest is reined in, in favor of the love of otherselfs

CHAPTER TWO: THE ALL IS CONSCIOUSNESS WORLDVIEW

AND THE LAW OF ONE (continued, p13)

CONCLUSION... FOR NOW

It is natural for we - possessed of human curiosity, the yearning *to know* - to yearn for some end-point, that might quench our thirst for understanding once and for all. What is interesting in considering this yearning is that it is, in fact, infinite; in the more important sense it is infinite. Meaning that there is always yet more mystery. Ra says as much. As have others. 'All begins in mystery.' And, as well, there truly is *no ending* to absolute and infinite endlessness. Mystery indeed.

And yet there are certain plateaus or stages in terms of answers which do in fact arrive, when we consider the "deep" questions. The deepest of these I would submit, is the nature of consciousness. It has both the simplest and easiest of answers - the tangible immediacy of my present moment consciousness / the present moment consciousness of anyone reading this - and, as well, by far the most complicated and ineluctable of all answers: for *you* must fashion it.

Which is to say, how are we to approach the infinite question concerning the consciousness of other selves? What I find refreshing in Ra's summation upon this thorny issue is that it may very effectively be framed in moral terms; *in terms of a moral fork in the road*. Consider:

The essence of service to ownself as a moral polarization is *challenge*.

In the loftiest terms, this means 'challenge' intellectually; in the arena of ideas, where the quest is for greater wisdom... which, of course, means more power. The two moral polarizations thus can be diagrammed around the hitherto-referenced idea of an "optimum arousal" between complementary but mutually exclusive states-of-being (such as for example waking versus sleeping; etc.).

Service to ownself moral polarizarion [2% or less, service to otherselfs]	Service to otherselfs moral polarization [52% or more, service to otherselfs]
Paradigm: <i>challenge</i> ; seeking wisdom 'unfreely' won; hard-bought after struggle Associated with a 'masculine' polarization	Paradigm: <i>nurture</i> ; seeking love freely given; hard-bought in self-sacrifice Associated with a 'feminine' polarization
A global, all-encompassing combativeness. Strategic, shifting alliances; 'tribal' thinking. C o n t r o l	A global, all-encompassing compassion. Cementing relationships; 'familial' thinking A c c e p t a n c e
"God" is not seen as transcendent / is denied.	"God" is seen as transcendent / is affirmed.

- p53 in 2021 Journal; draft of p11 of Chapter Six in "Islamic Mysticism and God: Sufism and the Law of One, Especially as Enunciated by Ra"
[not yet published at this writing (8/10/23)]

CHAPTER TWO: THE ALL IS CONSCIOUSNESS WORLDVIEW

AND THE LAW OF ONE (continued, p14)

CONCLUSION... FOR NOW (continued, p 2 of 2)

“On July 7, 1958... Dr. Frank Rosenblatt... demonstrated for reporters [*an early prototype of an Artificial Intelligence or A.I. machine*]... [*exaggerated claims were*] typical of A.I. research - an academic field created around the same time Dr. Rosenblatt went to work on the Perception.

// ...most technology labeled ‘artificial intelligence’ mimics the human brain in only small ways - if at all. ...People disagree on what is and is not intelligent. Sentience - the ability to experience feelings and sensations - is not something easily measured. Nor is consciousness - being awake and aware of your surroundings [*and your own thoughts and feelings*].” [1]

One conclusion is most valuable with respect to both the above quote and the preceding diagram as to service-to-ownself versus service to others/moral polarization. It is simply this. Free of the polarity of subject-only or Nirvana consciousness; and subject-object or ‘ordinary’ so-called samsara / maya [‘delusional, illusory’] consciousness; consciousness-without-an-object-and- without-a-subject consciousness a.k.a. Primordial Consciousness, is **undefinable**.

However, based upon my own personal imperiences (inward experiences), I know IT can and does interact with “my” personal awareness; *and*, IT appears to be the very acme of subtlety; *and*, as Ra does observe as well, I am persuaded that IT is *Whole* or *Unitary*. “I” am within that Wholeness, as are all others, *regardless* how well or how poorly any of us are aware of this!

Later in this book the issue of consciousness will again arise as a central discussion. It cannot be otherwise. If the entire physical universe - and realms yet larger and even more unknown - are *all* of One Piece in One Colossal Primordial Thought, and the seed-nature of that Thought is as well at the epicenter of each of us; well, we *each* are at the edge of Infinity and Eternity without even knowing it wholly or fully. Therefore, which is better? To call others to their own great adventure of discovery in this regard? Or, to ‘toot my own horn’ and rush about trying to organize some ‘cult’ or ‘new religion’ built around my own synthesis regarding these truths? The former is what strikes me as palatable, sensible, and deserving of a 52%-or-more commitment of my time and energies, insofar as they yet remain in this present life of mine [d.o.b. 4/24/1947]. The latter I recognize as - in the short term - something thrilling, but an inevitable cul-de-sac. Still, such self-aggrandizing tendencies are afoot not just among we in third-density, human level consciousness, but in fourth (lower astral), fifth (upper astral), and even the start of sixth or lower causal-level-affiliated consciousness; before such ‘hyper-egoity’ spontaneously reverses polarity so as to progress still further towards reunification with All That Is / Intelligent Infinity.

[1] pages Bu 6 - Bu 7 in the 8/7/22 issue of The New York Times; from the article, “A.I. Does Not Have Thoughts, No Matter What You Think,” by Cade Metz. Three [*interpositions*] and two underlinings added.

CHAPTER THREE: THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM [1]

Iconoclasm is in some measure the template for this chapter, as I do wish to enthrone the private and idiosyncratic quest of each and every sadakha (spiritual seeker) as to knowledge about God. There simply will never be a substitute for a sense of *inward personal communion* with the One Infinite Creator of Intelligent Infinity. I am deeply persuaded that God cherishes such private one-on-one communions. I feel I have had this truth amply demonstrated in my own life. Surely, lives far more noble than mine... where the striving has been even more adroit and intense... have been even more benefited in this way. One has only to briefly study world literature on the lives of mystics and saints since time immemorial to know that this is so.

And among all such lives what has arisen as to a consensus about such communion?

This is not easy to answer. For my part, I am persuaded that - among we experiencing human level or “third density” consciousness (Ra’s term) - we will answer this in accord with which moral ‘fork in the road’ we have decided to cleave towards.

The choice I advocate for, is “service to otherselves” with 52% or more of one’s time and energies and commitment, and this takes real effort as most of us are but about 27% thus inclined. Alternatively, in “service to ownself” an inward journey of great intensity comes to be the leitmotif. Stark dualism reigns. A sense of battle and great struggle reigns. It’s a decidedly ‘romantic’ choice and in ways gloomy and lonely. And even butts up against what’s been called “the dark path,” among other namings. Likewise must there be struggle to winnow that 27% down to 2% or less. A certain affinity with over-zealous asceticism can arise. Glamorous? Yes. Wise? No. Still, rational defenses for ‘the gloomy path’ *do* exist. Unpersuasive ones.

— — — — —
[1] The primary reference for this chapter will be S. Radhakrishnan’s masterful two-volume treatise on Indian Philosophy, cited hereafter in full and then in subsequent followup citations. (S. R. went on to be president of India). I acknowledge - but largely will not follow - such overviews on the philosophic literature as these:

“Every Indian school of thought believed in karma and reincarnation, and the aim of moksha was defined as liberation from the cycle of births and deaths. Moksha, or liberation, is the ultimate goal of human endeavour. The main difference, however, is that orthodox schools recognize the Veda’s authority.” Copied at 1:18 pm Sun 8/14/22 from the Internet website “<https://unacademy.com/content/bank-exam/study-material/general-awareness/key-notes-on-heterodox-schools-of-indian-philosophy/#:~:text=What%2>”

ALSO:

“Hindu philosophy encompasses the philosophies, world views and teachings of Hinduism that emerged in ancient India which include six systems: Sankhya, Yoga, Nyaya, Vaisheshika, Mimamsa and Vedanta. In Indian tradition, the word used for philosophy is Darshana (Viewpoint or perspective), from the Sanskrit root drish (to see, to experience). These [six] are also called the Astika (theistic) philosophical traditions and are those that accept the Vedas as an authoritative, important source of knowledge. Ancient and medieval India was also the source of philosophies that share philosophical concepts [with the six] but rejected the Vedas, and these have been called nastika (heterodox or non-orthodox) Indian philosophies. ...[among which are] Buddhism, Jainism, Charvaka, Ajivika, and others.”

Copied at 9:28 am Fri 8/12/22 from the internet website “http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hindu_philosophy”
Three [interpositions] added. Later, there may be some occasional further citations from this article.

CHAPTER THREE: THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM (*continued, p2*)

Regardless the moral polarity adopted - for it is worth noting that a substantial population of loner ascetics has since ancient times formed the Hindu milieu in India (which by no means implies service to self in a fully *invidious* sense, but certainly an otherworldliness whether for good or for ill) - a great concern about the spiritual journey has long been uppermost in Indian thought.

As the most ancient of the five most famous religious traditions of our present day world (chronologically Hinduism, Judaism, Buddhism, Christianity and Islam), Hinduism has been shaped by many forces, but most prominently by two. (A) The reform movement that Buddhism represented to the ancient Hinduism of Gautama's time, but which never fully reformed all of Hinduism - much akin to how Christianity sought to be a truly Jewish reform movement, but became a separate religious tradition instead - and (B) the impact of the Islamic conquest of most of India, which notably led to Sikhism: a dynamic melding of the fierceness of the Islamic tradition with core beliefs as to karma and reincarnation and the need for "a guru" that are so emblematic of Hinduism.

A special comment about the whole notion of "a guru" is quite important, and deserves to be addressed in this section on Hindu philosophy, inasmuch as western philosophy is very much characterized by the idea of a 'solo' quest for truth; whereas, in Hinduism the applicable word of Darshan (audience with a spiritual preceptor) is much associated with veneration of a spiritual teacher as in the oft heard remark, "I went to Guru [name] in order to receive Darshan." Viz., the benefit of his or her [1] views on God and the spiritual journey. So as to be inspired afresh as to the quest

A western bias against accepting anyone as a Guru figure militates against this tradition. Moreover the record is replete - both in the west and in the east - with 'guru' figures who have been less than unblemished in terms of personal morals. And in some cases are no doubt altogether wedded to a service-to-ownself moral polarization, and promulgate this amongst their followers. Establishing pecking-orders and "us-them" tensions, etc. Hence, a *cult* around this or that teacher oft-times exhibits an overall flavor moving towards service-to-ownself moral polarization. (Dramatic examples from recent history: the Heaven's Gate cult; and most luridly, "Rev" Jim Jones in Guyana; usually, such groups prefer almost utter secrecy, ergo, zero public scrutiny).

But the guru tradition - for surely it is that - in Hinduism is by no means all bad; actually, from a higher perspective the idea of a spiritual preceptor confers a distinct and unduplicable advantage. A curbing of the natural and universal tendency towards egoity; self-inflation. Such tendencies are curbed in offering one's fealty to a guru figure; a spiritual wayshower; a preceptor. For there can be no doubt that 'self importance' is a radical impediment to a deepening ingoddedness if one is trying to polarize in the service-to-otherselfs direction.

[1] Female adepts - spiritual teachers or wayshowers - are rare in Hinduism, but not unheard of. Moreover it has to be acknowledged an anti-female bias permeates most religious traditions; especially so in Islam.

CHAPTER THREE: THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM (*continued, p3*)

Of course the entire nature of “the self” is of signal importance in philosophical systems. I choose to follow the summary on “self” as articulated in FMW’s *“The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object (and Without a Subject)”* [see Entry Four in Part A of the Annotated Bibliog.] Namely, that ‘the self’ is *the immediately presupposed presence in consciousness* whenever ‘objects’ whether gross (senses-perceived) or subtle (thoughts) arise in consciousness. Yet - and this is all-important - ‘the self’ is never - **never!** - *itself* an object in consciousness. Oh to be sure all manner of association undertakes to cloud this fact: “my” body; “my” thoughts; “my” perception and so the self gets imagined as itself some sort of subtle object floating about somewhere. Never is it thus at the root; rather, is the immediately presupposed ‘somewhat’ whenever *any* objects arise.

Nor, however, is the opposite the case. Meaning that since objects come to be held as the be-all and end-all of the activity of consciousness... and, since ‘the self’ is absolutely never itself an object... *is the self somehow what consciousness is?* This is an altogether understandable speculation or hypothecation; in effect, a very subtle error. It explains, notionally or on the surface, the general, popularly-articulated, so-called schism between Hindu emphasis upon The Atman a.k.a. ‘The Self,’ writ large [1]; and, the Buddhist doctrine, anatman (no self).

The reconciliation I advocate has to do, quite simply, with understanding that consciousness as consciousness, is pre-existent before *any* self; thus, before *any* cornucopia of objects gross or subtle. In effect, the Buddhist doctrine of anatman announces this, but does so with great difficulty and - in various contexts and articulations - somewhat confusedly. Which is quite understandable. After all, what’s being pointed to by ‘anatman’ is, well, antecedent or primordial consciousness. An invisible vessel, as it were, to selves great and small, and *all* arrays of objects.

But the full implications of this are very hard to grasp, however adroit the articulation. What is much easier to grasp - logically or rationally - is the interrelationship of ‘self,’ and, ‘objects’ in consciousness, whether gross or subtle or both. It follows rather readily that The Self is somehow the be-all and end-all of the matter. When it’s not. Rather, in *ultimate* terms, ‘the self’ is as evanescent as all objects. When the latter cease their “arisings” the former likewise becomes a presupposition with no longer any reason for continued beingness; “pfft,” *it’s gone*. Of course, initially, this seems either fantastical or nihilistic or both. Because there’s no easy way to signal about the nature of consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject . Is IT a nothingness? Or an everythingness?

[1] See: “Indian Philosophy” by S. Radhakrishnan (1880-1955), 1923 (1st Ed) & 1929 (Rev. Ed), George Allen & Unwin Ltd. 1989 re-issuance by Oxford Univ. Press (1 Great Clarendon St., Oxford OX2 6DP, UK) in India; 7th reprinting 1994. (Pers. copy:1998 4th reprinting of 1996 issuance by “Oxford India Paperbacks.”). 788 pp as to Vol. I; then 807 pp as to Vol. II, which addresses the “six systems.” / p 146 in Ch 4 (Philosophy of the Upanishads), V. I: “Brahman is the Atman and the Atman is the Brahman. The one supreme power through which all things have been brought into being is one with the inmost **self** in each man’s heart.” [emphasis added].

CHAPTER THREE: THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM (continued, p4)

To express that it's neither - while comprehending both - is, in point of fact, one of the great challenges laid before philosophy as philosophy. How to discuss such ineffability, such "nirdvandva" (consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject, a term previously cited at p 3 of Ch. 2), using the inherently dualistic mechanism of logical rational thought and it's handmaiden, language? It's a challenge. I regard the Bhagavad Gita as unrivaled in answering this challenge.

"...if the hold which a work has on the mind of man is any clue to its importance, then the Gita is the most influential work in Indian thought [*revered by Hindus and Buddhists alike*]. ...It is said to be 'the most beautiful, perhaps the only true philosophical song existing in any known tongue.' " [1]

Dr. Radhakrishnan goes on to remark on the manner with which the Gita handles "self:"

"This eternal spirit dwells in all beings, and is therefore not a qualitatively distinct other to the finite. The Gita believes in the reality of an infinite being underlying and animating all finite existences. // The individual self is ever unsatisfied with itself and is struggling always to become something else. In it's consciousness of limitation, there is a sense of the infinite. The finite self which is limited, which ever tries to rise beyond its sad plight, is not ultimately real. [*cf. it's double jeopardy of 'never an object' as all selfness is thus constrained; and, then, being in the throes of the added jeopardy of identification with the realm of objects as 'the answer,' rather than THAT whence arise all selves as well as all objects*]. The true self [meaning actually consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject] has the character of imperishableness. The Gita tries to find out the element of permanence in the self, that which is always the subject and never the object." [2]

In the last sentence of this quote, an answer lies hidden, if the wording be adjusted. Rather than the wording given, instead: 'The Gita tries to find out the element of permanence in the self, that which is always **neither** 'the subject' **nor** 'the object,' but the ground consciousness whence both or wherein both, the twain of subject and object are both always perpetually jointly arising.'

Once again, in such a formulation, ordinary thought gets flummoxed. What is being referred to in such 'neti, neti?' (not this, nor this... etc.). It can be exasperating. One shortcut is to think that radical nothingness is what is being referenced. There is a hidden coherence to such a thought, if it's inverse be embraced. Because, in point of fact, radical everythingness is what is being referenced. But saying it like that sounds goofy or sloppy inasmuch as the subtle ineffableness of consciousness without an object and without a subject is not being properly emphasized; nor one all-important corollary: an infinity of intelligence. That intelligence comprehends both what I prefer to identify as global compassion; plus a 'scary' inverse: global indifference, 'the cold stone wall.'

[1] "Indian Philosophy" by S. Radhakrishnan, op cit; Vol. 1, p 519; [2] "Indian Philosophy" op cit., p 534;
one [interposition] added. two [interpositions] added.

CHAPTER THREE: THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM (continued, p5)

Global compassion as a moral paradigm is associated with feelings; the emotions. The ‘cold stone wall’ as, so to say, an eerie or ‘weird’ sort-of moral paradigm, harkens much more to the whole notion of *thought*; the intellect. Dispassion.

Heed moreover that such a paradigm is by no means a simple antithesis to global compassion, e.g. some global disassociation in the sense of some principle of stoicism. In other words, a distinction must be drawn between the moral polarization that’s the primary objective when ‘graduating’ from third density / familiar human consciousness; and, an apex dynamic tension between true global compassion - actually more a state of global ‘I am that’ as to all entities good and bad - and, the colossalness of a truly infinite ‘cold stone wall,’ meaning intelligent infinity; a kind of endless explorativeness that’s undertaken in what amounts to a massive solemnity: such is my intuition as to the quale or feeling-quality that predominates. In the latter I do feel that Ra is correct in observing that ‘in The Creator, the Unity Consciousness that is The Creator, all polarizations have ceased’ (paraphrase; ref: 78:25 on p202 in Vol. II), and the Totality Consciousness thereof is - to use FMW’s memorable turn of phrase - reposed in utter power and a colossal ‘High Indifference.’

These observations are somewhere between ‘wild stabs in the dark’ versus arisen from rock solid certainty. I can be certain simply of this. Intelligent Infinity has and continues to be in a felt interaction with my altogether mortal ‘frailty’ as to intelligence / sort-of intelligence. For I observe, time and again, congruences I hadn’t foreseen ahead of time; yet, when they unfold, they resonate with the nature of something adroitly thought out ahead of time.

A key to this mystery is Ra’s observation that “The seeming contradiction of determinism and free will melt when it is accepted that there is such a thing as true simultaneity.”

(70.11 on p 129 in Vol. II).

* * *

Returning briefly to Dr. Radhakrishnan’s treatment of the Gita in his magnum opus “Indian Philosophy” - for later on I address The Bhagavad Gita more fully in two separate chapters - in terms, particularly, of the mystery of never-an-object “Self” vis-a-vis nirdvandva (consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject), I will try to summarize what appears to be the overall assessment Dr. R. brings to this difficult and subtle metaphysical issue.

“ It [the source of all knowledge] is the element which combines and is present throughout even in deep sleep. ... If we drop the subject, the object vanishes.” - p 535, Vol. 1, op cit.; one [interposition] added.

What then is left? This is ever and always the gigantic question for all of philosophy. From the all-is-consciousness viewpoint, what remains is uncorralable, undefinable, *subtle fullness*.

CHAPTER THREE: THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM (*continued, p6*)

This ‘subtle fullness’ amounts to an optimum arousal as between two complementary but antithetical elements. Describing just those two elements - the never-an-object ‘subject,’ and the realm-of-objects ordinary consciousness - leaves a gaping explanatory hole.

Glossing past this leads to a catastrophic friction. Which - in a kind of crowning irony - is also a *productive* friction impelling the continued unfolding of the entire perceptual cosmos.

Absent an acknowledgement of what remains in ‘the gaping hole’ (consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject, signaled by the term *nirdvandva*), much of transcendental philosophy gets caught in a bind. Typically one element is called “real” (the self), and another element is called “un-real” (the object, meaning all of ordinary perceptual consciousness), and withdrawing the latter into the former is what constitutes “moksha” or liberation.

But - and again I commend FMW for rendering this distinction so clearly and accessibly - this isn’t the whole story; for while - yes - withdrawing the latter into the former is, *when fully accomplished*, a *pure* Nirvanic form of awareness; there is, yet, a further liberation and it is precisely an acknowledgment of **nirdvandva** (consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject).

Yet if ‘gaining nirvana’ is left as ‘the whole story,’ we behold the endless tug-of-war between idealism, so-called, calling out materialism as an utter fiction and a falsehood; and, materialists returning the favor by calling the idealists (sometimes lumped together with transcendentalists of whichever stripe) fabulists; pie-in-the-sky dreamers; escapists; navel-gazers; slackers... the vindictive epithets are endless. The scorn can be acute. Even leading to gruesome persecution - Christ; *many others* - in dramatic episodes where, in point of fact, deep Realization has led to ‘siddhi powers’ (extraordinary powers brought about by an elevation of personal consciousness into astral densities where greater powers of consciousness are a commonplace such as telepathy, telekinesis, teleportation, bilocality, etcetera), and those powers have been exercised and displayed in a effort to help others (service-to-others self moral polarization). [Such powers can also, of course, further a service-to-ownself moral polarization, which centrally is an insatiable thirst for more-and-more personal power: e.g. riches; dominating others; being ‘a star,;’ a ruler; etc. etc. etc.]

The corral of limited-view idealists with their classic formulations of transcendentalism are equally skilled at castigating the materialists: they who are content with the Cartesian dualism that collapses into the presumption - which is a fiction - that “consciousness,” whatever-it-is, is an epiphenomenon - a derivative and consequent arising - from terminally inscrutable matter (the alleged unconsciousness of atoms and molecules and interstellar space and etcetera). *Well this is just not so*. But it worsens the situation rather than helping it, to castigate they under such a misapprehension, calling them dopes, fools, prisoners ‘trapped in maya,’ doomed slaves, *etcetera*.

CHAPTER THREE: THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM (*continued, p7*)

What if we escape this seesaw of dynamic tension - materialists, v. idealists who don't acknowledge the subtle but vital distinctions between nirvana and nirdvandva - by delineating more carefully what constitutes The Real?

Coarse, but effective in it's bluntness, is to rank the three states one above the other. Materialism. Then, Nirvana. Then - lastly - nirdvandva, antecedent to *both* all manifest realms *and* all 'levels of Nirvana,' whence they spring. It's in nirdvandva where authentic foreverness resides.

Of course the interrelationship between these three states of consciousness is far more elaborate than a simple do-re-mi of bottom, middle, top. Consider the immediacy of your personal consciousness. As you read these words - similarly, as I write them - there is altogether subtle interplay between the three states. 'Subject-object consciousness' predominates. But what backlights such an awareness? Most dramatically: nirvana consciousness *in all it's levels*. More dramatic still? A never-an-object *and never-a-subject* ground consciousness radically incapable of definition. That ground consciousness does - as I prefer to express it - infuse it's immediacy and it's immanent substantiality in the foreground of subject-object consciousness. Likewise *and reciprocally* ground consciousness infuses with immediacy; with projected substantiality; the background of nirvana or subject-only consciousness. Whilst remaining in it's illimitability forever unaffected by the foreground of projective consciousness (subject-object consciousness); *nor* the 'hinterland' whence said foreground springs: never-an-object subjective, or nirvanic consciousness, perpetually so molten.

There you have it. A 'simple' map. But translating that map into the actual journey, that's a personal matter. What I discern as vitally helpful - speaking personally - is to disentangle nirvana from a pervasive misapprehension. At least it seems to me pervasive. Namely, that nirvana is a single quality - albeit a very subtle quality - whereas we see the abundant evidence of the infinite varied expressive forms of the manifest, senses-perceived cosmos.* Both spring forth from / exist in / are built from, consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject. Terminal ineffability. [* "*time/space* ['nirvana'] *is no more homogenous than space/time*" - 70.17, p131, v.II]

In defending my thesis that nirvana is not 'flat' or 'uniform' or 'a featureless, single place' as casual inference from most word depictions might lead one to assume, I must acknowledge wherefrom my conviction springs. The imperiences (inward, out-of-body experiences) depicted in Special Appendix A to this book. Delineating what happened (c.10/15/1981-c.4/15/1982) has become somewhat easier over time. Unseen 'angels,' if you will, or 'servants of God' if you will, facilitated me going out-of-body to what I've likened to God's private concert hall which, in point of fact, was a visit to the infinite vastness of the nirvana realm. More vast even, than this physical universe which in it's own right possesses it's own infinity. All was a 'dazzling dark' as Henry Vaughn (4/17/1621 - 4/23/1695) so ably puts it; and, in that dark, so grand a celestial symphony endlessly unfolds as beggars *any* description. *Unfolds still*. Although at present I cannot hear it. (See Special Appendix A).

CHAPTER THREE: THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM (*continued, p8*)

Such observations are a segue to a perpetually posed question. What is God? Answering this is impossible in any definitive way, inasmuch as God is co-extensive both with ‘consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject / NIRDVANDA’ *and*, with that dynamic equilibrium infusing the reciprocity of - on the one hand - ‘ordinary’ or ‘exterior’ subject-object consciousness and - on the other hand - rare, usually-dimly-understood, *subject only* consciousness, a.k.a. nirvana consciousness. Which - as I’ve just observed - ought be seen as *varied* in it’s boundless depthness. The ‘spatial void’ of nirvana is ‘void’ in “the-view-from-here,” but *rich* on its own terms.

Stated another way, the entire universe - and we each therein - are, in one entirety, a psychic production moving in and within the undefinable and uncorrallable One Primordial Consciousness of God. When IT seeks awareness of Itself, IT perforce arises from primordial changelessness in two reciprocal ways: as never-an-object *SELF* (FMW: the spatial void, or, as I think is even more evocative, *the dazzling dark* of nirvana consciousness) and as replete-with-objects ‘ordinary’ subject-object consciousness which may properly be seen as altogether a **constriction** consciousness imposes upon itself for the perpetually unfolding purpose of greater-and-greater SELF AWARENESS. Once again, the ‘koan’ I favor: ‘The Creation is the One Infinite Creator’s gift to Itself, so that It may experience an infinite number of pathways for Itself back to Itself.’

In thus opining, I am not ‘talking through my hat’ as the saying goes. These are not wispy speculations; ephemeral conjectures. No. They’re my best effort to put the ‘flesh’ of words onto the ‘bones’ of my serial epiphanies of c10/15/1981-c4/15/1982 (see Special Appendix A). Indeed these evocations are even more firmly rooted than just from that. Let me explain.

The Gita is rich with many noble insights and exhortations, but the central one is this (paraphrase cf. the 1947 Isherwood/Prabhavananda translation) : “not by alms or austerities can I be seen as you have seen Me; nor by book-learning; nor by ceremonial rites; nor by reciting scriptures nor by any other means; but, by a single-minded and **constant** attention upon Me day-by-day and year-by-year can I be seen and known and entered into as you have seen me.” (Ch. __, v__ - __).

My effort to comply with this cardinal exhortation of the Gita certainly persists moment-by-moment and day-by-day and year-by-year, yet it is far from the kind of unwavering absorption which I am sure more dedicated practitioners can accomplish and have accomplished. Still, it has been enough; enough to adduce, more-and-more, that a massively subtle ‘hand of Providence’ governs the unfoldings of events both large and small; in my ‘tiny, personal, inconsequential’ life, and in planetary strife among nations; indeed, the whirlings of galaxies; and in - truly - the heavenly bani. [1]

[1] see “The Path of the Masters” by Dr. Julian Johnson (8th Ed., 1972, 5000 copies). [1st Ed.: 1939]. Radha Soami Satsang, Beas (District Amritsar), East Punjab, India, Pub.; Entry Five in Part A of the Annotated Bibliography; *Re*, “audible lifestream.”

CHAPTER THREE: THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM (*continued, p9*)

To say that there is ‘the hand of Providence’ in matters large and small, is of course to open up a vast, vast subject; an endless one, actually. But here is the key to the matter. There is in you me ‘and yonder tree’ - in everything in point of fact - the latency / the manifestness, of the Awareness of Unity that is The One Infinite Creator of Intelligent Infinity. In ‘yonder tree’ partaking as it does in second-density consciousness, we may aver such Awareness to be more latent than it is manifest; in comparison to we of third-density consciousness (the spectrum of human awareness as, currently, some nearly eight billions of peoples worldwide are experiencing this). Yet, of course, even in we, such Awareness is - collectively speaking - mere ‘inches more,’ towards a genuine manifestation of the Unity that is - yes I elect to invoke the broad catholic term - God.

Welcome, now, to the nub of the matter as I choose to give it. Here it is. I am persuaded that Ra speaks correctly in observing that the central challenge or opportunity of third-density consciousness (human awareness) is to morally polarize in one of two ways. *Absent the accomplishment of such polarization*, many entities - perhaps most entities (or souls if your prefer, or the term Ra uses, mind/body/spirit complexes) - end their incarnations anchored in third density still. Exiting embodiment, and undergoing the ‘life review’ and other learnings in the vastness of The Nirvana Realm... such entities then incarnate yet again in a third density awareness embodiment on this planet or some kindred, similar planet. There’s nothing ‘bad’ or ‘wrong’ about this. One need merely reflect on the obvious truth that some learn more slowly than others. To learn more slowly, is this ‘bad’? Why should it be so? Under the relentless lash of the slings and arrows of ‘outrageous fortune,’ all will - at some point - grasp the essence of the matter, and commence to genuinely polarize. Once such polarization has truly taken root... then can the doorway to fourth density consciousness open; or, as Ra puts it, such an entity “graduates” to fourth density.

Positive polarization is quite simply the more intensive employment of the familiar injunction towards compassion, which is so pronounced as something good in all the ‘5’ (chronologically, Hinduism, Judaism, Buddhism, Christianity and Islam). To expend 52% or more of all one’s time and energies and commitment, toward the welfare of otherselves. Service-to-otherselves.

Negative polarization is, as I like to put it, the devil unmasked. The endless bugaboos in all the literature, and fables about Satan or Lucifer or The Devil (the names are endless), is, quite simply and bluntly, the enthroning of selfishness above everything. ‘Nothing matters except me.’

In the latter, any semblance of compassion all but vanishes, for such a one expends 98% or more of all his / her time, energies and commitment toward the welfare of: “*ME*.” Self-interest run riot. This leads, rather obviously, to an unhappy chain of results. ‘Victory’ now and again might be sweet... ah, but the defeats? How galling. What gnashing of teeth!*

[*I can vouch for one memorable imperience where - fleetingly - I heard
the massed gnashing of teeth from what I’ll call an infernal realm].

CHAPTER THREE: THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM (*continued, p10*)

However, to 'give the devil his due' the gravity pull towards selfishness - for various tendencies exert their own forms of gravity, the 'force of habit' being widely recognized and of course the tragedy of acute drug addiction is widely acknowledged - is not only something we all have experienced... it also has it's own survival benefits. A friend likes to offer this example. 'If the oxygen goes off in the airplane cabin and the facemasks drop, *put your own mask on first and then* you're in a position to help others get their masks on.' So in fine, the whole principle of selfishness is not something that need be jettisoned altogether; nor, indeed, is this even possible, until and unless - to use Yogananda's phrase - the 'corks of desire' have all been dissolved, and any wish for continued discrete embodiment - the palette of experiences thus afforded - has ceased; even at the minimal threshold where any active 'desire' is still of any force and effect at all.

Unless that desire be a continued wish to be of service to otherselfs, a sort of 'selfless' desire.

Against this backdrop of understanding, the absorptive force of unbridled selfishness can be understood as the *intensification* of desire, rather than any lessening of it. In just such a consideration we have the key to how The Universe / The Creator - which remember desires of know of itself by all means possible - finds value and benefit in what otherwise seems so bereft of benefit. What is the benefit? *The development of the force of the will*. Will against will in titanic struggle.

Willpower - the relentless desire to accomplish something and against all odds - is something that can be cultivated. One clear example is in athletics. Relentless training, pushing against one's own limits; forcing the body to perform more pull-ups or high-jumps or whatever the goal is. Indeed, the force of the power of the will is the only signature of The Self in subject-object, 'ordinary' space/time consciousness. The Self is never, itself, an object. It's sole signature is *Will*.

In service to otherselfs, the capacity for personal willfulness has by no means been extinguished; it merely has been corralled to 48% or less when willfulness is deployed to private / inner benefit. Such that the predominance of The Will is deployed to *public* or *exterior* benefit: the benefit of otherselfs.

In service to ownself such personal willfulness has exploded rather than being corralled. Private or inner benefit is chosen as the be-all and end-all. Compassion has all but evaporated. Exteriority - anything that is not the self - diminishes in interest, and, as Ra rightly observes in my opinion, a sort of 'psychic black hole' is the result. Such an entity can be viewed as absorptive rather than radiant; light-giving. What is the outcome for such a private, 'psychic black hole'?

The answer is of substantial cosmic consequence in my opinion. In early sixth (resonant of the early causal plane), equivalent *radiant* entities are observed by such a one as *still able to progress further towards The Creator*. Only by joining them - *reversing polarity* - can they go on.

CHAPTER THREE: THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM (continued, p11)

32.10 “[Q.] Can you expand a little bit on what you mean by ‘complete fusion nature?’ [A.] ...The entire creation is of the One Creator. Thus the division of sexual activity into simply that of the bodily complex is an artificial division, all things thusly being seen as sexual equally, the mind, the body, and the spirit; all of which are part of the polarity of the entity. [*To wit, that polarity as implied by the reciprocal terms, love / light and/or light / love, concerns a deeper architecture inherent in primordial consciousness.*] Thus sexual fusion may be seen with or without what you may call sexual intercourse to be the complete melding of the mind, the body, and the spirit in what feels to be a constant orgasm, shall we say, of joy and delight each in the other’s beingness.”

32.10 on p. 282 in Vol. I, “The Ra
Contact: Teaching the Law of One” op cit.

* * *

The preceding observations provide something of a key to the above quotation. If the self - which remember is never an object (not even a subtle object like a thought) - is given the attribute of being absorptive... and subject-object consciousness is given the attribute of being radiant, well, then, pure nirvana consciousness or ‘self-only’ consciousness, has the attribute of being terminally absorptive. With, then, subject-object consciousness being terminally radiative. Imagine a black hole, with it’s event horizon of swirling, radiant gases, super-hot gases. That event horizon can be notioned as subject-object consciousness. When there is a ‘push outward’ the self - a granular element of selfness so to say - swirls out to re-inhabit that event horizon. Then when there is a ‘pull inward’ that self, that granular element of selfness, exits said subject-object consciousness, said space/time consciousness... and re-merges back into the ‘black hole’ of subject-only or nirvana consciousness (Ra: *realm of time/space: between embodiments*).

A descriptive like the above inhabits a zone between pure exactitude / purely accurate depiction; and utter conjecture or will-o-the-wisp speculation. Why? Because ordinary wakeful rational thought and the words which express such consciousness, cannot escape their essential nature. A nature built up from contrasts. In order to discuss ‘self only’ or nirvana consciousness where such contrast is lacking, is absent... one must needs have recourse either to ‘neti neti’ (neither this nor that ad infinitum) or to ‘yes yes’ (yes it is thus-and-such and also that-and-such).

Small wonder that nirvana remains so tantalizing: so near-at-hand yet so maddeningly difficult of depiction. Returning, then, to the quotation atop this page, if entity “A” is more rooted in self-only awareness... and entity “B” more in self / otherself awareness a.k.a. subject-object awareness... it falls to reason how there can be mutual attraction. Love and nurture have acquired a genuine delight in the beingness of other-selves. The ultimately infinite willfulness of ‘challenge’ or service to ownself polarization has a paradox to confront, once all else has been absorbed. Where is there any more any boon of companionship? No-where. Nowhere, until and unless otherself be revered. Then, only, is there a ‘mirror’ so-to-say, where self / otherself can roll on, in great interactive intensity towards still deeper densities of consciousness.

CHAPTER THREE: THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM (*continued, p12*)

Conclusion of Chapter Three, "THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM, *PART ONE*"

Philosophy is an endless topic to be sure. "Philo," love, and "Sophia," goddess of wisdom, is the source of this western term, harkening to Greek mythology. "Darshan" - viewpoint or perspective - is it's Indian equivalent. Subtle differences are in evidence as to how each has developed. While "love" is alluded to in the western term, very little of it is in evidence in the western tendency toward a sort of dryness and formality in examining the boundaries of logic; seen pre-eminently among western philosophers in Immanuel Kant, widely acknowledged as the gateway into modern western philosophy with his "Critique of Pure Reason."

I am reviewing Professor Radhakrishnan's further chapters on Indian Philosophy in a separate followup Chapter. I have alluded here chiefly to his Chapter on the Bhagavad Gita. With a general emphasis upon morality as being the pith or essence of what infuses any perspective on philosophy, even as it does in the Gita; where, essentially, God (in the guise of the avatar or God-embodiment Krishna) is enjoining upon Arjuna (his warrior-prince interlocutor) a 'selfless' or service-to-other-selfs moral posture; summed in the admonition to serve God, only; Who, of course, is the mysterious acme of what the term 'other self' truly means; which is a bit of a paradox to say the least inasmuch as that 'other self' of God is innermost in we each as well.

In the meantime, before it's ultimate resolution, this is a highly fruitful paradox. For on the one hand the service-to-otherselfs moral polarization is one where one sees - in a variety of mirrors so to say - the "otherness" of God, and seeks to venerate that essence by being of service and assistance to other selfs. Yet, were this the whole story, where would be the drama, the narrative tension? In tension between "subject" and "object;" and, between both, with Primordial Consciousness, there is, in fact, tension a-plenty. Precisely by *tension* is consciousness aroused.

Is undeniable that with sufficient introspection one discovers one can have an inward communion with THE ONE INFINITE CREATOR OF INTELLIGENT INFINITY, the phrasing I regard as most formally evocative of the actual Beingness of God which I - or anyone I would argue - may personally interact with. Upon discovering the actuality of such communion, a wellspring of personal empowerment opens up. Then one of two austerities must needs be taken up. On the one hand the forswearing of seeking for 'siddhi powers' - exceptional displays of personal power such as telekinesis, telepathy, bi-location or many other potential abilities - which are usually rare; so rare, that when evidenced - say in the life of Jesus - they're regarded as unavailable to almost anyone else; when in fact they *are* available, if sufficient moral polarization be accomplished. The rarity is owing to the degree of personal commitment, morally, that's required beforehand.

The alternative austerity is to succumb to the exhilaration of personal power, which leads to an *alternative* hall-of-mirrors. Where instead of serving others, others become seen as, all of them, rivals: inimical, unless quasi absorbed - literally, devoured / amalgamated - into own-self.

CHAPTER THREE: THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM (*continued, p13*)

Conclusion of Chapter Three, "THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM, *PART ONE*" (*cont'd*)

In sum then I have chosen to emphasize how - in philosophy, which as I would term it, means 'life rightly lived' [1] - a *moral compass* of sufficient resolve is the one indispensable ingredient.

I arrived at this conviction upon first encountering Ra's perspective on the matter in 1983 shortly after the imperiences (inner experiences) recounted in Special Appendix A. It seemed then and still does, so fitting a laying-to-rest of all the historical bugaboos about devil / evil, etcetera; a sweeping-away of so many cobwebs of myth and legend and abysmal ignorance.

The perspective is this. We (of human awareness / consciousness or 'third density' consciousness) are in the main at the *default setting* of 27% service to otherselves, and 73% service to ownself. Left unexamined, this is 'the sinkhole of indifference' as Ra aptly puts it. But with sufficient resolve and effort we can **polarize** our moral commitment to 52% or more, service to otherselves; *or*, 98% or more, service to ownself. Either entails a 25% adjusting of our inward moral compass in one direction or the other and this must be accomplished *with conscious effort*. It cannot be faked. I'll put it this way. Thinking to 'fool' intelligent infinity is a fool's errand indeed. To wit, 'let's not do it and say we did.' Self-deception of this sort is baby-like; just plain immature and dishonest.

The consequences at the positive pole - service to otherselves - are abundantly evident and constitute the vast - roughly ninety percent - commitment of entities at fourth / fifth / sixth densities of consciousness. Little comment is necessary. However the *negative* pole seems so bereft of logic, the useful consequences seem murky indeed. I've been able to discern two as primary 'dividends,' so to say, of power-trippers (a fitting term) once they finally reverse polarity at mid-sixth density consciousness so as to continue their further evolution towards The Creator. ONE. *The development of The Will*. The sole signature of The Self, which, remember, is never itself an object in consciousness (not even a subtle object like a thought), is *willfulness*. In an endless contest of will-versus-will (the arena of negativity), how better to hone truly intense degrees of willfulness? TWO. *The development of veils and disguises and covert action*. In a word: secret influence. Beyond the cudgels of 'fear' or 'bullying.' All the way to masterful insinuation; a kind of shaping of the intentions of others without themselves being much aware of it. What is the capstone of all this? In a word, a paramount mysteriousness betokening THE ONE INFINITE CREATOR OF INTELLIGENT INFINITY.

[1] Do you want to lead your life stupidly, blindly, and lazily? Or, intelligently and with inward discernment / sight, and with energized vigilance? If the *latter*, you are ipso facto a philosopher; and, if the *former*, alas, you render yourself to a poor pitiable drudge, woefully unaware of your self-imprisonment.

CHAPTER THREE: THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM (*continued, p14*)

Conclusion of Chapter Three, “THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM, *PART ONE*” (p 3 of 3)

There is yet a third hallmark of the service-to-ownself moral polarization which can predominate from late third through fourth and fifth and to early sixth density consciousness [1], before a reversal of polarization occurs - to service to others - *if* such an entity chooses to progress further towards the ‘all-ness’ of THE ONE INFINITE CREATOR OF INTELLIGENT INFINITY. That hallmark is charisma: something inclusive of “will,” “beauty” (whether feminine or masculine), and a *something more*: a penetrating grasp of the emotional-and-intellectual disposition of an audience, whether one person or a few people; or, a vast amphitheater audience of thousands. Moreover, someone possessing such charisma would, by-and-large, be skilled at masking it, too. In sum then, the three dividends one can discern from the “negative” moral polarization in the overall scheme of things are *will*; a skill at *concealment / disguise*; and, *charisma*. With such a bundle of attributes it becomes easy to ‘bowl over’ an audience large or small, in most cases; bending such an audience to whatever one wishes: usually, self-glorification as an emperor or something; and the inculcation of us-them pecking-order rivalries. ‘Divide and conquer.’

* * *

Once all such “negative” skills have been surrendered-to / turned-over-to, the Allness of the ‘entirety consciousness’ of THE ONE INFINITE CREATOR OF INTELLIGENT INFINITY, it perforce becomes quite understandable at how - seemingly by surprise - the Creator can appear in fine raiment; as, for example, a rainbow at a propitious juncture; or a bolt of lightning at a propitious juncture; or a seeming breeze from no-where... or, the wafting of a scent... etcetera. Yet in no such display is the purpose to intimidate or frighten. This is the glory of the thing. I’ve oft summed it this way: God wants *lovers* not *slaves*. It remains for the inner discernment of each, to adduce the nearness of The Creator. “Veiled in my maya, I’m not shown to many.” [ch_v_ in Ish. / Prab. tr. of The Gita]

This leads to a crowning mystery of sorts, which has long eluded my comprehension until just recently. “The Lord is everywhere and always perfect.” [ch_v_ in 1944 Ish. / Prab. tr. of The Gita]. At first blush this seems to smack of the sort of fatalism and determinism and foolish optimism so trenchantly critiqued by Voltaire in “Candide.” Ought one, indeed, shrug one’s shoulders and announce the insipid remark that we live in the best of all possible worlds, when so obviously we do not? No. That’s not the point. Clearly, this realm of weal and woe is a sort of finishing school where - in the positive direction - one tries to give aid to others; or - in the negative direction - one ignores them all, except insofar as any of them may be exploited. *Thus is freedom proven*. Even if the price of such freedom is a burdensome false servitude some adopt

[1] Recall that “third” is our familiar human-spectrum consciousness; fourth, being akin to the lower astral fifth, akin to the so-called higher astral; and sixth density consciousness: the beginnings of the so-called causal planes of consciousness, insofar as I’ve thus far been able to tease out what I believe is the correct correlation vis-a-vis Ra’s use of the term “densities” vis-a-vis this octave’s consciousness spectrum.

CHAPTER FOUR: PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM FURTHER CONSIDERED

The divide between *reason* and *emotion* is usually regarded as just about total, or very near to it. Moreover *emotion* is usually considered the precinct of moral commitment such as has been emphasized throughout the preceding chapter; especially concerning the imperative of moral polarization if one wishes to “graduate” (Ra’s term) to fourth-density consciousness: which I adduce as largely congruent with what’s elsewhere alluded to as the lower astral realms.

To sum the matter vividly it’s a fool’s errand to keep “philosophy” in one box as ‘reason’ focused, while all else vis-a-vis the emotions and feelings, are allocated - usually disdainfully - into subjectivity and ‘free will run wild;’ a sort of hinterland that’s a realm of nuance, implication, murkiness... almost a realm of diverse fictions, with no up or down; where ‘anything goes’ and it’s well-nigh impossible to get any clear picture. Things seem murky or even downright dark. (Yet one can acknowledge the spooky allure of all this: akin to a moonless foggy night.)

Considering this contrast it comes into focus that philosophy - especially western philosophy - has the aim of bringing light - reason - to the human enterprise of making sound judgments and reasonable - perhaps optimal - decisions. Instead of ‘subjectivity,’ *objectivity* is the aim, and a set of interpersonal guidelines about reason and inference are touted. So that ‘all will be light.’

There’s no winner in this tussle. The dynamic of ‘I am me and you are you’ versus any civic guidelines we buy into, in the interests of civility and social stability, are perpetually in what’s best regarded as a dynamic tension. It comes out in the idea of ‘individual freedoms,’ versus ‘the good of all,’ social safety nets and - consequently - curbs on individual freedoms.

What’s missing in the above sensible observation is the whole idea of *God*, which in one sense is the very acme of subjectivity: the infinite circle whose center is everywhere and hence is the core of you; of me; and yonder tree. And yet - and yet - we behold ourselves moving through such a vast world, the starry skies overhead with whole other galaxies far far away. Are the two linked? ***I say yes.*** In other words I advocate for the all-is-consciousness worldview which is often not at all clearly acknowledged in philosophy, whether western *or* eastern.*

* From footnote “[1]” on page one of Chapter Three:

“Hindu philosophy encompasses the philosophies, world views and teachings of Hinduism that emerged in ancient India which include six systems: Sankhya { 4 }, Yoga { 5 }, Nyaya { 2 }, Vaisheshika { 3 }, Mimamsa { 6 } and Vedanta { 7 and 8 }. ... These [six] are also called the Astika (theistic) philosophical traditions and are those that accept the Vedas as an authoritative, important source of knowledge. Ancient and medieval India was also the source of philosophies that share philosophical concepts [with the six] but rejected the Vedas, and these have been called nastika (heterodox or non-orthodox) Indian philosophies. ...[among which are] Buddhism, Jainism, Charvaka, Ajivika, and others.” Philosophy in general is - as noted - usually ambivalent about the all-is-consciousness thesis.

Radhakrishnan in his Volume Two on “Indian Philosophy” (op cit.), addresses these six systems in Chapter numbers - { n } - as interposed above. I will try to briefly reprise the core precepts of each, in this chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR: PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM FURTHER CONSIDERED (*continued, p2*)

“The Purva [meaning ‘earlier’] Mimamsa, addressing ritual, vs. Uttara Mimamsa, addressing knowledge of the truth of things, is frankly polytheistic, though by implication atheistic. It accepts a realistic view of the world as against the Buddhists. (pp 374-375) ...It did not concern itself with the problems of ultimate reality... As a philosophical view of the universe it [the Purva Mimamsa] is strikingly incomplete. ...The performance of the sacrifice was regarded as the most essential thing... [with later devotional and monotheistic elements in Hinduism seen as arising in reaction to this sterility] (pp 428-429 in Vol.2, Radhakrishnan, op cit.)

“Seek *what the elders sought*; not to follow in the *ways* of the elders.” (anon; attribution lost)

Hindu philosophy in overview terms can be classed with all philosophy in the sense of efforts to bring intellectual clarity to bear upon the religious enterprise, which is essentially an *inner* and *one-by-one* enterprise, but is subsumed within all the world’s famous five - Chronologically Hinduism Judaism, Buddhism, Christianity and Islam - into folkways and customs and rituals and - eventually, to many varied degrees - dogma, scriptural authority, priests. Betokening a true antithesis to the core religious enterprise which in its essence is fundamentally *inner* and *free*. Not social and dogmatized; institutional.

Small wonder that many seekers abjure all religions. And espouse the refrain, ‘religion is secondhand revelation, living in someone else’s house; and spirituality is your personal encounter with The Divine and living in *your own* house.’ In general I am in complete agreement with this attitude but see no merit in turning one’s back on the religious traditions and the philosophies that have tried to elucidate those traditions in terms of: what is reality? What is God? Thus, I endeavor these series of books on the theme of ‘x and The Law of One.’ ‘X’ being the above noted famous five, plus a sixth: the modern dogma that is western scientific materialism.

What impels this effort is my personal encounter with The Divine and it leads me to a sadhana or spiritual practice shaped / encouraged / inspired by *five* key scriptural sources:

The Bhagavad Gita. Constant Mindfulness; an ongoing effort towards this.

The Ra Contact: Teaching the Law of One. Moral polarization. (52% or more, service to others /etc)

Autobiography of a Yogi. Cognizance of the ‘weird’ totalistic ways The Divine manifests

The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object (and without a subject). Three great consciousness provinces.

The Path of the Masters. The bani, a.k.a. the audible lifestream; ‘everything is vibration’

Thus I perforce must share the deep inward convictions about God and each of us, that these studies and practices have brought. 1. There is a truly unitive consciousness standing behind the starry heavens and each of us. 2. We each can innerly commune with that unitive consciousness. 3. There are definite dividends of felicity and quiet joy that emanate from that communion. 4. In a very real sense the inward consciousness of each of us contributes to this unfolding world. Both in *positive* terms; in *negative* terms; and ‘asleep at the wheel’ terms. *You* get to choose.

CHAPTER FOUR: PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM FURTHER CONSIDERED (*continued, p3*)

“No explanation of experience is possible if we do not assume the reality of a knowing self and an object known. (p 248). ... the dualistic Samkhya [philosophic system], which insists on the plurality of purusas [pure self or selfness from which ‘jivas’ or individual souls emanate] and the independence of prakriti [becomingness and manifestation: the realm of subject-object consciousness in overall terms] and drops all account of the Absolute... [marks this system as divergent from the Upanishads, from whence arose this philosophic system as textual commentary / interpretation]. [The Samkhya argues] on strictly rational grounds for the reality of selves and objects. [and, in it’s refutation of Buddhist views]...it was obliged to concede that there was no proof for the existence of God. (p 253). [Samkhya argues that] ...Purusa is the perfect spirit, not to be confused with the particular human spirit. The Purusa is certainly in me, this individual me, as my very core and substance; and the jiva, or the individual, with all his irrational caprices and selfish aims, is but a distortion of purusa. To say that every jiva is striving to realise its purusa means that every jiva is potentially purusa, every man is postentially divine.” (p 323 in Vol.2, Radhakrishnan, op cit.)

From a western perspective - and again, in overview terms - the general objection seems to be that the Hindu spiritual practices which have evolved in India and now have spread worldwide are way too *otherworldly*, and passive about constructive intercessions in this here-and-now world. This is reflected in Hindu philosophy; most dramatically, in the tendency to assert with much fanfare that ‘the world is an illusion.’ Various remarks to this effect. Notwithstanding such insights about worldliness-versus-divinity as are evidenced in the above quotation.

Other great religious traditions have something of this tendency too. There is a pronounced tendency to look askance at the hurly-burly ordinary world; to enjoin various practices of an ascetic nature; to emphasize prayer and God-devotion despite ‘zero’ practical or tangible *steady* evidence that the former is efficacious... or that the latter actually exists.

I have come to be convinced that the overall lack of evidence for the presence of THE ONE INFINITE CREATOR OF INTELLIGENT INFINITY / consciousness without an object and without a subject / God, is altogether ‘baked in’ by design. Thus is personal freedom proved and vouchsafed. Put another way: God is not desperate for attention; desperate for adulation; desperate for devotees; ‘God wants lovers not slaves’ as has been said; and, to be sure, the Beingness of Divinity is well hidden, absent any thirst to discern Its Presence. But once that thirst is freely aroused? Voila. “Veiled in my maya, I am not shown to many.” [ch_v_, 1944 Isherwood / Prab. tr., Bhagavad Gita]

There is no greater boon and no greater honor than to be a devotee of THE ONE INFINITE CREATOR OF INTELLIGENT INFINITY . Prayers are answered. The ineffable nature of the unity consciousness that is The Creator *can* be sensed, for it lies veiled in all the normal appearances of the world. Acceptance is the *positive* leitmotif. Whereas unrelenting efforts at control is the *negative* leitmotif. The latter, as hitherto noted, is not without it’s dividends; but, only after a very stony road indeed.

CHAPTER FOUR: PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM FURTHER CONSIDERED (continued, p4)

“Applying the methods of logical inquiry and criticism, they [*Nyaya and Vaisesika as analytic types of philosophy*] endeavor to show that these do not warrant the conclusions which the Buddhist thinkers derived from them, and that logic does not compel us to disperse the unity and pattern of life into its fleeting moments [*which is a kind of strict phenomenonism* [1]]. They are interested mainly in averting the skeptical consequences of the Buddhist phenomenonism, which merged external reality in [*or into*] the ideas of mind [*as - essentially - a superimposed fiction arisen from innately barren perceptual exteriorities*]. They seek to restore the traditional substance of the soul within and nature without, but not on the basis of mere authority [*to wit, based simply on the inner-experience testimony of this or that mystic personage or sage, however exotic or venerated, or this-or-that holy scripture*].”

- p 29-30 in Ch. 2, Vol.2, Radhakrishnan, op cit.; five [*interpositions*] added.

In overview terms, the philosophical tug-of-war as we find it in the historical record both in the east and in the west is between *materialism* broadly defined; and *idealism* broadly defined

At it's most extreme in terms of baldness of statement and true intellectual honesty, materialism disdains consciousness and disdains subjectivity. It's as simple as that.

Then in similar baldness of statement and candor, the idealists in various fashions and to various degrees call out the materialistic / phenomenological thinkers as deluded. As wrong-headed. “Objectivity” is - again, to be frank - demoted into the creature of a whole series of vast subjectivities / subjectivity-realms, which stretch onward and upward *into a true infinity*.

It deserves to be re-emphasized. This stand-off, this tug of war - which hitherto I sort of bemoaned, as do many others - is not accidental nor a tragedy. It vouchsafes free will down to the level of the individual jiva or soul (Ra: mind/body/spirit complex). There will never be a day where materialistic argumentations will succeed in being iron-clad; unassailable. Nor will there ever be a day where the idealists will come up with reasoning so sharp, so penetrating... that materialism as a defensible worldview and mind-set will be vanquished and demolished forever.

Is this a happy reality? Or a tragic reality? *You get to decide*. The cornerstone of The Law of One is freedom. In an inner sense - and in various circumscribed outer senses as well - we each are free; our freedoms exteriorly however being mediated by social contracts and facts of nature. Sometimes those outward forces crush or deform (Ra uses the term ‘distortions’) our sense of inward freedom. But inward freedom when lofted to mystic certainty becomes a great force indeed

[1] “phenomenology: the metaphysical doctrine that phenomena [*quanta ‘cognizable by the senses or in the way of immediate experience: apparent, sensible, perceptible’*] are the only objects of knowledge, or the only true realities; externalism. [*to wit, the statement that*] the objects of our knowledge are merely phenomenal.” - The Oxford English Dictionary, Unabridged; 1971; 20th printing, Jan. 1981.

CHAPTER FOUR: PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM FURTHER CONSIDERED (*continued, p5*)

“The word yoga [*essentially meaning to yoke or bind, as in a seeker binding with God*] is used in a variety of senses. It may simply mean ‘method’. In the Upanishads and the Bhagavad-Gita, the soul in its worldly and sinful [‘*sin*’ *having root reference to all powers-thirsting selfishnesses, where God is implicitly and/or explicitly denied as anything actual*] condition is said to live separate and estranged from the supreme soul. The root of all sin and suffering is separation, disunion, estrangement. To be rid [*of this is to attain*] ... the consciousness of two in one, or Yoga. In Patanjali Yoga does not mean union, but only effort... [*in sum, your sadhana or set of spiritual practices toward Union*].”

- p 337 in Ch. 5, Vol.2, Radhakrishnan,
op cit.; four [*interpositions*] added.

“Yoga” as a term adopted and widely used in the west is most often associated with effort, rather than the other meaning of ‘being a true yogi’ (a seeker truly merged into the Infinite Consciousness). In this sense of *effort* there are actually an infinite number of yogas additional to the four which seem most frequently to be discussed [1]. Moreover each seeker winds up practicing these different methods in different combinations; where one or the other of the various practices predominates. There can also be *blendings* of various types.

In personal terms I find the process of jnana yoga in combination with bhakti yoga most efficacious; when twinned with the practices of karma-yoga (‘the world is imprisoned in it’s own activities, except when those activities are performed as offerings to God’ - *B-Gita*) and constant mindfulness: as also enjoined in the Bhagavad Gita, but in even more forceful terms.

Behind all of this discussion is the issue of **subjectivity**. Does subjectivity - whose sole signature is the will as already noted - loom above and beyond what we think of as this exterior, ‘objective’ universe? I say yes. And that this is a necessary consequence of the all-is-consciousness worldview when taken in a positive direction. (There is also of course the negative direction of service-to-oneself where self-v-other distinctions deepen, because ‘self’ is seen as atomized; infinitely variegated; and, any notion of a unifying *overarching* Self, or God, gets ignored / denied or given an altogether secondary, totemistic, by-and-large agnostic status).

“Burroughs had a longstanding preoccupation with magic and the occult, dating from his earliest childhood, and was insistent throughout his life that we live in a ‘magical universe.’ As he himself explained: ‘In the magical universe there are no coincidences and there are no accidents. Nothing happens unless someone wills it to happen. The dogma of science is that the will cannot possibly affect external forces, and I think that’s just ridiculous. It’s as bad as the church.’ ”

[*cont’d on page after next*].

[1] Types of yoga practice familiar in the west are *hatha* yoga (body postures, breath control), *jnana* yoga (mental discipline toward discerning true wisdom), *raja* yoga (meditation), and *bhakti* yoga: a focus upon devotion toward God / THE ONE INFINITE CREATOR OF INTELLIGENT INFINITY / consciousness without an object and without a subject; however ably or feebly any devotee is able to hold a mental conception of The Divine with all it’s stunning attributes concerning *infinite* infinities, as well as timelessness / foreverness.

CHAPTER FOUR: PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM FURTHER CONSIDERED (*continued, p6*)

“The Vaisesika system takes its name from visesa, or particularity. ...The impulse of the Vaisesika system is derived from its hostility to Buddhistic phenomenalism. While the Vaisesika accepts the Buddhist view of the sources of knowledge - perception and inference - it argues that souls and substances are solid facts, and cannot be dismissed as fancy pictures of a fairy tale [*that utterly dissolve when bare consciousness is apprehended as Buddhist phenomenalism argues*]. ...It does not concern itself with the problems of theology, and Shankara’s criticism even suggests that the dominant tendency of the system was [*toward the same atheism that’s so much the tendency in Buddhistic phenomenalism*]...”

- pp 176-177 in Ch. 3, Vol.2, Radhakrishnan, op cit.; two [*interpositions*] added.

“As we have seen in our criticism of the Nyaya, both the psychological and the physical orders are rooted in a universal consciousness which is not to be confused with the psychological [*e.g., subject-object*] consciousness. It [*the universal consciousness*] underlies the distinction of subject and object.”

- p 246, Ch.3, op cit.; two [*interpositions*] added.

It is quite reassuring to see such philosophical clarity in Dr. Radhakrishnan’s discussion of not just the Vaisesika school of philosophical thought - evidenced especially in the second quotation above - but in other parts of his treatise. Certainly his style of academic discussion dates from the 1920’s, and could be called musty from today’s viewpoint a century later, but the overall viewpoint which he brings to Indian philosophy - and philosophy in general - is in my opinion sterling and transcends the particulars of his writing style.

It allows me to restate that viewpoint before resuming a review of Shankara (Chapters 7 and 8 in Vol. 2, op cit.) as was very briefly touched on already (Ch. 3, p5). It’s quite simply this. That Ra - and so many *other* commentators - are correct when they say, in effect: this entire universe and much more besides is of one piece; one transcendent and uncorrallable undefinable consciousness.

Is that uncorrallable, undefinable, primordial or root consciousness ‘other’ than who you are or who I am, or who or what yonder tree is? The answer must be nuanced. Elsewise the whole point gets lost in crude reductionism: that, *yes*, we are all of ‘It;’ or, *no*, none of us are of ‘It.’

The answer, most correctly, is yes and no. Why is the matter so subtle? I believe Ra is correct in stating that the “first distortion” (Ra’s term) of THE ONE INFINITE CREATOR OF INTELLIGENT INFINITY / consciousness without an object and without a subject is **freedom**. Freedom, of course, is a necessary precondition for love. But wait. There’s a dynamic tension. In a very subtle way freedom brings in train a difficult concept: ‘unfreedom;’ which, in point of fact, is infinite intelligence; a well-nigh inconceivable completeness. In such knowledge or wisdom is a sort of unfreedom. “Left or right?” Asked from a position of genuine unknowingness, or ‘confusion,’ freedom is implicit in such an asking. But the answer is *unfree*, if that answer be true and correct

[*The Burroughs quotation begun on the previous page is concluded on the following page*]

CHAPTER FOUR: PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM FURTHER CONSIDERED (*continued, p7*)

“Since the word ‘magic’ tends to cause confused thinking, I would like to say exactly what I mean by ‘magic’ and the magical interpretation of so-called reality. The underlying assumption of magic is the assertion of ‘will’ as the primary moving force in this universe - the deep conviction that nothing happens unless somebody or some being wills it to happen. To me this has always seemed self evident. ...From the viewpoint of magic [*as I am here clarifying it’s meaning*], no death, no illness, no misfortune, accident, war or riot is accidental. There are no accidents in the world of magic.” - conclusion of quotation begun on p 5 of Ch. 4. one [*interposition*] added. [1]

Need I remind to *the* telling quotation that deserves accompaniment to the above?

“The Lord is everywhere and always perfect.” [Ch_v_, Bhagavad Gita, 1944 Isherwood/Prabhav. tr.]

But quick. Let us not commit the error of the general run of uncritical - or not sufficiently discerning - idealists / transcendentalists. Indeed, an error embedded in much of Hindu theology and philosophy and practice, which led to the reaction / refinement which - today - we know of as Buddhism; inasmuch as Gautama Buddha failed to wholly reform errors of practice and theory (as he saw them) in the onrushing tradition of Hinduism of his time. Rather akin to how Jesus bar Joseph of Nazareth the Christed one failed in any wholesale reformation of the Judaism of *his* time; and so today - thanks to his disciples and the power of his message - we have Christianity alongside Judaism. In these two twinned rivers of tradition, we behold the power of *tradition*!

The important takeaway is this. What is the nature of ultimate will? “Brahman [God] is that which is without any cause, but Itself.” [Ch_v_, Bhagavad Gita, 1944 Isherwood/Prabhavananda tr.] Surely in this statement we behold the headwaters of The Will. Of Willfulness. Modeling this theoretically cannot be accomplished within ordinary human logic and intellect in an altogether satisfactory manner. But I rely upon the following sketch-map to make the thing clearer.

The start point is consciousness without an object and without a subject. The self-rousing in this primordial ‘soup’ so to say leads to equivalent out-thrusts in opposite directions. In one direction is never-an-object, subject-only awareness (the spatial ‘void’ of Nirvana: actually a plenum of in-potentiality energy). In the other direction is subject-object awareness where The Self takes on an *infinite* raiment of embodiment-vehicles for experience. *Always beneath both is nirdvanda*. Nirvana (expansiveness, exhilaration); subject-object awareness (constriction; irritants).

[1] p 20 of 26 pp in the printed out version of the Wikipedia entry for William Seward Burroughs II, 2/5/1914 - 8/2/1997, “widely considered a primary figure of the Beat Generation and a major post-modern author.” As copied from the internet website “https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_S_Burroughs” at 10:15 am Mon. 10/3/22. Burroughs “helped make homosexuality seem cool and highbrow, providing gay liberation with a delicious edge” (p26 of 26), inasmuch as recurring themes in his writing are “drugs, homosexuality and death.” (p 25 of 26). (And individualistic rebelliousness)

CHAPTER FOUR: PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM

FURTHER CONSIDERED (*continued, p8*)

Nirdvanda or consciousness without an object and without a subject (the FMW term) is a somewhat whose undefinability contrasts markedly with the clear and vivid foreground of subject-object consciousness; and, the less clear but still cognizable background of subject-only consciousness or the Spatial Void (the FMW term). It is in this matter of confusing - or not differentiating - subject-only consciousness or Nirvana, from Nirdvanda, that the seeming tug-of-war arises between Hindu philosophy - with it's focus upon the Atman or the Pure Self of Nirvana Consciousness - and Buddhist philosophy: with it's intended focus upon Nirdvanda, albeit said focus is accomplished in a somewhat confusing way - however inevitably - once recourse to language is utilized.

These types of confusions, in more detail, will be addressed in a separate chapter.

However the general reconciliation between Hindu and Buddhist philosophies can be summed or sketched as follows. It is important to offer this sketch, as a seeming standoff between Buddhist metaphysics and Hindu metaphysics is destructive of both. Because a skeptical observer is somewhat entitled to conclude that they're *both* wrong, when this isn't the case; they merely address "moksha" or liberation concerning *two different stages* in the spiritual journey, and may I suggest, there is every reason to suppose that that journey is actually infinite. A token of that infinity inheres in the 'moksha' definition of the two systems and the larger ramifications of this. (E.g., from 'joyous lake' (nirvana), to 'stupefyingly awesome' ocean (nirdvanda)).

The starting point is humdrum familiar subject-object consciousness. A self or jiva (say me or you) entertains certain thoughts (subtle objects) which lead to certain actions ('gross' or easily discernible objective phenomena which occur in the senses-perceivable worldabout). Now the idea of Nirvana is where such thoughts grow quiescent - by way of various sadhanas or spiritual disciplines - and a sort of consciousness hinterland is entered (FMW's term), where the jiva or thoughts-clouded self, gains acquaintance with the purusha or 'pure' self, to use the terms as they appear in the literature reviewed by Radhakrishnan. All in all the focus is upon the distinct *power* of the self and - when this power is recognized - ordinary or subject-object reality is seen in a different way. As - basically and in general - a projection of the power of *tiered* selfnesses.

Gautama Buddha and the spiritual tradition he founded - Buddhism - sought to bring attention to a still stranger or more esoteric realization; wherein "God" as a supreme self so to say, is transcended in a 'still, calm, void essence' consciousness (to use customary descriptives); and, this attainment entails not just the dissolution of the jiva (personal "me") but purusha (purified "me"); as no objects gross or subtle remain, and no self whether exalted or pedestrian remains to witness said objects. All dissolves in luminosity. That's way it's usually or very often described.

CHAPTER FOUR: PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM

FURTHER CONSIDERED (*continued, p9*)

In some measure this characterization of nirdvanda as ‘still, calm, void essence’ consciousness or ‘luminosity’ consciousness is evocative in a positive way. Stillness, calmness, and luminosity certainly resonate as positives. But what about *voidness*? While in some sense appropriate - surely from the standpoint of nirdvanda consciousness, the sensible objects and subtle objects of subject-object consciousness constitute bubbles of ‘nothing’ in the clear waters of nirdvanda consciousness, and so, we here in such awareness are, comparatively speaking, living among ‘voids’ - to say that nirdvanda consciousness is *even more* void or empty, this is to point the entire matter in more-or-less the wrong direction. This is my contention.

Consider for a moment the opposite term *plenum*, meaning full, and the very opposite of void or vacuum. Using this reference, we could say that subject-object consciousness is possessed of a certain measure of fullness... of *substantiality*. Inversely, such substantiality is emanating from never-an-object pure subjectivity consciousness which by contrast is indeed invisible; unable to be seen; having the comparative value of void, it would seem, as in the FMW term for nirvana consciousness (subject-only consciousness) as a spatial void. Consider for a moment that this kind of seesaw is operating everywhere. Little voids, so to say, emanating ripples of fullness (subtle objects and gross objects). It becomes clear that nirdvanda consciousness - the substrate of both - accommodates subject-only ‘voidness’ every bit as well as the ‘substantiality’ of subject-object awareness. Moreover that it’s in and around everything forever. Near at hand.

So the contrasting terms then of voidness or substantiality are neither of them altogether appropriate or satisfactory in trying to reference nirdvanda consciousness or what we could call root consciousness; primordial consciousness; ever-unchanging consciousness. Which of course brings up the seminal question: how arose the ‘changingness’ of selves and of objects from a state which is changeless? Which is, so to say, neither? This query is not lightly answerable. It may indeed have no definitive answer whatsoever. ‘Waking’ to nirdvanda consciousness can be sudden (the zen flash of satori so-called) or extremely, extremely, gradual: like sinking into a warm bath by stages. In a ruminative way as it were. Or as the result of long years of spiritual practice. [Note also that subject-object consciousness can be called ‘void;’ and nirvana ‘fulsome’]

The varieties of physical death - the soul sloughing off the body, the physical vehicle - can serve as something of a representation of what is at issue. That the transit from subject-object consciousness to subject-only consciousness to nirdvanda consciousness can occur rapidly; or by slow degrees; and in a rather traumatic painful manner or in a rather delicious and exhilarating manner. Trauma and pain can be brought to a minimum by a wholistic or a global compassion sort of consciousness. Whereas ‘us-them’ sharply divisive ‘selfish’ awareness? Agony at a fever pitch. (Recall, again, that *contrast* is the mechanism whereby consciousness is aroused in subject-object consciousness).

CHAPTER FOUR: PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM

FURTHER CONSIDERED (*continued, p 10*)

“The entranced self-absorption which arms itself with sanctity, involves a cruel indifference to practical life hardly acceptable to average intelligence [*much less to truly service-to-others morally polarizing persons*]. Shankara knows all this, and so gives us a logical theism which does not slight the intellect, does not scorn the wisdom of the ages, and is at the same time the highest intellectual account of the truth [*vis-a-vis true substantiality accruing to primordial consciousness*]. What is the relation between the absolutism of intuition and the empirical theism of logic, Shankara does not tell us; for, as Goethe wisely observed, ‘man is born not to solve the problem of the universe but to find out where the problem begins, and then to restrain himself within the limits of the comprehensible [*as to what he can undertake in inward terms of prayer / contemplation and in outward terms of action / collective action*].’ Shankara recognizes that there is a region which we cannot penetrate, and a wise agnosticism is the only rational attitude.”

- pp 657-658, Ch.10, Vol. 2, Radhakrishnan op cit.; three [*interpositions*] added. (Note: the FMW spelling for the name Shankara - Radhakrishnan ‘Samkara’ - has been used)

In the above summation as to Shankara and his Advaita (nondual) Vedanta as reviewed by Radhakrishnan, allusion is made to Shankara’s effort to thread together three disparate rivers: interior intuition and the absolute conviction it innerly brings to the seeker; the plaited-up weight of tradition as to rituals and revered texts, to wit religious tradition; and third the spirit of free and untrammelled intellectual inquiry as we see it in genuine philosophy and unblinkered science. In attempting such a rapprochement, it’s tacitly presumed that no definitive presentation either in religious ritual / ceremony, nor in logical exposition, *nor even in personal revelation*, can wholly compass Nirdvanda (consciousness without an object and without a subject) nor the eerie way It’s everywhere-always Presence undergirds both ‘subject only’ or nirvana consciousness (which is possessed of it’s own deeper-and-deeper depths), and, ‘subject-object’ or ordinary ‘you me’ consciousness.

My term ‘unblinkered science’ refers to that purity in western science that has rid itself of it’s materialistic bias (that consciousness is epiphenomenal), in favor either of an outright embrace of the all-is-consciousness thesis; or at least a thoroughgoing investigatory agnosticism about this account being possibly correct as to the true, really basic nature of reality.

Somewhat similarly ‘genuine philosophy’ is that dimension in philosophy which does not disdain the precincts of religious fervor and conviction - deeming such behavior as either inscrutable or just a downright private delusion - but reaches toward an account with a moral dimension. In a word? A service-to-others moral dimension. Needless to say, all too often philosophy becomes a fussy, derivative game of logical chess. If such chess be countenanced it ought to confess it’s bona fides as service-to-oneself ‘holier than thou’ elitism: closet atheism.

CHAPTER FOUR: PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM

FURTHER CONSIDERED (*continued, p 11*)

“Shankara’s devastating dialectic, which traces all - God, man, and the world - to one ultimate consciousness [*nirvanda*, consciousness without an object and without a subject]...produces [*no appeal to the emotions of the religious yearning, which Ramanuja seeks to address*]. Shankara’s followers outdo the master, and bring his doctrine perilously near atheistic mentalism [*akin to Buddhism’s ‘anatman’ doctrine getting tarred as subtle atheism and /or nihilism*]. ... A thin intellect with no depth of soul may be blind to the wonders of God’s ways, and may have offered us a seemingly simple solution. Not so Ramanuja, who gives us the best type of monotheism conceivable, inset with touches of immanentism [*to wit that God is innermost in we each*].”

- pp 720-721, Ch.9, Vol. 2, Radhakrishnan op cit.; four [interpositions] added. (Note: the FMW spelling for the name Shankara - Radhakrishnan ‘Samkara’ - has been used)

After all, that’s what atheism is all about. The loosing of any fetters upon private egoity or so to say the world-besotted jiva (self nature) which cloaks the purusha (pure self or soul). If the former presumes to take the throne as God - absolute life-and-death ruler - the moral neutrality implicit in atheism doesn’t blink; doesn’t waver. In service to otherselfs moral polarization (the opposite polarization) there is an implicit or ingrained hostility to such bald egoity. Such a polarization - the one I am attempting and recommend - can certainly glimpse the possibility that service-to-ownself results in certain boons to Intelligent Infinity. (I have already cited the three - strengthening of the will; dexterity at deception / concealment; cultivation of charisma - that seem to me to result from the kind of intense self-deification that’s at the heart of the service to ownself moral polarization trajectory of late third, to fourth, to fifth, to early sixth densities).

But that doesn’t mean any quarter need be given in the here-and-now world. Moral war is afoot. What neutralizes the enemy is not hatred but a withering intellectual dissection.

Radhakrishnan alludes to Shankara as possessing such intellectual clarity. I am persuaded that he is correct in doing so, even though my assimilation of Shankara’s viewpoint is a work in progress; still, I agree with the assessment that the Advaita (nondual) Vedanta (the Vedas as holy texts / sacred scriptures) espoused so skillfully by Shankara, was a masterful effort at rapprochement between Hindu religious tradition... and the newly blossoming Buddhist religious tradition.

That rapprochement is in my view best capsuled in the understanding that “atman” in Hindu religious thought is the purified self (the purusha within every jiva or ‘ordinary’ self), and that ‘anatman’ in Buddhist doctrine is not so much aimed at purusha as illusory, but *jiva* as illusory.

Moksha, then, can be said to have two stages. (1) Nirvana, where the individual self attains to subject-only ‘depth’ awareness. (2) Nirvanda, where it is imbibed - whether suddenly or by stages - that the apparent world is utterly of The Divine *as much as all of the Nirvana realm*.

CHAPTER FOUR: PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM

FURTHER CONSIDERED (*continued, p 12*)

“ Saivism [*Saivism - God evoked as Shiva, fiery destroyer / purifier - vs. Vaisnavism - God evoked as Vishnu, world-sustainer - {re, Brahma/Vishnu/Shiva as a trinity denoting birth-life-death/transformation}*] is even today a very popular creed in South India. While it prevailed in South India even before the Christian era, it received a great access of strength from its opposition to Buddhism and Jainism, which it, along with Vaisnavism, overcame about the fifth or the sixth century after Christ. It elaborated a distinctive philosophy called the Saiva Siddhanta about the eleventh century A.D. A leading form of reaction against Shankara's Advaitism [*nondualism*] is the dualistic philosophy associated with the name of Madhva [*regarded as a Saiva Siddhanta philosopher*], which has many points in common with Ramanuja's view of reality. Madhva stands out for unqualified dualism...”

- p 722 and 737-738, Ch.10, Vol. 2, Rdhakrishnan op cit.; three [*interpositions*] added. (Note: the FMW spelling for the name Shankara - Radhakrishnan 'Samkara' - has been used.)

This brings us back to an apparent trinity. The never-an-object *self* consciousness; the always-associated-with-objects 'ordinary' or familiar *subject-object* consciousness; and, the very elusive, kind-of-invisible but everywhere-always *nirdvanda* consciousness (consciousness without an object and without a subject). Invisible. Ineffable. Yet, **the** primordial substantiality.

Given that the all-is-consciousness worldview can have as its philosophical statement in overview terms, the actuality of all three of these great dimensions of consciousness, it's rather understandable how philosophy finds itself on the horns of a dilemma. Not just atheistic philosophy - which is quite happy with endless multiplicities ad infinitum - but *mystical* or *spiritual* philosophy as we have it in the west [e.g. FMW] and in India in the form of Shankara, Madhva, et al. Such mysticism-based, imperiences (inner experiences) based, philosophies about the reality of God, God-in-the-world, and individual souls... such philosophies can declare nonduality as Shankara does; or, a dynamic tension of subject-only consciousness versus subject-object consciousness can be declared as somehow eternal and dynamic in and of itself. Inasmuch as *nirdvanda* consciousness is 'indifferent' to the presence or absence of you or me or the world. At least such is the implication of the dualistic mystical philosophies. Which frees such philosophies to emphasize God as a tangible presence with whom the *sadakha* (the spiritual seeker) can have a direct and pungent and visceral and intimate interaction. A Presence both 'in me, of me,' and 'not me,' far & away. So 'me / inward divinity,' in communion with a Divine Otherness.

It can also be framed this way. If prayer be deemed efficacious - as I certainly do - are such prayers to One Being (monotheism) or Plural Beings (the implication in Buddhism)? In other words, are the many many agencies of Divinity to be regarded as multiple prayer-answers? Or, just Divinity Itself? Well, both are correct of course. If the lifeguard who saves you from drowning, for example, be deemed the immediate answer to your prayers; surely this is by no means *necessarily* incompatible with a One Divinity having acted *through that agency*.

CHAPTER FOUR: PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM

FURTHER CONSIDERED (*continued, p 13*), CONCLUSION

“ Consciousness-without-an-object [*and without-a-subject*] may be symbolized by a SPACE that is unaffected by the presence or absence of objects, for which there is neither Time nor Timelessness; neither a world containing Space nor a Spatial Void; neither Tension [*cf. world objects that tend ever toward their opposites / complements / inversions*] nor Equilibrium; neither Resistance [*as in subject-object consciousness*] nor Creativeness [*as in subject-only consciousness*]; neither Agony nor Bliss; neither Action nor Rest; neither Restriction nor Freedom.”

- Aphorism 51, FMW, Phil. Consc. w/o Obj., op cit.; four [*interpositions*] added. (as quoted on p1 of Fall 2022 “Sangha Newsletter” of the Merrell-Wolff Press rec’d 10/11/22). See annotated bibliography

“...The liberal theism of the Bhagavad Gita, which endows the all-soul with ethical in addition to metaphysical perfections; the logical scheme of the Nyaya...the Samkhya speculations in science and psychology; the Yoga scheme of the pathway to perfection; [*and the thought of Shankara and so many other Indian philosophers who all-in-all - as with philosophy worldwide - cannot dispel fundamental mystery. In sum:*] The resources of nature cannot generate consciousness. We cannot reduce nature and consciousness the one to the other, as scientific and psychological metaphysics [*to wit, materialism, where consciousness is deemed an epiphenomenon*] attempt to do.

- pp 766-767 and p 769, Ch.11, Vol. 2, Radhakrishnan op cit.; two [*interpositions*] added. (Note: the FMW spelling for the name Shankara - Radhakrishnan ‘Samkara’ - has been used.)

It can in general be noted that great efforts in logical systems founded on mystical imperiences (inward consciousness experiences) - as is so remarkably the case with FMW, and of course Shankara, as well as with many other Indian philosophers cited by Radhakrishnan - cannot, in and of themselves, substitute for the inward thirst of the sadakha (the spiritual aspirant).

Even is it so with religious affiliation in general. All great religious traditions - the famous five chronologically being Hinduism, Judaism, Buddhism, Christianity and Islam - have the laudable aim of inculcating amongst their adherents a sense of the divine, and a sense of a moral compass. Still, whether these elements truly percolate into any one individual... well, *that* is up to *that individual*.

Is this a tragedy? Or a blessing? I have come to the view it’s a blessing, for it is a yet further earnest that freedom and free will is the cornerstone of the creation - the first distortion as Ra implies - and any one individual can be as much of an atheist as he or she wishes; or, as much of a theist as he or she wishes; or, as much of a ‘wandering lost’ thinker as he or she wishes

My sense of the nearness and the enveloping Presence of The Creator are understandings I can attest to in these writings. Yet, they are sayings or ‘stories’ only, for the reader. Each reader is on his or her own personal journey towards mystical or if you prefer spiritual conviction. A sense of communion with The Divine. That divinity is in we each; *and*, is a Presence outerly, too!

CHAPTER FOUR: PHILOSOPHY IN HINDUISM

FURTHER CONSIDERED (*continued, p 14*), CONCLUSION, P2

“ ‘I have always found,’ [William] Blake wrote rather bitterly, ‘that Angels have the vanity to speak of themselves as the only wise. This they do with a confident insolence sprouting from systematic reasoning [*as in a reliance upon orderly logic and processes of the rational mind*].’ ” [1]

William Blake - a colleague amongst well known mystics Western and Eastern - uses the term “Angels” in reference to they steeped in churchly piety, and / or the erudition of philosophy, who presume to set forth parameters and characteristics of the religious life, in describing the journey of the genuine seeker after knowledge of God and intimacy with God. Which is so much the holy grail of all great religious traditions. But of countless rebels and iconoclasts too!

While I shall be conscientious in speaking further concerning the Bhagavad Gita and Shankara and other texts and sages which are part of Hinduism, I do so not from systematic reasoning in the sense of pretending to know what God is in Its wholly unbounded entirety; nor as to ‘the best way to get there,’ for that’s a sacred and utterly personal matter always. Rather, my advocacy - yes it is advocacy - is rooted in a continuing chain of personal earnestness concerning the Realness and the Beingness of the Creator; and the fact of Its inwardness in *everyone...* plus the fact of Its everywhere-ness in the majesty and sweep of this vast physical universe, and realms yet beyond.

Chapter One sought to address “*The Fundamental Pluralism of Indian Culture and Actual Hinduism.*” Chapter Two sought to make plain my advocacy for “*The All Is Consciousness Worldview and The Law of One.*” Chapter Three endeavored an overview upon “*The Meaning of Philosophy in Hinduism.*” In this Chapter just now ending I’ve sought to touch on some of the traditional schools of thought addressed in Radhakrishnan’s classical two volume review of Indian Philosophy, which makes so plain that a concern with God and the Soul and True Reality are very much enduring themes. And of course I’ve offered my personal viewpoint on these themes.

But I am not a referee making affectation of neutrality. I’m ‘all in.’ (“In a ham and eggs breakfast, the Chicken is involved, but the pig is committed.”) . My personal doubts are ended. I indeed sought for divine reassurance, and such reassurances have been forthcoming; they have been subtle, very often; dramatic, at times; but all-in-all utterly, utterly convincing, and again I refer the reader in particular to Special Appendix A. Thus I am as it were compelled to say that not only is God real, but that there’s *nothing but* God. The ‘consciousness that is unitary’ as Ra puts it, is everywhere always, and we all are *of* that, however much we be unawares.

[1] p 63 in “The Doors of Perception” by Aldous Huxley (1894-1963); 1973 Penguin UK pbk. ed.; first pub. by Chatto and Windus in 1954. Widely seen today as a classic concerning the deeper worldview that genuine spiritual vision bestows, whether induced by mescaline, spiritual practices, or in other ways.

CHAPTER FIVE. A PERSONAL CHOICE: THE PITFALLS OF PRESENT-DAY MATERIALISM, OR
AFFIRMING REALITY AS WALL-TO-WALL 'MAGIC' FEATURING *YOUR* INPUT.

It's been observed by others that 'the re-enchantment of the world' (the title of a recent book addressing the issue of inward spiritual conviction as pivotal to how we view the world) has its own pitfalls. That's why there hasn't been some pell-mell rush to re-enchant the world! But that's summing the matter a bit too cavalierly. This Chapter seeks to examine the current worldwide standoff between materialism; and, they persuaded towards a faith-based life, whether in Hinduism, or Judaism, or Buddhism, or Christianity, or Islam, or else-wise 'cult' affiliated [1].

As matters presently stand, orthodox religiosity largely confines itself within a materialistic orthodoxy. There is a sort of uneasy truce. While some observe that 'true' science - unblinkered by a materialistic worldview bias - and 'true' religiosity / spirituality - unblinkered by any rigidly transcendentalist worldview bias - ought to find common cause, common ground... this, in point of fact, has resulted in religious / spiritual orthodoxy accepting a de facto role within materialism. Rather than the other way around: science accepting some de facto role within a *re-enchant-ed* world: where consciousness is embraced as fundamental; universal; eternal; ever mysterious.

The personal choice at issue here is rather stark. Do you inhabit a Reality where 'you' - your personal experience of consciousness - are a kind of a tiny afterthought, an 'epiphenomenon' arisen out of and up from, permanently unknowable materialism 'stuff'? 'Unconscious' atoms and molecules and intergalactic gases? OR, do you inhabit a Reality where 'you' - your personal experience of consciousness - constitute a weave or a thread or a chord or a tonality, arisen out from / down from, a *potentially knowable* super-realm of super-consciousness? A Presence here already, all the time, albeit routinely 'masked' within a *seemingly* dead materialistic universe? *I say the latter*. Unequivocally. The 'authority' I have for this conviction is, I readily grant, personal / inward. Nonetheless, I *can* argue for it, as I shall endeavor to do in this chapter.

[1] Many examples abound, but recently in the news is Rev. Sun Myung Moon's "Unification Church" of South Korea, now headed by his widow, who still promulgates the dogma that she and Moon are a new Adam and Eve with special dispensation powers who can - for a fee, and a hefty one - perform rituals of ablution for long-ago ancestors, who, otherwise, 'will remain burning in hell.' This appeals to they who in the East - South Korea and Japan but elsewhere too - reverence ancestors; even engage in ancestor worship. With the Christian gloss given the sect by Moon (reverence for the historical Jesus), a particular confabulation has resulted which attracts many thousands from, especially, Japan; which, today, is very largely atheist / agnostic otherwise. This caused the son of a woman nearly bankrupted by this sect (paying for rituals who signed over in excess of seven hundred thousand dollars), to assassinate Shinzo Abe, who, like other politicians, made an appearance at a U. Church event, seeking the votes of its parishioners (who routinely vote in lockstep), and a video of this appearance was seen by this son. Since this assassination was such a huge anomaly in largely pacifist modern-day Japan, it shines a spotlight on this sort of doctrinal treachery and self-deification; concerning which, to be sure, *many* other cult examples from history exist, as well as some - like this one - still ongoing.

CHAPTER FIVE. A PERSONAL CHOICE: THE PITFALLS OF PRESENT-DAY MATERIALISM, OR
AFFIRMING REALITY AS WALL-TO-WALL ‘MAGIC’ FEATURING *YOUR* INPUT.
(*continued, p2*)

“We study, think about and gather endless information... and pride ourselves in standing aloof from the content of what we study. For much material this is a justifiable and useful attitude, but it is not the way one attains a psychical transformation. One can raise a study to the status of an effective transforming agent only by giving oneself to it with the same completeness that is characteristic of the more intense religious natures. Most scientific and scholarly minds seem to be [as] afraid of this as of the devil himself. ... ‘Knowledge about’ becomes an effective agent only when it is transformed into ‘knowledge through acquaintance’ [*implying thereby that what’s under review is a subject not ‘an object’ and that the reviewer’s subjectivity has linkage to said subjectivity*].” [1]

The elephant in the room is of course God. The apex subjectivity in point of fact. Moreover the pivotal issue throughout all history - debated again and again in theologies worldwide including of course in Hindu theology - is: in what manner is it, that we each have this subjectivity “in” us (alluded to as *The Atman* in Hinduism), whilst, also, this subjectivity is held to body forth the entire physical universe? Can it be that “I” have a projective ability akin to *God’s*?

I say yes. I defend this proposition in this Chapter, especially, as throughout this book more generally. The matter gets back to the categories of ‘subject,’ ‘object,’ and whether or not a substantiality - albeit ever so ineffable - is the medium in which these two are a mutual arising. Namely, primordial or root Consciousness (sometimes referenced as Ground Consciousness). This is my position. That consciousness is original; self-existent; and, constitutive of all things. That, moreover, there are *densities* of this; of which, human consciousness is ‘third’ density.

But our present day consensus world reality - led of course by an overt and covert dogma of materialism in ‘official / institutional’ western science - as mirrored in countless minds and especially very *learned* minds - seems to be as afraid of this perspective, as of the devil himself.

Such fear, I submit, is grounded in a failure of moral polarization. Or, to be more precise, it is the precinct of third-density or human consciousness, to polarize; thus progressing to embodiment in fourth density, generally analogous to ‘the lower astral’; failing this, successive embodiments or reincarnations occur for the questing soul ‘on the earth plane,’ here on *our* sacred planet or it’s analogues elsewhere. What’s to be ‘feared?’ Quite simply, self-deification. *This* is the “devil” unmasked!

[1] pp 149-150 in “Transformations in Consciousness (The Metaphysics and Epistemology)” by Franklin Merrell-Wolff (1887-1985); containing his “*Introceptualism*” [composed circa 1936 - 1946]; 1995, 1st Ed. by State University of New York (S.U.N.Y.) Press, addr. State Univ. Plaza, Albany N.Y. 12246. 326pp, pbk Underlining and one [*interposition*] added.

CHAPTER FIVE. A PERSONAL CHOICE: THE PITFALLS OF PRESENT-DAY MATERIALISM, OR
AFFIRMING REALITY AS WALL-TO-WALL 'MAGIC' FEATURING *YOUR* INPUT.

(*continued, p3*)

It is very much worth noting that this whole issue of negativity or wickedness or 'the dark side' or so many other namings... that the failure of any of the great religious traditions - or for that matter any of the secular atheist/agnostic philosophies - to really de-mystify this gigantic issue... it's the signal reason I came to regard the Ra material as so valuable. And I still do. [1]

Briefly the situation is this. 'Ordinary' reality in 'ordinary' consciousness, is shot through with a covert polarity that in philosophical terms, is summed in the terms 'the subject' and 'the object.' Encompassing both and beneath both, is an extremely hard-to-discern subfloor, so to say, that may be termed Primordial, forever-impossible-of-total-definition Consciousness.

This Consciousness is the highest Reality. All this physical universe floats, as it were, in It, as do realms far beyond. So, It is near at hand; all pervasive; expressed in all objects in 'ordinary' senses-perceived reality; and, expressed in *all selves* when we turn and consider never-an-object self / bare subjectivity. The instantly-presumed Presence when objects gross or subtle [thoughts] arise.

A sense of person-hood or subjectivity is native and strong within us all. What Ra enunciates with such refreshing clarity - and this of course mirrors many spiritual advisories since time immemorial - is that we need to get ahold of this native subjectivity... and ride it at full gallop to a moral-compass *polarization* in **either** of two directions. Forsaking 'the sinkhole of indifference' (Ra's term) of 73% selfishness / 27% selflessness (a.k.a. compassion or empathy). That's the moral-compass 'default setting' we all have at the start of the game of life; if we don't examine this, or strive to change it... well, this unpolarized mixture of selfishness/selflessness will serve to constrain us to further embodiments (reincarnations) in third density, human-level consciousness.

But if we *do* examine this, the choice is stark.

98% or more pure, unrepentant selfishness; that's the 25% move in *one* direction. Or:

48% *or less* of such selfishness; that's the 25% move in the *exact opposite* direction. Either moral-compass polarization takes genuine persistent effort. To grapple with our self natures is no easy task. Appetites need to be reined in. *Or*, allowed to take over the battlefield in riotous profusion and abandon.

[1] Second only to the Bhagavad Gita, I esteem "The Ra Contact (Teaching the Law of One)," along with three other texts: "Autobiography of a Yogi" by Paramahansa Yogananda; "The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object [and impliedly without a Subject]" by FMW; and "The Path of the Masters" by Dr. Julian Johnson. These five which I so esteem get referenced in a special Part A of the Annotated Bibliography hereto.

CHAPTER FIVE. A PERSONAL CHOICE: THE PITFALLS OF PRESENT-DAY MATERIALISM, OR
AFFIRMING REALITY AS WALL-TO-WALL ‘MAGIC’ FEATURING *YOUR* INPUT.
(continued, p4)

“A very great deal of creation was manifested without the use of the concepts involved in consciousness, as you know it. *[to wit, subject-object ‘ordinary’ human consciousness]*. The creation itself is a form of consciousness which is unified - the Logos *[boundless wisdom, intelligent infinity]* being the one great heart of creation.” [1]

“That which you call the Sarcophagus in your system *[of the tarot]* may be seen to be the material world, if you will. This material world is transformed by the spirit *[of the spiritual seeker]* into that which is infinite and eternal *[to wit, the Creator glimpsed ‘behind the passing scenery.’]*. The infinity of the spirit is an even greater realization than the infinity of consciousness, for consciousness which has been disciplined by will and faith is that consciousness which may contact intelligent infinity directly.” [2] [underlining added]

This is because the self - to wit, the personal self of you or me - is very much at the helm in decision-making about matters great and small. In many ways the self is, indeed, a magical agent; the Creator in microcosm if you will. The first quotation above refers to the Creator in total; and, the second quotation above refers to how the ‘ordinary’ or ‘humdrum’ day-to-day physical world can come to be known as a ‘lila’ (the Indian word meaning ‘play’) animated by the unified consciousness of intelligent infinity. Then this further quotation gets to the matter of how service-to-ownself or the negative polarization has ‘education’ consequences all it’s own:

“Such an entity *[polarizing negatively]* spends its consciousness within the realms of time/space in an attempt to learn the Ways of Wisdom through the utmost use of the powers and resources of the self. Since the self is the Creator, the wisdom density *[of consciousness a.k.a. fifth density, congruent with the higher astral]* provides many informative and fascinating experiences for the negatively polarized entity. // In some respects one may see a more lucid early attachment to wisdom from those of negative polarity, as the nexus of positions of consciousness upon which wisdom is laid is simpler. ...The negative path posits slavery of the less powerful as a means of learning the desire to serve the self to the extent that the will is brought to bear. It is in this way that polarity is increased in the negative sense *[via many ‘battles of wills,’ basically, where the will of the self gets more-and-more intensified]*. [3]

‘Giving the devil his due’ is an expression that comes to mind. But as I see it the all-important takeaway is this. Entities and/or social memory complexes of negative polarity reverse polarity in early sixth density (congruent with the lower causal) and all their ‘tricks’ are given to

[1] 82.12 (session 82, answer 12), on p. 239 of v. 2, 2018 1st Ed.* (2nd printing; pers. copy rec’d 10/19/20). Two *[interpositions]* and underlining added.
* of “The Ra Contact: Teaching the Law of One.”

[2] 80.20 (session 80, answer 20), on p. 224 of v. 2, op cit. Three *[interpositions]* added.

[3] 87.7 (session 87, answer 7), on pp. 284-285 of v. 2, op cit. Three *[interpositions]* & underlining added.

CHAPTER FIVE. A PERSONAL CHOICE: THE PITFALLS OF PRESENT-DAY MATERIALISM, OR
AFFIRMING REALITY AS WALL-TO-WALL 'MAGIC' FEATURING *YOUR* INPUT.
(continued, p5)

the Creator, in the sense of the preceding quotation which remarks, "the creation itself is a form of consciousness which is unified." In other words, the bag of tricks that accrue to those of the negative polarization - a veritable hierarchy of devils, so to say - become part of the *infinite wealth* of the ONE INFINITE CREATOR OF INTELLIGENT INFINITY, nirdvanda consciousness (consciousness without an object and without a subject), wherein all of such tricks come to be interblended with the similar-but-different wealth that's the harvest of the service to otherselves polarization. Why? Because, in a word, the Creator is both the one and the many. Both infinite otherselves - from nematodes and frogs to social memory complexes of fourth, fifth and early sixth densities - and, as well, *just one* self nature of utter unity; utter singularity; 'the one without a second' as announced in Hindu philosophy. Such a singularity of selfness - arising from nirdvanda - is uncorral-lable. And, undefinable. Boundless; illimitable; abiding in Foreverness.

It can be difficult, as already noted, to see what good can be said to derive from a form of selfishness associated with tyranny, despotism; megalomania, sociopathy; and unrepentant greed for power plus for every conceivable emolument of worldly dominion. "They are enemies of mankind, and of Myself" the Gita remarks [ch._v._, Isherwood/Prabhavananda 1944 tr.], and so, it can seem that no good whatsoever can be said to derive from such a 'horrible' moral polarization.

But what unmasks the hidden germ in such negativity is a careful intellectual inventory of what's really at play in and within what - outerly - are such distortions (Ra's term) toward zero compassion, alongside unbridled lust rage and greed, the three doors to hell cited in the Gita. Recall that 'pecking order' is the theme in this polarization. Ergo the three dividends already mentioned: the cultivation of an almost hypnotizing charisma; the cultivation of absolute skill in the deceit and surprise that can be garnered by utterly unrepentant lying; and, perhaps most telling of all, a driving, steel-like, strength of will...a relentless struggle to succeed forged in aeons of struggle. In sum such 'devils' ape at being God. Whom they either despise, regard as a lesser presence, or simply don't believe in whatsoever. Their aim is to prey on - to literally feed on - the lesser and the weak; every bit as much as the aim in service to otherselves polarization is to aid and comfort and nourish - and to literally feed - the lesser and the weak out of an abundance of genuine compassion.

Compassion. No compassion. Which is it, with God? We each are in charge of that algebra because love is a two way street. Whose epicenter is freedom. If we truly and spontaneously and freely choose to be God-focussed, we must understand that The Creator is similarly - albeit far more - truly and spontaneously free to be focussed upon the devotee, the adept, the sadakha. As either a service to otherselves acolyte, predominating; or, as a 'crazy wolf' trying to out-gun intelligent infinity, possessed of an almost insane singleness of purpose. Withal, the Creator

CHAPTER FIVE. A PERSONAL CHOICE: THE PITFALLS OF PRESENT-DAY MATERIALISM, OR
AFFIRMING REALITY AS WALL-TO-WALL 'MAGIC' FEATURING *YOUR* INPUT.

(continued, p6)

“The Christic ethic [*in particular*]...focuses on the primary consideration for otherness, and therefore is radically antiegoistic. Self depreciation is implied in the concern for the good of others that shall at least equal concern for one's own. This exaltation of otherness has two phases, (1) the primary self-giving to... [*Divinity a.k.a. the*] Transcendent Principle, and (2) the valuation and regard for [*others whether strangers or neighbors*] that shall be at least equal to the valuation and regard for oneself. ... // That which comes is to be accepted, but with loving compassion, not cold stoicism.” [1]

responds adroitly in both cases.

The reason I trouble so with the service-to-otherselves polarization - it's core goal of self-divination and it's attitude of battle and challenge, FMW alluding to it as a “military” ethic where cold calculation deadens the moral sense such that enemies are deemed non-human or chattel - is because I intuit that Ra is correct: this inverse morality (some would call it *no* morality) indeed plays a role in the vast cosmic drama; albeit, a secondary role until this polarity is re-absorbed into The Creator as, in effect, ‘a quiver of weapons’ whose use redounds to the good of The Whole.

To cite, again, my own imperience (inner experience), leaving out the particulars for now, I saw or ‘grokked’ (that wonderful word) that Lucifer or Satan or The Horned One (how many are the namings), as the True Chief of all that's sinister and ominous - countless legions of lesser demons and demiurges and vaults of nightmares without end - was, yes it's hard at first to fathom, a truly loyal servant to The Creator; indeed, unmatched in fervor to The Beloved. Intelligent Infinity. Why? Arriving at the gate to Foreverness, there simply is no question any more but that Intelligent Infinity has long ago digested the fruitage of all that any devil might acquire, and is, yes the more powerful and Dark Wizards with their lust of power discern they've met their match

This is a necessary digression because it explains the agenda of they who “hijack” God in the interest of us-them battle lines. Or who seek to use clever reasoning that God is a myth and *they* - the myth busters - ought to be worshipped instead. Countless are the deceptions such as these. There's only one sure way out. Discovering Divinity within. Then - then so especially - can one take up the royal choice. Service to otherselves? Love, a fruitage of nurture, compassion? Or service to oneself? Challenge. Endless battles. Arctic blasts of Infinite Light from Foreverness.

[1] p 228 in “Transformations in Consciousness (The Metaphysics and Epistemology)” by Franklin Merrell-Wolff (1887-1985); containing his “*Introceptualism*” [composed circa 1939 - 1946]; 1995, 1st Ed.* by State University of New York (S.U.N.Y.) Press, addr. State Univ. Plaza, Albany N.Y. 12246. 326pp, pbk underlining and two [*interposition*] added. (*Wolff's *actual* first edition: self-edited; in 19__; before his passing).

CHAPTER FIVE. A PERSONAL CHOICE: THE PITFALLS OF PRESENT-DAY MATERIALISM, OR
AFFIRMING REALITY AS WALL-TO-WALL 'MAGIC' FEATURING *YOUR* INPUT.
(*continued, p7*)

As said before most of us - I certainly include myself - have yet to become successfully polarized. However upon becoming aware of the dynamic at work I'm certainly desirous of sufficiently polarizing as service to otherselves. Which is not so simple as simply wishing it be so. The evidence must necessarily pile up as to actions. The evidence must necessarily pile up as to thoughts. The evidence must necessarily pile up as to both. Moment by moment. Day by day. Year by year. Moreover I don't believe a true overall assessment is accomplished, until we actually leave this physical plane at so-called bodily death, and others - call them hosts of angels or higher density entities who are a mixture of social memory complexes and individuals who are all desirous of assisting each of us upon our transition out from the physical vehicle - help us to determine by way of the so-called life review [1] whether we remain essentially un-polarized (to wit yet further human embodiments lie ahead) or have polarized: that our service to otherselves moral polarization is sufficiently cemented such that a continued soul growth in regions generally referenced as the lower astral, are where we will then be most comfortable and where we will find a congenial setting to be of service to otherselves... or, yes, to be of service to oneself.

If the latter, the context will be one of battles and struggles. For as noted the development of the will is uppermost. And there's no better way to hone the intensity of the will than in contests with *other* wills. Each desirous of conquest. Each intent on being king of the mountain.

I say: affirm that reality is wall-to-wall magic featuring your input. This is another way of saying that prayer works. We each are in a relationship with Intelligent Infinity whether we know it or not. Better to know it. Better to watch prayers being answered. Better to assist in the moving about of the cosmic scenery. We each can do so. Throw off the fetters of all the programming that says you are powerless. That the outer 'objective' world is something you cannot affect. You *can* affect it. You are in fact affecting it *all the time*. For good or for ill. So the opportunity is to become aware of this. Gradually, ever so slowly, I have become aware of this. Actions of times past where I was thoughtless and hurtful are an abiding and stinging reminder to try to do better. It's no fun recalling those past moments. Yet they serve as the best goad of all in an abiding effort to become more empathetic; more compassionate. Truly, the Lord is afoot everywhere and I've come to be convinced that, yes, "the Lord is everywhere and always perfect." *But consider what "perfection" is.*

[1] I'm persuaded a so-called Life Review is something that occurs for everyone who arrives at the point of transitioning out from the physical vehicle; the 'death transition.' It may not occur absolutely immediately, as many NDE accounts emphasize that friends and relatives who have hitherto passed over are present as a sort of welcoming committee. But it occurs. We get to assimilate our impact on others during all our lives and - indeed - we are aided in seeing 'through their eyes' what sort of impact we had; for good or ill. When that impact was deleterious or hurtful oh what a stinging goad amid tears of apology to try to do better. To atone...

CHAPTER FIVE. A PERSONAL CHOICE: THE PITFALLS OF PRESENT-DAY MATERIALISM, OR
AFFIRMING REALITY AS WALL-TO-WALL 'MAGIC' FEATURING *YOUR* INPUT.
(*continued, p8*)

“Perfection” is best understood as dynamical process. Not something static. Too often we characterize ‘perfection’ as unattainable; frozen and trivial; some treacly oversweet dessert. Not something that’s all around and everywhere. In working to discern ‘perfection’ as an ever-changing dynamic between ‘*my*’ inward consciousness and the worldabout, very subtly a change in the base of reference begins to take hold. That “I” am a part of something larger. Mysteriously, “I” am not eclipsed in that greater largeness. Yet, it’s true, egoic self-awareness kind of shrinks or shrivels in the course of contemplating a relationship involving ‘me;’ and eternity: foreverness.

We each have such a relationship with That which is forever and infinitely large. We are so evanescent; like fireflies. Yet we sparkle within a firmament that’s unbounded. Inwardly too.

Something of a fundamental equation about all this is the dynamical concept of *optimum arousal*. An ever-changing equilibrium of sorts, in the service of an expansion of consciousness. Perhaps the best general illustration of what’s meant is waking versus sleeping. Both are states of consciousness. Too little sleep... waking awareness is weakened, is jagged and jittery and less than optimal. Too much sleep, and waking awareness can slump, can feel soggy, oversaturated, sluggish. All these evaluations are very much subjective. Moreover they gradually change over time (e.g. the finding that older persons seem to need less sleep). In sum, each winds up with a distinct personal calculus of how much sleep and when, as to a waking awareness that’s at peak clarity; and then as to the mixture of waking-time activities that feel optimal for each person.

All of these considerations come back around to the pivotal issue of the relationship of the self vis-a-vis all-otherselves of the worldabout. In the panpsychism I subscribe to and espouse, the psyche of ‘me’ is but one data-point so to say, within an infinite field of other ‘me’s’ or other-selves. What is the moral or ‘optimum arousal’ relationship to the sea of otherselves? It is capable of being clarified into a struggle towards one or the other of two complementary but utterly distinct moral polarizations. Does a concern for otherselves outweigh personal regard? If 52% or more thus, this constitutes service-to-otherselves moral polarization. A 25% expansion of such an orientation from the 27% service-to-otherselves default setting or pre-programmed setting. And personal effort is essential to attain such an intensification. Very much so.

Similarly: does a concern for ownself start to outweigh any regard for others? In one sense this is a cruel calculus of self-regard. Yet it can be said to possess a sort of eerie array of justifications. Which are not sound in the final analysis. Still, some opt to be “doom-devoted heroes,” intent on self-glorification. On a desolate and lonely island of unalloyed hubris. They, too, in all their mad wars and battles, alas! Yet they too play a role in the vast - the infinite! - cosmic drama

CHAPTER FIVE. A PERSONAL CHOICE: THE PITFALLS OF PRESENT-DAY MATERIALISM, OR
AFFIRMING REALITY AS WALL-TO-WALL 'MAGIC' FEATURING *YOUR* INPUT.

(continued, p9)

In the all-important relationship of 'me' vis-a-vis 'God,' or if you prefer Supreme Reality or Infinite Density Consciousness, the choice as to moral polarization carries signature markings. In service to otherselves, two understandings take center stage. First, that otherselves in their vast totality - billions upon billions and in all 'densities' of consciousness to use Ra's term - are not 'other' than me, and so, they *all* ought to be regarded in a forbearing and compassionate manner. Second, that an inmost Presence - known personally, and understood to be everywhere else afoot as well - is voluntarily surrendered-to; such that *Acceptance* becomes the byword. Faith. Trust.

The signature markings concerning service to ownself are decidedly more murky and of course some consider this moral polarization no morality at all, but immorality. License. Dissolution. And so on. But it constitutes an alternative moral polarization on close inspection and I am persuaded Ra is correct in this regard. A vast swamp of superstition and fear of bogeymen is thus cleared up. The robes of devilry are trimmed and made comprehensible. The devil is near at hand and it is none other than self-regard run riot; a 'hooray for me and the hell with you' ethic taken to it's gloomy conclusion which may easily be summed: conflict. War. Struggle. Thus, *Control* is the byword or more exactly, *efforts* at control in a vast, vast battlefield. Nothing of wisdom recommends this polarization. Yet under the banner of freedom - utterly essential to the presence of love - this polarization indeed has it's season and, for that season - late third to early sixth consciousness densities as outlined by Ra - service-to-ownself fulfills it's role. And as already noted, the discernible 'dividends' for The Creator are (a) a cultivation of what can overall be called charisma; (b) astonishing skill at deception and concealment, the ability to be veiled; and (c) a remarkable development of willfulness consequent to umpteen years of battle-tested struggle (including bending the will of others to do one's bidding with sly dexterity).

Another characterization assists in discerning between these two polarizations. In service to otherselves the leitmotif is love with the hallmark feature of nurture; and, compassion married or blended into a genuine love of otherselves. In service to ownself the leitmotif is challenge. For challenge is at the epicenter of infinite intelligence. Consider the relationship of a circle representing all knowledge. As that circle expands, it's outer perimeter or circumference gets longer: the borderline between 'all knowledge,' and 'what lies beyond / the unknown.' The inward contemplation so characteristic of service to ownself plumbs toward that boundary. A kind of self absorption takes over. This is married to a kind of sternness or self-discipline. A stoicism. Every victory is savored. Every defeat redoubles the resolve to try again. To struggle and struggle even more. 'Doom devoted hero' is an apt moniker for one whose self-regard presumes the throne of Divinity... in perpetual battle with all other 'divinities.' All counterfeit. Until the far shore is glimpsed.

CHAPTER FIVE. A PERSONAL CHOICE: THE PITFALLS OF PRESENT-DAY MATERIALISM, OR
AFFIRMING REALITY AS WALL-TO-WALL ‘MAGIC’ FEATURING *YOUR* INPUT.
(*continued, p10*).

C O N C L U S I O N

“We can conceive - and there are [*Mystical*] Realizations very strongly confirming the conception - of a primary and universal consciousness that conditions the merely private personal consciousness.” [1]

In this chapter I have sought to affirm that ‘Reality’ *is*, in fact, and *quite fundamentally*, wall-to-wall ‘Magic’ featuring *my* input; *your* input; and in fact the embodied (and disembodied) inputs from *unlimited legions of other-selves* unfolded upon all seven “densities” (Ra’s term) of consciousness in “this octave” (Ra’s term) or the physical universe that we see unfolding all around us; and, the unseen “time/space” analog thereto (again, Ra’s term) which has the apparent function of being the *inward consciousness well* of more-and-more subject-only consciousness which terminates in what may be conceived of as a **deepest** Spatial Void region of nirvana; where, in fact, the the self-beingness of the One Infinite Creator of Intelligent Infinity - of which we all are a part - unfurls it’s UNLIMITED and ENDLESS scroll of beingness replete with utter power and glory.

Are most people aware of this profound divinity we all share in? Sadly, no.

However the good news that I have to share is that *it doesn’t have to be this way*. There are multiple pathways - some, the spiritual intensifications recommended by the great religions (chronologically, Hinduism, Judaism, Buddhism, Christianity and Islam) and some, the privately designed spirituality that *you yourself* fashion for yourself - which lead to a sense of profound and fascinating intimacy with God.* (*this elastic, both catholic and secular term, encompasses divinity seen as The Other; or, otherwise communed with inwardly). A recent book title sums it this way. “Is Reality Infinite Love?” The answer is yes if “Love” or “Logos” is comprehended in sufficient depth as *far more* than shallow sentimental hearts-and-flowers goop; but, as a vast moving river of infinite power; dispensing unlimited freedom; and informed by the boundless intellect of divinity best evoked by the notion of infinite light: “brighter than a thousand suns.”

Infinite brilliance. Dazzling darkness. We all are a part of *both*. And lest you think yourself “insignificant,” it’s quite otherwise. Each is an inalienable part of The Creator and each is hurrying upon a fascinating journey of unfolding the inward potentialities, which more-and-more make one a ‘co-Creator’ as it were. In service to otherselves, one assists others in unfurling this inward... well, *magic* is the best word. (And in service to ownself one deploys such ‘magic’ toward a thirst for *power* that’s quite unquenchable; until, that is, one turns it all over to Intelligent Infinity.)

[1] p 26 in “*Introceptualism*” by Franklin Merrell-Wolff (1887-1985); op cit., the 1995 SUNY Edition. One [*interposition*] added.

CHAPTER SIX: *WHAT IS THE ESSENCE OF HINDUISM ?*

A journey towards personal intimacy with God.

That is my personal conviction concerning the value and legitimacy of Hinduism as a vast cultural legacy [1] that is uniquely disparate in guiding the seeker towards *Gnosis* or the blessing of mysticism: meaning the immediate imperience (inner experience) that God is Real and - not only is God Real - but this entire physical universe, and all of us presently embodied therein, are *of* God; *in* God; inalienably *a part of* God, and - to invoke Ra's insight on the matter - we each are, in microcosm, the *entirety* of The One Infinite Creator of Intelligent Infinity in 'seed' form as it were. Perhaps not yet fully unfolded. But fully capable of such unfoldment.

* * *

My advocacy is for the all-is-consciousness worldview. That consciousness is original; is self-existent; and is constitutive of all things. That means: *your* personal consciousness; *my* personal consciousness; and, the big-C Consciousness within which, this entire physical universe is embedded... and realms far larger yet beyond... as well as of course the individual consciousness of not just me and you; but of whole classes of consciousnesses concerning which Ra - using the term "densities" - categorizes as seven in number, with numberless sub-categories.

My argument is that each great religious tradition as we presently have them in our present day world - chronologically, Hinduism, Judaism, Buddhism, Christianity and Islam - echoes or refracts these core insights. With greater or lesser clarity. And from many points of view. Oh there are numberless quibbles. All sorts of doctrinal disputes. This is as it should be. It permits you to be free to choose. Look keenly. Don't miss the forest for the trees. The 'forest' is the unboundedness of primordial consciousness; evoked widely as luminous, dazzling; a soft all-permeate white light of fathomless depth and inwardness. To which, I would add, The Creator expresses too as the Dazzling Dark (see Special Appendix A). And is *ever* near at hand!

[1] Updating the review given at the end of Chapter Four as to Chapters thus far: Chapter **One** sought to address "*The Fundamental Pluralism of Indian Culture and Actual Hinduism.*" Chapter **Two** sought to make plain my advocacy for "*The All Is Consciousness Worldview and The Law of One.*" Chapter **Three** endeavored an overview upon "*The Meaning of Philosophy in Hinduism.*" Chapter **Four** - "*Philosophy in Hinduism Further Considered*" - offered a brief commentary concerning six traditional schools of Hindu philosophy. Then, Chapter **Five** - "*A Personal Choice: the Pitfalls of Present-day Materialism, or Affirming Reality as Wall-to-wall 'Magic' Featuring Your Input*" - sought to inspire the reader to validate his / her personal unlimited potential to grow and evolve into a genuine co-Creator. Expansive with God-awareness.

“Some see Me one with themselves, or separate; some bow to the countless gods that are only My million faces.” [ch_ V_, Bhagavad-Gita; 1944 Isherwood / Prabhavanda Translation]

“I wanted to visit Godel again, but he told me that he was too ill. In the middle of January 1978, I dreamed I was at his bedside. // There was a chessboard on the covers in front of him. Godel reached his hand out and knocked the board over, tipping the men onto the floor. The chessboard expanded to an infinite mathematical plane. And then that, too, vanished. There was a brief play of symbols, and then emptiness - an emptiness flooded with even white light. // The next day I learned that Kurt Godel was dead.” [1]

So great in number are the possibilities - they are actually infinite in fact - as to developing a sense of inward communion with Infinite Reality / Ultimate Reality / God (the namings are similarly infinite in number), that it's rather challenging to sort them into groups or categories. Many efforts have been made. None of them are definitive. For myself I have chosen to try and polarize as service to otherselfs, as has been discussed already in the previous five chapters; and I try to bridge, intellectually, *three aspects* of The Divine Presence: that as is often said, ‘God is within’ (e.g. inward in my personal consciousness); *plus*, that God is veiled always all around in the play-of-appearances (in Hinduism this is alluded to as ‘the lila,’ the play); and that, *finally*, Divinity is all-permeate in an extremely subtle and powerful manner. For myself this last aspect comes into sharpest focus as the Presence that *does* hear prayers; and, that *can* answer prayers.

One important observation repeatedly comes to my attention. That our individual efforts are extremely important in and within the overall cosmic architecture. *Especially*, when we heed the advice in the Bhagavad-Gita: “the world is imprisoned in it's own activity, except when actions are preformed as offerings to Me.” [ch_ v _ paraphrase, Gita, op cit.] Performing outer duties in this life in such a manner is hugely beneficial. First, all worries about outcome start to melt away. One simply does one's best, however ‘imperfect’ that may seem. The action - already consecrated - simply flows to such result as divinity decides. Divinity is party to the consequences. Not me. Second, proceeding calmly and methodically (worries about outcome having melted), the work (the activity) flows more smoothly and efficiently; for it's no longer stressed with the chronic anxieties about outcome. It is as Ra counsels. ‘Trouble not over the counting. To aid one or two, or a thousand... worry not over such counting.’ (paraphr. of 2.1; op cit.). I even extrapolate this to prayer. One entreats as best one can. As to outcome? It becomes a cosmic matter. In such wise, I am persuaded that earnest pleas in heartfelt prayer for world betterment *can* have **massive** consequences. Never belittle what your prayers can accomplish.

[1] p 184 in “Infinity and the Mind (The Science and Philosophy of the Infinite)” by Rudy Rucker; (1946-); May 1982, Birkhauser Boston Inc., 1st Edition; 366 pp in Bantam Pbk. Ed., 1983. (Author's direct address: 1324 Church St., Lynchburg VA 24504 USA.)

CHAPTER SIX: *WHAT IS THE ESSENCE OF HINDUISM ?* (continued, p3)

In reaching toward the concept of intimacy with God, certain issues come to the fore. Tackling a massive - in fact infinitely massive - and endless topic (both temporally and spatially) in the confines of a chapter essay such as this is bound to be less than wholly adequate; but not to so attempt, this would be cowardice and queasiness. So the attempt will here be made.

The Law of One may be summed quite simply. There is infinity. Infinity perforce calls forth unity, for “many-ness” is a finite concept. Thus: the Law of One is that everything is of infinity and infinity is unbounded and everywhere and thrums within all of the “densities” (Ra’s term) of a big-C or Primordial Consciousness, which is everywhere forever, and can never be constrained within *any* definition, however well intended or artfully constructed. We see here the beginnings of how the endless divides begin to arise which are - in our collective present day world - bodied forth in many religious traditions, of which the five most famous are chronologically Hinduism, Judaism, Buddhism, Christianity and Islam. Each strives to provide the spiritual seeker with a map towards communion with The Creator, which is usually couched in terms of the activity or state called “meditation / samadhi;” or the alternate state, “prayer.”

Prayer is the more accessible term and essentially means conversation. In the convenient analogy of “me” vis-a-vis some “judge,” I ask for such-and-such as to an outcome either on my own behalf or on behalf of some other-self. The “judge” has been empowered with some collectively conferred authority. Which is far greater than mine. Hence, I make my prayer; e.g., for leniency on behalf of someone elsewise convicted of a capital offense. It can go either way. If granted the “convict” gets a reprieve of some sort; if denied... off to the gallows. End of story.

A childlike illustration? How can it be otherwise? In our present embodiment in third density (first is elements, second is plant /animal) human consciousness, we are scarcely more than children as four densities lie ahead: lower astral, upper astral, lower causal, causal. Fourth-fifth-sixth-seventh densities. Concerning service to otherselves polarization - as more-or-less 90% of entities choose - this amounts to angel-archangel-deva, and then Creator Presence. In service to ownself polarization, which is hubris run riot, the sequence is demon, devil, arch-devil, and then arch-devil-switched of polarity: inasmuch as none can pass lower causal but service to other-selves, as only one “self” lies in upper causal and beyond: The Creator.

Again, this is something of a child-like sketch but it is true to the bones of the matter. As best as I presently understand them. But why dare I venture even these sketches? See Special Appendix A. Concerning which, my over-riding motive is to get back “there” and the route I choose is service to otherselves. Hence this chapter. Which can proceed, now, to the issue of meditation / samadhi which have to do with experiencing a higher consciousness, which can elsewise be called Awareness of Presence. Such awareness has degrees of intensity and of modality. ‘Nirvikalpa Samadhi’ is in my opinion the endpoint; a state to be aspired to.

CHAPTER SIX: *WHAT IS THE ESSENCE OF HINDUISM ?* (continued, p4)

Before providing my own definition of *nirvikalpa samadhi*, here is one workable definition of “samadhi” in general; from amongst many such to be found in the literatures of both Hinduism and Buddhism:

“This term has a variety of meanings. In Zen it implies not merely equilibrium, tranquility, and one-pointedness, but a state of intense yet effortless concentration, of complete absorption of the mind in... [*an awareness of the Presence of God*], of heightened and expanded awareness. Samadhi and Bodhi are identical from the view of the enlightened Bodhi-mind. Seen from the developing stages leading to satori-awakening, however, samadhi and enlightenment are different.” [1]

I have of necessity, based upon my own imperiences (inner experiences), replaced the author’s phrase “complete absorption of the mind in itself” with: *complete absorbtion of the mind in an awareness of the Presence of God*. Briefly stated? I regard enlightenment as having **myriad stages**, and the nirdvanda consciousness (consciousness without an object and without a subject) propounded by Gautama Buddha does, itself, have myriad stages of realization-of / absorption-in. Subtle but all-important observations such as these - as are so richly provided by FMW - permit a bridging between the Hindu philosophic attitude about “Atman,” with the Buddhist position so famously summed in Buddhism’s use of the term “anatman” (no self).

Anatman in it’s most salient aspect references nirdvanda consciousness (consciousness without an object and without a subject). Although there are usages of “Atman” in Hindu literature which have this meaning, no doubt, more generally it’s the case that THE SELF is meant; as in the dynamic tension in subject-object consciousness of THE SELF versus THE OBJECT. Moreover THE SELF or “purusha” as referenced earlier, is the purified distillate so to say, of ‘jiva’ or the individual soul’s self-awareness, as in: every jiva is destined to ‘melt’ into it’s purity as purusha or THE SELF. Thus ‘anatman’ can be regarded as asserting the evanescence of every jiva. The preponderance of Hindu philosophy agrees with this. But the deeper reconciliation concerns subject-object consciousness where ‘pure’ self / ‘jiva’ self are in play... versus discerning nirdvanda consciousness (consciousnes without an object and without a subject). This distinction is tackled in Buddhism. Hinduism is less vivid in philosophically articulating this distinction about ‘two levels of Realization,’ and does generally seem to focus upon the jiva realizing the ‘purified’ self; but - thanks especially to Shankara - it cannot be said that all Hinduism ‘ignores,’ or is ‘unaware of,’ the nirdvanda attainment.

These prefatory remarks permit me to explain my use of the term, *nirvikalpa samadhi*.

[1] pp 376-377 in “The Three Pillars of Zen” by Roshi Philip Kapleau, Compiler and Editor; (1912-); 1965 John Weatherhill, Inc. (First Edition); [fourteen pbk. printings by Beacon Press thereafter]; 25th Anniv. Ed. (Rev.&Expanded); Anchor Books / Doubleday, 1989. [copyrights 1965, 1989 by P.K.. and 1980 by The Zen Center, Inc.] Underlining and one [interposition] added.

Nirvikalpa samadhi has a general meaning - such as I propose to use here - and a more historical resonance from Hindu philosophy and literature as will be cited hereafter. “Samadhi” as already noted can be summed as “intense yet effortless concentration.” And the term “nirvikalpa” generally can be said to allude to such intense, yet effortless concentration, *as abiding alongside* ‘ordinary’ consciousness; wherein one is engaged upon the humdrum affairs of ‘householder life’ as Hindu literature often calls it. Driving to work. Shopping for groceries. Visiting a doctor’s office or attending a meeting or speaking on the telephone... even (nowadays) surfing the internet. All of these matters - e.g. while at some job or other - ordinarily engross us. Almost totally. To the exclusion of almost anything else.

And yet. And yet. There can arise the capacity - little by little, by stages - to carry on with such affairs, even whilst at the same time engaging in an intense yet effortless concentration upon... upon what? Different religious traditions use different terms. In Buddhism the term ‘mindfulness’ as in ‘the mind being mindful of itself’ is often used, in some form or other. In Hinduism, being aware of God is what is stated: regardless how sophisticated or unsophisticated one’s understanding of God may be; or, how one even attempts to conceive of God at all. In monotheism generally - Hinduism, Judaism, Christianity, Islam and other faiths such as Sikhism - the general notion of “God” is at the fore; only in Buddhism is the term abjured in favor of an *impersonal* or *no-self* term; most usually, mindfulness or suchness or ‘satori.’

As just reviewed, ‘selfness’ has a lofty conception as the absolute or true self or the only self, wherein the purified personal self nature (the ‘jiva’ having become ‘purusha’) is described as gradually ‘melting’ or ‘fusing’ into pure divinity... into pure ingoddedness.

The seeker must imperience (innerly experience) such “Presence” on his or her own inward personal terms. I can of course only rely for certain upon my own case. Where - despite all my personal flaws and ‘fallen’ nature as some would call it - I have become more-and-more aware of the near-at-hand and abiding Presence of, well, pure divinity; what I feel is most accurately described as big-C or Primordial Consciousness; nirdvanda consciousness (consciousness without an object and without a subject). Inhering in such Consciousness is a Self Nature that is at once familiar and companionable... while at the same time being incredibly lofty and mysterious. A Self Nature so to say, that sustains this entire physical universe and realms beyond; whilst also inhering in me and you and all other creatures great and small; from a minnow or a sparrow to galactic intelligences of surpassingly subtle embodiments; intricate embodiments. These all inhere in The Presence. Moreover this Presence can be discerned little-by-little; in stages; even as one goes about one’s ordinary affairs. At first the juggling of mindfulness about routine or humdrum affairs with mindfulness about The Presence can be awkward. Like learning to ride a bicycle. But it gets better with time. This is what I mean by nirvikalpa [alt. sp. “nirbikalpa”]

samadhi in what I will call my broad and catholic and general public usage of this important term. As to a formal and specified and Hindu-context prescribed spiritual usage of this term I do rely upon the following as being suitably close to definitive.

“In the initial states of God-communion (sabikalpa samadhi) the devotee’s consciousness merges in the Cosmic Spirit; his life force is withdrawn from the body, which appears ‘dead,’ or motionless and rigid. The yogi is fully aware of his bodily condition of suspended animation. As he progresses to higher spiritual states (nirbikalpa samadhi), however, he communes with God without bodily fixation; and in his ordinary waking consciousness, even in the midst of exacting worldly duties.*

“* The Sanskrit word bikalpa means ‘difference, nonidentity.’ Sabikalpa is the state of samadhi ‘with difference,’ nirbikalpa is the state ‘without difference.’ That is, in sabikalpa samadhi the devotee still retains a slight feeling of separateness from God; in nirbikalpa samadhi he realizes fully his identity as Spirit.” [1]

“In sabikalpa samadhi the devotee has attained realization of his Oneness with Spirit but cannot maintain his cosmic consciousness except in the immobile trance state. By continuous meditation he reaches the superior state of nirbikalpa samadhi, in which he may move freely in the world without any loss of God-perception. // In nirbikalpa samadhi the yogi dissolves the last vestiges of his material or earthly karma. Nevertheless, he may still have certain astral and causal karma to work out, and therefore takes astral and then causal reembodiments on high-vibrational spheres.” [2]

It may seem to some that I take liberty that is unwarranted with my broader usage of the term, nirvikalpa samadhi, which I denote with the slightly different spelling. Certainly, any such persons are entitled to their opinions. But I have a general and a specific defense to such criticism. My general defense is the undefinability of God which is to say the undefinability or uncorralled nature of Primordial Consciousness / nirdvanda consciousness (consciousness without an object and without a subject). Yogananda uses the term “lifetrans” and elsewhere one sees the term “prana” as to an everywhere-present energy - like water - which is ordinarily imperceptible to our senses; and into which the entire apparent universe dissolves in certain states of exalted awareness or God consciousness. Such considerations are profound and subtle. Explaining them is a difficult task that approaches to being an endless task. Further to this, my specific defense concerns my personal spiritual journey of discerning more-and-more the everywhere-ness and all-the-time nature of God Presence. Please see Special Appendix A. And, *there’s more to it*; hence this chapter.

[1] p 266 with p 266 footnote, Ch. 26, in “Autobiography of a Yogi” by Paramahansa Yogananda (1/5/1893-3/7/1952), Copyright 1946 (renewed 1974; 1981, 1998, 2007 by Self-Realization Fellowship). From “Thirteenth Edition of 1998; this printing, 2021.” 580 pp, pbk., w/index. See annotated bibliography, entry three of five (1, Gita; 2, Ra; 4, FMW; 5, The Path of the Masters, 1939, J. Johnson) in Section A.

[2] Fn pp 457-458, Ch. 43, op cit.; underlining added.

CHAPTER SIX: *WHAT IS THE ESSENCE OF HINDUISM ?* (continued, p7)

The purpose here is to render a subtle and very nuanced relationship - that of ordinary human consciousness attaining an enduring and deepening relationship with pure and unbounded divinity - in as simple a manner as possible; while allowing for the infinite nature of this topic.

The topic is infinite, because no two people are alike. Or to use the Ra term, no two mind/body/spirit complexes processing embodied human-level or third density consciousness, are alike. Not only are there some eight billion people in embodiment on Earth at this time; but, suchlike populations on kindred planets elsewhere in the present octave: this present physical universe with it's complement of seven densities of consciousness. (As Ra observes and of course other spiritual texts have observed, prior "days of Brahm" as in Hinduism it's called, denoting prior cycles-of-universe, can be regarded as having occurred... unto time without end).

Atop this massive variation which approaches infinity in numbers... is the quite unlimited variation which inheres in big-c Consciousness or Primordial Consciousness / nirdvanda consciousness (consciousness without an object and without a subject); or to state such Suchness simply: God.

In sum - despite the infinite variation amongst human individuals and the greater variation in the expressiveness of Intelligent Infinity - the private consciousness of we each, can enter into a meaningful and deepening relationship with I.I. or God. Thus God is not far off. But near at hand. And is not "too busy" with other weighty matters of cosmic governance but can take the time - *does* take the time - to interact with each and every devotee. From the most errant and wayward; to suchlike as Gautama Buddha or Jesus or the many Sufi masters; and yogis and arhats that are lost to our present knowledge in the sands of time. *Each* of these commenced their journey into ever deeper ingoddedness as a *jiva* or human soul, beset with all manner of limitations and "distortions" (Ra's term) as to wishes and fears and all the rest... but, each persevered and each attained the inestimable blessing of communing with Intelligent Infinity... becoming, in a word, intimate with Intelligent Infinity. In sum? God heeds prayers. And can be petitioned with prayer. Never think it otherwise. Each is precious. And, each is, in seed form, divinity sprouting afresh.

There is an emotional component and an intellectual component to a process of raising one's consciousness towards God-awareness. I.I. for It's part, when discerning such efforts of true earnestness and persistence, provides to each such an 'on-ramp' into infinite ingoddedness. As between the two factors - often referenced as the head and the heart - the heart is far and away the most important. Even though, at first, it can be hard to "love" God. After all - as the cynics and the nay-sayers never tire of pointing out - how can one "love" a Beingness which countenances all the pitiful miseries of the world? To what end is all this suffering? No doubt, a leap of faith must be made. "From me, your ways are hidden." (Arjuna to God, ch_ v_ ,1944 Christopher Isherwood/ Swami Prabhavananda transl., op cit).

The general situation - that of each soul reaching towards a communion with Divinity - I prefer to sum this way. The creation is Divinity's gift to Itself, so that Divinity may experience an infinite, unlimited number of pathways, *for Itself, back to Itself*. As noted the vast plethora of pathways can be described in different ways; grouped in different ways; sorted in different ways. There truly are an infinite number of paths / yogas ('yoga' meaning to link with or yoke-with divinity; also, a 'path') [1], and they can be variously employed to suit one's personal temperament.

The all-important question can be posed thus. *Why do you wish to know - to become familiar with and intimate with - God?* What is your overriding reason for developing this acquaintance?

One obvious dimension of answer to this question is, 'to see all the grandeur and majesty of God / Intelligent Infinity.' (Plus of course the prefatory apprehension: '*is God real?* Or are all the evocations of Divinity just speculations and, in truth, *there's no 'There' there?*'). As to this verity I have indeed been afforded a glimpse. Speaking personally, my doubts are wholly dispelled and they are in fact further dispelled every single day, in addition to the landmark events sketched in Special Appendix A. A hidden Grandeur or Presence is all-permeate everywhere, forever. Of this I no longer have any doubt. And of course the inward germ of Infinity is within each; and is veiled in the worldabout (the 'lila'); and is, as well, capable of being sensed as subtle Presence. God as Presence; as you and all others; and as the infinite choreography of the unfolding cosmos. These all betoken the Creator, Who remains unconstrained as well to display further 'Magic' in realms and regions unbeknownst to any of us, not even to all the angels in heaven, or in hell!

Hell. That word again. Various described but perhaps the most apt descriptive is in the following aphorism. 'Heaven' is quite simply a felt nearness to God... and "hell" is equally simply a preoccupation with all the lures of worldliness and, chiefly, worldly power; fame; and hubris.' In a word, "hell" approximates to a service-to-ownself moral polarization and 'heaven' approximates to a service-to-others moral polarization. In the latter, the goal of a global compassion and a genuine delight in the beingness of other selves comes to predominate; self regard shrivels. In the former, 'compassion' has all but totally evaporated, leaving a barren salt flat of obsessive self regard and a delight in - above all - personal power and any and all means to *gain more* personal power. The thrill of egotism.

[1] Amongst the numberless yoga practices promulgated and in the literature, perhaps the four most often praised are bhakti yoga; jnana yoga; raja yoga; and hatha yoga; meaning, respectively, heart-devotion, wisdom-efforts; meditation efforts; and bodily disciplines / efforts (especially of breath-control). These can be undertaken in some mixture to suit the seeker's temperament as to spiritual practice, or, use just one. In my opinion the most powerful and valuable is a form of 'constant raja' in the broadest sense as cited in the Gita: "If you would truly seek to attain to Me remember Me *at all times* in a constant and all abiding effort at constant mindfulness." (paraphrase of ch_ v_, the 1944 Isherwood/Prabhavanada translation).

CHAPTER SIX: *WHAT IS THE ESSENCE OF HINDUISM ?* (continued, p9)

Such preoccupations with ‘personal power’ as in, gaining more personal power - for example having the express goal of gaining ‘siddhi powers’ or rare access to abilities seldom seen - are in my opinion quite obviously an impediment to further soul unfoldment. They amount to “advertisements for myself.” Quite the opposite result marks service to others self commitment, where in yoga [1] one seeks obscurity in the enveloping folds of infinite power.

“There is in God, some say,
A deep but dazzling darkness, as men here
Say it is late and dusky, because they
See not all clear.
O for that night! where I in Him
Might live invisible and dim!” From “The Night” by Henry Vaughan
(4/7/1671 - 4/23/1695)

I will only say that that dazzling darkness is real. I was permitted visits, as recounted in Special Appendix A. But go see for yourself. With enough resolve, Divinity is most gracious.

In an altogether sense, the true power of The Law of One, must be grasped as operating everywhere and forever, however incompletely we may be able to ‘grok’ this fact. Ra is trenchant in observing “infinity” as a “unity” concept, inasmuch as numbers have their habitation in manyness. Our essential nature is not in manyness. FMW has observed that infinities of infinities are a workable realization in theoretical mathematics. A workable realization, as well, in “my” personal consciousness or “your” personal consciousness. Whose unseen linkages are there all the same. The further efforts we make to Realize the Everywhere Infinity of ONE...such efforts redound all across the infinite realms of consciousness as we can but just begin to understand. For just as ‘lust rage greed’ etc (Gita, the three doors of hell) have their corroding impact or ‘negative gravity,’ the upward aspirations betokened by the service to others self moral polarization have their purifying impact, their positive or liberating gravity. Personal exhilaration at the felt Presence. Which of course is so reassuring.

Of a piece with this, global compassion deepens. So many are caught in the toils of weal and woe. Blinded, with no compass, stumbling. Even if just a little assistance can be proffered; even if but a heartfelt prayer for such is tendered; so much better by far than nothing.

[1] Wikipedia provides an article providing historical explications concerning the meaning of “yoga,” from the 4th century BCE (Vaisesika sutra) to 14th century CE (Yogabija, a Hatha Yoga work), as to quotations whose general effect is to reaffirm yoga as (A) practices; and (B) the *result* of those practices: “The union of... the individual Self [jiva] and the supreme Self [purusha], and in the same way [as this] the union of all dualities, is called yoga.” (from Yogabija, a Hatha Yoga work, three interpositions added). Shiva consciousness or purified consciousness is associated with the jiva merging in purusha, the purified self. Whereafter, still deeper communions with divinity can occur: *nirdvanda*.

CHAPTER SIX: *WHAT IS THE ESSENCE OF HINDUISM ?* (continued, p10)

What every person faces - and what every religious tradition must grapple with as well - is the central fact of death and dying. That friends and relatives predecease us. Ever the reminder that we, too, will sooner or later shuffle off the mortal coil. 'No one gets out of here alive.'

In fact we all *do* 'get out of here alive' but just not within our present physical vehicle. It is that that dies. And there's no denying that the unique and one-time-only event of dying - of leaving one's physical vehicle for one final last time, akin to drifting off to sleep but *permanently* so - can seem frightening, as the finality of the actual event approaches. Where are the guard rails? In point of fact there actually aren't any. However each religious tradition tries to fashion a set of customs and rituals intended to serve as guard-rails of sorts. But the unique fact remains that we are born alone... we die alone. The portal *into* life-here-now; the portal *out*. At each sacred juncture, our personal consciousness - however well prepared or poorly prepared - is afforded a unique and unduplicable opportunity to come face-to-face with the consciousness of The Creator / Intelligent Infinity / infinite density nirdvanda consciousness.

As I try to follow the service to others self's moral polarization which centrally involves as it does the whole idea of global compassion, I find that the emotions of grieving and of sorrow are inescapable. On the one hand every new day is a shiny new bauble full of giggles and surprises all afloat in trills of tinker-bell music, at least potentially and more notably of course in one's younger years; but on the other hand every new day is also a day draped in mourning, for every day many thousands of persons are somewhere somehow leaving their physical vehicles for one last time. Are they alone? Are they in sorrow? Alas, too many are. A kind of pall falls over everything as one sensitively tries to resonate with the oceans and oceans of grief that are as much an accompaniment to every new day as the very sun itself; for every day begins and ends within the cloak of darkness.

These truths are borne home most acutely for me personally by the memory of my dearest friend - and the great love of my life, Stephen - whose untimely passing I feel personally responsible for; for we had grown estranged, tragically, twelve years prior to that last fateful year of 2003. Memories of personal failings and my inability to offer S. all the love I in fact wished to offer or should have offered; these live on as burning stabs of remorse whose sting does not go away; not now; not ever. In such fashion are the bonds of love both painful and also... well, the tender memories resurface as well. Love has been called a many splendored thing and this is certainly true. No two loves are like. While love can be called something lofty and all-permeating, it's particularities within the lives of we each are delicate; one-time-only; and of infinite nuance and subtlety. Truly, the palette of experiences are so variegated. And all of them bring something to the overall impact of "my" life or "your" life... as we try to sum it's impact toward the Infinite Beingness of The Creator whom some choose to call Infinite Love. True enough. Matched, of course, by Infinite Intelligence. What a fiery dance unto infinity transpires between the two!

CONCLUSION

The essence of Hinduism - one's inward quest for intimacy with God - is variously expressed, and no other great world religious tradition - of which Hinduism is the oldest and the most variegated - provides quite the unbounded smorgasbord of practices whereby to cultivate such intimacy. The seeker is presented with truly an embarrassment of riches within Hinduism.

So whereas no two seekers are quite identical, it cannot be otherwise that the paths, the practices employed, are going to be disparate in the extreme. Hatha yoga (bodily disciplines and postures); bhakti yoga (God devotion); raja yoga (meditation); japa yoga (reciting the names of God), karma yoga (consecrating all actions as offerings to God); jnana yoga (practicing intellectual discernment in teasing out the mental subtleties that facilitate the Divine Presence within) and so many many other yogas besides; yogas of unlimited variety; all these are at hand. All these may be employed. In different mixtures. As suits the temperament, the psychic disposition of the seeker.

What is truly essential of course, is the burning thirst to *attain* to such inward intimacy. Without such inward thirst one but goes through the motions, listlessly. Success will seem ever out of reach. Yet *with* such thirst, God is easy of access and is truly near at hand. It then becomes but a matter of: how to make use of such intimacy? Will it be for an inward personal delight, only? Or, on behalf of others, that the sufferings of others be ever so slightly meliorated?

I can say unequivocally that the latter motivation has become the great fulcrum in my own spiritual practice. It is a not incidental footnote to say that, 1963-1978, various adventures with psychedelics were inconclusive in my case. They brought a certain inward exhilaration, no doubt. But the door definitely opening? It did not. Which is not to say that psychotropic drugs may perform some aid, as so famously remarked on by Huxley in "The Doors of Perception" and in other more recent writings [1]. Even the so-called tantric practices are at hand. But generally speaking, it can be dangerous merely to dabble in different practices simply for some sense of an inward boon. Questing after siddhi powers and the like are a path that slowly slides towards the service-to-ownself moral polarization; a polarization diametrically opposed to the service to otherselves moral polarization. Having firmly sought for the latter polarization I find it a great boon to not turn away from the huge amounts of tragedy and sorrow that so afflict us all. It isn't fun. But it is purifying.

[1] "Krishna in the Sky With Diamonds (the Bhagavad Gita as Psychedelic Guide)" by Scott Teitsworth; Copyright 2012; Park Street Press (1 Park St., Rochester VT 05767), VT and Toronto Canada; 182pp in First Edition, pbk. To write author directly: S.T. c/o Inner Traditions, Bear & Co., 1 Park St. Rochester VT 05767. *Chapter Twelve* of the Bhagavad Gita is the subject of this book of commentary. It provides a modern 'psychedelics'-informed perspective on the divine immanence shown to Arjuna by Krishna.

CONCLUSION. (page two of two pages)

The simple enormity of this physical universe... the numerous people presently in embodiment (now at eight billion and counting)... the huge complexity of life itself as to the years we have thus far lived and the memories accumulated... the whole tapestry of all this can feel quite overwhelming. Moreover the hugeness of all this, provides ample pretext for they who pick up the materialistic attitude and announce, “this is all a huge tapestry of sound and fury signifying nothing... and we are all motes of light passing through and our presence here can do little for good or for ill, in shifting the scenery one way or the other. Therefore sigh and mope.” That’s the summary of the worldview of the materialists, some of whom opt for sheer nihilism: nothing means anything and all is a giant emptiness. A bleak worldview indeed. Sorrow is triumphant. In such wall to wall horrorbleness the act of suicide acquires it’s reason for being.

The antidote to such grim materialism and ‘realism’ so-called, is the leap of faith; an inward impulse to rise above the hurly-burly of the world with it’s abundant cargo of pain and suffering, in an attempt to find a supernal rootedness. A ground wherein *I am*, and *I mean something*. A conviction that this vast universe is an arising in a Super-consciousness; and, that that Consciousness *can be known*. *Can be communed with*. It is the happy obligation of they who have been blessed with a brush with Super-consciousness - who have begun to discern this as a Presence behind all the foreground of myriad distractions - to announce this Good News to a disbelieving public. To assure they who will listen that the whole physical universe is alive; and realms yet larger still; and that all of this is bound up in one super-Consciousness; which has been called by some, Infinite Love; which I have alluded to as nirdvanda consciousness (consciousness without an object and without a subject); which is popularly alluded to as sheer divinity... as The Creator. As Intelligent Infinity.

There’s no way to “prove” any of this and this is both very good news... and rather sorrowful news. Why? Because thus is free will vouchsafed. Never has there been an iron-clad ‘proof’ of the doom-and-gloom asserted by the materialists; and never has there been an iron-clad ‘proof’ of the magic inward doorway into foreverness asserted by countless mystics throughout history from all the world’s religions (and some who have abjured any religious affiliation whatsoever). All that the latter can do is to encourage the earnest spiritual seeker to quest inwardly. To find out for yourself. No need to rely upon any authority, nor any particular scripture; nor, indeed, to hew necessarily to this-or-that prescription of spiritual practices. Seek simply and purely for results. Ask for God. For an inward communion with Foreverness. Such has been the boon that has come my way and I am in no wise special or particularly diligent in my sadhana (set of spiritual practices). If it’s happened *to me* - and by golly it has - it jolly well can happen *to anyone*. What is essential is The Thirst. That tears be shed where none can see. That the calling out for Divinity be heartfelt; unequivocal. Anointment with blessedness can ensue.

CHAPTER SEVEN: AS TO THE FURTHER MYSTERIOUSNESS OF THE LAW OF ONE

It has already been noted that “The Law of One” can be stated in a breezy offhand way that explains nothing: ‘everything is God.’ Well, fine, *but what is God?* The effort to articulate a profound answer to *that* question is what has kept theologians busy for thousands of years in all of the great religious traditions of our present-day world, including the five most famous (chronologically Hinduism, Judaism, Buddhism, Christianity and Islam) . To say nothing of modern-day philosophers, who oftener than not duck their noblest vocation of marrying “science” with “religion,” which they try so anxiously to avoid, thinking such a marriage impossible; or else, dangerous to their keeping tenure.

Actually a forceful and sophisticated answer to the what-is-God question is near at hand, but inexorably leads to still deeper questions. I phrased it in the title to Chapter Two [1] and it can be restated thus: “God is coterminous with unbounded and primordial big-c Consciousness, in the context of accepting the premise that ‘consciousness is original, self-existent, and constitutive of all things.’ ” Easy to say. But *accepting* this worldview is much easier said than done. It means dismantling our widely-unexamined premise that “matter” is separate from “consciousness.” In this seesaw, historically and in overview terms we wind up with ‘materialism’ (variously labeled) versus ‘idealism’ or ‘transcendentalism’ (again, variously labeled). The former tend to argue that consciousness is ‘the ghost in the machine’ and some sort of epiphenomenon to a world that is terminally un-knowable and is made up of dead, inert ‘stuff.’ While the later try to exhort listeners and/or readers to entertain an opposite worldview: that all the seemingly dead ‘stuff’ is actually emanation-of / expression-of a colossal consciousness in deep disguise; and that that consciousness is all of it alive. And that that consciousness is accessible to our ‘ordinary’ consciousness, if we but make the effort.

If we but make the effort. Yes, effort *is* involved but much less than some make it out to be. It means grasping that big-c Consciousness is supra-rational (not *irrational*). And is wholly conversant with the full palette of human emotions. Sorrow. Love. *All* the rest.

— — — — —
[1] As to the titles of the preceding six chapters:

1. “*The Fundamental Pluralism of Indian Culture and Actual Hinduism.*” (12 pages)*
2. “*The All Is Consciousness Worldview and The Law of One.*” (14 pages)
3. “*The Meaning of Philosophy in Hinduism.*” (14 pages)
4. “*Philosophy in Hinduism Further Considered.*” (14 pages)
5. “*A Personal Choice: the Pitfalls of Present-day Materialism, or Affirming Reality as Wall-to-wall ‘Magic’ Featuring Your Input,*” (10 pages)
6. “*What is the Essence of Hinduism.*” (12 pages)

*14 pages including a two page addenda

“In support of my present thesis [*about introceptualism vs. routine perceptual consciousness, where concepts or thought play a mediating role*], I call attention to the profound affinity between the idealism of philosophers such as Fichte, Hegel and Schopenhauer, on the one hand, and an orientation that is characteristic of the Upanishads (...as to supersensuous knowledge that liberates one from the bondage of the world), on the other hand. This similarity is especially notable [*as to*] the great Indian monist Shankara. Here also, reality is supersensible and radically monistic [*to wit interblended and unitary: all of one piece*] ...he successfully awakened a latent function of consciousness resulting in immediate Realizations of an essentially nonperceptual and nonconceptual nature ... I have employed the term *introcept* for this kind of immediacy, and *introception* for the process.”

[1]

The reality and existence and accessibility of super-Consciousness is carefully articulated by FMW in the above quotation. Namely, that it is other than ordinary awareness; but that the sadakha (the spiritual seeker) can, by inward self-disciplines of conscious attention, bring about a communion with super-Consciousness or primordial, unbounded Consciousness, which I have hitherto alluded to as nirdvanda consciousness (consciousness without an object and without a subject). The *reality* of said consciousness, I here argue, amounts to in subtle truth, The Law of One.

While some clarification of terms is useful, concerning what is being referred to, it is important not to get caught up into too many subtleties of terminology. Over-elaborate terminological sets of references have two adverse consequences. Firstly they kind of convey the suggestion - which is not true - that if one but masters all the subtleties of the terminologies... that this is tantamount to attaining to what's being referred to. To some extent this is a built-in trick of conceptual or thought-processes awareness. If I *think* about Chicago enough... I'm *in* Chicago. Not so. A beguiling substitution. But a misleading one. Secondly, there is simply the tendency of too many terms to obfuscate. This is a rampant problem in modern philosophy. So many careful and arcane terms have been introduced that general readers are put off. This is wrong and a disservice to the high and proper calling of philosophy, which is to render clearly a worldview.

The worldview that I am trying to render clearly is that all levels of consciousness - in Ra's presentation there are seven in this octave, this cycle-of-creation - are inter-blended with and inter-fused with, big-C or primordial, unbounded and uncorrallable Consciousness. Moreover, that said Consciousness has *empathy* and *volition*. Translation? Prayers are heard on high. We each can - by of course actions, *but also prayers* - help bring about a more harmonious world

[1] pp 125-126 in “Transformations in Consciousness (The Metaphysics and Epistemology)” by Franklin Merrell-Wolff (1887-1985); containing his “*Introceptualism*” [composed circa 1939 - 1946]; 1995, 1st Ed.* by State University of New York (S.U.N.Y.) Press, addr. State Univ. Plaza, Albany N.Y. 12246. 326pp, pbk three [*interpositions*] added. (*Wolff's *actual* first edition: self-edited; in 19__; before his passing).

CHAPTER SEVEN: AS TO THE FURTHER MYSTERIOUSNESS OF THE LAW OF ONE (continued, p3)

The empathy and volition of primordial consciousness - in point of fact an everywhere Presence that is not observed by most people except insofar as they have struggled to attune their awareness to step-by-step become sensitive to It, however dimly - does *partake* of these human characteristics, but by no means is *constrained* by them. This is part of the permanent mysteriousness of everywhere-always primordial consciousness. However advanced the adept is, in his or her practices of attunement, it's simply impossible to compass the Hugeness and the infinite subtlety of infinite and uncorrallable primordial consciousness. It's always more. The well of Its potentiation is unlimited; never exhausted. It is from Forever. No thought suffices.

In practical terms - in terms of the moral polarization that is the pre-eminent challenge for all of us in third-density or human level consciousness [1] - it's fair to say that two different attitudes become characteristic of entities towards primordial consciousness, depending on the polarization they have chosen to work toward. In service-to-others moral polarization, the attitude is clearer. *Surrender* and *acceptance* are the hallmarks of discerning Intelligent Infinity; and this is matched by the cultivation of a global compassion toward the beingness and the needs of others: all of which come to be seen as true evocations of The Creator.

The service-to-ownself attitude is considerably more murky. A quality of 'seeking conquest' and 'control' become the watchwords, for the All-ness of The Creator is seen in shadow and a general combative stance toward both 'God' and 'everyone else,' is the moral posture. Blind and doomed heroism could be used to describe the hubris that overtakes this polarization. All others are seen as (a) inferiors; (b) equals to be fought with; or (c) superiors to be feared. Indeed a quality of *fear* and *efforts at intimidation* are unsavory attributes of this polarization. In the analysis previously cited cf. the quotation on the previous page, this polarity is given it's proper characterization as militaristic and warlike and, in effect, a descent into stygian depths. Are there any redeeming features to this 'immoral' morality? Perhaps. But discerning them is hard.

[1] In brief recapitulation, the seven densities of consciousness as Ra presents them - I believe correctly, for Ra notes there are virtual infinities of sub-gradients within each density - are, One, primordial chemistry or 'matter' (elemental Beingness); Two, plant-animal awareness (growth and then self-replication); Three, human-level awareness (the dawning of self-awareness and then accomplishing moral polarization); Four, what's often referenced as the lower astral (service-to-others social memory complexes and service-to-ownself social memory complexes); Five, the upper astral regions (the social memory complexes of each type seek to deepen their wisdom concerning their 'love,' the moral polarization they've chosen); Six, the lower causal to use the most related term (the further blending of each type of wisdom with each type of love, and where service-to-ownself entities / social memory complexes must choose to reverse polarity if they wish to progress further, for aught is above except The Creator); Seven, the gateway density largely congruent with the term the upper causal realm, where the 'membrane' between entities and The Creator gets thinner and thinner and a process of coalescing with Primordial Unity draws closer and closer toward an actual 'melting-into' or fusion between entities / souls, and unbounded Intelligent Infinity.

CHAPTER SEVEN: AS TO THE FURTHER MYSTERIOUSNESS OF THE LAW OF ONE (continued, p4)

The reason for the effort at discerning it, is in my opinion all-important, for it touches upon the primary reason I have found the Ra material [1] so pivotal and valuable. In my opinion Ra dispels an enormous amount of confusion and alleged ‘mystery’ and / or ‘spookiness’ around the general subject of evil, and the mythologized figure The Devil, a.k.a. “Lucifer” or “Satan.” If such confusion is allowed to fester, it’s akin to a metastasized cancer. Evil can be summed as the Gita does: “hell has three doors: lust, rage and greed. He who passes by these three dark doors has achieved his own salvation.” (Ch_ v_ 1944 Isherwood / Prabhavannda Tr.) So whereas sanity and a clear intellect eschews these... they bent on self-glorification revel in all three.

Ra sums the matter succinctly. Moral polarization. That our ‘default setting’ is 73% selfishness, and 27% selflessness / compassion. If we corral our selfishness and redouble our commitment in thought word and deed to be of service to others, to 52% or more, this is a 25% shift in a clearly positive direction. It takes work. Self discipline. And a clear understanding of the worthiness of this orientation. Sanity and clear thinking recommend it; it’s a *positive* access to Intelligent Infinity / The Creator / Infinite Density Consciousness.

If however we alternatively allow selfishness to run riot, and decide to aim unabashedly for self-glorification (“I am God”) with nary a care for others - and this often is allied with a run-wild hedonism - the service-to-ownself moral (some would say “immoral”) polarization has been chosen. Frankly, it amounts to a ‘negative’ access to God: God in general is denied; instead it is the ‘jiva’ (the personal soul) that is the acme of all striving; self-glorification runs riot; and there is a vicious and poisonous obsession with ‘us / them’ tribal, hierarchical thinking. All in all a sorry state of affairs. So why tarry over it? To dispel the otherwise ‘spooky’ allure of the wickedness that’s afoot in such a worldview. Why, in cosmic terms, is it allowed to fester, like a garden weed? (A). It’s *proof positive* that personal freedom is total; *no* guardrails. (B). Against all odds, certain dividends accrue to The Creator, three especially: skill in deception and concealment; skill in self-presentation in alluring, magnetic, charismatic styles; and, frankly, the intensification of *the will* - ‘the’ key signature of the self - to a seemingly unbounded intensity and tenacity, as in “of steely willfulness.”

[1] “The Ra Contact: Teaching the Law of One.” Publ. 2018. Comprising Vols. I and II. A ‘third’ edition.*

* Inasmuch as I reference “the big blue books” as the first edition, 1982, and the Schiffer-as-publisher, the second edition, this is the ‘third’ edition; however (footnote one, p 258, Vol. II): “the original transcripts from the cassette recordings were published in four books under the title, “The Law of One” (the ‘big blue books’ or ‘first edition’).” ...then “years later in 1998” a “fifth book containing fragments omitted...” was published (Schiffer: part of ‘second edition’). “See ‘The Relistening Report’ in Vol. I [of this ‘third’ edition] for information about how the new transcriptions were produced and consequently this book, The Ra Contact, published.”

So this ‘third edition’ is an extremely reworked and massively improved edition; so much so, it deservedly can be termed more than a ‘third edition,’ but rather, *a new first edition* in important respects. Further remark is at Entry Number Two in Part A of The Annotated Bibliography

CHAPTER SEVEN: AS TO THE FURTHER MYSTERIOUSNESS OF THE LAW OF ONE (*continued, p5*)

“Ra uses the term ‘distortion’ to convey the twisting, modification, misrepresentation or *concealment* of the undifferentiated, un-potentiated [*e.g. still in latency and thus largely veiled*] intelligent infinity in its pure form, i.e. the Creator. Everything in the universe, then, is a distortion [*along with everything in any other realm or on the inner planes*], beginning with the First Distortion of Free Will, moving to Love, then to Light, then to the created universe, including stars, planets, people, space, time, etc. // ‘Distortion’ can have any value assigned to it (‘good,’ ‘bad,’ ‘beautiful,’ ‘terrible,’) but ultimately lacks positive and negative connotation. It is used as a strictly neutral term to indicate that everything experienced within creation is a distortion of the One Creator [*and thus in this important special sense is the everywhere-inward-in-consciousness embodiment of The Law of One: The One Presence that is the substrate within everything everywhere always*].”

[1]

It is my thesis that the successive embodiments of entities (mineral, plant/animal, human, lower astral forms, etcetera) are progressively more able to unfold and express the Infinite Beingness of The Creator; or, if you prefer, and perhaps stated more correctly, The Presence.

Bear in mind that these conceptual formulations regarding cosmic or higher states of consciousness can never be altogether accurate. ‘Stepping down’ loftier cosmic immediacies into human language is inevitably another case of unavoidable distortion.

That being said, it can be observed that plants and animals - indeed arguably even rocks - possess dim adumbrations in their consciousnesses, of The Presence. So do we humans. Even though in the vast majority of cases, this awareness remains dormant; un-activated; yet, when activated, it permits a greater awareness-of and communion-with, The Presence. This is ‘programmed in,’ so to say, in the mechanics/the engineering of a human embodiment. Quite logically it may be inferred that - perhaps we can call them ‘angelic’ and/or ‘demonic’ - the embodiments of entities within the lower astral... and then the upper astral... realms more ‘dense’ with consciousness... that the embodiments therein, are still more finely tuned so as to become able to commune with Intelligent Infinity; The Presence; which Presence has been ably termed by FMW The High Indifference.

I use the term, The Presence, in the sense that a still more profound dimension of infinite consciousness undergirds what is a more intelligible dichotomy: the spatial void of the nirvana realm; and the world-containing space of the universe as it manifests to subject-object awareness. The former touches upon the mystery of The Self (‘atman’). The latter is our familiar context where we engage in numberless entanglements of the personal self (jiva) with those constrictions of consciousness we call ‘objects;’ all of them ultimately irritants serving to arouse consciousness. Then, behind or beneath all of this is a yet stranger, more powerful, Presence: *Infinite-Density Consciousness / Primordial Consciousness / nirdvanda consciousness / The One Infinite Creator of Intelligent Infinity*.

[1] pp 481-482 in Vol. I of “The Ra Contact: Teaching the Law of One,” op cit.
Underlining and three [*interpositions*] added.

CHAPTER SEVEN: AS TO THE FURTHER MYSTERIOUSNESS OF THE LAW OF ONE (*continued, p6*)

The Presence, or Intelligent Infinity, while everywhere all the time, is mysterious in two ways most immediately. Firstly, it is *There, Here, Everywhere*, even though most of us are wholly or almost wholly unaware of this. It's a mystery in plain sight so to say.

This assertion is not a speculation; a conjecture; a "maybe." It's really *There*. And, you need not take my word for it. Nor even the word of any of the very many spiritual attestations that have been written by diverse mystics since time immemorial. Cultivate receptivity. For some - perhaps for most - this begins with faith. Then - in diverse ways and at some juncture in time wholly, or almost wholly, unforeseen - The Presence can and does make *Itself* manifest to the personal immediate waking consciousness of the sadakha (the spiritual seeker).

This has happened for me. Of this I am completely positive. And, not just in the special dispensation referenced in Special Appendix A. But many times since. And in many ways. Some of these ways I have found congruent with the testimony of great spiritual classics. For example as to Special Appendix A, it was and is a vivid and unforgettable affirmation of what Dr. Julian Johnson calls "the audible lifestream" in his great classic "The Path of the Masters." [1] In sum, if these Presentations of The Presence have happened for *me*, who am in *no wise* so conscientious a meditator - or otherwise a yoga practitioner - as many others... well, golly gee, it dang well can happen to *anybody*. With all my foibles and human frailties, Giantweirdness [2] has been most gracious in making *Itself* accessible. I am utterly certain it can be so for others who seek with sufficient intensity and dedication and sincerity, however wayward a life journey they (any of you) may have hitherto had. 'Every sinner has a future and every saint has a past.'

The second quality of Mystery has to do with the radical undefinability of Intelligent Infinity. The Presence is veiled and is unto *Itself*. Of all the certain signatures of I.I. or The Presence, that of fathomless and unbounded Power may be said to be the most important. All the world may want one thing... but if The Presence, Intelligent Infinity, wants something else; well it's something else that will be forthcoming. There ought to be no doubt whatsoever. This is why I regard prayer as so terribly important. The unbounded and uncorrallable infinite Power of Intelligent Infinity can and does hear prayers; *all* prayers. No honor is more precious and no honor is higher than to be an earnest petitioner to Intelligent Infinity that the world grow gentler.

[1] First published in 1939. For complete citation, see Entry Number Five in Part One of the annotated bibliography hereto, concerning five texts I most especially esteem and recommend to interested readers. The other four: one, "The Bhagavad Gita"; two, "The Ra Contact: Teaching the Law of One"; three, "Autobiography of a Yogi" by Paramhansa Yogananda (alt., Paramahansa Yogananda); four, "The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object [and impliedly without a Subject]" by FMW (1887-1985).

[2] This is my personal coinage of a term for The Presence. The word "Giant" is intended to evoke everythingness; all-inclusiveness; and the word "Weird" means, doubly, (a) unexpected, surprising; and (b) that everything - everything! - *truly is* interconnected with everything else in One *Weird* Unity.

CHAPTER SEVEN: AS TO THE FURTHER MYSTERIOUSNESS OF THE LAW OF ONE (continued, p7)

Alas, the world has not - as yet - grown gentler. Among planet Earth's presently incarnate eight billion people - to use Ra's more exact phrasing, mind/body/spirit complexes - experiencing third density or human level consciousness - there is firstly, a wide range concerning the maturity of they experiencing such consciousness: from so-called baby souls, to young souls, then mature souls, then old souls. Thus for some this is their first time here... but for some, scores and perhaps hundreds of previous incarnation at human level consciousness have already ripened them to, in some cases, becoming acutely aware of the need for their moral polarization finally and definitively occurring: cf. the last two paragraphs on page 92.

Secondly, as we all know from the daily news, wars and civil wars and poverty and even famine are afflicting many millions of people worldwide. It can seem at times like an ocean of misery is everywhere. For some, this snuffs out their faith. For some, they do rise to a heroism.

This vast and confusing tableau has - as a practical fact - led many to zero or at best lukewarm spiritual conviction; regardless their nominal religious affiliation. And of course the miseries of the world have been fodder for the anti-spirituality, anti-religion theorists, who are legion. [1]

I used to bemoan this state of affairs, as many do. No more. Gradually, by taking the massive view, so to say, concerning the 'consciousness architecture' of the Creation and it's very mysterious linkages to Primordial, Unbounded, Infinite Consciousness / Intelligent Infinity, it seems to me eminently sensible that Ra is correct. That the primary purpose of third density or human level consciousness is to awake to self-awareness and then to morally polarize that awareness. And that this is why - in cosmic terms - the time-duration of third density consciousness is comparatively short (as to it flourishing on Earth and kindred planets); whereas, the vast time duration of first, and second, and fourth, and fifth, and sixth densities of consciousness are all of them many times longer in duration. Which invites discussion of yet another mystery about God

This concerns the issue of time; versus eternity or "foreverness" (Ra's term). To get to the heart of the matter I'm convinced that foreverness is co-extensive with every single second or sub-second in the river of time; currently calculated by science as 13.7 billion years since 'The Big Bang' (or alternatively a prior cycle - a prior octave - of a creation process that's endless); plus 'x' billion years more ahead of us collectively. Does eternity accompany *all* this river of time?

[1] One of the most readable of such books - and perhaps among the most popular - is "The God Delusion" by Richard Dawkins. 2006; 406 pp in Hardback First Edition; Houghton Mifflin Co., Publ; 215 Park Av. South, NYC NY 10003. Mr. Dawkins' criticisms are aimed chiefly at western religious traditions - Judaism, Christianity and Islam - and especially at the Old Testament, so rife with tribal and authoritarian distortions. But he aims to discredit theism generally as 'wish projection' from our human-level personalities. However, Dawkins - and others - fail to distinguish between personalistic and *impersonalistic* aspects of Divinity. Nor does he acknowledge or accept that consciousness is *the* fundamental.

CHAPTER SEVEN: AS TO THE FURTHER MYSTERIOUSNESS OF THE LAW OF ONE

(continued, p8)

I say yes. For one thing, this throws light upon mystic testimonies in the literature where the mystic in effect describes a deep feeling of timelessness; of floating in foreverness. There are also numerous kinds of kindred episodes experienced by many, which, while not directly and so clearly mystical, are impactfully experienced as moments of '*floating outside of time*.' These can arise from moments of emotional crisis, and / or moments of acute emotional exhilaration.

I am able to briefly outline one such episode from personal experience. It illustrates the remarkable plasticity of consciousness. In 1985 I chose to experiment with a type of yoga of personal design which involved a deliberate intensification of the senses through certain postures and actions and - perhaps pivotally - a mental mood of inviting a sort of 'oblation of self' by the postures and actions; which sought to be, in essence, a display of intense worshipfulness towards Divinity; and, bear in mind, my prior discussions here about God as Presence rather than as A Self / An Other Self, however exalted. (Plus of course every seeker carries a personal and idiosyncratic cargo of ideations and memories comprising overt notions - and subliminal or unconscious notions - concerning God / the nature of Divinity).

In any case this episode concluded with a most memorable albeit highly fleeting imperience (inward consciousness experience). As I gazed at my own reflection in a mirror, suddenly the corporeal particulars of my embodiment became a sort of foreground blur of irrelevancy... and the background (which happened to be a white sheet hung across a window) assumed a totally otherworldly radiance and potency. No longer was it a background, a mere white sheet. Suddenly the whiteness shone as Presence; as Beingness of an altogether higher order. Compared to which the particulars of 'me' / my embodiment and whatever I was doing or not doing were quite simply secondary and inconsequential. Maybe, a trigger. But, what was precipitated, rendered the 'trigger' quite simply dross; dim; blotted out; utterly like no-longer-relevant dust.

The takeaway I derived from this episode is that *technique* and *method* are *very secondary* to the general personal desire to attain to a communion with deeper reality / Divinity. In my case my actions were heartfelt in this direction but their correctness or incorrectness were being shown to me as altogether secondary to my *emotional aspiration towards a felt communion* with Divinity.

Aspiration. Inward intent. That's what's key. Not this-or-that technique or practice. As summed in the adage, 'seek what the elders sought; not to follow in the *ways* of the elders.' Another advisory puts it this way: 'if you really want to see God, shed tears where none can see; Divinity will see, and ever answers the heartfelt cries of seekers with surpassing skill and precision.' I have found this to be true in my own case. I'm in no wise special. Ergo, it can happen for anyone. Attaining to such communion, it but remains to strive to morally polarize so as to eventually attain fourth density, across a sort of threshold of resistance / of testing

CHAPTER SEVEN: AS TO THE FURTHER MYSTERIOUSNESS OF THE LAW OF ONE

(continued, p 9)

The whole concept of ‘densities of consciousness’ can seem foreign to most; at the start it was a difficult conceptual framework for me to come to terms with. It became easier when I assimilated the corollary that infinities of sub-densities round out the picture. Thus ideationally the idea of densities ceases to be clunky and becomes more like the idea of a deepening deepening.

The relationship of such deepening to unbounded or primordial consciousness or Intelligent Infinity, hitherto alluded to as nirdvanda consciousness (consciousness without an object and without a subject), is fundamentally - this is my present understanding - deeply and profoundly and non-trivially mysterious.

For one thing the bridge of “self” as an immediate and potent understanding about the inner dynamo of consciousness, gets blown up. Following the acute analysis of FMW, first there is familiar ‘subject-object’ consciousness; then, a sort of gradient of degrees of subject-only consciousness terminating in Nirvana / the Spatial Void; and then, even this contrasting consciousness becomes absorbed within a yet deeper and decidedly eerie Consciousness That Is Foreverness.

All of these concepts and constructs are far from superfluous. Bear in mind that the all-is-consciousness worldview is tasked with rebutting the familiar - and wholly untrue - materialism worldview: that ‘matter’ or ‘matter/energy’ have given rise to consciousness as a gossamer epiphenomenon; and, hence, ‘ultimate reality’ is a gloomy morass of dead unconscious ‘stuff.’

In immediate terms such a worldview can bring cheer to the service-to-ownself moral polarization. Because it frees the whole idea of morality from any overarching context. Since ‘ultimate reality’ is just a sea of intergalactic, gas-and-molecules ‘stuff’ devoid of consciousness, it perforce becomes true that a morality built around ‘only me’ is every bit as legitimate as the service-to-others morality: which sooner-or-later involves a leap of faith that Life is Infinite. No such leap of faith is required for the service-to-ownself moral polarization. Reality is seen as just one vast ocean of friction-and-struggle amongst selves of varying potencies with nobody in charge; no ‘teacher’; no rhyme-or-reason; it’s just struggle, struggle, struggle; warfare forever.

As noted already I used to regard the anti-Realization, anti-Transcendental fixations and biases of the materialists - with their central bias against consciousness as primordial / primary - as some kind of horrible mistake that ought to be extirpated. Yet there’s no easy way to accomplish this, and in the meantime, all the vicious and poisonous consequences of the materialistic worldview remain Exhibit A as to the primordial truth and potency of the First Distortion: free will [1]. At first it’s difficult to conceive of a Creator of such enormity and grandeur... that oceans of misery and suffering can be countenanced as an inevitable corollary. How can one answer this

[1] p 482, Vol. 1, “The Ra Contact,” op cit. This is Ra’s *overall* implication, but not textually specified as such in any one place.

CHAPTER SEVEN: AS TO THE FURTHER MYSTERIOUSNESS OF THE LAW OF ONE

(continued, p 10)

The blunt answer is that it's not easily answered. The presence of oceans of pain and suffering and misery - and if The Creator be everywhere, that the Beingness of Intelligent Infinity in some measure is interblending-with and undergirding said oceans - is pretty much the primary basis for multiple, matter-oriented (materialistic) arguments that 'Intelligent Design' betokening a Creator Energy / Beingness that's wise and munificent... that this is a pipe dream; wishful thinking; and, promulgating such challengeable beliefs just produces "the opium of the masses."

But still. When I must and do stand by my indubitable inward affirmations that such a view is not mere wishful thinking; and as countless legions of mystics since time immemorial have thus affirmed as well; it becomes clear that there's a sort of fork in the road.

Deciding which way to jump, at that fork, may be ably summed in the understanding that there actually is a need for moral polarization. Failing which; abiding in 'the sinkhole of indifference' (the default setting of 73% selfishness and 27% true compassion / service to otherselfs); yet more lifetimes or embodiments in third density human consciousness await such a one.

Whereas having chosen, rather dramatically different 'planets' await the polarized entity. In one direction, yes, there's a sort of "hell" but it's not unmitigated and it's not eternal. In the other direction a sort of 'heaven realm' awaits; but, again, not unmitigated; not eternal.

Can it be that one single, unitary, Intelligent Infinity countenances both sorts of planets? I say yes. And that there's a sort of resolution. The lower astral 'hells' do not yawn on forever any more than the lower astral heavens are the end-all and be-all of felicity. Both sorts of environments *do* ultimately blend, so to say; such that, beyond sixth density (which I understand as largely congruent with the elsewhere-used term 'the lower causal'), all entities / social memory complexes (Ra's term), are of the service-to-otherselfs moral polarization. Why? Because all otherselfs are The Creator. To disdain any subset of otherselfs while giving preening 'superiority' to some alternate set-of-selfs, terming the latter "the elite;" this simply is unsupportable as one approaches the maelstrom of Intelligent Infinity. Where all that once was coal is pressed to become diamond. Oh I know these imageries are imprecise. Yet they give something of an important flavor. In I.I. there no longer are any persons; there's only I.I. The Presence. Which is everywhere always forever. A level of Transcendent / Primordial Consciousness which cannot be in any manner defined; altogether subtle; ineluctable; and whereas the term "prana" has sometimes been applied, this fails to convey the whole story. In sum I choose to evoke The Presence as "the dazzling dark" (Henry Vaughan, 4/17/1621-4/23/1695; and see Special Appendix A). Where the boundary between manifestation and potentiation arises. A bewitching realm. Beguiling. One stands at the threshold to the precincts of Foreverness.

CHAPTER SEVEN: AS TO THE FURTHER MYSTERIOUSNESS OF THE LAW OF ONE

(continued, p 11)

Bewitching and beguiling, yes. But are such descriptions irrelevant? That is, is the gulf between Intelligent Infinity - congruent with the FMW term The High Indifference and such Hindu terms as Brahman - and our ordinary senses-mediated consciousness so vast, that it's unbridgeable? Because if it is, we could meander all day about I.I. and it would be little more than silly pan-piping, without effect upon An Iron Door. That East is East and West is West and they never meet.

The image of an Iron Door is not without it's significance. Giantweirdness (my term) or Intelligent Infinity (the richly evocative term Ra employs) or God as Divine Presence, is not some peaches-and-cream silliness that can be conjured up, any which way, at the drop of a hat.

Not at all. There *is* an Iron Door. But think of the double door whereby two hotel rooms can be joined if *both* doors are unlocked. I would enlarge that imagery to where 'my' side of the door is in 'my' private consciousness (my soul-consciousness or 'jiva' consciousness) that basically amounts to a pretty prosaic place. Nice; comfortable; maybe even upscale... but still just a hotel room accessed by a hotel door. *I* can grab that handle and open *my* side of the double door.

I.I. / The Creator / Infinite Density Consciousness /nirdvandva consciousness (consciousness without an object and without a subject) / God as THE Divine Presence... when Divinity unlocks *It's* side of the door... 'The Iron Door'... wow: well, it's akin - in hotel terms - to gaining access to 'The Presidential Suite;' the fanciest accommodation available anywhere in the hotel. A whole suite of rooms with chandeliers; terraces; fountains; indoor and outdoor pools; the works. Selah.*

Oh I know such metaphors are frail. But better than nothing. The short summation is that access to The Presence involves TWO WILLS. To some extent those wills are everywhere/always interblended. But short of 'upper sixth density' so to say, where the two wills begin to truly melt into one will... such that in seventh density the 'jivas' there are near to indistinguishable from I.I. here in third density - and as well in fourth-fifth-sixth - there definitely is a big difference between 'my' will or 'your' will... and the infinite and unbounded willfulness of The Creator; I. I.

I speak these observations from personal conviction, built up across 44 years and many intimations of the availability of I.I. being presented to my private consciousness: sometimes, in the guise of dear friends whom I later understand as, literally, 'angels sent by God.' Sometimes, in the form of 'flukes' or 'coincidences' that upon later reflection I adduce to have been, yes, designed. And of course there have been the spectacular events; see Special Appendix A. In sum, for me - and in theory for any sadakha (spiritual seeker) - I feel an access to I.I. that is near-at-hand; familiar; yet, a Presence that in it's inmost nature remains veiled; yes, mysterious. And so we return once again to how infinite-density consciousness - primordial consciousness - is, truly, mysterious.

*"its etymology and precise meaning are unknown...either a liturgical-musical mark or...meaning of 'stop and listen'"..."used 74 times in the Hebrew Bible" (Wikipedia)

CHAPTER SEVEN: AS TO THE FURTHER MYSTERIOUSNESS OF THE LAW OF ONE

(continued, p 12)

“The roots of my consciousness, which prior to this moment had been (seemingly) more or less deeply implanted in the field of relative consciousness, now were forcibly removed and instantaneously transplanted into a supernal region. This sense of being thus transplanted has continued to the present day, and it seems to be a much more normal state of emplacement than ever the old rooting had been.” [1]

I had the distinct honor and privilege of meeting Dr. Wolff before his passing in October of 1985. Most importantly, of hearing his last ‘Convention Sermon’ in August of that year. Thus I am able to attest not only to the sterling character of this great mystic - *the* pre-eminent philosopher of mysticism the west has ever yet produced to date - but to a personal transformation in consciousness precipitated by his last sermon. Which he delivered with a timeless passion and emphasis.

In a state of ‘shock’ - like everyone else in the small audience - I exited the house (the sermon having been delivered in his house in Lone Pine CA) into the side garden... and there was Krishna! I say it that way partly in gentle jest and partly in utter seriousness. A fellow student had elected not to attend that final sermon and was lolling about under a tree with a carefree, almost ecstatic grin on his face. ‘Krishna’ became the foreground to an utterly subtle shift in my personal consciousness at that moment; for at that exact same moment, I ‘grokked’ (that wonderful word) that I... and ‘Krishna’... and, yes, the very garden itself; the mountainside it was on... in point of fact, that *everything*, out to the uttermost horizon of intergalactic stars and nebulae... that *everything* was a production in a Consciousness of simply dazzling subtlety and all-pervasiveness. I was engulfed in The Presence. A Presence so deft and tactful as to pass un-noticed unless effort be put forth to notice It. A Presence wherein were blended - so subtly - beauty; love; wisdom; power. It were as if I were being shown that God can - yes - *enjoy* It’s Lila; It’s play of appearances.

The sense of The Presence was dramatic at that moment. But - akin to FMW’s remark in the above quote - I am also able to say that slowly, bit-by-bit, a feeling of the nearness / the all-aroundness of The Presence has ever so slowly and subtly become the ‘new ground’ in which my personal consciousness is rooted. This is a great honor and delight. There is no honor so precious and no delight so exotic as to eclipse that of having one’s life rooted in The Presence. I try to express my gratitude moment-by-moment: the effort to be constantly mindful of the all-aroundness of I.I. is **the** epicenter of my sadhana (personal spiritual practice); that, and prayer.

[1] p 264 in “The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object” (Chapter Two), as reprinted in “Experience and Philosophy,” containing said book, as well as a reprinting of “Pathways Through to Space,” both by Franklin Merrell-Wolff (1887-1985); 1994; S.U.N.Y. Press (State Univ. Plaza, Albany NY 12455). “C w/o O” was First published in 1973 by Julian Press (of Crown Publ’g Group), 1 Park Ave., NYC NY 10016.

CHAPTER SEVEN: AS TO THE FURTHER MYSTERIOUSNESS OF THE LAW OF ONE

(continued, p 13; CONCLUSION)

“I both felt and knew that, at last, I had found *the solution of the ‘wrongness,’* the sensing of which constitutes the underlying driving force of all religion and much philosophical effort. ... there is a feeling of loneliness that is not dissipated by objective achievement or human companionship, however great the range and penetration of sympathetic adjustment. Religious and other literature afford abundant testimony that this feeling of solitude is very widely, if not universally, experienced. I am disposed to regard it as the driving motif of the religious quest.” [1]

The above observation has long resonated with myself, as well, as profoundly correct. That FMW correctly articulates a sorrowful or mournful - sometimes acute, sometimes inchoate - inward feeling of ALONENESS. A feeling that is deep and abiding. Might it have it's source in Intelligent Infinity / Primordial Consciousness *itself*? Obviously I cannot prove this. But I am disposed to feel it is so. That aloneness constitutes a driving force in The Creator “unfurling it's scroll of beingness” (Ra's artful turn of phrase) into infinity upon infinity of ensouled entities in *all* of the densities of consciousness. Voila. Alone no more.

I am convinced, further, that this drives a striking felicity toward devotees, by God, very widely remarked upon in the world's spiritual / mystical literature, and a blessing that I personally have felt very much; most especially since the conscious launch of my ‘career in mysticism’ as I've come to think of it, 8/15/1979 - onward. A career that might have had it's unconscious seeds even prior - and indeed during the course of one or many previous lifetimes - but this I do not know for sure. It doesn't matter. The benevolent kindness of the near-at-hand Presence is profoundly reassuring. Thus, I am never, ever, alone anymore, even when ‘alone’; nor is God! [2]

The feature of aloneness figures in the moral polarization remarked on so frequently in this book. Certainly, aloneness is doubly ‘gone’ in the service to others self's moral polarization; gone in the sense of the felt divinity of other self's; and, gone in the sense of intimacy with a Cosmical Self. Such is my experience and abiding conviction. In the *other* direction ‘aloneness’ becomes a veritable motif. A perception of the Aloneness of Intelligent Infinity becomes acute: a vast Solemnity is truly felt. Then, the personal aloneness, even apart from all others in one's ‘elite’ group becomes something intensely felt. This ache becomes a driving force in an unquenchable sensuality / indulgence-in-the-senses. A parade of intimacies. But all amount to just band-aids.

[1] p 266 in “The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object” (Chapter Two), op cit.; same edition.

[2] Two mis-readings ought not arise. Firstly, I am not so foolish as to give any special features to my relation with I.I., although as noted below some do. Secondly I employ the term “God” - as elsewhere throughout this book and in other writings - as Infinite Density Consciousness that's enduringly unfettered by *any* ‘corral’ of definition. Ever. Thus, Divine Presence contains resonances that are vividly personalistic, as well as resonances that seem utterly beyond any ‘self nature’ however exalted. See Special Appendix A.

CHAPTER SEVEN: AS TO THE FURTHER MYSTERIOUSNESS OF THE LAW OF ONE

(continued, p 14; CONCLUSION, continued)

While it is not my intention in this or any other chapter, to dwell overly on the service-to-ownself moral polarization - easily viewed by some as an 'immoral' sinking into the lust/rage/greed swamp of run-riot hubris and selfishness - it's important to point out that, as some have put it, 'God is *the* Lord: both of all hells; and, of all heavens.' No-where is too eerie or too strange for there not to be the all-pervading background Presence of I.I. (Intelligent Infinity); but dimly or not-at-all discerned by denizens there, perhaps; but, Present nonetheless. This is mysterious on its face. Mystery - as much as infinite love, infinite power, infinite wisdom, and numberless other infinities [1] - is a very exciting dimension of infinite-density Consciousness / Primordial Consciousness / nirdvandva consciousness (consciousness without an object and without a subject) / The One Infinite Creator of Intelligent Infinity. However far you want to go, there's always more. The beat goes on forever. The party never stops. Life love and consciousness are Forever.

These books are written from a double motive. Primarily they are an effort to offer sincere testimony about the Realness and the Unboundedness of I.I. as I have come to discern It as an undergirding Presence in my life / my day-to-day on-flowing milieu. Secondly they serve the office of self clarification; inasmuch as efforts at exposition like this allow the thinkable construct I have concerning the Transcendental Beingness of infinite density consciousness to acquire something of a yet deeper flavor and accuracy for my own waking awareness, as well as for the waking awareness of - hopefully - the reader; from out the well of inward endlessness.

There's no way to 'prove' any of this in the sense of iron-clad logical proof; yet by no means is I.I. illogical; rather, supra-logical: transcendent of routine thinkable systems. Comprehending them yet transcending them. When contemplating the enormity and unboundedness of The Creator, the logical response - undergirding the service to otherselves moral polarization - is acceptance. In one sense, surrender; but - since God wants lovers not slaves - this doesn't mean abjuring the questioning / 'challenging' vigor of intellectual acuity. Such acuity can grow sharp indeed... in the service of love of otherselves (secondarily of one's own-self). Whereas, since the hallmark of service to ownself is challenge; battle; struggle; acuity sharpens with the 'little' objective of personal power: '*how can I get God to do whatever I want?*' The addiction to power blinds such a one from unity which is freedom which is love which is infinity which is The Law of One. The negation of all these is a recipe for personal tragedy but rescue, mysteriously, is ever at hand.

[1] FMW has pointed out that multiple infinities is logical and mathematically correct. Some infinities are posited as larger classes-of-members than other infinities. One can say Infinity A, and Infinity not-A, are both subsumed within a yet greater infinity comprehending and accommodating both of them. And so on.

As a closing referral concerning Divine Mystery, "Conversations With God" (books 1, 2 and 3) by Neale Donald Walsh (1948 -), addresses time / timelessness. Hampton Roads Pub. Co., 134 Burgess Lane, Charlottesville, VA 22902; (804) 296-2772. All three books are well worthwhile on that and other 'mysterious' topics.

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE BHAGAVAD GITA (The Song of God)

I concur with other commentators that “The Bhagavad Gita is the most revered of all the Hindu texts, and has a unique pan-Hindu influence.” [1] It’s power goes even further.

The fame of the Gita - often referred to as “revered by all Hindus and Buddhists alike” - is, indeed, what led me to listen so attentively to excerpts from it, as read by the actor Zia Moheyydin, on that cassette from Caedmon Records in my car cassette player on that fateful afternoon in New Hampshire on 8/15/1979, all of over 43 years ago now. An event I continue to regard as the commencement - at age 32 - of my second career in mysticism.

Twenty-six months later, on or about 10/15/1981, while listening yet again to those excerpts - which use the 1944 Isherwood / Prabhavananda translation (see Entry One in Part A of the Annotated Bibliography) - I was precipitated into the precious imperiences - inner experiences - that are recounted in Special Appendix A. True out-of-body dispensations.

* * *

My essential thesis is this. All books - indeed all “things,” generally, from kitchen pots to cars to churches to stars - carry in themselves, in their inmost nature, a fundamental spiritual charge - a “vibe” it’s most often called - and this endowment is indwelling in everything; including of course planets and chemicals and plants and animals and people. Indeed, phenomena everywhere - beings in the lower and upper astral and the environments they inhabit and beings in the lower and upper causal and the environments *they* inhabit - are essentially built up from what we can call “vibes:” vibrations. Which is another way of saying that all of creation is built up from a rich and endless palette of music. We all participate in “manufacturing” or more properly said, “composing” this infinite/everywhere music. In it’s higher forms it has been called the music of the spheres or the celestial music; That which I was permitted to hear on 10/15/81, and for four to five months afterward. This idea of everywhere-vibrations as the nature of everything, is of a piece with the all-is-consciousness worldview I advocate (‘consciousness is original and self-existent and constitutive of all things’). Would that everyone would embrace this worldview. But personal freedom is always uppermost.

Anyhow my position is this. No spiritual-themed book anywhere extant in this world, of which I’m presently aware, matches the *spiritual power* or ‘vibes’ of The Bhagavad Gita.

[1] Page 3 of the 49 page full copy - made on January 23, 2023 - of the internet website “https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bhagavad_Gita.” The entirety of this Wikipedia entry for the Bhagavad Gita as copied, are excerpted from in varying degrees in this Chapter, with the page number from my full copy thereof provided by footnote citations; with the quoted remarks in quotation marks. I should note I use this manner of citing internet website sources by the date my copy was made, inasmuch as content from the internet generally - regardless whichever website - is almost constantly subject to change over time.

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE BHAGAVAD GITA (The Song of God) (*continued, p2*)

Before commenting further about this, a review of the Chapters (18) and Verses (total 700) is as follows. Some translations combine Chapters, and / or verses in Chapters. None of the Chapters originally had titles, but different translators have given them titles, *from which are*

Chapter Number / (Number of Verses) / Caption (*from among Translator Captions*) [1]

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| 1 (47) | Arjuna's Sorrow. (Arjuna as warrior-leader laments looming battle's destruction) |
| 2 (72) | Book of Doctrines. (God by way of avatar (Krishna) begins advisories to Arjuna) |
| 3 (50) | Karma Yoga. (performing acts sacramentally, as offerings to God, without possessiveness as to the consequences whether "good" or "bad") |
| 4 (42) | Jnana and Karma Yoga. ("Jnana" meaning wisdom; most especially, <i>discernment</i>) |
| 5 (29) | Karma Yoga. (further emphasis upon renouncing personal title to results of actions) |
| 6 (47) | Dhyana Yoga. (references to very deep - <i>dhyana</i> - meditation; stilling <i>all</i> thoughts) |
| 7 (30) | Jnana / Vijnana Yoga. (<i>vijnana</i> meaning realization, understanding; re Self / God) |
| 8 (28) | Religion by Devotion (Bhakti Yoga). (pivotal summary re Absolute Consciousness) |
| 9 (34) | Raja Yoga. "I am this world's mother, and grand-sire." (Isherwood/Prabhav. 1944 transl.) |
| 10 (42) | Divine Splendor. God via avatar - Krishna - recites chief of His Manifestations. |
| 11 (55) | The Cosmic Vision. God at Arjuna's entreaty, reveals His infinite glory and power. |
| 12 (20) | Bhakti (Devotional) Yoga. "Who burns with the sorrows of all creatures and shares in their joys also, him I hold highest of all the yogis." (Isher./Prab. 1944 transl.) |
| 13 (34) | The Field and the Knower. God - via avatar K. - "describes the difference between the transient perishable physical body (<i>kshetra</i>) and the immutable eternal Self (<i>kshetrajna</i>). ...[akin to] <i>ahamkara</i> (ego) and <i>atman</i> (Self)..." p22 op cit. |

[1] Pages 25 to 27 of the 49 page full copy of 1/23/2023 from the internet website, "https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bhagavad_Gita" Op cit.; *Plus* pages 16 to 24 re: Chapter Titles.

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE BHAGAVAD GITA (The Song of God) (*continued, p3*)

- 14 (27) The Forces of Evolution. (Phenomena and human personalities, etc., as super-impositions upon Primordial, Changeless, *Foreverness* Consciousness.)
- 15 (20) Yoga of the Supreme Purusha. God (FMW consciousness-without-an-object) transcends *both* ‘Nirvana’s void-selfness’ *and* ‘teeming-with-objects Samsara / Maya.’
- 16 (24) The Divine Path; the Demonic Path. Echoes the imperative for moral polarization as service-to-otherselves or the ‘doomed to battle’ service-to-ownself polarization
- 17 (28) Yoga of the Threefold Faith. I paraphrased this Yoga on page eight of Chapter Three (paraphrasing the 1944 Isherwood/Prabhavananda translation) : “not by alms or austerities can I be seen as you have seen Me; nor by book-learning; nor by ceremonial rites; nor by reciting scriptures nor by any other means; *but by a single-minded and constant attention upon Me day-by-day and year-by-year can I be seen and known and entered into as you have seen Me.*”
- 18 (78) Yoga of Liberation and Renunciation. The Gita’s longest chapter and a kind of summing-up. Re-emphasis upon “*karma-phalatyaga* (‘act while renouncing the fruits of your action’)” - p. 25, Op Cit.

* * *

My delineation of Divine Presence as intimated in the Gita builds upon the following observations:

“The Gita adopts the Upanishadic concept of Absolute Reality (Brahman), a shift from the earlier ritual-driven Vedic religion to one abstracting and internalizing spiritual experiences. According to Jeanne Fowler, the Gita builds on the Upanishadic Brahman theme, conceptualized to be that which is everywhere unaffected, constant, Absolute, indescribable and nirguna (abstract, without features). This Absolute in the Gita is neither a He nor a She, but a ‘neuter principle,’ an ‘It’ or ‘That.’ Like some of the Upanishads, the Gita does not limit itself to the nirguna Brahman.

“It teaches both the abstract and the personalized Brahman (God), the latter in the form of [such avatars or mahavatars - embodiments - as] Krishna. It accomplishes this synthesis by projecting the nirguna Brahman as higher than saguna or personalized Brahman, where nirguna Brahman ‘exists when everything else does not.’ The text blurs any distinction between a... [personalization of] God and impersonal absolute reality by amalgamating the two and using the concepts [of God personalized and God as nirguna Brahman] interchangeably in later chapters. This... [pattern] has led scholars to call the Gita **panentheistic**, [and] theistic as well as monistic.”

- pages 26-27, Op Cit.; *emphasis and five [interpositions] added.*

These observations re-emphasize the *fluidity* of the God concept as I seek to employ it in it’s more sweeping implications; versus repeated tendencies to ‘shrink’ God into this-or-that embodiment. There is, indeed, a dynamic tension at work here. *Both* are “God;” one reflects infinite

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE BHAGAVAD GITA (The Song of God) (*continued, p4*)

consciousness; while the other is That Consciousness bereft from *any* embodiment whatsoever.

This dynamic tension has its apex - in theological / historical terms - in the so-called “atman / anatman” divergence widely cited as separating Hinduism from Buddhism: which, remember, first arose as a corrective in / within the historical milieu of Hinduism at the time of Gautama Buddha’s physical life; much as Christianity first arose as a corrective in / within the historical milieu of Judaism at the time of Jesus’s life. For Jesus was a Jew quite similarly to how Gautama Buddha was a Hindu. The inter-relationship of the two understandings is aptly summed by FMW:

“With respect to a specific entity, the invariable identity is the Self, but with respect to all creatures and all modes of consciousness [*and within all densities of consciousness*], the Self becomes a parameter that varies. Behind and supporting this parameter is the ultimate invariant, Pure Consciousness itself. Herein we have a key for the reconciliation of the Atmic doctrine of Shankara [*and of others within the Hindu philosophical traditions*] and the anatmic doctrine of Buddha. Esotericism states that the Atmic doctrine was a ‘stepped down’ formulation of the Buddha’s doctrine and thus was more easily assimilated by relative consciousness [*such as we have it in usual ideation and usual subject-object consciousness*], whereas the pure Buddhist doctrine was well-nigh completely incomprehensible without a preliminary reorientation of human consciousness.” [1].

Inasmuch as both doctrines are presented in the text of the Bhagavad Gita, it is quite apt that the Gita is so very widely revered by Hindus and Buddhists alike.

Here I should like to add a clarification of my own that I have come to feel as very needful. Throughout much commentary, one finds “Krishna” - historically referenced as an avatar of God’s aspect as Vishnu - presented as *the* God principle. This trivializes the power of the Gita every bit as much as tribal chieftain portraiture trivializes God in the text and in many commentaries on the Old Testament / the Jewish Bible. One has to look past such well-meaning but unsophisticated characterization in both cases. They wind up doing a disservice to the broad intimations of Divinity that are vividly extant in the O.T. and in the Gita. Criticisms of such child-like interpretations of imagery are necessary in both cases. It is easy to lambaste the “Krishna” iconography - the flute playing cowherd with his Gopis (maidens), usually portrayed as a child-like blue hermaphrodite with a simpering smile - and comparison with available critiques of O.T. imagery are altogether apt: see quotation concerning the latter on the next page. In other words, to simply say The Presence is one-and-the-same as the foreground particularities of It’s ‘lila’ as this-or-that embodiment, is just plain misleading.

[1] p 412 in “The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object” (Chapter Six), as reprinted in “Experience and Philosophy,” containing said book, as well as a reprinting of “Pathways Through to Space,” both by Franklin Merrell-Wolff (1887-1985); 1994; S.U.N.Y. Press (State Univ. Plaza, Albany NY 12455). “C w/o O” was First published in 1973 by Julian Press (of Crown Publ’g Group), 1 Park Ave., NYC NY 10016. Three [*interpositions*] added.

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE BHAGAVAD GITA (The Song of God) (*continued, p5*)

Such foreground particularizations are of course woven into religious traditionalism world-wide. After all, religious traditions are like a river that carries along the mud with the clear water

“The God of the Old Testament is arguably the most unpleasant character in all fiction: jealous and proud of it; a petty, unjust, unforgiving control-freak; a vindictive, bloodthirsty ethic cleanser; a misogynistic, homophobic, racist, infanticidal, genocidal, filicidal, pestilential, megalomaniacal, sadomasochistic, capriciously malevolent bully.” [1]

All the famous five [chronologically Hinduism, Judaism, Buddhism, Christianity and Islam] are bismirched with this tendency. Judaism and to some extent Christianity as just noted; the very presence of a Sunni / Shiite schism within Islam and Islam’s obsession with enslaving females as a wholly unequal sex, imposing draconian and unforgiving “sharia” law systems too; and the whole edifice of traditional Christianity where Jesus - rather than being an exemplar as intended - becomes reified as a totem letting everyone off the hook: “He died for *your* sins.” One could go on. Dawkins does. But religionism per se is more than the sum of it’s invidious baggage, and to turn one’s back upon all religions, thereby, is to throw the baby out with the bathwater.

In any event, the Gita represents such a weaving of potentially misleading foreground particularities with timeless and liberating spiritual advice. The result has made it a classic.

“The Bhagavad Gita is the sealing achievement of the Hindu synthesis, incorporating its various religious traditions. The synthesis is at both philosophical and socio-religious levels, states the Gita scholar Keya Maitra. The text refrains from insisting on one right marga (path) to spirituality. It openly synthesizes and inclusively accepts multiple ways of life, harmonizing spiritual pursuits through action (karma), knowledge (jnana alt. sp. gyaana), and devotion (bhakti). According to the Gita translator [*and great scholar of Indian philosophy*] Radhakrishnan, quoted in a review by Robinson, Krishna’s discourse is a ‘comprehensive synthesis’ that inclusively unifies the competing strands of Hindu thought such as ‘Vedic ritual, Upanishadic wisdom, devotional theism and philosophical insight.’ Aurobindo described the text as a synthesis of various Yogas. The Indologist Robert Minor, and others ...state that the Gita is ‘more clearly defined as a synthesis of Vedanta, Yoga and Samkhya’ philosophies of Hinduism.” [2]

In the spirit of being such a classic, the Gita has been invoked to defend many different worldviews, all the way from ‘service to oneself’ doctrines about war and struggle; to far more ‘service to others’ doctrines of compassion and forbearance. And, philosophically, some use the Gita to propound a “Krishna” cult - which I have just so sharply criticized - while others try to tease out this-or-that view on Godly immanence. Concerning the latter, the inevitable subtlety that’s involved in discerning The Presence in *any* text, virtually guarantees that each reader will have the chance to form personally agreeable interpretations. My own comprise this Chapter.

[1] p. 31 in Dawkins, “The God Delusion,” op cit.

[2] p. 9 of 1/23/23 copy of the *Wikipedia on Gita*, op cit.

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE BHAGAVAD GITA (The Song of God) (continued, p6)

“...we may think of the ‘equals sign’ in mathematics as symbolizing equilibrium [*as between Nirvanic consciousness and familiar subject-object consciousness*], while zero symbolizes consciousness-without-an-object [*and without-a-subject*]. As an actually realized consciousness, the distinction here is extremely subtle, and yet of vital significance. It is very easy for the mystic to combine these two states into one and simply call them both ‘Nirvana.’ In most, but not all, literature on the subject this seems to have been done, and the result on the whole seems to have been confusing, at least to the western mind. ...when Consciousness-without-an-object [*Primordial, Undefinable Root Consciousness elsewhere alluded to by me as The Presence*] is distinguished from the purely subjective Nirvanic phase, a kind of mathematical clarity results. The subjective and the objective are then seen to inhere in a neutral and more primary principle [*amounting to a truly deeper density of Consciousness*], and thus they acquire a more thinkable perspective.” [1]

The lucidity of FMW’s thinking in the above quotation is germane to a deeper consideration of the Bhagavad Gita, and it’s message for we who are in embodied human existence here on planet Earth, and who wish to get ‘more in touch with God’ as it’s often put. For an interesting dynamic ensues from the power of the Gita. It leads me to express a further ramification of what Ra alludes to as ‘space-time,’ or our familiar waking consciousness on Earth... versus ‘time-space,’ or that consciousness-realm we journey to when we depart our physical vehicle or “die” in physical terms; corresponding more to the Nirvanic, subject-ascendant, consciousness realm.

I would like to phrase it thus. What sustains *both, equally*, is what may be thought of as an **extrusion of Realness** from Infinite-Density Consciousness / Primordial Consciousness / nirdvanda consciousness (consciousness without an object and without a subject) / The One Infinite Creator of Intelligent Infinity. In brief, *God*, in the fluidic and uncorrallable sense constituting the essence of the meaning of The Law of One. God-Beingness emanates as the entirety of this physical universe and it’s complement as to the ‘time-space’ regions thereof (“inner planes”); and, indeed, a larger-still astral realm; and, an *even larger* causal realm. In sum? *all* realms.

All of these are implicit in how God - channeling through the avatar-beingness of “Krishna” - reveals His unlimited power and grandeur to Arjuna, and in no uncertain terms. Arjuna is portrayed as stupefied; overwhelmed. The enormity and power of Divinity in the revealment described in the Gita are a dispensation responding to Arjuna’s genuine thirst to know. And to what end? To terrify Arjuna? No. To indicate, simply, that this unbounded Beingness of Divinity cherishes It’s relationship with It’s devotee; in this case, Arjuna. Who stands in for all we seekers who study and read the Gita avidly enough to catch the contagion for a relationship with God that the Gita is designed to bestow. A relationship that can deepen over time and which fosters soul growth. This is precisely the dividend I’ve achieved. And it’s available for all.

[1] p 393 in “The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object,” Chapter Six, *op cit*.

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE BHAGAVAD GITA (The Song of God) (*continued, p7*)

But there are many forces in the world that do *not* empower who you are and who even deny the very idea of “soul.” Forces that suggest, both overtly and covertly, that your “inward awareness” is no match for a vast uncaring and unconscious universe that cares nothing for who or what you are. That you’re a ‘blip’ on the radar screen; a meaningless nothing. I could go on. Such are the denialisms born of ignorance and a shallow hubris - however much a cloak of ‘realism’ is professed - by they who announce such views. Make no mistake. Such materialistic assumptions that, yes, even too many scientific luminaries embrace; they are a poisonous misreading of the actual nature of Reality. In symbolic terms, such are the armies of ignorance and of veiled hostility that the warrior Arjuna despairs of combatting in the Bhagavad Gita.

But God bids him to summon courage.

And goes on to announce the actual nature of Reality. That the universe *does* care. That the universe is *all of it* conscious. That - amazing as it may seem - the universe does *not* regard you as an irrelevant ‘nothing.’ Thus, you are not a victim cast into an uncaring universe... but an inalienable part of a vast and alive and conscious universe, brought forth from pure Divinity; and you have the great honor and responsibility to grow as a soul into being a co-creator of not only *this* universe; but *realms larger still*. Such is the core message within the Bhagavad Gita.

* * *

While there is considerable disagreement among scholars due to very scanty historical record the Gita appears to have been composed around 150 B.C. / B.C.E. (“Before Christ” and now expressed usually as “Before Common Era;” e.g., prior to year 0 to 39), or around 2,173 to 2200 years ago. [1] Internal evidence suggests to some scholars that three or more persons contributed to shaping the text, whose earliest manuscript copies probably occurred about 250 CE. (- p 7 of 49 pp, *Wikipedia Gita, op cit.*) . These archival particulars are of course of interest to historians and to all of us who wish to place a text within it’s historical / cultural context. But the Gita escapes such boundaries. As do all great spiritual classics. They are carried down through the centuries owing to their internal importance in evoking God. And the relationship of God - or The Presence, The Infinite - to devotees. This gives the Gita it’s strength. It’s a conversation between God and a perplexed devotee, and in that sense Arjuna stands in for all of us.

[1] “Some scholars accept dates from the 5th century to the 2nd century BCE as the probable range, the latter likely. The Hinduism scholar Jeanne Fowler, in her commentary on the Gita, considers second century BCE to be the probable date of composition. J.A.B. van Buitenen also states that the Gita was likely composed about 200 BCE. According to the Indologist Arvind Sharma, the Gita is generally accepted to be a 2nd-century-BCE text.”

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE BHAGAVAD GITA (The Song of God) (*continued, p8*)

For we are all - if the truth be told - “perplexed devotees.” It’s a blinding feat of hubris to declare, “I’ve got it all figured out; I’m not perplexed anymore.” Which is as fitting a preamble as any to the central issue of *moral polarization* so vividly touched on in the Bhagavad Gita and so central to soul growth as outlined by Ra. To start with, here is Ra’s presentation in brief.

There are seven densities of consciousness and as entities or souls - “mind/body/spirit complexes” when human-level awareness is reached - traverse this octave, or cycle-of-creation, progressive unfoldments of awareness occur. First density (rocks, minerals, ‘inert’ metals, etc.) is where *sheer beingness* is experienced. I AM THAT I AM. Second density (plants and animals as we observe them here on earth) undertake inward-directed *growth and self-replication*. The elaboration and sophistication of plants and animals evolving - yes evolution is definitely at work but it’s an inner-directed thing and not a mere result of ‘blind chance’ environmental pressures - remarkably intricate ways of growing and then self-replicating: it’s a wonder to behold.

Third density or human-level awareness / consciousness [1] is where *self-awareness* comes into play. Fast on the heels of this breakthrough as to a further sophistication of consciousness being experienced, is the dawning imperative for **moral polarization**. This simply means a 25% effort in one or the other direction from our general ‘default setting’ of 27% service-to-others or compassionate concern for others; and, 73% service-to-oneself or overweening self-regard. In the *positive* direction - extolled as such in the Bhagavad Gita - self-regard is constrained through inward self discipline to 48% *or less*, and service-to-others becomes the 52%-*or more* direction of one’s thoughts and efforts amidst a genuine flowering of what can be called global compassion.

In the negative direction - again, explicitly identified as such in the Bhagavad Gita - self-regard runs riot. Lust, rage and greed (identified as the three gates of hell in the Gita) are indulged in. Any idea of “compassion” comes to be replaced by a relentless ‘intellectual scrutiny’ of everything as either ‘inferior,’ hence to be disdained; or ‘superior,’ hence to be feared; or ‘approximately equal,’ hence to be fought-with as to who-is-who within an infinitely-graded pecking order. The signal value of Ra’s presentation is to *clearly identify* this ‘dark’ or ‘negative’ moral polarization as an *actual path* which some entities choose to embark on, however manifestly unwisely.

[1] Implicit throughout “The Ra Contact: Teaching the Law of One” is that premise which I bring to the fore as *the all-is-consciousness worldview*. Ra indeed observes that the entire Universe is a “form of consciousness that is unified” (82.2, p 239, v. II), and is a Somewhat, coterminous with *Beingness* and *Life* (“the entire creation is alive” 29.8, p 255, v. I). I agree with FMW that Root or Primordial Consciousness can *never* be compassed within *any* definition, however sophisticated; as The Presence transcends even the complementarity of ‘subject-only spatial void’ Nirvana exhilaration; and subject-object world-containing space, with its well-nigh incessant pressures which are so tinged with tragedy and suffering and struggle.

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE BHAGAVAD GITA (The Song of God) (*continued, p9*)

Indeed it is this very presence of such an unwise choosing as to a dark or negative moral polarization that renders the service-to-others moral polarization in the opposite direction so terribly vivid. For each kind of moral polarization occurs against a backdrop of human societies here on Earth which are manifestly poisoned with the allure of totalitarianism / authoritarianism, which are the social structures echoing service-to-ownself values: militarism; ever bellicose; obsessed with pecking-order ‘us-them’ social stratifications. Today at this writing (5/21/23), such societies exist in Russia; China; Iran; North Korea; Myanmar / Burma, and to a lesser or nascent extent in other countries. Such as Hungary’s present leader who seeks to ape the veiled agenda of dictatorship that sought to bloom in the U.S.; ‘Trumpism,’ as led by the utterly deceitful and immoral would-be dictator Donald Trump, so manifestly a racist; a pathological liar; and an egomaniac who gleefully chopped at the very roots of democracy in the United States.

In sum, these dark and destructive tendencies are nakedly on display worldwide.

Yet things are never black-and-white. Every country carries karma even as we as individuals do: the forward inertia arisen from past actions. As individuals we have the task of struggling against our past unwholesome actions while striving to seed toward a future positive karma that will be conducive to liberation and enlightenment in the *positive* sense: within a service-to-others moral polarization. Where public good outweighs still-extant personal license.

The service to ownself moral polarization strives toward a form of “liberation” and “enlightenment” soaked in a negativity that’s quite easily capsuled: hooray for me and to hell with you. The goal is raw and simple. Personal power. Expressed in the form of sensual riches; run-riot sexual license; thirst for fame; and of course, governmental / societal power. When the drive for these unwholesome fruits reaches a fever pitch, a form of personal intensity is achieved. Such intensity does yield dividends which redound ultimately to the benefit of Intelligent Infinity which is ever the terminus of all soul journeys. As already noted: a skill at cultivating charisma; a skill at complete deception; and perhaps most of all, a degree of self-discipline as to *willfulness*. These are resources within the self-nature that can be so deftly cultivated as to gain contact with Intelligent Infinity, even as the service-to-others moral polarization achieves contact as well.

I once heard it summed this way. “God made the good and the bad, but backs only the good.” Ra points out - correctly in my opinion - that neither polarization is “bad;” *both* just ‘are’ but in different ways. The cultivation of personal power in service-to-ownself is a lonely and barren road. But it gives the dividends just noted. Moreover, Intelligent Infinity can and does amalgamate such dividends with the compassionate dividends, in fashioning a Unity whose power and grandeur know no bounds. That power is veiled. Wiser, far, to stand in awe of that power.

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE BHAGAVAD GITA (The Song of God) (*continued, p10*)

My reason for dwelling upon the imperative of moral polarization - imperative, if one wishes to progress past the boundary of third density consciousness to fourth density consciousness, which is largely congruent with what's meant by the term "the lower astral" - is, primarily, to diminish the allure of service-to-oneself, which for centuries has been wrapped in charismatic mystery; being forbidden; dangerous; amidst such terms as demonic; the devil; beelzebub, lucifer; 'fallen angel'; plus mythologies galore. This whole gooey spooky mess has been trundled along, garnering more notoriety - and inciting more fear - than it deserves, for century after century. No religion among the famous five (chronologically Hinduism, Judaism, Buddhism, Christianity and Islam) has rid itself of this bugaboo baggage, albeit perhaps Buddhism comes closest by universalizing Suffering as a pall upon *everything*. A theme that's echoed elsewhere; that 'this realm' is ruled by a Dark Force. Such are the tentacles, aided by ignorance, abetted by fear, that devil-doctrines have grown over centuries.

In point of fact, this realm - this Earth - is neither 'good' *nor* 'evil,' but rather a proving-ground wherein, in complete personal freedom, each of us can either polarize as service to otherself; or - quite simply put - embrace wholeheartedly the 'devil' agenda of service to oneself. Without choosing one way or the other, one simply continues to slump in 'the sinkhole of indifference' (Ra's term), accepting the 27% / 73% default setting; without going 25% toward either polarity. No harm no foul. There's no limit as to how many reincarnations are 'allowed.'

To dramatize the contrast between the two polarizations I rely upon the following thumb-nail sketch:

Service to oneself (98% or more selfish). Challenge. Efforts at control. Cultivating towards a stoical indifference. (other self seen as radically <i>other</i> ; 'not me') That rationality must rule; garnering of siddhi powers and 'routine' mysticism disavowed The relationship to God is either to wholly disavow any real Beingness to God or, to frankly regard 'Providence' as something to be battled with.	<i>versus</i>	52%-or-more Service to otherself Surrender. Acceptance. Cultivating towards a <i>global compassion</i> . (other self are seen as yes 'parts of me') That empathy / 'the heart' must rule; 'siddhi powers,' and etc. disavowed The relationship to God is more-and-more accepting-of, and intimate-with, The Presence; whose Will is acceded to.
--	---------------	--

Voila. All the spookiness is gone. It's a personal choice. "The Devil" is near at hand, and can either be put in a bottle, so to say, and rendered a servant; or, given free rein over one's personal beingness with the unhappy result of one's becoming lost in the tapestries of maya, without the faintest idea how to extricate oneself from - yes - literally endless corridors of suffering; struggle. Yet such a hell-or-purgatory is *never* endless. The Presence - however much unseen - is *ever* near at hand.

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE BHAGAVAD GITA (The Song of God) (*continued, p11*)

The real strength of the Gita is the manner in which it implies the everywhere-ness of God and moreover that God / Divinity Presence is unconstrained; and encompasses the many classic attitudes about Divinity: “some see Me as themselves, or separate; some worship the countless gods that are only my million faces.” (paraphrase of chapt. v. cf. the 1944 Isherwood/ Prabhavananda translation).

It’s a truism that every reader brings his or her personal viewpoint to the reading of any particular text. Any book ‘A’ has separate and modified beingness in the consciousness of every reader; and, moreover, each reader can and does gradually modify that assimilated beingness over the passage of time. If book A is read at age 22 and acquires at that first reading quality *x*, that same reader upon re-reading that book at age 72 may imbue that book / interpret that book as having truly *different* qualities. The book may possess some affection in the memories of the reader; but, upon later re-readings, those affections may have in some respects grown, while in other respects they may have diminished. It’s like that with me and pre-eminently in the case of the Gita. [1]. Pre-eminent, because the Gita truly comprises a portal to the presence of God.

The Gita is more than a book. It’s a gateway. Oh every book can fulfill such an office. In a manner of speaking every book is a gateway to a larger world. Many genres exist. Escapist fiction. Whodunits. True-life adventure tales. Exciting autobiographies. Even specialty texts can perform this way, as in the case of exceptionally good works of philosophy or of science.

But the Gita is of such gateway status in the rarefied world of worldwide spiritual classics; religious classics. There is of course the OT/The Jewish Bible. Then, of course, the extensive compilations of Gautama Buddha’s teachings (the Pali Canon and other compilations). Then, the NT and apocryphal texts (texts not included in the NT) of Christendom. Then, the Koran and the poetry of the Sufi mystics. Going further afield, the Granth Shab of the Sikhs. Many many other spiritual classics could be mentioned. A complete listing is impossible. There are just too many.

“Too many,” as in an infinite supply. As Ra - and others - observe, the Creation partakes of endlessness. It’s in the nature of God to be endless. Without any beginning; without any end. Oh, cycles-of-creation can have their beginnings and their ends. But That whence they came - the realm of foreverness - it’s without boundaries. A peculiar and astonishing evidence of this is in the way in which The Creator delights in a personal bridge unto each and every seeker.

[1] Only with great rarity do I come across texts that seem so worthwhile; so pregnant with meaning and with artful turns of phrasings, that I re-read them again and again, in whole or in part, to the point where I lose count. In this regard the Gita is number one in my experience and always will be. Then, four other texts that I read and re-read and *re-read*, in whole or in part, almost as often, because I take them to be so rich with important meanings, are assembled together as Part A of the Annotated Bibliography hereto.

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE BHAGAVAD GITA (The Song of God) (*continued, p12*)

A personal bridge unto each and every seeker. The Gita accomplished - and continues to accomplish - this for me. Inasmuch as the Gita is widely heralded as an unrivaled synthesis and compilation of the religious tradition that is Hinduism, does this make me a Hindu? In one manner of speaking yes. But I am similarly Jewish; Christian; a Mohammedan (I use the out-of-favor phrase betokening adherents of Islam) and a Buddhist, because there are “bridges” to ingoddedness within “The Book of Splendor,” and certain NT passages, and certain Sufi poems, and certain sayings of Gautama Buddha... in *many many* spiritual treatises are there bridges to sensing The Presence. And not just in all such books. In the daily “*lila*” of life, too!

This is summed in one of the passages of the Gita that I previously did not pay much attention to, as it seemed flowery and over-the-top and pie-in-the-sky poetic license. “The Lord is everywhere and always perfect” (chapt. v. , 1944 Isherwood/ Prabhavananda translation). Yet gradually, over time, I have come to discern this observation as a portal directly into ingoddedness. Oh it’s easy and fun to apply this statement into one’s life when everything’s all peaches-and-cream: the bathtub the perfect temperature; the dinner exquisite; the sunset sublime; one feels all healthy and fit, “ready to conquer the world,” and so on, and so on. But what about the gloomy times? The times when one hears dispiriting news: the death of a loved one? Or that thousands are dead in an earthquake? Or that there’s a fresh outbreak of war in this-or-that country or region of the world? *Is all of that “perfect,” too?*

Such observations are classic and time-worn objections to the Beingness of God, and are often summed in a statement like the following: “how can I believe in a munificent and loving Creator, when all these terrible things are happening? There is just too much dissonance. It cannot be. I choose to repudiate the possibility of a benign Creator.” This of course is the cardinal privilege of each and every “mind-body-spirit complex” experiencing embodiment in third-density human-level consciousness, here in our presently-constituted world.

The reconciliation in my personal opinion is that present-day life here on Earth is a proving ground. We’re at liberty to respond to “the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune” in such manner as we see fit. It’s not always easy to muster serenity in the teeth of horrible news; terrible suffering. To the extent we somehow muster up to this, I believe we do - in a manner of speaking - pass a test. Of course this applies to polarization in the service-to-others direction (52% or more of one’s time and effort to aid others in a configuration of compassion). It’s very much otherwise for service-to-oneself: “Providence” is a bitter joke; God is a fiction or if “God” there be, he/she/it is The Enemy. Thus, all the suffering and terrible news is just evidence atop evidence that either God doesn’t care... or that there is no God... or that (heaven forfend) God is some kind of Arch-Demon! It’s precisely in de-fanging this last possibility that I so extoll the Ra material.

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE BHAGAVAD GITA (The Song of God) (*continued, p13*)

God as denied... or God as arch-demon. While both of these alternatives aren't very palatable, their possibility in consciousness is - as oft noted - renewed proof of the unlimited freedom we each have in coming to terms with 'Ordinary Reality / The World Around Us.' [1] The challenge is to truly examine the presumptions we have about *who we are* and *why we are here*.

The Bhagavad Gita is an exposition couched upon the all-is-consciousness worldview. Which is neither materialistic (consciousness is an epiphenomenon), nor - in the narrow sense - idealistic (consciousness as *thought* that mediates between sensory immediacy and an introceptive {the FMW term} 'unconscious;' a largely veiled and largely not-yet-unfolded *Nirvana Self-Beingness*). Rather, the Bhagavad Gita is revelatory as to out-and-out mystical realization. God Presence.

The full-blown all-is-consciousness worldview as it flows forth in The Bhagavad Gita is that Infinite, or Ultimate-density Consciousness, is an everywhere-always Presence, however diminished our access may be to this fact, within our ordinary or routine consciousness. Classically, it's summed in the remark that 'everything is God,' which Ra paraphrases beautifully in the remark that "the entire creation is alive." (29.8, p 255, v. I). In other words, God is all around us all the time, oft-times largely unbeknownst to us; just as our private awareness is in and of God, with the challenge being to unfold this, and to express this, in either of the moral polarizations.

Thus in the service-to-ownself moral polarization - wherein one tries to inculcate personal power for self-serving reasons - it's altogether logical to notion Divinity as some form of 'arch demon' with whom one is in mortal combat... or, towards whom one pledges a fealty with the aim of garnering a 'flow' of power for selfish or self-serving purposes; e.g., garnering riches, or enhancing charisma whereby to manipulate others, or acquiring various 'siddhi powers,' etc. etc.

Alternatively in the service-to-others self moral polarization any sort of 'private pool' of personal power is forsworn in favor of participating in the infinite species of Divine Power with the express purpose, the express aim, of meliorating sufferings, and securing comforts for other selfs; displaying a genuine development of global compassion. Striving to remember, always, that "The Lord is everywhere and always perfect." At times this may be easy. At other times it may be extremely hard and ever at hand is the distillation of such self-sacrifice in the Christ story

[1] James W. Sire, PhD (U. of Missouri) (1930-2018), a college lecturer on challenges to religious faith whether Christian or otherwise, provides a helpful overview to Existentialism and Nihilism and other worldviews in "The Universe Next Door (A Basic Worldview Catalog)" 1997 (Fourth Edition), InterVarsity Press (6400 Schroeder Rd., P.O.Box 7895, Madison WI 53707-7895; mail@ivpress.com ; www.ivpress.com). Prof. Sire's references and bibliography are thorough and the presentation readable and forthright; although, of course, like so very many writers, his tacit assumption is that consciousness is an epiphenomenon arisen from a "matter" universe (when in fact it's just the reverse).

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE BHAGAVAD GITA (The Song of God) (*continued, p14*)

Conclusion as to First of Two Chapters on The Bhagavad Gita

The Gita amounts to a precise compendium on God, with The Creator Itself compassing the endlessness of It's embodied Presences to an astonished / bewildered seeker (Arjuna). There's a quality of Authority and Power when Divinity - through It's embodiment avatar of the moment, Krishna - enunciates (a) It's endlessness of embodiments; and, (b) It's forever-more-ness. Precisely in reference to the latter did I find the Gita so compelling on 8/15/1979... and ever since. As is perhaps best summed as follows: "I am subtler, far, than mind's inmost subtlety" (chapt. v. , 1944 Isherwood/ Prabhavananda translation) This far and away best sums the matter and as to the matter of *Itself* versus It's avatar of the moment (Krishna), there's no better cautionary than this: "Thus think the ignorant; that I, the imperishable, am become man."

(chapt. v. , 1944 Isherwood/ Prabhavananda translation; paraphrase.)

It's been my happy occupation ever since 8/15/1979 as mentioned on page one of this Chapter - a beginning now over 43 years ago - to exposition toward clarity on the endlessness and foreverness of Divinity. Of singular assistance has been the landmark clarity of FMW whose reconciliation of the lynchpin Hindu doctrine enunciated by Shankara - "Atman" or "Self" - with Gautama Buddha's ideations vis-a-vis "anatman" (no self), has already been referenced; e.g. the quotation on p 4 of this Chapter, and elsewhere; and, it can be easily re-capsuled here as follows.

The pure category of self / selfness is never - *never!* - an object *to* consciousness, but ever is the immediately presupposed Presence *in* consciousness, whenever objects *gross or subtle* arise: as to so narrow a subset thereof of *my* thoughts and *my* 'objective world' witnessings... or, the obvious enormity of *Divinity's* thoughts and witnessings vis-a-vis *this entire manifest cosmos*. Can the latter be accessed by the former? *Yes*. Haltingly; little-by-little. And can the former be regarded as one iteration (of an infinite series) of Self-Beingness, as to the latter? *Yes. Truly so.*

Whose sole signature in manifestation - as to objects that are of sensation or of subtlety like thoughts - is the presence of *the will*; or, *willfulness*. This is re-eminently demonstrable as to thought: e.g. I can *will* thus-and-such a train of thoughts to occupy my attention... or, some *other* train of thoughts; and so on - and this applies to the whole creation as an emanation from one truly boundless and infinite willfulness that's expressive of a truly boundless and infinite self-nature.

Such a capstone self-nature inheres in a still greater boundlessness. Consciousness that *is*, with-or-without *any* self nature or *any* field-of-objects however vast (this cosmos) or narrow ("my" thoughts, "my" witnessings). Such a Consciousness is ever-present everywhere and forever. The Gita amounts to a guidebook as to how "my" consciousness can get in touch with "*that*" Consciousness. "*That*" Consciousness is very loving; boundlessly intelligent; and above all: very, very, powerful.

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE BHAGAVAD GITA (The Song of God) (*continued, p15*)

Conclusion as to First of Two Chapters on The Bhagavad Gita (cont'd)

When I say, ‘*That*’ Consciousness is very loving; super intelligent; and very, very, powerful, I speak from a reservoir of personal certitude. Which has been built up from a series of imperiences (inward consciousness experiences) wherein ‘my’ personal subjectivity has felt the Presence of a ‘cosmic’ subjectivity... whereupon, there is something of a momentary blending... and, tacit in that communion, is the conviction that ‘personal me’ and ‘cosmic personhood’ are, both of them, contained in / supported by, what FMW calls *consciousness-without-an-object-and -without-a-subject* and which is coterminous with the meaning of Infinite-Density Consciousness / Primordial Consciousness / nirdvanda consciousness / The One Infinite Creator of Intelligent Infinity. What Dr. Johnson [1] alludes to as “the Supreme Region... the nameless Region,” where primordial Light is such as to render our solar system’s sun a tiny darkened blot by comparison. And, I would add, that that Light is matched by an equally infinite and unbounded ‘dazzling dark’ betokening Infinite Love. (Not hearts-and-flowers love; *Titanic* Love). Such a Realm - such a Presence - is actually present everywhere; all the time; albeit, veiled. Thus, when mystical accounts evoke the idea of ‘being swallowed by infinity’ or suchlike phrases, these are accounts where the personal consciousness has ‘melted’ into The Presence. Such a melting *is* possible; but the personal consciousness must seek it avidly and be as suitably prepared as possible.

I must again emphasize that I invite the reader to his / her own encounters with The Presence. ‘Assertion from authority’ - e.g. ‘my’ account of ‘my’ encounters, etc - is not the purpose in this book. Rather, it is to arouse the reader to his / her own inward inquiries toward... toward The Presence. And I first encountered The Presence thanks to careful attention to The Bhagavad Gita.

The question can arise: which is more primordial; that of *subjectivity*, or what we mean when we say *objectivity*? In all the foregoing, and I can say it again here, there is actually an equal weighting, when “objectivity” is understood as, so to say, a projection from Intelligent Infinity constituting an equilibrating projection alongside that of “subjectivity:” whose signature is freedom as to how willfulness will lead ‘subjectivity’ to deploy itself in ‘objectivity,’ with the primary purposes of beingness / growth, self-replication / self awareness / service to otherselfs or service to ownself / intensifying the chosen polarity in love / matching the chosen polarity in wisdom / fusing both polarities in journeying towards re-immersion in Intelligent Infinity. A long journey. Which Intelligent Infinity accommodates from It’s reservoir of infinite potentiation / infinite power. This vast, vast entirety is *all* sketched in the Gita. By way of God’s dialog and then manifestation to a perplexed devotee. Which possesses an unrivaled magical charge.

[1] Ref: “The Path of the Masters” by Dr. Julian Johnson (8th Ed., 1972, 5000 copies). [1st Ed.: 1939]. Radha Soami Satsang, Beas (District Amritsar), East Punjab, India. Entry five in Part A of the Annotated Bibliography hereto. The “audible lifestream” alluded to, is referenced also in Special Appendix A.

CHAPTER NINE: THE BHAGAVAD GITA, A ROSETTA STONE TO HINDUISM'S "PERSONALISTIC"
GOD (*PANTHEISM*) AND BUDDHISM'S "NETI NETI" PURE AWARENESS (*PANENTHEISM*)

(Page One of Chapter)

"While pantheism asserts that 'all is God,' panentheism claims that God is greater than the universe. Some versions of panentheism suggest that the universe is nothing more than... [*one expressive-modality*] manifestation of God. In addition, some forms indicate that the universe is contained within God, like in the Kabbalah concept of tzimtzum. Also much Hindu thought is highly characterized by panentheism and pantheism. The basic tradition on which Krause's concept [*coined in 1828, cf. a supposed distinction between G. W. F. Hegel {1770-1831} and F. W. Schelling {1775-1854} vis-a-vis Spinoza's imputed 'mere' pantheism*] was built seems to have been Neoplatonic philosophy and its successors in Western philosophy [*and in some theological systems both orthodox and unorthodox*]." [1]

It is useful to emphasize, again, that Gautama Buddha began his quest for enlightenment as a Hindu. Thus, Buddha's observations about the nature of Ultimate Reality - that there is a state of pure consciousness outside-of and before all familiar 'subject-object' states of consciousness - were intended as correctives to the Hindu worldview of his time; which tended to regard God as basically a big person, projecting all the universe as "his / her / its thought," much as I might project "my" thoughts, or you might project "your" thoughts. And so on. An imputed dualism, where bare "I AM" subjectivity is taken to be the superior and the controlling element. Period.

Buddha sought to refine this understanding. But efforts to articulate what is ineffable and prior to all words; all thoughts; all intellectual discernment; tend to be - however noble (and Buddha's efforts were exceptionally noble) - easily misunderstood and greatly mis-construed. Thus, we have today the aspersions cast upon Buddhism that it's not a religion; that, in fact, it promotes nihilism; and, that it's really just an 'anything goes' sort of intellectual parlor game.

Efforts to escape these misunderstandings and to graft Buddha's teachings onto basically a reformed Hinduism persisted for some few centuries; but in the long historical view from today, these efforts were unsuccessful. The force of tradition is great indeed. Moreover, a personalistic God is far more congenial than striving to align with a lofty, ineffable Somewhat. (It ought to be noted that a similar schism arose where the transcendentalism of Jesus was so shocking and so radical to the Judaism of his day that today we have a Christian tradition separate from Judaism; although the reasons for their incompatibility - sharp emphasis upon a moral compass versus a ferocious and jealous God figure; and a doctrine of love versus an intense wisdom orientation - were, while similarly intricate and very multiform, largely different vis-a-vis different essentials.)

Does the Gita express words from a Divinity that comprehends both? I submit that it does.

[1] From copy made at circa 11:53 a.m. Sat. 6/19/21 from the internet website

“ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Panentheism> ;” three [*interpositions*] added.

CHAPTER NINE: THE BHAGAVAD GITA, A ROSETTA STONE TO HINDUISM'S "PERSONALISTIC"
GOD (*PANTHEISM*) AND BUDDHISM'S "NETI NETI" PURE AWARENESS (*PANENTHEISM*)

(Page 2 of Chapter)

Moreover I have come to entertain something of a novel perspective upon doctrines centered upon *Atman* - God as a 'big person' basically, witnessing all the universe rather akin to how I witness all the phenomena of 'my' waking life and all of 'my' thoughts - versus, or over and against, *anatman*, where instead of a 'big person' God is notioned as *a container* - FMW coins the term, The Great Space - which is Indifferent to the presence or absence of objects (e.g. the subject-object diorama of The Universe); *and*, the presence or absence of any and all subjectivities, whether of 'you' or of 'me,' or of some aggregated Pure Subjectivity ('*purusha*'); for Whom, or in Whom / for Which, or in Which, this entire physical universe both "is;" and "is not."

My novel perspective has to do with what I will call the general principle of 'bleed-through.' In other words, the phenomena of 'me' / 'my subjectivity,' can bleed through to God / God's subjectivity considered as 'a big person,' such that I influence and impact Divinity; and, every bit as much (or probably more so), Divinity influences and impacts me. Or you. Or anyone else. *But that's not all.*

God as a big person / the abstracted polarity of Pure Subjectivity, *similarly* influences and impacts The Great Space; in whom, Pure Subjectivity has it's arising. This is a recondite way of indicating - using words, which are frail vessels for a comprehending purpose outside the bounds of customary dualistic ideation - that, put simply, *everything is influencing / interacting with everything else*. Moreover: this everything-always interactingness is not some hurly-burly, pell-mell sort of goings-on. Something 'chaotic.' No. Structure is involved. And purposiveness.

What is that purpose? That The Creator - considered as Unity, a capstone Infinity of all infinities and what is 'secretly' or innerly betokened by "The Law of One" - wishes to know of Itself by all means possible. In other words, there are no guardrails. Nothing is off limits. And the very furthest reaches of free will / multiple selves, is in a remarkable equilibrium with an unbounded fixity or 'unfreedom;' betokened by the notion of *intelligent infinity*.

Intelligent Infinity is more than just ingenuity on steroids. Many, many seemingly disparate spheres of comprehension are interblended and assimilated in a process that's endless. Emotion and feeling-tones, spanning a colossal spectrum, are interactive with conceptuality and comprehension; again, spanning a colossal spectrum. We each are at liberty to contemplate this enormity; this boundlessness and endlessness. Wherein Infinite Love; Infinite Power; and Infinite Wisdom are interactive. *Fusion!* The best indicative phrase? 'It boggles the mind.'

CHAPTER NINE: THE BHAGAVAD GITA, A ROSETTA STONE TO HINDUISM'S "PERSONALISTIC"
GOD (*PANTHEISM*) AND BUDDHISM'S "NETI NETI" PURE AWARENESS (*PANENTHEISM*)

(Page 3 of Chapter)

Indeed, the title of this Chapter renders the complexity of Divinity, or Reality / Pure Beingness, much more simply than is actually the case. Ra uses broad brushstrokes in rendering the issue: First Density Consciousness (chemistry, elements: *beingness*); Second (plant / animal: *growth, self-replication*); Third (human: dawning *self-awareness and then moral polarization*); Fourth (akin to lower astral: *service to otherselfs / service to ownself*); Fifth (akin to upper astral: blending the love as to the chosen service polarization with greater *wisdom*); Sixth (akin to the lower causal: where service-to-ownself entities / social memory complexes remain 'stuck' unless they elect to switch polarization so as to journey onwards in and into the upper causal: where the membrane between entities and social memory complexes vis-a-vis Divinity becomes thinner and thinner as re-unification / fusion nears between entities as such vis-a-vis utter Divinity).

The key to such a progression is that, gradually, one enters densities where Consciousness is progressively *more dense*. Social memory complexes and the entities comprising them become richer; more alive; more intricate; more subtle; more nuanced. This holds true both for the development of Subjectivity (think the 'spatial void' of nirvana: unfettered creativity) and the complementary development of Objectivity (the world-containing space: concerning realms where 'matter' is finer and richer and more infused with energy / life / beingness). Remember of course that such understandings build upon the all-is-consciousness worldview ('consciousness is original and self-existent and constitutive of all things'), where the *density* of consciousness increases to where consciousness is so deeply infused with spirit essence as to be infinite-density consciousness.

Dr. Johnson says it ably :

[*alluding to Pinda (physical universe), Anda ("the lowest of the heavens"), Brahmanda (more spiritually infused, in effect a higher heaven) and then...*] In this last and highest grand division we discover the region of Universal Spirit. Its name is *Sat Desh* ...the abiding or real country. It is the region of truth, of ultimate reality. ...*Sat Desh* is itself divided into four distinct planes [*of Sach Khand or True Home, then above Alakh Purush or Invisibile Realm, then above Agam Purush or Inaccessible Realm; then...*] the highest and last of which is the supreme seat of the Infinite, the Absolute, the Source... This section is so vast in extent that no understanding of it can be conveyed to human intelligence. No mind can grasp it. ...it embraces all else, and is both the beginning and the end of all else. ...this entire *ensemble* [*of trillions of suns and galaxies*] would appear no more than a few dark specks floating in the clear and luminous sky of... [*Anami Lok, the highest, the 'nameless region' of Sat Desh*]
- pp 260-263; see citation at f.n. 1 on p. 14 of Chapter Eight; four [interpositions] added.

Consciousness. Spirit. Life. It is the misnomer of we traveling through 'Pinda' (the physical universe) to think that these are arisen from / epiphenomena of, "matter;" or "matter / energy." No. It's the reverse. The latter are 'veils' or disguises of an Infinite Awareness of unbounded power. And aliveness. Wholly uncorrallable as to boundaries or definition.

CHAPTER NINE: THE BHAGAVAD GITA, A ROSETTA STONE TO HINDUISM'S "PERSONALISTIC"
GOD (*PANTHEISM*) AND BUDDHISM'S "NETI NETI" PURE AWARENESS (*PANENTHEISM*)

(Page 4 of Chapter)

I have alluded to this "Infinite Awareness of unbounded power" as The Presence. Discerning this Presence by one's personal, ordinary and familiar subject-object waking consciousness is in fact possible... however attenuated the discernment. Indeed, attenuation is necessary. Huxley speaks of "the biological reducing valve," whereby our field of consciousness is deliberately shrunk towards the immediate and practical affairs of embodied human existence. Thus, were that consciousness to be apprised all-at-once of The Presence in it's overwhelming Fullness, it would be disorienting in the extreme. Divinity has the capacity to so present. But to do so would be unkind. We would be overwhelmed and driven from our normal coping-and-surviving focus. In a manner of speaking we would be driven mad, into a species of 'mystical ecstasy' and while some indeed invite such episodes of being drunk with the Divine, most of us aren't ready.

In brief review, the five texts cited in Section A of the Annotated Bibliography all allude to The Presence, albeit with differences in emphasis; in terminology; and using differing schematics

- The Bhagavad Gita. The Presence is revealed to Arjuna full force, because Arjuna sought this.
- The Ra Contact: Teaching the Law of One. Employs the "densities" outline as just alluded to.
- Autobiography of a Yogi. Presumes the service-to-others moral polarization, and depicts the prayer-access and vision-access to Divinity that is thus afforded.
- The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object [and impliedly without a Subject]. A careful philosophical skeleton is developed outlining personal access to Divinity
- The Path of the Masters. The *audible life stream* is discussed as uniting the manifesting of this physical universe; the larger, more subtle astral realm; the still larger Brahmanda realm, a.k.a. the far more subtle causal realm; and of course *Sat Desh* or the Universal Spirit realm: from whence the audible life stream issues forth in great multiplicity as well as in the all-pervading primordial harmonic vibration betokened in the word, "Aum."

It's important to establish the correspondences between these important spiritual classics provided by different authors from different cultural and personal contexts, as all of them have developed - in their many different ways - communion with The Presence. And not pointing this out might leave the impression that they do not fundamentally agree and so the skeptic feels justified in dismissing that there's any veracity in any of them. 'They don't agree so they must all be mere flights of fancy; gossamer dreamings.' Not so. See Special Appendix A. Moreover the subtle ways in which The Presence can permeate 'normal' and 'humdrum' awareness are astonishing. Withal, freedom is ever uppermost. Some even stubbornly deny their *own* epiphanies, alongside the epiphanies of anyone else.

CHAPTER NINE: THE BHAGAVAD GITA, A ROSETTA STONE TO HINDUISM'S "PERSONALISTIC"
GOD (*PANTHEISM*) AND BUDDHISM'S "NETI NETI" PURE AWARENESS (*PANENTHEISM*)

(Page 5 of Chapter)

"Even amongst those inclined towards holism, it may come across as extreme to postulate that the entire universe is one, single, emergent [*and never wholly definable*] consciousness. Some of the earliest folks to think in such terms, though, were seventh to sixth-century B.C.E. Greek hylozoist philosophers like Thales, Alaximander, and Heraclitus, as [*the website*] Hellenica World explains. While hylozoists didn't think that the universe was conscious in a self-aware way, they did adopt a kind of ultra-animistic belief, whereby everything everywhere is alive together. But rather than each individual thing having a discreet life — a tree, a mountain, a lion — each thing was a facet of a whole, unified, living cosmos. Such a belief was later defined as monism, the belief that the universe comprises an undivided union of matter and spirit, life and God, into an indivisible oneness."

Professor Milner goes on to say,

" And so we come to the final facet of panpsychism, one which circles around to animism and lends itself well to the 'consciousness is in the smallest atom' argument: pantheism. Pantheism is bound to raise some theological hackles. But even modern, monotheistic religions like Christianity have come to the same conclusion, per [*the website*] Christianity.com. Namely, that God is in everything. Put differently, everything is a facet of God. Or simply, everything is God. If consciousness exists in all material objects of all sizes (atoms, dogs, stars), and... material and spiritual are indivisible (monism), then simply swap "God" for "consciousness" and you've revealed the **pantheism** hidden within panpsychism." [1]

Prof. Milner's essay illustrates such correspondences adroitly, and explains in effect the acceptance of pantheism by many persons - plus the religious tradition of Hinduism - but it fails to tackle head-on the which-is-which seesaw battle between 'matter' versus 'consciousness:' which is an arising from the other? *Is* 'consciousness' epiphenomenal from 'matter'? *Or, vice-versa?*

I texted this as summary to another reader of this essay: '*the analysis derived from millennia of deep mystical experience: life - and all the universe - is emergent from a primordial and **panentheistic** and never fully definable consciousness.*' There's a vital difference in this position versus some who say "consciousness is emergent from matter" and who buttress their position by saying, similarly, that matter is never wholly definable. Yet such a position is specious. Whether one predicates definability or undefinability to matter, either is unverifiable presumption, inasmuch as no consciousness can ever affirm which is actually the case. Positing 'matter' as primal is a self-concocted diminution that announces True Reality as unknowable... and opens the door to pernicious egoity: 'what *I* say, goes; for there's no way to certitude except by what *I* say.' This kind of 'knowledge from authority' is counterfeit knowledge. Rather, *inward consciousness* is king. Thus true royalty is immanent everywhere. Not just in any self-announced poobah.

[1] From a copy made at 9:30 a.m. Mon. 3/6/23 from the internet website <https://www.grunge.com/1215477/theories-that-claim-the-universe-is-conscious-have-persisted-for-thousands-of-years/>, cf. an essay by Richard Milner, captioned with a posting/publishing date of 3/5/23. Underlining and 3 [*interpositions*] & boldface added.

The idea that "inward consciousness is king" leaves unresolved *how deeply* there is a plumbing of inward consciousness. Inwardness becomes tantalizing and open-ended when one accepts the all-is-consciousness worldview, as I do; as this book does. As mysticism does. But alas, a great majority of persons remain in lockstep with materialistic orthodoxy. Thus:

Materialistic orthodoxy is behind the sort of navel-gazing central to existentialism in all its sub-varieties, as well as the conceit of "postmodernism" as a sort of cul-de-sac into the arbitrariness of language. Many other forays into deconstructing the sensible realm into fiction, and even the seeming verity of the self can be asserted to be a concocted delusion, once one skates onto the thin ice of consciousness-as-an-epiphenomenon, as so many "modern" but tragically shallow theorists do: both in the humanities and in the sciences. Their shared shallowness is pretty easily exposed, and Dr. Sire does just this in his survey of many modern flavors of 'ego-as-God,' [1] where the ego attains its exalted status vis-a-vis a 'giant dead universe,' or so the situation is imagined, because the secret door that is the verity of mystical insight is disavowed; is labeled private delusion. 'Inwardness' is jeered at as escapism.

I used to bemoan this state of affairs. No more. I've come to regard the worldwide suspicion of mysticism as proof-positive that free will is genuine. There are no guardrails on free will. Thus the devout are at liberty to construct a bridge of faith toward the prospect of verification in a mystical dispensation. When such faith is genuine enough; is ardent enough; inward assurance *does* arrive. It has for me. And I'm in no wise special; except in my 'ordinariness.'

But the numbers of they who are thus devout, who cultivate a genuine thirst for transcendental reassurance, are alas greatly outnumbered by they slumped in "the sinkhole of indifference" (Ra's term), who fail to heed the call concerning moral polarization. When moral polarization is accomplished, the "mind/body/spirit complex" (Ra's term) or entity or soul, becomes strengthened towards a 'stepping up' into fourth density which - as best I can adduce the matter - is largely congruent with what's elsewhere termed the lower astral. (Importantly, Ra does note that at the threshold between densities there's a kind of demarcation or resistance, so *real resolve* is needed to make such a transition). Thus one's 'global compassion' must be of sufficient strength, sufficient resolve, vis-a-vis service to others. Contrariwise, one's ferocity of selfishness, so to say, must be of sufficient strength vis-a-vis a *service to oneself* 'graduation' into the lower astral hells. (Which to such folk seem like perfectly fine and logical habitation).

[1] James W. Sire, "The Universe Next Door (A Basic Worldview Catalog)" 1997 (Fourth Edition), InterVarsity Press (6400 Schroeder Rd., P.O.Box 7895, Madison WI 53707-7895; mail@ivpress.com; www.ivpress.com), op cit.: prev. cited at p 13 of Chapter Eight.

CHAPTER NINE: THE BHAGAVAD GITA, A ROSETTA STONE TO HINDUISM'S "PERSONALISTIC"
GOD (*PANTHEISM*) AND BUDDHISM'S "NETI NETI" PURE AWARENESS (*PANENTHEISM*)

(Page 7 of Chapter)

"...Who killed the Kennedys? Well after all it was you and me."

- "Sympathy for the Devil" (*Mick Jagger of The Rolling Stones*)

I've often noted, and it bears repeating yet again, that Ra is singularly helpful on the issue of the moral compass, vis-a-vis that huge historical quagmire about 'the devil;' 'evil;' and on and on. How much hand-wringing has been expended! How much rolling of the eyes! How much purported mystery and drama have been draped around the namings! *Beelzebub*; *Satan*; *Avidhya* (ignorance); *The Great Liar*; and so on and so on. "Get thee behind me." These efforts at the exteriorization of evil are accompanied by tons of woo-woo music and spooky suggestions about *fear*. Fear the power of Lucifer! And suchlike nonsense. None of the world's great religious traditions - not even the famous five (*chronologically Hinduism, Judaism, Buddhism, Christianity and Islam*) - have ever, *ever*, insofar as I am aware, been truly successful in supplying a clear and satisfying explanation concerning this gigantic swamp of mystery, suspicion and fear that have swirled around murky notions of "evil," age after age. Not even Buddhism succeeds, although it comes closer by a sweeping indictment of 'attachfulness to maya' as what's evil; yet, murkiness persists.

But Ra does.

Very successfully, in my opinion. The matter is simplicity itself. A genuine concern for others and the growth toward a genuine sense of global compassion... *versus* the cultivation of the exact opposite: an utter disregard for others, and the cultivation of a pernicious cleverness instead of true wisdom. In short? The enthronement of personal egoity. "Hooray for me!" *This* is "the devil" unmasked. *This* is 'the great mystery' de-mystified. And - here is the clincher - Ra suggests, with disarming calmness, that The Creator, wishing to know of Itself by all means possible, blinks not at they who choose such a pathway for soul growth. A *negative* pathway. A pathway of war; of unending struggle; of ego-against-ego, all trying to be king of the mountain

Thus, what we who choose service-to-others self's moral polarization - and over-all about ninety percent of souls growing into fourth and fifth and sixth-density consciousness so choose - would call the "hells" of the lower astral; and their subtilized analogs as to the upper astral; before hitting their collective dead-end in the lower causal, or sixth-density consciousness; these realms are *heavens* for the entities who indeed choose negativity as their path for soul growth! It does indeed make sense. A dynamic tension as to morality. How better to populate an infinite creation? There are dividends in both directions after all. Both enrich the solemn infinity of foreverness that is Pure Awareness; the One Infinite Creator of Intelligent Infinity; The Presence.

Of course in singling out truly obsessive selfishness as the taproot for the constellation of attitudes and attributes collectively called "evil," a very intricate mosaic is being substituted for the far more nebulous mosaic that's ordinarily swept under the rug and called "bad." After all, a committed 'service to self' orientation carries a certain metaphysical resonance: if The Creator is indeed One, God is 'self-directed' or 'selfish' in attending after It's own Beingness in the creation, but - and here is where the weaving of the creation comes in - it is *similarly* true that manyness is the purpose of the unfurling scroll of Beingness that is the Creation. Whereby, The Presence or Divinity lovingly - and with sagacity - nurtures the myriad echoes of Itself in the Otherness of the creation, generally; in all plants and animals; in human-level consciousness; and in the awareness of entities who have morally polarized and who have thus come to reside within the fourth, fifth and sixth densities of consciousness.

By way of quick recapitulation on moral polarization: in one direction a more *balanced* weighting of 'selfishness' and 'selflessness' constitutes the polarization, insofar as others-concern nonetheless holds the decisive and determinant - 52% or more - emphasis. It is different in the opposite direction. This is because the general moral default setting of people is 27% others-concerned, and 73% self-concerned (Ra: "the sinkhole of indifference"). *Reining-in* such selfishness 25% - to 48% or less - accomplishes service to otherself's moral polarization. Alternatively, letting such selfishness 'run riot' through and through, to where almost no compassion / others-concern remains: this is the laser-like focus that guides a moral polarization that's service-to-ownself. Both acknowledge the power of the will emanating from The Self as a metaphysical principle, but use such willfulness for diametrically opposite purposes: either to bond with others in loving them and serving them; or, to exploit others in a cold calculus aimed squarely at a private and selfish ambition for power. [1]

* * *

The Gita's use of "war" as the motif for considering these drastically different alternatives is quite fitting. The enemy is killed. In service-to-otherself, what "dies" is the primacy of selfishness; it's still present to be sure, but no longer holds sway. It is subservient. In service to ownself - which certainly has it's analog in how *some* spiritual practices are mapped out - the "other" of the world is sweepingly declared the enemy; to be killed; except insofar as the private goal of self-deification is served. "Submit or die." Utter militarism; tyranny / totalitarianism.

[1] I hope to soon undertake a stand-alone book addressing both the simplicity and the complexity of accomplishing moral polarization. Which will attend to such sources as "The Complete Book of Devils and Demons" (compiled by Leonard R. H. Ashley; 279 pp pbk; Skyhorse Press) re the interiorization of moral commitment, unalloyed, which thoroughgoing moral polarization in *either* direction entails.

CHAPTER NINE: THE BHAGAVAD GITA, A ROSETTA STONE TO HINDUISM'S "PERSONALISTIC"
GOD (*PANTHEISM*) AND BUDDHISM'S "NETI NETI" PURE AWARENESS (*PANENTHEISM*)

(Page 9 of Chapter)

"I remembered something I'd been told by a friend whose father worked in North Korea's ministry of State Security. When their overseas agents brought home a criminal considered a flight risk, they would first break his limbs and then put him in a coffin for transport over the border. [p. 306]. ...my peace lies in waging war against despotism, until our people are freed. Without that, my privilege of freedom would be no more than selfishness. But if the [*now three generations Kim regime*]... has murder, deception and nuclear bombs in its arsenal, the weapon I wield is truth." [p. 313] [1]

If ever a reminder were needed that the likes of Stalin, Pol Pot, Idi Amin and suchlike tyrants still grab national leadership by systematic recourse to terror and propaganda - and in some cases to the cynical use of cult-leader deification - it has for its Exhibit A in the dossier North Korea. Current-day Iran, China, Russia and a few others *are* in the running, no doubt; but North Korea is the hands-down champ in the sweepstakes for inhumane nation-wide enslavement.

It may seem incongruous to some that a high-minded survey of Hindu-style pantheism vis-a-vis Buddhist-style panentheism, drags into the discussion the perfidies of human tyrants; which of course have flourished throughout history; and, the means whereby they work to intimidate and enslave whole nations of peoples; but the dark, the ugly, the 'buried' libido of our collective human consciousness, is very much an element that we ignore at our peril. For good or for ill, a "devil" element is buried in each person. In service-to-others, this "devil" element is harnessed to a majority commitment to at all times serve what's good and noble and lovely in *all* other persons. In service-to-oneself this inward devil aspect is unchained and given almost absolute license.

The fundamental criticism that can be leveled at Buddhist metaphysics as popularly understood is that it paints with too broad a brush. *All* personalism is jettisoned as an impediment. In imagery terms, all this world is viewed as the tainted playground of despots and 'enslavement by the senses.' This austere recipe for self-transcendence isn't the only way, however. The radical devaluation of the world, and the radical valuation of 'void-state nirvana,' misses the crucial element so ably identified by FMW: *consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject*, that's coterminous with the meaning of Infinite-Density Consciousness / Primordial Consciousness / nirdvanda consciousness / The One Infinite Creator of Intelligent Infinity. Infinite Awareness supports both 'the world'... and 'the path to world-renouncing nirvana,' as a blown-out state where pure subjectivity - possessed of *free will* - is free to engineer both heavens... *and hells*.

[1] from "Dear Leader" by Jiang Jin-Sung (pen-name for ___, dob 1971- ; escaped N. Korea by stealth into China, 1/15/04-c.4/30/04), a high level operative in the Kim dynasty reign of coercive terror; (c) 2014, Ebury publg. / Rider, of Random House Group. (Engl. Translation (c) 2014 by Shirley Lee). 326pp, 1st Ed. paperback.

CHAPTER NINE: THE BHAGAVAD GITA, A ROSETTA STONE TO HINDUISM'S "PERSONALISTIC"
GOD (*PANTHEISM*) AND BUDDHISM'S "NETI NETI" PURE AWARENESS (*PANENTHEISM*)

(Page 10 of Chapter)

The preceding observation about freedom is absolutely essential, and is the vital consideration that renders the whole ensemble intelligible: 'void-state' nirvana; the 'world-containing space' wherein we struggle and strive amidst the vast panoply of familiar, subject-object consciousnesses (ours and that of others); and - last but *very* far from least - the both-accommodating nirdvanda consciousness: *consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject*.

Not only does nirdvanda consciousness not blink at what is 'good' (however defined) versus what is 'bad' (however defined); *but the whole schema* that is the realm of subject-object consciousness ("space-time" cf. Ra) vis-a-vis it's veiled or hidden but always-present complement: void-state nirvana ("time-space" cf. Ra). With well-reasoned justification FMW calls this behind-both consciousness or nirdvanda consciousness The High Indifference. Neither cruel *nor* indulgent.

But without careful commentary - such as what I attempt here, however imperfectly - it's quite easy to misunderstand the use of the term, "Indifference." One might jump to the assumption that we address here an Indifference that is callow; sodden; something like an unwitting and insentient death; something that's altogether seemingly vacuous or "void" (the term so confusedly employed in Buddhism). Well, such terms - although misleading - have their justification in attempting to point toward a Somewhat of Awareness that is *greater than* nirvana in the proper sense of "nirvana" as betokening the subjective pole in subject-object consciousness; just as this Somewhat Awareness is *greater than* samsara awareness: again, in the proper sense of "samsara" as betokening the objective pole in subject-object consciousness: the seemingly so concrete and impassive enormity of the whole physical universe and the solidity of Earth with it's oceans; and so on and so on; an ensemble that can seem enormously disinterested in our personal subjectivity

Here is where my 'bleed-through' hypothesis comes into play. Alongside a complementary hypothesis that's summed in the phrase 'optimum arousal as between complementary but very contrastant states or conditions or circumstances' (as in sleeping-waking but *both* are consciousness).

The point is this. What's meant by The High Indifference is altogether opposite from a state or condition that's callow, sodden, unwitting, insentient, vacuous, "void." Yet similarly opposite from the familiar-usage terms refinement, sparkling, alert, sensitive, rich, full, *solid*. 'Optimum arousal' as to partaking of both goes some of the distance towards why the universe exists in such manner as we usually notion it and sensually apprehend it. *An arousing of consciousness* is underway in each of us. Might such arousing of consciousness be underway in the universe as a whole? In a manner somehow linked to the 'waking process' underway in we each? Are we each able to 'slow down' or 'speed up' the universe in a 'bleed-through' way?

CHAPTER NINE: THE BHAGAVAD GITA, A ROSETTA STONE TO HINDUISM'S "PERSONALISTIC"
GOD (*PANTHEISM*) AND BUDDHISM'S "NETI NETI" PURE AWARENESS (*PANENTHEISM*)

(Page 11 of Chapter)

The general answer is yes.

That this is more the case, than the generally held opposite supposition: that we each are insignificant 'flyspecks' on the windshield of creation. 'I am meaningless; you are meaningless; we *all* are meaningless.' This is the dreary and doomed view where 'objectivity' is king. The consequence that rattles forth from the 'consciousness as epiphenomenon' prevailing materialistic worldview, which purports to venerate permanent unknowability and estrangement as 'what's real.'

Well, even though this is wrong - bedrock *known* as wrong by any who have been blessed with even a fleeting taste of mystical insight or any spiritual epiphany however arrived at - it is damnably hard to demonstrate this to the collective inertia of materialistic naysayers. In fact, it is impossible. 'The gateway is inward.' More and more do I grasp this as bedrock truth. It explains, indeed, the inwardness and austerity of Hindu and Buddhist renunciants, and renunciants from other spiritual traditions as well. To seek is, and remains, a free choice. An *inward* choice.

Indeed, the wisdom of Hinduism and Buddhism both hold forth the 'slings and arrows of outrageous fortune' as specifically and intentionally designed to goad they who journey through an incarnation - an embodiment here on the earth plane - to look deeper; to look inwardly; that they might escape the 'hypnotism of maya' that leaves us convinced the world is more real than the mystic visions which some are blessed with. Because it's actually the reverse. The world is less real. What's more real, are the horizons of deeper consciousness (Ra: "densities" of consciousness) which 'looking within' truly do uncover for the genuine sadakha (spiritual seeker).

But, again, it's unhelpful to revert to the childish over-simplicity about 'maya' as wholly unreal with 'nirvana' as wholly real. No. Both arise from, and are sustained by, nirdvanda consciousness. And, indeed, it is the case that The Presence (nirdvanda consciousness) can be discerned 'lurking behind' the day-to-day tapestry of maya or world-appearances. Once one has begun to thus discern, journeying through 'maya' becomes a pathway to ingoddedness every bit as much as austerity and renunciation; still and all, discernment and discretion and vigilance are very much needed to accomplish this. "Veiled in my maya, I am not shown to many." (Ch_ v_, 1944 Isherwood/Prabhavananda Gita translation). It's most unwise to stumble drunkenly through this world.

Still and all, optimum arousal, and the bleed-through effect, are, I am convinced, important understandings that permit us to see how *even I* can influence The Creation; even you can. This is empowerment of the highest order. It's part of the plan of Creation. You as co-creator; empowered.

The exaltation of the self. The discernment that 'self nirvana' - of which there are many - are potentially gateways to 'public nirvana.' That self as never-an-object witness, whose central signature is everywhere and always The Will, has the honor / responsibility of consciously deciding to morally polarize, should you or I as an entity see fit to strive toward 'crossing the border' into fourth density consciousness, across a threshold of consciousness-intensification, whereby one's resolve is tested as to whether one has truly successfully polarized. [1]

These are some of the themes this Chapter has sought to highlight. Against the backdrop of the Gita, where the theme of "war" has this as it's motif. Choose your side. Then do not shrink from the struggle; the combat. For the combat is with *inner* tendencies, as well as their reflection in the world at large. Both are vivid. The acts of a Jesus... versus the acts of a bullying tyrant.

If it may be called such, that which I have also sought to introduce here, is what I'm calling the 'bleed-through effect' - where the universe influences me, and I the universe; and we both *in toto* contribute to nirdvanda consciousness, even as nirdvanda consciousness both sustains this universe and all universes... and, is informed by them, in a process of ever deepening wisdom or intelligence that's unbounded; is forever and forever. This is foreverness. This is pure awareness

As to the general principle of Equilibrium - the thesis of an Optimum Arousal between complementary but mutually contradictory states or conditions (such as sleeping versus waking where both are states of consciousness) - this can be discerned as operating in so simple a system as 'me,' personally; or in more-and-more complex systems up to & including the whole universe.

Pantheistic Realization - God with attributes, arising from a vast collective subjectivity that may be notioned as an unbounded and infinitely deep Public Nirvana - is every bit as valuable and meaningful as Panentheistic Realization. In a manner of speaking the latter is far more accessible when the former sort of Realization has been at least accepted as a deep and powerful potentiality, even if not wholly and personally Realized. But the central takeaway is this. God is a Presence that may be personally realized. This is The Law of One. It is a Presence of surpassing subtlety and one possessed of both gentleness and kindness as well as steely, steely, will *and is within you.*

[1] Polarization is personal effort to *increase* one's commitment to service-to-otherselves by 25% (to 52% or more), or to *decrease* such a commitment by 25%, to 2% or less. In the latter process, a moral polarization towards service to oneself has been chosen. In the former, service to otherselves. Struggle in either direction is *work* in order to escape the 'sinkhole of indifference' which is to just remain in the default setting of 73% selfishness that we all kind of 'come into the world with,' as a sort of overall evolutionary given.

CHAPTER TEN: CONCLUDING CONSIDERATIONS CONCERNING HINDUISM AND THE LAW OF ONE

I have tried to be thorough about my intended topic in the preceding 129 pages of this second draft of *Hinduism and The Law of One* [1] which - if it is ever combined with the first draft - might be longer still. However no effort however long - whether 1,290 or 12,900 pages - can ever exhaust this most ancient of present-day religious traditions; to say nothing of the nested subtleties inherent in the boundlessness and foreverness of The Law of One. To cite just one interesting fact about Hinduism, it's great epic poem the Mahabharata of over 100,000 stanzas and which includes the Bhagavad Gita, is fifteen times longer than the Bible [Jewish or OT plus Christian NT]. And as to the deities and devas referenced in Hinduism? Thousands upon thousands.

The Law of One, of course, at one end is simplicity itself - to wit, that everything is God - and at the other end is an esoteric assertion that all creatures and even grains of sand themselves are - *each* - the actual epicenter of a boundless unity. A unity of infinite subtlety.

“To see a world in a grain of sand / And a heaven in a Wild Flower / Hold Infinity in the palm of your hand / And eternity in an hour.” [from “Auguries of Innocence” by Wm. Blake, 1757-1827]

When mystic exhilaration takes hold of one's awareness, one is swept out past reason. Even a glimpse into that realm (on 12/6/1273) led the famed scholastic Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) to declare of his prior works, “all that I have written seems to me so much straw.” [as quoted on p 107 in “The Philosophy Bible” by Martin Cohen, Firefly Books, 2016] Three months later, aged 49, Aquinas died. There are others I could cite (M. Bucke, J. Johnson). The point is this. Contact with God is transformative.

— — — — —
[1] 129 pages thus far, including the Introduction (12 pages) plus, as to the titles of the preceding nine chapters:

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. <i>The Fundamental Pluralism of Indian Culture and Actual Hinduism.</i> | 12 pages* |
| 2. <i>The All Is Consciousness Worldview and The Law of One.</i> | 14 pages |
| 3. <i>The Meaning of Philosophy in Hinduism.</i> | 14 pages |
| 4. <i>Philosophy in Hinduism Further Considered.</i> | 14 pages |
| 5. <i>A Personal Choice: the Pitfalls of Present-day Materialism, or Affirming Reality as Wall-to-wall 'Magic' Featuring Your Input.</i> | 10 pages |
| 6. <i>What is the Essence of Hinduism.</i> | 12 pages |
| 7. <i>As to The Further Mysteriousness of The Law of One</i> | 14 pages |
| 8. <i>The Bhagavad Gita</i> | 15 pages |
| 9. <i>The Bhagavad Gita, a Rosetta Stone to Hinduism's 'Personalistic' God (Pantheism) and Buddhism's 'Neti Neti' Pure Awareness (Panentheism)</i> | 12 pages |

*14 pages including a two page
end-of-book Addenda / Special Section

Contact with God is the epicenter of every religious tradition and thus it is with Hinduism as with all the others (*the famous five of our present world being chronologically Hinduism, Judaism, Buddhism, Christianity and Islam*). Accreted customs tend to obscure this fact. The heavy drapery of tradition and custom are in all of them. None of it is ever *intentionally* obscurantist. The best of intentions are at work. An effort to enshrine core insights and doctrines. However the net effect is to dull; to render trivial; to become over-fussy with ritual and tradition and legend and doctrine and - because Hinduism is the oldest religious tradition (and is actually a bundle of subsects and sub-varieties of religious practices) - this is massively the case with Hinduism. It's so easy to miss the forest for the trees. And to forget the warning, "seek *what the elders sought*; not merely to follow in the *ways* of the elders." Thus we have Hinduism associated with it's more invidious drapery - casteism, umpteen thousands of deities, etc. - instead of it's core mission: contact with God. This is also understandable inasmuch as "God" is so mysterious... whereas drapery is not.

But my purpose here is to address the core mission, and not the drapery.

All religions try to tackle in their philosophies / theologies the 'otherness' and the 'mystery' of God, and thus there have been formulations aplenty. The one I have found to be the most trenchant and valuable is to associate the "mysteriousness" of God *with consciousness itself*. However, since "consciousness" is clearly mysterious in it's own right, we can be said to be at something like the headwaters of mystery in fusing the two into one. Yet this is actually a most valuable and fruitful endeavor, for - as the previous chapter sought to point out - a consideration of the evanescence of consciousness and it's myriad forms and gradients will, with care, allow a rapprochement between Hinduism and "Atman" (the Self) vis-a-vis "anatman" (no self; the void)

Buddhism, after all, arose as a *correction* to; a *refinement* of; Hindu religious understanding and not - at least initially - an altogether different religion. (In this regard we have an echo of how Christianity arose as intended corrections / refinements to Jewish religiosity; but the chains of tradition being so heavy as they alas are, two separate religions wound up being the result).

The reconciliation is disarmingly simple. In routine awareness, consciousness is more readily associated with "me," the "self;" rather than with 'out there' or 'the world;' "objects." Yet, it is clear that *both* inhere in consciousness. This is the open sesame. A leap of faith at first, perhaps. But the gate to understanding is opened. Whereas, it's opposite - materialism and consciousness as epiphenomenal - closes the gate on any true assurance for anyone, anywhere, ever. Well so far so good. "I" am in consciousness, and so are all the "objects" I behold (including subtle ones like thoughts). *But what is consciousness in and of itself?*

I believe that FMW is correct in observing that consciousness as it is in and of itself; in it's 'primordialness' and antecedent to any self-beingness and antecedent to any projections of objects, is undefinable [1]. FMW uses the term *consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject* and also the term, *The Great Space*, and makes it clear that - what I've elsewhere alluded to as The Presence and which is generally referenced as mystical awareness or Cosmic Consciousness - is none other than *Infinite-Density Consciousness / Primordial Consciousness / nirdvanda consciousness / The One Infinite Creator of Intelligent Infinity*. Are all of these terms inter-changeable? Not exactly. Each emphasizes a different aspect of a unity; cf. 'the blind men with the elephant.'

Here is where Hinduism in general and the Gita in particular - as discussed in the previous two Chapters - show genius in celebrating Divinity as both many ("some worship the countless gods that are only my million faces" Gita Ch_V_Isherw./Prabhav. Trsl.)... and, also, as One; something ineffable; transcendent [2]. These invite discernment as to the protean nature of "Self."

In sum, all of this is a revisiting of the ineffability of consciousness, *as consciousness*.

Certainly, there is an immediacy to consciousness. "My" consciousness; or, "your" consciousness. Moreover, we readily accept *differing moods* or *states* of consciousness - as for example when I am asleep or you are asleep - and this extends to rare states of consciousness; of which there are a great many: arousal in fear; arousal in subtle states of meditation; drug-induced states; plus, various so-called mystical states of consciousness; plus flights of imagination... the list seems endless, and in point of fact, we ought to take it as a given that *it actually is*.

That, in sum, *everything* is in and of consciousness. Infinite variation is the very nature of it.

What distinguishes this insight or understanding, from the conceit of materialism (where consciousness is posited as epiphenomenal to a permanently unknowable substrate of "matter") is that we may entertain a possibility of *communion* between "my" consciousness or "your" consciousness... and, a condition of consciousness that is eternal; is primordial. Then things get tricky if I add the word "God:" because the issue of Selfness as the immediately presupposed 'given' whenever object gross (senses-perceived) or subtle (thoughts) are in presentation. And, moreover, there's the dynamic between "me" and "my" thoughts... vis-a-vis a Creator and a Cosmic sweep of creativity. Both are creativity. One is much bigger. *Is there interplay between them?*

[1] See entry Number Four in Part A of the Annotated Bibliography.

[2] Christianity tries to get at this perplexity by way of "The Trinity" of manifestness (Son); unmanifestness (Father); and, an all-permeate quality (The Holy Ghost), with all three being both a unity...and yet distinct. *Subject-object* consciousness; *subject-only*; with "Holy Ghost" approximating to *nirdvanda*.

I say yes. And I can think of no better way to illustrate what I mean than to cite a meaningful episode between “me,” “Giantweirdness” - my affectionate name for God / Intelligent Infinity - and an “unknown stranger.”

It was July 1986. I was en route back to California from attending my third Rainbow Gathering (the fifteenth one, in Pennsylvania, 7/1-5/1986), and I exited the freeway to do research about Rainbow at a library in Arizona (probably / possibly in Flagstaff; or perhaps it was Tucson); because I’d become convinced the Rainbow Gatherings were, in their essence, quite profoundly worthwhile spiritual events, despite their diverse surface blemishes and eccentricities [1].

As I exited the freeway I noticed a lone hippy on the onramp. “Probably a Rainbow attendee” I thought to myself; “he’ll probably get a ride before I re-enter the freeway after my library research though.” (I was in the habit of giving rides to such folk, through whom I learned much)

In any event when I returned to the freeway onramp about ninety minutes later, there he still was. I stopped the car. He got in eagerly. And his happy first remark was one I’ll never forget; one I very much cherish. “Gosh, Dad must really have wanted me to meet you! I usually get a ride in ten minutes or less!”

It turned out that ‘David’ (alas I’ve forgotten the name he told me) was first and foremost a genuine God devotee in his own winsome and inimitable way, despite his being a long time ‘road warrior’ or ‘on-the-road rainbow’ as Gatherers often call themselves. What struck me then - and still does - was his rock-solid conviction that “Dad” was looking out for him. And was arranging the particulars of his life journey in ways large and small. About this David was rock solid sure.

I’m sure he still is. And today so am I. And my most affectionate name for God remains “Dad”

I would love to digress on some of the charming memories David shared about his spiritual journey. But there isn’t time; not here, not right now. Because the central point is the point. It’s what matters. An intangible or so to say “invisible” God Presence - call it a “Dad” presence if you like or a “Mom” presence or the “Giantweirdness” presence as I prefer - accompanies the life journey of each of us. If we awaken to this Presence we can elect to *submit* to this Presence and accept it’s guidance in service-to-otherself terms. Or, to *challenge it*: the less wise option.

[1] During 1984 to 1988 (CA, MO, PA, NC, TX), my first five attended, I conducted somewhat extensive research about the Gatherings since their inception (1972, CO) and I self-published a booklet (about 112 copies) about the Gathering’s interdisciplinary approach to mysticism: “Rainbow Anthology.” My records were lost on 8/18/20 in the 86,000-acre “CZU Lightning Complex Fire.” But some copies may yet survive in the libraries / personal papers of some people.

In general, since consciousness when properly grasped is the substrate of everything, there is no topic so boundless; so capable of being ‘sliced and diced’ umpteen different ways. So consider just the essentials. *You* are conscious, and your consciousness came from somewhere before your physical birth... and, is going somewhere after your ‘death:’ your departure from your physical vehicle. Moreover, during your entire physical life you are surrounded by ‘objects’ which - all of them - are *productions in and of consciousness*. With some of these, your interactions are quite marked. Family; friends; beloved pets; beloved flowers in your garden... and of course, the dazzling signature of foreverness that is the starry night sky. *You interact with all of these!*

Ra - in seeking to articulate the Law of One - employs the general idea of *densities* as to consciousness. ‘One’ is the tangible physical universe of atoms and elements. They - all of them - are *productions in consciousness too*. ‘Two’ is the plant and animal kingdoms that we behold here on planet Earth. That consciousness animates all plants and animals is much easier to grasp. Then of course there’s the vastly more intricate spectrum of human consciousness. We’re quite used to grasping that others are experiencing consciousness spectra more-or-less similar to ours.

As to densities four (love-of-otherselves / love-of-ownself and broadly akin to what’s elsewhere called the lower astral plane), five (balancing either sort of love with wisdom in what’s roughly congruent to the upper astral plane), and six (the lower causal plane), these are, as Ra puts it, ‘freely choosing to be veiled from our routine discernment,’ although mystical accounts - for example that of Swedenborg - make it clear that *some* individuals become able to ‘pierce the veil’ while still physically alive. They try to impart this understanding to others, in writings and teachings. In sifting through such teachings for the ‘common’ or ‘theme’ meanings, we gain something of understanding. Most essentially? That these higher densities are ‘*more real*,’ more bursting with life, with beingness, with *presence*.

Along with such greater real-ness come two signature qualities in greater abundance. They are different but complementary. “Love,” and in the unbounded meaning of that term as is suggested by the term, Global Compassion (similarly: “Agape”). Then: Light or “Power” and again in the unbounded meaning of the term, Power. *Both* of these are great mysteries. They interact.

In service to otherselves “Love” is the quality whose growth is cultivated: love of otherselves, with the corollary that one’s personal self is in submission to a Cosmic Self. Then, in service to ownself, “Power” is the quality or attribute whose growth is cultivated; as oft remarked, there’s no greater aphrodisiac. Such a selfish agenda puts one in what amounts to a ‘clash’ with notions concerning a Cosmic Self. Stated bluntly? One comes to be at war with God, whether obviously

or subtly. In other words, in service-to-ownself moral polarization, self-service - enhancement of the prestige and power of the privative self - comes to not just take center stage, but runs riot. Inevitably, a warping of perspective is entailed. The irrational conceit that “everything is all about me” is not just entertained, but accepted; in extreme cases, it will manifest in absurd and dysfunctional megalomania: regarding which, an Exhibit A is readily at hand: Donald Trump. From small-town psychological train wreck... to a gigantic spectacle on the world stage. Is he alone as an example? Sadly, not at all. Tyrants of all stripes are readily at hand [1].

However the service-to-ownself moral polarization possesses a more sinister overmantle, as is so widely fretted over in Devil or Satan theories; many if not most of which preserve the kernel of truth about the matter, which is this: what most call negativity (service to ownself moral polarization) is centrally characterized by a war with God. Light - power - is the sought for elixir for “me,” and to ape at being God is the game: as tyrant; as chieftain; and so on.

The Creator, however, has a far better remedy for this preference than a ‘lake of fire’ or such-like dire perditions. An *entire realm* is furnished for they who choose this conceit. And who do they have for company? Others similarly conceited! Ergo, warfare is the order of the day.

It can be almost disappointing to find that centuries of claptrap about devil / negativity etc., have so simple an explanation. After all, negative types like to soup up their game with all manner of secrecies. To cite ‘the’ glaring example for our age: only after WWII did the world get to learn of the holocaust.

The holocaust illustrates the other feature of service-to-ownself moral polarization: a fixation with pecking orders, where some group - Jews, blacks, gypsies, you-name-it - are made the scape goat of everything that’s wrong. It’s a petty and vindictive mindset. Intellectually it can seem at first, robust; but when the fancy terms and convoluted reasoning are all stripped away, it’s barren

Of course such folk have their own style of belittling the service-to-others morally polarizing groups or individuals. That it’s a soft-headed folly to “love the universe.” That the afflicted deserve their sufferings; if aided, sooner than not they’ll be back in the gutter anyhow. This doom and gloom fatalism is the calling card of the service to ownself moral polarization and favors theories that the universe is all a random, accidental soup with no coherent One Intellect behind it.

[1] “Fascism: A Warning” by Madeleine Albright (1928-2022) with Bill Woodward; copyright 2018; HarperCollins, Publ'r (195 Broadway, NYC NY 10007). Dedication page: “To the victims of Fascism / Then and now / and to all who fight Fascism / In others / And in themselves.” An excellent survey of the political dimension of the service-to-ownself moral polarization as seen in despots old and new; common and famous. The last two Chapters are in my opinion over-edited; a punch ‘in opposition’ is softened to mush

So name-calling and mutual disdain between the two moral polarizations is actually quite robust. This is a strong piece of evidence for the actuality - the legitimacy - of moral polarization: that there actually *is* such a thing. That moreover effort to accomplish such polarization is Job One for they who wake to their freedom in charting their future course through infinity and foreverness. For, like it or not, we all actually *are* in infinity; we actually *are* in foreverness. The Presence that richly embodies both, is near at hand; very near at hand. Does it ever intrude, uninvited? Never. Well, I should say, *almost* “never,” for Infinite Density Consciousness is, *Itself*, free. This seems like a sort of simple observation. Actually, it has very profound consequences.

It means that none of us is actually so very far from The Creator as some tend to suggest.

There is, on the one hand, affinity. Yet there are, on the other hand, differences both obvious and subtle. Where ought the emphasis be placed? Generally speaking worldviews that affirm the all-is-consciousness worldview in terms of service-to-others selfs moral polarization, do tend to emphasize the basic affinity between “me” as a privative self, or “you” as a privative self, and that Actual Infinite Selfness - FMW: the spatial void of Nirvana - Which we *can actually* get in touch with; with which we can *actually* commune. The Creator is, thus, *near at hand*.

Service-to-ownself as a moral polarization, to the extent it embraces the all-is-consciousness worldview - normally it does not, preferring the denialist fictions of materialistic false doctrines - purports to take a ‘realist’ approach. Which goes something like this. The world is in a sorry state. It’s afflictions are massive and durable. Therefore why tarry over such an awful train wreck? Extricate yourself from the smoking wreckage. And hold fast to the famous admonition from Theravada (‘Way of the elders,’ cf. the Pali Canon as preserved in Ceylon) Buddhism: “attend to thine own salvation with diligence.” That’s the watchword. All else is futile hand-wringing. ‘They’re all going to die anyway.’

This can be called a hardheaded or realistic perspective. Sentimentality is banished. The smoking wreckage of the world is regarded as just that: smoking wreckage. Inward consciousness is disciplined towards a grail that I feel can properly be called, The Private Nirvana. That there are many, many, Private Nirvanas - an infinite number, actually - is something that is an actual fact; I am increasingly persuaded it’s so. So, what’s the difference? In a Private Nirvana the world is ignored: the ‘outer’ world of the senses; the tangible physical universe. A personal escape becomes the fixation; the obsession. Requiring intense amounts of self discipline. If perseverance is sufficient... the grail is attained. The ‘smoking wreckage’ of the world is left behind. Moreover, an important corollary: such a one becomes a sort of conduit to ‘the land of the private nirvanas.’ Implicit in this? Authoritarianism. Pecking Orders. And, yes, duality.

“Freedom simply becomes the liberty to surrender to the Divine Law, or to affirm the autonomy of the [*familiar privative personal*] self. If the course of surrender is taken, it is not to be conceived as something at all difficult to do. It is an act most highly desired by the self. Surprisingly, the affirmation of autonomy requires a distinctly austere act of will. ...[*contrariwise*] A certain glory is felt in the depreciation of the self relative to the Divine Otherness. ...Union with the Divine is thus an act of freedom. [p.114]. ...The dualism of the individual self and the Divine Otherness is not yet reduced to a true unity. In the language of religious mysticism, such unity as there may be [*is*] conceived as the union of the Lover and the Beloved where, from the finite point of view, the lover is the individual self and the Beloved is the Divinity. However, because the relationship is mutual, the Divine Otherness also appears as the Lover of whom the object is the individual self. A noteworthy part of the satisfaction of this state lies in the fact that the dualism still remains; otherwise the relationship of love would lose its objective meaning. ...[*perhaps*] the term *mysticism* should be applied exclusively to this stage, while deeper states may more properly be categorized as Gnosticism, in the generic sense. ...this relativity [*between the feeling value in mysticism versus the noetic value in Gnosticism*] is reversed in the deeper and more Gnostic state [*where the noetic value engulfs the feeling value*].”

[p. 115] Six [*interpositions*] added. [1]

The above quotation provides - in a nutshell as it were - not only the classic standoff between “atman” (self) in Hindu theology / philosophy, and “anatman” (no self) in Buddhist philosophy - which actually ‘engulfs’ the religious perspective of Hinduism rather than disputing it or contravening it - but the even wider and more eternal question of a manifest cosmos vis-a-vis any ideation of Presence; Creator; First Cause; something *bigger than even all the cosmos*. In mysticism as above referenced the seeker ‘dances’ with Divine Otherness. Whereas Gnosticism ‘devours.’

Thus the service to ownself moral polarization hews to a doctrine that may be called Gnostic where ‘love’ as such is depreciated or lost sight of. But, in trying to leapfrog straight to a Gnostic fusion with All That Is, the luggage of the self - the privative individual self - becomes an unrecognized impediment; until, that is, in early to middle sixth density consciousness (a.k.a. lower causal realm), this impediment is recognized; is *jettisoned*; and such a one then ‘reverses polarity’ to the service to others self moral polarization (52% or more of one’s time and energy and feeling tone becoming a commitment to others self). This is true as to individuals *and* social memory complexes. Can I ‘prove’ this? *Innerly, I feel I have*. Outerly? Close to impossible for anyone. Thus is free will for each preserved. Even they choosing the perilous path of lunatic selfishness.

[1] start of Chapter (“Self and Divine Otherness”) in “Introceptualism,” the 1995 SUNY Edition entitled, “Transformations in Consciousness: The Metaphysics and Epistemology” by Franklin Merrell-Wolff (nee Franklin Fowler Wolff, 1887-1985); SUNY (State U. Plaza, Albany NY 12246); BF1999.M483 1995. Wolff’s pre-eminent value as a philosopher of mysticism is not yet so widely acclaimed as is warranted.

“Lunatic” selfishness fulfills a cosmic purpose for all of that. The hell wherein they choosing the service to ownself moral polarization (98% or more service to ownself with 2% or less service to otherselfs or a vanishing small residue) find themselves, in the lower and then the higher astral (Ra: fourth and fifth density consciousness), comports with *their* idea of ‘how things ought to be,’ and therefore is not perceived as a ‘hell,’ but is - for them - a heaven. But such a heaven is a strange place. One of ceaseless struggle and warfare. Moreover all the senses are amplified so it is a sensuousness wherein sensual delight can become intense; but, also, sensual agony.

I heretofore sought to note what - by all indications as best I can discern them - are the distinguishing dividends of such a gloomy pathway, in an ultimate sense; because the dividends of both moral polarizations (service to otherselfs and service to ownself) become the emoluments of Intelligent Infinity, when the soul of any entity truly accomplishes it’s journey through creation; and, after all, in such unity, service to self balances with service to other-self because there is only Unity. Moreover said Unity is fundamental and indissoluble at all times, albeit hard to discern when third density consciousness (human consciousness) is functioning with all it’s foreground of duties and struggles. Such that The Presence of Intelligent Infinity becomes hard to discern.

Firstly: a development of willfulness (the only signature of the self, which is *never* an object in any and all cases). Secondly: a development of deception; disguise; dissembling; or, to put it baldly, a truly astonishing skill at outright lying, whenever lies suit the purpose of such a one, who ever is after becoming ‘king of the mountain,’ to the detriment of any and all rivals. Thirdly - and this is a skill that is honed toward the goal of the pre-eminence of the privative self - a definite cultivation of both charisma... and, oft-times, alluring beauty (whether male or female). Fourthly, it might be mentioned that mental agility becomes developed to remarkable degree.

In service to otherselfs, somewhat the opposite traits become seen as virtuous. That one bends one’s will toward the needs of others; letting *their* willfulness rule the day. That in all matters great and small, one strives to be scrupulously honest; any deception at all is seen as destructive and ugly. There is, as well, a valuation of genuine authentic humility as over and above any charisma, any ‘putting on of airs.’ And as to beauty? An ‘inner beauty of the heart’ is valued above outer or surface appearances. Fifthly - rounding out these instructive contrasts - a loss as to mental agility in *comparative* terms, is made up for by a **great** capacity to love: and in train with this? Qualities of intuition; and a sensitivity to others’ feelings of very pronounced degree.

The key takeaway is that Intelligent Infinity is possessed of the fruitage of *both* moral polarities. To astonishing intensity. Little wonder companionship with God is unboundedly

awesome by any discerning measure.

In service to otherselves entities - and, later, social memory complexes - *both* sets of attributes as just enumerated in contrasting fashion are present; where, however - and it's an all-important caveat - the latter attributes predominate: the bending of one's will toward the needs of others; scrupulous efforts at honesty; authentic humility; *inward* (not so much outward) beauty; and a pronounced intuitiveness or ability to be empathetic (hence the term 'empaths') that in general can be summed as efforts at global compassion. However. The *former* attributes remain.

In service to ownself those former attributes not only remain, but they almost totally drown out their complements. A self-will and *disregard* for the wills (wishes) of others; a fixation on wiles, 'sharp dealing,' trickery, with *almost nothing* of straightforward honesty remaining; much cultivation of charisma and the 'putting on of airs,' a 'holier than thou' pre-tentiousness; and virtually nothing of humility, ever (except as false disguise); much in the way of outward beauty, with little to nothing of 'inward' beauty; and a great intensity as to mental skill but very little in the way of intuition, nor regard for the feelings of others. So in this over-view sort of way, the service-to-otherselves moral polarization can be said to be much more a 'balanced' polarization; and, as such, closer to absolute truth (see below); whereas, the service to ownself moral polarization goes off the deep end; is very much unbalanced; is very much oriented to struggle; combat; 'life's a struggle;' 'nature red in tooth and claw;' 'survival of the fittest.' Such doctrines being even extended to human societies.

But social Darwinism is gradually falling out of favor. The Darwin thesis of 'random' selection by nature, of 'the fittest,' is slowly being supplanted by *Intelligent Design* and the recognition that the *consciousness* and *the conscious will* of entities, in responding to nature or environmental pressures, is **the** true engine of genetic change and evolution. In other words, there *is* evolution, yes; but not in just a random way. Creatures, *themselves*, bring about adaptive changes in their genes. Such a view accords far better with the all-is-consciousness truth of things.

It is not the purpose here to revisit this ongoing war in biological theory, but simply to state that the so-called Intelligent Design view of the matter is far nearer the truth. As noted - and FMW remarks on it explicitly - a state of EQUILIBRIUM is truly a feature of cosmic architecture. We see this mirrored everywhere. Sleeping and waking. Male and Female. The balancing of elements in the enduring beauty of classical architecture, famously evident in the work of Andrea Palladio. Night and day. Love and Light. It's endless, *endless*. Which is exactly the point. To discern infinity in the design of things, that all of this goes on forever; such insight is to begin to discern Intelligent Infinity in It's true boundlessness.

To restate: the word “God” is a polarizing term. This is as it should be. Because after all, three grand mysteries are bound up in the all-is-consciousness worldview (*that consciousness is original; is self-existent, and is constitutive of all things*). Each mystery engulfs the preceding mystery. First, the object; that we discern things - sensible forms, and thoughts which are subtle objects - as quantities that are *other than ‘me.’* Indeed, a tree or a rock seems to be static and inert regardless of what “I” think. *But are they really?* Interactive influence is nearer the truth. The subtle objects which are thoughts, are the easiest illustration. *Habitual* thoughts indeed acquire a fixity that seems other than “me”... and yet it was none other than “my” thinking processes that birthed those thoughts that gradually acquired a fixity; and - *seemingly* - a beingness independent of “me.” As famously remarked: “bad habits are hard to break; sometimes, *very* hard.”

Might it be the same with sensible forms: the all-about natural world? Do we, in fact - collectively and as individuals - impact the all-about world with our feelings; our intentions; our thoughts? Not just in the obvious ways: coal mines; oil wells; the ‘great gyre’ of atomized plastic trash in the northern Pacific Ocean. Such impacts are mediated by physical actions; by attention or the *lack* thereof: e.g., becoming insensitive to the Alive Beingness of all of nature. So obviously actions begin as thoughts. Creating a garden begins as a thought process. In sum, our thoughts - collectively and as individuals - have direct impact upon the all-about physical world, in ways that are glaringly obvious... *and, also, in ways altogether subtle.* It is action - the *will* - of we as individuals, and of we in social collectivities, that brings about all such impacts.

The idea of subtlety introduces the mystery of “self” that engulfs the mystery of “object.” What triggers Realization, in a sense, is the recognition that the self is never - never! - *itself* an object, although we habitually think it so: “my” body or “your” body as if embodiment constitutes the self. Well embodiment is a means of the self becoming expressive here in this external world-of-the-senses, but sufficient introspection - as has occurred throughout history and especially in the history of philosophy - has made plain that “self” as a potent category of the understanding is not - ever - *itself* an object. The realm of objects is the means of self-expression; but is none of it, *itself*, the self. We say that nature reveals the grandeur of God. This can lead to a view that God - as a category partaking of the being-ness of self - is but ‘co-extensive’ with all of nature: that all objects together are the ‘big object’ that is God.

They aren’t. It’s something more. In sum the self is the greater mystery that engulfs the mystery of the object: to wit, all the outwardly discernible world. When this arises as an impactful Realization, one begins to approach the all-self ‘void’ of nirvana which is all around, all the time; but invisible (not discernible) to ordinary, objects-focused consciousness. Effort is needed: application of *the will*. Then - encompassing both ‘nirvana’ (the self) and ‘samsara’ (the world of objects) - we arrive to the recognition of consciousness antecedent to *any* selves or *any* objects projected from said selves-or-self.

This brings us to the third of the three grand mysteries, whereby we can begin to get something of a handle into the subtlety - indeed the infinite subtlety - that is consciousness in its most fundamental - or if you prefer, its loftiest - iteration. Unbounded, primordial consciousness which FMW evokes - intensely correctly in my opinion - by a term I have previously referenced in this chapter, as follows (and I repeat it, along with it's context, here):

“I believe that FMW is correct in observing that consciousness as it is in and of itself; in it's ‘primordialness’ and antecedent to any self-beingness and antecedent to any projections of objects, is undefinable. FMW uses the term *consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject* and also the term, *The Great Space*, and makes it clear that - what I've elsewhere alluded to as The Presence and which is generally referenced as mystical awareness or Cosmic Consciousness - is none other than *Infinite-Density Consciousness / Primordial Consciousness / nirdvanda consciousness / The One Infinite Creator of Intelligent Infinity.*”

In other words we start with ‘the object’ (the first mystery). Upon careful reflection we can arrive to the insight that ‘objects’ as a general category (including thoughts which are subtle objects) are derivative from a *greater* mystery: ‘the self.’ Which is never *itself* an object (although casual and incautious thinking may imply this), but whose only signature in the ‘object field’ or ordinary awareness, is **the will**. So, “the self” is indeed a great mystery, and fingering the self (atman) in Hindu philosophy and theology is of primary importance as “Divinity.”

However. Along came Buddhism, which sought to evoke a still greater mystery: *consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject* as alluded to just above. With somewhat unfortunate consequences, this greater density of consciousness acquired the moniker “voidness” within Buddhist thought. Such a referent is intended to shake us loose from habitual thinking. Where we impute greatest ‘realness’ to The Object; questionable ‘realness’ to the never-an-object Self... *and no attention nor attribution of realness whatsoever, to That giving rise to The Self:* bare consciousness. Nirdvanda consciousness. A.k.a. unbounded, or primordial, consciousness.

There is nothing wrong with being suspicious about nirdvandva consciousness as merel a theoretical construct. Until and unless IT is imperienced (inwardly experienced) in the consciousness of the sadakha (the spiritual seeker), it remains just a tantalizing possibility; a “maybe.” Thus it is indeed a leap of faith to endure disciplines and austerities in quest of a state we've *heard of but have never experienced*. But I have good news. The Creator - That which is *both* The Self and the *greater* mystery of all-immanent-therein nirdvanda consciousness - is most gracious toward ardent seekers. For *all* are sprung from spiritual infinity / foreverness; intelligent infinity; unboundedness; forever uncorrallable infinite density consciousness; The Creator.

Throughout this book I have sought to emphasize the truth and actuality of the all is consciousness worldview (‘*consciousness is original and self-existent and constitutive of all things*’), and that apex or infinite density consciousness is mysterious (Ra: “*all begins and ends in mystery*”), but that, withal, we *each* - in infinitely varied and infinitely subtle ways - are capable of a *one-on-one* communion with Intelligent Infinity.

I have also sought to emphasize the validity of how Buddhist Practice - so focused on ‘anatman,’ sometimes denoted as ‘voidness’ - is *complementary* and not ‘in opposition’ to Hindu Practice: which is for the most part rather differently focused on ‘atman,’ or The Self, with a companion emphasis upon *nirvana*, the “blown-out state,” where the consciousness of the seeker is aroused toward an awakening into self-only consciousness, versus customary and familiar subject-object consciousness. I concur with FMW that the term “mysticism” is best confined to states of Cosmic Consciousness - the inclusive term invoked by Maurice Bucke in his great classic “Cosmic Consciousness” - where attainment of ‘self only,’ or ‘nirvana’ consciousness, is the predominant accomplishment; with the term “Gnostic Realization” or Gnosticism - in the generic sense and not denoting any particular school of doctrines - is more aptly confined to they striving toward *anatman* Realization, which Buddhism so largely focuses upon. In the sense of “a relationship with God,” Hindu thought is most conducive; whereas, in the sense of “merging with the divine ground that is above all Gods and above all lesser entities,” this is where Buddhism seeks to set forth a guiding doctrine, a guiding philosophy. These are complementary stages of attunement with Intelligent Infinity. They are not actually in any sort of doctrinal tug-of-war as popularly supposed. Is anatman realization “higher?” In one sense yes. In nirdvanda consciousness we’re in view of that ground awareness that sustains all nirvanas, all selves; as well as all creation-realms, including this physical universe; and *sustains them both, undergirds them both, but is not confined to either*. In another sense both are equal in a sort of equilibrium.

An unhelpful inference ought not be the result of these understandings. It can be summed this way. “ ‘God’ - if God there be - is indifferent to suffering, cruelty and all the rest.” Not so. I am deeply convinced of this. While there may be - for a season, as it were - entities who incline toward all manner of cruelties associated with self-glorification and selfishness; in ultimate terms such entities turn their backs on their realm of tragedy and suffering and hideous insensitivity. And reverse polarity (Ra’s term) at the end of sixth density consciousness - or lower causal consciousness, the closest alternative term as best I adduce the matter - so as to move yet further toward Intelligent Infinity; where a magnanimity towards all creatures great and small abides; abides, because God *is* all those creatures; as well as the empyrean in which they all inhere. In sum a permeable membrane of sorts is at work vis-a-vis nirvana states... and, nirdvanda realization. Such words, of course, are imprecise approximations of the enormities being referenced.

My argument for what amounts to a permeable membrane between nirvana states and nirdvanda realization, per se, cannot be proven in any exterior, western-science sense; however I am personally persuaded it is so. Yet me simply declaring this is insufficient. It would be sufficient if I expected the reader to accept this thesis ‘because I said so:’ knowledge by authority. I do not. The central feature of this entire book, in fact, is *you*, the reader. That *you* are empowered to explore these dimensions of consciousness *for yourself* and, thereby, to decide what is what

Again: Buddhist philosophy and practice are not at odds with Hindu philosophy and practice. While it is true that Buddhism uses the figure of speech about the ‘emptiness’ of things in ordinary subject-object consciousness... and Hinduism more or less does the same... in the Hindu tradition, the apex of the journey is mysticism in the fulsome and traditional sense; a felt communion with Divinity. For the Buddhist, the apex of the journey is ‘gnosis’ in the broad inclusive sense; in apprehending a state of consciousness barren of objects in any sense *and* barren even of subjectivity in any sense. Easy to articulate as a word-picture pointer-notion. Hard to actually enter such a province of Cosmic Consciousness. Just as it is hard to disengage from the ordinary world toward nirvana as a consciousness-principle representing an all-encompassing subjectivity.

* * *

The essence of Hinduism is to realize that God is real, and, in subtle form as a sort of Presence, all-permeate; and not bounded even by something so enormous as this entire physical universe. In this Presence there is what can be called a mystical exhilaration; a sense that ‘little me’ is capable of communion / conversation with All That Is. In this Presence is also a sense of a potential Unity, however much such Unity remains a work in progress. A sense of Infinite Power is, I believe, a hallmark of the onset of Gnosis; and a sense of Intelligent Infinity is, I believe, a hallmark of the onset of mystical communion with The Creator. These two are characteristics of Pure Divinity. Perhaps we can say with some justification that one is ‘deeper.’ Yet, in the depths, *all* is mystery. *All* is in potentiation. But those depths interact with “Logos” as boundless Creator: and, we each have the potential to enlarge as co-creators.

“The Lord is everywhere and always perfect.” [v_ ch_ 1944 Isherwood/Prabhavananda translation, Bhagavad Gita] I have already remarked upon this as a potential realization; as more than poetic hyperbole. I think it is so. Easy to embrace when everything is rosy. Terribly hard when everything seems horrific; a nightmare. Still, buried in what is so terrible, there can be the germs of something infinite and eternal. This is the hope of the sadakha (the spiritual seeker). This is my hope. I urge the reader to at least entertain such a hope. For it can be transformative.

SPECIAL APPENDIX A: THE LONGER VERSION

The music. The music. Oh what alive sumptuousness, the *music*! Alas the paltry dry word “music” does the content of those imperiences (those inner experiences) very weak justice.

What transpired as I sank into that first fateful nap - and as continued to transpire for the next six to twelve weeks until I grokked the import of what I was being aided to imperience - is that I was very gently and expertly guided out of my body in order to travel to... to *where*? Over the years of trying to evince the sensation of what that “where” was like I’ve settled on the following thumbnail sketch:

Imagine for a moment you’ve been ushered to your premium front row center seat in the most acoustically perfected concert hall in all the world and the house lights have darkened; and you’re about to share - with a very fortunate unseen assemblage, doubtless glittering-with-diamonds wealthy powerful dignitaries from every continent plus all manner of professional and professorial dignitaries and crowned princes and kings and no doubt all arrayed in their tuxes and gowns - an absolutely stupendous musical tour de force performed by the finest orchestra in all the world; this enormous skilled orchestra performing a brand new premiere rendition of a symphony devised by as a great a musical genius as ever you would have if you were to fuse Beethoven with Brahm and Schubert and countless other genius composers and they all of them together had composed this work of towering musical genius. And the enormous skilled orchestra commences its performance of this new symphony. Ah! What perfection! What skill! What jaw-dropping sumptuousness to this gigantic symphony so skillfully performed by this vast orchestra in this acoustically perfect concert hall! It were as if this music were alive, so thrilling was it to hear; so *nourishing* to hear.

And then one afternoon - I began to devise pretexts for naps for I was unfailingly guided out of my body and transported to the “dazzling darkness” [1] - I ‘grokked’ with astonishment the bottom line. It never stops. *It never stops*. This captivating symphony I’d been hearing...it never once repeated; it was always thrillingly new, new, *new*. It sank into me. I was beholding the endlessness and the foreverness of The One Infinite Creator of Intelligent Infinity. When my unseen guides - call them angels if you like - observed I’d ‘grokked the message,’ these episodes stopped. Bam. *Ka-boom*. Class dismissed. The love of God perfectly blended with the wisdom of God discerned that if I’d stayed overlong, it might have been as imperfect as if I’d not stayed long enough. As it was, I was allowed to stay long enough to get utterly drunk with the infinite sumptuousness of The Creator. And, in a word, I’ve just been getting drunker ever since.

[1] “*There is in God, some say, / A deep but dazzling darkness...*” from the poem “The Night” by the gifted Welsh poet and mystic, Henry Vaughan (4/17/1621- 4/23/1695). Ah, how truly he did speak.

On 1/15-17/16 for the manuscript entitled “What Is Reality Anyway? (Thirteen ‘Controversies’ and The Law of One as Enuniated by Ra)” I drafted this three page version [2018 Jml pp 6-8]. *A one page version from 2021 follows, with it’s one page addenda*. Then: any final remarks.

SPECIAL APPENDIX A: THE LONGER VERSION (*continued, p2*)

Drunker and drunker ever since. I like to put it that way in terms of bottom line honesty about the consequences of those thirty or so imperiential visits to God's Concert Hall from about 10/15 of 1981 to about 4/15 of 1982, involving some thirty to forty-odd truly memorable guided journeys to There as a best estimate (I wasn't so cautious a diarist back then). But it cannot be denied; poetic license is at work. I'm not wont to outerly reveal drunkenness.

"Masts" in India - Meher Baba's term for eccentric, wandering, seemingly crazy God-devotees - are sometimes reported as appearing drunk 'midst their inward exhilaration at imbibing who-knows-what in the way of inward celestial epiphanies. Others of course are more restrained. Outwardly at least. I endeavor some semblance of outward decorum. But here's the point. As emphasized throughout this book - and it's two companion predecessors in a trilogy of books ("Hinduism and The Law of One" [first version] and "Buddhism and The Law of One")* - *there is a process of entering ever deeper ingoddedness and this can continue to deepen throughout one's lifetime*. Moreover this process does not have to happen in any particular way. For some it can happen all-at-once. For some it is like a long slow-moving freight train. My Concert Hall imperiences were rather like the locomotive on my personal slow-moving freight train; which continues apace even as I write these lines. Car after car passes by. The click and the clack of the rails beneath the wheels of those cars. Each freight car is laden with riches past describing. And, at last, I have gleaned the bottom line of this as well. It never stops. *It never stops*. There is quite simply no ending to the long slow moving freight train of heavy-laden riches that presents the glories and the powers of The One Infinite Creator of Intelligent Infinity.

Ra puts it this way. The first distortion is freedom. The second distortion is love. The third distortion is light which expresses the wisdom of The One Infinite Creator. All is made of *light* in all of its varying wavelengths; all present the limitless outward-moving manifestness of The Creator. All of that Light emerges from the Dazzling Dark. That's how I understand it. That Dazzling Dark is The Creator. Therein, are infinitely perfectly blended infinite love with in finite wisdom and the never-ceasing concatenation of these two colossal categories represents a complete and total and unlimited power. Power. *Boundless* Power. That's how I understand God today. Beholding that Power, there's fear only if unresolved desire-seeds of thirst-for-power yet persist. 'Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely; and, of course, there's no aphrodisiac like power.' This encomium gives us something of the magnetism of power. It can be used - as Ra so succinctly puts it - for service-to-self; or, for service-to-otherselfs. I aspire to use such Power as will heed me in service to otherselfs; and, the effort to thus polarize is ongoing Amen.

.
* On 1/15-17/16 for the manuscript entitled "What Is Reality Anyway? (Thirteen 'Controversies' and The Law of One as Enunciated by Ra)" I drafted this three page version [2018 JmI pp 6-8]. *A one page version from 2021 follows, with it's addenda*. Then: any final remarks.

SPECIAL APPENDIX A: THE LONGER VERSION (*continued, p3*)

“Such Power as will heed me.” I mean by this that the Infinite Power of The Creator is heavy veiled. Not lightly veiled. Heavy veiled. ‘None see God but God,’ as more than one metaphysical wag has put it. Or put another way “prayer” is exactly that, because the response(s) thereto are descended from out a futurity wherein, so to say, The Creator Is; the boundless realm of Forever Now; the Dazzling Dark. At times I’ve put it that God is as addictive as black tar heroin but this comparison is ultimately unsuccessful; an addiction to The Presence of The Creator is orders of magnitude stronger, even, than the wish for *breath*; and, the addiction simply gets stronger and stronger: rather as if one has passed an ‘event horizon’ and were hurtling into the Singularity of a Black Hole. Into, in fact, The Dazzling Dark. So awesome there, floods of tears.

* * *

A conclusion to this ‘longer version’ is somewhat an artifice, for in fact there is no conclusion; nor ever will there be one. Withal, the most important notes proffered from this present juncture can be said to be three. **One.** God is kind. Astonishingly kind. That such kindness should shower upon one so undeserving but serves to anchor, stronger, true humility.

Two. God presents ‘on my terms’ (on the seeker’s terms), but not *entirely* so, for ever is there gentle-but-oh-so-adroit challenge to grow; to develop further still; and this is the earnest that The Creator is by no means ipso facto coterminous with The Self in even the loftiest sense; FMW puts it best (within the frailties of language), by opining that Consciousness, *Itself*^, in Its boundless Mysteriousness, is the best notioning with which to reach towards The Creator’s stunning empyrean. (^ meaning *consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject*: nirdvanda)

Three. This entire physical universe - and each of us therein, living, breathing, ceaselessly erring, ceaselessly trying yet again - needs to be understood, *all* of it, as inhering in and within The Creator. As I like to put it in my inward daily ruminations, ‘I know you’re Real, God; the cat’s out of the bag, the bell’s been rung and the toothpaste’s out of the tube. “Faith” has no longer got anything to do with it. You’re out and about and uncorrallable and forever here-now. So allow me to get on with my prostrations that, if it be *Thy* Will, some few of my prayers might be answered.’ And answered they often are. Sometimes subtly. Sometimes obviously. And, of course, sometimes the answer is No. The Creator is no kosmic ATM machine or lapdog, so to say. This is why prayer is exactly that: prayer. A solicitation. By no means a done deal. And remember the pithy verity within the humorous phrase “the harder I work the luckier I get.” ‘God helps those who help themselves.’ So I’ll continue to work to try to be suitably companionable to Thee; amen.

SPECIAL APPENDIX A

“I’ll never be good enough; never! It’s hopeless!” And so I fell to sobbing.

This was the afternoon of October 15, 1981. I was 34. Twenty-six months previous, on August 15th of 1979, I’d had an extremely subtle epiphany while listening to a recording of “The Bhagavad Gita” on my car cassette-tape player. (Caedmon Records: Zia Moheyddin reading from the 1944 Isherwood / Prabhavananda translation). The line resonates with me to this very day. “I am subtler, far, than mind’s inmost subtlety.” Now, here was a declaration from God that sounded *hot!*

The rest of the Gita is replete, of course, with statements as profound, or even more so. Suffice to say I had been listening to this recording not just dozens of times, but - no exaggeration - probably *two hundred* times during the ensuing 780 days. And now on this pleasant afternoon I was listening to it yet again, in the living room of my small house south of Watsonville California. A sense of enthusiasm for an encounter with God had *definitely* been kindled.

But how could such an encounter ever occur? I was no yogi. No ascetic. No meditator. My life had been replete with worldly ambitions; sensual enjoyments; and - on the surface - a fashionable ‘agnosticism’ I’d acquired while in college.* Yet, here I was being aroused to an enthusiasm about God from a scripture over two thousand years old. Which, somehow and against all odds, made God ‘come alive’ with stirring portrayals of Godly magnificence.

But still. That evocation of Godly magnificence ...versus *me*? Hopeless. Hopeless! And so I’d fallen to sobbing. And retired to my bedroom to take a nap, feeling totally wrung out.

Whereupon, the magic commenced. Into what’s been called The Audible Lifestream [1]

Because instead of ‘a nap’ I was gently guided out of my body for an OOB (Out-Of-Body experience) that turned out to be the first of about fifty such OOB’s I was to experience during the next six months; to about mid April 1982. And what transpired? What indeed. Oh how hard it is to put into words. I think my friend J. feels similarly about describing The Ineffable [2]

In short, I was guided to what I now describe as *God’s Private Concert Hall*.

* Rice University, 1966-1970

[1] “The Path of the Masters” by Julian Johnson; Eighth Edition of 1972 (first edition 1939). See the annotated bibliography for more detail on this important book: J.J.’s book is the fifth work cited in Part A of the Annotated Bibliography. [Also quoted at p4 of Chapter Two (in “*Islamic Mysticism and God: Sufism and The Law of One, Especially as Enunciated by Ra*”), plus citations elsewhere, esp. Chapter Six (*in said text*)].

[2] This reference is to J. B. , whose nine page recounting of his 2/19/1970 NDE was received 4/30/21. He and I met some 12 years ago - about 2009 - at a seminar in Lone Pine, California honoring the teachings of the *great* and *pivotal* transcendental philosopher, Franklin Merrell-Wolff (1887-1985): see fourth work cited in Part A of the Annotated Bibliography.

SPECIAL APPENDIX A (p2, an addenda to the 'one page' version)

“The light knew me better than I knew myself. ...We need to experience every moment [*as precious; as holy*]. ...I know my existence is going to cause ripples - I saw that in my life review... Most importantly, I now understand that we do not die at the time of physical death. We live on with a higher level of consciousness. So with this understanding, I no longer fear death.” [1]

Part Two

That God would send silent, unseen angels to guide me Out-of-Body to *God's Own Private Concert Hall*... I was, to say the very least, completely and totally flabbergasted. Still am

Oh how many times I've sought to evoke those sumptuous visits to that stunning Hall. Let me start by quoting Henry Vaughan (17 April 1621 – 23 April 1695): “**There is in God, some say, / A deep but dazzling darkness, as men here / Say it is late and dusky, because they See not all clear. / O for that night! where I in Him / Might live invisible and dim!**” [*From the poem, “The Night;” underlining added.*]. Well, I'm here to say he speaks aright. That Concert Hall - as I call it - was stunningly, *stunningly*, **dazzlingly** dark. Unseen shimmerings seemed to be all around me. The atmosphere was electric. Imagine the grandest concert hall where the lights have gone down and a stellar audience - billionaires, kings, queens, scholars, dignitaries - are all in a hushed eager silence, for the world's grandest orchestra is about to launch into a genuinely new orchestral composition by Beethoven and Brahms *and others*. Then: the music booms forth. O what mastery! What genius! What *power*! I was mesmerized. *Hooked*. As, surely, were all the unseen attendees all around me. We were all in a thrall to hear such towering, *towering*, musical genius booming forth.

I was granted visit after visit to that Concert Hall. It was addictive. Totally so. I began to conjure pretexts to take another nap; because, almost every time, the silent unseen angels gently ushered me into yet another OOB to that faraway magical Concert Hall. How loving. How kind. I would be there yet; but, on about the fiftieth visit, I found myself grokking the most stunning fact of all: “Hey, this grand music, shit, this is no ‘set piece;’ wow, *it's always new.*” Class dismissed. For my unseen Guide / group-of-Guides ‘read’ *my Realization about God*.

[1] p 78 in “The Transformative Power of Near-Death Experiences (How the Messages of NDEs Positively Impact the World);” Chapter Six (“Purpose, Purpose, Purpose? What Purpose?”) by D. Bennet Pub. by Watkins Media Limited, UK (Est. 1893); 2017. One [*interposition*] added.

Many other valuable books about NDEs now exist, among them “Proof of Heaven” by Dr. Eben Alexander; “After” by Dr. Bruce Grayson; “ ” by Dr. Tim Von Lommel; “ ” by Prof. Steven Meyer of The Discovery Institute (Seattle, WA); “Messages From Heaven” by ; “Consciousness Beyond Life” by ; “NDE: The Rest of the Story” by Dr. P. M. H. Atwater; Publications of IANDS (Intl. Assn. for Near Death Studies); “Walking in the Light” by ; and many citations in the book with D.Bennett's account.

SPECIAL APPENDIX A: CONCLUDING REMARKS

“To be sure, strange things happen when one initiates the introceptive process [*which is a genuine psychical function and process, but rooted far deeper than the ‘thought’ and ‘perception’ categories of ordinary subject-object consciousness*], things of such revolutionary implication that the radical Copernican change in astronomy or in Kant’s thought is distinctly mild in contrast. The would-be investigator may well think twice before embarking on the enterprise if he or she fears of his or her gods, be they scientific or traditional, for once the door is opened, there is no turning back.” [1]

* * *

Once the door is opened, there is no turning back.

Metaphysical uncertainty - at least in overview terms - is gone forever. Kaput. Vanished.

The previous five pages have sought to evince my personal “opening of the door” event.

Briefly, what happens is the replacement of “faith” - whistling through the graveyard if you will - with a *Knowing*, which emerges as *a process* that goes deeper and deeper, forever and forever. This leads the imperiencer - the inward-consciousness experiencer - to try to share a set of meaningful insights for the benefit of others; which, as a happy byproduct, enables a process of personal analytic clarification to gradually become more articulate and proficient.

The preceding book seeks to accomplish this for the reader, as it has for myself.

It has enabled me to be able to suggest that God has ‘two levels,’ if you will. The deeper level can be regarded as That which is ever *in potentiation*: a limitless reservoir of power and intelligence and emotional depth that is not revealed; not manifest; not yet brought forth. This reservoir of power - yes it sounds strange - *can be communicated with*. (The upper level is *you*).

If one chooses service-to-others self moral polarization, the reservoir can be activated toward what’s most readily called answers to prayers: prayers to give boons and / or aids to others. Or, in the service-to-ownself moral polarization, a ‘private nirvana’ is approached, and the world is left to suffer onwards. I cannot recommend the latter course. The public nirvana is much better.

— — — — —
[1] p148 in Chapter 7 - the first part of Part II, “Introceptualism” - in “Transformations in Consciousness, The Metaphysics and Epistemology,” containing as Part II, “Introceptualism;” by Franklin Merrell-Wolff (1887-1985); Pub. 1995 by S.U.N.Y. Press (State U. Plaza, Albany N.Y. 12246) . Underlining and one [parenthetical] remark added. And, please note:

Dr. Wolff’s pre-eminent writing accomplishment - “*The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object*” [and impliedly without a subject] is cited as Entry Four in Part A of the Annotated Bibliography

Special Section. The Rainbow Family of Living Light [1]

In 1971 two quasi-mystical, quasi-revolutionary youth groups in the U.S.A. coalesced around a vision for a kind of synthetic, cultural-reform / spiritual-revival “Gathering,” which was envisioned as being held the next summer at around the July 4th national holiday in Colorado.

They were planning a first-ever event. But it quickly became an annual event, and it quickly adopted for itself the moniker *The Rainbow Family of Living Light*.

Having imperienced (innerly experienced) a very galvanizing spiritual sense of the nearness of The Creator at my first-ever Gathering attended - the 13th, in California - I’ve been to all of them since then, excepting twice. So I’ve attended 35 of them [2]. (One attendee whose Rainbow moniker is Glowing Feather has attended 44 and a few others may match or even exceed that total).

As to those two youth groups, one was in OR and centered on a farm co-owned by Garrick Beck, whose parents were iconoclastic theater impresarios (“The LivingTheater”). The other was in WA and had a rather charismatic leader figure named Barry Adams (Rainbow name “Plunker”). In the course of my preparing an unofficial “hipstory” of the early Gatherings in 1990, I came to know both these persons, whose loyalty to the inner value or mystical value of the Gatherings has remained steadfast. Of course many many other notable figures have contributed, not least Ram Dass and the Grateful Dead, who helped word spread about the Gatherings from the stage at their gigs: especially via their unofficial ‘ringleader,’ Jerry Garcia.

In short, while the Gatherings are indelibly an American phenomenon - albeit kindred events rotate now in Europe (the Europa Gatherings) and globally (e.g., in Brazil; in Africa; etc.) - they are even more importantly and just as well, a *globally transformative spiritual* phenomenon.

This is their linkage with the fundamentally pluralistic *yet singular* mysticism of Hinduism.

Because - for all of having acquired a thick carapace of custom and ritual and ceremony - in essence Hinduism aspires to be a vehicle for *The Sanatan Dharma*, The Eternal Truth. This is it’s core mission. Does it accomplish this? Not always. Not in every instance. But still it does try. The Gatherings similarly try. *Both* are impelled by persons - mystics - who seek The Creator.

[1] These remarks are envisaged as an Annex Section to Chapter One - “*The Fundamental Pluralism of Indian Culture and Actual Hinduism*” - because they suggest that Rainbow in its Pluralism is Exhibit A that such variety now bids to spread worldwide. No longer “Hindu” per se; nor “Visionary Christian-based Americanism” per se; but *worldwide* in nature, and *mysticism-focused* in terms of a true and sincere service-to-others/polarization as I have sought to discuss this throughout this book.

[2] See listing on page three of this Special Section as to all of the annual “North American” Gathering sites.

Special Section. The Rainbow Family of Living Light (p2)

Now when I attended my first Gathering in 1984, the 13th in CA (see the following listing) - I had *no inkling* of the inner mystical value of the Gatherings. Giantweirdness dispelled my bias that the Gatherings were mere parties of aging, pot-addled hippies in the woods, and suchlike disparagements, which I myself had bought into on hearsay advice, leading to my first visit. My reappraisal was altogether transformative.

“KA- BAAAM.” The sizable lightning bolt landed about ten feet behind me at late dusk on 7/5/1984, and the brilliant flash of light that illuminated every forest twig in front of me alongside the virtually instantaneous roar of that KA-BAAAM is an epiphany I shall always cherish, for it was capped by the marvelous spontaneity of the cheer I heard from hundreds of Rainbow campers concealed in the forest all about: “*Yeah, God!*” The die was cast. I was in. the rest is history.

As if to seal the deal, a kindred epiphany transpired in 1985 in MO. It was the morning of July 4 and a more-or-less generally respected morning silence was being observed throughout the camp and I was conducting a sort of private prayer vigil at the edge of the main meadow; and, just as I completed my silent and personal veneration of The Creator and was settling my sandals in front of me.... KA-BAAM. But this time it was from two Air Force jets streaking low overhead, intending a kind of salute to the Gathering. Some caviled at this ‘honor,’ but it was transformative for me inasmuch as they roared overhead in a precise synchronicity with the capstone of my personal ablutions.

Withal, all such personal reminiscence is - I am well aware - at best a charming story for listeners or readers. At worst they sniff I’ve an over-active imagination. I’m impervious to such dismissals thanks to a very long, heavily freighted, trainload of yet other epiphanies both before - see Special Appendix A - and since; and, indeed, they’ve led to my full embrace of an oft-heard remark. “There are no coincidences.” In other words, there is a subtle *meantness* to this world drama, and upon multiple levels. Bestowed with a jeweler’s precision. In which we all participate.

To restate, we each - in ways known and unknown, and for better or worse - have a conscious input as to every nook and cranny of this ever-unfolding world maelstrom all about us. It echoes our inputs! Can we improve the outcomes? Ever is it so. Massively so. Never underestimate your personal power. Nor God’s! ‘Maelstrom’ it may seem, to be sure, at times; for surely there is drama aplenty. Yet, is it all ‘sound and fury, signifying nothing?’ Some - in the freedom vouchsafed to all - do cultivate such an attitude; yet, they with eyes to see can glimpse an in-dwelling harmony in which they - *and indeed, we all* - participate; however unwittingly; however unknowingly. “Veiled in my maya, I am not shown to many.” [Gita, translation No. 26; see entry one in Part A of the Annotated Bibliography] Can it be the Gita is correct in saying this? I say yes. And the Gita’s further admonition - seemingly so wild and far-fetched - may likewise be correct, as I am increasingly persuaded. “The Lord is everywhere and always perfect.”

In closing this reminiscence I dedicate it to dear Stephen the great love of my life.

Special Section. The Rainbow Family of Living Light (p 3)

(databases exist for maps and coordinates of each site, regarded as consecrated by prayer)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1, 1972, CO; | 34, 2005, W VA; ** |
| 2, 1973, WY; | 35, 2006, CO (bank offcl*); |
| 3, 1974, UT; | 36, 2007, AR; ** |
| 4, 1975, Ark; | 37, 2008, WY; ** |
| 5, 1976, MT; | 38, 2009, NM; ** |
| 6, 1977, NM; | 39, 2010, PA; ** |
| 7, 1978, OR; | 40, 2011, WA; ** |
| 8, 1979, AZ; | 41, 2012, TN; ** |
| 9, 1980, WV; | 42, 2013, MT; ** |
| 10, 1982, ID; | 43, 2014, UT; ** |
| 11, 1981, WA; | 44, 2015, SD; ** |
| 12, 1983 MI; then | 45, 2016, VT (Medicine Story*); |
| 13, 1984, CA, my first attended. [1] | 46, 2017, OR; ** |
| 14, 1985 MO (“Jets”*); | 47, 2018, GA; ** |
| 15, 1986 PA; ** | 48, 2019, WI; ** |
| 16, 1987 NC; ** | 49, 2020, (covid, but small satellite Gathering in ID); |
| 17, 1988 TX (Delirious: “welcome home”*); | 50, 2021, (“Prism” 4 smaller regionals NM, NC, PA |
| 18, 1989 NV; ** | and ID [pers. attended] **). |
| 19, 1990 MN; ** | 51, 2022, CO; ** |
| 20, 1991 VT (w SJD*); | 52, 2023, NH [2] |
| 21, 1992 CO; ** | |
| 22, 1992 KY / AL; ** | |
| 23, 1993 WY (in India); | |
| 24, 1994 NM; ** | |
| 25, 1995 MO (re-encountered Indian Friend*); | |
| 26, 1996 OR (1st for RSL); ** | |
| 27, 1998 AZ (on plateau); ** | |
| 28, 1999 PA (songs at Krishna tent*); | |
| 29, 2000 MT; ** | |
| 30, 2001 ID; ** | |
| 31, 2002 MI; ** | |
| 32, 2003 UT; ** | |
| 33, 2004 CA; ** | |

(* pers. reminiscence)

(** these, also, have personal reminiscences associated, but since the 8/18/20 Wildfire loss of my home my extensive archives are no longer available to rekindle many, many diverse memories)

[1] This enumeration of the USA sites - in each State on National Forest land, unlike the first one - shows all the North American Gathering Sites (as the ‘nationals’ are termed) and since 1984, continuing on, I have attended each one, excepting 23, 1994, WY (was in India), and 49, 2020 CO (“covid” but a small ‘semi-official’ event also occurred in ID); meaning, 37; albeit in 1993 (double site due to mis-communications) I was at the KY site not the AL site; and in 2021 (covid lingered so four sites) I was at the ID site, not the NM, NC or PA sites. [2] At this writing (6/13/23) it is unclear whether I will be able to attend.

THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY WITH PARTS A AND B

General Introduction

Books can be a tremendous assist - they've assisted me enormously - but they are no substitute for an inward thirst to know God, THAT of numberless names, venerated in all religions - the famous five being Hinduism, Judaism, Buddhism, Christianity and Islam - and Whom I have referenced as The Presence; The Creator; Infinite Density Consciousness; The One Infinite Creator of Intelligent Infinity; plus many other namings - "Dad," Giantweirdness; *consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject*; Primordial Consciousness / nirdvanda consciousness - because, in point of fact, the namings are infinite, truly endless. Concerning all of which the term in both secular and sacred usage has become, today, broadly and quite simply, *GOD*.

Part A supplies particulars on the five texts which most efficaciously and powerfully guide toward a genuine ingoddedness descending upon the sufficiently ardent seeker, and they are listed in order of importance *in my opinion*. I stress this so, because each seeker must form opinions of his or her own. 'Take what suits; discard the rest.' Any genuine seeker would be well advised to adopt this motto when perusing *any* book either in Part A or Part B. (Based on reader feedback successor editions of this book - if any there be - will add or delete texts with an overall emphasis on including more worthwhile books that have proven of real benefit).

As to Part A

Part A - the 'curated' version of this Annotated Bibliography - concerns just five texts given in the order of their importance. In my opinion, obviously.

The Bhagavad-Gita is number one for the obvious reasons provided in Special Appendix A. Specifically the Isherwood / Prabhavananda 1944 translation; and, even more specifically, excerpts from that translation as read by Zia Moheyydin in a cassette tape first issued by Caedmon Records in circa 1975. However, such is the deserved fame of the Gita - and in my opinion it's pre-eminent 'magical charge' if you will amongst all other of the world's great assemblage of spiritual / religious writings, which each carry something of a magical charge as well - that I try to supply reference to alternate translations and pre-eminent commentaries.

Number two is "The Ra Contact (Teaching the Law of One)." Citations from this writing occur throughout this book alongside discussions of it's central important themes.

Number three is "Autobiography of a Yogi" by Paramahansa Yogananda. Number four is "The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object [and impliedly without a Subject]" by FMW (7/11/1887-10/4/1985). Number five: "The Path of the Masters" by Dr. Julian Johnson.

THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

PART A

FIRST ENTRY: THE BHAGAVAD GITA

The following general remarks are excerpted from pages 36 to 46 of a copy made on January 23, 2023 from the internet website “https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bhagavad_Gita” The entirety of the Wikipedia entry for the Bhagavad Gita as copied, comprising 46 pages, are excerpted from in varying degrees in Chapter Eight along with my interspersed commentaries.

TRANSLATIONS

“The first English translation of the Bhagavad Gita was published by Charles Wilkins in 1785. The Wilkins translation had an introduction to the Gita by Warren Hastings. Soon the work was translated into other European languages such as French (1787), German, and Russian. In 1849, the Wesleyan Mission Press in Bangalore published *The Bhagavat-Geeta, Or, Dialogues of Krishna and Arjoon in Eighteen Lectures*, with Sanskrit, Canarese and English in parallel columns, edited by Rev. John Garrett, with the effort being supported by Sir Mark Cubbon.

* * *

“In 1981, Larson stated that ‘a complete listing of Gita translations and a related secondary bibliography would be nearly endless.’ According to Larson, there is ‘a massive translational tradition in English, pioneered by the British, solidly grounded philologically by the French and Germans, provided with its indigenous roots by a rich heritage of modern Indian comment and reflection, extended into various disciplinary areas by Americans, and having generated in our time a broadly based cross-cultural awareness of the importance of the Bhagavad Gita both as an expression of a specifically Indian spirituality and as one of the great religious classics of all time.’

“According to Sargeant, the Gita is ‘said to have been translated at least 200 times, in both poetic and prose forms.’ Richard Davis cites a count by Callewaert & Hemraj in 1982 of 1,891 translations of the Bhagavad Gita in 75 languages, including 273 in English. These translations vary, and are in part an interpretative reconstruction of the original Sanskrit text that differ in their ‘friendliness to the reader,’ and in the amount of ‘violence to the original Gita text.’

“The translations and interpretations of the Gita have been so diverse that these have been used to support apparently contradictory political and philosophical values. For example, Galvin Flood and Charles Martin note that interpretations of the Gita have been used to support ‘pacifism to aggressive nationalism’ in politics, from ‘monism to theism’ in philosophy. According to William Johnson, the synthesis of ideas in the Gita is such that it can bear almost any

shade of interpretation. A translation ‘can never fully reproduce an original and no translation is transparent,’ states Richard Davis, but in the case of the Gita the linguistic and cultural distance for many translators is large and steep which adds to the challenge and affects the translation. For some native translators, their personal beliefs, motivations and subjectivity affect their understanding, their choice of words and interpretation. Some translations by Indians, with or without Western co-translators, have ‘orientalist,’ ‘apologetic,’ ‘Neo-Vedantic’ or ‘guru phenomenon’ biases.”

* * *

Said website provides “A sample of translations of the Bhagavad Gita” as to 95 selected translations. For each: the Title used; the Translator’s name(s); and the Year first published.*

* All 95 are recited here; the 95th - 11.5 of 95 *Die Bhagavadgita* by Richard Garbe 1905 - was inadvertently omitted at first. See footnotes as to further particulars as to ten of these entries.

- | | | | |
|-------------|--|------------------------------|------------|
| 1 of 95. | <i>The Bhagavat geeta, or Dialogue of Kreeshna and Arjoon in Eighteen Lectures with Notes.</i> | Charles Wikins | 1785 |
| 2 of 95. | <i>Bhagavad-Gita.</i> | August Wilhelm Schlegel | 1823 |
| 3 of 95. | <i>The Bhagavadgita.</i> | J. C. Thomson | 1856 |
| 4 of 95. | <i>La Bhagavad-Gita.</i> | Eugene Burnout | 1861 |
| 5 of 95. | <i>The Bhagavad-Gita.</i> | Kashninath T. Telang | 1882 [1] |
| 6 of 95. | <i>The Song Celestial</i> | Sir Edwin Arnold | 1885 [2] |
| 7 of 95. | <i>The Bhagavad Gita.</i> | William Quan Judge | 1890 |
| 8 of 95. | <i>...Bhagavad-Gita with the Commentary of Sri Sankaracarya.</i> | A. Mahadeva Sastry | 1897 [10] |
| 9 of 95. | <i>Young Men’s Gita.</i> | Jagindranath Mukharji | 1900 |
| 10 of 95. | <i>Bhagavadgita: The Lord’s Song.</i> | L. D. Barnett | 1905 |
| 11 of 95. | <i>Bhagavad-Gita.</i> | Anne Besant and Bhagavan Das | 1905 [3] |
| 11.5 of 95. | <i>Die Bhagavadgita</i> | Richard Garbe | 1905 |
| 12 of 95. | <i>Srimad Bhagavad-Gita.</i> | Swami Swarupananda | 1909 [4] |
| 13 of 95. | <i>Der Gesang des Heiligen.</i> | Paul Deussen | 1911 |
| 14 of 95. | <i>Srimad Bhagavad-Gita.</i> | Swami Paramananda | 1913 [5] |

THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY, PART A, Entry Number One, *Continued p 3*

15 of 95.	<i>La Bhagavad-Gita.</i>	Emile Senart	1915?
16 of 95.	<i>The Bhagavad-Gita according to Gandhi.</i>	Mohandas K. Gandhi	1926
17 of 95.	<i>The Bhagavad Gita.</i>	W. Douglas P. Hill	1928
18 of 95.	<i>The Bhagavad-Gita.</i>	Arthur W. Ryder	1929
19 of 95.	<i>The Song of the Lord, Bhagavad-Gita.</i>	E. J. Thomas	1931 [6]
20 of 95.	<i>The Geeta.</i>	Shri Purohit Swami	1935
21 of 95.	<i>The Yoga of the Bhagavat Gita.</i>	Sri Krishna Prem	1938
22 of 95.	<i>The Message of the Gita (or Essays on the Gita)</i>	Sri Aurobindo ed by Anilbaran Roy	1938
23 of 95.	<i>Bhagavadgita.</i>	Swami Sivananda	1942
24 of 95.	<i>Bhagavad Gita.</i>	Swami Nikhilananda	1943
25 of 95.	<i>The Bhagavad Gita.</i>	Franklin Edgerton	1944 [7]
26 of 95.	<i>Bhagavad Gita: The Song of God.</i>	Swami Prabhavananda and Christopher Isherwood	1944 [8]
27 of 95.	<i>The Bhagavad-Gita.</i>	Swami Nikhilananda	1944
28 of 95.	<i>The Bhagavadgita.</i>	S. Radhakrishnan	1948 [9]
29 of 95.	<i>God Talks with Arjuna.</i>	Paramhansa Yogananda	1955
30 of 95.	<i>The Bhagavadgita.</i>	Shakuntala Rao Sastri	1959
31 of 95.	<i>The Bhagavad Gita.</i>	Juan Mascaro	1962
32 of 95.	<i>Bhagavad Gita.</i>	C. Rajagopalachari	1963
33 of 95.	<i>The Bhagavadgita.</i>	Swami Chidbhavananda	1965
34 of 95.	<i>The Bhagavad Gita.</i>	Maharishi Mahesh Yogi	1967
35 of 95.	<i>The Bhagavadgita: Translated with Introduction and Critical Essays.</i>	Eliot Deutsch	1968
36 of 95.	<i>Bhagavad-Gita As It Is.</i>	A. C. Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupada	1968

THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY, PART A, Entry Number One, *Continued p 4*

- | | | |
|---|------------------------|-----------|
| 37 of 95. <i>The Bhagavad Gita.</i> | R. C. Zaehner | 1969 |
| 38 of 95. <i>The Bhagavad Gita: A New Verse Translation.</i> | Ann Stanford | 1970 |
| 39 of 95. <i>The Holy Gita, Translation and Commentary.</i> | Swami Chinmayananda | 1972 |
| 40 of 95. <i>Srimad Bhagavad Gita.</i> | Swami Vireswarananda | 1974 |
| 41 of 95. <i>Bhagavad-Gita: A Verse Translation.</i> | Geoffrey Parrinder | 1974 |
| 42 of 95. <i>The Bhagavad Gita.</i> | Kees. W. Bolle | 1979 |
| 43 of 95. <i>The Bhagavad Gita.</i> Winthrop Sargeant and Chistopher K. Chapple, editor | | 1979 |
| 44 of 95. <i>The Bhagavadgita in the Mahabharata.</i> | J. A. B. van Buitenen | 1981 |
| 45 of 95. <i>The Bhagavad-Gita.</i> | Winthrop Sargeant | 1984 |
| 46 of 95. <i>Srimad Bhagavad Gita of Sri Samkaracharya.</i> | A. G. Krishna Warriar | 1984 [10] |
| 47 of 95. <i>The Bhagavadgita.</i> | Eknath Easwaran | 1985 |
| 48 of 95. <i>Srimad Bhagavad Gita</i> | Swami Tapasyananda | 1985 |
| 49 of 95. <i>Bhagavad Gita.</i> | Srinivasa Murthy | 1985 |
| 50 of 95. <i>The Bhagavad-Gita: Krishna's Counsel in Time of War.</i> Barbara Stoler Miller | | 1986 |
| 51 of 95. <i>Bhagavad-Gita.</i> | Ragavan Iyer | 1986 |
| 52 of 95. <i>The Bhagavad-Gita.</i> | Ramananda Prasad | 1988 |
| 53 of 95. <i>Bhagavad-Gita for You & Me.</i> | M. S. Patwardhan | 1990 |
| 54 of 95. <i>Bhagavad-Gita.</i> | Antonio T. De Nicholas | 1991 |
| 55 of 95. <i>Bhagavad Gita.</i> | Sachindra K. Majumdar | 1991 |
| 56 of 95. <i>Bhagavad Gita.</i> | O. P. Ghai | 1992 |
| 57 of 95. <i>Ramanuja Gita Bhashya.</i> | Swami Adidevananda | 1992 |
| 58 of 95. <i>Gita Bhashya.</i> | Jagannatha Prakasha | 1993 |

THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY, PART A, Entry Number One, *Continued p 5*

- 59 of 95. *Bhagavad-Gita: Translation and Commentary.* Richard Gotshalk 1993
- 60 of 95. *The Bhagavad Gita.* P. Lal 1994
- 61 of 95. *The Bhagavad-Gita.* W. J. Johnson 1994
- 62 of 95. *Bhagavad Gita (The Song of God).* Ramananda Prasad 1996
- 63 of 95. *Bhagavad Gita.* Vrinda Nabar and Shanta Tumkur 1997
- 64 of 95. *The Living Gita: ...A Commentary for Modern Readers.* Swami Satchidananda 1997
- 65 of 95. *Bhagavad-Gita.* Satyananda Saraswati 1997
- 66 of 95. *Bhagavad-Gita with the Commentary of Sankaracarya.* Swami Gambhirananda 1998 [10]
- 67 of 95. *Bhagavad Gita, With Commentary of Sankara.* Alladi M. Sastry 1998 [10]
- 68 of 95. *Transcreation of the Bhagavad Gita.* Ashok K. Malhotra 1998
- 69 of 95. *You Know Me: The Gita.* Irina Gajjar 1999
- 70 of 95. *The Bhagavad-Gita, Your Charioteer in the Battlefield of Life.* R. K. Piparaiya 1999
- 71 of 95. *The Bhagavad-Gita, an Original Translation.* V. Jayaram 2000
- 72 of 95. *Bhagavad Gita: A Walkthrough for Westerners.* Jack Hawley 2001
- 73 of 95. *Bhagavad Gita.* Rosetta Williams 2001
- 74 of 95. *The Bhagavad Gita of Order.* Anand Aadhar Prabhu 2001
- 75 of 95. *Bhagavad Gita: The Song Divine.* Carl E. Woodham 2001
- 76 of 95. *The Bhagavat Gita (as part of the Wisdom Bible).* Sanderson Beck 2001
- 77 of 95. *Bhagavad-Gita: A New Translation.* Stephen Mitchell 2002
- 78 of 95. *Bhagavad Gita As a Living Experience.* Wilfried Huchzermeyer and Jutta Zimmermann 2002
- 79 of 95. *Bhagavad Gita.* Alan Jacobs 2002
- 80 of 95. *Bhagavad Gita: Translation and Commentary.* Veeraswamy Krishnaraj 2002

THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY, PART A, Entry Number One, *Continued p 6*

- 81 of 95. *The Bhagavad Gita*. Richard Prime 2003
- 82 of 95. *The Sacred Song: A New Translation of the Bhagavad Gita for the Third Millenium*. McComas Taylor and Richard Stanley 2004
- 83 of 95. *Srimad Bhagavad Gita*. Swami Dayananda Saraswati 2007
- 84 of 95. *The Bhagavad-Gita: A New Translation*. George Thompson 2008
- 85 of 95. *The Bhagavad Gita, A New Translation*. Georg Feuerstein 2011
- 86 of 95. *The Bhagavad-Gita: A Text and Commentary for Students*. Jeaneane D. Fowler 2012
- 87 of 95. *The Bhagavad Gita: A New Translation*. Gavin Flood and Charles Martin 2012
- 88 of 95. *Bhagavad-Gita: The Song of God*. Swami Mukundananda 2013
- 89 of 95. *Bhagavad-Gita: Rhythm of Krishna*. (Gita in Rhymes) Sushrut Badhe 2015
- 90 of 95. *Philosophy of the Bhagavad-Gita*. Keya Maitra 2018
- 91 of 95. *The Bhagavad Gita Chapter 1 to 13 - English*. ISBN 978-93-87578-96-8 Ravi Shankar 2018
- 92 of 95. *The Bhagavad Gita*. Bibek Debroy 2019
- 93 of 95. *The Teachings of Bhagavad Gita: Timeless Wisdom for the Modern Age* Richa Tilokani 2021
- 94 of 95. *The Poetic Saga of Mahabharata*. Shiva Ramnath Pillutla 2022
- 95 of 95. **

* * *

*End of excerpts from Wikipedia Entry as above noted, inclusive of the 95 translations cited (**95 including 11.5 of 95 *Die Bhagavadgita* by Richard Garbe, 1905, inadvertently omitted at first).*

The website listing concludes as follows: “According to exegesis scholar Robert Minor, the Gita is ‘probably the most translated of any Asian text,’ but many modern versions heavily reflect the views of the organization or person who does the translating and distribution. In Minor’s view, the Harvard scholar Franklin Egerton’s English translation* and Richard Garbe’s German translation are closer to the text than many others. According to Larson the Edgerton translation is remarkably faithful, but it is ‘harsh, stilted, and syntactically awkward’ with an ‘orientalist’ bias and lacks ‘appreciation of the text’s contemporary religious significance.’ ”

* this translations - and others of note - has a footnote number as to further remarks which begin on the following page.

- [1] No. 5 of the 94 preceding translations - almost all to English - is the 1882 translation by Kashnininath T. Telang. Prof. Telang's translation appears as Volume Eight in the fifty-volume "Sacred Books of the East," general editor F. Max Mueller (/ / - / /), first published in 1882 (Oxford University Press). Quoting from the bibliography to my book manuscript entitled "*What IS Reality, Anyway? (Thirteen 'Controversies' and The Law of One as enunciated by RA)*," which remains unpublished as of this writing:
- “ [these 50 volumes] supplied the West with more or less it's first in-depth scholarly acquaintance with Hinduism (21 volumes, as to primarily the Vedic Brahmanic system plus the catholic lay treatise so deservedly called the crown jewel of Hindu spirituality, *The Bhagavad Gita*), Buddhism (10 volumes), Jainism (2 volumes, thus completing a 33-volume conspectus on India's three most influential traditions); China (6 volumes, 2 of them concerning Taoism); Persia (8 volumes on Zoroastrianism); and Arabia (2 volumes as to the Qu'ran), thus completing an overall total of forty-nine volumes, with the 50th volume containing the index. This is still the sole translation for very many of the less read texts, especially concerning Hinduism, but concerning the other faith traditions as well.
- [2] Sir Edwin Arnold (5/14/1857-3/3/1935) titled his translation "*The Song Celestial*" which was published in 1885 by Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. [London] and it remains one that is widely cited.
- [3] The "Sixth Adyar Edition" of 1968 as personally consulted, shows copyright by The Theosophical Publishing House [Adyar, Madras 20, India] and is 231 pages including index and is 4.5" x 5.5" in this hardback edition. Theosophy remains important as a school and lineage in metaphysics of course but this translation appears to be less widely cited.
- [4] The thirteenth revised edition of June 1982 shows copyright Advaita Ashrama [5 Delhi Entally Rd., Calcutta 700-014, India] and is 435 pages. A fourteenth edition was issued in August of 1989. This translation by Swami Swarupananda (/ / - / /) continues to enjoy popularity in India.
- [5] The Swami Paramanda (/ / - / /) translation of 1913 First Edition publication, is among "over 825 published books" cited in the bibliography of a book discussing the life and philosophy of Franklin Merrell-Wolff (1887-1985), whose most important book is cited as entry Four in Part A of this annotated bibliography. While Mr. V's book builds upon commendable scholarship, it's so grievous in it's incomprehension about FMW's philosophical contribution to western philosophy - and world philosophy concerning mysticism and gnosticism - that it is deliberately omitted from further reference here, but interested readers can write for my pamphlet of criticism giving it's publication particulars.
- [6] The E. J. Thomas (/ / - / /) translation of 1931 First Edition publication was included in a series of books entitled "The Wisdom of the East," and is cited by Prof. Lin Yutang (/ / - / /).
- [7] The Edgerton translation of 1944 First Edition publication, praised for accuracy on the preceding page is among the translations I will try to consult if I'm ever able to assist in a 'modern English' translation
- [8] The Isherwood (/ / - / /) / Prabhavananda (/ / - / /) translation of 1944 First Edition publication, by Vedanta Society of Southern California: see Special Appendix A.

- [9] The S. Radhakrishnan (/ 1880- / 1955) translation of 1948 First Edition publication (28th on the 94 list): George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London. The 1973 paperback Edition is 388 pages, pub. by Harper & Row (NY, Hagerstown, SF, London; ISBN 0-06-090489-5). Oxford Professor Radhakrishnan served as the first President of Independent India and dedicated this translation to Mahatma Gandhi. His philosophical writing - see Part B of this Annotated Bibliography - served as a principal resource in preparing Chapters Three and Four. This translation has an Introductory Essay and then the text in Sanskrit and then his translation into English, with notes.
- [10] Four translations incorporate the commentary of Shankara (I am using the Americanized spelling of his name). In his short 32 year life span - according to recent scholarship, from around 700 to around 750 CE (Common Era) / AD (“After Dead” is now regarded as too ethnocentric as to Christianity) - he exerted a tremendous impact on Hindu thought and practice, although modern scholarship traces his fame and influence becoming widespread from the 14th Century onward, as mainstream Hinduism came to venerate his Advaita Vedanta - nondual reality - philosophical writings, encouraged by the patronage of powerful Hindu kings who had hitherto supported Shaivism (worship of Shiva). As often happens in Hinduism, Shankara attained to almost a god-like status in some hagiographies, but as a practical matter he is credited with founding India’s nation-wide system of monasteries which still predominate; and equally or more importantly, arguing for philosophical rapprochement between Buddhism and Hinduism, which is today known as Advaita (nondual) Vedanta (the Vedas are the sacred texts of Hinduism), such that the Vedas are interpreted as affirming the sort of nondualism which is so characteristic of Buddhist thought (“anatman,” no self), versus the plethora of gods and goddesses in Hinduism (the “atman” or self of God seen as manifesting through many forms). The issues involved are subtle. Dr. Wolff elucidates the interrelationship between self or atman, and nirdvanda or anatman, following in the philosophical tradition of Shankara: that these two doctrines are not in conflict, but represent Realization as having a “mystical” depth... which then can and often does deepen to a “gnostic” or nondual depth. In affirming this view, I have added the remark that a sort of ‘leakage’ between these two depths is, in fact, happening all the time.

Be all this as it may, over 300 commentaries and expositions are attributed to Shankara, but modern scholarship regards most of these as actually authored by admirers or students or others. Still, the Shankara commentaries on the Gita remain hugely influential and esteemed, and they are included in the 1897 Sastry translation (11th of the 95 translations list), the 1984 Warrier translation (46th of the 95 translations list), the 1998 Gambhirananda translation (66th of the 95 translations list), and the 1998 Sastry translation (67th of the 95 translations list).

Previously, I studied a “1984 First Edition” of the Gambhirananda translation: 826 pages in a February 1991 paperback second edition of same, issued by Advaita Ashrama (5 Delhi Entally Road, Calcutta 700-014 India). There may have been a 1998 re-issuance, leading to the 1998 date above cited. (Dates for Shankara therein cited: dob, c 686; deceased circa 718 AD).

* * *

This concludes Entry Number One on the Bhagavad Gita in Part A of the Annotated Bibliography.

THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

PART A

SECOND ENTRY: THE RA CONTACT: TEACHING THE LAW OF ONE

The above-titled book is so much an important refinement of how ‘The RA Material’ was first published, that in large measure it truly constitutes a new text: a 2018 first edition issuance.

However, since I know a something of the back-story I am going to begin by providing my Part A Second Entry as it was prepared for the Annotated Bibliography for “*Thirteen ‘Controversies’ and The Law of One as Enunciated by Ra*” in 2018: a book manuscript which as of this writing (6/15/23) remains unpublished. [That Part A cited the same texts as *this* Part A - Gita; Law of One; Autobiography of a Yogi; The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object; - to which I’ve added a fifth text: The Path of the Masters.]

2. “The Law of One.” *The Law is One. You are the embodiment of that Law; you, and the Cosmos.*

This book [the book manuscript “*Thirteen ‘Controversies’ and The Law of One as Enunciated by Ra*”] has addressed thirteen ‘controversies’ that may arise, for some, when Ra endeavors to articulate for the Questioner (Don Elkins, 2/28/1930-11/7/1984) via the medium or channel or “instrument” who is in trance (Carla Rueckert, 7/16/1943-4/1/2015, later married name Carla McCarty), The Law of One; which, as I seek always to point out, has been articulated and re-articulated many, many times, since time immemorial.

Ra’s articulation of The Law of One, as a written text then, faithfully transcribed by Jim McCarty (5/10/1947 - / / , who alone of the trio is still in earthly bodily form as I write this), has gone through **three editions** since the actual transmission sessions which occurred from 1/15/ 81 - 3 /15 /1984. ‘Providentially’ - at the time I viewed it as happenstance but now I regard it otherwise - I met Jim and Carla in 1985 (6/26/85 to be exact), and have been able to glean Ra’s comments articulating The Law of One, not only based from the First Edition, but from dialog with Jim and Carla (especially Jim), and from much re-reading of both the first and second editions. I’ll quote from a letter from Jim received just today - 1/7/2018 - as to an overview on the first two editions:

“Yes, you basically have the order of the publications correct. The Donning Company published THE RA MATERIAL as the first mass-market publisher in 1982 **after we had published them privately in the large, blue books in 1981 and 1982.** [The First Edition.] Then The Donning Company sold our rights to Schiffer Publications who published Books II, III, & IV in 1992. They then published Book V, the Personal Material in 1998.” emphasis and [interposition] added

Thus, the Second Edition appeared in 1982-1992 (with a one volume addenda in 1998), after the first edition of 1981-1982. While, sentimentally, I treasure my copies of the First and Second Editions, the soon-to-issue Third Edition is truly the Edition to attend to, because of extensive careful correction of minor transmittal errors that crept into the First and Second Editions; and, owing to the relistening project overseen by Tobey Wheelock, who maintains the truly invaluable informational website,

<http://www.lawofone.info>

Thus, I provide below the most detailed bibliographic information concerning **The Third Edition**. As I've bemusedly remarked to Jim, bibliophiles may in future seek out - due to rarity - editions One and Two, but for they who truly wish to attend to the pith and essence of what Ra has to say about The Law of One, **pay attention to The Third Edition!** More important still, pay attention to what The Creator whispers in thy ear, moment to moment; day to day; for, we *each* are vessels of the pith and essence of The One Infinite Creator of Intelligent Infinity; as is this grand cosmos.

So to reiterate, the First Edition was self published and was issued as four large books in 1981-1982 under the simple and immediate title suggested by Ra: ***"The Law of One."*** No exact records still exist but about four thousand copies, overall, were printed. Then the Second Edition appeared - as to the re-issuance of all four books under the title *"The Ra Material (an Ancient Astronaut Speaks)"* plus a Book V (hitherto omitted personal material) - across a sixteen year span, 1982 to 1998, as explained just above, via Donning Company (Donning Co. publr., 5659 Virginia Beach Blvd, Norfolk VA) / Schiffer Publications (Whitford Press of Schiffer Publg. Ltd., 4880 Lower Valley Road, Atglen PA 19310). [Eff. 6/24/23, 227,000 copies printed of 2nd Ed.: 100,000, *just* Book 1; 43,000, *just* Book 2; 34,000, *just* Book 3, 31,000, *just* Book 4 and 19,000, *just* Book 5].

As of this writing (1/23/2018) the Third Edition has yet to be 'launched' - the considerable preparation behind a carefully reviewed-and-adjusted successor edition can be compared to launching a yacht or a battleship or a newly manufactured jet coming out of it's hangar - but is due imminently; it's particulars were summarized as follows [in excerpted form] in a Christmas Card Letter I received on 12/11/17:

"...the preparation for publication of *"The Ra Contact: Teaching The Law of One"* [has been going on all year in 2017]. This will include the transcripts created by re-listening to Carla's channeling of Ra, the basis of which comes from **Tobey Wheelock's Relistening Project**, plus a new Introduction, Dedication, Acknowledgements, New Photo Gallery, Index and End-notes. There will be two volumes to hold all 283,000 words... [about] The Law of One [as presented by Ra [1]]. All of the work to publish these [two volumes] is being done 'in house' by Austin [Bridges] and Gary [Bean] in the L/L office." [Emphasis and six [interpositions] added].

THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY, PART A, Entry Number Two, *Continued p3*

[1] As I've been at pains many times to observe, The Law of One is a true universal, and can be - and has been - expressed in limitless ways since time immemorial. Each fresh expression brings fresh vigor and clarity to a timeless verity; this Ra has *commendably* done!

* * *

After the above was written, 12/11/17 - 1/7/18, the 'Third Edition' - and as noted, in many important respects a very much *corrected* Edition, so much as to be *almost* a 'New First Edition' - has been issued in 2018 with many very important improvements and clarifications:

The Ra Contact: Teaching the Law of One; two volumes; "Source: Ra, an Humble Messenger of the Law of One; Instrument: Carla L. Rueckert; Questioner: Don Elkins; Scribe: Jim McCarty." *Aided by* "Relistening Project: Tobey Wheelock." *Production and Editing:* Gary Bean and Austin Bridges. First printing issued on , 2018. Second printing issued on August 28, 2020. Copyright 2018 by L/L Research and Tobey Wheelock. ISBN 978-0-945007-98-2. Published by L/L Research, P.O.Box 5195, Louisville KY 40255-0195, USA. Two websites: <www.llresearch.org> (email: <contact@llresearch.org>); and <<http://www.lawofone.info>>. 541 pages in Volume One, and 539 pages in Volume Two; includes Glossary and Index.

I wish to conclude with a special thanks to Aaron Maret, who provided the cover art for Volume One, and oversaw the cover art for Volume Two, which includes a photo by Mark Zealor. Aaron's sense of design for both covers is in my opinion spectacular. One could say *heaven sent*.

* * *

THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY, PART A, Entry Number Three

Autobiography of a Yogi by Paramahansa Yogananda (1/5/1893 - 3/7/1952); "1947 Edition Copyright (c) 1947," pub. by Self-Realization Fellowship (3880 San Rafael Av, L.A. CA 90065-3298). "Author's Acknowledgements" is dated 10/28/1945. My previous copy was the 2003 paperback printing of the 1998 Thirteenth Edition. Frontispiece: "translated into 21 other languages." Many editions and many languages are hallmarks of a true classic and this is the case here.

The Philosophical Library (15 East 40th Street, NYC) was the publisher of the 1946 First Edition, indicating "Copyright 1946 by Paramhansa Yogananda." A 1995 Reprint of the 1946 First Edition was published by Crystal Clarity Publishers (14618 Tyler Foote Road, Nevada City CA 95959), Tel. (800) 424-1055. My copy of this facsimile edition (which includes "errors of

spelling, grammar or punctuation”) is 481 pages; the typeset is in a font resembling the original font. “In 1953, SRF, the organization founded by Yogananda in Los Angeles... acquired the rights to *Autobiography of a Yogi* from Philosophical Library; it has been the publisher of all subsequent editions, until this original reprint put out by Crystal Clarity, Publishers. [*Which is*] ...the publishing house of Ananda Church of Self-Realization. // Ananda... was founded in 1968 by one of Yogananda’s direct disciples, J. Donald Walters (Kriyananda).” Publication date: 1993, “the 100th anniversary of Paramhansa Yogananda’s birth in 1893.” *From the frontispiece of said edition.*

Inasmuch as my house - with all documents and rare books, etc. - was destroyed in a California wildfire on 8/18/20, I will quote from a draft for this entry prepared on 1/25/18: “... the Introduction in my own paperback copy of the 13th edition (p xviii) notes that The Philosophical Library... issued the First Edition in 1946, ‘but only after much “shopping” of the manuscript to many publishers by Miss L. V. Pratt (Tara Mata), Yogananda’s brilliant and devoted editor as to finalizing the book in it’s manuscript form. Then, it was only in the 7th edition of 1956 that all of Yogananda’s revisions before his physical passing were fully incorporated in *Autobiography of a Yogi*.’ SRF - address as above - also provides free [or low cost] other books, pamphlets and essays that Yogananda wrote before his passing.”

As cited for Entry One - 29 of 94, p 156 - Yogananda’s Gita translation with commentary, is doubtless worthwhile but I have yet to personally review it. Before providing another quote from my 1/25/18 entry draft, I wish to note that a key episode in the *Autobiography* was singularly important for me: in it, Yogananda is candid about an appeal to God that he had... and that that appeal went un-answered. I will omit citing the relevant episode, because it’s the general point that’s important: even a very purified and advanced yogi such as Yogananda with - as some would see it, including myself - a highly purified pipeline of prayer-communication with Intelligent Infinity... even such a soul has wishes and aspirations which The Creator in It’s infinite wisdom/love / love/wisdom, sees fit not to accede to. For surely there remains a vast gulf between human “third density” consciousness (Ra’s term) and... infinite density consciousness.

“Gentle humor. Abiding humility. Relentless but politely rendered candor. And, above all, a frank confession of Yogananda’s ardent pursuit of an intimate relationship with God. With - the true magic of this wonderful account - a splendid portrayal of all that Yogananda had come to understand about God; or, as much as can be expressed in words in any event. Notwithstanding the ineffability and evanescence of Intelligent Infinity, Yogananda succeeds in giving us a brilliant portrait; a truly valuable portal into realms lofty and mysterious and difficult to comprehend.”

Two closing points. (A) It was a very pure spiritual seeker (his aura was quite distinct) who urged me to pay close attention to this book. (B) Heed this truth: even a classic such as this, can encounter the cold shoulder from publishers! (This has occurred for many other now-classics too!).

The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object [*and, impliedly without a Subject in any proper use of the term*] (**Reflections on the Nature of Transcendental Consciousness**) by Franklin Merrell-Wolff (1887-1985*). First Edition published in 1973 by Julian Press (div. of Crown Publ'g Group, 1 Park Av, NYC NY 10016) and Copyright that year by FMW. 265 pages in the paperback version of the First Edition. [*July 11, 1887 to October 4, 1985; thus: 7/11/1887-10/4/1985].

In 1983-1984 I became acquainted with this book in the course of research at Stanford's Green Library, impelled by the imperiences (inward consciousness experiences) described in Special Appendix A. I began a detailed study on 3/27/1984 (my notes show I bought my copy that day), which led to the great honor of meeting Dr. Wolff in Lone Pine CA that summer. As to general observations I stand by my summary as composed on 1/25/2018 as updated:

This great work by an accomplished mystic is the fourth of five texts I so esteem as to give it highlighted special consideration in this Part A of my Annotated Bibliography for "*Hinduism and The Law of One*." It has greatly aided me toward a better grounding as to God's Infinite Grandeur.

Using the ever-fraught term "God" in relation to FMW's philosophical masterpiece may be seen as a 'muddying' by some. But Realization permeates all of FMW's writings whether with obvious emphasis or subtly; and Realization as I understand it - and as Dr. Wolff is at pains to point out - is a development in consciousness that partakes both of a *mystical* dimension (where the actuality of God as a powerful presence, The Other, is massive), and a still deeper *gnostic* dimension, where the nature of Divinity has become so all-permeate throughout one's sense-of-self that distinction between "me" or "I" and "God" has become fainter and fainter until - for all intents and purposes - the terms both reference a simple pure unity.

FMW was ever attempting to distinguish his careful philosophical presentation from the inevitable emotional component that accompanies religiosity broadly considered; and which of course vectors into the term *God*. Which in broadest customary usage presupposes a personalistic Creator with whom the sadakha (spiritual seeker) desires either a mergence-with (a la jnana or wisdom yoga, *gnosis*); or, companionability-with (bhakti or devotional yoga, *mysticism*). The value of this masterpiece is that it employs a truly penetrating intellect to ever so carefully disentangle Divinity regarded as on the one hand Creative towards a maya (or 'lila' or divine play, when Divine Presence is discerned by the seeker as truly behind *all* 'random' appearances); and on the other hand as Quiescent vis-a-vis a 'blown out' state - nirvana or moksha - denoting consciousness without objects-awareness in any ordinary sense. But then the capstone of his presentation is invoked. Yet a third dimension or quale, which - although the term may be

misleading - FMW terms the High Indifference. Rather than defend this extremely subtle pointer notion - whose hallmark is indeed Infinite Power - I hope the reader is by this point of whetted appetite to peruse this richly rewarding text for him or herself.

The Franklin Merrell-Wolff Fellowship - P. O. Box 162, Burlington WI 51305-0162 USA and email at <contact@merrell-wolff.org> - maintains an excellent website:

<<http://www.merrell-wolff.org>>

Thereat (or via regular mail if the reader prefer and of course offsetting donations are always most welcome), "The Franklin Merrell-Wolff Fellowship Newsletter" appears on a quarterly basis, and contains very helpful background information about FMW (e.g. interviews with persons who knew FMW and etc.). The website itself is a veritable cornucopia of material concerning nearly all of FMW's writings and lectures.

As of this writing (6/17/23) the Fellowship is nearing the end of an over thirteen-year effort to assemble all of Dr. Wolff's writings and papers and books in one carefully supervised archive for the benefit of future scholars and students. Personally I hope they will be finally housed at Stanford University, where Dr. Wolff once taught, and where the University has hitherto expressed a willingness. Yet the process is not yet complete. There is an intricate backstory about all of this effort and the general details have been outlined in a draft issue of the Fellowship Newsletter: which either myself or the Fellowship can attempt to summarize to interested readers. All of the fraught complexities - while quite interesting - are very much beyond the scope of even this extended and annotated bibliographical entry.

* * *

The Path of the Masters by Dr. Julian P. Johnson (8/11/1867 - 1/25/1939) [Full title: "*The Path of the Masters: The Science of Surat Shabd Yoga: The Yoga of the Audible Life Stream*"]. 216 pages in the abridged 1965 second edition (5000 copies), which I acquired on 4/5/1984. First Edition publication in 1939 in France; in 1957 in the USA. Publisher: Radha Soami Satsang in Beas, East Punjab, India. The Indian Edition was "slightly revised by the... Publications Committee in 1972 and 1985 to delete provocative language, and extensively revised in 1993" (whereat the chapters of said edition were radically re-arranged and have remained so in successor editions). ISBN 81-8256-019-5.

The copy of this remarkable book which I presently have is cited on the following page, where I explain the reasons that, in my opinion, this landmark writing deserves special mention.

The Path of the Masters (The Science of Surat Shabd Yoga) by J. Johnson, op cit.; Copyright 1939; 572 pages in Hardback 1972 “Eighth Edition,” 5000 copies (1st, 1939, 2000 copies; 2nd, 1951 (reprint in USA), 2000 copies; 3rd, *revised*, 1957, 1000 copies; 4th, 1968 (reprint in USA), 1000 copies; 5th, *revised*, 1963, 2000 copies; 6th, *revised*, 1965, 3000 copies; 7th, *revised*, 1969); Publisher: Shri K. L. Khanna, Secretary, Radha Soami Satsang, Beas (Punjab), India. Subtitle: *Yoga of the Audible Life Stream*.

I am relieved I have a copy prior to the extensive revisions of 1993.

A case can be made for the original edition: some strongly favor the original edition of Darwin’s *Origin of Species*, and I personally suspect that Professor Bucke’s untimely death upon his finishing *Cosmic Consciousness* may have - by ‘mistake,’ or, arguably, by Divine Design? - preserved his great classic in it’s First Edition freshness forever and ever.

But this is not to say that a genuine case cannot also be made for very careful and judicious editing as to a Revised Edition. In this regard please refer to the discussion of the greatly revised and improved Third Edition of “...*The Law of One*.” Entry Two of this Part A of my Annotated Bibliography just preceding.

However, I find Dr. Johnson’s at times unvarnished language wholly refreshing.

A certain authenticity radiates. I do worry that over-fretful editing can harm more than help

* * *

Be all that as it may, there’s one overriding reason to single out this book for special praise. The reality behind the term that Dr. Johnson coined: the Audible Life Stream.

I know it is true.

I tried to explain how I know in Special Appendix A

* * *

A very helpful Wikipedia article on Dr. Johnson can be consulted, as I did on the 5th of June this year (2023): <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Julian_Johnson>

A closing note may be worthwhile. Factionalism can and does afflict religious and spiritual organizations large and small; benign (service-to-others self morally polarized) or... malicious (service-to-ownself morally polarized). I have seen enough of this up close to realize that schisms and quarrels are a well-nigh universal. Take Exhibit A, the history of Christianity! Or Judaism! Or... I could go on and on. It’s everywhere. Hence: fret not over the quarreling, the doctrinal schisms. Remember the primary focus: communion with Intelligent Infinity. Do I know how I was guided to The Music? I do not. But I’m here to say it happened. And that it can for you as well.

THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

PART B

Whereas Part A provides the publication information on just five texts, this Part B is open-ended; a great number of books deserve inclusion to some extent or other, and later Editions - if there are any - may supply many more book citations, perhaps in a helter-skelter presentation as at present [1], but perhaps in more orderly fashion. General preference has been given to widely acclaimed - e.g. more authoritative - commentaries on Hinduism generally, and/or important translations of Hindu texts and scriptures; but relevant books on the general subject of the universality of mystic and / or gnostic Realization - touching as these do on the true universality of The Law of One - are cited as well. And:

A notation on the biography of the principal author of each book is supplied in a minimal fashion as to date-of-birth / date-deceased (*unless still 'in physical' at entry of citation*), whether known - e.g. (5/14/1857 - 3/1/1935) per Sir Edwin Arnold - or, *if as yet unknown*, a place for future inclusion is provided, to wit, (/ / - / /).

* * *

1. *The System of the Vedanta, According to Baadarayana's Brahma Sutras and Cankara's [Shankara's] Commentary Thereon, Set Forth as a Compendium of the Dogmatics of Brahmanism from the standpoint of Cankara [Shankara]*; translated by Paul Jakob Deussen (/ / - / /); 1883 First Edition, ___ Publ. (in German); ___ pp in 1912 / 1973 English Editions, Dover Publications, N.Y., NY, USA, Publ. [no. 200 in V's bibliography cited at fn 5, p 160, Part A]. German scholarship pioneered an acquaintance with Hinduism and Buddhism in the West, starting around 1850. Schopenhauer and other philosophers in Europe and the U.S. found inspiration concerning the world-transcending mysticism referenced in treatises such as this one.

continued on page two

[1] "The General Section of this Annotated Bibliography is of course curated as well but with this proviso. The cited writings are 'helter skelter,' deliberately so. After all every writing has something of redeeming worth and - yes - it's own 'magical charge' so to say. Thus I am continually in a process of sifting and curating from amongst hundreds of worthy writings. Perhaps in a later edition these will be alphabetized by author name; and / or by subject category. For now, their 'mixed up' placement invites perusal on your own terms. But please remember: all the world's writings, 5,000 BCE to now - all! - are as naught, versus your inward guidance in seeking God. An infinite circle has it's epicenter everywhere. The truly vital epicenter is you." - *from page one of the overall introduction to this Annotated Bibliography.*

THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY, PART B, Entry Numbers Two to Five

2. *A Thousand Teachings (The Upadesasahasri of Sankara)* by Shankara (c 686 to 718 CE, cf. Gambhirananda: see fn 10, p 160, Annotated Bibliography Part A), as Translated and Edited by Prof. Sengaku Mayeda (/ / - / /); 1979, Copyright U. of Tokyo Press; 265 pp in 1992 pbk Ed by S.U.N.Y. Press, Albany NY 12246; which notes that Copyright is retained by U. of Tokyo.

Shankara - note that a number of alternate spellings are in use - is not only pivotal to modern Hinduism, but as companion to Kant in discerning the infinite, for Shankara's teachings unite the subtlety of the Infinite as *personal* - God as 'person' / all-about Great Companion - alongside *impersonality*: God as primordial, uncorrallable 'nirdvanda' Consciousness. As is somewhat summed in the dictum 'this world is *like* a dream, but it is not - strictly speaking - a dream.'

3. *Be Here Now* by Ram Dass, birth name Richard Alpert (/ / - / /); 140 pp in 1971 pbk First Edition, Copyright Lama Foundation (P.O. Box 444, San Cristobal NM), *distrib. via* Crown Publishing (419 Park Av S, NYC NY 10016); pers. copy rec'd 1/31/84 of 17th prtg. of Oct. 1975 ("488 thousand copies, 1st through 16th printings").

A modern classic, *Be Here Now* became kind of a new age bible in the 1970's. It may fairly be observed it remains a testament containing the *Santana* or *Eternal* Dharma: The Law of One.

4. *It's Here Now (Are You?) (A Spiritual Memoir)* by Bhagavan Das (/ / - / /); 312 pp in 1997 Hardback First Edition Pub. by Broadway Books (div. of Bantam Doubleday Dell, 1540 Broadway, NYC NY 10036); author's address: Bhavan Das Music, P.O.Box 941, Middleton CA 95461. Bhagavan introduced Ram Dass to Neem Karoli Baba in India in 1968 and the rest, as they say, is history: see entry number three just above. What's truly laudable here is Bhagavan's candor and plain-spoken honesty, provided at numerous junctures. Which is summed in his kind-of-a-shrug conclusion (paraphrase): "Now I just talk to God." Coincidentally or not, I just do this too.

5. *More Messages from Michael* by Chelsea Quinn Yarbro (9/15/1942 - / /); 318 pp in 1986 First Edition Pub. by The Berkley Publg Group (200 Madison Av NYC NY 10016). [Pers. copy rec'd 3/3/86.]

Remember this timeless advice: assimilate what your inner ear advises as worthy, and let all the rest slip away. Thus much of the Michael material resonates for me as useful and informative. The honor/responsibility of each is the fitting together of 'all these pieces.' My own effort in this regard is the preceding book. Yet the grand sweep of the journey of Infinite Consciousness with-in countless embodiments enveloped in ever-greater-densities of Awareness, is a symphony never fully compassed. But Michael offers some pointers which - even if wholly correct - are secondary to the *moral polarization* Ra identifies as 'job one' for human (third density) consciousness.

THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY, PART B, Entry Numbers Six to Nine

6. *A Search in Secret India* by Paul Brunton (pen name of Raphael Hurst, (10/21/1898 - 7/27/1981)); 1934 First Edition pub. by Rider & Co. (Fitzroy Sq., London W1); Copyright renewed 1974 by author; 312 pp in 1989 reprinting of 1970 Indian Edition by B.I. Publications Pvt Ltd (54 Janpath, New Delhi 110001). (author's copy acquired 3/23/1994, gone by 8/18/2020 fire as hitherto noted).

Thanks largely to this book, Ramana Maharshi was introduced to western readers, and it has since become a 'spiritual seeking' classic of sorts. R.M.'s disarmingly simple monism - Thou art That - partakes of a spiritual effulgence I was blessed to firsthand experience in Tiruvanamali at his ashram sometime in early to middle 1994. I have hitherto pointed this out and will again; for while I visited many worthwhile and impactful ashrams in India, the R.M. ashram was singular in the degree of... well, blessedness or permeating spirituality... that I felt quite vividly upon entering the ashram gates. This is a cherished earnest of how spiritual blessedness can come to permeate a spiritual-centered ashram; and indeed it can be felt in many churches, synagogues and mosques and temples worldwide. The Creator is magnanimous in that a special effulgence can be discerned in such places by they who truly seek; and even by wayward seekers like me!

7. *Isis Unveiled. A Master Key to the Mysteries of Ancient and Modern Science and Technology* (Vols. 1 and 2), by Helena Petrova Blavatsky (8/12/1831 - / /1891); 1877 First Edition by Bouton, Publ'r., NYC NY. (author's copy rec'd 5/18/1989 of 7th Edition issued 1972 by Theosophical Publishing House of Wheaton, IL). Co-founder with Henry Steel Olcott (/ /1832 - / /1907) et al., of the Theosophical Society in 1875 (on Sept. 8th) in New York City, which is "now considered the fountainhead of modern esoteric discourse in general" by V. [see fn 5, p 160, Part A] and many others. FMW (see entry Four in Part A) defended HPB's legitimacy. See also general remark following entry (9.) below.

8. *Dharma* by Annie Besant (/ / - / /) 1898 First Edition Pub. by The Theosophical Publishing House (USA addr.: P.O.Box 270, Wheaton IL 60187); 72 pp in the 1973 fourth printing of the 1918 Fourth Edition; same publisher. (Author's copy was acquired 4/18/1984). In general, Theosophy much impressed FMW (op.cit.) and he defended Besant and her co-religionists as not "phony." In other words, beneath what appear to be a welter of surface differences, the alert and keen-minded seeker does discern a certain grand architecture of which all are part, and that betokens limitlessness and eternity.

9. *Sanatana Dharma: an Elementary Text book of Hindu Religion and Ethics* by Annie Besant (/ / - / /); 1904/1906 First Edition pub. by Central Hindu College (Benares, India). Besant is best known as successor to HPB as leader of the Theosophy Society, who, along with her closest collaborator Charles Webster Leadbeater (/ /1854 - / /1934) groomed Jiddu Krishna-

THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY, PART B, Entry Numbers Ten to Twelve

murti (/ /1895 - / /1986) to be a special “World Teacher,” a role Krishnamurti spectacularly and famously disavowed; thereafter remaining a respected spiritual wayshower all the more.

This a propitious juncture to remark generally on spiritual wayshowers, many of whose worthy books - and/or books about them - are being referenced here. In brief there is no ‘perfect’ or ‘faultless’ wayshower, notwithstanding that many become lionized as ‘The’ exemplar, in human form, of the Creator. Yet - as the Gita and other important mystical / spiritual texts caution - the Absolute / The Creator can *never* be constrained into *any* one form; nor, constrained as “only” this-or-that strata of exalted Subjectivity; but is, rather, a far horizon - as Ra wisely observes a deeply mysterious horizon - of (I would aver) an infinitely ‘intense’ or ‘dense’ strata of consciousness-without-an-object-and-without-a-subject which is, nonetheless, capable of interacting - through prayer and/or meditation for example - with all manner of sufficiently sincere and genuine and ardent devotees: ‘if thou shed tears of longing with sincerity, in private and secret, “where none can see,” *surely The Creator sees this.*’ I know it is so. See Special Appendix A.

10. *E-2 [energy squared] (Nine Do-It-Yourself Energy Experiments That Prove Your Thoughts Create Your Reality)* by Pam Grout (/ / - / /) (see www.pamgrout.com); 164 pp in 2013 pbk First Edition pub by Hay House, Inc (www.hayhouse.com); author’s copy acquired 6/27/2017. “the field [of *potentiality*] connects all of us, and ... the reason we control our lives [*more than most of us think*] is because every thought we have is an energy wave that affects everything else in the universe.” [*underlining and two [interpositions] added*]. E.g., “Field of Potentiality (FP) = IP (Infinite Potentiality).” [p 5]. Most thoughts bring about confused consequences, because we permit them to waft about aimlessly, believing them to have no ‘charge,’ no ‘import.’ Alternatively, *validating* our thoughts as ‘charged’ and ‘important,’ ramps up their impact a thousand-fold or more. This is true whether the chosen polarization be service-to-ownself (usually regarded as negative, e.g. efforts to enhance personal egoity); *or*, service-to-otherselves: the polarization usually termed positive, e.g., efforts to love and assist otherselves, and cultivating a ‘global compassion’ mindset. (The importance of polarization has been emphasized and re-emphasized throughout this book).

11. *Cosmic Consciousness: A Study in the Evolution of the Human Mind* by Richard Maurice Bucke (/ /1849 - / /1901). 1901 First Edition pub by Innes Sons; 1922 re-issuance pub by E.P. Dutton & Co. (NYC NY); re-issued yet again circa 1969 (publication particulars missing). Regarded today as a classic; eminently readable and widely cited. Dr. Bucke perished soon after publication.

12. *Cosmic Consciousness Revisited* by Robert M. May (/ /1942 - / /). 1993 First Edition pub by Element Inc (42 Broadway, Rockport MA 01966). 356 pp in First Edition pbk (author’s copy acquir-

THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY, PART B, Entry Numbers Thirteen to Fifteen

ed 6/14/2017). May's 1962 imperience - inward consciousness experience - of what for him was an indelible episode of Cosmic Consciousness, led him to his endeavor to place such Consciousness within a comprehension about Reality that knits together the mystic transports of religious persons since time immemorial, relying upon Bucke's landmark effort in this regard. I certainly sympathize with May's goal, and wish he moved more forcefully in his analysis toward the all-is-consciousness worldview, which - I submit - is the one sure way to exit the 'impasse' over mysticism and episodes of Gnostic realization, etcetera. Neither Bucke nor May does this definitively

13. *The varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature* by William James (/ /1842 - / /1910); 1902 First Edition pub by New American Library (NYC NY) / Routledge (London). (Routledge in 2004 did a re-issuance in pbk.) Widely acclaimed as a classic and I agree. Professor Jame's underlying sympathies with the verity in and within mystical imperiences (inner experiences) were balanced in a pedagogical style that never becomes hectoring and dogmatic on the one hand, nor overly hesitant and almost condemnatorily noncommittal on the other. His was and is among the voices who rightly respect mysticism; whilst, emphasizing personal freedom in seeking for the confirming legacy of certitude that mystical experiences do confer for each individual thus blessed. To wit, mysticism is the *a priori*, to *any* religious system

14. *The Tibetan Book of the Dead* translated by W. Y. Evans-Wentz (2/2/1878 - 7/17/1965), 1927 First Edition pub by Oxford University Press; 249 pp in the 1966 pbk reptg of the 1957 Third Edition as a "Galaxy Book" imprint from Oxford U. Press (author's copy acquired 1/10/2017). This land-mark translation threw a 'metaphysical pipe bomb' towards many in the west harboring a smug materialism, where too often, there is, frankly, a *fear* of death. To consider the Tibetan view of the "bardos" (the after-death states) as places where the prayers of they still alive can assist: this was a remarkable alternative to western conventions about spirits (souls) leaving the body.

15. *The World's Religions (Our Great Wisdom Traditions)* by Huston Smith (/ / - / /), 1958 First Edition pub by HarperSanFrancisco (a division of Harper Collins Publishers, 10 E 53rd St, NYC NY 10022); 399 pp in the pbk 1991 re-issuance. The erudition and sensitivity which Prof. Smith brings to his ten chapters - one each as to Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Taoism, Islam, Judaism, Christianity and "The Primal Religions," with a summary chapter plus an opening chapter - is bound to impress even the most jaded reader who, yet, truly wishes an insightful and thoroughly researched introductory to this present world's great religious traditions. I would but add that I have become convinced that there were past civilizations here on earth with *their* earnest efforts at guidance as to spiritual development, for the urge to grow in spiritual terms truly appears to be a genuine cosmic universal, with echoes on planets elsewhere.

THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY, PART B, Entry Numbers Sixteen to Nineteen

16. *The Five Great Religions* by Edward Rice (/ / - / /), 1973 First Edition pub by Four Winds Press (50 W 44th St NYC NY 10036); 249pp in 1972 2nd Ed pbk by Bantam Books Inc (666 5th Av, NYC NY) (pers cc acquired in early 1982). Mr. Rice's treatment of 'the big five' (chronologically Hinduism, Judaism, Buddhism, Christianity and Islam) is thoughtful and helpful. As with many if not most of the authors of other books such as this, Mr. Rice's motive in writing it is rather clearly his own inward journey as a sadakha (a spiritual seeker). Thus he benefits both his own inward journey and the journey of his fellow seekers: his readers. It is just such a double benefit - with the emphasis upon benefits for the reader - that so reliably impels my own writing efforts.

17. *The Great Religious Leaders* (First Edition titled *The Story of Religion*) by Charles Francis Potter (/ / - / /); 1929 First Edition pub by Simon & Schuster Inc; 471pp in 1962 2nd Edition pbk by Washington Square Press Inc (32 Wa Place NYC/ Exec Offcs 630 5th Av, NY 20, NY) (pers cc acquired in early 1965).* [* It deserves explanation as to why this data concerning personal copies - whether purchased or perused at 'x' location - is given: too often, bibliographies seem perfunctory, and replete with 'obligatory' entries the author perhaps has never seen; or, that the bibliography has even been padded with umpteen additional titles probably / possibly never studied; for this reason, it seems worthwhile to cite the bona fides concerning texts I've personally consulted wherever possible]. Seventeen Chapters entitled "Jesus," "Buddha," and fifteen other founders and/or reformers prominent in world religious history are profiled in well written prose, with an eighteenth Chapter on "American Apostles" (Joseph Smith [Mormonism], Mary Baker Eddy [Christian Science] and six others). This is the sort of well-meaning and very readable 'outer history' about social-reforming mystics so much featured in V's book [see fn 5, p 160, Part A]; which, alas, are pretty much inevitably lacking the kind of verve and insight often arising in the writings of authors grown deeply intimate with the mystical depths; albeit, such latter blessing from The Universe is no *guarantor* of skilled writing.

18. *The Spiritual Seeker's Guide (the Complete Source for Religions and Spiritual Groups of the World)* by Steven S. Sadlier (/ / - / /); 1992 First Edition pub by Allwon Pub Co (300 Redhill Av, Costa Mesa CA 92629); 343pp in 1992 1st Ed pbk (author's copy acquired 11/30/07). With deft impartiality Mr Sadlier offers brief descriptive remarks on 130 spiritual teachers, spiritual groups, major religions, and spiritual practices. A valuable and rarely-accomplished tour across a very wide range of spiritual paths. I've found it most informative and well worth recommending.

19. *Tibetan Yoga and Secret Doctrines* translated by W.Y. Evans-Wentz (2/2/1878 - 7/17/1965); also editor of the selection of texts; 1935 First Edition pub by Oxford University Press; 1958 2nd Edition Copyright by W.Y. Evans-Wentz; 1971 reprinting by same publisher, NYC, 389pp in Hardback (author's copy acquired 10/5/1983). Widely viewed to this day as a pioneering scholar who introduced many source texts to western readers, this is among the classics he translated/edited.

Treats of some of the more esoteric dimensions of Mahayana Buddhism as practiced in Tibet in the ninth century and before.

20. *Beyond Scientific Materialism: Toward a Transcendent Theory of Consciousness* by Imants Baruss (/ / - / /); 2010 First Edition in Journal of Consciousness Studies, v. 17, no. 7-8, pp 213-231. (No. 65 in V's book's bibliog. [see fn 5, p 160, Part A]). Like his colleague Amit Goswami, Professor Baruss is among those students of FMW who discern an unmistakeable authenticity in FMW's central philosophical insight: "consciousness is original and self-existent and constitutive of all things;" not least, the *apparent* bifurcation betwixt 'matter' and the *seemingly* radical ineffability of thought or consciousness; when in fact in the broadest sense the latter is actual author of the former: via Creator / co-Creator mechanics we as yet but dimly understand if at all, and which are summed in the FMW philosophy as The Subject (all levels thereof) or The Self (again: all levels thereof).

21. *Tilting at Windmills (An Interview with Carla L. Rueckert and Jim McCarty)* by Gary Bean (/ /1980 - / /); 2016 Copyright by and First Edition pub by L/L Research (P.O.Box 5195, Louisville KY 40255-0195); website: www.llresearch.org (for Law of One content re the Third Edition - Second Entry in Part A of this Annotated Bibliography - see www.lawofone.info); 598pp incl front and back cover in First Edition; thirty chapters plus five appendices and a photo gallery and an Epilogue (plus Dedication, Acknowledgements and Introduction). Future Editions: maybe also an index.

According to the timeline in this book, at or soon after 2/1/2006 the author (Gary Bean) became Carla's administrative assistant, per her ongoing medical difficulties, and nine years afterwards - in October 2015 - he became Director of L/L Research.

This commendably thorough review of how the Law of One books came to be - to wit as a result of the unique group energies of Don Elkins and Carla Rueckert and Jim McCarty in facilitating the channeling of Ra's profound and wide-reaching presentation of The Law of One during 106 sessions from 1/15/1981 to 3/15/1984 (all but the last session occurring in one location in the Louisville KY area) - will be an inestimable resource for all who wish to look behind the formal presentation of the material, in order to better understand the nuts and bolts of just how such a remarkable literary masterpiece of wise spiritual insight came to be.

"Read part of Volume Two of The Law of One (Bonnie's copy)" is the relevant gist of my entry for 10/16/1984, when I was visiting The Light of Christ Community Church in Talequah, OK (Carol Parrish Harrah, pastor). It was on that day - via Bonnie, a gifted singer in their church choir - that I first heard of, and saw, The Law of One as presented by Ra. I add the qualifier, "as presented by Ra," because the Law of One has been - and continues to be - enunciated in an in-

finite number of ways by entities of infinite number; from entities wiser than Ra - although in customary conceptual terms this is hard to imagine - to entities far less wise (e.g., myself).

From about 9:00 am on Wednesday 6/26/1985 to noon Thursday, 6/27/1985, I had my first personal encounter with Jim McCarty, and with Carla (who on 4/1/2015 passed on to larger life). It came as a shock - upon just now consulting my diary for that year - to learn I spent only 28 hours with them; because in memory's eye it seems like I spent at least a week. (It's *possible* I made just one revisit - in early 1993 - but I can no longer ascertain this, as my home with all my archives and diaries and books completely burned on 8/18/2020 in the 60,000-acre CZU Lightning Complex Fire).

Fast forward to today, 9/25/2016 (when the above five paragraphs were written, excepting the parenthetical remark about 8/18/2020). What can I say. The Law of One is here to stay, and *it always has been* here; and, *everywhere*; whether any of us have been aware of this - however dimly - or not.

22. *The Wisdom of Vedanta* by Swami Abhayananda (/ / - / /); 1991 First Edition pub by Atma Books (POBox 2993, Naples FL 33939-2993), Copyright 1991 by author. (author's copy acquired 3/12/1991 with a cover letter from the author (birth name Stan Trout), whom I had the honor of meeting in 1984). Swami Abhayananda had a Realization imperience (inward consciousness experience) of The Self in the Santa Cruz mountains, which is where I today (3/27/18) complete this bibliographical entry.

23. *Conversations With God (an uncommon dialogue), Book Three*, by Neale Donald Walsch (/ / - / /); 1998 First Edition pub by Hampton Roads Publg Co Inc (134 Burgess Ln Charlottesville VA 22902; (804) 296-2772 or (800) 766-8009); website www.hrpub.com, email hrpc@hrpub.com (author states that on 2/8/16 after twenty years he started Book Four, issued in 2017). [The First Edition of Book One was 1992-3, and Book Two First Edition was circa 1995]. On the basis of personal resonance, I find much of worth in Book Three and I do recommend it.

24. *The New Oxford Annotated Bible (New Revised Standard Version)* by Bruce M. Metzger and Roland E. Murphy, co-chairs of the Oxford translation / editing committee. 536pp, including maps and index, in the 1994 re-issuance; Copyright 1962-1994, inclusive, by Oxford University Press Inc (200 Madison Av NYC NY 10016). Incorporates the Copyright 1989 "New Revised Standard [English] Version [NRSV]" held by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA (475 Riverside Dr NYC NY 10115-0050). (author's copy acquired 7/1/04). Biblical reference texts are so familiar to most western readers in their Christian and/or Jewish and/or Islamic milieus, that I've chosen to omit them in general, in favor of comparable and analogous references pertaining to New Age and/or Eastern spiritual texts: as my essential point is that *all* of these traditions are endeavoring to communicate the same essential message to disparate populations, concerning The Law of One; withal, in the broad overview, *all* are heartfelt and sincere.

25. *The God Delusion* by Richard Dawkins (3/26/1941 - / /); 2006 First Edition pub by Bantam Press (London, a div of Transworld Publishers); 464pp in 2008 pbk reprinting, Mariner books (imprint of Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Pub Co, 215 Park Av S, NYC NY 10003) (author's copy acquired 2/10/16). It might seem strange for a transcendentalist mystic - an extracosmic-intracosmic, panentheistic mystic no less - like myself, to praise the suspicious, allegedly atheistic acuity of Mr. Dawkins, as he employs it to set forth his case in this articulate and eminently readable book. But the fact is Mr. Dawkins accomplishes a great service; he strips away much that is trivial and foolish and obscuring vis-a-vis the grandeur of TOICII (The One Infinite Creator of Intelligent Infinity) as variously limned by mystics since the dawn of time (and acknowledged by Dawkins in his paeon to Einstein), and permits the reader to come away refreshed, if he or she understands the basic error of Dawkins and ever so many like him (Bertrand Russell comes to mind): they labor under the massively widespread but incorrect premise that consciousness arose from matter, *rather than the other way around, as is actually the case*. When one entertains the latter thesis - the correct thesis - rather than the former thesis, an implicit premise of *knowability* replaces barren and hopeless unknowability, and all the existential despair and rootlessness that this causes.

26. *The Gospel of Ramakrishna (Originally recorded in Bengali, in five volumes, by M., a disciple of the Master)* by Ramakrishna (2/18/1836-8/16/1886) [by way of the many chronicles that were compiled by M.]; translated and Copyright 1942 by Swami Nikhilanda; 1942 First Edition pub by Ramakrishna-Vivekananda Center (17 E 94th St, NYC NY USA / Sri Ramakrishna Math at P.O. Belur Math, Distr. Howrah, Bengal, India); 1063 pp in the Hardback 5th Printing of 1973; Foreword by Aldous Huxley and a February 1942-dated Introduction by the translator; 52 Chapters and two Appendices; with a Chronology, a Glossary, an Index of Songs and Hymns and a general index; (author's copy acquired 10/12/20). I visited the Dakshineswar Kali Temple outside Calcutta, and the larger Ramakrishna Temple across the river, in 1994 (exact date lost as my diaries are gone). I have fond memories concerning both Temples, and found it touching that the small apartment Vivekananda (/ / - / /) occupied at the Ramakrishna Temple is being preserved exactly as he left it at the time of his passing. The crowds of devotees were noticeably larger at the Ramakrishna temple. Professor Huxley commendably extols the rarity of this book, as such thorough accounts of the lives of "God-intoxicated" saints / holy men are *exceedingly* rare. This book is the exemplar all such few books as ever there may be.

27. *The Wisdom of China and India* as edited by Lin Yutang (/ / - / /). 1942 First Edition pub by Random House, Inc. 1106pp in 1942 First Edition hardback (author's copy acquired 10/9/1968). This useful anthology of important spiritual texts - e.g. the 1913 Paramananda translation of the Bhagavad Gita (translation number 14 cited at Entry One in Part A) is included - is

a sentimental favorite. Growing up, it sat on the bookshelf in our basement rec. room (1961-4 era), and a dragon on the book-cover became a kind of friend. It still is. My readings and re-readings herein continue. But the adage remains true: ‘ “liberation” is not to be found in the pages of any book, but *all* books have the potential ability to inspire and truly encourage the genuine sadakha (spiritual seeker).’

28. *Proof of Heaven: A Neurosurgeon's Journey Into the Afterlife* by Eben Alexander III (12/11/1953 - / /); 19 First Edition pub by

While Dr. Alexander's book has done much to move popular belief toward accepting the view that life doesn't end at the so-called “death” of the physical body, rather that the inner entity journeys onward, there are always some naysayers. Throwing brickbats at this book and/or it's author. I used to bemoan how some were so knuckleheaded about this or any other testament. Now I see such conduct as proof-positive about the total freedom of choice possessed by each and every entity. “How shall these acts bind Me, who am indifferent to the fruit they bear?” (Gita, ch_ V_, the Isherwood/Prabhavananda translation).

29. *The Hero With a Thousand Faces* by Joseph John Campbell (/ / - / /); 1949 First Edition pub by Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ; re-issued in 2004. In the broadest resonant sense, Campbell's title captures the notion that we *each* are “the Hero” in our personal journey to re-encounter the Creator in *our* way.

30. *The Perennial Philosophy* by Aldous Huxley (/ / - / /); 19 First Edition pub by

My own copy of this classic - lost to fire - will soon be replaced, for I remember how compelling Professor Huxley's presentation was (he deserves the appellation, “Professor,” in the larger sense of spiritual wayshower that history today accords him). In cross-cultural terms, while affirming the indissoluble nature of every mystical conviction by they blessed with this affirmation.

31. *Siddhartha* by Hermann Hesse (7/2/1877 - 8/9/1962); 1922 First Edition pub by 157pp in 1971 pbk reissuance by New Directions Pub Corp (80 Eighth Av NYC 10011; Oct. 1951: Hardback Edition). Hesse's most famous novel. But the N.Y.Times deemed his “greatest novel” to be “Narcissus and Goldmund” (about two medieval priests; one, complacent; the other, restive & striving). His 1943 “Magister Ludi” won Hesse the 1946 Nobel Prize in literature. In later life mostly a recluse in Switzerland, yet his literary undertones of sincere spiritual thirst won for him cult status into the 1960's and beyond.

THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY, PART B, Entry Numbers Thirty-two to Thirty-six

32. *Zen Buddhism (Selected Writings of D. T. Suzuki)* by Daisetsu Teitaro Suzuki (10/18/1870 - 7/12/1966); 1956 First Edition pub by Anchor Books; 294pp in pbk. (Being excerpts from six of his books as edited by - and Copyright by - William Barrett. L/C No. 56-9406.) D.T. is widely regarded as insightful and sagacious about Buddhism in general and Zen Buddhism especially.

33. *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance (An Inquiry into Values)* by Robert M. Pirsig (9/6/1928 - 4/24/2017 at home in S. Berwick ME); 1974 First Edition pub by William Morrow Co (105 Madison Av NYC NY 10016); 380pp in 1984 pbk Ed with Author's "Afterword" added; by Bantam Doubleday Dell Publ Group Inc (1540 Broadway, NYC NY 10036); (author's copy acquired 4/1/2017).

This rumination on Reality and Values commemorates Pirsig's 1968 Minnesota to California motorcycle trip with his eldest son, twelve year old Chris (tragically killed in 1979 aged 23 in a mugging outside of S.F.'s Zen Center where he was a student). Only published after 121 publisher rejections! Yet this lonesome tale of a quest for meaning became a runaway bestseller. Thought-provoking and an enjoyable read, as much for it's honesty as for any "aha!" God moment, and in particular for it's rendering of many poignant interactions with Chris.

34. *Foundations of Tibetan Mysticism* by Lama Anagarika Govinda (/ / - / /); 1959 First Edition of English translation pub by Rider & Co (London). 311pp. 1969 pbk re-issue by Samuel Weiser (York Beach ME). "The voidness of indifference" is cautioned against; commendably so. I found this presentation to be singularly impressive for the deep feelings conveyed by the author

35. *Seven Lessons from Heaven* by Mary C. Neal, M.D. (/ / - / /); 2017 First Edition pub by Penguin Random House LLC via it's "crown publ group's 'Convergent Books'" imprint (ref. crownpublishing.com); (author's copy acquired 2/5/2018). Dr. Neal's review of the growing NDE (Near Death Experience) literature is crisp, wide-ranging and helpful. This book was preceded by her "To Heaven and Back" book, and the affirmations therein are further articulated here. All of the NDE books corroborate The Law of One as articulated by Ra, in my opinion; notwithstanding the varieties of presentation particulars in each; that there *is* such a thing as Intelligent Infinity.

36. *The Light Between Us* by Laura Lynne Jackson (/ /1970 - / /); First Edition pub by Penguin Random House LLC via it's imprint, Spiegel and Grau (Spiegelandgrau.com); 265pp in Hardbk 1st Ed. (author's copy acquired 1/18/2016). As a gifted medium, Laura has helped many reconnect with friends and relatives "on the other side" involving, sometimes, expressions of regret from those 'beyond the veil' who wish they'd been more supportive to we who are still physically embodied. I see this as an underscoring of a Ra message: if we can make headway here (where the 'yukky vibes' are sometimes so obstructing), it aids us in progressing hundreds of

times faster than in the astral realms, where conditions are often so exquisite as to invite laziness.

37. *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* by Charles Darwin (2/12/1809-4/19/1882); 1859 First Edition pub by John Murray (London); 550pp (incl 35pp of front matter) in 1998 Fifteenth Printing of Harvard University Press's 1964 Facsimile Reissuance (author's copy acquired early 2015). To this very day a great tumult of debate surrounds evolution: is it 'blind forces,' or 'guided by consciousness within the the entities themselves?' The latter position is defended in Entry 38 following. Ra of course puts a finer point on the matter by underscoring the intentionality of cycles of 'densities' - levels of unfolded consciousness - throughout a limitless Universe. Wherein, The Creator / Intelligent Infinity undertakes to Know Itself in a 'limitless dance of infinite Beingness,' one of whom, is the body/mind/spirit entity writing this book; another, being the reader him or herself. I can but hope that the net effect of this book is to aid the reader in his/her further soul journey as he/she freely chooses to have same unfold in and within the One Infinite Creator's Beingness.

38. *The Lotka Hypothesis* by Lawrence Luhr Horstman Jr (10/8/1937 - / /); 2006 First Edition pub by Vantage Press. *Note.* A co-authorship attributed to myself is, while kind and therefore appreciated, rather inaccurate, as the 'final edits' were ones in which I played no role, after having participated in discussions about chapter drafts in the summer of 1993 prior to leaving for a two-plus year stay in India, starting in October of 1993. *Remarks.* It should be noted that this effort to defend the principle of consciousness as a universal guiding all evolution was one that my older brother sought to articulate in early drafts of this book starting in 1966. The larger and all-important corollary to it - that consciousness in a primal and eternal modality gives rise to and undergirds all physical and sensible phenomena, rather than being epiphenomenal thereto - is not explicitly addressed however. Thus, by default, the premise in this work remains a species of Cartesian dualism, and so it has to be said to be intellectually unsatisfactory in overview terms.

39. (39.01 to 39.50). *The Sacred Books of the East in Fifty Volumes*, translated by various oriental scholars under the general editorship of Friedrich Max Mueller (/ / - / /); 1894 First Edition pub by Oxford University Press (reprinted in Delhi India in 1965, 1968, 1972, 1978, 1985 and 1990). Overall, about 10,500 pages (an average of 210 pages per volume x 50 vols) as to the 1990 reprinting by Motilal Banarsidass (41 Bungalow Rd, Jawahar Nagar, New Delhi 110 007, with offices in Varanasi, Patna, Bangalore and Madras). (Author's copy acquired 3/3/1994 at Bungalow Rd). A listing of the translator as to each volume, and that volume's general contents, is as follows:

39.01 (Hinduism) *The Upanishads* (1st of 2 vols); tr. by F. Max Mueller.

THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY, PART B, Entry Numbers 39.02 to 39.36

- 39.02 (Hinduism) *Sacred Laws of the Aryas* (1st of 2 vols); tr by Johann Georg Buhler
- 39.03 (Confucianism) *Various Texts (with commentaries)*; tr by J. Legge
- 39.04 (Zoroastrianism) *Zend Avesta* (1st of 3 vols); tr by J. Darmester & L. H. Mills
- 39.05 (Zoroastrianism) *Pahlavi Texts* (1st of 5 vols); tr by E. W. West
- 39.06 (Islam) *Qur 'an* (vol 1 of 2 vols); tr by E. H. Palmer
- 39.07 (Hinduism) *The Institutes of Vishnu*; tr by Julius Jolly [or Jully]
- 39.08 (Buddhism, Hinduism, et alia) *The Bhagavad Gita*; tr by K. T. Telang
- 39.09 (Islam) *Qur 'an* (vol 2 of 2 vols); tr by E. H. Palmer
- 39.10 (Buddhism) *Dhammapada & Suttanipatta*; tr by V. Fausboll
- 39.11 (Buddhism) *Buddhist Sutras*; tr by T. W. Rhys Davids
- 39.12 (Hinduism) *Satapatha Brahmana* (1st of 5 vols); tr by J. Eggeling
- 39.13 (Buddhism) *Vinaya Texts* (1st of 3 vols); tr by T. W. Rhys Davids
- 39.14 (Hinduism) *Sacred Laws of the Aryas* (2nd of 2 vols); tr by Johann Georg Buhler
- 39.15 (Hinduism) *The Upanishads* (2nd of 2 vols); tr. by F. Max Mueller.
- 39.16 (Confucianism) *The I Ching*; tr by J. Legge
- 39.17 (Buddhism) *Vinaya Texts*; (2nd of 3 vols) tr by T. W. Rhys Davids
- 39.18 (Zoroastrianism) *Pahlavi Texts* (2nd of 5 vols); tr by E. W. West
- 39.19 (Buddhism) *Life of Buddha by Avaghosa*; tr by Samuel Beal
- 39.20 (Buddhism) *Vinaya Texts* (3rd of 3 vols); tr by Hermann Oldenberg
- 39.21 (Buddhism) *Sadharma Pundarika (Lotus of the True Law)*; tr by H. Kern
- 39.22 (Jainism) *Sutras* (1st of 2 vols); tr by H. Jacobi
- 39.23 (Zoroastrianism) *Zend Avesta* (2nd of 3 vols); tr by J. Darmester & L. H. Mills
- 39.24 (Zoroastrianism) *Pahlavi Texts* (3rd of 5 vols); tr by E. W. West
- 39.25 (Hinduism) *Manu, the Laws of* (single vol); tr by Georg Buhler
- 39.26 (Hinduism) *Satapatha Brahmana* (2nd of 5 vols); tr by J. Eggeling
- 39.27 (Confucianism) *Various Texts (w commentaries)* (vol 2) tr by J. Legge
- 39.28 (China) *Confucianism & Folk Ceremonials*; tr by Hermann Oldenberg
- 39.29 (Hinduism) *The Grihya Sutra* (1st of 2 vols); tr by Hermann Oldenberg
- 39.30 (Hinduism) *The Grihya Sutra* (2nd of 2 vols); tr by Hermann Oldenberg
- 39.31 (Zoroastrianism) *Zend Avesta* (3rd of 3 vols); tr by J. Darmester & L. H. Mills
- 39.32 (Hinduism) *Vedic Hymns*; tr by Hermann Oldenberg
- 39.33 (Hinduism) *Minor Law Books*; tr by Julius Jolly
- 39.34 (Hinduism) *Vedanta Sutras* (1st of 2 vols); tr by T. W. Rhys Davids
- 39.35 (Buddhism) *The Questions of King Milinda*; tr by T. W. Rhys Davids
- 39.36 (Buddhism) *The Q's of King Milinda* (conclusion); tr by T. W. Rhys Davids

THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY, PART B, Entry Numbers 39.37 to 39.50

39.37 (Zoroastrianism) <i>Pahlavi Texts</i> (4th of 5 vols);	tr by E. W. West
39.38 (Hinduism) <i>Vedanta Sutras</i> (2nd of 2 vols);	tr by T. W. Rhys Davids
39.39 (Taoism) <i>TAO TE CHING</i> ;	tr by J. Legge
39.40 (Taoism) <i>Various Texts</i> ;	tr by J. Legge
39.41 (Hinduism) <i>Satapatha Brahmana</i> (3rd of 5 vols);	tr by J. Eggeling
39.42 (Hinduism) <i>Hymns of the Atharava-Veda</i> ;	tr by M. Bloomfield
39.43 (Hinduism) <i>Satapatha Brahmana</i> (4th of 5 vols);	tr by J. Eggeling
39.44 (Hinduism) <i>Satapatha Brahmana</i> (5th of 5 vols);	tr by J. Eggeling
39.45 (Jainism) <i>Sutras</i> ;	tr by H. Oldenberg
39.46 (Hinduism) <i>Vedic Hymns</i> ;	tr by H. Oldenberg
39.47 (Zoroastrianism) <i>Pahlavi Texts</i> (5th of 5 vols);	tr by E. W. West
39.48 (Hinduism) <i>Vedanta Sutras w/ Ramanuja's Sribhasya</i> ;	tr by G. Thibaut
39.49 (Buddhism) <i>Mahayana Texts</i> (various);	tr by E. B. Cowell
39.50	I N D E X

Note. The full title of vols. 55.02 and 55.14 translated by Johann Georg Buhler, is “*The Sacred Laws of the Aryas as Taught in the Schools of Apastamba, Gautama, Vasishtha and Baudhayana, Part I and II.*” 1898 First American Edition pub by The Christian Literature Co., N.Y.

In order of coverage, this landmark series - produced toward the end of the British Raj in India, a three hundred year era (circa 1647 to 1947) - supplied the West with more or less it's first in-depth scholarly acquaintance with Hinduism (21 vols, as to primarily the Vedic Brahmanic system plus the catholic lay treatise - the crown jewel of Hindu spirituality and piety - *The Bhagavad Gita*); Buddhism (10 vols); Jainism (2 vols, thus completing a 33-vols conspectus on India's three most influential religious traditions); China (6 vols, 2 of them concerning Taoism); Persia (8 vols on Zoroastrianism); and Arabia (2 vols as to the *Qu'ran*, thus completing an overall total of 49 vols)

While extremely famous texts like the *Gita* and *Qu'ran* have before and since been much translated elsewhere, this series remains revered for supplying English renderings hitherto nonexistent - and since largely unduplicated - of many Hindu spiritual texts. Some are shocking - like vol 25 with it's translations of sexist laws, e.g. Sati (wives condemned to cremation alive: atop the cremation pyres of their husbands) - while many others illuminate subtleties within a Hindu spirituality richly grounded in millennia of attaining great spiritual imperiences (inward consciousness experiences) of true mystic depth by sadhus (holy men) or swamis (monastics who seek The Self) or otherwise-labeled spiritual seekers of genuine yogic acumen.

THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY, PART B, Entry Numbers Forty to Forty-three

40. *The Life Divine* by Aurobindo Ghose (/ /1872 - / /1949); 1949 First Edition pub by Greystone Press. *Comment.* There is little doubt - in my mind at least and certainly in the opinion of FMW - that Aurobindo was a mystic of considerable imperiential (inner consciousness experience) attainment. I visited Auroville in 1994 and enjoyed my time there and met one loveably sincere spiritual seeker there. Aurobindo sought the re-enchantment of the world as, all of it, expressive of the Creator's boundless love and intelligence; he and his successors have undertaken to bring this vision to fruition in Auroville. His voluminous writings evoke The Creator as, decidedly, having a persona - albeit, one extremely evanescent and veiled from ordinary view - and, that we can undertake to align with this Beingness in, as Ra observes, either a service-to-self or service-to-others morality; either, in sufficiently dedicated intensity, ushers the seeker to what Ra calls fourth density, which appears to be roughly equivalent to the beginning astral levels. As with all pioneering spiritual wayshowers, the world has somewhat accommodated Aurobindo's counsel, but, alas, has in the main ignored it thus far. No matter. Aurobindo's writings continue to inspire. And the re-enchantment of the world remains possible.

41. *The Essential Aurobindo (Selections)* by Aurobindo (/ /1872 - / /1949) and edited by Robert A. McDermott; 1973 First Edition pub by Schocken Books (200 Madison Av, NYC NY 10016). 258pp in 1974 second printing pbk (author's copy acquired 4/18/1984). *Comment.* See remarks just above. A thoughtful reading of Aurobindo reveals his overall worldview to be strikingly in alignment with Ra's.

42. *Long Pilgrimage* by John G Bennett (6/8/1897 - 12/13/1974) in collaboration with Thakur Lal Manandhar (/ / - / /); 1965 First Edition pub by Hodder and Stoughton Ltd (London); 185pp in 1983 pbk reprinted, The Dawn Horse Press (POBox 3680, Clearlake CA 95422) (author's copy acquired 4/21/1985). During about Feb-Apr of 1995 I was able to visit the woodlands ashram of Sri Govindananda Bharati - better known as the Shivapuri Baba (9/27/1826 to __/__/1963, aged 137 years) - whose biography and teachings are recounted in this excellent book by Mr Bennett, a mystic and spiritual teacher in his own right. Shri S. Baba regarded himself as teaching the B Gita precepts, "updated."

43. *Right Living (Being the Teachings of... known as Sri Shivapuri Baba)* by Dr Y. B. Shrestha (/ / - / /); 1993 First Edition pub by YB Shrestha (POBox 181, Lajimpat, Kathmandu, Nepal); 292pp in 1st Ed pbk (author's copy acquired 4/28/1995 in Kathmandu). "even [astral level] gods feel jealous of [embodiment in a] human life... Because in human life *only you* can work out a charter for higher life; [astral level] gods, and lower level life [e.g. plant-animal 2nd density] cannot do anything except to enjoy or suffer what they have earned previously." (p 125, emphasis and four [interpositions] added). This and other of the simple, easy-to-understand teachings of Shivapuri Baba

accord with Ra. The kindness of the ashram stewards is a lingering fond memory, and someday - if other duties would permit - I would much like to assist with Shivapuri Baba's counsel reaching a wider audience.

44. *Short Treatise on God, Man and Human Welfare* by Benedict de Spinoza (/ /1632 - / /1677); circa 1660 First Edition (in Dutch) by (unknown); translation by Lydia Gillingham Robinson; 1990 First Edition of L.G.R. translation by Open Court Pblg Co (Chicago). See comment below.

45. *Complete Works of Benedict de Spinoza* (/ /1632 - / /1677); tr by Samuel Shirley and ed by Michael L. Morgan; 2002 First Edition pub by Hackett Pub Co (Indianapolis). *Comment.* What I would call the extracosmic / intracosmic panentheism of Spinoza's clearly mystical spiritual understandings, which he sought to express so carefully in the philosophical terms of his era, earned him widespread misunderstandings in his own time - he was even excommunicated from his own Jewish congregation in Amsterdam for his perceived (wrongly) championing of atheism - but growing accolades ever since. As a landmark contributor to our collective development towards a far more holistic and encompassing understanding of The Creator / Intelligent Infinity / Infinite Density Nirdvanda Consciousness. Again - as with Aurobindo just previously cited - there is much substantial concordance between Spinoza's holism about God and Ra's treatise on God; or, to use Ra's precise terminology, The One Infinite Creator of Intelligent Infinity.

46. *The Conscious Universe (The Scientific Truth of Psychic Phenomena)* by Dr. Dean I. Radin (/ / - / /); 1997 First Edition pub by HarperCollins Pubs Inc (10 E 53rd St, NYC NY 10022) (author's copy acquired 1/22/2004). 362pp in 1st Ed Hardback. *Comment.* Widely respected and rightly so for taking a western science approach to the all-is-consciousness worldview, albeit, in the modality of acausality. To wit, that the psychical omniverse is 'without a captain' to put it bluntly. This is no mere oversight nor, necessarily, a defect. It accords with the universal precept as to *free will* so ably championed by Ra and of course many others. Withal, The Creator can and does reveal Its Presence to they with sufficient intensity of thirst to so discern; and is otherwise veiled. Personal volition *can* gradually harmonize with a discernible horizon that's boundlessly amazing

47. *God Struck Me Dead (Voices of Ex-Slaves)*; narratives edited by Clifton Herman Johnson (/ / - / /); 1969 First Edition pub by The Pilgrim Press (Cleveland OH). (author's copy acquired 6/14/2017* **note.* All acquisition dates prior to 8/18/20 were lost in the fire of that date as hitherto remarked). Based upon 1930's interviews with yet surviving slaves born pre-1865 in the American South, conducted by Fisk University's Amistad Research Center (Anthropologist C. H. Johnson, Director), Johnson's 38 selected and edited narratives provide both chilling eyewitness accounts into the barbarity of

conduct in ‘antebellum days;’ and, very convincing spiritual testimonials, some of which depict deeply mystical transports. A reminder that spiritual epiphanies have always been a human universal.

48. *The Book of the Unfolding* by Anonymous. Privately printed, circa 1991 (8.5” x 11” softbound, about ninety pages); perhaps as few as fifty to one hundred copies were ever printed. The author - an American anchorite of sorts - composed this book in his small basement rented room in Southern California, according to a lady who said she knew him, whom I briefly met in 1992; my copy came from a small bookshop (location lost to memory). *Comment.* I provide this citation for two reasons. FIRST. The book itself is compelling in how it seeks to bear witness to the enormity of The Creator as a kind of veiled Force behind the mists of passing history; and seeks to encourage the reader to seek for The Creator: whether he be in prison, or deepest misery, or however elsewhere afflicted. (There’s a Chapter addressed to murderers for example). SECOND. I wish this citation to stand in for many, many valuable and heartfelt books about the spiritual journey, which never attain wide notice; which, often, are privately printed in just a small number of copies; but, are nonetheless memorable for the impress of mystical conviction on their pages. In this way, I salute them all. (And - who knows - maybe some of them will find my way)

49. *Initiations and Initiates in Tibet* by Alexandra David-Neel (/ / - / /); 1930 First Edition pub by (unknown); 1970 re-issuance by Shambala Publications (Berkeley CA). Like H.P.B. (see entry number seven) Ms. David-Neel was an intrepid spiritual adventurer in, as it were, a league of her own. Her fascinating life story as a spiritual seeker is well worth examining

50. *The Way to Freedom* by HH the 14th Dalai Lama (/ / 1936 - / /), winner of the 1989 Nobel Peace Prize. 1995 First Edition pub by HarperCollins (7/16 Ansari Rd, Daryaganj, New Delhi 110 002 India). A part of “The Library of Tibet” publication series. *Comment.* The Creator was kind enough to avail me of a 5/3/1996 private audience with His Holiness, who was bereft of pretension and displayed altogether a kindly shouldering of his duties to protect and preserve his peoples’ Tibetan Buddhist wisdom - and Tibetan Buddhist spirituality - legacy.

51. *Stilling the Mind (Shamatha Teachings from Dudjom Lingpa’s Vajra Essence)* by B. Allan Wallace (/ / - / /), translator. 2011 First Edition pub by Wisdom Publications (199 Elm St, Somerville MA 02144, www.wisdompubs.org). Mr. Wallace is a noted scholar and meditation teacher and - among prior activities - was translator for HH the Dalai Lama.

52. *The Tantric Mysticism of Tibet* by John Blofeld (/ / - / /); 1970 First Edition pub by

E.P.Dutton & Co, Inc (NYC NY). A careful and discerning scholar, Prof. Blofeld is widely lauded as an insightful teacher of Buddhist tenets. “Buddhism postulates that ultimately every sentient being will attain to the bliss that is called Nirvana.” (p 47).

53. *The Consciousness of the Atom (A Series of Lectures Delivered in New York City, Winter of 1921-1922)* by Alice Ann Bailey (pen name /pseudonym of Alice LaTrobe Bateman, (/ / - / /); 1922 First Edition pub by Lucis Pub Co (address unknown, poss in NYC). Ms. Bailey’s book comprising her lecture discussions deserves inclusion if for no other reason than the important implications of her book’s title: namely that is inherent in - and moreover undergirds - all of this manifest universe; from what can be said to be the enormous aggregate consciousness of this Milky Way Galaxy, down to the tiniest atoms and subatomic particles... *and further in both directions*. Relevant comment: a spiritual seeker whom I briefly encountered in India described a vivid spiritual epiphany / mystical vision, wherein he ‘grokked’ that infinity was vaster in extent by far, than all the stars above... and, smaller by far than even the blades of grass near his head (where he was sprawled on a lawn). In other words spatial dimensions, nor durations in time, have any circumscribing bearing upon the Infinite Potentiality Beingness of The Creator.

54. *Indian Philosophy* by S. Radkrishnan (/ /1880 - / /1955); 1923 First Edition pub by Oxford University Press (Walton St Oxford OX2 6DP UK / 1 Great Clarendon St., Oxford OX2 6DP, UK); 1929 Revised Edition; 1997 reprt of Rev Ed: 738pp Vol 1, pbk; 807pp Vol 2, pbk. Prof. Radakrishnan’s text is cited in Chapter Three and elsewhere in this book. It provides a helpful and readable window into the many subtleties of Indian Philosophy as developed over the centuries.

55. *Secrets of the UFO* by Don Elkins (2/28/1930 - 11/7/1984) and Carla L. Rueckert (7/16/1943 - 4/1/2015); May 1977 First Edition pub by L/L Research (POBox 5195, Louisville KY 40255-0195) and Copyright 1977; ninth printing, October 1990; present copy (acquired by author on 10/19/20) is from the 2011 reissuance (“printed Monee IL, 1/12/2020”); 213pp in pbk with Endnote Listings and Bibliography *Comment*. I have yet to give this the thorough read-through I hope to, and so for now confine my remarks to “UFO” information generally: as discussed on radio talk shows and in many many books. What makes the subject tricky is that UFO sightings and encounters have both a “tangible-physical” component or aspect; and a “subjective-inner consciousness” component or aspect. For example, cases where person A sees distinctly a craft in the sky; but companions B and C do not. Of course Ra makes multiple references to UFO’s, discussing different types; for now I can do no better than to refer the reader to Ra’s comments in “The Ra Contact,” vols 1&2.

56. *A Wanderer’s Handbook (An Owner’s Manual for ET’s And Other Spiritual Outsiders)*, the

THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY, PART B, Entry Numbers Fifty-seven to Fifty-nine

Abridged Version by Carla Lisbeth Rueckert (7/16/1943 - 4/1/2015) , as edited by Jim McCarty (5/10/1947 - / /); 2001 First Edition pub by L/L Research (POBox 5195, Louisville KY 40255-0195) and Copyright 2001 by L/L Research (Telephone and Fax (502) 245-6495, Email: jim@llresearch.org). 566pp in pbk second printing ("Columbia SC 9/19/2020"). *Comment.* This book combines Carla's personal thoughts; quotations from her channeling of Q'uo; excerpts from "The Ra Contact," vols I and II; and excerpts from letters and other materials. Even 'loaded' topics like abortion and suicide are handled. Each Chapter has footnotes, and there is a Glossary. I have read this but glancingly as yet, but enough to say the Chapters seem all of value and well written, and of course both Carla and Jim were invaluable in effecting The Ra Contact (along with Don Elkins). It's a recommend.

57. *A Concept Guide (The Ra Contact Resource Series)* by Gary L. Bean (/ / - / /) with Diana Roy (/ / - / /). 2020 First Edition pub by L/L Research (POBox 5195, Louisville KY 40255-0195) and Copyright 2020; 393pp in pbk, incl front and back covers; shows 5/1/2020 as printing date. "From Adept to Will, this guide offers a comprehensive study of 64 different concepts" (from back cover). *Comment.* I cannot fairly provide a review as my study of this book remains incomplete, but have sampled of it's contents enough to know it's a valuable resource and worth recommending.

58. *On Death and Dying* by Elisabeth Kubler-Ross (/ / - / /); 1969 First Edition pub by The Macmillan Co (866 3rd Av NYC NY); 289pp in 1972 seventh printing of the 1970 pbk ed (author's copy acquired 1/16/1986). *Comment.* A pioneer in trying to take the doom and dread out of the dying process here in our modern western cultural milieu, Dr. Kubler-Ross spanned the gulf between insightful psychoanalysis, and the inevitable door her approach engages: that there's a greater and richer series of dimensions to the infinite consciousness of Reality beyond 'the physical.' Once the all-is-consciousness worldview is embraced as a working hypothesis, this possibility comes to seem as natural and logical as daylight. But a great many of us - ensnared in the veil of the 'reality' of the here-now physical world, to the exclusion of all else - have been greatly aided by Dr. Kubler-Ross at least opening the door just a little bit.

59. *Sunrise Over Hell* by Ka-Tzetnik 135633, of birth name Harry Prelesnik (/ / - / /) [author also, of "House of Dolls," "Piepel," "House of Love" and "Star Eternal"]; 1977 First Edition in English pub by W.H.Allen ("a Howard & Wyndham Company," 44 Hill St, London W1X 8LB); 215pp in First English Edition Hardback. Translated from the Hebrew text original by Nina De-Nur and Copyright by Ms De-Nur in 1977. First published under the title "SALAMANDRA" by Dvir Pub Co (Tel-Aviv, Israel). *Comment.* I found this searing account to be brilliantly written. I deliberately omit the gruesome details it chronicles. *There is a contagious spiritual magic in this memoir.* I completed my first reading on 11/28/2001 and I hope the time will not be long off

when a suitable opportunity presents itself to read it yet again.

60. *The Universal Path to Enlightenment* by Stephen Knapp (/ / - / /); 1992 First Edition pub by “ <http://www.Stephen-Knapp.com> .” 313pp in First Edition pbk (6/6/11 reprinting). (author’s copy acquired 1/17/2018). Chapters 4 and 5 in particular, comprising 77 pages, offer a thoughtful review of our present-day world’s major religions, of aid to most if not all spiritual aspirants. The issue of “mahavatars” versus never-embodied Divinity is somewhat addressed.

61. *Three Pillars of Zen* by Phillip Kapleau (/ / - / /); Copyright in Japan 1965 by author. 1967 Beacon pbk from 2nd prtg (w 1967 revisions): John Weatherhill Inc (NY and Tokoyo) Also Anchor Books Edition, 1980. A worthwhile and insightful review of Zen Buddhism.

62. *The Wholeness of Nature (Goethe’s Way of Science)* by Henri Bortoft (/ / - / /). 19__ First Edition pub by (unknown at this time). Bortoft studied with David Bohm (a physicist at the Burbank College of London) and with John Godolphin Bennett (author of Entry 42, which see), a keen analyst of Gurdjieff, and a mystic in his right, which is clear from his autobiography (not included now, possibly later). With two such notable Professors - as to Bohm, his book on ‘The Implicate Order of Nature’ has been hailed as of landmark caliber but is not included at this time (but maybe in later iterations of this bibliography in successor edition(s) if any) - it seems it cannot be otherwise but that Bortoft’s discussion of “Goethe’s Way of Science” will contain contrarian and spiritualistic ideas and themes at least to some extent. Hence it’s inclusion here without my personal acquaintance as yet.

Thus far, this Part B of this Annotated Bibliography has provided the titles and the authors and the publisher particulars concerning 62 books, plus one entry (number 39) comprising fifty subsection books. Were enough listed? Well yes, if even a few are fresh introductions to useful books for at least a few readers. Were not enough listed? In one sense this is always the case. We’re fortunate to have at hand here on present-day Earth *many* thousands of valuable books about mysticism and spiritual matters and religious traditions. It would never be possible to fully list them all. Every year I discover new titles I wish I’d known about long ago. Speaking of new titles, then, it seems fitting to conclude this Annotated Bibliography with a listing - compiled by unknown persons - of “The One Hundred Best Spiritual Books of the Twentieth Century.” The list turns out to have but ninety-eight entries, and of those, eight have already been cited: Entry 3 of Part A, and as to Part B, Entries 13, 15, 26, 30, 31, 32 and 33. Thus there are 206 books listed in this Annotated Bibliography, most with comments / annotations added. I hope readers will find themselves guided to new and worthwhile reading.

THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY, PART B, Closing Entry: “The 100 Best Spiritual Books”

The following list was copied from the internet website “[https://www.librarything.com/bookaward/HarperCollins+ 100+Best+Spiritual+Books+of+the+Century](https://www.librarything.com/bookaward/HarperCollins+100+Best+Spiritual+Books+of+the+Century)” at 9:54 am on Monday May 26, 2023. Some notation to some of the entries has been added. Since many if not most - if not all - of the texts cited *do* deserve inclusion in such a list, insofar as I can at present adduce the matter, it seems fitting to conclude with their recital here. They are listed alphabetically by title.

1. *Alcoholics Anonymous* by Alcoholics Anonymous.
2. *And There Was Light: Autobiography of Jacques Lusseyran, Blind Hero of the French Resistance* by Jacques Lusseyran
3. *I and Thou* by Martin Buber
- [4: see entry Number Three in Part A of this Annotated Bibliography]
5. *The Autobiography of Malcolm X* by Malcolm X
6. *The Autobiography of Saint Therese of Lisieux: The Story of a Soul* by Saint Therese of Lisieux
7. *An Autobiography: The Story of My Experiments With Truth* by Mahatma Gandhi
8. *Black Elk Speaks: Being the Life Story of a Holy Man of the Oglala Sioux* by John G. Neihardt
9. *The Candle of Vision* by George William Russell
10. *Celebration of Discipline: The Path to Spiritual Growth* by Richard J. Foster
11. *Centuries* by Thomas Traherne
12. *Christ and Culture* by H. Richard Niebuhr
13. *Christianity and Culture* by T. S. Eliot
14. *Collected Poems* by W. B. Yeats
15. *The Collected Stories* by Isaac Bashevis Singer
16. *The Cost of Discipleship* by Dietrich Bonhoeffer
17. *The Courage to Be* by Paul Tillich
18. *Crossing the Threshold of Hope* by John Paul II
19. *Cutting Through Spiritual Materialism* by Chogyam Trungpa
20. *The Dharma Bums* by Jack Kerouac
21. *The Diary of a Country Priest* by Georges Bernanos
22. *Duino Elegies* by Rainer Maria Rilke
23. *Enthusiasm* by Ronald Arbuthnott Knox
24. *The Epistle to the Romans* by Karl Barth
- [25: see entry Number Thirty-two in Part B of this Annotated Bibliography]
26. *Four Quartets* by T. S. Eliot [and see his “number 13” above]
27. *Gitanjali* by Rabindranath Tagore

[page one of four pages]

28. *God in Search of Man: A Philosophy of Judaism*
by Abraham Joshua Heschel
29. *The Golden String: An Autobiography*
by Bede Griffiths
- [30: see entry Number Twenty-six in Part B of this Annotated Bibliography]
31. *The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus*
by Marvin W. Meyer
32. *A Guide for the Perplexed* by E. F. Schumacher
33. *I Have a Dream: Writings and Speeches That Changed the World*
by Martin Luther King
34. *The Idea of the Holy* by Rudolf Otto
35. *The Immense Journey: An Imaginative Naturalist Explores the Mysteries of Man and Nature*
by Loren Eiseley
36. *In Search of the Miraculous: Fragments of an Unknown Teaching*
by P. D. Ouspensky
37. *In the Heart of the Seas* by Shmuel Yosef Agnon
38. *Journal of a Soul: The Autobiography of Pope John XXIII*
by Pope John XXIII
39. *Letters and Papers from Prison* by Dietrich Bonhoeffer [and see his "number 16" above]
40. *The Lord* by Romano Guardini
41. *The Lord of the Rings* by J. R. R. Tolkien
42. *Lost in the Cosmos: The Last Self-Help Book*
by Walker Percy
43. *The Love of Learning and The Desire for God: A Study of Monastic Culture*
by Jean Leclercq
44. *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*
by Gershom Scholem
45. *Man's Search for Meaning* by Viktor E. Frankl
46. *Markings* by Dag Hammarskjöld
47. *Meditations on the Tarot: A Journey into Christian Hermeticism*
by Anonymous
48. *Meetings With Remarkable Men*
by G. I. Gurdjieff
49. *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*
by C. G. Jung

[page two of four pages]

50. *Mere Christianity* by C. S. Lewis [see also No. 69 of this list]
51. *Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres* by Henry Adams
52. *Mount Analogue* by Rene Daumal
53. *My Guru and His Disciple* by Christopher Isherwood
54. *Mystical Dimensions of Islam* by Annemarie Schimmel
55. *The Myth of the Eternal Return: Or, Cosmos and History*
by Mircea Eliade
56. *The Nature and Destiny of Man: A Christian Interpretation*
by Reinhold Niebuhr
57. *New Seeds of Contemplation* by Thomas Merton [see also No. 77 of this list]
58. *Night* by Elie Weisel
59. *Orthodoxy* by G. K. Chesterton
60. *Peace is Every Step: The Path of Mindfulness in Everyday Life*
by Thich Nhat Hanh
- [61: see entry Number Thirty in Part B of this Annotated Bibliography]
62. *The Phenomenon of Man.* by Pierre Teilhard de Chardin
63. *Pilgrim at Tinker Creek* by Annie Dillard
64. *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth: An Essay in Orthodox Theodicy in Twelve Letters*
by Pavel Florensky
65. *The Plague* by Albert Camus
66. *The Poems of Gerald Manley Hopkins* by Gerald Manley Hopkins
67. *The Power and The Glory.* by Graham Greene
68. *Practical Mysticism* by Evelyn Underhill
69. *Prince Caspian* by C. S. Lewis [see also No. 50 of this list]
70. *Raissa's Journal* by Raissa Maritain
71. *The Razor's Edge* by W. Somerset Maugham
72. *The Reign of Quantity & the Signs of the Times*
by Rene Guenon
73. *The Road Less Traveled: A New Psychology of Love, Traditional Values, and Spiritual Growth*
by M. Scott Peck
74. *The Sabbath* by Abraham Joshua Heschel
75. *Saving the Appearances: A Study in Idolatry*
by Owen Barfield
76. *Seeing the Form (The Glory of the Lord: a Theological Aesthetics)*
by Hans Urs von Balthasar

THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY, PART B, "The 100 Best Spiritual Books," *conclusion p4*

77. *The Seven Storey Mountain* by Thomas Merton [see also No. 57 of this list]
[78: see entry Number Thirty-one in Part B of this Annotated Bibliography]
79. *Silence* by Shusaku Endo
80. *A Simple Path* by Mother Teresa
81. *Something Beautiful for God: Mother Teresa of Calcutta*
by Malcolm Muggeridge
82. *Spiritual Letters* by John Chapman
83. *The Spiritual Teaching of Ramana Maharshi*
by Ramana Maharshi
84. *The Star of Redemption* by Franz Rosenzweig
85. *Taking on the Heart of Christ: Meditations and Devotions*
by John Henry Newman
86. *Tales of the Hasidim* by Martin Buber
87. *A Testament of Devotion* by Thomas R. Kelly
88. *Think on These Things* by Jiddu Krishnamurti
89. *The Thirteen Petalled Rose: A Discourse On The Essence Of Jewish Existence and Belief*
by Adin Steinsaltz
90. *The Transcendent Unity of Religions* by Frithjof Schuon
[91: see entry Number Thirteen in Part B of this Annotated Bibliography]
92. *Waiting for God* by Simone Weil
93. *The Way of All the Earth: Experiments in Truth and Religion*
by John S. Dunne
94. *Wise Blood* by Flannery O'Connor
[95: see entry Number Fifteen in Part B of this Annotated Bibliography]
[96: see entry Number Thirty-three in Part B of this Annotated Bibliography]
97. *Zen Flesh Zen Bones: A Collection of Zen and Pre-Zen Writings*
by Paul Reps
98. *Zen Mind, Beginner's Mind* by Shunryu Suzuki
- 99.
- 100.

Either by error in transcription - or covert intention in the list copied - this list ends two entries short of "100." Which, fortuitously, permits *you the reader* to add your own favorite spiritual / religion-themed books to this bibliography not hitherto included.

[page four of four pages]

THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY, PART B: *List of 62 Book Titles Given in Part B*

- 1 *The System of the Vedanta, According to Baadarayana's Brahma Sutras and Shankara's Commentary Thereon, Set Forth as a Compendium of the Dogmatics of Brahmanism from [Shankara's] standpoint*
- 2 *A Thousand Teachings (The Upadesasahasri of Sankara)*
- 3 *Be Here Now*
- 4 *It's Here Now (Are You?) (A Spiritual Memoir)*
- 5 *More Messages from Michael*
- 6 *A Search in Secret India*
- 7 *Isis Unveiled*
- 8 *Dharma*
- 9 *Sanatana Dharma: an Elementary Text book of Hindu Religion and Ethics*
- 10 E-2 ["e" sq.] *(Nine Do-It-Yourself Energy Experiments That Prove Your Thoughts Create Your Reality)*
- 11 *Cosmic Consciousness: A Study in the Evolution of the Human Mind*
- 12 *Cosmic Consciousness Revisited*
- 13 *The varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature* [No. 91 on "100 Best" List]
- 14 *The Tibetan Book of the Dead*
- 15 *The World's Religions (Our Great Wisdom Traditions)* [No. 95 on "100 Best" List]
16. *The Five Great Religions*
- 17 *The Great Religious Leaders*
- 18 *The Spiritual Seeker's Guide (the Complete Source for Religions and Spiritual Groups...*
- 19 *Tibetan Yoga and Secret Doctrines*
- 20 *Beyond Scientific Materialism: Toward a Transcendent Theory of Consciousness*

THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY, PART B: *List of 62 Book Titles Given in Part B, cont'd*

- 21 *Tilting at Windmills (An Interview with Carla L. Rueckert and Jim McCarty)*
- 22 *The Wisdom of Vedanta*
- 23 *Conversations With God (an uncommon dialogue), Book Three*
- 24 *The New Oxford Annotated Bible (New Revised Standard Version)*
- 25 *The God Delusion*
- 26 *The Gospel of Ramakrishna.* [No. 30 on "100 Best" List]
- 27 *The Wisdom of China and India*
- 28 *Proof of Heaven: A Neurosurgeon's Journey Into the Afterlife*
- 29 *The Hero With a Thousand Faces*
- 30 *The Perennial Philosophy* [No. 61 on "100 Best" List]
- 31 *Siddhartha* [No. 78 on "100 Best" List]
- 32 *Zen Buddhism (Selected Writings of D. T. Suzuki)* [No. 25 on "100 Best" List]
[No. 96 on "100 Best" List:]
- 33 *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance (An Inquiry into Values)*
- 34 *Foundations of Tibetan Mysticism*
- 35 *Seven Lessons from Heaven*
- 36 *The Light Between Us*
- 37 *On the Origin of Species*
- 38 *The Lotka Hypothesis*
- 39.01 to .50 *The Sacred Books of the East in Fifty Volumes*
- 40 *The Life Divine*
- 41 *The Essential Aurobindo*

THE ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY, PART B: *List of 62 Book Titles Given in Part B, conclusion*

- 42 *Long Pilgrimage*
- 43 *Right Living (Being the Teachings of... known as Sri Shivapuri Baba)*
- 44 *Short Treatise on God, Man and Human Welfare*
- 45 *Complete Works of Benedict de Spinoza*
- 46 *The Conscious Universe (The Scientific Truth of Psychic Phenomena)*
- 47 *God Struck Me Dead (Voices of Ex-Slaves)*
- 48 *The Book of the Unfolding*
- 49 *Initiations and Initiates in Tibet*
- 50 *The Way to Freedom*
- 51 *Stilling the Mind (Shamatha Teachings from Dudjom Lingpa's Vajra Essence)*
- 52 *The Tantric Mysticism of Tibet*
- 53 *The Consciousness of the Atom*
- 54 *Indian Philosophy*
- 55 *Secrets of the UFO*
- 56 *A Wanderer's Handbook (An Owner's Manual for ET's And Other Spiritual Outsiders)*
- 57 *A Concept Guide (The Ra Contact Resource Series)*
- 58 *On Death and Dying*
- 59 *Sunrise Over Hell*
- 60 *The Universal Path to Enlightenment*
- 61 *Three Pillars of Zen*
- 62 *The Wholeness of Nature (Goethe's Way of Science)*