

## The Higher Evolution of Man

### Tape 82: Buddhism, Nietzsche, and 'The Superman'

I am sure that all of you, or at least very nearly all of you, have seen those nice, thick, glossy mail order catalogues. We know, in any case, that Christmas is coming and usually at this time of year there's rather a lot of these catalogues around. Well, let's just suppose something. Let's just suppose that, just for once, you do what you don't usually do, you yield to temptation after flicking over these rather glossy, rather colourful pages. You yield to temptation, you fill in a form, and you send it away: you order something. It can be anything; it can be a coat for the winter or it can be a new dining room table, or it could be a washing machine or an electric razor - it could be anything. And suppose, after days, possibly weeks, of waiting it comes. The parcel comes, just before Christmas. And suppose that when the parcel comes you very eagerly undo the wrappings, take it out of its box or whatever else it's in; but suppose then you find that the article which you had ordered, which you had started unwrapping with so much eagerness, was in fact only half-made, only half-complete, that it wasn't all there, maybe the dining room table has just two legs instead of four, or maybe there are some parts missing from the washing machine, and so on. Well, in those circumstances what would be our reaction? Would we be satisfied with what we had received? I think we can be pretty sure that, far from being satisfied, we would be very dissatisfied indeed; not only dissatisfied but disappointed; not only disappointed, even indignant; not only indignant, even angry. And no doubt we would at once send the half-made, incomplete article straight back to where it came from and probably accompanied by a rather strongly-worded note. This is no doubt what would happen. But strange to say, there's one article that we order as it were, that arrives in a half-made, half-finished, incomplete state but with which we seem perfectly satisfied, which we show no inclination at all to send back. And what is that article? I am sure you've already guessed it. That article, that incomplete, that unfinished article, with which usually we are perfectly satisfied, which we never dream of sending back, is of course *ourselves*. Strange to say, we want everything else, all our possessions to be complete, to be perfect, to be well-made, to be highly polished, to be beautifully finished; but we are quite satisfied, perfectly well satisfied with ourselves as an incomplete and imperfect, badly-made, half-made, not to say botched and unfinished job. And one of the purposes of the present series of lectures, is to make us dissatisfied and disgruntled with ourselves; make us want, as it were, to send ourselves back.

Now how does one become dissatisfied? In what way, by what method, if you like, does one become dissatisfied? One becomes dissatisfied when one compares oneself, as one is here and now, with oneself as one can, as one could, even as one *must* in the future, be. We become dissatisfied with ourselves as we are now when we get a glimpse, even just a little glimpse, of our own tremendous potentialities compared with which what we are now is as nothing; potentialities which have literally no limit at all. And this is what happens when we consider this subject of the Higher Evolution of Man - that is to say when we consider that whole process of development from unawareness to awareness, from collectivity (the herd) to true individuality, from reactivity to creativity, and from unenlightened to Enlightened humanity. When we see that vision, as it were, that vision of the Higher Evolution, that vision of what we can become, what we must become, then we become dissatisfied, become disgruntled with ourselves as we are now. And it is, as you know very well, with this subject of the Higher Evolution of Man that we've been concerned over the last two months. Being concerned with it, we have tried to see it at work, we have tried to see its underlying principle at work, in a number of different fields of human activity, at different levels within widely different contexts. We've examined, to begin with, the concept of Higher Evolution:-

- within the context of science, especially biology and what we called metabiology;
- we've examined it, similarly, within the context of history and anthropology;
- within the context of art;
- within the context of comparative religion;

- within the context of Buddhism in general;
- within the context of the Hinayana form of Buddhism - in other words, within the context of the process of individual emancipation;
- and finally we've examined it within the context of the Mahayana form of Buddhism, that is to say within the context, the widest possible context on this occasion, of the whole cosmic order.

---oOo---

Now tonight we are going to consider the whole evolution of Man within yet another context. We are going to consider it tonight *within the context of modern Western thought*. Tonight we come to the eighth and last lecture of this series and we come to the topic of *Buddhism, Nietzsche and 'The Superman'*. Now I am going to begin by referring back to lecture number two [tape 76]. This was on *The Axial Age and the Emergence of the New Man*. You may remember that on that occasion, in that lecture, surveying human history, we divided the whole half-million-year period of the history of Man into four great successive segments:

- (i) first of all there was the Promethean Age, the Age of Fire;
- (ii) then there was the Age of Divine Kingship, the Age of Agriculture;
- (iii) then there was the Axial Age;
- (iv) finally there was the Age of Science and Technology.

Now tonight I'm going to suggest an alternative name for the fourth Age, that is to say for the Age which we called in that lecture the Age of Science and Technology. I am going to suggest, tonight, that this Age - the Age in the midst of which we are now living - could also be called the *Age of Globalisation*. I am afraid 'globalisation' is a rather ugly word. It is, I believe, an American coinage and like quite a number of these rather ugly American coinages, it's rather expressive and very useful. I say Age of Globalisation rather than the Global Age, which would have been simpler and sweeter, because the process of globalisation is still going on. The Age in which we live, or perhaps towards the end of which we are living, is very much a period of the breaking down of barriers.

First of all, it is, largely was, has been, a period of the breaking down of geographical barriers. Formerly for thousands, for tens of thousands of years, the different parts of the world, the different sections of humanity, the different races of mankind, were comparatively, if not almost entirely, isolated from one another, and they developed more or less in isolation from one another. If there was any contact it tended to be peripheral and it tended to be occasional. But all that has now changed, in fact is changing, though the change seems to have been almost completed by now. We find that all the different sections of the human race, all the different races of mankind, all the different populations of the world living in different countries, following different customs, evolving different cultures, have all now come into closer and closer contact with one another.

And we find that this has been brought about due to immensely increased facilities of communication. First of all, at the very beginning almost of this period, this Age of Globalisation, there came the railway, linking continents together. Then there came the ocean-going steamship. Then there came the telegraph and the telephone. And finally, at an ever-increasing pace there came, in this century itself, the aeroplane, the radio and television. And this vast, this intricate communications network has made it very much easier than ever before simply to get around. And it has made, therefore, metaphorically speaking, the world a very much smaller place, so much so that it has created what one modern thinker, [Marshall] McLuhan<sup>2</sup>, calls the global village. Nowadays we are, as it were, living on top of one another. Everybody in the world, everybody who cares to know, knows what is happening everywhere in the world, at the very time that it is happening, just as in a village. If you're living in a little

village, whether it is in India or in this country, maybe a hundred, maybe two hundred houses, if Mr So-and-so is going to get married, or if Mrs So-and-so hung out her washing half-an-hour late yesterday, you know it within a matter of minutes, within a matter of hours. You're just one little tight community and news flashes around very quickly. Well, now the characteristic of this Age in which we are living, this Age of Globalisation, is that this sort of thing happens so far as the world as a whole is concerned. The world itself has become a sort of village, and we, all of us millions and millions though we may be, are as it were villagers in this global village. And this is the first time in the history of the world that such a thing has happened. So we have all been drawn much closer together. We are all living, as it were, almost literally on top of one another in this world at present. The repercussions of this as it were tightening up of everything, this in-folding of everything upon itself, this in-folding, as Teilhard de Chardin puts it, of the human race in upon itself has had repercussions in all the different fields of life and human activity.

First of all, most obviously, there are the political and the economic repercussions. One hears on the radio, for instance, about something happening in West Germany, some election result or other, and then one hears a few minutes later that as a result of that stocks and shares have gone down on the Tokyo Stock Exchange immediately, in response. So all this sort of thing, these political, these economic repercussions, are all so obvious and so well-known there is no need to go into any detail.

And then there's the cultural field, the same sort of thing is happening there. We find that the fine arts, for instance, are all becoming nowadays international, becoming if you like supra-national. Take for instance the field of music: we find nowadays that oriental music, whether Indian or Chinese or Japanese, is beginning to fertilise Western music; and Western music, classical music, pop music, beginning to fertilise too Eastern music. In this way this sort of reciprocal process, this mutual influence goes on.

And it is just the same in the field, the even more important field, of philosophy and religion. It is no longer one-way. For centuries, we know, Christian missionaries have been going forth from the West to the East to convert the heathen. Catholics and Protestants, Lutherans, Methodists, Salvation Army people, they've all been streaming out to the East to convert people there. But now the traffic is, as it were, reversed. Now we find that missionaries of great oriental religions are, I won't say pouring into the West, but very very many of them are coming as compared with before. Nowadays in the streets of London, the streets of New York, the streets of Paris, you can find representatives of Zen Buddhism, of various Hindu cults, and so on. And the net result of all this, the sort of intermingling of East and West, is that the spiritual teachings of all Ages, and all countries, and all climes, are becoming more and more the common heritage of all mankind. If you think of some of the popular paper-back series being published in this country and in the United States today, if one reflects upon it, it is a really amazing thing that just for a pound or two you can purchase translations of most of the really great spiritual classics of the East and of the West, and have them all on your own shelf, to read yourself, in your own time, at your leisure; a thing that was not possible before in the whole history of the world.

So we find that all these things, all these spiritual teachings, all these spiritual traditions, all these great spiritual classics, are all as it were in the melting pot together nowadays, all acting upon or influencing one another. This is the situation that we find in the field of philosophy, in the field of religion. Globalisation of thought, also; globalisation of spiritual experience even, is now in process of coming about. And in these circumstances, under these conditions, it is, we may say, inevitable that sooner or later, in one way or another, we should come to the subject matter of tonight's lecture, that is to say *Buddhism, Nietzsche and 'the Superman'*. Inevitable that sooner or later these two should be compared.

Buddhism, as we all know, is one of the three great universal religions of the world (the other two being Christianity and Islam). It is also the greatest, the most highly influential, the best known, of all the spiritual traditions of the East. When you think of the Wisdom of the East, if you think of it all, you think of the figure of the Buddha; and in much the same way, the philosophy, the thought of Nietzsche is one of the most important philosophies or lines of thought that the West so far has produced. In fact, one might even go so far as to say that as a point of departure at present the philosophy, the thought of Nietzsche is the most important of

all that the West, certainly the modern West, has produced. Now most of you are already acquainted with Buddhism, the fundamentals of its Teaching, its basic practices, its basic exercises. And some of you I know are even well acquainted with Buddhism. So tonight I am not going to say anything directly on this part of the subject. I am not going to give you, to begin with, an exposition of what we mean by Buddhism.

What I propose to do is to say, first of all, a few words about the life and the work of Nietzsche and then to proceed at once to one of the central conceptions of his thought, that is to say the conception of 'the Superman'. After this we will compare his conception of 'the superman' and allied ideas with some of the ideas expounded in the course of these lectures. In other words we'll be comparing Nietzsche's thought, especially 'the superman', with this whole subject of the Higher Evolution of Man, as well as with Buddhism as the embodiment, the exemplification of that Higher Evolution.

I must say, to start with, and here we have perhaps just another little fragment of autobiography, that I am personally very glad to be able to make this comparison of Buddhism with Nietzsche's thought via the conception of 'the Superman'. I became acquainted with Nietzsche, with his writings, when I was about eighteen-and-a-half, and at that time I happened to be in the Army. I remember very well that one day I had the day off, and I remember I took advantage of the day off and went to Box Hill in Surrey, a famous beauty spot, as many of you know. It was a glorious summer's day and I climbed up to the top of Box Hill, and I lay there in the brilliant sunshine, on the grass, and read *Thus Spake Zarathustra*. I can remember even now the tremendous impression made upon me then by this work, generally considered Nietzsche's most famous and popular work. As I read those words, those sentences - as some of you know they are not only profound thought but very beautiful poetry - and as I looked up at the blue sky it seemed almost as though the words of Zarathustra, the words of Nietzsche, were written across the blue sky in scarlet letters. So I have entertained a sort of weakness, if you like, for Nietzsche ever since, and have returned to him, read him, from time to time.

Now Nietzsche was born in Germany in 1844. His father was a Lutheran minister. It was, in fact, Nietzsche who said that the Lutheran minister was the father of German philosophy; but that's another story. His father died in 1849, when Nietzsche was only four or five, and Nietzsche spent his whole childhood surrounded by his mother, his sister, his grandmother, and two maiden aunts. And he was sent, I am glad to be able to tell you, when he was a little older to boarding school, and from there he proceeded to the universities of Bonn and Leipzig where he studied Classical Philology<sup>3</sup>; this was his subject. But for one reason or another he didn't obtain his doctorate, but in spite of that he received a call, at the age of 24, to Basle University to occupy the Chair of Philology. This came about on account of the strong recommendation of the very great scholar and philologist, Ritschl, who had been very much impressed by Nietzsche's work as a student. So there was Nietzsche at Basle University teaching Classical Philology. But he didn't drop his studies, he studied Philosophy<sup>4</sup>, especially Schopenhauer<sup>5</sup>, and he took an interest in music, especially the music of Wagner. And in 1872, when he was still a very young man, he published his first book which carried the title of *The Birth of Tragedy*. This was a short but very brilliant work of quite exceptional interest. During the next few years he published a number of other important works. But in 1879, when he was only 35, he resigned his University appointment, terminated his academic career, and thereafter he spent most of his active, that is to say his writing, life in Switzerland and in Italy.

As one reads the life of Nietzsche, despite his tremendous achievement in the field of philosophy, in the field of thought, quite brilliant, quite exceptional achievements, one cannot help feeling a little sad because Nietzsche's whole life from the time that he left the University was a life of intense, even increasing loneliness. He was completely on his own. There was, apparently, nobody, or at least hardly anybody who understood him or with whom he could be really friends, except in one or two cases just through the medium of correspondence. And he also had to suffer, more and more, very great physical pain. He wasn't a healthy person, and one of the scholars who have written about him has left a very moving, a very touching, portrait of Nietzsche and the way in which he used to live, this very lonely, this very secluded, very isolated life with continual mental and physical suffering. But despite all this, Nietzsche continued to write, and between 1883 and 1885 he wrote *Thus Spake Zarathustra* which, as I have already said, was and is his

most famous and most popular work. And he continued writing until 1888, but he continued writing amidst increasing isolation and increasing physical suffering, sometimes quite unbearable physical suffering. Not only that, but there came to him, as a result of his work, hardly any recognition. When he published, for instance, the fourth part of *Zarathustra*, I believe only a few dozen copies were sold. Nobody seemed to take any notice at all of his writing, of his ideas, and so on. So he had no recognition, or at best just a very tiny, very faint glimmer of recognition, certainly nothing commensurate with the importance of his work. And then in 1889, Nietzsche became insane and he died, still insane, in 1900 at the age of 55. So such was the life, such was the work of Nietzsche.

Now I have referred already from time to time to Nietzsche's philosophy, but this is really a misnomer. The word 'philosophy' doesn't really apply to Nietzsche's thought, or to his thinking as we perhaps ought to say. Nietzsche elaborated, he excogitated<sup>6</sup>, he struck out as it were a number of ideas, brilliant, illuminating ideas, and these ideas, certainly the leading ideas amongst them, hang together, they belong together. But at the same time, Nietzsche certainly did not aim at elaborating a logically consistent interpretation of the whole of existence, of the whole of experience. He certainly did not aim at building up a system, a system of philosophy. This is, of course, what his great predecessors had done or tried to do. This was what Kant<sup>7</sup> tried to do, what Hegel<sup>8</sup> tried to do, what Fichte<sup>9</sup> tried to do, what Schelling<sup>9</sup> tried to do, what Schopenhauer tried to do, before Nietzsche. But Nietzsche did not attempt to do anything of that sort. He was not a systematic philosopher. He was not a system builder, he did not aspire to erect one gigantic edifice of thought within which everything could be accommodated. That was not his aspiration, that was not his ambition. Indeed Nietzsche was opposed to this sort of approach, to this sort of method. And he went so far as to declare, in one of his works, that 'the will to system is a will to lack of integrity'. This is one of his very iconoclastic<sup>10</sup> thoughts indeed. And this lack or this absence of, or this indifference to, this opposition to system, to system building, is reflected in his works, in his writings, especially in the later ones. With the exception of *Thus Spake Zarathustra*, all of Nietzsche's later writings are simply strings of aphorisms, short sharp sayings; or rather some are longer and others are shorter. And Nietzsche, we may say, is the master of the aphorism. No one else has been able, it seems, to say so much in so few words, to shed so much light within such a short space as Nietzsche. He is absolutely the master of this particular type of composition, this particular type of literary approach. We might even say that Nietzsche in this field, the field of the aphorism, has absolutely no rival at all, with the possible exception of William Blake, who hasn't left us very many but he has left us a whole series of them in that little work, *The Proverbs of Hell*, a section of the *Marriage of Heaven and Hell*. And the Proverbs of Hell, one might say, compare with Nietzsche. They are perhaps even more condensed than Nietzsche himself, but, alas, there is only this one work of Blake's in this particular form. As he got older Blake, unlike Nietzsche, tended to become rather more, perhaps we shouldn't use such a disrespectful word, rather more long-winded. He wrote *The Proverbs of Hell* when he was a comparatively young man. But Nietzsche, as he got older, as he wrote more, became more and more aphoristic, more and more brilliant also, more and more pungent, more and more lambent<sup>11</sup>, more and more lightning-like, and more and more devastating and iconoclastic. So that his aphorisms are very often like thunder-claps or like blows.

Now this aphoristic approach on the part of Nietzsche is not accidental. This lack of system, this indifference to system, is not accidental. One might even say that the aphoristic approach is of the essence of Nietzsche's method. He is aphoristic not because he can't be systematic but because he *chooses* to be aphoristic, because he thinks that this is the right approach. We might even go so far as to say that in this respect Nietzsche is a bit Zen-like. Some of Nietzsche's aphorisms are not unlike, at least in spirit if not in actual content, some of the utterances, some of the sayings of the Zen masters of China and Japan. Each aphorism of Nietzsche penetrates, we may say, deeply into existence, into reality, from a particular point of view, from a particular direction; and each stands as it were on its own merits, on its own feet. The truth of one aphorism is not dependent on the truth of some other aphorism. They are not logically connected in this way. You may recollect that Coleridge<sup>12</sup>, the great poet and thinker and critic, said of Kean's<sup>13</sup> acting, 'Seeing him was like reading Shakespeare by flashes of lightning'. And one can say much the same thing of Nietzsche. One can say that reading Nietzsche is rather like trying to make out a landscape, the landscape of existence itself, human existence itself, with the help of flashes of lightning; and these flashes of lightning are the aphorisms. We read an aphorism and for an

instant, just by means of those few lines, those few dozen words, it is as though everything was brilliantly illuminated, we see everything clearly from that particular point of view, that particular angle. And then after that, absolute darkness. We read another aphorism and then another flash from another quarter, from another direction, and once again everything is clear, everything is lit up, everything is revealed, but after that, again, darkness. And all these flashes, these aphorisms, show us as it were different pictures. We know, in a sense, in a way, that all the pictures that are revealed to us by these flashes, by these aphorisms, refer to the same landscape, but it is difficult if not impossible to piece them all together as a coherent whole, into one complete, all-embracing picture. And this is very much how it is with Nietzsche. His writings make, we may say, very inspiring reading but they are very difficult indeed to expound systematically. But fortunately we are not called upon tonight to do this.

Tonight we are concerned with only one flash, as it were, and that one of the brightest of Nietzsche's flashes. Or we might say we are concerned with, at the most, two or three flashes. And these flashes show us a landscape very similar to that which has been revealed to us in the present course of lectures. We'll be concerned now with the idea, with Nietzsche's idea of 'the Superman' as well as with the idea of self-overcoming and with 'the will to power'. Now those of you who have seen our notices for these lectures will probably have observed that the word 'superman' is printed between single inverted commas. And this has been done for a definite reason, in fact for two reasons. First of all, it indicates that the word 'superman' is not a literal translation of Nietzsche's original German term. And the inverted commas also remind us, also warn us that we must not attach to the word or to Nietzsche's idea, Nietzsche's concept, connotations which have gathered around this word 'superman' in recent years, even in recent decades. The original term, the term used by Nietzsche, the German term, is *übermensch*, which literally means not 'superman' but 'overman'; or we might even translate it, not to say paraphrase, as 'over-and-above-man'. In other words, the *übermensch*, the 'overman', is the man who stands over and above Man as he exists at present. The 'overman' is what, or who, transcends Man. In fact, we could even speak of the 'overman' as 'transcendent man'. In other words, the 'overman', what we have been mis-calling 'superman', the Nietzschean 'superman' or 'overman', is not just present-day man writ large, as it were; not just present-day man, present-day humanity in a superlative degree. The 'overman' represents, rather, a completely different type of man. So one can see at once that here there are affinities with what we have called, in the course of these lectures, the 'New Man'. But more of that in a few minutes.

From now onwards in this lecture I shall speak not of 'the superman' with all its misleading connotations, but of 'the overman'. The word 'superman', incidentally, as a rendition of Nietzsche's *übermensch*, was first popularised apparently by George Bernard Shaw. You probably remember there is a play of his called *Man and Superman*. And since then the term, the word, has become hopelessly vulgarised and hopelessly debased, so that it has come to mean something very far indeed from what Nietzsche meant, from what Nietzsche intended by this expression *übermensch* or 'overman'. In fact we may say, and it is a very regrettable fact, we may say that after his death the whole thought, the whole way of thinking of Nietzsche was hopelessly corrupted and debased; first of all, as is very well known, at the hands of his sister, and after that at the hands of various people who wanted to try to make out a sort of case for the Nietzschean philosophy or Nietzschean thinking being in accordance with the thinking of the [Third] German Reich, the Nazi régime. And it is only in comparatively recent years that Nietzsche's thinking has been rescued from all these misinterpretations, these perversions, and been at last correctly interpreted, notably by [Walter] Kaufmann [of Princeton University] and a few other scholars and commentators.

Now the question arises: How does Nietzsche arrive at his concept of 'the overman'? And to answer this question we have to refer to the beginning of *Thus Spake Zarathustra*, have to refer to the section which is called *Zarathustra's Prologue*. Zarathustra is, of course, the name of the founder of the ancient Zoroastrian faith. As we saw in our fourth lecture, Zoroastrianism is one of the universal religions. But here, in Nietzsche's work, Zarathustra has very little to do indeed with the historical Spitama Zarathustra. In *Thus Spake Zarathustra*, the figure of Zarathustra is simply a mouthpiece for Nietzsche's own ideas. There's no connection between those ideas and historical Zoroastrianism.

Now Zarathustra's Prologue represents him as coming down from the mountain; and this is of course symbolical and meant to be symbolical. Apparently, we gather, Zarathustra has spent, on the mountain, a period of ten years. He's been thinking, he's been meditating, and now his wisdom has become ripe, is ready to overflow, and he wants to share it with mankind. So he comes down the mountain. And on the way down he meets a saintly hermit, someone who had been living in the forest at the foot of the mountain for years and years together. And the saintly hermit recognises Zarathustra. Apparently he had seen him years earlier on his way up; now he meets him on his way down. And the saintly hermit tries to persuade Zarathustra not to go down amongst men. He says, 'It will be a waste of time, don't trouble yourself. Men are ungrateful. Men are distracted. Don't waste your time going down amongst them.' He says, 'It's much better to be a hermit like me, it's much better to live in the forest with the birds and the beasts. It's much better to live in the forest, ignoring men, forgetting men, simply worshipping God.' But Zarathustra is not to be dissuaded from his mission. He leaves the saintly hermit at his prayers in the forest, and he goes on down the mountain. And as he goes, he says to himself, 'Could it be possible that this old saint in the forest has not yet heard anything of this, that God is dead?' And this, of course, this remark that 'God is dead', represents, constitutes one of Nietzsche's most important insights. 'God is dead.'

We've heard a lot about the 'God is dead' or the 'death of God' theology in recent years, in recent decades, but it all started with Nietzsche. He was the first one to see this, to see that God was dead, that he wasn't up there in the heavens any longer. Now this of course means that Nietzsche saw, clearly, what many people don't even seem able to see today, a hundred years afterwards. Nietzsche saw clearly that orthodox Christian teaching, the teaching of the Churches, orthodox Christian theology with its doctrines of a personal God, of a Supreme Being, a Creator, the doctrines of sin and faith, justification and atonement and resurrection, and all the rest, that this whole system is in fact dead, is in fact finished, is in fact irrelevant; and that, as someone more recently has remarked, we are now living not just in the Age of Science and Technology, not just in the Age of Globalisation even, we are living now, though we haven't yet perhaps woken up to the fact, in the Post-Christian Age. The Christian Ages, whether of faith or un-faith, are behind us. So God is dead. And this fact, this statement, gives us also a clue to the sources of Nietzsche's thought regarding 'the overman'. If God is dead, if Christianity is dead, if Christian dogma is dead, if Christian theology is dead, then the Christian view, the Christian conception of Man, is dead as well. The conception of Man as a fallen being, a being who once was disobedient, who sinned, who now needs grace to redeem him, who has to believe, who will be judged, who will be punished perhaps, this sort of concept, this sort of dogma about Man is exploded, is finished, is dead.

So one has to get a new conception of Man. Man finds himself, as it were, in a universe without God. He is on his own, he is alone. So Man has to try to understand himself afresh. He can't take ready-made any conception, any idea about himself. He can't simply accept what the Christian tradition tells him about himself. He just finds himself here, here and now, and has to ask himself 'Who am I? What am I?' He finds himself in the midst of the starry universe, he finds himself standing on the Earth, surrounded by other men, with a history behind him, perhaps with a future before him, and he has to ask himself, and ask only himself - nobody else because there's nobody else to tell him - he has to ask himself 'Who am I? What am I?' Now that all the old definitions are gone, Man has to define himself, has to define himself anew, has to discover himself, to know himself. And this in fact is what Zarathustra has already done on the mountain. He has thought, he has meditated perhaps, contemplated perhaps, for ten long years, and now he knows what Man is. And this is the message that he now brings to humanity. This is the insight that he now brings to humanity.

So Zarathustra reaches the edge of the forest, he comes to a town on the edge of the forest, he enters the town and there in the town, in the market square, he finds people gathered together. So what are they gathered together for? They certainly haven't gathered together to listen to him. They didn't even know he was coming, they knew nothing about him. They have come to see a travelling tightrope-walker. That's what they are really interested in. But nevertheless, as the tightrope-walker hasn't turned up yet (apparently he's late or something like that), Zarathustra, taking advantage of the opportunity, seizing it with both hands as it were, he speaks to them. And what does he say? Remember this is his first message, this is his initial statement. What does he

say? Zarathustra says, addressing the people in that market square, addressing if you like all humanity, he says, 'I teach you "the overman". Man is something that shall be overcome. What have you done to overcome him?'

So this is the great insight with which we are concerned especially tonight; this is the great lightning flash as it were, that Zarathustra teaches 'the overman', teaches that Man is something that shall be overcome, and asks 'What have you done to overcome him?' That means, of course, to overcome yourself. Other, lesser flashes follow, and the other flashes show us how Nietzsche arrived at the concept of 'the overman' and we find, perhaps not surprisingly, that he arrived at it in much the same way that we've arrived at it in these lectures, arrived that is to say at the concept of the Higher Evolution, at the concept of the New Man. Nietzsche quite clearly, quite explicitly, arrived at the concept of 'the overman' by consideration of the general nature of the evolutionary process. Zarathustra, in this prologue - or rather Nietzsche - points out that so far in history all beings have created something beyond themselves. They never stopped. They never came to a halt. Every being, every kind of being, has created something beyond itself, has given birth as it were to something higher than itself in the evolutionary scale. And Nietzsche, through the mouth of Zarathustra, says that there is no reason to suppose that this process will stop with Man. He says, clearly, explicitly: the ape created man. And in the same way, in an even higher way, an even better way, more glorious way, Man himself must now create 'the overman'; and how does Man create 'the overman'? Man must create 'the overman' by overcoming himself. And this means, Nietzsche goes on to say, that he must learn to look down on himself, to despise himself, to be dissatisfied and discontented and disgruntled with himself; because it is only when he begins to look down on himself that he can begin to rise above himself and be something higher and greater and nobler than he was.

But it is very important to make clear, it is very important to point out that Nietzsche was not a Darwinian in the popular sense of the term. For Nietzsche, 'the overman' is not simply, or will not be simply the latest, the last product of the evolutionary process. It's not that the evolutionary process just goes on and on and on and then up comes 'the overman'. In other words, 'the overman' will not be produced automatically, will not be produced as a result of the general blind function of the evolutionary process. In fact, we find in his writings, in his works, that Nietzsche distinguishes quite sharply between what he calls 'the last man' on the one hand, and 'the overman' himself on the other. And 'the last man' is simply the latest product of the general, the collective evolutionary process of humanity. 'The last man' is not a higher type. 'The overman', that is to say, will be the product of the individual man's effort to overcome himself, to rise, to soar if you like, above himself. And it is on account of this distinction, this distinction which he makes between 'the last man' on the one hand and 'the overman' on the other, that Nietzsche is able to dissociate himself from superficial 19th-century ideas of human progress; ideas to the effect that progress continues indefinitely and Man becomes better and better, higher and higher. Nietzsche does not accept that. In other words, Man is not becoming better automatically simply by virtue of the passage of time. We have to do something about it. Man isn't becoming better automatically by virtue of the passage of time but he can *make himself better* if he so chooses.

We must confess that Nietzsche isn't very clear at times on this point, or at least not always very explicit, but he seems to be saying the same sort of thing that we've been saying in these lectures when we say that, whereas the lower evolution is collective, the higher evolution is individual. Nietzsche in fact has a sort of vision of Man, a sort of picture of Man, in his mind. Nietzsche says that he sees Man as a rope; a rope, he says, stretched out between the beast on one hand and 'the overman' on the other. And Nietzsche, who is nothing if not graphic, nothing if not imaginative, says that this rope which is stretched between the beast and 'the overman' is stretched over an abyss. It's dangerous to be a man, in other words, or at least it should be dangerous. Man, he points out, is something transitional. He is not only just a rope, he is also a bridge. He's a bridge and not an end; and being a rope as it were, being a bridge as it were, being not an end, he must live for something other than himself. And this something other, for the sake of which Man, each and every individual man should and must live, is 'the overman'. Nietzsche, in fact, does not only distinguish between beast and overman, he distinguishes too between Man and overman. He distinguishes between Man as animal and Man as human being; and the distinction for Nietzsche is a very sharp one indeed. He says, in fact, that the majority of men are not men; the majority of men are animals. As we pointed out more than once in the course of these lectures, most



people have not yet achieved humanity. According to Nietzsche, the turning point, the great watershed of evolution, of the evolutionary process, is not as between animal and Man, it is between Man who is still an animal and Man who is no longer an animal, Man who is truly human. This turning point, this watershed, is of course point 2 on our original chart, the point of the emergence of self-consciousness, of awareness, the point at which, as we saw in some detail in previous weeks, the point at which begins the Higher Evolution.

Kaufmann, expounding Nietzsche, says of him, 'He maintains, in effect, that the gulf which separates Plato from the average man is greater than the cleft between the average man and the chimpanzee.' This is Nietzsche's thought. The other week, we found it echoed by a very prominent modern novelist, and this is of course very much our own view as expounded in the course of these lectures. And it's not a view which is very flattering to the average man. The average man doesn't really like to hear that he is lifted very little, if at all, above the animal level, that he falls short of true humanity. This is not the sort of picture of himself that he cares to see, and it is not surprising that when Zarathustra, in the Prologue, spoke to the people in the market place about 'the overman' they just laughed at him. They were much more interested in watching the tightrope-walker.

We may say that Nietzsche distinguishes three categories:

first there's the category of animal, including animal-man, that is the majority of so-called human beings - honorary human beings, we may say;

second, the category of Man, true Man;

and thirdly the category of 'the overman'.

Nietzsche also speaks of what he calls 'prefatory men' and, though he is not very clear on the point, these seem to be intermediate between True Man on the one hand and 'the overman' on the other; and Nietzsche describes these 'prefatory men' as bent on seeking in all things for that aspect which must be overcome. This is the characteristic of the 'prefatory men'; and he exhorts these 'prefatory men' to live dangerously; not safely, not cosily, not comfortably, not securely, but insecurely, even dangerously. In a way, we may say, Nietzsche's views on what constitutes humanity, true manhood, are even more radical, even more demanding than our own have been in the course of these lectures. And Nietzsche says, among other things, that the true men, those who are no longer animals, are simply the philosophers, the artists and the saints. In a sense, he considers only them to be really and truly human, which is going considerably farther than we have gone. And 'the overman', apparently, is something even higher, even superior to the philosophers, the artists and the saints. But at any rate it is also clear, in Nietzsche's thinking, that man becomes 'overman' by the process of self-overcoming; and it is clear too that philosophers, artists, saints, are overcoming themselves, and to that extent are, in a sense, to some extent 'overmen'.

Now Nietzsche also speaks of self-overcoming in terms of what he calls 'giving style to one's character'. He complains that most people's characters have no particular style and by 'giving style to one's character' he means not accepting oneself ready-made, just as you come from the factory. Certainly not accepting yourself as badly-made or half-made, as incomplete. By this sort of attitude he means an attitude of treating one's life and one's character as so much raw material. Usually, we think: well, here we are, with such-and-such character, such-and-such temperament, such-and-such characteristics, qualities, and what can I do about it? We think this is something given, we are landed with it for the rest of our lives. That if we, for instance, have a tendency to get angry quickly, then that's that, we're landed with it for life. If by nature we are very sensitive, we're landed with that for life. If we are shy, we are landed with that for life. Just as we are landed with being tall or short or fat or thin, healthy or unhealthy, and so on. But Nietzsche says, no. As you are now, as you've been handed to yourself by your parents and so on, your education, your general social conditioning, educational conditioning, this is not the finished product, this is just the raw material. This is where you begin, this is where you start. So Nietzsche says in effect that one should work upon oneself, create oneself like a work of art. Just as you can get a great lump of clay - all heavy and sticky and stodgy - and you can get your fingers into it, get

your hands into it and start shaping it into something, in the same way you must behave with your own character, with yourself. Just see yourself as this untidy, shapeless, dough-like mass; that's you. And just, as it were, get your fingers, get your hands into yourself and start shaping yourself. Don't think that you're landed with this sort of mass, this sort of stodgy, dough-like stuff or heap for ever, indefinitely. This is what you start with. This is your raw material. So give shape, give style, he says, to your own life, to your own character. Make something of yourself. Produce yourself like producing a work of art. Just knock yourself into shape, slap yourself if you like into shape; but make something shapely. Don't be satisfied with yourselves as you are.

And in this connection, in connection with this whole idea of giving style to one's character, Nietzsche is very fond of mentioning the great example of Goethe, the great German poet and dramatist and novelist and thinker and scientist and mystic. Nietzsche admired Goethe very much and he admired him most of all for this particular quality. If we read Goethe's life, if we read his conversations, we see that Goethe all the time was trying to make something of himself. He was trying to work upon himself just like he might work upon a poem or a drama or a novel or a scientific treatise, making himself better and clearer and more perfect and more balanced. This is what Goethe was trying to do through the whole of his long life, more than eighty years, and he succeeded. So that when the great Napoleon saw Goethe for the first time, what did he say quite spontaneously, when he was confronted by Goethe? And Goethe after all, politically, was nobody, he was just an ex-minister of a little tiny state in Germany; and there was Napoleon, the conqueror of Europe. But when Napoleon saw Goethe, well, Goethe wasn't impressed by Napoleon particularly, but Napoleon exclaimed of Goethe: 'Look, there's a man.' A very simple exclamation but full of meaning. 'Look, there's a man.' And this is what Goethe made of himself from this sort of bundle of passions and ideas. As a young man he was very turbulent and very wild indeed, quite a rake we are told. But from this rather unpromising raw material, he made of himself a man in the fullest and truest sense. When Nietzsche refers to Goethe, he admires Goethe for this particular quality of giving style to his character.

Now we have seen that Nietzsche arrives at the concept of 'the overman' by a consideration of the general nature of the evolutionary process; by realising that all beings have created something beyond themselves and that man is no exception, that man must do likewise, man must do similarly. And the same consideration, we may say, enables Nietzsche to understand the nature of existence itself. *Life, he says, is that which must always overcome itself.* This is the very nature of life, not just of human existence, but life in general; that it is never satisfied with itself. It always wants to go beyond, always wants to go further. Life is that which must always overcome itself. In our own words, earlier in this course, *life is a self-transcending process.* Life is a process which continually at every stage transcends, goes beyond, goes above itself.

Now this urge, this innate urge of life to overcome itself, to transcend itself, is what Nietzsche calls (though the expression is introduced comparatively late in his writings) 'the will to power'. This term, like the term 'superman', has been much misunderstood, much misrepresented. It has been interpreted, needless to say, in the grossest of terms as 'will to power' in the political, not to say even the military sense. But by Power here, power with a capital 'P', Nietzsche does not mean anything material at all. Power in this sense has nothing to do with brute force, with physical power. It has nothing to do with politics, nothing to do with the state. Nietzsche was against the state because it was collective not individual. Power, in Nietzsche's thought, especially in this expression 'will to power', means simply a higher, a more abundant degree of being, of life. So that 'the will to power' means the will to a higher degree, a higher mode of being, a more abundant, a fuller, a richer, a nobler, a sublimer, a qualitatively different, a dimensionally different life. Especially it means the will to the production from man of 'the overman'. Nietzsche makes it abundantly clear that this higher degree of being, this higher mode of being, is attainable only to the extent that the lower degree, the lower mode of being is left behind. In fact, Nietzsche emphasises that the lower degree of being, the lower degree or mode of life, has to be negated, even destroyed before the higher can be reached, before it can be attained.

This brings us to an extremely important aspect of 'the will to power', an aspect that is very important, we may say, in Nietzsche's whole thinking. We can call it the iconoclastic aspect. Nietzsche sees, he sees only too well, that Man as we know him today, at the present stage of

evolutionary process, lives in a certain way, that he thinks in a certain way, that he has certain values, certain notions of good and evil. Nietzsche says, seeing all these things, seeing the way Man lives or he thinks, seeing his values, his ideas of good and evil, Nietzsche says quite categorically, quite peremptorily, that they must all be destroyed; otherwise, he says, 'the overman' cannot be created, cannot come, cannot be brought into existence. And Nietzsche, we must be clear, is absolutely ruthless, absolutely uncompromising here. He is for shattering, in his own terms, all the old tablets of the law. In fact he is utterly devastating in the full, the literal sense of that term. He has no time at all, no time whatever for the whole of modern civilisation and culture. No time for it, that is to say, to the extent that it is the product of the average man, sub-human man, and his sub-human requirements. Nietzsche sees quite clearly and he says quite emphatically that it must all go. So this is his ruthless, his uncompromising, his iconoclastic aspect, or the iconoclastic aspect of 'the will to power'. Nietzsche, we may say, is, in fact, the greatest critic of itself that the human race, especially the Western section of the human race, has ever produced. We are accustomed to thinking of the Hebrew prophets, Amos<sup>14</sup> and Jeremiah<sup>15</sup>, and the second Isaiah and so on, as terrible enough; but we may say that the Hebrew prophets are mildness itself compared with Nietzsche. He is absolutely wholesale, absolutely unmitigated in his denunciation of Man as we know him, and all his works, all his ways. He says simply of them that they must go, they must be transcended, overcome, otherwise no 'overman'. Because, as we must emphasise, Nietzsche's ultimate aim is not negative at all, it is positive. His ultimate aim is the creation of 'the overman', and Man as we know him at present, have him at present, gets in the way of 'the overman'. So Man, if 'the overman' is to come, must go.

Also, and this is even more important to grasp, when one speaks of negating external values, or negating existing values, existing ways, modes of thought, there is no question of negating something external to oneself. It is not a question of going on negating other people because you think that they are not sufficiently like 'the overman'. Oh no, says Nietzsche, it's yourself that you must negate, it's yourself that you must overcome. It is with oneself that one must be ruthless, with oneself that one must be uncompromising. And Nietzsche speaks - he's very fond of using this sort of language - speaks in terms of warfare and battle. And this sort of language, this sort of terminology has of course been misunderstood. But it is the inner warfare, the inner battle that he speaks about. One must fight with oneself because, as he says in so many words, 'Who is one's worst enemy? One's worst enemy is oneself.' So that's the enemy you really have to overcome, and he who conquers himself has the more glorious victory. '*Though one may conquer a thousand men, a thousand times in battle, yet he who conquers himself has the more glorious victory*', because it's the self, one's own self, one's lower self, oneself as one is here and now, that is the greatest enemy, the greatest obstacle, to the creation of 'the overman'. That quotation, of course, comes from the *Dhammapada*<sup>16</sup>. Those were the words of the Buddha and with them we come back to Buddhism, back to the Higher Evolution, because it's time that we started making our comparisons.

-----O-----

A few comparisons have already been made simply in passing. But it's time that resemblances and differences were brought out much more clearly. But before we do that, just one point: Nietzsche knew something of Buddhism. In his writings there are several references to Buddhism, but he didn't know enough about Buddhism to be in a position to arrive at a balanced judgement about it. In his day very few Buddhist texts had been translated and, though what Nietzsche says about Buddhism is of great interest, it's to some extent based on misinformation and misunderstanding. So I don't propose to say anything about his views, in any case quite incidental, on Buddhism here.

Now it's obvious, I am sure, if nothing else is obvious, that there is a very great deal of similarity as between the concept of the Higher Evolution and the New Man on the one hand, and Nietzsche's conception of 'the overman' on the other. Not, of course, that the two are identical. As compared with the ideal, let us say, of Buddhahood, Nietzsche's overman is rather lacking in positive content, and this isn't surprising. After all, Nietzsche's conception of 'the overman' is the product of thought, very brilliant thought, thought of a genius; but still thought, something intellectual, even though intellectual to the point of intuition, even though penetrating to the point of intuition, but still thought - *not* actual spiritual, not actual transcendental realisation. So for

this reason, Nietzsche's conception of 'the overman' is rather lacking in content, especially in positive content. But Nietzsche's main point is very well and very clearly made; and that point is that 'the overman' is not Man as we know him, that 'the overman' transcends Man, goes far beyond Man, transcends him, goes beyond him as Man himself transcends the ape. From this it is abundantly clear, starkly clear, we may say, that Man is transitional. As we saw in Nietzsche's phrase, Man is a rope stretched between the beast and 'the overman'. In terms of our chart again, Man is the line from Point 2 up to Point Infinity. Point 2 of course is the point where the human animal ends and the true man begins; and point infinity is the point where transcendental man, man in the fullness, in the very abundance of his being, at the very highest level, very highest pitch, reaches final culmination and consummation. I am not, of course, saying by any means that the conception of 'the overman' equals the conception of Buddha, of Enlightened man, but certainly the conception of 'the overman' points in the same general direction. And Nietzsche's rope therefore corresponds in a general way to the Path of the Higher Evolution. And of course it is Man himself who is this path, Man that is to say not as static but Man as an evolving, a developing being. And Man, according to Nietzsche as well as according to Buddhism, as well as according to the whole system of the Higher Evolution, follows this path by overcoming himself at successively higher and higher levels.

And this of course brings us back to the subject of 'the will to power', the will, that is to say, to a higher degree of being achieved through self-overcoming. Now I'm going to make at this stage what may appear to be to some people a rather bold suggestion. I am going to suggest that 'the will to power' corresponds in a very general way to The Will to Enlightenment. Both are active. 'The will to power' is a will. The Will to Enlightenment is also a will. And both are concerned with the actual production, not just with thinking about, but with the actual production of the highest realisable ideal. One, of course, is the ideal of 'the overman'. The other, of course, is the ideal of Buddhahood, Enlightenment, Supreme Enlightenment for the sake, for the benefit, of all living beings. And the achievement of both ideals, that of 'the overman', that of Buddhahood, both require the overcoming of one's lower self or lower selves, overcoming of all lower values, lower evaluations, lower ideas of every kind. So here there's a similarity, here there's a resemblance.

At the same time there are differences. The Will to Enlightenment which constitutes the Bodhisattva is more altruistic, more other-regarding, more cosmic. As we saw many lectures ago, it is the manifestation in the individual, in the Bodhisattva, in fact, of a universal, a cosmic principle; but 'the will to power' is much more individualistic. It is much more concerned with one's own creation of 'the overman' by overcoming oneself. But at the same time we must add, in fairness, that the altruistic side is not overlooked altogether by Nietzsche. Remember that Zarathustra, this great figure of Zarathustra, exemplifying perhaps 'the overman', wants to share his wisdom with mankind. He wants each man to realise that Man is something to be overcome.

And this brings us again to the most immediately relevant aspect, perhaps, of Nietzsche's whole thinking; that is to say, brings us back to the fact, to the truth, to the realisation, that we should be dissatisfied with ourselves; that we should look down on ourselves, that, as I said at the beginning, we should want to send ourselves back. Without this dissatisfaction, there's no self-overcoming and no spiritual progress, no Higher Evolution of Man.

This also brings out, or this also brings us to the weakest aspect of Nietzsche's thinking. We're exhorted to overcome ourselves and the necessity for this, the necessity for overcoming ourselves so that 'the overman' may be produced, may be created, this is shown by Nietzsche with dazzling, with blinding clarity, this need for overcoming ourselves, being discontented with ourselves, dissatisfied with ourselves, he shows us this, perhaps, more clearly than almost any other teacher, certainly more clearly than any other Western philosopher or Western thinker. But Nietzsche does not show us - and this is where he fails, fails miserably though nobly - he does not show us how to do it. He says overcome yourself but he doesn't show us the way, doesn't show us the method. There are no practical instructions. We are left in a sense with the empty exhortation. And here we can see, at once, the immense advantage possessed by a tradition, an ancient spiritual tradition like Buddhism, with its methods, with its exercises, with its definite practices for self-overcoming. After all, it is not so difficult to see that a man is ill if he's groaning in fever, if he's in pain, if he's howling in agony. It's easy to see that he's ill, that

there's something wrong with him. But it's only a doctor, only a physician who can prescribe the actual method of treatment so that he may get better. And Nietzsche certainly paints, we may say, a really appalling picture of the disease of modern humanity, the disease of Man, the disease which *is* man, if you like. He even gives us a diagnosis, a very acute diagnosis. And he also goes on to paint a very glowing, a very beautiful, a very inspiring picture of the patient restored in the future to perfect health. But he does not give us an actual, a concrete method of treatment for restoring the patient to health; in other words, for overcoming oneself, for actually creating, producing, 'the overman'. In Nietzsche's thinking, needless to say, there is no practice of mindfulness. There is no method of meditation, and so on. So despite the clear, the vivid picture of the patient and his suffering, and of the patient as restored to health, despite the acute diagnosis, the patient - certainly in the West, on the whole - continues to suffer.

But fortunately, in an ancient spiritual tradition like Buddhism we do find those very things which are lacking in Nietzsche. We find not only the abstract ideal - in this case the ideal of Buddhahood - but also practical means, practical methods for realisation. We find in fact a whole way of life prescribed. And what is true of Nietzsche, we may say in this respect, is true of almost the whole of modern Western philosophy. It is all a matter of abstract thought, abstract thinking, academic thought, dry and lifeless. Nietzsche at least does pulse with life, he is alive as a thinker. Many are not. The only possible exceptions, the only areas of modern Western philosophy perhaps where one finds some sort of practical approach, practical corollary, as well as theory, as well as speculation, are perhaps Marxism on the one hand and existentialism on the other. But there is no need to go into this at present. It all underlines perhaps, this whole question underlines, the need for closer contact, not to say closer co-operation, between Western philosophy on the one hand and Eastern spiritual traditions on the other. And I hope to this contact, to this co-operation, this lecture has made some contribution.

---oOo---

We come almost to the end now, not only of this lecture but indeed of our whole present series, our whole present course. And I'd like to conclude with a few considerations of a more general nature. The present is the fifth complete course of lectures which have been given by me under the auspices of the Friends of the Western Buddhist Order, and on the whole I think I can say, I think I can even claim, that it is - I must now say it has been - the most important series. And this for two reasons:

1. It has been the most comprehensive. It has dealt with existence as a whole; dealt, more specifically, with human existence; more specifically still, dealt with the spiritual life, higher evolution. And it has linked them all, linked existence as a whole with human existence; human existence with spiritual life, higher evolution; linked them all up into a series if you like, almost into a whole, by means of a single concept. That is to say, by means of a greatly expanded and a metaphysically backed concept of evolution, a concept which, as we've seen, is also fully in accordance with traditional Buddhist thought and practice.

2. The subject matter of the course has been presented, unlike the subject matter of previous courses, almost entirely in contemporary and indigenous terms. There have of course been just a few back-slidings and we have found occasionally that Pali and Sanskrit came creeping in in spite of us, but not too often I hope. To begin with, as I have said, the subject matter has been expounded in terms of evolution and this is, of course, historically speaking, a modern Western concept, even though, as I have just pointed out, it is fully in accordance with the spirit of Buddhism.

In this course, moreover, I have tried to express Buddhist teachings, Buddhist insights, not in the traditional doctrinal form but more directly as it were by means of a fresh approach. And for these two reasons - one on account of its comprehensiveness, and secondly on account of its more contemporary and indigenous approach - this particular course will constitute the basis of a great deal of subsequent teaching and practice. In fact I must admit that already, in the course of the last few weeks, I have found myself referring quite a number of times to these lectures, either while addressing groups or even when in conversation with individuals. But this is not to say that these lectures, or this course, are complete in every detail. This would be too much to

expect and one must admit that there are *a number of important omissions*. Let me just list a few of them:

First of all, in this course there has been no reference to the *two types of conditionality*, that is to say the cyclical and the spiral types, in connection with the lower and the higher evolution respectively. This is something we'll have to go into later on. I touched upon it about two years ago but I don't think it's been mentioned since.

Secondly, I would like on some suitable occasion to say a lot more on the subject of *energy, especially emotional energy*. This is a topic which seems to be cropping up again and again in discussion of late, and it is a topic which is very, very germane indeed to the whole subject of the Higher Evolution. In fact, we have seen on a number of occasions that the cultivation of positive emotion, for which of course energy needs to be released, is an extremely important aspect of the whole spiritual life.

Thirdly, at some time I shall have to say something about the place of *sex in evolution, especially in the Higher Evolution*. Indeed we shall have to see whether and in what sense it has any place there at all.

Fourthly is the question of *Christianity*. I've referred to it as a Universal religion along with Buddhism, Zoroastrianism, and Islam. But whereas I've discussed Buddhism as the Path of the Higher Evolution, I have not discussed Christianity in the same way; so this some day will have to be done. We shall have to discuss the path of the Higher Evolution in terms not of Buddhism but in terms of Christianity; that is to say, in terms of the actual teaching of Christ so far as this is recorded in the Gospels.

Fifthly and lastly, we have said nothing at all about *the Higher Evolution in the context of the Vajrayana*, that is to say Tantric Buddhism. We have spoken about the Higher Evolution in the context of the Hinayana, in the context of the Mahayana, but not in the context of the Vajrayana, the Vajrayana being the third great phase of development of Buddhism in India.

So sooner or later all these omissions from the present course will have to be made good, either in individual lectures or in complete courses of lectures. But nevertheless, despite these omissions - which are in a way peripheral - the present course remains the foundation, the foundation both for study and for practice. As you know, as you have seen, in fact, all the lectures have been recorded on tape and the tapes will be played some time next year. And after the playing of each tape, there will be discussion in the course of which we will go much more deeply into some of the topics raised. We may in fact even have special study groups on particular topics which are of greater importance and relevance. As I mentioned also some weeks ago, I hope to work out shortly a systematic practical course, with exercises, as a sort of practical corollary to the present course. And this practical course will be called *Dynamics of the Higher Evolution*.

Now just one final word. I have emphasised the importance of this particular course, emphasised its importance as a basis for study as well as for practice. But this study and this practice do not take place in isolation. The study and the practice both take place, so far as we are concerned, within the context of a spiritual movement, and this movement is of course what we call The Friends of the Western Buddhist Order, together with its inner nucleus, the Western Buddhist Order. And this movement, this spiritual movement, within the context of which we practise and study, exists to put into actual practice and realisation the ideas, the ideals which have been outlined in the present course. The FWBO represents a group of people trying, in close association, in friendly association, to achieve - each one for himself, each one for herself, and also together (I won't say collectively, but together) - the Higher Evolution. Trying, that is to say, to follow the spiritual path, or in traditional language, traditional terminology, the Path to Enlightenment.

Now I hope, and I can only hope, that all of you having heard these lectures, having sat here patiently now for eight weeks, many of you, I can only hope that you've now become thoroughly dissatisfied with yourselves. And I can only hope in parting, in concluding this series, that you

will continue to be dissatisfied, that you will become more and more and more dissatisfied; so dissatisfied, indeed, that you'll feel like doing something about it. So that perhaps you will start at least thinking about embarking yourselves on the course, on the great adventure, on the great enterprise of the Higher Evolution of Man.

Revised May 2002

**NOTES - Tape 82**  
**(mostly taken from Collins English Dictionary)**

1. **Nietzsche**, Friedrich Wilhelm, 1844-1900, German philosopher, poet, and critic, noted especially for his concept of the superman and his rejection of traditional Christian values. His chief works are *The Birth of Tragedy* (1872), *Thus Spake Zarathustra* (1883-91), and *Beyond Good and Evil* (1886).
2. **McLuhan**, (Herbert) Marshall, born 1911, Canadian author of works analysing the mass media, including *Understanding Media* (1964) and *The Medium is the Message* (1967).
3. **Philology**: (no longer in scholarly use) 1. comparative and historical linguistics. 2. the scientific analysis of written records and literary texts. 3. the study of literature in general.
4. **Philosophy**: 1. the rational investigation of being, knowledge, and right conduct. 2. a system or school of thought: *the philosophy of Descartes*. 3. the critical study of the basic principles and concepts of a discipline: *the philosophy of law*. 4. *Archaic or literary*. the investigation of natural phenomena, esp. alchemy, astrology, and astronomy. 5. any system of belief, values, or tenets. 6. a personal outlook or viewpoint. 7. serenity of temper.
5. **Schopenhauer**, Arthur, 1788-1860, German pessimist philosopher. In his chief work, *The World as Will and Idea* (1819), he expounded the view that will is the creative primary factor and idea the secondary receptive factor.
6. **Excogitate**: 1. to devise, invent, or contrive. 2. to think out in detail.
7. **Kant**, Immanuel, 1724-1804, German idealist philosopher. He sought to determine the limits of man's knowledge in *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781) and propounded his system of ethics as guided by the categorical imperative in *Critique of Practical Reason* (1788).
8. **Hegel**, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, 1770-1831, German philosopher, who created a fundamentally influential system of thought. His view of man's mind as the highest expression of the Absolute is expounded in *The Phenomenology of Mind* (1807) and he developed his concept of dialectic in *Science of Logic* (1812-16).
9. **Fichte**: 1762-1814
10. **Schelling**: 1775-1854
11. **Iconoclast**: a person who attacks established or traditional concepts, principles, laws, etc. (Literally, an image-breaker.)
12. **Lambent**: 1. (esp. of a flame) flickering softly over a surface. 2. glowing with soft radiance. 3. (of wit or humour) light or brilliant.
13. **Coleridge**, Samuel Taylor, 1772-1834, English Romantic poet and critic, noted for poems such as *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner* (1798), *Kubla Khan* (1816), and *Christabel* ((1816), and for his critical work *Biographia Literaria* (1817).
14. **Kean**, Edmund, 1789-1833, English actor, noted for his Shakespearian roles.
15. **Amos**: *Old Testament*. A Hebrew prophet of the 8th century BC.
16. **Jeremiah**: *Old Testament*. A major prophet of Judah from about 626 to 587 BC.
17. **Dhammapada**: verse 103.