

General Introduction to Sangharakshita's Seminars

Hidden Treasure

From the mid-seventies through to the mid-eighties, Urgyen Sangharakshita led many seminars on a wide range of texts for invited groups of [Order members](#) and [Mitrās](#). These seminars were highly formative for the FWBO/Triratna as Sangharakshita opened up for the still very young community what it might mean to live a life in the Dharma.

The seminars were all recorded and later transcribed. Some of these transcriptions have been carefully checked and edited and are [now available in book form](#). However, a great deal of material has so far remained unchecked and unedited and we want to make it available to people who wish to deepen their understanding of Sangharakshita's presentation of the Dharma.

How should one approach reading a seminar transcription from so long ago? Maybe the first thing to do is to vividly imagine the context. What year is it? Who is present? We then step into a world in which Sangharakshita is directly communicating the Dharma. Sometimes he is explaining a text, at other times he is responding to questions and we can see how the emergence of Dharma teachings in this context was a collaborative process, the teaching being drawn out by the questions people asked. Sometimes those questions were less to do with the text and arose more from the contemporary situation of the emerging new Buddhist movement.

Reading through the transcripts can be a bit like working as a miner, sifting through silt and rubble to find the real jewels. Sometimes the discussion is just a bit dull. Sometimes we see Sangharakshita trying to engage with the confusion of ideas many of us brought to Buddhism, confusion which can be reflected in the texts themselves. With brilliant flashes of clarity and understanding, we see him giving teachings in response that have since become an integral part of the Triratna Dharma landscape.

Not all Sangharakshita's ways of seeing things are palatable to modern tastes and outlook. At times some of the views captured in these transcripts express attitudes and ideas [Triratna has acknowledged as unhelpful](#) and which form no part of our teaching today. In encountering all of the ideas contained in over seventeen million words of Dharma investigation and exchange, we are each challenged to test what is said in the fire of our own practice and experience; and to talk over 'knotty points' with friends and teachers to better clarify our own understanding and, where we wish to, to decide to disagree.

We hope that over the next years more seminars will be checked and edited for a wider readership. In the meantime we hope that what you find here will inspire, stimulate, encourage - and challenge you in your practice of the Dharma and in understanding more deeply the approach of Urgyen Sangharakshita.

Sangharakshita's Literary Executors and the Adhithana Dharma Team

DISCLAIMER

This transcript has not been checked by Sangharakshita, and may contain mistakes and mishearings. Checked and reprinted copies of all seminars will be available as part of the [Complete Works Project](#).

TRANSCRIPTION OF SUTRA OF 42 SECTIONS

(Seminar Study in - New Zealand. 2 Weekends)

Sangharakshita: Well we are going to start this morning on the Sutra of the Forty Two Sections -uh-. Which, according to tradition, is the first Buddhist text to have been translated into Chinese. We probably won't get through the whole text this weekend but if we don't then we shall continue in about five weeks time after I get back from Christchurch, when we have another weekend study. Before we actually start, just a few words about the study in general.huh- I think everybody appreciates that in the FWBO we attach great importance not to

justAreading huh, but to study, that is to say going through a

text in this way, section by section, line by line, even, you know word by word, and really trying to get to the bottom of it -hah- and trying to relate it to our own spiritual needs, as growing and developing individuals, ah- So as we go through the Text, ah - I don't propose that we shall be dealing with things that we ought to know anyway - I'll for instance not stop and go into the Four Noble Truths, because they've been dealt with on so many occasions, but rather deal with matters which arise out of the text - ah - which haven't been covered, you know, on previous occasions, which aren't covered in the "Survey" or in the lectures, or even any of the other Seminars, and concentrate more on those points, those issues, eh, raised in the text, which directly relate to us and are of some concern to us, or are not very clear to us, eh, for which we haven't had an opportunity of clearing up or going into bed?re, so that if we approach it in this way, we'll get more out of the study, and also won't be going over the same old ground again - uh. Now what we'll do, what we usually do, we just go around the circle, each person reading a section - eh - here the sections are numbered, so

it's quite, you know,easy and convenient. Each person in turn reads a section - uh - we then stop and discuss that that section - go into it for as long as possible, eh - and usually what happens is that we are not too strict about keeping to the text, eh. If, you know, a question of interest or concern arises just out of the text, even though it isn't even very directly related to it, or some questions arise simply out of

COruLext, eh, they may not not be very directly based on the text, well don't hesitate to bring it up. We can go into it, we can even digress a little bit - it doesn't matter -eh- provided that we come back to the text, of course (in the end - eh- We have in fact spent weekends going into half a page of text, that's quite all right; that's quite in order. We don't have to get through it in a certain given time. If we don't manage to finish the whole text in two weekends even, well, we'll just have to carry on next time I come back to New Zealand, - eh- (Laughter) That'll be the way we'll have to do it -eh- Another thing - before we actually start, we ought to take, what I believe is called a voice-print-uh- so that when somebody or other

eventually gets around to transcribing it, they know who is speaking~uh. So what I suggest is - you know - everybody already has heard my voice,eh (chuckles) we go round the circle and everybody introduces themselves, you know, mentioning their name and just a few words about themselves so that whoever transcribes later on can recognise that voice and attribute, you know, the correct sayings to the correct person, you know, and not get them muddled up. So maybe we can do that first, just take a voice-print, then we'd better check back t~at we've got it all right, and that it's sounding all right, and then we can start. So let's start with Udaya, introducing himself - uh - just an address and telephone number - (Laughter) if you can't think of anything better.

Udaya: I'm Udaya, and I'm living at Suvarnaketu, and I'm very happy to be on this study with Bhante, and hope to get a lot out of it.

Barbara Gill (Aniketa) : I'm Barbara. I've been coming along to the

FWBO for a number of years now, since Bhante's last visit when he gave some lectures here in Auckland - and I am also very happy to be here.

Ann (Suvajri): I'm Ann Gill and I can't really think of anything to say - (Laughter) .

Bhante: Right! you're identified. (Laughter).

Megha: I'm Megha. I live some distance away from this place. I'm~ry happy to be here.

Verne: I'm Verne Barrett and I come from the North Shore, and I'm also very pleased to be here.

Vijaya: I'm Vijaya - I've been invited up here from Christchurch and very happy to be here.

Purna: I'm Purna - I'm resident in the community here also very happy to be here

Bhante: They seem to encourage here - (Laughter).

Dave Moore: My name is David Moore, I'm a mitra of Auckland,
(Ratnaketu) and live in Suvarnaketu.

Keith Downer

(Dharmadhara): I'm Keith. I've just come up from Wellington.

It's a great great occasion for me, and I'm very pleased.

Priyananda: I'm Priyananda and I'm now living in Auckland having recently arrived here from England.

Jim Sharples

(Vipula): I'm Jim Sharples, mitra, and I'm doing the recording, so if anything goes wrong, it'll be my fault. (Laughter)-

S: All right the Sutra of 42 Sections spoken by the Buddha.)

We're going to start on Page ten - there's no need to go into the introduction - translated in the Dynasty

3

So maybe Udaya could read the first section.

Udaya: SECTION 1 ~~AT

S: There's all sorts of points arising in this section - eh- First of all about the "World honoured One" - The foot-note says ~okajt~t~a title of the Buddha. Does anybody know what it actually means, or what it signifies?

Udaya: The Elder brother of the world.

S: Um is more like "elder brother" - "Loka" is of course - 'world'. So why do you think the Buddha is called the "elder brother of the world" - what's the significance of this particular title?

Dave: Does it mean he's the helper of the world or the younger brothers?

S: Um - yes - it certainly suggest that - but there's an additional significance -eh- which is something so obvious that you're probably not noticing it, it's staring you right in the face, yes.

Purna: It's the priority in time - he was first.

S: Yes - but it's in a way even more obvious than that.

Priyananda: -

S: Yes - but it's in a way more obvious than that.

Verne: It feels to me like we're part of that - that same family.

S: Yes - part of that same family. You're getting quite close now - (Laughter) So what does that mean?

Udaya: There's no fundamental difference.

S: There's no fundamental difference. There's no difference of kind. The Buddha is a human being, as you are a human being, so just as the 'younger brother' can grow up and become like the 'elder brother', so the unenlightened human being can grow spiritually and become like, or even become the enlightened human being, i.e. the Buddha. So this is the significance of

4

the title -eh- so this is quite important. I've gone into it on other occasions, but it's worth underlining that from time to time. Uh. "So when the 'world honoured' had become enlightened, he reflected thus - To abandon desire and rest in perfect quietude is the greatest of victories. To remain in a state of complete abstraction is to overcome the ways of all the Evil ones" --eh- you mustn't forget here that this is a translation from the Chinese, and that the translation into Chinese, that Chinese version - was a translation from the Sanskrit - so the terminology is a bit general -uh- not to say - vague. The technicalities tend to get a bit lost, so we mustn't take some of expressions translated into English from Chinese translated from Sanskrit -- presuming the Sanskrit to be the original. We mustn't take them too literally -eh- especially expressions like 'complete abstraction' - if you take that too literally it would almost make nonsense of Buddhism. But anyway one or two general points worth considering here. This question of victory -uh- The Buddha says "to abandon desire and rest in perfect quietude is the greatest of victories". Clearly he is talking of some spiritual achievement, but why does he describe it as the greatest of victories? Does it remind you of anything? Does it remind you of any verse or teaching you've read before, some other text?

Barbara: Victory over death?

S: Victory over death, yes.

Keith: Sounds like something from the Dhammapada.

S: Sounds like something from the Dhammapada, so which verse?

Purna: If one conquers a thousand men, a thousand times in battle

S: Ah, yes, yes - Puma - etc.

- S: So it seems to be an indirect reference to that - 'To

abandon desire and rest in perfect quietude' is the greatest

5

of victories' because that is the victory over oneself -um- the greatest of victories, is the victory over oneself. All right, this question of abandoning desire. No doubt it is clear in your own minds, but often isn't always clear in the minds of people who come along to classes and start looking into Buddhism, eh-. They hear that Buddhism teaches the of desire -eh- so then they come up with what to them, seems the obvious question, not to say the obvious objection, "Well isn't that self-contradictory - because you have to desire to get rid of desire", so they think they've really caught Buddhism out, eh- and by caught you out -eh-. So, you know if you are faced by that question, or rather, when you are faced by this question what do you do, what do you say? If your talk about Buddhism must be self-contradictory. The Four Noble Truths talk about the cessation of desire getting rid of desire - but you have got to desire to get rid of desire, so surely you tie yourself in a sort of psychological knot. Well, what is the Buddhist attitude toward desire? Are you yourself trying every minute to extirpat desire of every kind? So what is your attitude, towards desire, what do you mean by desire? It's no use just repeating the Four Noble Truths -uh- What do you really understand, what do you mean by desire? How do you look at desire?

Puma: Changing our desires from-or recognising that most of our desires cannot in fact be fulfilled.

S: Urn.

Puma: In a complete sense - that - that - desire only comes with complete fulfillment of Nirvana.

S: But what about this expression - 'to get rid of desire by desire' - and that, you know, in the very effort to get rid of desire you are perhaps developing desire. This is the objection that people bring.

Udaya: You can think of it in terms of 'skillful means' - 6

like a wedge.

S: Yes.

Dave: Weighing yourself up.

S: Yes.

Priyananda: Is there's also the desire to rid oneself of pain? or to be rid of pain - In that sense it's a healthy desire.

S: Ah. So this suggests a sort of distinction between a healthy desire and an unhealthy desire -eh- Do you think that's a valid distinction?

Megha: I thought when you're recognising about abandoning desires, it's recognising some~hings don't give you what you want. You've gone after them time and time again and they haven't given you what you wanted so you realise it's no good chasing it, so you put it aside, but, there's something more positive, so you'd rather have that, than carry on that old desire - So it's kind of each time -

S: But, it's still not a question of desire - this might be said, this might be objected to - you're still not getting rid of desire - you're still cultivating desire in a way and Buddhism says you're supposed to get rid of desire. You actually come up against this question? Have you heard it, or wondered about it yourself, perhaps.

Jim: It doesn't happen I mean in the ultimate sense, surely - but as one develops one has to get rid of grosser desires gradually.

S: Yes. This is more like it - that as you develop, your whole being, your energy becomes more and more refined -eh-. So it is more a question of giving up the grosser and getting into the more refined - and in the end the most refined of all sort of becomes so refined you can't even see it, maybe you can just sense it is there, and even then that sort of you evaporates.

7

Verne: It's almost like a tool we need to use while we are i-n the conditioned.

S: uh?

Verne: to get to the other

S: Uh~

Verne like a tool that we use skilfully to move from the conditioned.

S: Yes - yes -

Verne: refining it all the while.

S: There is also the point -eh- the more technical point -eh- whether we should in fact render "trsna", which is the original Sanskrit word, which literally means thirst, as desire, whether that itself is not misleading. If you say that 'thirst' is to be abandoned -eh- that sounds a bit different from that desire is to be abandoned, eh, or you could paraphrase "trsna" as neurotic desire -eh- (Sounds of agreement). - Or even egocentric desi-re - something of that sort. So as to make it clear that there i-s an energy which can be harnessed to the pursuit of the Good, and which cannot be equated with 'trsna', at least not in its raw- and crude state, or raw and crude sense, eh- you see what I mean? eh. Perhaps the original mistake is - or, you know, the -uh- original cause of the confusion is to translate 'trsna' as desire, which is perhaps too broad and too general, uh. 'Desire' perhaps renders better the Pali - canda - uh - in pali there i-s a 'Kamacanda' which is distinguished from 'Dhammacanda' - so 'Kamacanda' is more like desire for pleasure, desire for one might say ego-satisfaction - 'dhammacanda' is desire for the dharma -uh - uh. So this makes it clear that there are two forms of desire, one as it were unhealthy the other quite healthy, uh - and perhaps to be cultivated -uh. But if you just say 'desire', and you use 'desire' as a translation for 'trsna' you probably do get into difficulties, uh- and you obliterate that distinction

S

between a relatively more healthy & relatively less healthy, you know, form of desire -uh- and obliterate also, you know, the need to, as it were, eliminate the less healthy form of desire with the help of the more healthy form of desire, so that eventually you get into a state of, you know, desirelessness, which is not an inert, dead sort of state, but a state of, you know energy which is not harnessed to any ego-centric ends, uh- otherwise the danger is, if you speak in terms of elimination of desire, to the average person, that just means death -uh- there is nothing to live for, there is nothing of interest, there is no zest, there's no life, there's no enthusiasm when desire is gone, well life is gone, one might just as well be dead and buried, you know, in your coffin. This is the impression that can be given, if you speak simply in terms of cessation of desire - Buddhism teaches getting rid of desire - and leave it at that. So one must distinguish -uh- and perhaps one can distinguish by speaking in terms of the relatively healthy desire or the relatively unhealthy desire, even the neurotic desire or neurotic craving and pointing out that 'trsna' is better translated by 'thirst' -uh- otherwise it's as though you have got no motivation left, you know, for the spiritual life - if you are told well, even the desire to develop is a desire which must be got rid of - well, ultimately yes, uh- but not in the early stages, obviously, otherwise you just leave yourselves without anything to stand on uh.

Udaya: People often use that as a rationalisation not doing anything - theoretically put themselves further along the path than what they actually are and stalemate themselves

S: yes - yes - so in the smae way there is a possible misunderstanding with this "rest in perfect quietude" -uh- well we know what the text is really getting at, but the

language

9

could be very misleading -uh- you see what I mean? That, that the highest goal of Buddh-i~sm is just a sort of state of rest -uh- well what happens to the Bodhisattva Ideal then? Well what ever happens to the Buddha's life - and 'quietude' -uh-. It's too one-sided -uh- so one has to be very careful about the language here -uh-. When you abandon desire, you know, all unhealthy desire, and you're free from all those perturbations, yes - you are certainly very peaceful, you certainly enjoy a state of, you know, peace of mind, quietude, and so on, yes - but that is not the end of the matter there is more to Enlighten- ment than just that - There is also Wisdom - there is also Compassion -uh- we shall see this coming out in a few minutes. So "to remain in a state of complete abstraction is to overcome the ways of all the evil ones" uh - again there is a possibility of some misunderstanding - this "complete abstraction" - What do you think the text is getting at, or really referring to when it speaks in terms of "complete abstraction"?

Barbara: It's not being attached to um objects of desire. In one sense I feel that -um- there is more enjo~ment when there isn't the desire to grasp at something to make it one's own.... There is that -um- enjoyment, that appreciation of what life has to offer

S: Yes, "abstraction" just seems to suggest more a sort of aloofness. You just remain sort of separate in a positive sort of sense - you just look - you just observe - you just watch - you just appreciate - you just enjoy from a distance -uh- so that the beauty of something instead of trying to grab it and appropriate it for yourself -uh

Barbara: Or make it into something ---

S: Yes, or to incorporate it into, you know, the structure of your own being. "Abstraction" seems to suggest that -- just

10

sort of detachedness, but not in a cold sense -uh- it's quite important to understand that -uh- You are not detached in the sense of being uninterested and not bothered and 'couldn't care less' - not in that sort of sense -uh-. So 'to remain in a state of complete abstraction is to overcome the ways of all the evil ones'. Now, there is a footnote to 'all the evil ones' which says 'The ways of maras - one of the six ..?.. Well in this context it means evil ways in general. Well actually the 'maras' are not one of the six ..?.. unless you include the maras

under the 'asuras', which is sometimes done. 'All the maras' means something different. There are four kinds of maras mentioned in Buddhist Texts. Does anybody know what these are? Four species of 'mara' - you know, to keep on the look out for. There is first of all what is called in Sanskrit, 'Klesa mara' -um- do you know what 'Klesa' means? 'Klesa' means 'defilement' or 'passion'. So there is 'mara' in the sense of all the defilements, the mental defilements, um - which simply obstruct the path to enlightenment. So this is mara, as it were, in the psychological sense, mara here simply means the personification of your own mental defilements -um-. Here mara is a sort of allegory -uh- for those. So this is called uh 'Klesa mara'. Then there is what is called, eh---eh - 'skandha mara' -uh- 'skanda mara' -eh- 'skanda mara' means -eh- skanda - this is a familiar term -uh-? I think most people know this skanda.

Priyananda: (first part inaudible) The five skandas.

S: These so-called heaps -uh? The aggregates - meaning conditioned existence itself -uh- mundane existence itself. So mara in the sense of mundane existence itself. In the sense that mundane existence itself, conditioned existence, is or can be an obstacle to the spiritual life. So even conditioned

11

existence itself -uh- compared say, with enlightenment, is a mara -huh- so, in a way mara personified, not simply your own psychological state of mental defilement, but conditioned

existence itself, uh - in the sense that it is an obstacle and veil ? a hindrance -uh- or a at least, so far as the spiritual

life is concerned uh. So this is 'skandha mara' -uh- again a

kind of allegorisation of mara - and then there's mara, or 'murtu? mara' - 'murtu? mara' is mara as the personification of

death -uh-uh- of the contingent if you like of 'evil' in a sort of metaphysical sense - the Personification of the impermanence and suffering of the world. Mara appears to you as something evil when you don't like that worldly things should perish and that you should die, so these appear to you as a 'mara' - some- thing dreadful and threatening -huh- and then there is what is called 'devaputra mara' - mara the son of a god, which is simply mara as a figure in ancient Indian folk-lore, or mythology, you know, the figure that pops up from time to time in the Buddhist Scriptures and puts questions to the Buddha, which the Buddha easily answers who tries to trip the monks up, you know, in one way or another, you know, (chuckle)

sometimes interferes when they go on their begging rounds. Or that they don't get any food; or who drops stones on them from above. When they are meditating, you know, this is 'devaputra mara' mara the son of the god who cuts a rather foolish and ridiculous figure, uh - in the Buddhist scriptures -uh- so 'to remain in a state of complete abstraction is to overcome the ways of all the evil ones' -uh-. So to remain in a state of complete detachment and positive aloofness - appreciative aloofness, eh- not stirred by anything objective, not reaching out to grasp it, eh, this is in fact to overcome all mental defilements, to overcome conditioned existence itself, -uh- to overcome death -uh- and to overcome of course, this ridiculous and pathetic figure of mara (chuckles) the son

12

of a god, yes, -uh-. So here you can see the meaning is coming out a little bit more - have these -uh- selections - these sayings, seem to be translated mainly from Hinayana sources, -uh- perhaps from the rather let's say, developed Hinayana's, developed after the Buddha's Parinirvana. So the emphasis does seem a little bit, as it were, negative, at least so far as language is concerned, but even though the language may be negative, so to speak, we must understand or must realise that underneath the negative language there is a positive spiritual content -uh-. It isn't really negative. It isn't just a negative state - this state of 'having abandoned desire and resting in perfect quietude' and so on, -- that comes out in the very next few sentences -uh-. Because it goes on - "in the royal deer park expounded the doctrine of the Four Noble Truths, converting Kaundinya and four others, thus manifesting the fruit of the way". So what does this suggest? ---- the fact that the Buddha did this -uh- immediately after he's described as having become enlightened, and reflecting that to abandon desire and resting in perfect quietude is the greatest of victories etc - immediately after he's described as reflecting in this way, he's shown expounding the doctrine, expounding the dharma, so what does this suggest?

Barbara: He's right in the midst of Um

S: Right in the midst of everything, and also that this abandonment of desire, and this state of complete abstraction etc - is not a sort of negative inactive state - this is what it brings out -uh-eh- there is also compassion there, and of course also wisdom there - as a result of that - there he is, you see, in the midst of life, in the midst of the deer park, expounding and teaching. He doesn't rest in quietude, in that state of complete abstraction - not that he abandons it,

13

but that it is not a one-sided sort of experience - the other complementary aspect which is compassion - is also there -uh-. So it goes straight on in the royal deer park expounded the

doctri-ne of the Four Noble Truths -uh- That is according to a rath~er later tradi-tion - the earliest texts don't say anything about the Four Noble Truth-s in this context -uh- converting Kaundinya and four others, his five erst-while followers and thus manifesting th-e fruit of the way, -uh. The footnote says - Way i-s Dharma. This, I think means that -uh- the Chinese text has got 'Tao', and 'dharma' was often rendered as Tao in Chinese, or Dao - but it is not a bad renderer even for Dharma itself. If one understands, you know, how this concept of Dharma arose -uh- for instance, -uh- Dharma comes from a root meaning to support it really means "the way in which the world goes on" - "the way in which the universe goes on" - the 'natural order of things' - the cosmic order, therefore the moral and spiritual order, therefore the moral and spiritual law, therefore the Teaching which reveals that law, -uh- so "way" - th-e Dharma in a practical sense - is your life in accordance with that law, as manifested in the teaching, so the translation - "way" - bring's out that practical side, the Dharma as th-e way of the universe, especially the spiritual way of the universe, the way things happen spiritually, and your following of that, your bringing of yourself into harmony with that, of following the way as we say. So 'Way' is not a bad translation for Dharma, even leaving aside the fact that, you know, here it translates the Chinese - Tao probably which is a sort of equivalent of Dharma. So thus manifests in the fruit of the way, the fruit of the Dharma, -uh-. So what is that fruit? the fruit is that it works (chuckle) -uh- yes. That when the Puddha communicated it, when he expressed it, it made a tremendous

14

impact, on those five people, and they were changed, they converted, they were converted, they converted themselves, -uh- thus manisfesting the fruit of the way, showing that the Dharma worked -uh-. Not just for the Buddha - it wasn't just something peculiar to the Buddha - it was something that worked for all human beings, by virtue of their common humanity - and you know, here we come back to 'lokagista ?' the world-honoured one, the Elder Brother of mankind, -uh-. So this, you know, little introducti-on is say three introductory sentences, you know, properly read, properly understood, -uh-, they give us more, you know, than would appear at first sight So "when the world honoured one became enlightened he reflected thus - to abandon desire and rest in perfect quietude is the greatest victories, to remain in a state of complete abstraction is to overcome the ways of the evil ones. In the royal deer park he expounded the doctrine of the Four Noble Truths, converting Kaundinya and four others, thus manisfesting the fruit of the way" -uh-. So compassion is implied -uh- the text doesn't state it -uh- but if you look a little more deeply into the text you find it -uh-. It must be there, otherwise there would not have been the exposition of the doctri-ne - or that proclamation of the way, -uh-. Then it goes on - "There were frequently monks who voiced their doubts and asked the Buddha to resolve them, so the world honoured taught and commanded them until, one by one, they became enlightened and bringing their hands together in respectful agreement prepared to follow the sacred commands". Well there are several points here too - one is - "The monks voiced their doubts" -uh- So one musn't forget that quite a lot of the Buddha's teachings were given in response to people's doubts. Not only monks but nuns and lay people of all sorts -uh- people voiced their doubts and asked questions and then the Buddha

replied, either with a few words or with a lengthy exposition. So we musn't think of the Buddha, as sort of, you know, getting up in the morning and preparing a nice lengthy lecture for the monks and nuns and other followers and then delivering it - no - his teaching was sort of 'ad hoe' teaching mostly, you see what I mean/ and therefore one must bear in mind that it was very often directed to a particular person in a particular situation and in order to understand the teaching you have got to understand that particular situation, that particular person, and bear in mind, other wise you sort of, you know, generalise, or apply in the wrong sort of way, , if someone is very lazy, dull slothful, indolent, the Buddha says "Wake up, be energetic, work more, work more on yourself" - But if someone is very active, restless - energetic, the Buddha says "calm down, slow down, take it easy" - so if you're not careful you see these two teachings in different portions of the scriptures, and say, well what does the Buddha want us to do - you know, he says, you know, "work more on yourself, stir up your energy", and there he's saying, you know, "Slow down and take it easy" - which is the Buddha's teaching? You've got to understand to whom he was addressing it -uh-. So this must always be born in mind, -uh- you must always ask - Who's the Buddha talking to, try to understand that - what sort of person did he have in mind? - in what sort of mental state, in what sort of situation -uh-? Otherwise one may not understand the teaching properly, or at least not thoroughly, or completely - so it is not only a question of what is said, but to whom it is said, and under what condition, what circumstances. I know even within the FWBO you get things taken out of context. I suffer from this personally, again and again - people say - "Well Bhante said this, or he said that on such and such a seminar, but what they don't say is to whom he said it, under what conditions,

what circumstances, one must understand that too, -uh- so how much more so i~n the case of the Buddha's teaching -

Barbara: It seems so paradoxical, because it's a very individual thing and yet at the same time because it is so individual it seems to apply to so many others -

S: Yes - yes - if someone encounters a teaching addressed directly, you know, to a particular individual in certain circumstances then one says "well, that applies to me" - because I'm the same sort of person in much the same sort of situation". Then - yes - one sees that the teaching is universal, or very widely applicable, at least, in that particular form, -uh-. But, --uh-, you know, sometimes you come across a teaching which is obviously addressed to someone in very different circumstances, in a very di-fferent mental state, you feel no

resonance at all, it doesn't concern you then, so you don't say, 'well that teaching is wrong' -uh- or it isn't the Buddha's teaching - no - it just does not apply to you at that particular time, it may do some other time, you don't know, so you just leave it aside, and you just take from the scriptures, from the Buddha's teachings, what speaks to your condition, as the saying is, here and now, as you are just now, and you leave aside the rest. There are so many volumes of scriptures, -uh-. They can't all of them apply to you, as you are just this very minute. There are some that will seem completely irrelevant -uh- -uh- so there is no point in saying that the Buddha was talking a lot of irrelevancies -uh- do you see? This is sort of generalising what should not be generalising -uh- a sort of objectifying something which is, you know, essentially subjective. Leave it aside if it doesn't apply to you, and just concentrate on the things that do. So you know, we might even find, say, situated as we are, just because we've got a sort of common background, that in the

17

West, you know, whether it's 'the West' in the sense of 'England', or West in the sense of New Zealand, which I think we can take as "West" roughly speaking - there are certain things in the Buddhist teachings, Buddhist scriptures, or Buddhist traditions which are relevant to everybody in the West, -uh- at sometime or other, and certain other things perhaps that will never be relevant to them at any time -uh- which seem to be applicable to, or relevant to, people specifically in the East. So these things as it were, permanently leave aside and not bother about, -uh- in that way, you know, the teaching, as it presents itself to us, in the West, assumes a particular form, a particular aspect. There are certain aspects of the teaching which are valid for us, and useful to us, but what happens, others may leave us completely cold, they don't seem to speak to our condition. Whereas, you know, they might be absolutely fascinating and wonderful and useful and relevant ~s far as a Buddhist in Ceylon is concerned, or a Buddhist in China, but not Buddhists in the West - but never mind, you know the scriptures are so vast, -uh- not everything can be relevant to everybody all the time -uh- we take what is relevant to us here and now, and the rest we sort of respectfully leave to one side -uh- 'So there were frequently, (this word frequently is interesting) monks who voiced their doubts and asked the Buddha to resolve them, so the world-honoured taught and commanded them'. If there hadn't been any doubts there might not have been any teachings - the world-honoured taught and commanded them'. What about this word commanded? Do you think he really commanded? Are people in New Zealand sensitive about words of this sort? They certainly are in England. -Uh- Does the Buddha

18~

command, does he order?

Puma: It seems to be more in the nature of giving them precepts - i.e. guide-lines.

S: Yes - you notice that later on 'prepared to follow the sacred commands' - though 'commands' seems to be a translation of the 'precepts'. Not a very good one because immediately the -uh- you know the commandments, the ten commandments spring to mind, that sparks off all the wrong sort of associations and reactions and son on - and 'sacred commands' - that only makes it worse (chuckle) - you know - you're trying, you know, put commands across by saying that they're sacred, you know, they come from God, as it were, or from some divine authoritative source. So how do you think that could be better paraphrased? I'm rather surprised at John Blofeld, you know, using this word. One can say sacred precepts, or hold precepts, of course but what about the ? -uh- "taught and commanded them - you know, taught and gave t} %~ ~-ce£-ts, or suggested certain lines of positive conduct would be helpful. This is what it really means - because can some one like the Buddha literally command? Who commands, what sort of person, what sort of figure commands? -uh- commands suggests authority - suggests power - you see. It does not suggest understanding and compassion -uh- I mean, does the parent even command, you know, the child, or even in that context, is it appropriate? Oh yes, you tell the child what to do, but command is rather a heavy word. If you were to say to him "Do what I command you" - you know, there would be speedy rebellion in the home, I'm sure - (chuckle).

Udaya: You know - command suggests the complete break down of initial willingness for somebody to do anything anyway

S: Yes - It suggests you know, the use of force, it suggests coercion, so in the spiritual field, as I tried to bring out in

~ 18C~

in the lecture on "Authority and the Individual in the New Society'. There can be no question of coercion, therefore no question of force, no question of power, you know, in the negative sense - Therefore surely, one can't speak of command- ments or of commanding. So I think that kind of language is best avoided.

Verne: It reminds me of the tape on "The Spiritual Friend", that we were listening to on our last retreat, too where a command can only be effective in as far as the person has received it.

S: Yes. So it doesn't need to be a command. If you just say what you think, or you give your advice and the other person is receptive, well they see the truth of that they see the value of that, they just accept it and follow it after ---?--- you are not coercing you are not forcing, you are not commanding, you are just pointing out what you see, and fortunately they are able to receive that, and they see thins in the way you do when you point things out to them. (END OF SIDE I TAPE I)

So - "there were frequently monks who voiced their doubts and asked the Buddha to resolve them, so the world-honoured taught them" - and explained to them what they should do, yes

lets say - "until one by one they became enlightened, and bringing their hands together in respectful agreement prepared to follow (pause) the skilful precepts" (laughter) How do you like that? But do you notice a sort of inconsistency here? They are enlightened first, and then they prepare to follow the precepts, so wouldn't one have thought it was the other way round, you follow the precepts and then gain enlightenment, rather than you become enlightened and then follow the precepts, or is there in fact not an inconsistency?

Verne: Once a person is enlightened that following the precepts

19

will be a natural

S: Yes - it is a natural and spontaneous thing, and therefore perfect - until you are enlightened your following of the precepts is more of a sort of conscious discipline - something that you consciously and deliberately undertake. This is the difference between - or something of the nature of a difference between, for instance, the mundane 8-fold path and the transcendental 8-fold path - for instance between 'Right- Understanding', and 'Perfect Vision', or say between 'Right- Livelihood' and 'Perfect Livelihood'. When you are doing something as a discipline, as a result of you know, a conscious effort, then there is always some flaw, some imperfection, but when you do something skilful, out of, you know, your own inmost realisation, and understanding, then it becomes something much more spontaneous, and to that extent, you know, more perfect, or even after completely perfecting. So one isn't to imagine an enlightened person carefully observing the precepts, you know, reminding himself that you know, he must observe this, or observe that. Unfortunately some Buddhist literature, not necessarily the scriptures, does you know, tend to give that sort of impression, you know, that the more enlightened you become, the more sort of scrupulous you become, the more things there are for you to observe the more things there are for you to do, and to remember, and to obey, you just become more and more perfect, observing more and more precepts. Sometimes that impression is created, but it really isn't like that at all-

Purna: That - that seems to be related to a more Christian orientation of the precepts being something alien, being given, rather than being the pattern of behaviour naturally expressive of an enlightened individual.

S: Yes - Right.

VWWmi~aa: Do you think, Bhante, that the - the translation here of enlightened could mean that the monks had had their doubts cleared up, or their questions answered, and that sort of enlightenment takes the meaning on the level of answering their questions.

S: It could be taken in this way, except that it is exactly the same expression as we have at the beginning when the World-honoured had become enlightened, so here we have they became Enlightened with a capital E. So it suggests that the translator was you know, using the two enlightenments in the same sense - though if that hadn't been the case, one could have said, yes, they understood the truth of the matter and practised accordingly - one could take it in that way.

Puma: Also putting it in this way brings out the on-going nature of enlightenment.

S: Yes - yes - Right - yes I mean, there is the tendency - I mean - language in fact in ? and certainly the scriptures seem to confirm it - Enlightenment is a sort of fixed point, a fixed point of reference and that there really does come a great mement when it's Ah! Here - Enlightenment! Thank Heavens! (Laughter) I'm enlightenment, the rest aren't - what a pity, hut we are! (Laughter) and you're really there, you know, in a quite literal sense, and you get your certificate of Enlightenment- Believe it or not, soem teachers do issue certificates of enlightenment to Bodhisattvas - I've seen them, hanging up on the wall, I remember seeing for instance a certificate of Stream- Entry, which a friend of mine had which he had obtained in Burma, at the end of a meditation course. There it was that Upasaka so-and-so had obtained Stream Entry, signed. So you see, some people can take these things very literally indeed and no doubt, you have to think, in the beginning, in terms of enlightenment as a goal, out there, as it were, with the 8-Fold path leading

21

up to it, but as you go on and- on, you begin to suspect that it really isn't like that, you know, it suggests enlighten- ment as a personal acquisition, but again it isn't like that, but owing to the very nature of language, the very nature of thought, and the very nature, the very structure~of your own personal experience as an ego - ridden being~you can't help thinking and speaking of it in that way. So you have to, for the time being - but trying not to take it all too literally, otherwise you get~sort of deadly earnest and there you are aiming at enlightenment,you know, and it all becomes quite a sort of strain, and in the end you realise, and this is brought out very strongly in the Zen tradition, that there is no goal there. There is no enlightenment, in a sense, in the sense of something out there to be achieved. There is no person striving and struggling to achieve it, you realise that too, but in the meantime you can't help thinking in those term5~ speaking in those terms, you have to) but sooner or later your use of language becomes more subtle as your experience becomes more subtle, and you see it isn't really quite like that after all. Anyway, that's the first section. So just look through it and see if there is anything that isn't completely clear. Ohe there is one point we didn't go into - "bringing their hands together in respectful agreement" - this is the 'anjaifl' - this is the 'anjah' - br~~g~(~h~~r hands together - so it doesn't only suggest or express respectful agreement - it's sort of acceptance, devotion, receptivity, it suggests all that. So when the Buddha speaks, when he teaches, the disciples are so happy, and they are so grateful that their

doubts have been all cleared up, they see the way more clearly, they know what they have to do, so they just fold their hands as an expression of acceptance and gratitude - and acceptance of the teaching and

22

expression of their willingness to follow that.

Barbara: Puja -

S: Uh?

Barbara: the feeling that comes with the worship - coming into contact with something that you feel within yourself is true, and there is that that action-

S: Yes, Yes. It is quite natural for the hands sort of come near the heart, the two hands come together which suggests sort of a total acceptance a bringing together even the different sides of your nature, your character, sort of integration, you are all at one, you are centered, you are centered on your heart, from your heart, also the hands point up, so you are going forward (Laughter). It suggests that too, and of course it is said that the Buddhist 'anjah' as distinct from the Brahminical one, this is one the Tibetans insist on very much, you musn' t salute like that - (demonstrating the Brahminical gesture) you salute like that - (demonstrating Buddhist gesture) because it suggests the lotus bud - the lotus bud is like that - and that means receptivity, and here is your jewel in the lotus (demonstrating gesture) You see - It's that too, See - So the hands held like this represent the jewel in the lotus - the spiritual potential, and your receptivity to whatever helps you to develop that. So you see Avalokitesvara not holding his hand like that, (demonstration) but holding them like that (demonstration) to indicate the jewel in the lotus. The Tibetans are very strong on points like this, you know, quite rightly so. So if they see any Western Buddhist saluting the Buddha like that (demonstrating) they say "no-no-no" Not like that - it must be like that - the Buddhist way not the Brahminical way. So, yes, it suggests that one is prepared to follow, because one accepts, and concedes the point of what has been pointed out. So any other little points?

23

Puma: It's interesting that it is taught and commanded - they seem to be the verbal equivalents of the Doctrine of discipline.

S: Yes - there is that - Dharma Vinaya - Theory and Practice - Well, alright let's go one then if there is no further points. On to section two. You go straight on through that note - In Chinese books apparently, notes come in the middle of the text so we go on straight through the whole section, ignoring that

note that comes in the middle. &~fION ~

Barbara: "The Buddha said. Those, who taking leave of their families, and adopting . . - .etc (look up text)

S: Well, there are quite a few points to comment on here. Let's start off with. "The Buddha said: those, who taking leave of their families and adopting the homeless life, know the nature of their minds and reach to what is fundamental, thus understanding the Teaching Beyond (Wordly) activity, are called Sramanas". 'Sramana' here, seems to be used synonymously with 'Bhiksu', or monk. In the Buddha's day, the term was used more widely, the 'Sramana' was one who abandoned his home and went off in search of a teacher, or wandered about following the teaching or teacher, and, not necessarily Buddhist, not necessarily a Buddhist 'Sramana' - and the 'bhikus' were, the Sramanas who especially followed the Buddha's teaching - so 'Sramana' here, we may say, can be taken as 'bhiku'. Well, the points to be considered are - the leaving, the taking leave of their family, adopting the homeless life, knowing the nature of the mind and reaching what is fundamental, and understanding the teaching of non-workly activity - all these points. The basic point here of course is to what extent, or in what sense, this is necessary from a spiritual point of view - this is something that needs to be gone into, it's one of the questions which people often ask "In order to be a real Buddhist, you

24

have to become a monk" - this is sort of putting it crudely "You have to take leave of your family, adopt the homeless life etc". Is this necessary? Is this the basic thing in Buddhism? The Hinayana - and this seems to come from Hinayana sources, especially Sarvastivadin sources 250 precepts are mentioned, seems to suggest that, but is it really so? Is that the right emphasis even would one say? If not, what is the right emphasis?

Dave: Going for refuge.

S: The going for refuge. So even at a quite early stage in the development of Buddhism, after the Buddha's death, it does seem that emphasis was placed more on becoming a monk, in the literal sense, than on the 'Going for refuge' - well, of course, the becoming a monk, leaving home, can be the natural result, the natural expression of your 'going for refuge', but not, necessarily so. The basic thing is the 'going for refuge' So then this point has to be made, or also even supposing one does recognise that "taking leave of one's family and adopting the homeless life" may be necessary, as an expression of one's

'going for refuge' in what sense does one understand that, even? Let's, you know, let's take the easier point first - "adopting the homeless life" well, what is "the homeless life"?

Puma: Recognising that certain life-styles cannot give you the security you wanted - and so hinged on going for refuge. "

S: It really hinges on what you mean by "home

Udaya: Home to most people is where it's safe and secure and warm, and all your needs are taken care of.

S: Yes.

Barbara: That your refuge is not in your mate, or your refuge is not the children. A ~~~'not in ~C~ parents, and their refuge is not really in their children, and it's not in anything else, it's not in some sort of psychological~~~~'~~

25

psycho-therapy - it's not a refuge in any group.

S: Or in any building.

Barbara: No.

Keith: It's not Predictable

S: Predictable? (Laughter) Yes the homeless life, literally taken in the old-fashioned sense, is completely unpredictable. You don't know where you're going to be tomorrow, or whether you're going to get any food, you've no money to buy any. Is a completely homeless life actually possible, do you think?

Priyananda: Not in the west, no, because - well it's not

Practical for practising Buddhists, because, it means that they will probably be put in prison (Laughter). There's a

Puma: I think forms of it are possible because I think it hinges on the thing of personal identification of things. I think community living is quite a close equivalent of this particularly

S: To homelessness

Puma: To homelessness, where you have virtually nothing that you actually call your own.

S: Yes - because even the Buddhist monks had their viharas, which in the old days were just sort of temporary resting places, in the very early days, just places where you stayed during the rainy season. So the principle of accommodation so to speak was not ruled out, but it wasn't the monks home. He was ready to leave it at the end of the rainy season - It didn't of course, always happen.

Me~gha: It was purely taken as a shelter.

S: Shelter - right. A shelter is not necessarily home, though the home of course is a shelter. Let us look a little more deeply into it. It's important to sort of try to understand what is real homelessness. It is said, in a traditionally Buddhist

2:e

country you can be a monk, which is to say, you've gone forth, you've left home, you don't stay with your family, you've no wife and children, but you live in a monastery, but if you're not careful, your monastery becomes your home, you are very safe there, you are very cosy, you are very snug, you've got all your little conveniences around you. So if you're not careful, the monastery itself, the vihara itself will become your home, and one can see this - I remember my first impression of a Buddhist monastery in Ceylon. I can still remember it. It was a large bungalow with an enormous verandah, and along that verandah, there was a whole row, there must have been twenty arm-chairs (Laughter) you know, and there were these proper- I think they were called 'planter's chairs' -

Barbara: "Oh "

S: the arm rest extended and you can put your feet up on them, and there were plenty of these, and in each one there were four ~ (Laughter) five nice fat cushions - this was my first impression of monastic life in Ceylon. So, well I - you can guess what I thought. I was only nineteen and a bit, you know, pretty inquisitive, and tended to think a little for myself, you know, so even this question of adopting the homeless life - we have to be very sure that it is ~really a homeless life, and it is not technically a homeless life, with the label "the homeless life" simply because you've undergone some ceremony, you know, and all the rest of it. So this is also very important to understand. So "taking leave of the family and adopting the homeless life" - what does it really mean? If it is to be seen as expression of 'the going for refuge'. Supposing someone really does want to do that, to leave home, to be homeless, as an expression of their going for refuge', well what form will that take? the real form?

Priyananda: Well, practically for a lot of people it would

27

take on the form of community living

S: Community living

Priyananda: a 'common purse' situation

Vipula: It would probably be largely a freedom from attachments and possessions - 'attachments' in the sense of physical and so on and psychological attachments -

S: There's also the, the question, which is not really mentioned here, of the Sangha, the spiritual community. I mean - those who "taking leave of their families and adopting the homeless life" it says they - it says they do this, they take leave they adopt. So what does that suggest. It isn't brought out very clearly, or very strongly, it suggests a number of people doing the same thing, suggests they are all doing the same thing, so what does that mean - they are all sort of following a common pattern, and therefore they are a spiritual community. That isn't really brought out by the text, is it? That fact - It is as though they all do it, but they sort of remain sort of you know, side by side, rather than sort of together in a spiritual community, but we know that there was a Sangha, there was a spiritual community, so sometimes, I think that 'the going forth' really means - the 'going forth' from let's say the old society to the new, you see what I mean? that's the real 'going forth', because you can't get away from people altogether, that's quite impossible. You need some shelter, so you have to stay somewhere. You need some food, there have to be some arrangements for getting it, so you can't really, in the literal sense, cut yourself off from the world, or from other people, but you can change the basis of your relating, and you change that, you know, in our terms let say, by making, by a result of your 'going for refuge', making the transition, from the old society to the new society, and trying to live with other committed

28

people in a way that is ideal, which is in accordance with your common spiritual ideals, this is what, you know what "taking leave of family and adopting the homeless life" really means, because - I mean - you know, having a spiritual family and no true home, you could put it in that way, if you don't want to put it negatively - you know, you see what I mean? So one must be clear of what one is really about and what one is really doing. Supposing say, in a

country like Ceylon, you become a monk, you know, you have a certain ceremony, you put on a yellow robe, shave your head, and then you move straight into a nice bungalow, not very far from home, and mother comes along, you know, with your 'dana' everyday, (Laughter). This sort of thing happens, you know, mother is rather anxious about the young monk, and thinks the monks won't look after him very well, so along she goes everyday with all the things he's use to and that he likes, all his favourite dishes, and takes along - So is he really going forth, even though he's technically a monk and living in what is technically a monastery, and accepting what is technically 'dana' from someone who is technically his lay devotee - No - It's his own mother still looking after him, he really hasn't gone very far from home. Has he really gone forth? So 'going forth' isn't as easy as that. Also it's a change of culture - when you go to a foreign country - that's a sort of 'going forth', because you shake off familiar associations and familiar ways of doing things, so all this is involved and implied in the 'going forth' and adopting the homeless life. It really means well sitting rather loose to the particular situation, in which you find yourself, your particular 'shelter', your particular facilities, not being too attached to your tape recorder, or your record player, if someone wants to borrow them, or use them - o.k. you don't identify with them as definitely yours, or even if you have to sell them to raise the

29

to go to India or to go to England, never mind, you know, you don't bother, because you just sit loose to them also you see the sort of thing I'm trying to get at? So, you know, the basic thing is 'the going for refuge' which includes the Sangha refuge, and that Sangha refuge seems to imply or suggest a transition from the old society to the new, in other words making a definite effort to live in 'society' - to use that term, or let's say, a spiritual community, a sort of structure with other people - that is much more conducive to your spiritual life and spiritual development than the old structure in the old society. So we musn't think too literally in terms of becoming a monk, you know, in the old-fashioned sense, though one might still do even that but it is more than simply a matter of that - So "know the nature ~o~f ~their min~s'~, - I those who, ~ taking leave of their families and -adopting the homeless life kno~w the natu~re of their minds and re-a-ch - to what is -fundamental11. So what do you think is meant here - "know ~the atute oT their~ minds"? What is meant by 'knowing the nature of the mind'?

Dave: To see what condition you are in

S: Yes.

Dave: Where you started from

Puma: Experiencing it's conditioned nature -

S: Experiencing it's conditioned nature - watching your own reactions, you know, to certain situations, perhaps as a result of that 'going forth', and if you see the conditionedness

of the conditioned - if you see the conditioned nature of your own responses, what does that mean? It means you are sort of aloof from the conditionedness, you know, if you are aloof from the conditionedness, from the conditioned, to that extent you are not conditioned you know, to that extent you are unconditioned, and to that extent you have reached what is fundamental, thus

30

understanding the teaching beyond; worldly activity" and then you are a real Sramana - you see? This is a very important point, actually, that the ~knowledge of the conditioned is unconditioned - you can't really have a conditioned knowledge of the conditioned, to the extent that you know the conditioned that knowledge is unconditioned.

Puma: There seems to be a use of the word 'Sramana' in the way the Dhammapada uses 'Brahmana'. A use of it in terms of - this is -really what a 'Sramana' is -

S: Yes - The Dhammapada uses 'Sramana' and 'Brahmana' and 'bhiku' more or less synonymously - they seem to have been used synonymously in the early days of Buddhism, you know, before Buddhist terminology became fixed or specifically Buddhist, as it were, you know, - "They constantly observed the 250 precepts", according to the Theravada tradition, there are 227 precepts for 'bhikus' to observe - 220 to be observed individually, and seven to be observed collectively. The Sarvastivadin tradition has 250. So what do you think is meant by this? Do you think this is to be taken very literally? You know, Buddhists certainly do take it literally, modern Theravadans do take it literally but is it not possible to look at it, in another way? The 250 or 220 precepts, I mean, gives a fixed number to what one can think of as all the possible modes of skilful expression in actual behaviour. You could say there is far more than 250, you know, there's thousands, there's millions, because every act is different, because circumstances are different, but the spirit behind the skilful mental state is the same.

Puma: Don't the Tantra talk about a hundred thousand precepts?

S: Yes, yes, even infinite precepts.

- Dave: It's not looking at it negatively, or cutting out what you're not allowed to do, so it's just opening your eyes

up to being totally skilful.

31

S: What is the most skilful thing to do in this particular situation -- if you're asking yourself that, in effect you are asking what precept should I observe. But it is not, a rule you can refer to and think, well, ah, that's the rule I should be observing in this situation, then observe it, no! Just look at the situation, you've got that desire to be skilful, and you just think to yourself, well, what is the most skilful thing I can do in this situation - with the best sort of motive, the best sort of mental state, then your act will be right. But it isn't a question of mechanically checking up on the right precept and doing it. No, No.

Barbara: It's even in a way, sort of recognising and identifying the actual state

S Um

Bar-bar: mb and having experience of the unskilful as well as the skilful -

S: Ah - yes - yes - recognising the consequences of the unskilful, how you were, and then just avoiding them, and doing the most positive thing. You know what it's been to get yourself into that state. Yes, well, I think there is this sort of tendency, well, in what we call the Hinayana, to stress the literal observance of precepts, you know, in a sort of almost legalistic way. You have a lot of this in the Theravada countries, for instance, there is the rule for instance that the bhikku doesn't eat after twelve o'clock - you know, he's supposed to have only one or two meals, so he finishes before twelve o'clock, the rule says - alright you don't eat after twelve o'clock - so what do they do, they start earlier, they start at five and have a very early breakfast and then another meal at eight or nine, and another one at eleven, but they really believe they are observing the precepts, but clearly the spirit

32

of moderation in eating is being broken - so one has to be very careful not to adopt a legalistic attitude towards the observance of precepts, which is completely against the whole spirit of Buddhism, you know. So-"they co-n-stantly observe the 250 precepts" - that is to say, they constantly - as naturally, spontaneously even, folYow various modes of skilful action, skilful behaviour, according to circumstances, "entering into and abiding in perfect quietude. - By working their way through the four 5-tages of progress t-h-ey becoine Arahants" So the rest of this section describes the Hinayana path of 'stream-entry', 'once-returner', 'non-returner and finally 'Arahantship' which the Mahayana of course, you know, regards as a lower, as a lesser ideal. I think we'll take these stages as read, so to speak, because I've gone into them in considerable detail in "The Three Jewels", but there are one or two points that should be mentioned, the four stages of progress are, of course - those four stages - they start at the top and work their way down - first the Arahant - that is as regards enumeration not practice - "who possess the powers of levitation and transformation, as well as the ability to prolong their lives for many aeons and to reside or move about anywhere in -heaven or ear-th", it's rather interesting they should describe the Arahants in this way. Why do you think that is? After all what is the Arhanat? Essentially it's a person who has gained

Enlightenment as a follower of the Buddha, who has destroyed all defilements, who has awoken to knowledge, but why this description? - "he possesses the powers of levitation and transformation, as well as the ability to prolong their life for many aeons, and to reside or move about anywhere in Heaven or earth" - what does this remind you of?

Puma: The Taoist Sage -

S: The Taoist Immortal. So this was translated, you know,

33

for a Chinese audience, it seems as though, the, you know, translator has adapted from those descriptions of the Arahant, those very features which are going to appeal to the popular Chinese mind. The 'Arahant' possesses the power of levitation, flying up through the sky - (Laug-hter) and transformation - he can take on the form of a fox or a deer, or an elephant, or a young girl, or an old man, - and reside as well as the ability to prolong their lives for many aeons. Well we know that the Taoist is very concerned with this the elixir of immortality - it might have had a philosophical esoteric meaning, but the masses took it quite literally, even the emperors took it quite literally - some of them are said to have killed themselves, swallowing different concoctions, different drugs, different versions of the elixir of immortality, they killed themselves in this way (Laughter), and to rise or move about anywhere in heaven or earth - so clearly it's a sort of magical being who is being described here, not that the Arahant doesn't possess these characteristics according to the Indian Buddhist scriptures, however one may take that, but it is interesting that these particular features are stressed, well, they are the only ones that are enumerated, so the Arahant- is made to appear a sort of, you -know, Taoist Immortal, a Taoist sage. It's (understandable, because after all, here is Buddhism being brought to China, a very very strange foreign teaching, the Chinese seemed to have been throughout their history, very xenophobic, that is to say, they hated everything foreign, and here were these two monks from central India, might have been from Maharashtra, might have been monks () who lived in those caves, temples of Western India, coming to China, bringing this new, foreign un-Chinese teaching, so clearly, one of the things that they would have wanted to do was to make it sound a bit Chinese, especially if they had been talking about 'abandoning desire ,

34

which wasn't a very Chinese idea at all. So I suppose they thought they had better make it a bit more acceptable, and a bit more intelligible even to the Chinese, when it came to describing the 'Arahant' the ideal man of the Hinayana, so they described him in terms which

would be familiar to their Chinese audience, in terms admittedly taken or selected from the Buddhist scriptures, the Indian Buddhist scriptures, they describe him as a sort of Taoist sage, 5 sort of immortal, riding on the clouds, living indefinitely, able to transform himself into all sorts of

shapes - that the Chinese mind would have understood. So this raises that very important principle, you know, of skilful means - when we talk about the Buddhist ideal in the West, what do we usually stress? The individual, so, you know, why is that? That is in accordance with our needs, we say yes, that aspect is there, yeh - in the Buddha's teaching, the Arahant is the Individual, even the 'once-returner' the 'non-returner', the 'stream-entrant', they are individuals true individuals, in a certain measure - but why do we stress that? Why do we stress individuality? Just because in modern times, we are being crushed by the corporate state, and by the impersonality of things, the impersonality of social and economic and political life, therefore we stress the individuality of things much more, we stress that the enlightened person is the true individual, so maybe the Chinese were no more wrong than we are, or those translators no more wrong than we are, you know. They made it intelligible, they gave the Chinese mind something to catch hold of, something to latch on to, and we are doing just the same when we speak of enlightenment or spiritual development in terms of individuality or the individual. That is the aspect which appeals most to people, just because of the situation in which they find themselves, which is one in which individuality

35

seems to be crushed out of them, so we think very much of individuality in terms of individuality, in a sense, it is an issue to be individuals, because it is just what society, even our own families, our own homes, our own nearest and dearest very often don't allow us to be - you see for us Buddhism means being an individual. It doesn't mean careering through the clouds, or anything like that, we are quite happy to leave all that aside for the evangelists? we just want to be individuals, so we take Buddhism in accordance with our own needs - we look at it in terms of our needs, and quite validly so, so it's not surprising that the Chinese also did this, or at least these Indian Buddhists tried to introduce, you know, Buddhism into China, translating the first Buddhist texts to at least try and make them a bit appealing and intelligible. So below them come the 'Anagamins' - So at the end of long life, you know, (we mustn't forget tea must we?) - (Last bit blank)

END OF TAPE I

2nd Tape ° - 1st side (1st Session)

they don't return to the earth, they are not reborn on earth as human beings anymore, they are reborn in these higher

~ worlds, the text speaks ~ nineteen heavens, other texts give, you know, different numbers, but these worlds or heavens are collectively called the 'pure abodes', again I've gone into this in "The Three Jewels" - and there become Arahants -

Vijaya: Will they be 'kamalokas'?

S They we be ?

Vijaya: Higher worlds of the senses?

S: No - No, they are said to be at the summit of the world

of form, beyond the 'rupaloka'. Then come the 'Sakridagamins', Oh~ that is to say, the £(once~returners, who come back ~n to this

earth, who are reborn here once more, who must ascend one step,

36

and must be reborn once more that is one earth before becoming Arahants - "There are also the 'Srota-ap~nas' who cannot become Arahants until they have passed through nine (Pali texts usually say seven) more rounds of death and birth. One who has put an end to his longings and desires is like a man who, having no further use for his limbs (lit. having cut off his limbs), never uses them again". There are just a few points to be cleared up - These four stages of progress, as I said, they do summarise the Hinayana view of the highest spiritual path. The important point practically is that of 'Stream-entry'. I've gone into this many a time, you might have encountered this in lectures and also in seminars - Some of the very early Pali texts in fact don't distinguish these higher stages of the 'once-returner' and the 'non-returner', they speak only in terms of the Arahant that is to say, the one who has reached the highest goal, not 'Arahant' as opposed to 'Bodhisattva' as became the case later on, but the Arahant in the simple earlier sense of one who had reached to the goal of human perfection, on the one hand, and the 'stream-entrant' on the other - the early texts seem only to speak of these two, so these are really the two points. When you've 'entered the stream' of spiritual life, you break what afterwards were called the three lower fetters, the first three fetters out of ten, and you ascend the stream. You get into the current of spiritual life, and you are sort of borne irresistibly along, you can't help yourself anymore, you couldn't go back to wordly life in the true sense, not the external wordly life, even if you tried. So you 've'entered the stream', and you go on, you go further and further higher and higher up that stream until you, as it were, disappear over the horizon, you know, in the direction of the ocean, ie. Nirvana, which is a sort of hypothetical full stop, but only a hypothetical

37

one. So therefore the 'entry of the stream' is the important point, one need not bother too much about the details of, you know, 'once-returner' and 'non-returner', it's the point of 'stream-entry' that really concerns one, after that, I won't say everything is plain sailing, but one can't fall back, you can only progress. So in quite a few talks I've dealt with the three fetters, in quite a few seminars, that is quite important. Alright that's one point. So another point is - "one who has put an end to his longings and desires, (that is to say, who has become an Arahant) is like a Than who, having no further use for his limbs (lit. having cut off his limbs), never uses them again This doesn't seem a very happy sort of analogy, you know, from a modern point of view.

Priyananda: Well, it does stress the negative aspect

S: Yes, it does stress the negative aspect very strongly. The extirpation of desire with a vengeance - you just cut off your arms and legs, and you know, gouge out your eyes, you know, that is what, you know, the state of enlightenment is like. So this doesn't convey the right sort of impression really at all does it?

Udaya: I prefer that -urn- that you quoted I think from, St.Paul, about putting away childish things, the toys, coming to maturity, seems a more positive way of looking at it

-

S: Yes, Yes. So it is true that you put an end to your longings and desires, your neurotic desires, so they don't exist any more, but it's more like, you could say, someone who had gone about with artificial limbs, even though he had his own arms and legs, you see what I mean? So, he throws away the artificial arms and legs and now uses his own arms and legs, it's more like that, rather than actually - cutting off your own arms and legs, so really you're just without them,

38

deprived of them, that's similar to the state of enlightenment when you're deprived of all desire, it doesn't convey a very pleasant impression actually - it doesn't. So maybe it's better to emphasise growth rather than extirpation, you see what I mean? It's true though, you -do have to get rid of certain things, one must not compromise about that, there are certain negative states, and certain bad neurotic habits that have to be given up, there is nothing else you can do about them, you can't refine them, you can only give them up, but the spiritual life you know, is not limited, - you just give it up, and just cast it off, and just extirpate it, - essentially it's a process of growth, and as the tree grows, as the plant grows, it casts off the old leaves, you know, it's like that, it's not just a process of casting off old leaves, it's a

process of positive growth and eventual flowering going on at the same time. So we have to watch comparisons of this sort, otherwise if someone asks you "what is this state of desirelessness like, when you become an Arahant?" Oh well it's only like having all your arms and legs cut off.... (Laughter) Well this is what the text says, but, you know, it obviously isn't really like that. I don't remember in the Pali Scriptures, finding any comparison of that sort it must have come from a very Hinayanic source indeed. Are there any further points about section two? Bearing in mind that those four stages have been dealt with quite comprehensively elsewhere - Alright - let's go on then, Section three.

Ann: Look up text

Section 3

S: There's quite a bit to consider here - "The 'Sramana' who, having left home, - puts an end to his desires and drives away his longings". There seems to be a distinction between desires and

39

longings, what do you think is the basis of this distinction, taking the words quite literally? Especially this word 'longings'.

Keith: It's more for something in the future -

S: 'Longing' is more for something in the future, yes - It suggests thinking about it a lot, you know, yearning after, really wanting it, So - 'knowing the source of his own mind' - what do you think is meant by that? - "The source of his own mind" - what is the source of one's own mind? Is it possible to see the source of one's own mind, who sees?

Priyananda: It's not looking at or just perceiving the reactive mind is it? It seems to be going beyond that. It's going to some sort of, something sort of - ah an insight -uh- into the nature of the mind, it's not just perceiving the nature of the mind,

S: It's not that the mind is seeing the mind, it's not reactive mind seeing reactive mind, which you can only do reactively, you know, it is not that. It's a bit like what I said before, that you know, if you really do see the conditionedness of the mind, the mind that sees is a non-conditioned mind, it's rather like that. So you can't know the source of the mind, you know, with the mind itself, you know, in the ordinary sense, at all, So it suggests that a higher faculty, a more intuitive, more transcendental faculty has to come into operation, otherwise you don't see the origin of the mind. But even so what is the origin of the mind? or is there an origin of the mind? Does it mean going back and back with time, does it refer to the process of rebirth, does it mean seeing your first birth, your first embodiment, does it

mean that? It doesn't really does it.

Vijaya; At the same time is the nature of the experience, clearer, purer and more powerful, you can only say that that is all you, you know, something like that.

S: But in a way it means seeing where you go wrong, seeing the origin of the mind - It's not the origin once and for all, ~ it were, way back in the past, you know, it's an origin which is constantly being repeated, over and over again in the present itself, and 'seeing the origin of the mind' means seeing how this whole reactive process takes place, this whole silly circle, that's, you know, 'seeing the origin of the mind', and when you really see that, you inverted commas, are outside that circle, you see the conditionedness of it all, you see the reactivity of it all, and at that moment you are not conditioned and you are not reactive, you are creative, you are intuitive, you are even transcendental, you are unconditioned, and in that way you get out, you penetrate to the profound principles of Buddhahood, because at that moment you're intuitive, transcendental, un- conditioned, so what is that if not Buddhahood, at least the beginnings of it, the principles or qualities of Buddhahood, so "seeing the conditionedness of your own mind" - knowing the source of your own mind, at the same time, you awaken to, you penetrate to the profound principles of Buddhahood. A Buddha is one who thoroughly clearly sees the conditionedness of his own conditioned mind, and as soon as the conditionedness of the mind is really seen, the conditionedness ceases - If you really see yourself reacting, you cease to react - There has to be a real seeing, not just a theoretical, not just a mental, knowing. So you can stop any instant, as it were, stop your reactivity by seeing it, and you see how ridiculous and how absurd it is, and how unnecessary and how you just go round and round in the same old circle, you see the foolishness of it, and you just stop. So you don't just stop, there's more than that. In order to stop you have to be more than that reactive person, so, the creative element, the intuitive element, the

41

transcendental element comes in, as it were, automatically, it's not that one happens and then the other, no, it's sort of instantaneous, in a sense, it's simultaneous, so - "he awakens to the non-phenomenal (that is to say 'the unconditioned') clinging to nothing within and seeking for nothing from without" - because, in a sense, there is no within or without, there is no self, and non-self - there's no subject and object, they are all part of the reactive mind's activity. So the mind that sees then, (the unconditioned mind) is not a subject as opposed to object - this is very important to see so to speak, it's only the reactive mind that can be a subject. The 'seeing', unconditioned mind is not a 'seer' that 'sees' something "seen" as distinct from, or opposed to itself, so it really means also, a sort of dissolution, a breaking down of the subject-object relationship, or experience, in a sort of unitary awareness, this is the only way in which we can describe it, an awareness which is at the same time subject and object, there is awareness, but nothing of which you are aware, you can't make it into an object, though, at first, of course it seems like an object but it is what they call a pseudo-object- you can think of it as an object, but really it isn't an object. So - "clinging to nothing within" well let's

accuem for the time being that there is a distinction and it's a relative one between 'within' and 'without' - alright you don't cling to anything within, you don't cling to any personal experience, you let it pass, let it go, let it change, and you seek for nothing from without, because you know that nothing from without can give you any real lasting satisfaction - "His mind is not shackled with dogmas, nor is he enmeshed by karma."- 'shackled by dogmas' - 'dogmas' is a rather Western sort of word, I suspect that in the Indian original it must have been 'ditthis' - 'views' - 'opinions' - so what is a 'view', what is an 'opinion'

42

basically?

Barbara: I would say my opinion is seeing something from where I stand, from my point of view, from the position I take up or the way that I see it, the attitude

S: Yes - right

Puma: It's essentially static

S: Yes, it's not only seeing things from a particular point of view, you can't help doing that, but it is absolutising that

Barbara: Yes!

S: and regarding that as something static and fixed, and which cannot be changed. It is the absolutisation of what is essentially a relative standpoint...

Barbara and saying it is The Truth

S: And saying it's The Truth.

Udaya: Whereas it's only an interpretation of what's happening.

S: Yes, which may be quite valid from that particular point of view, but otly from that particular point of view, It's not a universal Truth.

Vijaya: Often value judgments are made in that way, without
any at all.

S: Oh yes! "nor is he enmeshed by karma" - What is 'karma' essentially? It's your own action, your own willed action, you know, and the result of that, but you know, putting t

a bit more broadly, a bit more generally, what is 'karma'?

Vijaya: It is energy? habit energy?

S: 'Habit energy' - that's another translation yes.

Udaya: You could say, that maybe, it's a process that can only happen to somebody, when there's someone there for it there for it to happen to. To the extent that there's not that

43

solid ego individual for it to happen to it can't really affect one....

S: It's not that there is, you know, in this case a sort of self there, but it just happens not to be enmeshed by karma - it's not quite that but the possibility of karma is no longer there because the of karma i.e. the perduring self, the unchanging self isn't there, in a sense, it's been transcended, it's been seen through, externally it may appear as though things are happening to that person because he's got a body, but he doesn't really experience it like that, even the Buddha himself, his external body, had to undergo the results of previous karma, so we are told - he had a splinter of stone in his foot as a result of Devadatta's action, and that was attributed to past 'karma', but the Buddha wasn't perturbed or upset by that, he didn't think - "Oh! look what's happened to me", or "Why should this happen to me". There wasn't that sort of reaction, so he was not enmeshed by karma - He experienced karma, in a sense, but he wasn't enmeshed by it.

M~ha: It seems as if karma sets up another chain of events - it's like - "not being enmeshed" means that it doesn't continue on from there..

S: Yes, yes, actions do end.

M½mha Yes.

S: You do something and that's that, actions end. There is a technical term - the Arahant's said to be 'acarya' "inoperative" - They don't produce karma, it is also translated as 'spontaneous' - They don't lead to anything else for him, he's free, he's detached - just like says about lightning in the sky, or the track of birds, if birds pan through the air well they don't leave any track, in the same way the Arahant passes through the world, well, he doesn't

44

leave any track, any trace, in the sense of "karmic vestiges"

which he has to follow up in some future existence. It's very difficult to act in such a way that, you're not involved further in something, you see what I mean? It's very rare, that you can do an action which ends with itself - that doesn't have consequences.

Udaya: You have to have that ability to end with it don't you?

S: Well, objectively it must have consequences, but there need not be consequences for you, you are uninvolved.

Priyananda: Even if you want to withdraw from something, you want to stop doing something, that in itself can have results.

S: Oh yes. So once you've been involved, it's very difficult to get uninvolved, it's only too easy to enter but to leave, to withdraw, is much more difficult.

Verne: It is a difficult question for me.

S: Well, how do people come to be shackled with problems?

Verne: By solidifying inaudible -

S: Well sometimes it's not only a question of absolutising your own relative experience, but accepting an absolutisation of somebody else's relative experience, which is even worse. Well, even your own dogmas. (Laughter) And there are all sorts of dogmas, there are not only religious dogmas, there are scientific dogmas. I suppose that is a natural tendency of the human mind, to produce dogmas.

Priyananda: Scientific dogmas seem to be . . . well, scientific theories, become more or less dogmas I mean, science is said to be the idea of relativity or scientific theory.

S: Yes, very often it's not the scientists who are at fault but, you know, people who read - (a break in the recording) then follows something rather paradoxical, and according

45

to the translator, this particular bit might have been added on later by C'han people - you know, in the course of Buddhist history, you get this sort of thing happening, there is a text some people like, so they want to bring it a bit more in accordance, you know, with their own way of thinking. So it is suggested that there are some rather 'C'han' like passages in this text which wouldn't have been translated from the original Indian text, but which were probably added at a later date by the people belonging to the C'han tradition, because they don't seem to fit in very well with the predominantly Hinayana approach the rest of the text, so we've

come to one of these texts now - "Pondering nothing and doing nothing, practising nothing and manifesting nothing, without passing through all the successive stages, he (nevertheless) reaches the loftiest of all. This is what is meant by "The Way"." Why, in the previous section, is enumerated these four stages of progress, but here it says - "Without passing through all the successive stages", so there it is a contradiction. So it is suggested you see the finger of 'Chan' here, but I would say, not necessarily so, because, certainly as regards the Pali scriptures, if you look at texts like the Sutta Nipata, especially the two chapters which, according to modern schools, are the two oldest,

and come very close to the Buddha's own teaching, that is to 2?

say, the Arthaca varga, and the ayana varga. There are

teachings which are quite a bit like this..

Puma: The Udana is

S: The Udana too, yes. So it may be that this was in

~ fact translated, from Sanskrit texts, paralleling the sort of material that we find in Pali, in the, you know, Sutta Nipata, in those two chapters of the Sutta Nipata. There is incidentally,

a Chinese version of parts of the Sutta Nipata, including the i)

Arthaca? varga, which were of course translated from the Sanskrit.

46

So it is not impossible that there is a Sanskrit original for this, but it goes back to an earlier stratum of the Indian tradition, the Indian text, so to speak, than does the Hinayana formulation of four stages, so forth - you see what I mean? In the Pali scriptures, in their corresponding Indian version, there corresponding Sanskrit version, in the Buddhist scriptures as a whole, looking at them historically, you can see that there is an earlier material and a later material, even in the Pali Canon, earlier material and later material, so this particular section, "Ponderin nothin and doin nothin" _ this seems to correspond much more with the earlier portions, some of the earlier portions of the Pali Canon, and, you know, the teaching in the previous sections about - working one's way through the four stages of progress, this seems to correspond more to later stage of development. So we don't necessarily have to invoke 'Chan' here, well, I mean, 'Chan' itself, you can say, goes back to an earlier, and in a way, more primitive kind of Buddhism, by-passing the later more scholastic Hinayana development, so - "pondering nothing and doing nothing" - how literally are we supposed to take this.

A voice: What does it mean?

S: can you say "Pondering nothing and doing nothingK?

Purna: We're dealing with the nature of a mind that has experienced the unconditioned

S: Yes, right.

Puma where there is no object as we understand it.

S: There is no one who is pondering nothing and doing ° nothing", it is not that there is no 'pondering' or that there is no 'doing', but it is as though there is no one in the ordinary, mundane, egoistic sense, who is there pondering and doing, 'pondering' just happens, 'doing' just happens, it's

47

spontaneous... So "practising nothing and manifesting nothing", - well, in a sense, you've got there, in a sense, you've arrived, there's nothing to practise, nothing to manifest, because where is the distinction between subject and object? - "without passing through all the successive stages" - you see that this path of four stages, and six stages, and ten stages and fifty-two stages, in a way, is all the same thing, it's just a way of looking at the path. So if you have an ordinary road, if you like, you can divide it up into miles with milestones, but is the road really divided into miles? Is it really marked off into those stages? In a sense, yes, but, in a sense no, this is one continuous path that you could divide in so many ways, you could divide it into furlongs, you could divide it into kilometres, if you like, you could divide it into yoganās, but it is still the same road, and you still have to pass over it, "he (nevertheless) reaches the loftiest of all" - this is what is meant by 'the way' - this is what is meant by 'the Dharma'. The true Dharma is transcendental, it's the realisation of the unconditioned. Any further questions on that? You just get the general impression of someone free and spontaneous, and not conditioned, not taking anything literally, not being misled into absolutising relative experience, someone fluid, someone free.

Megha: It reminds me of the Heart Sutra.

S: Yes, yes. What do you think is really meant by "passing through all of the successive stages"? Does it mean he doesn't actually pass through them?

Puma: Well, to talk of somebody passing through stages is absolutising that subject, as if there is somebody to actually pass through and attain them.

S: Yes, yes - and also that there literally are stages.

Barbara: It's more a feeling of a linear thing, when in a sense it is -ah- a different, a different dimensions that are present in the round.

S; Ah, yes, that's also true.

Vijaya: A sense of something going from something to some- C thing - or beyo~nd something.

S: Yes..

Vijaya: CInaudible --

S: Sometimes people do say, after many years of spiritual progress that thay feel in one sense, yes, they have made a lot of progress, but in another sense they haven't make any progress at all, and both statements are equally true. They don't mean that in a negative sense, if you see what I mean. In one sense they have made a lot of progress, and in another sense they haven't ma~de any progress at all.

Verne: It's more a (Inaudible.)

S: Yes, there is that too.

Verne: (jInaudible.~

Udaya: You can say the same sort of thing about people if you see them after a number of years and maybe from the initial contact, in a sense, they seemed to have changed incredibly. Another way of looking at it, is in a sense that they're more themselves. There is nothing that they are now, that wasn't there to some extent initially.

S: Yes, there is that too. An enlightened person, say, like the Buddha, is still, presumably, recognisably the same person, which is quite interesting in a way, you know, when the Buddha first met his five erstwhile disciples, after his Enlightenment, though he was enlightened they still recognised him, but you could say well he had the same physical appearance, etc, etc but it surely couldn't have just been that, you know,

an enlightened individual, is still an individual. Sometimes people speak as though when you become enlightened you become sort of blank and featureless, and indistinguishable from

some- body else who is enlightened, but your individuality is still there, it's an enlightened individuality, a very purged individuality, and your bad habits are all gone, but even without them you are still perfectly recognizable.

Udaya: Like the traditional simile of the light coming through different lamps or different kinds of glass.

S: You can even say, you know, before they are enlightened people are very different from one another, and after they 've become enlightened they are more different still, even though they are all enlightened. This is a very strange thing, and this is what one sees in the spiritual communities, what one sees in the Order, the Sangha -they become more and more together, and more and more themselves - they become more and more alike because of their common commitment, and the common path that they follow, and at the same time they become more and more different - (Laughter) - the two don't exclude each other.

Barbara: I get the feeling, that it is not so much that people that you have met, as Udaya was saying, that you think they've progressed, but it is almost as if you begin to see qualities that were there, but because of my own insensitivity to it, or my own blindness to it, I did not, I was not aware of those qualities. And as the ones within myself develop then I recognise in others...

S: Yes, and can relate to them.

Barbara: Yes.

S: Alright, let's do just one more section, before we finish for this morning -
Number four -

50

SECTION 4

Megha; "The Buddha said: "He who has shorn his locks and beard to become a Sramana and has accepted the Doctrine of the -Way, abandons everything of worldly value and is satisfied by the food he obtains by begging, eating but once a day. If there is a tree under which to rest, he desires nothing else. Longings and desires are what make men stupid and darken their minds".

b S: Well, what sort of ideal do you think this section (points out). Can it be taken literally? It harkens, you know, back to what we were discussing a bit earlier on~ you know, "taking leave of their families and adopting the homeless life"- the ideal of the Sramana - In the Buddha's day this was followed quite literally, and for some this built afterwards. "abandons everything of worldly value"

Verne: It occurs to me that he's taken refuge in himself

and that (inaudible) & he's not dependent,

or relating to this in any (inaudible) He's free.

Ratnaketu: he's taking out the symbols of the old society and throwing them away.

S: Yes, right. This comes out even more clearly in the story of the Buddha's great renunciation, the... where the Buddha goes out from the palace, if you like, at night, in fact in the middle of the night, and rides his horse to the border of the Sakya kingdom or Sakya republic, that border is a river, he crosses that river to the other side, he takes off his princely robes, and this is the .. so he takes off his princely robes, jewels, ornaments, and then of course he shaves, he cuts off his hair, and gives up his sword, so he's just left, as it were, a human being, without recognisable social identity. This is what it really means I think. It isn't just the shaving off the hair and beard, as another uniform, you see what I mean? If you're not careful, it

-51

can become a uniform - so it says later in the story that a wandering beggar, happened to be passing by, and the Buddha took these steps, and that represented that later on, a sort of uniform, the uniform, you know, of the Buddhist monk, but in a sense that contradicts the basic idea, of not being identifiable. I think this also connects up with the sort of ancient tradition or practice, or custom of people following different occupations, different trades, even a different social position, having a different recognisable dress so that you can identify their occupation, their class, their social position, trade, profession and so on, and deal with them accordingly, which meant of course you weren't dealing with them as human beings. So it is as though the Buddha's casting off of his princely robes, and all that sort of thing you know, cutting off his hair and beard, symbolised that divesting of oneself of one's purely social identity, one's persona, and just being a straight-forward human being. Logically, in a sense, to make the analogy, more perfect, one might say that the Buddha should not have been described as accepting any other clothes because after all a beggar has an identity, as a beggar, but anyway, traditionally, at the least Buddhist monks did not practice nudity, but the Jains did, in a way, being more logical, you see what I mean? because they insist on a man simply a man, you know, not even wearing the dress of a beggar, not even wearing the dress of a monk, just his skin.

Ratnaketu: Even that can be quite -

Several voices at once: Words blurred - (Laughter) -

S: That too - wherein Jainism so to speak, becomes a recognisable religion to which you can identifiably belong, so, as you said, even your nudity becomes a garb you know, it's a bit like the modern Hippies, you know, your dirty

stained patched jeans - (Laughter) - that's a symbol of
rebellious and non-conformity, but then after a few years,

~ they are a must for every teenager you know, the teenager wouldn't be seen dead without them, thoroughly conforming. You see what I mean, I was really amused last year, when I was travelling by train, a really smart, well-groomed young man got on to the train, so I noticed that he was wearing a very beautiful new pair of jeans, and they'd clearly been made ready patched in the factory. Yes, yes. They were so neat, and so nice, completely made of patches, so beautifully tailored and pressed, brand new (Laughter)- and brand new yes? So, you know, it loses its original significance. But they did this in ancient times - every profession, every class had its distinctive dress, so you dealt with people not as individuals, but as members of their particular occupations, classes, communities, professions - many countries in Europe, in the Middle Ages, and later, even in the United States, had what we call sumptuary legislation, that is to say legislation restricting the consumption of certain classes of people, and also the kind of clothes that they could wear. For instance in Elizabethan England, if you did not belong to the gentry and nobility you were not allowed to wear silk, and you could be punished for wearing silk, and for certain kinds of furs, ah, you see, because to wear those, meant you belonged to a certain kind of class, uh, and other people were not permitted to usurp your identity, so your identity is not in yourself, but in the class, or the profession, or the trade, the community to which you belonged, which you follow, and this is the negation of individuality, uh, because it means you are identified

completely with your membership of a particular group,

you are seen essentially as a group member, not as an

?

individual, you're seen as an, a, (grain) merchant, or

you're seen as a soldier, or an Indian, perhaps you are seen as an untouchable or you're seen as a trader, someone of the Brahmin class, or someone of the (Sikh?) class, you are not seen as an individual, this is a comparatively new concept, that of the individual, who has his existence and an identity and being apart from his actual occupation.

END OF SIDE 1 - TAPE 2

SIDE 2 TAPE 2

S: (cont'd) - You might have been identified even completely with your family. This is more the case with regards to women. If you read early Roman history, you find that a surprising number of women are called Julia, for instance, or have similar names, or Claudia, so why is this? It simply means - Julia simply means - "the woman of the Julian clan" - she has no other name of her own, nor probably the woman of the Claudian has, has no name of her own, and if she is distinguished at all, for there are so many of them, as the Julia, who is so-and-so's mother, or the Julia who is so-and-so's sister, or the Julia who is so-and-so's auntie and she doesn't have a name, really, of her own, you see what I mean? because she is merged in not to say submerged in the family, in other words, a particular group. So it is the same with the occupations, and the castes, and the classes, you are merged in your particular group, you don't have an identity of your own, well, we can see that even with occupational names - Mr. Smith, Mr. Miller - well, in the old days you were just the smith, or you were just the

54

millar, in Wales, apparently, they still refer to people like this - they talk about Tommy, the BBread, meaning the baker, or Jimmy, the post, meaning the postman - he's identified with his occupation, so this does not make for the appreciation or development of individuality. So that the Buddha's renunciation of his princely garb, had a sort of profound spiritual significance. You shouldn't be identified, completely with your social role, you as an individual transcend or should transcend that, if in fact you are an individual.

Barbara: We do this so subtly, to each other too, by saying AM wife of m~ husband, and this is ~m child, or let me introduce you to, you know and they are at once

S: Yes, yes. It is sometimes useful to know how people

~ are related to one another, but it certainly is not useful to identify them exclusively and entirely with their particular roles in relation to other people and society in general. If someone is essentially "mother" well, she is ~m mother, and she just has to stay in that place, or you know she's ~ child, or he's my father, and that's that, or my headmaster, or whatever it might be.

Vipula: Or the doctor.

S: Yes.

Udaya: I've been in situations where I've felt quite pressured to give a description, and you know, been at a loss to satisfy the person's demands as to who this person is - you can't

just say well this is so-and-so and give their names in some situations. There is almost a sort of questioning look in their eyes - Well, who is he, or who is she - and who or what is she to you?

55

Puma: What's his claim to ~ame? (Laughter).

Barbara: What's his job? or what's her job?

S: Oh, yes - or as they ask in England it's "What do you do?"

Barbara: Right. What do you do? (Laughter)

S: Well, they don't know you, until they know what you do. Well this may be an interesting piece of informa- tion about you, but it doesn't identify you.

Barbara: And there is always, that even if it may not be -um- conciously recognised at the time, there is I'm sure, that resistance to being um almost looked on as an impersonal being - I can remember being introduced once as "Courtland's widow" - (Laughter). I knew the people sufficiently well so I sort of

S: Well, you are lucky (Laughter).

Barbara: said - My name is Barbara.

S: Yes, right. Also well people say, "This is my mother, you know, and leave it at that - and so you fade into the backgrou~n and think tea - (Laughter) - Well, you know, that's mother, so you beam, and

Udaya: Yes, it's a sort of for labelling everything, to keep it all together.

S: Well, labelling is all right, providing it's the correct label.

Udaya: Well, you can ~et past the label - that there is something that you're labelling - not the label itself.

S: So "he who has shorn his locks and beard to become a 'Sramana' and has accepted the doctrine of the Way, abandons everything of wordly value", - and that abandonment seems to be symbolised, as I said, by the you know, his relinquishment of his social position, his social identity.

It is not that you can refuse to recognise those things 56

on their own plane, but they aren't of ultimate value, you know, - "and is satisfied by the food he obtains by begging". What do you think about this begging? Eh? You know, was the practice in the Buddha's day? Do you think it really means or signifies, or has it any relevance today?

Priyananda: It suggests to me, contentment. He is contented with what he just gets in his bowl.

S: So what is the principle involved here?

Ratnaketu: The emphasis is as little energy as possible on the basic necessities.

S: Yes, there's that too, yes. You have energy for other things.

Barbara: And also that his work is . . . Um- it's not an arrogant . . it's not the arrogance of Um.

Udaya: Does 'the abstaining from taking the not-given' come into this at all?

S; Well yes, because begging and stealing are you know, incompatible aren't they. When you beg, you just ask, or you just make yourself available to receive - according to the Vinaya, the Buddhist monk is not supposed actually to ask, he's not supposed to say, "please give me alms". He just stands at the door of the house, and if people want, they can come out and give him something, and, you know, Buddhists, in Buddhist countries, they know what time the monks is likely to arrive, so they just keep a look-out for him, you know.

Udaya: So what's the principle involved~ that you make your need known?

S: You make your need known.

Vipula: Stand there looking very hungry - (Laughter)

57

S: Well, one of the principles involved is contentment.

You take what you need to sustain life, but you don't ?

really your own. eating but once a day." - perhaps that can be taken literally, perhaps not - "If

there is a tree under which to rest, he desires nothing else" - just shelter for the day, that's all he really wants - "Longings and desires are what make men stupid and darken their minds". - If he starts thinking Oh! I'd like a bigger tree or a better tree or I'd like to build a little hut under that tree well while building a little hut, I might as well make it a palatial sort of mansion, a real monastery, yes? in this way "Longings and desires what make men stupid and darken their minds". Of course there is, you know, a difference as between the Buddha's day and ours, and also in different parts of the world, in India you can live very simply, you can still live very simply, because the climate is so different, the weather is so different, where in England if you tried to live at the foot of a tree, or even rest at the foot of a tree, in certain weather, well, it would be rather difficult to say the least. In England you need a good stout building to keep out the weather. But still we mustn't lose sight of the principle. I think if anything it's more relevant than ever these days, 'wants' seem to multiply, 'needs' seem very strong. So "abandon everything of worldly Value" seems to mean not attaching, you know, supreme importance to worldly values. Even a monk doesn't abandon food, which has some worldly value, he just doesn't over value it; he doesn't abandon shelter but again he doesn't overvalue it, he doesn't take more than he actually needs. So one could paraphrase and speak of a 'Sramana'

58

as one has repudiated his social identity, you know, has accepted the principle of individual development, gives the first place and the highest value to individual development for himself and for others, and lives a life of contentment, taking and using only the things that he needs to live as an individual, and is satisfied with whatever ~~~~~ are provided for his basic needs, and requires nothing else, it's more like that. But you know, why do we have to identify ourselves with our worlds? Well usually it's because we get a kind of security, isn't it, you know, and we can be recognised by other people and be treated by other people in a certain way, and that reassures us, maybe in the old familiar way, or the way that we like, the way that gratifies us. So in that sense, in that way, our ego-sense is sort of strengthened or confirmed.

Barbara: I can see very much the mother role, the sort of feeling of being needed - that position of, of um, power in ~~~~~ of being needed, or felt to be needed by others which is ah

S: Of having a function, of having a use.

Barbara: Um

S: If others don't want you anymore, and you can't

~ help anybody anymore, in that way well you feel as though, you know, you have nothing to do, as though your occupation's gone, there is no point in your life anymore.

Purna: Um- It's interesting people's attitudes

towards the elderly, particularly elderly women. There's almost this thing often that there's no more function for them.

S: And it's all the more so for the elderly man who

59

has retired, he loses his social identity and he often goes to seed, goes to pieces.

Megha: the elderly are more likely to die, after retirement.

Barbara: Yes. I think there's quite a lot, --- I don't know how many incidents of suicide among people like that, but I think that there is some

S: After the age of sixty-five you might be quite an

~ important person in a big corporation, and have a busy,

~ bustling active life that you attach some value and significance from then one day you're given your testimonial dinner and your gold watch and the next morning you are nobody. Nobody! Sudden, just like that! You're just at home with your wife, who is as old as you are perhaps, nothing to do, just, you know, look after the garden, mow the lawn, help the wife with a bit of shopping, so you seem to have completely lost your role, your function, your identity, you've nothing to live for, so you don't live -

Dave Moore: Some people even start to realise too, that all their life they have been working for this time, when they can stop working, when they can take it easy, and then, they finally, after years of doing that, they get there, and there is nothing.

S: So even, you know, apart from the whole spiritual side of things it becomes important to cultivate interests, hobbies, occupations, friends, to fall back on, as it were, you know, after retirement., even from just a Practical, worldly, you know, psychological point of view, but a lot of people don't even do this.

Dave Moore: It's very hard for to retire - (chuckle)

S: Yes, well that really solves the problem - You don't even retire when you die - (Laughter).

Vipula: ----Inaudible The change of is work.

S: Yes, Indeed and there are old people who can very often go on working, you know,

very efficiently, who don't particularly want to retire and they could certainly do

~ something&~perhpas they have to retire, becuase they are

64 or whatever it is. C)

Vijaya: identity that the society sees people

as being a consumer, and that's the role everyone can

play

S: And of course after retirement you are purchasing power usually decreases, you are less value as consumer, so again you only become more insignificant, because you haven't ot the spending power that you used to have, you can't lash out like you used to do, so you become of less importance, you matter less.

Dave Moore: The other week we borrowed a sander from a hire place, and we were coming back, and there's a big motorway, and on one side was this old folk's home, and this had been pushed, quite right into you know, right up against the motorway because the motorway is expanding, on the other side was, a hospital for the insane. And that was where I felt I was getting pushed along this big motorway - and the motorway sort of led right out to the suburbs where all the acceptable people were, and the socially acceptable were sort of pushed out on either side on the motorway.

S: I mean, the sum substance of this seems to be to lead a simple, uncluttered life, dedicated to the pursuit of true values, this is what it seems to boil down to.

60

Well, leave aside all the exotic oriental bits, well that is really the essence of the matter.

This question of eating is also quite important, it's not just a question of once or twice or thrice day or all day, but the place that eating occupies in your life, in your psychological economy, so to speak. Why do you eat? What makes you eat? What significance do you attach to eating, to the things that you eat? Is it just nutriment to keep you going, or is it perhaps a substitute for some- thing else, for something, missing in your life, does it make up for something, I mean, that's also important. It's not just a question of the quantity of the stuff that you eat, or, you know, what kind of food, bu w~ you eat, what role does food play in your life - what does it mean to you psychologically, well, food is a ~er emotive thing, you know-

Voices: - Inaudible -

Vijaya: Sensuous.

Udaya: I've earned this.

Voice: Yes.

S: Well, you know, some people are much more concerned about food than others, aren't they? Some have all sorts of fads about food. Some are not happy unless they're nibbling. So I think, probably this is a much more important aspect of the question rather than how many times a day you eat, or what even you eat, apart from the question of being a vegetarian.

Priyananda: In terms of how much importance one places on the activity of eating, if one is - if it is very important, it becomes quite a sort of major activity in your day, then it will be indicating that there is

something wrong.

61

S: Yes. Well this is what I found, when I went to Nepal, on my second visit - there was a big gathering for the reception of some relics of the Buddha and his two chief disciples, and lots and lots of monks had gathered there, and this was my first experience of lots and lots of monks, and lots of Zen monks, and especially Nepalese monks, and they were mostly Theravada monks, so they didn't eat after twelve o'clock, so we had an early breakfast at seven o'clock, at eight o'clock a lot of the young ones would say, "Come on, get ready for lunch" - (Laughter) "Lunch is coming up, mustn't be late for lunch, be sure to have your bath quick, be ready for lunch." So there was all this thing of, about getting ready for lunch, right after breakfast. (Laughter) And rather elderly monks would say, "What's all this about lunch, there is plenty of time!", but they were really quite, neurotically, I think that's the word in this case really, "neurotically" absorbed in lunch coming, and being ready for lunch, and not missing it, and of course it did come at half-past eleven, there they were at half-past ten, at the place, waiting for it, and getting a bit impatient, and maybe talking about it, and eleven-thirty it came, well, they couldn't eat after twelve, so as quickly as possible in that half-hour, they ate as much as they could, at twelve o'clock well they were so full, they had to lie down and sleep it off - (Laughter) - till five o'clock when they got up and had a cup of tea, which was permitted. So I saw this sort of obsession with food, just because there is this rule, which they were observing, you know, not eating after twelve o'clock. So it just seemed out of proportion, so from that time I started to think about this quite

62

seriously, though I myself at that time, and for some years after, was not eating after twelve

o'clock, but I saw that there was something to watch here, that food could come to mean too much, and take too important a place in your life, even if you were a monk and not eating, after twelve o'clock. On some of the retreats, you know, we 've had brunch, and early supper or high tea, instead of our usual three meals a day, just to see, what people's reactions were. But it is said by psychologists that food is ver~ often a sort of substitute for affection. The person who is starved of affection, or feels starved of affection, or feels starved of affection they str\$%t stuffing them- selves with food, especially sweet things, you know, especially chocolates, if you spend the whole evening with a big box of chocolates, and you steadily work your way through it, you've probably got an emotional problem.

Batbara: It seems these patterns are set up quite early in life. The sort of attitudes that parents, um, and even using food as rewards for behaviour, and things like that

S: Yes, and to keep children quiet.

Barbara which is

S: Sweets.

Megha: (laughter)

Vijaya: It was a kindness to dish out the bis- cuits, and cakes to kids, and the kids liked that, like rewards.

Barbara: Yes! had to earn it!

Vijaya: want to be loved---- conditioning.

Puma: I notice that even in a lot of adults who reward themselves with a night out at the restaurant.

63

Voices: Yes, Yeah.

S: Ah? It's interesting, this sort of, giving your- self something or enjoying something, not because you want it, or want to do it, but because you earned it as a reward. In a way you are enmeshed by karma, where you feel guilty about enjoying that particular thing, so you don't dare to go and just enjoy it, because you want to, but you have to make our that you have sort of earned it and you deserve it. There is not a feeling that in a sense you have a right to enjoy it just because you want to enjoy it, you've got to deserve it, you've got to make up for enjoying that particular thing by doing something else you don't particularly like. It's a quite odd sort of thing, isn't it?

Barbara: It really cuts right deep down into every- thing. Reasons for doing work, or having a job, or the kind of work you do.

S: So there is this dichotomy very often between work, which of course you don't like doing, and the reward for work, and these two are kept quite separate and distinct, but there is very little idea of doing things, not because you enjoy them, even that isn't quite right, you just do them and you enjoy them, you enjoy doing them, it's your life, you're just functioning. You don't do them in order to have a certain enjoyment, the two blend, they integrate. Just as you don't just breathe in the fresh air in the morning to enjoy the experience - (Laughter) The two are completely unified, you know, our experience isn't like that - we do something for the sake of something else which is the reward of what we do. So this is 'not pleasant' and 'that is pleasant', you know, so

64

we lose the idea of pleasure in what we do. Pleasure is the reward of what we do, if it's the right sort of thing that we've done, I'm sure you can think of all sorts of instances and examples of this.

Udaya: I think this is what we're finding in the Movement with work, we work in the community - that, uh, initially you get people working entirely just towards completion of the job, and spending as little time as possible on the preparation and the means towards that completion.

S: You work towards the weekend. You work so that you can stop work and enjoy the weekend.

Udaya: Yeah

S: It's a very strange state of affairs because you are alienated from much of your present experience.

°Suvajri: Doing artist's work is a very hard thing - because something that you sort of have to enjoy, otherwise you don't do it, then you almost feel guilty about spending so much time doing something you enjoy, which is also work. °(Laughter).

Dave Moore: You're sort of conditioned into thinking "Well, if I've got to work and I was to get pleasure, well then that surely any work that I do is um, pleasant. It can't be pleasant, because I've got to do something unpleasant first.

S: Yes, yes. Work cannot be pleasure, and pleasure cannot be work. So there is this split between the work which is unpleasant and leisure which is pleasant, and you work to earn leisure. You work five days to earn, or to deserve two days of leisure and enjoyment. So in this way there is a sort of dreadful split in your

which is quite a sobering thought. There are very few people, I think actually and spontaneously doing the things they "want to do" inverted commas, and enjoying doing them at the same time.

Dave Moore: There is a danger of that being carried out in the spiritual life - by saying, "All things connected with spiritual growth are unpleasant because they are the work you have to do to get the pleasure at the end.

S: Right. I find this very much, especially in the West this is, with people following the same tradition, it has to be hard, it has to be tough, it has to be painful, it has to hurt, you find the more it hurts, the better. The more your knees hurt when you sit all the better it is, don't change your position, no, because that might relieve the pain. (Laughter). Keep on letting it hurt - That's the real practice, the real Zen, as it were,

that is what a lot of people think. But wow! the reward ?

at the end (Loud Laughter) the of enlightenment,

sheer bliss, which will make up for all that. That is the way it seems, by many Western practitioners. But also if you think too much about the end result and the reward, you cannot even really properly, deeply, thoroughly, get into the means to that end. Just like when you're thinking too much about finishing the painting and how much you'll charge for it, and what you'll do with the money you get into the painting, can you? It's impossible. This is why Mah~~~~ Ghandi once said that "The end is the extreme of means." The end is only the means, so-to-speak, come to perfection, and possibly still continuing, you know, not coming to a dead halt,- so the spiritual is just something that goes on and on, you haven't want it

to end - well what a drag when it all comes to an end, you know, Enlightened, you just sit down with nothing to do, apparently, so, you know, this is brought out in the Bodhisattva Ideal, the Bodhisattva goes on and on, aeon after aeon, he doesn't want it to end. He is delighted to continue, he doesn't want to come to a full-stop - He's not just working for that, he's not just doing all that for the sake of enlightenment at the end. In a sense he's doing it for its own sake, and he's happy to continue. So this idea of a reward you know, remember in the story philosopher there is Hegel's sarcastic remark to the moral philosopher he said - "Huh, so you want a trinket do you for not murdering your mother!" (Laughter) It seems like this very

often, you want a trinket for not murdering your mother, you want the reward for your good deed, you won't do it for its own sake - (It's not that you love your mother) therefore if you don't murder her, you want a trinket, you want a little reward, you know, uh. And this is, you know, the so-called good person. The good person observes all the rules so as to get the promised reward, whether it's 'going to heaven', or whatever else it is social approbation, or parental love, or whatever it may be.

Puma: It's interesting how conditioned this is - the sort of 'sinner' all over - in terms of you reward certain behaviour, you reinforce that behaviour, it's very conditioned.

S: Perhaps on the level of social life, you know, it is necessary especially, perhaps, with small children. don't think one can altogether avoid that, but it should be skilfully connected, with something, you know, higher, something more individual, as soon as it is possible to

67

do that.

Verne: With the children, I try to make sure they realise, that something that they do, that makes Murray and I happy, is going to be good for everybody

S: Right.

Verne:....And that there is a backward-forward thing that's going to affect everybody - it's a sort of rewarding, but not that

S: In a less selfish way.

Verne: .. it's natural.

S: Otherwise the whole idea of reward is so selfish and individualistic when as in the case of some Christians they don't mind, you know, if they get heaven, they don't care what happens to everybody else, you know, which seems very dreadful - I mean, there are even some Christian writers, who say that one of the joys of heaven is looking down into Hell and rejoicing at the sight of all the people in torment there - (Laughter) as if they were the entertainments of the saved. It seems terrible, doesn't it? Really awful, You're sort of gloating over your own reward, and somebody else's punishment, like really hasty little children.

Barbara: I used to feel it would be rather boring to

?

be in Heaven, I didn't feel that I would like to

when I was a child, that I wanted to sit

S: Yes, this sort of idea of a static end result. When everything's done and you've got your reward and you sit there suffering it. (Laughter)

Barbara: It doesn't have that dynamic on-going quality, that alive, vibrant quality.

S: So I think as soon as we can, we must get children, get people, out of this idea of a reward, that something

68

like heaven or Nirvana or even Enlightenment is the reward of "a good life", which usually means the conformist's life you know, meticulously scrupulously following, obeying, you know, all the rules, and grovelling a bit, and you know, keeping on the right side of whatever spiritual authority happens to be around.

Keith: Some sort of threat of not getting a reward, the golden apple...

S: Yes, yes, because even God can be rather arbitrary and unpredictable, and you might do all that, observe all those rules, be such a good boy, and in the end, you know, it's not enough - you haven't been quite good enough, there are one or two rules you've forgot. There is a verse in a poem by Robert Browning called the Soliloquy of the Spanish Cloister - I've quoted it in the "Survey", and it goes like this - one particular rather unpleasant character, a monk, is talking, a Christian monk of course, and he says, "There's a great text in Galatians - (Galatians is, you know, St. Paul's epistle to the Galatians in the Bible) there's a great text in Galatians - once you trip on it - it entails forty-six distinct damnations, one sure if another fails" _ (Laughter) so that's

a bit you feel like that, CC have I observed all the _____ right? Have I rules, you know, have I done everything 2

got everything right, have I even understood everything I?

right, you know, have I understood the dogma in the right 'C

way or have I been an unconscious heretic, you know, will

I be burned for that? There was a sin I forgot to confess, ~ ((etc etc. Was the priest who, you know, heard my confession

and gave me my absolution properly ordained~ was he perhaps in a state of sin or not - if he was, well what happens to me? He might have been and got absolution

69

from his bishop, but supposing there was something wrong with the bishop'i~(Laughter). It goes round and round in your mind if you are trying to work by the rules, with the idea of reward, and getting something in that sort of way, there is no certainty and no surety, and no real security of any kind. So you end up you know, in such a wretched, uncomfortable state, there is no question of spiritual growth and development. It's much better to just to sin, because you want to sin, straightforwardly, you know, just like Luther said, "Sin stoutly", he said - (Laughter) you know, I forget the Latin of it, but that is how it's translated, "Sin stoutly". So that suggests a sort of straightforward, direct attitude of doing something because you want to do it, even if it is unskilful. So sometimes it happens you've got so estranged, you know, so alienated from your own experience, from your own desires, from your own feelings, that you have to get back into contact by simply doing what you want to do, almost whatever it happens to be, to establish that contact and get back on to the right path of your own spontaneous emotional, psychological and spiritual life. You become so alienated doing what you think you ought to do, or what other people think you ought to do, and following the rules, and being such a good boy, or such a good girl, such a good son, or such a good mother, you know, whatever it may be, you know, you are just no longer in touch with what you really think, what you really feel, what you really want, so you know, you just have to stop and get back into touch with that, and do what you want to do, perhaps something really irrational from other people's

£ points of vies, it may be something very simple, you know, 70

it doesn't necessarily mean you're going to go and commit some wild, outrageous crime, (though you might be tempted to do that, after all those years of alienation) You may just want to do some very simple thing, just sit down and do nothing for a few hours which is one of the greatest crimes and sins in the Western calendar, well you say, I'll just do nothing, you might feel till you just get back in contact with what you feel, and then a feeling of what you want to do just comes surging back, you know, out of that, you know, that inactivity, then you're in touch with yourself again. Otherwise, with the best of intentions you can get out of touch in~a way, with yourself, doing all the things that you think you ought to be doing, which often mean appropriate to your position and station in life, and the expectations of other people, your own fear of rejection, and so on. So sometimes, I think that for many people entering on the spiritual life, under the very alienated conditions of modern western society, the first thing they have to do is to get back into contact with their own feelings. Do you really want to evolve? Have you really got a feeling for it? or is it just something that you've just convinced yourself you ought to be doing? If that is the case, you won't get very far. You

have really to want to - to be into it, and enjoy it. So this is why, sometimes, you know, I don't quite agree, you know, when sometimes visitors come say to a community and they see everybody happy and jolly, but, yes, they are a bit unmindful huh, but on the other hand they are doing what they want to do, but sometimes you know, the visitor may think well this is not very religious, or very spiritual, they just seem to be having a thoroughly good time - (Laughter)

71

you know, maybe it isn't very religious, or very spiritual but they are on the right path because they're in touch with themselves and their own feelings, and they are doing what they want to do, what they really want to do, and sooner or later you will get on to the right path, you know, with clear thinking, sort of proper genuine guidance, you will get on to the right path. But the first~thing is to be intouch with your own genuine experience, your own feelings, and what you want to do. Anyway, perhaps we'd better leave it there, and think in terms of lunch.

END OF SIDE 2 TAPE 2

TAPE 3 - SIDE 1 ~jCT(0N £ S: Section 5

Verne: Text:- The Buddha said: "There are ten things by which beings do good and ten by which they do evil. What are they? Three are performed with the body, four with the mouth and three with the mind. The (evils) performed with the mouth are duplicity, slandering, lying and idle talk; those with the mind are covetousness, anger and foolishness. These ten are not in keeping with the holy Way and are called the ten evil practices. Putting a stop to all of them is called performing the ten virtuous practices.

S: So what are these, these ten? It's pretty clear, isn't it.

Voice: Inaudible.

S. the ten precepts, well, you know, as they are called Pali, the ten, ~kus;1&la dhammas", "~u~lla" means 'skilful' - 'dhamma', here means more like principle, 'the ten skilful principles', or unskilful principles, as the case may be. In a way it's quite important that we make a distinction between what I sometimes call 'principle'

72

and what I sometimes call 'rule', do you get the sense of the distinction between principle and a rule? These are 'principles' not rules. You can deduce a rule, from a principle but the two are in fact quite distinct. For instance if you take the first of these, what is the principle? The

principle is - not to kill, (this isn't really a literal translation) it's you know, as in the 'panatipa~a' - you know, it's to abstain from injury to living beings, that is the principle, the principle of abstention from injury, or the principle of non-violence, or putting it positively, the principle of reverence for life, that is the principle, but for instance that you should not eat meat, that is a rule, it is not a principle, yuh know, the rule being the application of the principle to a particular set of circumstances, or in a particular situation, or to a certain aspect of life, so it is really important to distinguish between principle on the one hand, and rule on the other, I mean, the principle is the source of the rule, therefore the principle is more important than the rule, and one must always be able to trace back the rule to the principle, the rule must be an intelligent application of the principle, not a, you know, mechanical or automatic one. So this is quite important, that it's a question of the ten principles of skill, the ten principles of skilful or unskilful behaviour. So, "three which are performed with the body, four with the mouth, or speech, and three with the mind". So killing is a bit more than killing, it's, not - or rather, abstaining from killing is a bit more than that, it's abstaining from injury to living beings, and the same is stealing is a bit more than that, it's the principle of non-appropriation. "The four

73

with the mouth", these are fairly literally rendered, or maybe not quite so, there is one missed out that is usually included, perhaps there is a slight misunderstanding, and that is, - wrathful, or abusive, or harsh speech; duplicity and slandering speech are more or less the same thing, usually it's abstention from untruthfulness, from harsh speech, from back-biting and from idle and useless talk, or gossip, that's the usual list, but anyway, the spirit of it is clear - and then "covetousness", "anger", 1, anger" is more like '1animosity', anger being the expression of animosity, and it isn't "foolishness" - this is quite incorrect, it's "abstention from false or wrong views", that is to say, views which represent absolutisations of relative experiences, as we saw this morning, or which represent illegitimate generalisations from a very limited range of experience. So, "These ten are not in keeping with the holy Way" - that is to say, the ten principles of unskilful behaviour, and are called "the ten evil practices", well, 'unskilful principles' would be a literal translation, putting a stop to all of them is called "Performing the ten virtuous practices". But is it really as simple as that, or just a matter of that. Is it just a matter of putting a stop to ten unskilful principles?

Jim: It's developing their positive counterparts.

S: It's developing their positive counterparts - that at least, is very important. But anyway, as I said at the beginning, this distinction between the principle and the rule is very, very important, though in the context of the ten 'kusala dharmas', we speak of the ten precepts, it's precept in the sense of principle, rather than the sense of rule. None of these are very precisely formulated.

74

But that is deliberate, because they are principles not rules, from one principle you can get hundreds and hundreds of rules. I'd like to say something also about vows. I don't know if this topic has been discussed at all in N.Z.

Several voices: ~Indistinguishable.~

S: Because, you know at the time of the upasaka or upasika ordination, people you know, go for refuge, and then they, they give expression, you know to the as it were, initial application of their commitment, through their ordinary day to day lives by taking upon themselves the ten principles of skilful behaviour, you know, so, you know, these give one's broad outline, as it were, of ethical life, but that's not really enough, not nearly detailed enough, to cover all possible exigencies, or even the needs of your own particular spiritual life, as they develop and unfold, so the precepts represent the principles, the ten precepts represent the principles, which I'd say are valid all the time and are to be applied all the time, in different ways, for instance you're always going to try to practise 'non-injury' and to have a caring, you know, and reverent attitude towards life. That's going to be a permanently valid principle, which you may be able to express in different ways, but from time to time, you may need to take upon yourself a vow; the vow is trained to meet the needs of a particular situation, which may not be of a very long duration, you see what I mean? for instance, just to give you an example, a vow which people very often take is 'to give up smoking', now it's not a principle of your whole moral life, you know, 'not to smoke' (Laughter) because first of all, it only applies if you are actually smoking, so clearly it can't be universal,

75

and again once you've stopped smoking, well, it falls into abeyance, because there is no need for that particular, you know, observance, or that particular rule, so the vow 'to give up smoking' is clearly designed to meet a particular situation, that being, the situation of you happening at this particular moment of time, to smoke. So this is what we call a vow, when someone sees that they need to take a specific limited action to meet a specific limited situation, in their lives, to assist in their general growth and development, they take what is called a vow. So the ten precepts, or the ten principles, of ethical, moral, or skilful behaviour, are supplemented from time to time, as need arises, by vows. For instance somebody might feel the need to take the vow to meditate twice a day for six months without fail, whatever happens, that's a vow, you don't undertake that at the time of your ordination, you see what I mean? on the other hand someone might take a vow that they are going to abstain not only from meat and fish and eggs, but from all animal products including even milk and cheese and butter, for say, a year, that's another vow. But somebody else takes a vow, that say within a period of three months they are going to write out the whole of the Bodhicaryaratara in the English translation, a vow uh. It's something that they definitely tie themselves to, to do or not to do, and usually for, or within, a specific period. So this is sort of giving substance, and body, and concreteness to one's spiritual life, so that, it's not sort of frittered away in just vague general aspirations, you see what I mean? Or somebody else makes a vow, that say for

six months,they're

~ not going to say a single criti~word about anybody, even 76

though it happens to be justified, (soft chuckles). They are just going to keep quiet. Or somebody else, you know, makes a vow that they are going to give 5% of their income to some particular worthy cause, (I need not mention which!) (Laughter) every week, you know, for a certain definite period, or somebody else might take a vow, that you know, that they are going to go jogging every morning, for a least half-an-hour for three months. So all these things, are vows, they supplement, and give definiteness to one's general ethical and spiritual endeavour. So vows can be very useful, and vows can change, because you are changing all the time, you need to concentrate on different things at different times, different periods, so the ten ethical principles represent what you are trying to do all the time, constantly, regularly, everyday, in as large a measure as you can, but the vows represent, - or the vows, are framed or designed to meet specific situations that might arise from time to time, and of course a vow can be an expression of one or another of the ten ethical principles. So usually what happens - I don't know if people know this - In England at least what happens is, that usually, at least in the context of the community during the week Puja, or whatever seems appropriate, sometimes during the confession section, or at the end of the Confession section, somebody stands up and says I'd like to made such and such vow and I call on everybody to witness that, and that gives you an additional strength, because everybody knows (Laughter) for you've said it in from of the whole community you're not going to smoke for three months, well you just can't then, because they'll know about it, and hopefully they'll all pull you up if they see you pulling out your cigarettes,

77

or at least they won't offer you one - (Laughter) They'll help you to try to observe the vow.

Udaya: We did, um, a community vow, for a month, last year - there were only four of us in the community at that time - of all members of the community staying celibate for one month...

S: Ah - ah.

Udaya:...and that seemed to um increase the effect or power of the vow as many times as there were people taking part in it.

S: Yeah-yes-right. Yes, that seems to provide that too.

Udaya: It really gives it a lot more energy.

S: Yes, the fact that you are all observing it to- gether, and you are giving one

another mutual support.

Jim: Not in the sense of a-a-vow, in the sense of Bodhisattva vow, that would also - that - that -

S: Ah, yes.

Jim: that-that- is in a-a- another class, that is- is rather a-a- longer one.

S: Ah, yes.

Jim: you know. ...

S: Ah! actually we shouldn't translate by the same word or term - In the case of the Bodhisattva the word is "pranidhana", which means 'a whole hearted', 'utterly total aspiration and determination', it's all that sort of thing, even 'commitment' - it's much much more. So though we translate "pranidana" also by vow, in English, this is where we're not quite, you know, right, the, the, the term for "vow", in this more limited sense would be "vrata", "vrata", "vrata", and "pranidhana" (?) but we translate both

as vow. 7S

Puma: It's V-R-A-T-A

S: V-R-A-T-A- The same as in 'Silavrata'

this being the first of the fetters - that you become attached to your 'sila' (note by transcriber - very low chuckles

C" ~ from some, at the play on sounds of sila and Sheila - Sheila being N.Z. and Australian jargon for 'a dame' your woman, or girlfriend) your ethical observance, and your 'vrata' your vow, regarded as something that belongs to you, you've appropriated it, it's yours, it makes you a good man, or a good woman, then it becomes a sort of subtle fetter. Not that there is anything wrong with 'sila' or the 'vrata', there is nothing wrong with them at all, and you ought to go on observing them, fully, but not develop that sort of attachment, that sort of ego-based, or ego-oriented appropriation. Alright, I think that's enough about them. Let's go on to six.

Vijaya: Text - SECTION 6

The Buddha said: "If a man has all kinds of faults and does not regret them, in the space of a moment retribution will suddenly fall upon him and, as water returning to the sea, will gradually become deeper and wider. (But), if a man has faults and, becoming aware, of them, changes for the better, retribution will melt away into nothingness of its own accord, as the

danger of a fever gradually abates once perspiration has set in."

S: Well, there are a few just very simple points here that might easily be overlooked "If a man has all kinds of faults and does not regret them", ' Someone, say has all kinds of faults, and then there are two possibilities, either you regret them, or you don't regret them - now this is quite a point, I mean, there is nobody who is

79

perfect, everybody has some faults or other, but the

point is 'do you regret those faults'? Uh - It's very

° easy to just, to become so used to yourself that you accept yourself in the wrong sort of way, that you accept the fact that you are a bit short-tempered, or you are a bit lazy, or you can't get up in the morning, or, you know, you snap back if someone says anything to you, you just sort of accept all those little thoughts and well that's just you, so you accept them, so others have got to accept them too, presumably, put up with them, so you don't regret them, you don't feel sorry, you aren't indulging of course in any neurotic guilt feelings but you don't feel as it were objective, aware, regret that you just are flawed by those faults, by those imperfections, you get so used to yourself, that in the same way that you accept your short nose, or your brown hair, or your long ears, in the same way you just accept all these faults of character, which can be changed. So this sort of "not regretting your faults", such faults as you have means really ah, a certain slackness in development, in wanting to develop, because, you know, when you develop, you know, what does it mean? You want to change, you are not satisfied with yourself as you are, you are not satisfied with your existing qualities, you've seen those faults, and you want to change, so if you "don't regret", then it means you're not seeing those faults, as faults, you're not seeing the need to develop, so this 'regret for faults' is quite an important thing, you should be really sorry, again, without sort of beating your breast or, you know, bewailing yourself, or feeling neurotically guilty, but quite objectively, and quite awarely, regretting that you do have those faults, you know, which make life very difficult for you, and for everybody that's in touch with you, uh, so 'regret for one's faults' is quite important, and there's not only that, you know, not only the fact that your faults sort of keep you down, as well as the fact that faults have their consequences, the term 'retribution' is used here, which, perhaps, is not very fortunate, but the Buddha said "If a man has all kinds of faults and does not regret them, in the space of a moment retribution will suddenly fall upon him, and, as water returning to the sea will gradually become deeper and wider", your faults eventually, if you are not careful, engulf you. They don't get better as it were automatically as time goes on they get worse, and the consequences become more and more serious, according to the nature of the faults, and eventually you are overwhelmed by them, and at that state, there is very little you can do about them, without a lot of help from other people.

Priyananda: It seems this has something to do with 'habit', "energy"...

S: Yes.

Priyananda:...if one constantly performs a certain action, it will... it has a means of getting a habitual energy.

S: Yes, it builds up, 'habitual energy', if one can call it that, or a pattern that gradually becomes more and more rigid, more and more fixed, and more hardened, so that you find it very difficult to break it.

Vijaya: Negative feed-back.

S: Negative feed-back, yes. So the only thing that can stop this progress is just regretting, regretting that you've got these faults, and that means you'll try to do

81

something about them otherwise if you don't even see them as faults, or don't even regret them, they just go on getting worse and worse, until in the end they overwhelm you, and that's the 'retribution'. Just like somebody, you know, rolling downhill, the further down the hill they roll, the faster and faster they go, and in the end there is no stopping them. So it is good just to examine oneself from time to time, and just try to appreciate that, you know one is not exactly a mass of perfections, there are little faults lurking here and there, that need to be eradicated, otherwise, you know, they will just grow, and one will be overwhelmed by them - you know, just like weeds in the garden, especially in New Zealand, I imagine, you need those weeds to be uprooted, they'll be young trees in a few months. (Laughter). So one has to deal with them, while

~ they are still young, and that means searching for them, finding them, and seeing them as weeds, not as beautiful blossoms. But here it's a question of the middle way, not sort of complacently accepting yourself exactly as you are in the wrong sort of way, and being pretty satisfied with yourself, nor on the other hand, depreciating oneself, in a negative sort of way, or feeling guilty about one's faults, in a negative sort of way, in a neurotic sort of way, but just seeing oneself steadily and as a whole, so to speak, and seeing that faults are faults and should be eradicated or extirpated, or transcended, you know, or whatever terminology you may care to use. Otherwise they will only get worse. It's not that you are punished for your faults, oh no! your faults themselves are the punishment, uh. Of course you may be punished too, in addition, but even if you're not, those faults themselves, having

82

those particular faults, being hampered by them, crippled by them, is punishment in itself - "But if a man has faults and, becoming aware of them, changes for the better, retribution will melt away into nothingness of its own accord"

- well, that's natural, that's inevitable - "as the danger of a fever gradually abates once perspiration has set in" - So first of all there is the state of having faults, then you become aware that you have them, then you change for the better, and then of course, with the fault the retribution itself melts away. Of course, sometimes, it's very difficult to see one's own faults, sometimes you need the help of other people, and this is where your good friends come in, I mean, one sort of, of the responsibilities, one of the duties, of the good friend - being to point out your own faults or weaknesses to you. There is a verse about this in the Dhammapadam, do you remember? Speaking about the wise man - "he exhorts, he reproves, he points out faults, like indicating a very treasure" (laughter) Yes, if someone points out your faults to you, you should be as pleased as if he had pointed out to you where to dig for a buried treasure, because it's such a valuable thing to you to have your faults pointed out, faults which, perhaps, you couldn't see for yourself, so you can do something about them. That's as good as having a buried treasure pointed out to you, so think how grateful you should be if someone draws your attention, tactfully, but firmly, to certain faults or weaknesses which you may have. But clearly, something that needs to be done with great tact - People don't always appreciate, you know, having their faults pointed out, strange as it may seem; you know, they don't seem to want this buried treasure, or to dig

83

for it, when we point it out to them, so even within the spiritual community one needs to exercise tact, and choose the right moment, you know, when a person is in a receptive frame of mind, and when you are getting on well together, and preferably when you are alone, because it's more easy usually, to accept one's criticism in that sort of way, when there aren't other people around, otherwise, sometimes, you feel a bit humiliated or small, and all that sort of thing - you know, so, let the other person off lightly, you know, don't point out his faults loudly and boldly in the midst of the assembly, and you know, but just take him aside and tell him quietly in a very friendly sort of way, you know. Maybe after having pointed out a few virtues, you know, just to establish the right sort of communication. get him into a receptive frame of mind or praise him for a few things and then say, well that is slightly, slightly sort of impaired, or prevented from shining in their full splendour by just one or another very small blemishes, you know, which I'd like to point out to you, if I may - (Laughter) That might be a better way of doing it, it's depending on, you know, how well you know that person and what sort of, you know, degree of trust subsists between you. With some people you just come straight out and tell them, they don't mind, they accept it, because they trust you, and also they do want to change. With others you have to exercise

Q) tact~ and caution, pointing out these little blemishes, otherwise they might react rather sharply, and not thank you at all, and throw away that buried treasure

END OF SIDE 1 TAPE 3 (C.60 Tape)

BEGINNING OF SIDE~ 2 - TAPE 3

S:....and sometimes, of course, there may be genuine misunderstandings what you might have seen as a fault or a mistake might on examination turn out actually not to be such. So one must be prepared for that too, you know, the person whose fault, you know, you thought you were pointing out, may in fact give you an explanation which makes the whole thing seem much more reasonable, acceptable, and you know, not so much a fault as you had thought. Well, broadly speaking, we do need the help of spiritual friends to help us see our faults. It's very difficult, you know, for us to see them ourselves, we really are in love with ourselves, you know, infatuated with ourselves, and see nothing but beauty and perfection - (Laughter). Actually, we realyy we don't really think we're all that bad really - (Chuckles) - That's our secret conviction more often than not, unless of course we have the secret conviction that we're really very, very wicked, not to say evil - you know, we seem unable, usually, just to follow that Middle Way, or just see quite objectively and clearly what we are, seeing our good side and seeing our weaker side as well, and do the proper action - - -

Barbara: It's such a

S:....accordingly eh.

Barbara: It's such a good feeling when there can be this honest approach, and,ah9because, there's no need for sort of pussy-footing around a thing - which I find it very difficult to -ah- confront someone.

S: Um

Udaya: I think I probably tend to oscillate between

feeling that I'm really probably quite o.k., and doing all right really, and between being quite anxious of whether or not I can really overcome all my negative tendencies.

S: Um, so one tends to oscillate between these two extremes, but not really come to rest in the middle. Well alright let's go on to 7.

Puma: Text - SECTION 7

The Buddha said: "If an evil man, on hearing of what is good, comes and creates a disturbance, you should hold your peace. You must not angrily upbraid him; then he who has come to curse you will merely harm himself."

S: That doesn't sound very Bodhisattva like, does it? It seems a bit of rather harsh Hinayana here, if I may say so. I mean, it's as though if he harms himself, that doesn't really matter very much, well, clearly, you should be concerned for him too, you know, if there is that possibility. "So the Buddha said: "If an evil man, on hearing of what is good, comes and creates a disturbance

z " - Now why on earth should the evil man do that? Why should the evil man, on hearing what is good, come at all?

Puma: It's a threat....

S: on hearing of what is good come -huh

Puma: It's a threat.

Voices: Um - Um.

S: It's a threat.

Voices Um - um - (in agreement)

Keith: It's a challenge.

S: It's a challenge yes - People are sort of drawn to it, as it were, you know, the attraction of opposites.

86

That's a quite strange thing, isn't it? They can't leave the good alone, you know, you can also say that, you know, in the, in the 'evil man', to use that expression since the, the text, you know, uses it - there is deep down, you know, a sort of innate hunger for the good, but he can't handle it, his only way of approaching it is to attack it, there is a quite strange bit of Hindu mythology in this connection, you know that Hindus believe in 'avatars', incarnations of God' uh, so,

~ apparently, there is a story that someone - (I forget the details, you know, these Hindu mythological terms do go rather into detail) but anyway, a particular Rishi, or sage, committed some offense, so God was going to punish him. so the, so God said "All right you've got to be reborn, several times now, as a punishment for this offense, you can be reborn either eight times, as a great devotee of mine, or three times as my enemy", so the sage said, "well I don't want eight more rebirths, that would be too many", you know, "Three, all right -I- I'll take three, I'll be reborn three times as the enemy of God". So there is a sort of explanation there - these three enemies were the three great evil personalities in Hindu mythology that fought with the then current incarnation of God, you know, so they've got this rather strange tale, - But it does suggest this sort of intertwining of good and evil, in a way doesn't it? that you know, even the evil has a fascination for the good, can't keep away from it, but to trouble it, and worry it and disturb it, uh? You sometimes find this with spiritual centres, don't you? All sorts of odd people seem to get attracted - (Laughter). They just

87

come to create a disturbance. They are attracted in some strange, almost perverse way, but they can't sort of accommodate themselves to what they are attracted to, they have to worry it, and trouble it, and bother it, and oppose it, and disturb it. It's a quite strange sort of thing - So "The Buddha said: 'If an evil man, on hearing of what is good, comes and creates a disturbance, you should hold your peace', which suggests it's a rather difficult sort of situation, he's a rather difficult sort of character, there's not much you can do, perhaps the Buddha is speaking to the ordinary, average disciple, you must not angrily upbraid him, that would be reactive,

"then he who has come to curse you will merely harm himself" - Well, that's true, but if possible, try to do a bit more than that, try to prevent him from harming himself, that may be very difficult, to deal with a person of that sort, they may even seem a little bit mad, certainly quite a bit unbalanced very often - I think this tends to happen when a spiritual centre sort of has just started up, and is definitely good, definitely a spiritual centre, but a bit weak, it does tend to attract these unbalanced people, it's not strong enough to exert a very positive influence on them, you know, it's not strong enough not to be troubled and disturbed by them, but it is strong enough to attract them.

Voices: yeah.

S: But one notices that as the spiritual centre becomes stronger and more and more positive, the 'evil person', again to use that expression, 'the evil man' you know, will be attracted, but he won't be able to stay, the sheer positivity will be too much for him, and he'll go away.

88

his second visit, he isn't really one of our regular people, (Laughter). Of course, if he also is an old faithful, who has disturbed you regularly every week, for a year, well, it's difficult to say that. You just have to deal with the situation, as best you can as it arises. There's not only the 'evil man' who is attracted, it is as though Mara also is attracted, you know, as soon as the Buddha takes his seat under the Bodhi tree and is about to get Enlightenment, along comes Mara, the forces of evil are attracted; they sort of see the balance of things in the universe, the balance of power, as it were, between the good and the evil forces about to be seriously disturbed, by a sudden influx of good, and they rush to the spot, to try to intervene, to prevent it, to do something about it. I remember in this connection I once asked Dharpo Rimpoché, how it was that some of the Tibetan lamas, Incarnate lamas, were surrounded by such, you know, very unpleasant characters, and he said, "Well, you know, wherever you get the light, there is a greater darkness around it", and I really see - it's very strange - I've really thought about this quite a bit. Why is it? because - he confirmed this - that the greatest lamas are always surrounded by the worst people, now why is that? - and the Dalai Lama, by the worst people of all, because the Dalai Lama is the greatest of the Incarnate lamas, perhaps the best, one might say at least in principle, but surrounded by the worst people, now why is that?

Priyana~da: They would attract quite strong personalities to them, perhaps quite bad people I'm afraid.

S: Why should this be? Why should the greatest and best lamas attract these powerful, strong characters?

90

Let us consider the position of the great lama? What is that position, what do you imagine it to be? He's very well-known, he's very famous, lots of people coming to see him, lots of money flowing in, huh.

Vijaya: Those people gain a strength from his identity....

S: Yes.

Vijaya.. and also intervene between his strength and the people coming to see him...

S: Yes - Right! Yes, this is what you get. In the case of the Dalai Lama, well you get it most of all because he is the King of Tibet, you know, - so there's power, there's money, there's influence, there's fame, there's all these things, so, you know, these strong, powerful, ambitious characters, not maybe necessarily bad characters, but certainly not very spiritual people, are attracted to the, you know, the entourage, so to speak, of the Great Lama, so the greater the Lama, the worse the people, by whom he is surrounded. This seems to be the explanation, but on the other hand, there's another side to it, that also the Great Lama ought to be able to control his

C entourage, ~is is waht I used to say to Dhardo Rimpoche,

- we us~to talk about certain people who surrounded the Dalai Lama mainly his own relations, and we just, you know, thought he should exercise some of his power and influence, and I usetjto say to Dhardo Rimpoche, well if you'd been in the Dalai Lama's place, you surely wouldn't have allowed this, he just use6(to laugh. I couldn't imagine him allowing it, so it also suggests a certain weakness on the part of the Lama. Alright let's go on to 8.

91

Dave: Text - SECTION 8

S: So this little st~;oy illustrates a situation in which somebody behaves negatively, so to speak, towards somebody else. But his negative behaviour only rebounds, you know, on to himself, on one condition, as it were, that you don't retaliate. This is quite important. If you are not reactive in turn, the reactivity remains with the person to whom it belongs. But if you react, you, as it were, take it over, you accept it. If someone is rude to you and you don't accept that rudeness and don't react, well it remains with him or with her, but if you are rude in return, well it passes from him to you, you've accepted that rudeness - You've taken on, you've taken it over. If you react to someone who is reactive you just become more reactive yourself, but if you don't react, you know, the reactivity bounces back on to that person. You are unaffected. And we know that reactivity can be very contagious, so to speak, you know. Sometimes it's very difficult, especially if you've got into that sort of habit, as sometimes one does with certain people, and they know it at least unconsciously -(Murmurs of agreement), and you only have to say a certain thing in a certain way, and at once you react, they know it, so sometimes they exploit that knowledge, but if you don't react, just stay calm, then, you know, the reactivity, whatever it is, the negativity, remains with them - it can't go any further, you're sort of insulated from it.

-Inaudible sentence

The principle of non-retaliation - it's very difficult because, you know, if someone gets angry with you, it's as though somehow, sort of, a spark from his anger passes

92

over to you and makes you angry, and then you blaze up, it's really quite strange. As though there is a sort of psychological osmosis going on, you know, with regard to the anger because the potentiality of anger or the potentiality for anger is present in you, and it's easy, it's not

very difficult to ignite it - the proximity of anger, you know, tends to activate your own anger, which is latent all the time.

Barbara: I find it difficult too in a situation where it is not just a one-to-one thing but where there are other people present and then it's

S: And then it's like, you know, 'pointing out the faults', it's more difficult when there are other people around. You've got a prestige to keep up then, you know, so to speak.

Verne: It's the other way too, isn't it? with positivity as well, you can 'catch' that too.

S: Oh yes - Oh yes - and you with your positivity can spark of positivity in other people.

Verne: I remember once, not so long back, when I was feeling very negative about my spiritual development, my little three-and-half year old son came up the passage chanting - "I'm the little train that thinks it can - I think I can, I think I can" ...

(Chuckles and laughter)

Verne:...And I thought it - and it really gave me a lift, you know, and I it just suddenly sparked that belief off in myself

S: There's an article by Nagabodhi in the current Newsletter which I received the other day, and he's talking about the opening of Sukhavati and he refers to

93

the fact that he calculates there were one-hundred and eighty-eight hours of metta put in in that shrine by different relays of people, over that opening week, and he says, "I don't care what people say about 'vibe' and all that sort of thing, I know that an atmosphere can be changed in this sort of way." And it's really true. The positivity was becoming more and more tangible every day. The atmosphere of the place did change~ and you realised that people were doing their Metta bhavana, uninterruptedly, relay after relay of them, over that whole period, and positivity is catching, and people felt there was a good atmosphere there, whereas before there was just a big room there, people had been hammering and banging and nailing things, you know, plastering and all the rest of it. Yes, so positivity is catching, it's even more catching than negativity. Luckily for us. Otherwise there would be no possibility of Enlightenment if, you know, the forces of positivity, in the case of the individual, we're not more powerful than the forces of negativity. I mean, all the negativity in the world can't stop you from being positive if you really want to, you know, that's quite a thought.

Udaya: It's the immediate value of living in a spiritual community isn't it?

S: Oh! yes.

Udaya: Even if you are not feeling spiritually positive, at least there'll be one or two others that are, hopefully that can carry you for that time, and you maybe carrying them the next day.

S: Yes, right! right! It's very important, you know, to create that sort of atmosphere in the centre, I mean,

94

the whole arrangement at the centre, suggests this even the colour-scheme, the arrangement, the way it's kept, or the neatness, the tidiness, the cleanliness, the beauty of it, even the very pictures you have up, or the things you have around, you don't just sort of stick up something here and something there and hope that that will do, you know, you sort of decorate the centre in a token sort of way, that's not enough, and you know, just have everything really nice, and positive and attractive and inspiring, you know, be careful how you behave there, or what sort of things you talk about. All this is very important. So that as soon as people step in the door they feel, "Oh! what a pleasant place, what a nice place, what a fresh place, what an inspiring place!" The centre should immediately create that sort of feeling, that sort of impression.

Dave Moore: I remember when we were doing the 'jack-in-the-box' job, a few nights I slept at the centre, and I was sleeping in the 'meeting' room, and I remember waking up the first night, on the first morning, and I noticed the difference. It felt - I felt really warm and full - and sort of - sort of sleep had been really full.

S: Perhaps part of that is because people don't usually sleep in the meeting room.
(Laughter)

Udaya: I don't know about that.

S: Well not officially anyway. Alright Section 9.

Keith: Text - SECTION 9

S: Of course there is the possibility of doing harm to others unfortunately, but you may not succeed, but if you try to do, you know, whether you succeed, or whether you don't succeed, you do harm to yourself - I mean, it's true that virtue cannot be destroyed, but, you can do very serious damage to people, if you're not careful, or if you really want to injure them, but you do at least as much damage to yourself in the process, even if you 'succeed'. But it is, you know, a very unfortunate thing, a very sobering reflection, that we can do harm to other people, even unintentionally, by our own foolishness. And you can even do harm to people with "good " intentions - not just even bad ones, or just out of carelessness.

Priyananda: Would that arise out of - as you say - 'out of carelessness' - out of not being aware of that situation or that person.

S: Yes, exactly!

Priyananda: . . . fully I mean

S: You may sometimes not be aware that someone is in a very sensitive state, and you may say the sort of thing that does harm.

Voice: Yeah

Priyananda: Your intention may have been 'good'.

S: Your intention may have been good, but, you know, good intentions are not quite enough. I mean, one must be very careful with children, because, you know can do a great deal of harm, thoughtlessly. every parent knows that, I'm sure. I once asked one of our Order members in England, who has five grown up sons, whether she felt she had many mistakes bringing them up. She

thought for awhile and said "Ah! mistakes are inevitable". This is how she felt. Her five sons seemed to be doing pretty well all the same, they seemed quite healthy sort of lads. It isn't easy, because you're dealing with human beings, and human beings are unpredictable, they

are very difficult to know, and they aren't always the same as you, you're not always in tune with their mood, or in

£ touch with their feelings, so you don't know what the effect of your words or your actions will be - often you are completely in the dark, even in the case of those who are supposedly 'nearest and dearest' to you, you just don't know where they're at, sometimes, ~ any given moment, so you don't really know what the effect of what you say or do is going to be, so one can only hope that the overall good understanding just smooths everything out in the longrun and means that no lasting or serious damage is done. But sometimes we can hurt someone very deeply, quite unintentionally, or they can hurt you. But you can hurt others, you can harm others, you can do injury to others, so I think that this is something we always have to remember. I remember there was, for instance, a driving instructor I knew, when I was in London, he use to say to all the people he taught driving, - this is the first thing he use to tell them, he use to say "Always remember, when you are at that wheel, you have at your disposal a lethal weapon". You see? Remember, you know, that with that car - you're seated behind that wheel - if you are not very careful, and very mindful, you can do a lot of damage, just as though, with a rifle, or a revolver, or a machine gun - or something of that sort, not only the car, but with your own psycho-physical organism, can be a

97

lethal weapon, not in the way of actually killing people, but in subtler ways, that is why the Buddha said "Every human being is born with an axe in his mouth" (Laughter). What is that axe? It's this little tongue - with that little tongue you can do

END OF SIDE 2 TAPE 3

TAPE 4 - SIDE 1

S: so much damage, so much harm, you can hurt people, you can wound people so deeply, in ways that they will remember and suffer from for year after year, just by a few, you know, very unkind, or cutting, or malicious or even thoughtless remarks, so you have to bear that in mind all the time, that you yourself are a lethal weapon, and can do a lot of harm, a lot of damage, if you aren't careful, if you aren't mindful, as well as a lot of good. (Pause) And good intentions are not enough, I mean, there is a saying I sometimes quote, I forget the source of it, but it goes something like this - "It takes all the wisdom of the wise to undo the harm done by the merely good". All right - Section 10.

Priyanada: Text SECTION 10

S: Way' of course, here means Dharma - So "the Buddha said: "Listen avidly to and cherish the Way" - the Dharma - So "Listen avidly" - wholeheartedly, eagerly, yoi know, with a real desire to hear, to listen, to understand, to cherish the way. I mean, these are very simple words but they've got a great deal of meaning in them. "Listen avidly"- don't listen carelessly, don't sort of half- listen, don't listen distractedly, listen avidly to-and cherish the Way", - guard the way, protect the way, look

98

after the way, you know, not only the way, so to speak, objectively, the Dharma, objectively, but the Dharma within yourself, the way within yourself, cherish that, look after that, nurse that, nourish that, care for that, protect that, cultivate that. "The Way will certainly be hard to reach" - You need to listen avidly, you need to cherish, because "the Way will certainly be hard to reach". You won't reach it, you won't attain it, if you're careless, if you're neglectful - So this of cherishing the Way is particularly important, it suggests a very definite attitude of mind and heart, doesn't it, towards the Dharma, cherishing it, cherishing it as it exists objectively in the world, in the form of the teaching, and, also, you know, subjectively, within oneself, as one's own actual path, as one's own actual experience.

Dave: I find that in myself there is a lot of conditioning just from living in Society - I go to the centre and everything's so easy, it's so easy to hear all the tape-lectures, it's easy to learn the meditations, and everything like that, that you're use to - that things that are free aren't important, and they're not worth anything, things that cost a lot of money and are hard to get are worth to you, so if you're not careful it's easy to develop that attitude that all the puja and everything is just sort of commonplace.

S: Yes, I think at first this is inevitable, we certainly found it in England, the first few years people didn't appreciate really, didn't value, you know, what they were getting, you know, this only developed gradually, you know, over a period of quite a few years⁴

99

Dave: Even in books, you see it indoctrinated into cheap little books like this, unimportant, there are no glossy pages, and no pictures, so there's no they're not worth it.

S: So there's no cherishing of the Way, no cherishing of the Dharma without a real love for it, and this is not developed quickly and easily, it comes with long acquaintance with the Dharma, when you really understand the value of it. It's the same thing with people, I mean, except in the purely sort of natural way, yoi know, as in the case of the mother with the child, you know, you don't really cherish people, because you don't really value them, do

you? And you don't value them because you don't really know them, you treat people in a very off-hand careless sort of way, more often than not, much less carefully than you treat maybe your new record-player or your new car - you see a boy with a new car, oh, he's so careful, he doesn't like a single little scratch, he becomes really annoyed if it gets scratched, but maybe, you know, he treats people with much less carefully than that. "The Way will certainly be hard to reach" - what does this suggest here? There is a sort of implication here - What does it suggest when it says "the Way will certainly be hard to reach"?

Puma: That gravitational pull will always be very strong.

S: Yes - That's true. But even more simple, more than that.

Dave: Voice soft and inaudible.

Verne:.. even to come across it

S: Yes, but it says it "will certainly be hard to reach"

... so what does that suggest, what does that imply?

Verne: ~Inaudible.~~

S: Well, you haven't reached it yet, you haven't....

Verne: No.

S: reached it yet. You may think that because you know about the Dharma and you've read so many books, or even practised some meditation, that you've reached the Way, but you haven't actually yet - it's hard to reach - You only reach the Way when you come into contact with some real spiritual experience, some real spiritual insight, only then you've reached the Way, until then you're just sort of looking at it, just regarding it from a distance, or even just hearing about it, you haven't actually reached the Way, itself, the Dharma, itself, you're not really in contact with it - so often we think that we've reached the Dharma, or we're in contact with the Dharma, when we haven't, we're in contact with ideas about the Dharma, but that is a quite different matter. Are we in contact with the Dharma itself? That's the real point. So - "Maintain your desire to accept it humbly" - that also suggests you haven't got it yet, because you aren't open enough, not receptive enough, so "Maintain your desire to accept it humbly" - Maybe 'humbly' is not quite the right word, you know, due to the connotations, you know, that the word 'humble', has for us in the West, now-a-days. Maybe we should just say just 'simply', 'naturally' - Just - Maintain your desire to accept it just 'simply', 'naturally', without self-assertion, without pride. It's very important to maintain that desire to accept it humbly, or simply, or naturally, because it isn't something that you accept once and for all, sometimes

people say that when you say - Dhammam saranam gachami well, there you are, you've accepted the Dharma, Whereas the Dharma represents an on-going experience to which you've always got to remain open, so therefore - "Maintain your desire to accept it humbly" - Not simply that if you maintain your desire to accept it humbly then you'll get and will have accepted it, and that's that! No! You have to maintain that desire, to accept humbly, or simply all the time - because there's more and more of the Dharma, you never come to the end of it, - so you have to maintain that attitude of acceptance all the time. The Dharma is not something you receive on one particular occasion once and for all. "The Way is mighty indeed",- it really transcends, our efforts and our understandings, there's a lot of it, and it's very, very powerful, so to speak. All right go on to eleven then.

Jim: Text ~ECTION 11

S: Spiritual knowledge is not, so to speak, divisible, if you share your spiritual knowledge with somebody, you don't have, as it were, less than before. It's not divided. That person, you know, has just as much as you had - You perhaps have more than before, because you've gained the additional experience of sharing your knowledge with somebody else. So the more you give of your knowledge the more you have. So the Buddha said "Observe those who bestow knowledge of the Way, for to help them is a great joy and many blessings can thus be obtained" - Not, only by bestowing your own knowledge of the Way, but even helping others to bestow their knowledge of the Way, even that is a blessing, and there is no limit to such blessing, because there is no limit to the knowledge that can be

102

spread in that way. So even if one helps in the spreading of the knowledge of the Dharma, that itself is a source of blessings - even if one isn't able to do it directly, but in any case, knowledge of the person who bestows the Dharma, you know, far from decreasing, increases. This is interesting, because in the Buddha's day, the Brahmins tended to make a monopoly of religious knowledge and to keep certain things very secret, very abstrusive, but that wasn't the Buddha's attitude, his attitude was to share with everybody, because his Enlightenment was for the benefit of all, and his spiritual knowledge, his spiritual understanding, was for the benefit of all, not just for his own benefit, or the benefit of a small band of followers, it was for the benefit of whoever could take advantage of it, or practise it. So even within this Sphere of Spiritual knowledge, there is this danger of wanting to keep it for ourselves. Have you ever noticed this sort of tendency either in yourselves or in other people? Because if you've got some knowledge, which the others haven't got, it does in a subtle way, differentiate you from them especially if they think you've got it, and some times if, you know, they want that knowledge, they want you to share your knowledge with them, you may be a little bit reluctant, because if you share your knowledge with them, they will become, as it were, equal with you, so long as you know something which they don't know, there is a bit of superiority. But then that so-called knowledge, you know, doesn't become real knowledge, it's just a sort of trick, just a bit of information, it's more like that, I mean real knowledge, cannot but be shared. If you really understand something

103

you know, spiritually speaking, the very nature of that understanding is such that you will share it. If it is something you want to keep to yourself, it means you haven't really understood it, it is not real spiritual knowledge. You can't keep real spiritual knowledge to yourself. So inherent in spiritual knowledge is a willingness to communicate

Vijaya: I think there are people, so-called teachers, who maintain a demeanour or a mystique because they have been somewhere to visit ... 4or been to the East or been to some place and might feel that it's their possession in a way.

S: Yes, that's true. It means they haven't realised that the more you give, the more you share, the more actually you have. Apparently they really do think that the more they give, the less they will have, or that others will have the same as they have and therefore that they will be equal - Well maybe so, if it is, that's fine. But in many cases it may not be so, because in giving, or in sharing, you increase your own experience and your own knowledge, so you're still maybe a little way ahead in any case, not that you should want to be, but often it happens like that.

Priyananda: Shall we just have tea?

S: Yes, we can conveniently stop there.

SECTION 12

Megha: Udaya

Udaya: Did we do section eleven?

MS~gh~ Yes.

Udaya: TEXT - Section 12.

S: Perhaps the first footnote here is a bit relevant. The translator says "This whole paragraph may be taken as an illustration of the tremendous importance of striving to attain the very best possible" - In other words one sees this, ascending series of beings from the bad man to the good man, from the good man to the 'Srotapana', the stream-entrant, right up to the Buddhas of the Triple World, or the person who does nothing, practises nothing and so on - So one gets the idea of a whole possible future evolution - so to speak. This is the way the translator is looking at it in this passage, and this is true, this isn't, really, in a way, the traditional starting point or the traditional attitude, it mentions 'bestowing food' on all these people, it's not just a question of their existence, that they constitute this sort of higher

evolutionary series, the point that the text is concerned with is the bestowing of food on all these people. So why do you think this is, what is the connection? Why do you give food to other people?

Priyananda: Respect?

S: Respect, yes. And what else? I'm thinking in more traditional terms.

Purna: Merit?

S: Merit, yes. I think perhaps as we study Buddhism, even practise Buddhism in the West we don't always realise the importance of the part that merit, 'punya', in the religious life of Buddhists in the East, especially, perhaps in South East Asia. So one of the best ways of earning or acquiring merit is to make offerings, especially to give food, to those who are more spiritually

105

developed than yourself, and this usually means the making of offerings or the giving of food by lay people to the monks. So this is one of the standard, you know, forms of religious life. If you are a religious-minded lay Buddhist, you support the monks, you feed the monks, sometimes that becomes your sort of principle occupation (chuckle) or your principle religious practice - that you feed the monks - because it's believed that if you make these sort of offerings to those more spiritually developed than yourself you do earn merit - or you do make merit. In Singalese there is the which means karma', and it's their term for a sort of festival, in the course of which they make punya offerings. So this 'merit', rebounds to your benefit in this life, and also your benefit in future lives through an accumulation of merit you can obtain a better rebirth, and many ordinary Buddhists in Buddhist countries, think mainly in these terms. They seek to obtain a better rebirth, either a better rebirth on this earth, or a rebirth in heaven, by making religious offerings for which they obtain merit. So it becomes very important that the person to whom you make the offerings is a good person that the monk is a real monk, otherwise you don't get as much, you don't acquire as much merit as you had hoped, because it is a traditional Buddhist teaching, whether it is the Buddha's own teaching, it is difficult to say, that the more virtuous, the more holy, the person to whom you make your offering, the greater the merit that rebounds to you from that offering, you see the point? Therefore people who are intent on earning or making merit are very anxious to seek out the most

106

virtuous people, which means in practise usually the monks, the most holy monks amongst them, to make their offerings to someone who has the reputation, say of being an arahant, will have people flocking around to make offerings to him, so that they can thereby earn a greater amount of merit. So you can see the point of all this - This is why it's said for instance in the Salutation to the Sangha, the Sangha Vandana, that the Sangha, i.e. the Bhikkhu Sangha, is the incomparable field of merit - In other words offerings made, to the members of the Sangha, bear greater fruit than offerings which are made outside. So this is why, you know,

people are very anxious to give to the monks. Well you can also see a slightly, I won't say negative side of this but a weaker side of this, that your religious life becomes a sort of search for a kind of 'safe' religious investment, you go around looking for the very best possible person, the most highly developed person, the most spiritual person, just so that without any more expenditure so to speak, on your part, you can make sure of a much greater return - become a sort of investment so to speak. There is this aspect to it. Though on the other hand it is certainly one of the teachings of Buddhism traditionally, that the more virtuous the person to whom you make your offerings the greater the merit that accrues to you, so naturally one would tend to prefer, to make one's offerings, you know, where they would be most productive of merit. But there is another way of looking at it, one need not look at it in quite this sort of self- interested way, because you could say, that it's better

107

to sustain a higher form of life than a lower form of life, if you have the opportunity, just as if you had to make a choice between sustaining human life, and sustaining animal life, you'd probably decide to sustain the human life, to save the human life, in the same way, if you had the opportunity to help sustain, or maintain a higher form of spiritual life rather than a lower form, you would do that, just because a higher form is intrinsically better that the higher form of spiritual life should be sustained, should be maintained in existence. So one need not look at it from simply from one's own rather interested merit-making point of view - but simply looking at it in terms of maintaining or sustaining the highest form of spiritual life, the most evolved beings, that are known to you - Just as, for instance, people may support a very strict and intensive meditative community, not because they thought there by that they'd be earning more merit, than by giving the same amount of support to other people, but because they were convinced that by keeping that strict meditative in existence, they were helping to sustain something which would be of great spiritual benefit for everybody concerned, everybody who came in contact with it. They might even decide it was better to support something like that than some ordinary public centre. Do you see what I mean? Here you are looking at it more objectively.

Vijaya: I heard of a case of that in Sri Lanka, where these 'hermit' monks or 'forest' monks were about the most highly regarded bhikkhus and there were some who lived in caves on the side of this mountain and

108

once a day they'd come down to where the lay people had gathered to give them food and the lay people would have to 'book' ahead for the chance to give them food

S: (Laughter) Yes, you can look at this in two ways, if you are an ordinary lay Buddhist in Sri Lanka, the chances are you are thinking in forms of merit, an opportunity to acquire great merit for yourself, but if you take a more objective view, you may simply feel, well, it is better for the sake of the Dharma, it is better for the sake of everyone concerned, that there should be people like that, you know, leading a more intensive spiritual life-

Verne: Almost like an ecological responsibility we have.

S: Yes, yes, a spiritual ecology. Maintain all

~ these rare spiritual flora & fauna;~ so that they don't die out.

Dave: Wouldn't it be a better way ---a more---- of trying to become one - instead of just trying to support them, of trying to become one of them

S: Well, yes, but you know, in a country where you've got virtually the whole population Buddhist not many people think like this - they are thinking in terms of leading their ordinary lives, they don't particularly want to get, you know, to give up anything, they want to enhance their ordinary lives, they want to lead better, that is to say more successful and prosperous ordinary lives, and they believe that religion can help. Maybe this is a left-over from religion as magic, so to speak. This is something I've spoken about quite a bit in England with reference to India,

109

BECAUSE India is very often said to be a very religious country, everybody in India is supposed to be very deeply religious, and the Indians themselves believe this implicitly, they often they make this unfavourable comparison between India and the West - India is very religious, India is very spiritual, and the West of course is very materialistic, so India enjoys a sort of superiority, this is what most Indians firmly believe, and if you look - and there is some truth in it, in the sense, yes, spiritual teachings are available in India, in a way which they are not so readily available in many other parts of the world, especially the West. At the same time it must be said that if you look a little more closely at the religiosity of the ordinary man, you find it tending to evaporate. That what he thinks of as his religiosity, is his belief that religious ~~~~~ or even spiritual forces can be evoked, or invoked, for worldly purposes, you see what I mean, which is basically, magic, uh. I'm not using this word magic in a sense, using it in a quite neutral sense. For instance he believes, that holy men have got certain powers, that they can bless you, so that if you go to a holy man and win his favour and if you want say a son, supposing you haven't got a son well, he can bless you, you can get a son. If you want promotion in your job, if he blesses you, you will get promotion. He can do this if he wishes, or he can cure you of an illness, or he can just, well, in his blessing, ensure that you are a more prosperous. So there is no idea, here, of your developing, of your developing as an individual, spiri- tually speaking, but there is this firm belief, in

110

'the occult' as an ---? religious, and that the holy man, by virtue of his holiness has sort of occult powers, which, if he wishes, he can use for your material benefit. What you're after is material benefit, and you believe that religion can give material benefit. This is what you're mainly interested in, and this, more often than not, is the sum and substance of your religiosity in India. You see what I mean? So we find, you know, something of this in

Buddhist countries too, though not so much, I think, as we get in India - But this is

END OF SIDE 1 TAPE 4

SIDE 2

S:....But this is not religion in the sense of one's own active spiritual life, directed to one's own spiritual development. You're simply trying to invoke, or evoke, occult forces, for the sake of your own material advancement. Occasionally of course, even for quite evil and anti-social purposes. So one musn't forget that for the average Indian, for the average Hindu, you know, religion means just this. Though, of course among the Western-educated, you know, the urban Indians, this is tending, beginning to die out one could say - this sort of attitude.

Purna: I, I notice so, even in New Zealand among Indians, some fruit shops you walk into, there'll often be hidden, a small picture of Ganesh, up in a corner...

S: Yes, yes

Purna:.... or in some such place

S: He being 'the remover of obstacles....

Purna: To material success.

111

S: To material success. (Laughter) I think one has to realise that this sort of attitude is deeply rooted in the East. Well, it was deeply rooted in the West too, in Mediaeval times, I mean, you prayed you know, for all sorts of worldly benefits because you know, even now, this is the function of God, you know, to answer your prayers. Sometimes people feel bitterly disappointed if their prayers are not answered, and they don't get what they want, they say, "I've been praying so sincerely for

such a long time. God doesn't give me what I want, I

"

don't know why He doesn't. It doesn't seem fair

They don't speak of religion in terms of spiritual self- development, any more than the average Hindu does.

Vijaya: There's a fairly strong Buddhist sect in Japan at the moment and they chant, " ~ll for material success.

S: Yes -

Vijaya: But it seems to be connected to a stage of progress where people will soon people to the stage where they will see that, um, they might gain material success, but that's not what they really want.

S: Yes - I'm not saying that you can't gain material success in this way. I'm not saying that magic doesn't work, I'm only saying that magic is not the same thing as religion in the sense of spirital self-develop- ment. I'm not saying that you can't get all these things through the blessing of that holy man, those holy men can do some quite extraordinary things, but all this is not religion in the sense of spiritual self-development, it's something else, which, maybe, has its place, but which is not to be confused with genuine spiritual life.

112

Barbara: It is, it's recognising the value can see very much how this came up when the appeal was made for Tyn-y-dol and for Dhardo Rinpoche - that, um, there was this feeling that it was not immediately relevant to me here in this situation in Auckland, but I could very mu~h see the value, and I think this was felt by all of us, that it was something that was valuable, and the value of it was important.

S: Yes - It's value was in a wider context than one s own personal context...

Barbara: Yes

S: There is also this point allied with this, that people very often ask "what is the material benefit of religion? What good does it do?" I think this is you know, a question, which sometimes one, sort of, has to face head-on. I've been asked this, you know, at meetings - "Well what good does Buddhism do, how does it benefit people materially?" So I say, in that sense it doesn't do any good at all; we don't aim to do any good in that sense, which quite shocks them at first. They are quite horrified, and then I explain, it is not that we are against material improvement or anything like that, but it is not the specific business of the Dharma to bring that about. The specific business, the specific function of the Dharma is the spiritual self- development of the individual, in association with other like-minded individuals for the spiritual benefit, ultimately, of all. So sometimes they, you know, sometimes people ask, in connection with the FWBO, well what material good does it do? How many soup-kitchens

113

has it got, you know, and things like that. This is what they're thinking of, so I say, well there

are a lot bad things, I'm not against these things, nowadays such functions are generally, you know, performed by the State, the specific function of the Dharma is to help of the individual to a higher level, and this is what we are concerned with. But, very often, people tend to assume that religion must be geared to the fulfilment of worldly needs, and, you know, even some religious teachers blatantly make that sort of appeal. I mean, for instance I heard an interview on the radio a few years ago with the Maharishi Mahesh Yogi, you know, and in the course of that interview, (and if I hadn't heard it with my own ears I might not have believed it, if I'd simply been told about it -) He said, that if you are a millionaire, and you practice the Transcendental Meditation, you' ll become a millionaire twice-over (Laughter) You know the appeal was as sort of crude and blatant as that, so I thought "Well this is really staggering, you know, perhaps you will, perhaps you will become a millionaire twice over if you do the Trnascendental Meditation, but this is not what Spiritual life is meant to do. This is certainly not the purpose of the you know, the transcendental to subserve the mundane, and to give you an enhanced enjoyment of the mundane, it might do that incidentally, I'm not saying that it won't, but this is not it's principal function. So we have to be very careful about this. It is not that we are blind to the needs of people beyond the mundane level, or that we wish that anyone should be deprived, or anything of that sort, but the function of the Dharma is something

114

else, and we need make no apology about that. We're supposed to be apologetic, you know, so to speak, so we haven't got so many soup-kitchens, and ah, we haven't, you know got so many hostels for, whoever needs hostels, I'm not sure nowadays, (laughter) etc etc. You must almost be apologetic about only having meditation classes, and only studying the Dharma, and things of that sort. In India, maybe, we need to have more, as it were, social welfare activities, because, you know, there's very little provision by the government, but in Enlgand we certainly don't need to have that, we can concentrate all our energies on the Dharma in the purely spiritual sense.

Udaya: Maybe a parallel area is -ah- something mentioned to me by a friend um a couple of weeks ago - He siad, What can Buddhism do for the psychologically disturbed or ill. I though about it for a while, and

& I wasn't sure what to~day, but what I ended up telling him was in a sense, it can do very little because maybe it's only to the extent that someone is healthy enough to recognise where they are and what they need that Buddhism is of any use.

S: This is a little bit different, because the assumption here is it would be good if the mentally disturbed could be helped out of that state, but very often that is not the assumption behind that sort of question. For instance you're asked, Well what can Buddhism do for the family, uh? So the assumption here is - The family is the ultimate value it must be kept intact, it mjst be preserved, so what can Buddhism do to help that, - this is the sort of assumption - What

115

can Buddhism do to make me a better salesman? The assumption is - well - that's all right, that musn't be touched, that musn't be disturbed, Buddhism must be just brought in to subserve that, you see what I mean? So this is why I coined a saying, you know, a few months ago - that "Buddhism is not a service industry" - (Laughter) you see what I mean? It's not just something that helps service the existing society, the existing institution the existing way of doing things, but very often the assumption behind certain questions, is that this is exactly what Buddhism is, or any religion is, or ought to be.

Puma: I think that it's often the assumption behind individual's taking up the Dharma too.

S: Oh, yes indeed! Or even you know at first it can hardly be anything else - One has to recognise this as a valid approach, though only an approach. You can't help seeing Buddhism as a sort of magic, generally to help people deal with psychological problems, not so that you can develop as an individual so much, as that, having solved your psychological problems, you can go on leading the sort of life that probably brought about the psychological problems, (chuckles) you know - Not change your life - you know. But, you know, it's a valid approach, you can't expect people, you know, who come along for the first time to have a clear understanding about the Higher Evolution, and the transcendental and all that. You can't expect it. Of course they will come along wanting to enhance their existing lives, and this is quite valid, I'm not saying that it's wrong, it's quite valid that they

116

shou~ want to do that, but it's not Buddhism it's not the Dharma in the higher sense. So some people will be quite happy coming along to a yoga class once a week, coming along to the occasional Puja, and that gives them a certain lift, it helps them to carry on leading their ordinary lives more satisfactorily, fair enough, we perform that function also, that is a certain level, but we don't confine ourselves to that level, that's the point, we don't deny it, or negate that level, and that is also a valid level, it's up to people to decide how far they want to go, but they do not, thereby, exhaust the total, you know, potentiality of Buddhism, or their own possibilities, their own potential. So it is very important to get this clear - Does the spiritual exist for the sake of the mundane, or does the mundane exist for the sake of the spiritual? Of course one must not be too 'precious' about that. There is that danger too. So make it clear that essentially we are sort of uncompromisingly a spiritual movement, and, you know, if there is any sort of clash between the mundane values and spiritual values, we believe, or at least we hope, that the mundane values you know, can give way. But sometimes it's regarded as a sort of implicit criticism of 'religion', to use that word, if it can be shown not to support existing values.

Voices: Um -(in agreement -)

S: I mean, this comes out in the West, especially with regard to the family, You know, it's one of the great selling points of Catholicism, at least in the eyes of Catholics, that it supports the family, you know, as f everybody wants to support the family, it's

the most important thing in life, and the most precious thing, so Catholicism is for the family, it ~ts the family, so this is the great 'selling' point, so to speak, you know. Obviously, you should be a Catholic, because everybody wants to support the family.

Puma: It's only the concern of socially-orientated

people - Socialists ask "what has religion done for people"

S: Yes. What are you doing about 'apartheid' for

instance. I mean they just ask straightforward questions like that. So sometimes I say, Well we are doing the very best possible thing, you know, we are helping people to be individuals, and it's only when you your- self are an individual and can recognise others as individuals that things like 'apartheid' will disappear,

~ the same as with the caste systme in India. I'm not saying that sometimes, spiritually committed people, might not engage in a more direct attack on such things, I'm not even excluding that, but basically one has to concentrate, you know, on the more spiritual approach, and, you know, do one's best to encourage people to develop as individuals. I mean, you know, if an order member felt that he should devote himself, or she should devote herself to, you know, in combating 'apartheid', even on the ordinary social level, I wouldn't necessarily be against that, but this is not the function of the, you know, the Movement as a whole, to operate on that particular level.

Verne: It's very hard when people have got that other frame of reference urn for instance, my mother, who got she. . urn... .got in a bit of a state about me - she feels that I have what she sees happening is me going out of her community and, you know, a particular community project

I was very involved in and getting away from the world. She's getting very worried that I'm not going to you know, what's happened to all the contribution I was making to my community. Where has that gone? And what am I contributing now.

S: Yes, yes.

Verne: She can't see anything.

S: As though you're not contributing anything, because maybe that other sort of sphere is just, you know, not apparent to her. I think this is inevitable, that you go out of sight you go over people's horizons, but that's their fault if their horizons are too narrow. You just disappear so far as they're concerned. They can't 'see' you anymore. You disappear into the void, you're trackless, like those birds in the sky (Laughter) what on earth is he doing, he hasn't got a job you know, he's not married, what is he doing, he isn't doing any- thing -

(Laughter) That's the attitude.

Verne: I've just realised that what you were saying about helping people with spiritual life, involving helping, you know, yourself and others to become true individuals, it's not until they have a stable that those other social problems are ever going to be affected to any real degree.

S: I think there is a sort of interaction. I think the existence of a positive, healthy group, as I call it, in a sort of social or socio-religious sense, is almost necessary as the basis for the development of the spiritual community, but on the other hand the existence of the spiritual community makes it more easy for there to be this positive, healthy group.

119

Barbara: ... because you're given the means of cleansing that, urn, of cleansing that um - that whole area of communication so that all the unclarities can be

S: Um, Urn.

Barbara:...where you can't do it from just the positive group.

S: No - no (in agreement). I mean if you want just to confine yourself to the positive group, you can, but the fact that there is a spiritual community you know, in existence too, makes it possible for the positive group itself to function. So there's a need for a certain open-endedness as between, you know, the positive group and the spiritual community. In a sense, the spiritual community has its roots in the positive group. This should have as broad a base as possible. I think it's quite unwise for the spiritual community to cut itself off from, the positive group, on the other hand, it is quite dangerous for the positive group to get out of contact with the spiritual community - you know. So you don't want the positive group, cutting itself off from the spiritual community, this is why, it's in a way quite good, that people do make offerings, say, to members of the spiritual community, even with an apparently selfish motive, they are in touch, they are in contact, they are in communication, you know. On the other hand, it is also good that members of the spiritual community should be a bit involved with the world, should not become too isolated even in their spirituality, even in their spiritual life. This is also good. Because if you do that, well, among other things, it's after all the positive group that is your area of recruitment for the spiritual community, at least that, (Chuckles).

Verne: Could you be more specific about what you mean by the positive group?

S: Ah - well the positive group, in a way, is an ideal. In some ways even more an ideal, than is the spiritual community. You can even say, in a sense, paradoxically, it's easier to have a spiritual community, than a positive group. Yes, because in the positive group you need a fine sort of balance, by a positive group I mean, people who are happy, healthy, human beings who don't have any real psychological problems, who function normally, who in most cases say have, families that have a husband and wife and children and ordinary jobs, but who are happy and healthy, and open towards, open you know, in respect of the spiritual dimension, let's say, but are not making any active efforts to develop themselves spiritually,

say, through very much meditation or involvement in the Dharma, or anything like that - that's what I call (the spiritual community)* *(Error? shdn't it be 'positive group'?)

Verne: Would growth psychology groups into that....

S: Um?

Verne: Would growth psychology groups come into that?

S: I think many of them would -yes- many of them would. Some I think I wouldn't. But others definitely would. Yeah.

Verne: I see that some of those groups now are getting into meditation and

S: Yes, because meditation has become so 'popular', so to speak. so many people are trying it

121

Verne: It's interesting your point about it being a point of um, contact, a point of contact -um- recruitment, a lot of those people have developed and clarified their views a bit, and they're just of sitting there ready and ripe for something

S: Yes. Right.

Verne: deeper and clearer-

S: Yes-yes. I don't think you necessarily come into Buddhism, or into the spiritual life on account of the traumas you are suffering, or the mess that you've got yourself into. In fact, this is the sort of traditional Buddhist attitude, that you grow into the spiritual life in the higher sense, in the more specific sense, from a happy healthy human life, this seems to be regarded as the norm, you know, as far as the Buddhist scriptures are concerned. You see what I mean? Not that you necessarily go through all sorts of agonies and make all sorts of awful mistakes, and make a real mess of your life, and then there is nothing else to do but to go into Buddhism. This occasionally, does happen, even in the East, I mean look at the example of Milarepa, but the normal would seem to be that you lead a, happy, healthy, human life, your human needs and desires are all quite reasonably fulfilled, you feel quite satisfied and happy on that level, but then you start thinking well there is some- thing beyond, nonetheless, towards which I should now start growing, it's not that you've had a bitter, harrowing disappointed human life and you want the spiritual life as a sort of compensation, not that at all. You've fulfilled one level of development and now you're ready for the next. You've been a happy healthy

uman being, now you want some kind of higher spiritual life. That would seem to be the more regular approach from the traditional Buddhist point of view.

Udaya: I wonder how often that really happens, though, because most of the people I know, that are really serious about their growth have just 'had it' with life in the worldly sense - You know, this - they seem to have realised that basically, it's never going to really come together I wonder whether or not it ever really does 'come to-gether', whether it's just a Utopia.

S: Yes, well, this is why I said that the positive group was even more of an ideal than the spiritual community. I say that, with a proviso - and that is - 'under the conditions of modern life'. Under the conditions of more traditional life way of life, such as you still have in India and S.E. Asia, it is not so difficult to have a happy human life.

Udaya: This is what Schumacher's saying.

S: And many of the people who, say, are coming along to the FWBO in India, in Pune, they do have, though- they're often very poor, they do have a happy, you know, healthy human life, you notice that their family life is quite happy, and quite positive, they seem all to get on very well with one another, on the whole, and to be fond of one another, even though they live in tiny little houses, and tiny little rooms, all sort of crowded in together, but you get the impression of a much more positive and happy family life, than you usually encounter in the West. So I think this has got a great deal to do with you know, modern civilisation, modern way of life, you see what I mean?

Voices: Yeah.

S: Of course, you know, in New Zealand, it's not quite the same as in even in Enland, because here, I think, you are nearer in a way the sort of traditional pattern. You're not quite so modernised, and mechanised, and industrialised, as many, you know, countries in the West, especially in

Udaya: Not quite as extreme.

S: Not quite so extreme. Yes - So I think this whole question of the positive group and the spiritual community and the relations between them is quite important - That, that one musn't adopt an extreme attitude. In your wish to transcend (the spiritual community) the positive group, you musn't negate it on it's own level, you musn ' t invalidate it on it's own level, this is very important, on the other hand, if you are simply a member of the positive group, you shouldn't regard that as the end-all - and be - all of human existence. These are the two extremes. So therefore there should be a sort of open-endedness between

the two, so it isn't too difficult to pass, to make the transition from the positive group to the spiritual community, as smoothly and easily as it humanly possible. There will be a certain amount of trauma, but, you know, a certain amount of pain and difficulty, even tension, but not, we hope, too much. You know some people seem able to make that transition relatively smoothly and easily and I think there doesn't have to be trauma, there doesn't -have to be pain and suffering, you don't have to sort of tear yourself up by the roots and have them all sort of hanging out and bleeding (Laughter). That isn't necessary.

124

Verne: But sometimes the pain comes¹ to those who come close to it - they feel that we are turning into lost causes.

S: (Laughter) Well, you are disappearing o~ver the horizon, uh.

Verne: I find that quite painful to watch.

S: Oh yes, of course. I mean there is a saying in India, that, you know, every, every woman in India lets say, regards renunciation as a wonderful thing, but not for her own husband, or her own son - you know, - Anyway let's go on, uh to thirteen.

Ann: Text SECTION 13

S: Urn. This is quite a list isn't it?

Voices: Yes.

S: We'll try to do just a few of them before we stop for, you know, whatever it is. So the Buddha said, "There are twenty things which are hard for human beings. It is hard to practise charity when one is poor.

Jim: I'm not quite so sure about that.

S: Does one actually find this? Does one not perhaps sometimes find that the poor, you know, are able to practise charity.

Jim: I think that's true.

S: Why do you think this is?

Jim: They are less "possession" oriented because they haven't got possessions.

Udaya: They can feel some sort of empathy also with others experiencing difficulties.

S: Yes, that's very true.

Udaya: They've been there ore are there.

Dave: They haven't got their security wrapped up 125

in all these possessions.

Keith: They might not be so spiritually poor.

S: I did suggest sometime ago, jokingly, that this should really be reversed and should read, "Hard to practice charity when one is rich".

Jim: That would be true.

S: Perhaps the line actually refers just to the objective difficulty, of, you know, of giving something which you actually haven't got, perhaps it's probably in that sense, well, if you haven't got something you can't give it, but if you use the term "poor" simply in the sense of 'not having very much', a person who hasn't got very much himself doesn't necessarily find it more difficult to be charitable, if anything, he might find it more easy to be charitable, than someone who's got a lot.

END OF SIDE 2 - TAPE 4

126

SIDE 1 TAPE 5

Barbara: It seems to be that if one is in a state need on whatever level it is, then it is hard to be giving.

S: Yes - yes. Right.

Barbara: Because those needs ..you feel as if what one has is being drained from one rather than ah so therefore, in that state of need I know in that state of being, I

am not open and giving.

S: Yes, right. So in that case it's the subjective need which is the determining factor, not the objective wealth.

Vijaya: There are people who seem to be psychologically "poor", and when you meet them you feel that they are always wanting things.

S: Yes, well perhaps you could say it is hard to practise charity when one feels poor - uh.

Voices: Yes.

Udaya: Poorly - (Laughter)

S: And a very rich man can feel poor. There's the very well-known story of the American multi-millionaire who committed suicide because he was down to his last million - (Laughter) It's a bit like that - he felt poor, he felt deprived. He had one miserable million left, how was he going to live? So he shot himself. He felt poor. So it's as though the subjective factor is more important than the objective here. If you feel poor, if you feel impoverished, destitute, you feel it difficult to give whether it is materially or psychologically or even spiritually. But if you don't feel poor you can give. However little objectively you might have.

127

Udaya: This has quite a bit of relevance for Order Members taking classes, if you're feeling jaded you can't be inspiring anyone else, can you?

S: No, No. (Laughter)

Megha: This means Udaya won't be taking classes.

S: You have to have something to give, and this is why preparation is quite important, which doesn't necessarily mean swotting up your text books, but just, you know, putting yourself into a quiet harmonious frame of mind before you go along and, you know, take the class. You know, not just rushing along to it straight after doing something else.

Udaya: I had a letter recently from Kulamitra and he was talking about classes at the London Buddhist Centre and he was saying, um - paraphrasing slightly, in a sense, what it came down to in the class situation, when people just seemed to be saying - Speak, speak, speak it was vasically dependent on what he had actually absorbed himself, and could radiate, you know, um, sort of external preparation and what people normally see as preparation, didn't really come into it over much, it was more to the extent that he had absorbed it.

S: Yeh. It is difficult for a 'preta' to practise you know, charity, this - a 'preta's' only feeling is to get, they feel so impoverished, so deprived, and you know, there are many preta-like people. You can't try to satisfy other's needs, you know, when you just feel your

own need, very, very, strongly, maybe in a quite neurotic sort of way.

Verne: All the energy is bound up in that.

S: Yeh.

128

Verne: In that grasping in that need - I was thinking that if people were in it for the merit, then obviously they are going to have trouble um, if they are 'poor', you know, they are going to be in an awful state trying to give, if they think their merit is bound up in what they can give, materially. That must be....

S: Yes. This is why I've notice&that some of the for instance, Singhalese lay people are very concerned that the monk should be observing all the rules, not because if he observes all the rules, let's say he will develop spiritually, but if he isn't observing them, then he's not a very good monk and they will not get so much merit from making offerings, so they are very concerned keeping him up to scratch, so the poor monk is sometimes quite hounded. And they are quite aware of this and, you know, sometimes talk about this among themselves, you know, that they are just merit-making machines for the lay-people, and some times they quite resent it, because they feel they are just being used, and which they are, you know, in the case of the more heavy-handed, you know, lay supporters. There is this quite amusing, sometimes you get the reverse attitude, I remember that I was in Calcutta once, and there was a young Singhalese, a quite uncoventional Singhalese Buddhist, who got on very well with the monks, so he knew it was the custom to make the food offering of food befdre twelve o'clock etc etc - So there were several Singhalese monks who were going along to Calcutta university and they couldn't always eat, you know, before twelve o'clock, because they had classes, so this yound Singhalese siad he'd provide them all with a meal in the evening, so he

129

provided them with this meal in the evening which most orthodox Singhalese would be horrified even to hear of, and he went through all the ceremonies very cheerfully in Pali, and when it came to the words "I make this food offering", he said very cheerfully, 'I make this untimely food offering to the monks' - (Laughter), and they chanted the blessings in the usual way, and they thought it great fun. So it was quite sort of interesting to see, you know, this sort of rather hide-bound, you know, tradition being broken in this sort of way, you know, quite awarely. They knew what they were doing, and in a sense, why, and this young Singhalese supporter, he quite enjoyed doing it in this way. He wasn't, you know, thinking in terms of getting any merit out of it . He was just concerned with to provide the monks with a

meal. But they needed it in the evening, they hadn't been able to get it in the morning, because of their classes, but, you know, this would have been regarded in Ceylon as wildly unorthodox, even wicked. Alright let's go on then - "It's hard to study~he~ay when occupying a position of great authority". So why do you think it is hard?

Vijaya: You're always on the hop, there's always things to do.

S: You're always on the hop, there's always things to do.

Jim: Also authority can be so impersonal.

S: Yes.

~: Also there is a feeling of pressure because you have got the responsibility, and maybe you're very much in the spotlight.

130

S: Um

M~: Maybe there're signs of that greater mandala...

S: Yes-

Megha and you have to come back to what you're supposed to do.

S: Yes - yes.

Vijaya: You may not feel the need to...

S: This is brought out in India, just recently, you know, in the course of my recent visit, when I was in contact with you know, the ex-untouchable Indian Buddhists, you probably know that, Dr. Ambedkar started two organisations, one a religious Buddhist organisation, and the other a political party, after his conversion, and then he died six weeks later. So what happened was that there were these two sort of parallel movements as they were meant to be the, you know, the purely Buddhist, and the political, the political being the Republican Party of India, which was supposed to represent the interests, the political interests, mainly, of the Buddhists. So what happened was after Dr. Ambedkar's death, a number of people sort of tried to take over the leadership, both politically and religiously, from among his followers, and those who had been close to him, but what tended to happen, was that these people attached far more importance to politics and tried to sort of run the religious activities on the side, if you see what I mean. They were also the sort of office bearers in the Buddhist organisation, in its different branches, but their main interest, even, and certainly their main occupation was the political. But for several years they tried to do both, they tried to, sort of, be into politics, and also into the

~Tht

Dharma. And they rather resented 'bhikkhus', doing very much in the purely sort of Dharma field, because they felt that that would undermine their influence, and indirectly their political influence also. You can see how the whole thing developed. But anyway, when I came back this time I found that the politicians were taking a rather more sober view of things - (Laughter) and in Bombay, Lokamitra and I had lunch with one of the leading Buddhist politicians, you might know him quite well, he

is a . . . , and he confessed rather sadly, that he had realised it was quite impossible to combine the two, that someone who was active in political life could not give any genuine leadership in the sphere of the Dharma activities, as far as the Dharma activities were concerned, and he said that he recognised that these had to be handled by an entirely different set of people who were not involved in Politics. So he had realised that, and he had quite responsible positions - he had been Minister of the Maharashtra State Govt, twice. And at that very time that we met him, that very day, and the day before, he'd been involved in all sorts of manoeuvring politically, because there was a possibility that he might become the next Chief Minister of the Maha- rashtra State, so it was even difficult to squeeze in a meeting with us, though he very much wanted to, and he said I just don't have time, I don't even have time to read about the Dharma, what sort of guidance, can I give, he said "It's got to be done by you people, I've realised that, you can't combine the two". There's got to be separate leaders, for you know, the politics and the religious activities, so he has certainly realised the

132

truth of this - "It is hard to study the Way when occupying a position of great authority"~
You can't

do it, there is the question of time, there's the pressure on you, the different sort of mood you're in. Yes - this raises an interesting point. When I was in Pune, lots and lots of people came to see me that I'd known before, and amongst them, 'the Buddhist politician That is to say, those Buddhists, who well some of them were only nominal Buddhists, who were very very active, in the political field, party politics field and Lokamitra assured me afterwards, that he knew at once as soon as certain people entered that they were politicians and not just ordinary Buddhists, he said they gave off a completely different vibe, and that was true. They were in a different mental state, and you just - you picked up something different, something a little, almost threatening and a little sort of dangerous, they were in a different state of mind from the other people, the other ordinary Buddhists who came along. And sometimes he didn't know them, they'd just say they were old friends of mine, they wanted to see me so he just arranged for me to see them and didn't know who they were or what they did, but he picked up something odd, something different, something not very pleasant, and then afterwards I'd say, "well these are old friends of mine, and they have such and such positions in the local, you know, party machinery, and then, he'd say "I thought there was something like that", you know, I picked up something quite different, there. It's really strange. So when you get into sort of, active party politics, you get into a very definite frame of mind, which is rather unDharmic,

incompatible with Dharmic activities, you cannot run Buddhist activities with that sort of mind, or rather, when you're in that frame of mind, it is quite impossible. I don't know whether you have anything in New Zealand, like that, that party politics in India is a very unpleasant business indeed. And you can't be involved in that, however noble your intentions, and be at the same time involved with Buddhist activities. It is simply impossible. So this will illustrate the truth of this saying - "It is hard to study the Way when occupying a position of great authority" and these political leaders originally, they thought not only in terms of studying the Way, but of actually propagating it - (Laughter) But that's even more, you know, impossible. So they've realised that now. But it was quite, in a way, quite amusing, though at the same time tragic, years and years ago that these politicians thought that they could actually run the whole Buddhist movement in their spare time, as it were, they really thought that, and they really thought that they could give religious or spiritual leadership to people, it was amazing to see that sort of blindness and their effrontery, they really did think this, that without having sort of really studied the Dharma, or without even practising it, they could give religious leadership to millions of people. It is really astonishing. But most of them know better now, you know, twelve or fourteen or more years later. Alright, one more and then I think we will stop and have our mid-morning refreshment.

"It is hard to surrender life at the approach of inevitable death". Do you think this is true? that at the approach of inevitable death you know it's inevitable, you

can't escape, there's no way round it, you've got to face it, you've got to die. But even if you've lived a long, successful fruitful happy life, it's very difficult very often, to just surrender, just to accept the fact that the moment has come, you are really now at the end of the road, or at least this particular section of the road, and you've got to die, it's not easy to accept that.

Megha: It's probably not until death is inevitable that you think you really are going to die.

S: Yes, yes. Yes everybody knows that they are going to die, but very few people really think so to speak they are going to die. Really feel it, or know it.

Udaya: It's not a reality.

S: It's not a reality to them-

Barbara: Even in the presence of the dying

S: Yes. Well, yes, this is why we tend to avoid the dying - you know, we hide them away in hospital, and you know, we go~ to see them but of course we always assure them that they are going to get better, so perhaps we are reassuring ourselves at the same time.

Barbara: Yes there is a fear with the dying process, a fear with that....

S: Yes, not only do we not, ah, surrender life at the approaching of inevitable death we won't allow other people to

Megha: . . .others to die.

S: We won't allow other people just to surrender their lives. We keep, you know, telling them, No, you're not - - well, we don't say you're not going

135

a

to die, we're not as direct as that, but~you're going 11

to be all right, and how we all love you, and you're

going to be able to have your holiday next year~ you know, when really~in your hearts of hearts you know that they're going to be dead by the end of the week, but you go on talking in this sort of way, supposedly to cheer them up, or to encourage them, and to get them off the subject of death so they don't have any morbid thoughts about dying, or something of that sort.

Udaya: I think maybe it's for our own benefit, we don't want to face it, or handle it that someone is actually going to die cause it - it.

S: That, well~ what will you say to them, for if you really know someone is going to die, say by the end of the week, well you go to see them, and you know that they're going to die, and supposing that they know that they're going to die, and it's sort of understood and accepted, well what are you going to say - It's a rather awkward social situation - You know -

Dave Moore~Laughter~

S:.... But if you can keep up this preten~e, - Well you're going to be alright , dear, we'll meet again next week, we'll go out the week after together, - well you can have a really, friendly, sort of cheerful social chat, but not really face any deeper issues. This is what tends to happen.

Barbara: It was only when I was prepared to accept that my mother was dying that she could give herself to dying.

S: Yes - yes.

136

Barbara: And it was when I could reassure her that I would be with her, that I was not afraid to be with her, that I knew what was happening⁹ and that to the best of my ability I would be with her and it - and in this way

S: And there is this factor too, that if you don't recognise that someone is going to die, and allow them to recognise that you do recognise it, and accept it, you have to leave that person alone to die.

Barbara: Yes. yes.

S: Or at least with merely professional help or you know assistance, which, doesn't help really very much.

Barbara: Yes, yes.

S: So if you're pretending that they're not going to die, you are leaving them with it - I mean, very often they know they are going to die, but you don't want to accept that, so you don't refer to it, so they feel that they can't, and therefore they're left with it, they're left to die on their own because you won't share their dying with them. This is what

happens very often. So that's a terrible and inhuman

sort of situation. All because of this general fear of death, or because death has become a sort of 'tabu' word for us - It's not nice - doctors too don't like you to talk to their patients about death. They are trying to prolong the patient's life at whatever cost.

Barbara: I've found it is not in the actual experience of dying, or being in that actual reality of it,

~i that is the fitKr, but it is the, it is the)um~ the

137

fantasy that, the idea that one thinks, what one thinks death is, and what one has been taught to feel death is, rather than the actual reality of it when it is~when it is there.

S: It's a bit like childbirth in the old days, you know, there were all sorts of horror stories about childbirth, that women sometimes used to repeat to one another - or over hear, or things of that sort they'd be terrified at the idea of childbirth, it's the same with death, you know, which in a sense, is another form of birth too, you hear about this terrible rattling in the throat, and all that sort of thing, that is what you hear, and about the death agony, and so on and so forth - whereas more often than not there is nothing of that sort whatever

Barbara: No. There is just a quiet breathing in and

S: Calm and Peaceful.

Barbara: A quiet beathing in and out.

S: And suddenly the breath just stops.

Barbara: Yes.

S: That's that - That's all it is - just that little thread.

Barbara: Yes.

S: Which has become very fine, very tenuous, just snaps, very gently, you hardly notice it - Very often you don't know when a person has died, not the exact moment, that they've gone, it's usually like that, but we've built it up into a sort of horror story unfortunately. Anyway let's leave it there and have our refreshment.

138

Break

S: "So it is hard to get an opportunity of reading the sutras" - Perhaps more difficult in those days than now, because, when this particular work was translated, sutras had to be copied by hand, and before sutras were copied even by hand, it was still more difficult to get a chance to read them - or you couldn't get a chance to read them, you had to hear them, you had to find a learned monk who had committed the entire text to memory, and ask him to recite it aloud for your benefit, and to perhaps explain it, for you. So in those days it was very hard to get an opportunity of hearing or reading the sutras. That opportunity came much later on, with the invention, well first of all, the Chinese wood-block printing and then modern printing. So it's not so hard now, providing one takes the word 'reading' quite superficially, but really to read the sutras is much more difficult. It's as though even that, you know, superficially, at least the wheel has turned full circle, and it's only too easy to get an opportunity of reading the sutras, so we don't bother all that much with them

Voice: We don't appreciate them.

S: They're available, all translated in English, there are so many, there they are, on the shelf, and, you know, people aren't so keen to read them as they might have been some years ago, when they weren't available and not translated.

Megha: Though in some ways it's hard now, because, just with regard to English, how we have to be careful what in fact they actually mean....

139

S: That's true-

Megha :.... The words that they use - So we're not we're not reading the actual the actual language they were written in.

S: No.

Udaya: I sort of get the impression that what we are left with is just a fraction of what might have been lost at Nalanda when that was 'hit'. Would that be true?

S: No, I think there are not probably very many really important sutras which have been really lost.

Udaya: Oh!

S: Many survive in Chinese and Tibetan translations, uh and all the major ones at least, are available in Sanskrit, or Pali as the case may be. No. I think it's not so much a question of actual words lost, so much as what goes with the words, uh. And, you know, in this connection I've been quite interested to hear what people say about the tapes of the Seminars, what a difference in just listening to the tape of a seminar or even of a lecture, of being in on it all, and just reading the transcribed edited and words, so even to a greater extent it must be the same with the sutras - we have only the Buddha's words, we do not experience the impact of the Buddha's personality, which the original disciples experienced when they heard those words. So you know, I was thinking about this quite a while ago, I started thinking about this quite a while ago, because one reads so often in the sutras, that the Buddha appears, someone asks him a question, the Buddha gives a short reply, something quite simple and easy to understand, and the person is converted, and you think, Well how could it have happened? What was there in those words that produced that effect? But it wasn't just the words, it was the Buddha's whole personality, so to speak, it was the whole atmosphere of the occasion, the whole feeling. That we do not get in the Scriptures, we get only the words that the Buddha actually uttered. At best we get an introductory paragraph stating, you know, the circumstances under which the teaching was given, or the Sutra was delivered, why the Buddha gave it, who was present, that's all, but there's no attempt to create the sort of atmosphere or the impact of the Buddha's personality, on that occasion. Sometimes he comes across but not very often, usually there's just words that he uttered and sometimes there's also a summary of what he said, under different headings, which have been numbered for the sake of ready reference, which doesn't help us to get into the spirit of it all very easily, you see what I mean? So even in the case of the Sutras, even when we've got them, and when we can read them, we've still got only the bare bones, of what was communicated. It was a total communication - body, speech and mind - but we only get a sort of 'abstract' of the words; we have to make do as best we can with them, that's why the study is good in a group, because more and more comes out in that way, and 'flesh' can be put on 'the skeleton' as it were, on the bare bones. I

mean when I been editing some of the seminar material, and have been listening to the tape of the seminar, as well as working on the transcription, I've been really surprised sometimes the difference it makes to the meaning just a slight intonation, or a pause and you have to try to

reproduce that, or recreate that on the, you know, written page, the printed page, and it isn't easy. There's a slight emphasis, a slight modulation which is very important to the meaning or to the that if you merely have the words, even properly typed out and punctuated, you don't get that subtle shade of meaning, which subtle as it is may be all important. So how much more is it the case with the Sutras. YOU have to imagine so much more, try to feel so much more read so much more into the words of the Sutras, otherwise we don't get the real meaning, we just get the words So, yes, "it is hard to get an opportunity of reading the Sutras" - Reading in the real sense, in the full sense, just recreating everything just as it happened, you know, in the time of Buddha himself, or feeling it all or seeing it all. This is why I often think that, the, you know, the so-called sort of negative terminology, you know, of the Pali scriptures, for instance, the rather negative approach, would not have come across as negative, because the Buddha's personality was not negative, when the Buddha said - suppose the Buddha said - 'Give up all desires', it wouldn't have come across as something dull and negative and gloomy but as something very cheerful and inspiring and liberating, just because the Buddha's personality was behind it all

142

and there was the person who had given up all desires, so he wasn't just dry and withered and ull. He was just the opposite of that and he was saying that, he was saying 'Give up all desires', so the message that came across despite the words almost was 'It's a wonderful thing to have given up all desires'. That also came across not just the words, that we get - 'Give up all desires'

END OF SIDE 1 TAPE 5

SIDE 2 TAPE 5

S: Alright then the next saying - "It's hard to be born directly into Buddhist surroundings" - What do you think is meant by this? "to be born directly into Buddhist surroundings"? What are Buddhist surroundings?

Udaya: Surroundings conducive to growth and where there's maybe contact with the Buddhist tradition.

S: Yes.

ffuUdaa: And also, you know, committed Buddhists practising -

S: Um - Of course it doesn't help you perhaps, directly, for a few years, but as you grow up, as you get older well clearly, it's a very useful thing to have the Buddhist tradition, directly accessible, but not just in the form of a tradition, not just in the form of local customs which people follow without understanding, but the actual Dharma, actually practiced.

Barbara: That development of awareness of, of a-of us ~~ being aware.

S: Um.

Vipula: Probably it would be quite sort of direct, well even you wouldn't get all that bad conditioning that you later on have to overcome.

S: Yes. Though sometimes I think from a higher spiritual point of view,

nowadays, it's almost a mis- fortune to be born directly into a Buddhist cultural environment, where people think that their Buddhists and believe that they're practising Buddhism, very often, but where actually they are not - that can be even a disadvantage. Well it doesn't matter so much now,

144

because, you know, the Buddha's teachings are so widely available in so many different forms. But it must be a real Buddhist environment, real Buddhist surroundings that you are born directly into, to be of real value, you know. Not just you know, a community, a society where Buddhism is the predominant culture, so to speak, that is nominally followed, that might make it more difficult for you to follow Buddhism by putting you off it, you know, when you grow up, and start thinking for yourself. I mean, I know many young 'born' Buddhists, as they're called, who, you know, have been alienated from Buddhism. But to be born directly into Buddhist surroundings doesn't necessarily mean to be born into a culture where Buddhism, or where Buddhist culture is sort of predominant or where people sort of follow it as a matter of cultural inheritance, but just wherever the Dharma, as a spiritual teaching happens to be available, reasonably easy, for those who want to find it. It's available in Auckland, you can find it if you want it, but you wouldn't describe Auckland -as a whole, as 'Buddhist surroundings', but it is available here and modern advertising being what it is (Laughter) everybody in Auckland who is interested in Buddhism will sooner or later get to know about the FWBO..

Verne: Do you think of rebirth, you know, as rebirth in each moment, it's appropriate to think of karma, as your karma having led you into contact with Buddhism.

S: Well, this is the Buddha's view - that if you 145

have cultivated skilful states of mind, then you will be drawn, you will be attracted, to others with skilful states of mind, and surroundings, in which skilful states of mind are more easy to develop. Yes, it is hard to be born directly into Buddhist surroundings, providing you understand what those 'Buddhist surroundings' really are, you know. It doesn't necessarily mean that you've got lots of lovely images, and pictures of the Buddha on the wall, and monks chanting in the distance, it doesn't necessarily mean that at all. Alright - "It is hard to bear lust and desire without yielding to them - And maybe take it with the next one - "It is hard to see something attractive without desiring it" - and even the next one which, gives in a way a negative form of the same thing - "It is hard to bear insult without being angry". What is the common point here?

Dave Moore: Um - to be creative instead of reactive.

S: Yes.

Vijaya: It is hard to overcome selfishness.

S: Um - It is when, uh, when you have the experience in terms of the twelve nidanas, 'feeling', it is very difficult just to experience the feeling whether pleasant, painful or

neutral, and not allow the reaction to take place of craving in the form, in the case of the pleasurable feeling, and aversion in the form of the painful feeling. It's very difficult just to stop, just to be aware, just to see what is happening and not react, uh, that is what is meant by 'bearing' here. Experiencing, you know, pleasure and

146

pain and so on without reacting, without the reactive mind, uh, and that kind of thing.

Verne: The operative word here seems to be 'experiencing', because I've noticed that if um I'm really in touch with, you know, the feeling that I'm experiencing, I tend just to go straight through it -

S: Urn -

V~rne: You know, and I urn I experience it

directly.

S: Urn. But with mindfulness.

Verne: Yes.

S: Mindfulness should be there-

Verne: Yes, and if that happens, they don't get caught up , it doesn't happen very often but if it does happen - I don't get caught up in the reactivity, whether it be wanting something or hating something.

S: Right! Right. And the awareness, as I've pointed out before, must be an integrated awareness and not just an alienated one. You must have the experience, this is, you know, this is the point you're making. You must fully experience it, not cut yourself off from it, experience it, but maintain that attitude of awareness towards it - integrated awareness - and just not react. Respond creatively, it doesn't necessarily mean, just sort of standing still, essentially there must be a sort of creative response, and not a mechanical reaction.

Barbara: I find it difficult with certain emotions to admit that they are there....

S: Yes

Barbara and those other feelings that I 147

S: So there's not even the beginnings of a creative response

Voices: Um

S: You have to break through, you know, to the integrated awareness, and that requires your, first of all, getting into touch with your actual feelings, and allowing yourself to experience them. I mean, essentially breaking through to the sensation of pleasure or of pain.

(Sounds of agreement)

Verne: I can see how that makes sense of that 'hell-realm' being you know, having such potential for breaking through because in that state, you are in such a such a

S: You are having contact with something.

Verne: Yes. There is no doubt about having contact.

S: Yes - Right.

Priyananda: There is no alienation, you are directly experiencing it.

S: Yes, yes.

Verne: . . . and it's acute.

S: Well, where does this state of alienation come in if there wasn't that thought all the time? Is that a modern disease?

Verne: In the god realm?

S: Well, not alienated from pleasure.

Verne: Oh, no.

S: They have the pleasurable feeling, the pleasurable sensation.

Priyananda: Possibly in the sort of 'preta realm' - where you're not really experiencing

Puma: What the desire is - you think it's something else -

S: Ah! yes.

Voices: yeah - yeah - (thoughtfully)

S: You think you want something out there, but it isn't able to satisfy you, presumably because you are alienated from your own real need, uh.

Voices: Yes.

S: You are alienated from your own true being, you know, you experience yourself as empty and needing to be filled from outside. You are not in contact with your own, well 'worth', in a way - I mean, I think this features quite prominently in modern, you know, psychoanalysis, or psychotherapy - that a person feels worthless they devalue themselves, they feel they are nothing, they're no good, they have to be filled or given worth, from outside - if others think well of them it's o.k., if others value you, it's o.k. but if that goes then they think, oh in themselves, "worthless" and, "useless", and "empty". So, yes, that is a sort of alienation from one's own being, one's own worth, one's own individuality, well the 'preta', at least from one point of view, probably represents that You're trying to fill that, you know, inner, aching void, stuffing into it something external, but it never satisfies, so you remain 'hungry', (Pause) - So you know, what the Buddha is really saying here is, - it is hard to experience, ah the ah - the last 'nidana', of that 'result' process, to arise, without allowing the first nidana of the

149

'action' process to arise, this is what he is really saying in more technical terms you know - It's hard to stop. It's hard to stop being reactive and to start being creative. This is what is really hard. So whether it's a question of yielding to the attractive, or being upset by the unattractive, it's equally difficult. (Pause) - Lust and desire or something attractive you experience as pleasant, insult of course you experience as painful. So in the one case the reaction is of craving, and the other is of anger. In both cases, you know, the body goes Alright, the next one - "It is hard to have power, and not to pay regard to it" - What do you think this means? Pause - What is 'not paying regard to power'?

Verne: Not... not that part of your ego.

Megha: or using that power to manipulate others.

S: Um

(General murmurs)

Puma: Or not to be infatuated or intoxicated by

it.

S: One can take this word power in a number of different senses, the word 'power' in English is quite ambiguous. I sometimes use it in a positive sense, and sometimes in a negative sense. In the lecture on 'Authority and the Individual' (individual in society) I used the word 'power' in a negative sense. I think this is clear. I stated at the beginning that I

was going to use it in the negative sense, though it's sometimes used it in a positive sense. There is an ambiguity, unfortunately. Chintamani, in some of his

150

writings, which have appeared in the Newsletter, uses it in a positive sense.

Udaya: Urn - will and Power

S: Ah - so one could take 'power' here in either sense. There is 'power' in the sense that Nietzsche uses the term, the, sort of 'fulness' of your own being, and also there is 'power' in the sense in which I used the term in that lecture, of, power which, you know, you, usurp almost, which doesn't really belong to you but which is invested in you by a group, or maybe, supposedly, some sort of higher authority, some higher power. Their power comes to be invested in you. It's not really yours. So in the first place, the power, whether it maybe material or spiritual, or any power whatever, does actually belong to you. For instance, if you're physically strong, or you've got physical power, well, that is yours, but supposing you're driving a motor-car, the power of the motor-car is not your power actually. You are using it, but it isn't really your own power, or if you've got a gun and you shoot somebody, that's not your own power, you are using power, so "it is hard to have power and not pay regard to it" - This probably applies to both kinds of power, that if you're big and strong and can throw your weight about a bit it's rather hard not to do that, it's hard not to pay regard to your physical strength - and even to be a bit intoxicated by that, and in the same way, in the case of authority, that is to say power which has been delegated to you, or which you have even usurped, if you've got that also, 'it's hard not to pay regard to it' - even harder - Now one could;

151

'Does this matter'? - This 'paying regard to power' - So you could say that in the case of your natural power, the power that really does belong to you, or even power that's been delegated to you, provided you use it circumspectly and with awareness, it doesn't matter that you do actually use it, on the level that is appropriate. Supposing for instance a policeman is coming along, he's invested with the whole power of the state, he doesn't exercise his own power - he may have a certain amount of physical strength which he utilises, but his power basically is the power of the state, is backed up by the power of the state, so, supposing you are about to commit some illegal act and he stops you, well that you could say is a valid use of his power - so he cannot really be said to be paying regard to his power, psychologically, perhaps, he may be doing that, he may be getting a bit of 'kick' out of stopping you from doing what you shouldn't do anyway, but that's a separate matter, objectively, he's not paying regard to his power uh, but supposing you try to use your power in a sphere, where power simply should not be operating,

~ where power is, quite inappropriate, then you really are 'paying regard' to it. For instance, we used to get quite a bit of this in India when (I've mentioned this before) at

Buddhist meetings you'd sometimes get politicians, standing up on the platform and holding forth on Buddhism, and the fact that they were there was due to the fact that they had political power, not that they knew anything about Buddhism really, but people used to listen open-mouthed to their, sometimes

152

foolish, remarks about Buddhism because they made those remarks, you know, invested with their political authority, as it were, so in that way they were paying regard to their power, they were using their power in a sphere where it didn't apply to 'push' as it were, their views on Buddhism, which can only be 'pushed' by reason, and experience, you see what I mean? So you 'pay regard to your power', essentially, if you use it for the wrong purpose, a purpose for which it wasn't intended, or you use power through the work of knowledge and experience.

Vijaya: Will we have to watch this within the Movement? Say, people connected with, say, stronger and well-established centres would derive a greater sense of involvement and power from there being a lot of activity and involvement, whereas if you try and see them on their own two feet, as if there wasn't that level of activity and involvement, within the movement, can you assess their

S: Well it might be so, but then you can also ask, well how does it come about that in that particular centre there is more of activity? Because there are more, as it were perhaps, 'powerful' individuals, in the sense of people having their own power. So you could say that also - That it represents something that they haven't created, if anyone represents something they haven't created and their power is of purely delegated power which is not embodied in themselves, I mean, then that sort of situation may arise, you know, the classic example which I gave in the lecture, was the

153

Ambassador, of a country, of a state, you know, he represents that - he is the Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, which means, endowed with full power, you know. But the activity of a centre, at least ideally, depends on the activity of the individuals collectively, so those individuals you know, have the power - the centre doesn't really have the power at all, so it's not a question of the individuals representing the power of the centre, you know, it is the power of the individuals that makes up the centre, that's why it's a spiritual centre, and that may vary, you know, according to the number of the individuals, or even the degree of the activity, the degree of the power (so to speak) though I probably wouldn't like to use the word 'power' in this sort of connection, I think it can be misleading. This is the sort of 'Chintamani' sense of the term, but I think we have to be a bit cautious using it in that sense. (Pause)

So "It is hard to have power and not pay regard to it" Because you are very conscious of yourself as possessing power, in any sense, and if you're not careful, even when it is your own genuine power that really belongs to you, at least objectively speaking, it's hard not to regard this as the sort of property of the ego and for the ego to use it and manipulate it, even though it's your own genuine power. So "it is hard to have power and not to pay regard to it." Just

as - If you're bigger and stronger than other people, it's very difficult as it were, to forget the fact.

Verne: Other people's expectations come into that too - I think they can have expectations, um of you,

154

and you can.... and you, you... perhaps... .get caught up in that yourself, and um.

S: Well, perhaps they make you more conscious of your power than you otherwise would have been.

Verne:or.. .or.. . appropriate

S: Perhaps they say, 'How big and strong you are' and you start becoming a bit conscious of it. Or 'How pretty you are' and you start becoming a bit conscious of it and sort of manipulate your prettiness for effect.

Verne: Um.

S: So power can take many forms. That's why it produces an effect on other people and changes them, in any way, on any level

Udaya: It could be something quite subtle.

S: Oh, yes. And the 'paying regard to it' is sort of, being conscious of it in a sort of egocentric way, and then, of course, if you are conscious of it in that sort of way, then sooner or later you may start .ah.. using your own power manipulating your own power, with reference to your own ego-requirements. (pause). Alright, next one - "It is hard to come into contact with things and yet remain unaffected by them"~ - Well, this is a very general statement of those previous three. I mean, we're coming into contact with things all the time, things are impinging on us, sensations are impinging on us, experiences are impinging on us, all the time through our five senses and through the mind, all the time, we are in contact with the external world, the world of nature, with other people, society, etc - so it is just one, long, continuous, contact with

things, even in our dreams, we are still in contact with 155

things. So "It's very hard to come into contact with thin 5 and et remain unaffected" - That is to say, Not react, that's all, not react. Ideally to respond creatively. That's the most difficult thing of all, not to react.

Voices: Um.

S: There's no question of being 'in contact' or 'out of contact', you are in contact, even the monk, is in contact, even if you live in the forest, in a little hut, you are in contact all

the time, it's only a different kind of contact, contact is there, but the basic thing, the basic point, is to remain unaffected. Which doesn't mean to be sort of dead, and unfeeling, or insensitive, or unaware, it means to respond creatively and not just to react.

Vijaya: Would 'uninfected' be a better word?

S: Um?

Vijaya: ... 'uninfected'?

S: 'U~infected'? Yes.

Vijaya: Cause in many ways I feel we are always, um, the expression of our mind and what we are is, in a way, a transformation of the experience of the environment and situation we're in.

S: Yeh, yeh.

Udaya: I've found at times when I'm very... when I'm feeling very full, positive and clear in myself, like after a solitary retreat, I feel very immune um to things that normally you get entangled with - but, by the same token, something quite um, aesthetically pleasing like a landscape, does seem to penetrate and just seems to further enrich your own positive state,

156

and yet you seem immune from bill-board advertising, and rush hour traffic, or whatever, at least for a little

S: Well, many people report this, that, you know, after a retreat, especially a solitary retreat, they feel sort of encapsulated, they feel as though there's a sort of aura surrounding them, a sort of protective aura, and this is almost literally true, this is a bit like, the fourth Dhyana experience, you know, when you are enveloped in that white sheet, you remember?

Voices: Yes.

S: So when you are on your own, you do sort of build up, or you intensify, your own vibration, so to speak, you are sort of transmitting on your own wave-length all the time, you're not affected by other people's transmissions on their wavelengths, you see what I mean? So you intensify your own being, when you're on your own, or when you're on retreat, even with other people. You intensify what we may call the integrity of your own being. Your whole being is enhanced and strengthened and made more positive and straightened out, so when you come back into society, so to speak, into 'the world', you are much more whole, and stronger, firmer, and clearer than you were before, so you can resist, much more than you could resist before. You are not affected, it's as though the shell, or the aura, extends so far those impressions, get so far and then they just drop, but of course, after you've been back in society, back in the world for a while, after a few days even, you're aura is badly dented -

(Laughter) dented, and

157

you know, and these outside influences and forces start breaking through and really getting at you, and of course you start reacting, but initially there is that, and the more developed you are, you know, the more sort of permanent, in a sense, your aura becomes, that, you know, it's not so easily dented, and outside influences and forces don't quite so easily get through to the core, you know, which is this, you know tender quivering, sensitive you, owing to your, you know, just sort of waiting to be affected, and to react.

Barbara: It is in retreat situations - where I have found very much that, this that the awareness of my state of being, being dependent to a large extent on the state of being of those around me and that the ... the feeling... it's almost as if different auras are sort of interpenetrating

S: On retreat you do find this; especially when you're all observing silence, and, you know, when you are normally much more aware of others than you are usually.

Barbara:....The more positivity there is...

S: Yes

Barbara:....the less the easier it is to, to um.. not to try to shield off from it, or to contract from it

S: Well there is no need to do it. .uh.

Barbara: No - No.

S. there is nothing to protect yourself from, Q,. because everything in the, in the environment is positive,

so you can open up - Whereas usually, you close in on your self

158

Barbara:...and even that uh

S: just because there are these threatening things all around you.

Udaya: Where you have to) as a matter of survival.

S: You have to. Yes.

Voices: Yes.

S: Which is unfortunate, uh. Well at least there should be some circle, some circle of friends within which you can freely expand and open up, and not have to shut off all the time, and close up.

Udaya: I get a shock every now again when I have contact with people outside the Friends, because, other than my family, I virtually have nothing to do with people outside the Movement, and it's always a rude awakening when I have to spend time with them and I usually feel quite 'battered' after a period of time.

S: Um.

Ver~~: That brings me to a question about children, because um, we're going, sort of.. there's a lot of attention being paid to the children's education, and my feelings that I'd like to get my children into a good environment, a really positive environment, I'm not satisfied with the school, and yet, you know, there's the point of view that perhaps by doing that, you're not preparing your children for what they might come up against should they have to go out into

S: There is that too.

Verne.. They might not always be able to be in that positive environment...

S: Yes

Verne: . . .a bit of conflict. I think perhaps it's 159

good

S: But I think perhaps it's more apparent than real, because if they do grow up in the positive environment, in a robust (continue below)

END OF SIDE 2 TAPE 5-

(The first part of the 1st side of tape marked Missing pieces is relevant to another session)

SECTION FROM 'MISSING PIECES' TAPE - (on next page)

S. sort of way, you know, then they will be all the more~ able to cope when they

go out into the world, you know. We musn 't sort of even of you shouldn't bring them up in a 'sheltered' way, they should ~be 'cloistered' or 'precious' or over-delicate - and if

~ they are healthy children they sho~n't grow up like that. It may be that they'll get a few unpleasant surprises when they go out into the world, but I think they'll probably be better equipped than someone who was actually brought up in the world, uh, who are already a little batterr~ and scarred.

Udaya: The healthy person can cope more easily, ah - in a sick world than a sick person in a sick world..

_S Yes, um, yes (Pause) and you can give them a few sort of circumspect warnings. You musn't expect everything outside to be quite as nice as it usually is at home, you know. The world isn't exactly full of nice, friendly people, that they gave to be a little bit cautious. It's alright to be as 'harmless as doves but we also have to be as wise as serpents'. In fact, you know, as I've sometimes said, you can't afford to be as harmless as a dove unless you are also as wise as a serpent.

Well next saying, "It is hard to study widely and

investigate everything thoroughly" (Laughter). continued page 162.

SECION FROM 'MISSING PIECES' TAPE

Very Beginning of 'Missing Pieces' Tape - (Tea break discussion

on Masc & Fem -)

S: She isn't exposed to the wear and tear of modern, competitive, industrial, commercial life. Even if she gets a job, it's usually fairly easy, a little job just around the corner, something not ver demanding, maybe physically quite demanding, but not really demanding of her as an individual, not requiring worry - she has a little cleaning job, or she goes and does some typing, or something like that, she doesn't take on usually real responsibility, and she doesn't have, usually, unless of course it's a, you know, a solo parent family, the responsibility of the family in the way that the man does, (or she hasn't until quite recently), so going out into the world and working and earning now, is much tougher on the man than on a woman, uh, and there's a lot of men who can't face it. So one can say that what usually happens is men, generally, react or respond in two ways, either they exaggerate their masculine qualities and become exaggeratedly competitive, and try to grow extra hair on their chest, and all that sort of think, or, if they're just unable to do that, they opt out, they opt out -ah- with one rationalisation or another into something soft and easy, into an almost a sort of 'feminine' role. Sometimes you'll see you know, him, staying at home, you know, and letting her go out to work, and being supported by her, or sometimes you'll

find him just getting a very easy little job, and just not you know, bothering to compete or try to get on better anymore, or trying to get into something 'artistic', you know, this is a favourite sort of refuge, or into some kind of pseudo-spiritual life. This is the cop out, that, actually you are not adequate to the situation, uh.

TAPE 6- SIDE 1: Continued from page 161 (top of page)

S: Well, it really is. You know, this is illustrated sometimes when you hear that somethings happended - maybe a very simple, everyday incident, something happened, maybe someone said something to somebody else, or someone did something, very simple, but to get to the bottom of this, and to find out what really happened and what was really said is sometimes very very difficult indeed, almost impossible. So sometimes one thinks about this, one tries to understand what happend in history, what really were the causes, you know, of such and such General's defeat, and of such and such a battle, you know, it's very difficult to get to the bottom of it and be sure, you know, well this is why he was defeated, or this is why he was uh so sort of went in history, you know, you can look at,~in this sort of way, It is sometimes very difficult to find out what actually, really, happened, I mean there are all sorts of well-known historical mysteries, you know,very much whether King Richard III really did murder those little

in the Tower, you know. They don't really know - soem say he did, some say he didn't, there are all sorts of arguments, pro and con - So almost every

162

thing with history, you know, can be looked at in this sort of way, and it's very difficult, you know, to know things that, that have happened, it is sometimes very difficult to get to the bottom of it, even it you interview all the persons concerned who were there at the time indistinct different reports, sometimes, they seem to be reporting completely different events, they still give different accounts, different reports, you know - And sometimes it's very difficult to find out whether somebody was actually there or not, sometimes there's a dispute about that, even though you've got all the people who were supposedly present-.

Barbara: It's kind of a selective - a selective process in each person seems to just pick out what seems to be relevant, or whatever they latch on to, and that's the whole of the reality rather than really being aware of what's been going on

S: But the difficulty is that sometimes, our actions have to depend upon our assessment of what actually happened. So sometimes we have to act completely in the dark

because, or just rely on our intuition, so to speak, because we just haven't been able to, haven't been able to "study widely and investigate everything thoroughly", we have to act without that very often, especially you know - the 'investigating everything thoroughly'. It is easier 'to study widely' than 'to investigate everything thoroughly'. So this is quite a thought - most of the time - much of the time at least, we act, we have to act, without knowledge. Supposing, (lets give a practical example) supposing your child falls sick, and you hear there's some new

163

drug on the market, which is just the thing, it's it's believe for that particular illness, that particular illness, that particular disease, all right, you think of getting that, naturally, but then you hear that, well so-and-so authority, medical authorities are not in favour of it, it's got certain side effects, so you start thinking, well, you know, is it wise to have this particular drug, let's say, administered to my child. You read a bit further then you say, well, the objections on the alleged side effects don't seem in fact to take place and doctors so far have done quite a lot of investigation so you go a bit further into it, but then you find Doctor so-and-so has done a bit of these investigations in the course of his career and some of them subsequently found to be erroneous, so in this way you go into it and into it, you get more and more confused, and you don't really know whether it's advisable to get that drug for your child or not, and in the end you have to decide, very often the layman has to decide, very often, just out of intuition, or a sort of hunch, that it might do good, or might not do good. But that's our position most of our lives, of having to make up our minds and act, with inadequate knowledge, with inadequate information, because you can follow nothing through to the end, apparently. So most of the time we are in fact living by faith, and the people who are the most effective in the world, are those who have got a lot of faith, especially faith in themselves, and who just do things regardless. Maybe make a few preliminary enquiries and so on, but don't insist, out of sort of basic feelings of insecurity on going into everything

164

thoroughly before they take any act&on. That way you just stultify yourself. So, you know, you just have to know how far to go, otherwise you just never take any action, you never do anything. And that's the secret of success really, in a very practical sense, you know, but you know when to stop you don't go into anything too far, otherwise you find out so much about it perhaps (chuckles) you can't do anything about it.

Voices

Barbara: Yes, it's a bit like that story of having the wound, the arrow wound, and sort of asking and finding out who did it and where it came from.

(Laughter)

S: Ah! yes! Right - Well that's the classic instance-

Verne: It takes a lot of faith to act on that - sort of knowledge that

S:...or inadequate ..?... in a way

Barbara: Stepping into that unknown...

S: Yeah, yeah . . . a lot of confidence, or, you know, knowing the very great (fear ?) of making you sick.

Verne: As I said, the real (wisdom ?) happens - that in itself it's not going to - to... happen.

S: Well some situations are more crucial than others, you know, some decisions are more crucial than others, but

an or complete certainty and predictability for every decision you may make, that is impossible.

Keith: (Scientists ?) are advising us not to become specialists but to . by knowledge or to know where to lay off

S: Well - No, we can't hope to be specialists in every branch of knowledge. There is no harm in being, you know,

165

a specialists in one or two branches of knowledge, I think that's probably a good thing, but you can't hope to be a specialist in every branch of knowledge, so that you can act in any particular situation with complete certainty that what you are doing is the right thing, you can very rarely have that certainty, even within that sphere where you are a specialist very often. It happens sometimes that the more of a specialist you are, the more conscious you become of the uncertainties and the gaps in your knowledge

Voices: Urn

S: It's the tyro who goes into (something ?) with complete confidence, but not the man who knows all about

it. So this is quite a point "That it is hard to study widely and investigate everything thoroughly" - But, you know, with experience of life, you develop a sort of knack, and a sort of 'sense', of how far you can go, how far you need look, and often you find people with very little knowledge succeeding, just because of their self-confidence and their drive, I mean, sometimes they get themselves into difficulties but they also manage to get themselves out of them very often. Where as you mustn't just blunder in like a fool without any sort of preliminary enquiries at all, that's the other extreme, but you mustn't make so many enquiries that you confuse yourself and just never act when some action is apparently needed. (Pause) Alright, next one - "It is hard to overcome selfishness and sloth" Well everyone knows that it's even hard to get up in the morning, isn't it? Hard to get out of bed, especially in cold, wet weather. It's as in India - "It's hard to overcome selfishness and sloth".

Verne: (Puma ?) has often mentioned in Meditation classes how you have one of these selves that doesn't want to get out of bed, but I have trouble when all of my selves don't want to get out of bed. (chuckles). Sometimes I can cope with one or two, but the whole lot - (lost in laughter)

S: Well there's no problem then is there?

(Laughter)

Verne: No meditation either- ~.

S: Complete absence of conflict-

Voices: Consensus-

(Laughter)

Well I think we need not say so very much about that one, it's so glaringly evident, it doesn't require many comments. "It is hard to avoid making light of not having studied the Way ~noughfl - The Dharma, enough. Why do you think one should ever make light of not having studied the Dharma enough - Notice the word is 'enough', it is not because of theoretical study, you know, to satisfy your theoretical interest, enough, you know, for your practical needs. So why is it 'hard to avoid making makin light of not havin studied the Wa enou h"? One would have though~it was something to be ashamed of, and to take very seriously, so why should one make light of not having studied the Way enough. "Studied" I presume means really studied it.

Priyananda: It suggests an over self-confidence in being too self-confident in your own, your own perceptions, your own abilities.

S: Yes-

Priyananda: And, and not wanting to understand the 167

Dharma enough.

S: Yes.

Purna: A lack of awareness of the of what we're ? that unless we do something, unless we get stream-entry, there 5 always that possibility

S: A lack of awareness of your own real spiritual need.

Priyananda: There's that saying, "there's always more that we can learn". There's always more that we can learn about the Dharma.

S: Yes - Which we need to know. It's not just

Q... indistinct.) So 'making light' is almost like making excuses, for not having studied the Dharma enough - we

don't have enough time, it's very, very difficult and

something of that sort, so we try to pass it off as not really mattering that we haven't studied the Dharma enough, you know. Because, you know, we don't realise how much we do need to evolve, in fact we're not sufficiently conscious of our own faults, and our own weaknesses, so we don't think it matters very much that we haven't studied the Dharma enough. Whereas studying the Dharma doesn't necessarily simply mean, you know, going deeper and deeper into texts and learning the original languages and all that, it means familiarising yourself with those principles, you know, which are really going to help you to develop and you know, putting them into practice, in your own daily life.

Barbara: It's only by making light of them that you avoid....

S: So you think you've got a lot of time, you don't have to do it now it doesn't matter, you can do it later

168

on, it's something that can be put off, and can be postponed. Or you think that there are other things that are more important. (Pause). - Alright, next one - 'It is hard to keep the mind evenly balanced'. That's a bit like some of those previous ones, isn't it? (You think of ?) balance as something creative, it's a creative response, not being thrown off balance by your experiences you know, 'Balance' refers to the (mind ?), the more we, it comes into contact with very different experiences one after another, it's not thrown, it remains even, it remains centred, sometimes you may have been in a very happy, favourable fulfilling sort of situation and immediately afterwards, in a quite different sort of situation, so you're not elated by the one or depressed by the other, you don't just react, you know, in that sort of violently different way according to the changing in your circumstance, so you remain evenly balanced. There's not many people can do this-

Ann: You could even apply this to concentration, keeping the mind in one place

S: Yes, because even when you are trying to concentrate, you know, distractions can be different kinds, there might be a loud, unpleasant noise one minute, and a very soft, attractive one the next, so you just keep the mind evenly balanced, you don't react to either - neither to this extreme nor to that extreme, so you're balanced.

Verne (indistinct) equanimity.

S: Um?

Verne: It could be equanimity?

S: Equanimity. Yes - It probably is the same word, yes. So, you know, the person with a balanced mind, the

169

person who practises equanimity is the person who doesn't over-react however extreme, to the favourable or the, you know, or the painful contact. He'd never becomes violently elated or very, very depressed. Maybe just a little reaction, but not too much, he keeps fairly sort of steady, fairly even, all being on the human level. I mean, we all know people who over- react, you know, something good happens well, they get wildly excited, something bad happens they get really depressed and upset and miserable. Whereas other people take it in a much more philosophic sort of way, you know, they're not thrown by these extreme experiences, in the same way.

Verne: Indistinct - Energy quite

an balance

S: It's not using too much or not using too little. Alright the next is very similar, "It is hard to refrain from affirmation and denial" . So what does that mean ? Yet 'affirmation' and 'denial' seem to be used in a rather extreme mutually exclusive sort of way. It's hard to refrain from being too absolute in your judgements, you see what I mean? It's very easy to think of someone as being really bad overlooking all those good points, and on the other hand it is very easy to become infatuated with someone and think they're really wonderful overlooking all their weaknesses - You just say "yes" to one kind of person and "No" to the other.

Barbara: I can see this happening that two people can be saying the same thing, really, and you will violently disagree with that person, and really agree with the other one, when they are both saying the same

170

S: Yes, Right - But we tend, in our judgement, to be unqualified, do you see what I mean? You can't say ? did this or did that - it is much too subtle. Often you can't say "Yes" or "No" to somebody's questions, very often they want you to, to give a straight forward 'Yes' or a straightforward 'No', but very often the situation is too complex for that. So one should refrain from a one-sided, exclusive, affirmation or denial, it very rarely gives you the truth of the situation. If someone asks you about someone, "well - is he a good man or is he a bad man?" Well what can you say, you can't say he's good, you can't say he's bad, as most people are a rather complicated mixture, depending on circumstances very often, depending where he is and who he is in contact with, how can you sort of label him categorically, either good or bad then they ask you, you know, do you think Christianity is true or false, well Christianity is a complex phenomenon, there are certain things in it that you would agree with, true and others that you would think definitely false, you can't just, say

'Yes' or just say 'No', you can't just affirm or just deny, you know, but you're expected to do this, - "Do you think the foreign policy of Australia is right or wrong"? Well you're expected to answer 'Yes' or 'No' - How can you? It's more complex than that. So you know, this one-sided affirmation or denial always indicates a certain immaturity of thought, an immaturity of outlook. I mean, as you get older, sometimes you can see this, you just realise how very complex life is, and it is very difficult to generalise. I mean, sometimes people say

171

'what do you think of women?' (Laughter) I am supposed to say well that they're very good, or they're very bad, you see, what do you think? How can one say just in a few words a simple straightforward statement, it's impossible, but you know there are so many qualifications one always needs to make about everything and everybody.

Barbara: You do become aware how it is relative to what

S: Yes - yes-

Barbara:.. ...In everything, and it's not an absolute, general thing - but it is surrounded by what conditions and what circumstance.

S: Yes - yes.

Udaya: I've found in talking to some people, they've asked me a question, and I've had to sort of pull their question to bits. Well what do you mean by it? And sometimes the people get quite frustrated and I realise

S: They say they just want a plain, straightforward answer -

Udaya: (Laughter) You've

S to a simple question

Udaya: You've realised then that they don't really want to know what they were asking about, they just want that answer 'Yes' or 'No' to justify something, or support them in some way

Voices: Yeah, yeah.

S: Because why do people affirm or deny in this strong exclusive way? It's because they want thereby to express a certain one-sided feeling. This is what it really

amounts to. So the affirmation or the denial becomes a rationalisation of a feeling of some kind. If you say that well "He's bad" what does it really mean. It really means you don't like him. It doesn't mean he's bad, it means you just don't like him - That's the real message, the real sub.

Verne: It's more to do with your projection than that person's actual being.

S: Yes

Barbara: And there are also the questions that end up like being ~ L&~ ~) like being convicted of being a witch, if you were 'ducked', you drowned in either case.

S: Right, yes.

Vijaya: Teachers must say, . ah..., when they are teaching kids, that this is right or that is wrong, urn - they can't say (openly ?), well this is right or this is my opinion because (this is ?) weak, they need to seem firm to the children, and this will come through to them as authoritative even though the teachers themselves aren't too sure.

S: Well very often people want you to make a very strong, straight, clear, unambiguous one-sided statement. This is very often what is demanded of one.

Verne: (Once one of children came to me Indistinct) I want to know if there are devas or if there are no (Laughter)

-?: A pretty good job of not affirming or denying

S: Well with regard to certain factual matters you can say well, it is so, or it is not so. Is that door open? or shut? (well you know ?) that it's definitely

shut, there is no doubt about it, you see. Provided you specify the actual moment, Now it is shut - you give the actual time, (We could get into a discussion about time... Indistinct ?) We'll leave that aside - But within that sort of closed you can make that definite factual statement, one way or the other. But with, with regards to more complex phenomena of people's experience and people themselves, you just can't. I mean, sometimes in History there's a discussion as to who won a particular battle - Well one would have thought that was plain enough. But sometimes both sides claim the

Udaya: Something just as common though, C(S~people over ready to affirm or deny something) f~ a sort of woolly thinking~a sort of

S: That's true -

Udaya an unwilling~55 to really commit themselves to having any opinion whatsoever, and they hedge around and hedge around, talking for hours, and you feel you've got nowhere.

S: Yes, because if they do you know, come to some sort of conclusion well that conclusion will indicate that a certain amount of action, at least some sort of commitment, and it's that that they want to avoid, so they instinctively shy away from any definiteness or clarity of thought. So you. So you ask one question or answer a question for them and they immediately raise another and go on doing that.

Vijaya: Just to perpetuate a conversation which could just be frivolous speech

° S: Urn

174

Vijaya: in some cases. It sounds serious, strong opinions, strong

S: Yes. I sometimes tell the story about the, the Christian clergyman who was preaching in this church on Sunday, and, he had his sermon all written out, and at one point he was really shouting at the congregation, so somebody in the congregation went up to his pulpit afterwards and looked at his manuscript, and saw that in the margin, against that passage where he had shouted, he had made a little note - "Shout here argument weak". (Laughter) Well, sometimes it's a bit like that. YOu don't know what when they are not inwardly sure, they become more insistent. Do you see what I mean?

Priyananda: to cover up their own inner doubt.

S: Yes - to cover up their own inner doubt. So this is why it is sometimes said that underneath the dogmatic belief that there lurks a sort of doubt, and this sometimes makes people more insistent - you find this with a lot of Christians. They don't like to hear your doubts because those doubts are activating their own, are triggering off that -

Verne: I find it very hard trying to hold a conversation with somebody who is being dead rational, and wanting answers to questions on that level, which can't be answered on that level. I had a conversation like that three or four weeks ago, and I got a headache, really trying to fit things into that context.

S: Yes - It's like trying to get, you know, to get the contents of a really big box into a little box, this is the sort of sensation you put into that little

S..~ cont'd box; but they just don't fit; they just won't go! 0 1 as though you are having to contract yourself in order to talk to that person, and that becomes -) a very, sort of oppressive experience.

VOICES: Yeh. Yeh.

S.: You are not allowed to bring your feelings or intuitions in- to It; you're only allowed

to bring cut-and-dried reasons which may be quite valid but they're not the whole story.

VIJAYA: The world seems to be like that.

S.: Oh yes!

VIJAYA: You leave yourself, your subjective self, out or it completely.

PURNA: I still reel that the weird thing is that they don't!

VOICES: (Jumbled)

~ They don't have to - they profess to do. They profess to do, but actually their motives°
.....

VOICES: Yeh, yeh.

___ are all sorts of violent emotions, and - I've mentioned this before - one or the things that surprised me about Buddhist academic scholars, when I came into contact with them for the first time, was the passions that motivated them : the feuds, the competitions, the jealousies, so violent! But they professed to be calm and poised and objective, because they hadn't consciously admitted emotions into their life, and into their work. They were just 'playing in the basement', so to speak, controlling things from there. (Pause) So it is very difficult to sort of keep your middle point - to be clear and direct in your distinctions, but at the same time, not to go to extremes or affirmation or denial : to recognise the complexity of the situation, but still to keep a certain line or action, a certain course of conduct. It isn't easy to do both of these. All right! Then it says: "it is hard to come into contact with clear perception of The Way." - it is easy enough to have ideas and understanding, but to come into contact with clear perception of 'The Way' - direct, personal experience - is hard. This is sufficiently obvious, isn't it? And then: "It is hard to help others towards Enlightenment according to their various needs." Well, it is hard enough to help oneself, and one would have thought one knew one's own needs, but very often one doesn't!

PURNA: "To see one's own nature".....

~ Ah? Sorry'. 'It is hard to .

END OF SIDE ONE TAPE SIX

SIDE TWO TAPE SIX

S. : (cont'd. ... ~a bit is missing so assume it is the last bit to the sentence " "It is hard to see one's own nature. ")

~ This is connected with what we were talking about yesterday, that is to say, perceiving - being really aware of one's own conditionedness, one's own relativity; if one could really do that, really be that, well then, at least for a moment, one would be unconditioned; or, in a manner of speaking, experiencing the unconditioned. So that's the way to study The Way':

through one's perception, or one's awareness of the conditioned, you experience the unconditioned, and it is the unconditioned which is the Dharma. It is not a question of sort of understanding the workings of one's own nature - it's not just that, in a scientific, sort of psychological way: you are sort of standing back, standing aloof in a sense, and just seeing the conditionedness without the 'seeing' itself being conditioned, without the 'seeing', itself being re-active, but just mirror-like, and then your experience at that moment is unconditioned, and then of course, you do 'study The Way', because you are directly in contact with the Unconditioned, you are unconditioned. And then - "It is hard to help others towards Enlightenment according to their various needs." I was thinking just then that one could be paradoxical and say - it's easier to help others than to help oneself, So what do you think of that?

LJi)AiA: ulten yuu are too close to yuurselr to have it in focus.

~ies. Sometimes it applies to people who are very close to you - you know them so well you 'can't see the wood for the trees'! But someone comes to you, maybe whom you don't know particularly well, or maybe you don't know them at all, and that person may be quite open and all that, and you can see quite clearly what they need to do, because you are not in the least emotionally tied up with them, or entangled in any way, so you can be completely objective and you can, maybe, give some very good advice, and tell them what they need to do. But with people that you're more closely connected with and perhaps, in a sense, most or all with your own self, it's much more difficult. Sometimes you can see with regard to somebody - 'Well, the best thing for him to do is to go off and have a solitary retreat.' It's so obvious it sticks out a mile! But when it comes to you, you say - 'Well, do I need a solitary retreat? Could I really go one? Would it be the best thing for me to do?' You are not so sure, and not so clear. So sometimes, in this strange, paradoxical way, it's easier to see the spiritual needs of others, and to help others even, rather than to help oneself. This is not what is usually said, is it?

UDAYA & others: No.

S.: . or usually thought. But at least there are times when it is true, circumstances in which it is true. "It is hard to help others towards Enlightenment according to their various needs." This is very important: "according to their various needs". In order to be able to help them you must be able to see their needs to recognise that their needs are various; you can't just apply one standard formula to everybody, and say, - "Well, do this and you'll be on the right path." Well, with certain things, you can say to everybody, but they are usually so general, even though perfectly true, as to be useless in specific instances - specific cases.

I'77

178. - S ~2 S - 2/6

UDAYA: Or you could, maybe, even recognise their needs, but not be quite sure what appropriate action should be taken by them.

S.: I~ybe not in a very concrete way, but u8ually, if you see the need, you can also see what needs to be done to meet that need; if~ in fact, that need can be isolated, so to speak. Well, you may see that someone's need is to go away and have a solitary re- treat. That may be perfectly clear, crystal clear, but supposing they've got a family, and supposing they have to go to work, and supposing they can't get time off, well, what are they to do? What is your advice going to be then? S0~ sometimes, you can see some- one's need, but it isn't all that easy to give advice. Not because you don't know what will meet their need, but because you have to take into account their total situation, their total circumstances. I mean, in the case of lots of people you can say, "Well, the best thing, you ~now, - do you agree? - is to go off to England, and stay there for a year. It might even be what they need, but it may not be what is possible. So, you know, that makes it diffi- cult. So, when you give advice, ideally you should~ not only take li~o account specific needs, even specific spiritual needs, but also that person's total situation, and the possibility', the practical possibilities of that situation~ otherwise, ~ou know, you might even be a little unkind in telling them they ought to do this, or ~ to do that, with regard to this one particular spiritual need, Ignoring their circumstances. Though of course, it's also true that people can usually do a bit more ~han they think they can. That's true as well....~Pause)a bit more. Then there's a saying that is a bit similar to some we've already had - "It's hard to see the various phenomena without being moved by them". That's very obvious, isn't it? And again, the next one is almost the same - " h r to em n unmoved b our -zsurroundinsll~ those phenomena which are immediately around us - it is very hard not to be moved by them.

UDAYA: Sometimes in m~ditation...ah....probably not everyone, but I think , probably quite a few people...um...experieflce a sort of thing...um...that's maybe a different state of consciousness~ but not necessarily a higher state° of consciousness....will lust sort Of~ move past....um...and I think it's difficult, often, not to get caught up in that sort of thing, and just be quite open- minded about It, and just let it flow by. Often it's a bit more interesting than what's been going on.

~ "Remaining unmoved" doesn't mean again remaining insensitive, or anything of that sort. (It means~'just ~alanced' . And fin- ally: "It is hard to understand the proper use of skilful means. in teaching and practising the Uharma." The skilful meahs is the means that is exactly appropriate to that particular situation, that particular person's needs. It is very easy to give general advice; good, sound, practical advice; but to give advice that is suited to the specific situation, to the specific need, ~that's very difficult, and that's where the skilful means comes in.

ThAi{~k{A ~subsequently ANIKETA) It takes much wisdom.

~Nni. And it is not easy to estimate someone's possible reaction to what you say to them. We find this even in the case of the

S°. :~cont'd) Buddha. There is the famous story I mention some- times, that the Buddha had a few monks staying with him and he taught them the meditation on death, and then he went off

on his alms-round, or something of that sort, and when he came back he found they had all committed suicide. So you know, clearly, the Buddha had taught them the meditation on death with the best of intentions, but that was the effect, that's the way they had taken it. So we have to be very careful of what we say, because we don't always know how somebody is going to take it. We have to be aware of them. We may give perfectly good advice, but then they take that advice in, so to speak, the wrong sort of way.

BARBARA GILL: I find this is where personality comes in quite a lot. I find that...um...I will take from someone the pointing out of my...um...of what I need...um... where I would not be open to another.

S.: Yes.

BARBARA G.: And also...um...I can see where I can direct others in the same way: that I could give advice to others...um...point out to others...but....

S.: We~I~ this is why it's good to have a team of people helping, so the appropriate person can, you know? point out certain things that need to be pointed out to somebody. (Pause)

If you know that somebody is very sensitive, you know you won't ask someone who is rather sort of blundering in his way of talking, if you want to approach them about something: you would choose someone who was much more sensitive, who would therefore do it in a sensitive sort of way.

BARBARA G.: I find that where there has been some communication that has taken place from a very positive angle outside any kind of difficulties or anything....where that contact has been made prior to any difficulties, I find that easier.

You should beware of communicating with anybody only about difficulties.

VOICES: Yes!

You've got to be able to take your stand on ground, as it were which is common and which is positive. If you communicate with someone only about difficulties, sooner or later they'll have a 'thing' about you, you know, every time you turn up it means trouble! That's not good.

VIJAYA: you can get tangled up in other people's difficulties quite easily.

S.: M[n.

VIJAYA: I think retreats are a really good thing, it seems as if anyone gets a meditative experience, it seems to have an 'answering' effect on so many problems, because they are elevated from (it), it allows a distance to (be) put between them and their problems, and they can see where they've been, and where they are going.

1~. - ~ £+2 S - 2/b

~ Right! You can get so boring and so frustrating, bfl^t some- times you-can't drop it, you go on and on, and I do believe from what[°] I he[°]ar[°], that husbands and wives very often[°] do this: they go on and on half the night. They don't want to just stop and go to sleep, or listen to the radio together, or even watch TV - never mind, but just stop it. That's not the way to sort out per- sonal problems.

VIJAYA: I think encounter groups and some'problem'-orientated psychology just don't work.

S.: That's true. Yes. Often it is a means of indulgence. ~ughter)

BARBARA G.: Yes. 'NeuroLc,' kinds.....

PRIYANANDA: Itaybe a sort of indulgence instead of a catharsis. They've sort of gone into the problem² and sort of keep on going into it until there's this sort of crisis.

~ It's all right to have a catharsis. It's all right to bring up all these unpleasant things from the past but very often, once they've done that, all they can think of is to do it over again! (Laughter) which seems quite unnecessary.

BAR3M~ G.: Right.

S.: The more times you do it, the better it's supposed to be! Really, you're sort[°] of forcin yourself to be negative to satisfy your psychologist, or ~our t erapist.

BARBARA G.: I found this (in an encounter group type of gathering I used to participate in) that, instead of relating.....that.. that....although space was given to the negative aspect² and that is necessary sometimes to be able to just let it all spill out, nevertheless it seemed continually, people..... when we were get- ting on a more positive level, and were really getting more...0 um....getting closer together, there was almost that fear, in a sense, so another problem would come up, and that sort of real contact, that real communication from that positive level was.... was just shut off.

S.: Yes. Well, some years ago I came to the conclusion that a lot of people had positive things repressed rather than negative things.

BARBARA G.: Yes~°

~ The assumption seems to be, on everybody's part almost, that whatever was repressed, was negative, so if you weren't bringing up something negative you weren't bringing up repressed material. If it was positive it could not[°] have been repressed, so to speak, so you weren't encouraged to be positive, you were encouraged to be negative because that neant you were bringing up repressed mat- erial, so I concluded that, actually, this was quite wrong. Yes, as you said, sometimes we do need to bring up something negative that has been repressed, and let it out, but more often thaⁿ not, I'm sure, people had, through force of circumst nces to repress the positive side of themselves, and it is that~hich also has to

S.: (cont'd) be let out; but very often it isn't.

BARBARA G. But very often, the negative, ° in a se°nse, ° 5 not really negative~either, it is because~ of the repres°iOn~.4~...! ° the lack of opportunity 7or the expression of the positive emotions.

~ Right! And also there is the rather unpleasant assumption that the more negative you are being, the more negative things you are °bringing up, the more anger, hatred fear, and jealousy, the more you're being yourself! (Laughter~ So when you are be- ing nice and positive and friendly, you're not really being your- self : you're covering up something!

VIPULA: You're blocking off your 'nasties'!

S.: Yes, 'you're blocking off your nasties'! You know, this seems such a cynical view of human nature: as though there's only a sort 0~ cgss-pool underneath, and nothing else, and you're encouraged to bring up more and more of this, and if you can't find anything of that nature, well, you've sort of got to invent it on the spot. But anyway, it's not even nice to talk about it. I sometimes sayj even talking about negativity is negative. It is better not to talk about it but to get on to something positiv~ You can't ° really talk about negativity in a positive way, I think. You know, you start feeling the negativity infecting the atmosphere even when you're talking about it positively, or trying to.

~EGhA (indistinct) put your finger on it.

S.: We., anyway, there are twenty hard, or difficult things hard, or quite hard

VIJAYA: One thing that intrigues me is that all these things are to do with practice, whereas the previous section was....um.... holding it at its loftiest peak -"the nerson who does nothin~. practises nothin~q nothin~."

~ ~ni. Well, there is this point, (maybe we can conclude with this point),there is this point, you know, it is true that the spiritual life is very hard, all these things are hard, but is it correct to think of the spiritual ONLY in terms of be- ing something hard to do ? I think we have to be careful of that, partly, maybe, on account of our Christian conditioning: it can also be easy, and possibly . It isn't always go- ing to be hard and . Certainly it is hard, or there is a hard aspect to it, or there are certain specific things which are very hard for us to do, but actually there are other things we can enjoy doing. It is true that meditation is hard; it is hard to get concentrated, but then again meditation can be a source of great enjoyment, even the effort can be a source of enjoyment. So, we shouldn't over-emphasise this hard aspect of the spirit- ual life: it's also an enjoyment. It's also even a pleasur°e.' You can enjoy growing: it's fun! It's fascinating! It's interesting! - there's this aspect°too. I mean, the Dhammapada (noisy traffic drowns out~afew words) say: "i°iappily we live among °those who ~r°~flhappy.~tt Despite the hardship, despite thc fact ti~a°t it is hard to follow the Path, yet we are happy. So this is important too. After all, what could be more natural than to grow ? So we ought to be happy growing . All right, let's leave it there.

SIDE I TAPE 7

BARBARA G.: TEXT SECTION ik.

~ ~irst, we should say something about the phrase - 'I~reservin~ the will'~ and the translator adds: 'I to stru~~le onwards'. "Will I like 'power I', is a rather ambiguous term, isn't it? So what do you think is meant by this "will" to stru~~le onwards?

KU~A: ~erhaps it's getting more at a movement or the heart towards, rather than the head as alienated from emotion.

~: I't's a movement or the total being. It's not just the will- ing of the ego, so to speak. So by "purifying the mind and pre- serving the will I, one might even say: ~~~ef~~tegrated will - 'I to Struggle onwards', you can come in contact with the Way.

VIJAYA: There's a later reference to (the Way in the following verse, saying: "When the will is in conformity with the Way.

~ies~ ~ight~ So it surely doesn't mean it's the will in the narrow sense. It's the whole being: when the whole being is in conformity with the Way. Also notice the way in which the Buddha ~rst the question. The question is: "By what method can we acknowledge of our previous lives?" That is, part of the question. Part of the answer is: "You should be able to put a stop to life in the phenomenon here". So the Buddha doesn't really answer the question, does he? He doesn't really explain how one can attain knowledge of our previous lives. He explains how you can come to the end of all lives. ~ou see the difference? It's as if he says, "Well, what does it matter, you know, about attaining knowledge of your previous lives! - the important thing is to put an end to desire~'desire' in the sense of 'craving' here and now, and then you will have no further life to worry about! It's rather like what we were talking about earlier on, - that why don't you solve all your problems? - Go back and solve them all, and maybe then, get started on the spiritual life. But you don't really have to do that.

UDAYA: It's sort of avoiding coming to terms with the present, in a way.

~ Miii. Yes! ALSO, this phrase: "by eliminatin~ desires and seek- in~ ho~~ else" - ...um....well, sometimes, only too often, we eliminate one desire, but it's promptly replaced by another, perhaps subtler and even more insidious. But, you know, being that it is the 'negative' aspect of the spiritual life that is being stressed: "Eliminate all desires, and seekin~ for nothin~ and ~to to life" - but there's also the other aspect~ of cultivating the positive, and developing and growing.

BARBARA G. It's almost as if, until you take responsibility for being born in the first place, that there is no end to the continual being born.

~ Miiim. ~tmrn. Yes. BARBARA G: And not putting it back as if it's the parents, or the things that have happened through your life. k°

S : 'ies. Iu'l ctLfl vIn~y ~aige wna° ~ ~u t~e i~e~punsib£l it~ ~r. ~ knvW? 'th~S is staxi~~~arct ~ci~h~st ~hraseoI9~Y~ Dflt~ ~ tfliii~~° ex~ia£ning t&ie Uliarma to 8the~ ~oplc~ we a~~ to be care- liii a~~ut '~sin00 e~~ressiuns ii~e - t'pL1ttlfl'~ a sto~ ~Q ~t~~"~ ~e- ca~se lt'j wi~e~S%ood ni~ilistica~iy

VERI~ BARRET: I remember when we were first studying the "Bodhi- caryavatala' seninar I was worried about my past karma, and how I was going to cope, and I did open it up one night, at the Centre, and you saying , "~ositivity in the present can be tried for past karma."

S.: Oh yes.'

VERI~ B.: I was not that much about it.

(several words indistinct)

~ Well, again, perhaps the parable of the man wo~ded by the poisoned arrow is relevant here. If you want to trace back into your previous lives, and see how it happened, and how you went wrong, in a way, it is a waste of time You can go° back and back indefinitely just as you can go back and back in this life it- self, into aii sorts of old, past problems, right back into your childhood, and all the terrible things that happened to you; the terrible things mother did to you; the wicked thoughts that she thought when she was p~egnant with you; all this must have affected you; the time she went and saw that horrific film (Laughter) You're sure it must have given you a jolt even though you were in the womb, you know, etcetera, etcetera. You can go back and back in this sort of way. Well it's better to put a stop to it, here and now! Let's deal with the present. After all, the pre- sent is the result of the past, so the past ~ here in the presnt, so deal with ~l~resent, that's the best w&v to deal with it. ~ right, let's go on to fifteen.

I~~GHA: TEXT -¼SECTIONI.

~ So clearly, here, a distinction is made between "goodness" and "greatness". These seem to represent two technical Chinese terms, in a way. So what do you think is the basis of the distinct- ion between "goodness" and "greatness" here ? Between follow- ing the Way according to what is true, and having the will in con- formity with the Way ?

BARBARA G.: It seems to tie up with the precepts, with 'sila', the difference between following the precepts, and when they come as a natural expression of . . . one's being.

S.: Yes. This seems to be the basis of the distinction: the fol- lowing the Way as a sort of discipline, and following of the Way - following the j)°harma - because your nature is conforming with it, so that you are following it spontaneously. This seems to be the basis of the distinction.

VIJAYA: This would seem to neutralise past karma, and the second would seem to prevent

the generating of fresh karma, in a way

S. :Yes.

185. - S 42 S - 1/7

VIJAYA:.....fresh bad karma.

S.: iJer haps the point at which you pass over from the one to the Qther is the'point of no return', the point of 'stream-entry'. Then you are swept away by the current, so° to speak, - you are one wjth the current. You can't fall° ~ack, not into lower states anyway. "Goodness~ and "greatness" then are the technical terms in Chinese, It's very important to make that transition, beeause until you make that transition, you can always fall right back, and this is something I ask people to remember sometimes - that however far you might have got, however far you might be getting on with your meditation, however well you might understand the Dharma, and however positive you might be, and however committed, if you haven't reached the 'point of no return' ~ou can always ~all back; you ~an always fall away; and right away, and, may- be, have nothing to do with Buddhism, you are completely cut off from ~he Dharma, from your spiritual practice, from the spiritual community. You can't be sure you won't be, unless you've made that'point of no return'. That is what one should really work for: to be 'irreversible', sp to speak, at least in Mahayana terms. All right, sixteen.

VERNE B.: TEXT SECTION 16.

S.: So what is "~reat power and acme of brilliance" ? "To be able to bear insult without retort implies great power" That is quite a thought~ isn't it ?We usually think of bearing insult, forbear- ance, patience, as sort of passive, don't we ? But here, the Buddha is saying that "to be able to bear insult without retort implies great power". You see this ? That the apparent pas- sivity is really great power. So why do you think this is ?

UDAYA: That person is so strong and confident and secure within themselves that they can't be put off by something as negative as somebody, you know, calling them a name, or insulting them. So that's great power to be that strongand confident.

~;Yes. Right! Yes, patience implies strength; forbearance imp- lies strength and power. "He that does not cherish cause for re- sentment but remains calm and firmly eaul under all circumstances, °~ou°t indulging in abuse~ will certainlY be honoured by men." 'l°oe 5 not cherish cause for resentment" - even if he has been given cause for resentment, he doesn't bear it in mind,' he doesn't cher- ish it; he doesn't go over it again and again in his mind, he, sort or, forgets about it; he's undisturbed' remains calm and firm, and equal under all circumstances; bears ail things without in- dulging in abuse himselr, "so, he will be honoured by all men. W~ll, he may or he may not be, now-a-days, but~ at least, he will be happy, rirm, and secure within himself. Of course'insult" can mean different things to different people at different times. I mian, in the old dayspeople used to fight duels ir they thought their honour

had been affronted. It might have been a v~ry small thing, that we wouldn't have bothered about, nowadays you know, some one walked on the 'wrong' side of the steel:: 1 could be taken as an insult, if he didn't give way to you. It could be taken as an insult, and you could 'challenge him to a duel - fight.' One person may have been killed. They had these sort of notions about honour.

tt;b. - S L+2 S -

VE~NE 3.: I think this is one of the most difficult things or all to develop.

S.: Patience and forbearance.

VOICES: Mm. Mm.

VE1{NE B.: For me, it's ii. I feel insecure in an area I'm just waiting for someone to pick up on

~ Well, what is an insult ?

VERNE B.: insult.

~ ~o 'insult' is something which shows you don't think much of the other person; you look down upon them you have an attitude of contempt towards them, so, the insult tends to humiliate because it shows that the other person is looking down on you; they don't think much of you, and of course, you react to that, almost perhaps, more than to anything else.

VOICES.: ~t.

DAVE MOO~:(subsequently RATNA&ETO°): Even ii there's nothing wrong with the other person, even ii it was a perfect being, a Buddha, you could still show your contempt for them and insult them, but of course the Buddha wouldn't react.

3A~~ARA 0.: Mm. L~e it's an attack on the whole worth of your being, just as you .0....just because..... not seeing you as a being, or even as being.

S.: Yes. Yes.

V~I{NE B.: That whole area is getting a bit clearer to me now, but when I first came into contact with Buddhism I was still, sort of veryum....thought ill of myself that I didn't know, and when people are rejecting things said to you and saying 'That is you', and ii. you're not sure think yourself whether that is an aspect of you, or whether it's somebody's fabrication, then .

S.: Yes. If it's a fabrication, they are putting you down. In that case it's an insult; but if it isn't a fabrication, you know, if what they are saying what they actually do see, is there, then it can't be taken as an insult, unless, of course, you imagine it isn't there. ~ v~ri could say that

~ ,n~iit ~ ~ ~- liberate attempt ~ put somebody down ~, 'rou ~~~~ ~ in~ attention to some unpleasant aspect of the~ ~lit or appearance, and so i'orth. li mav be there, obiectively, or it ma~ not Le, but your purpose jii drawin~ attention to it is to de- nigrate and humiliate that other person, and ol course, tney us- ually react, because they ieel that their whole being is at stake, their whole worth, perhaps, is at stake. Yerhaps it isn't, but that is, usually, how they would reel.

VERN~ B.: I very much with the 'Perfection of Patience' from the "Bodhicaryavatara"

1~7. - S°&+2 S I!7A

~es. The (ordinary ?) insult also suggests some~hing deliberate - that someone does it quite calculatedly. It isn't some- thing that happens by ac°cident, or that you didn't mean to say; it's a sort of deliberate, conscious, almost calculated, you know, humiliation of another person by drawing attention to some dis- pleasing feature in their appearance or personality, which may or ma°y not, be there, in such a way as to make them reel humili- ated.

BA~{BAflA G.: ~ometimes nothing may be said .

S.: Ah. Silence can be insulting, yes.

BAt(BARa G.:it can just be an ignoring.

VOICES.: Miii.

~ Well in the army, in the old days, there used to be an of- fence called "dumb insolence". Yes. iou could be put on a charge for "dumb insolence".

JIM S1~A1{k'ifi~;S:(subsequently VIYULA): Just by ign~rance.

~ ies. Someone asks you a question - you just ignore them. That can be very Insulting, because you are treating them as.... you know, with contempt, not even worthy of an answer. And sometimes people can get very angry, you know, when you keep quiet. iou may be keeping quiet out of patience - feeling that, well, If you say anyth°ing at all, it will only make the situation worse, so actually, you are keeping quiet, but your very patience makes it worse for so~e people, because they take your silence as the si- lence of contempt, and they get all the more angry. SO~ you can't win either way~ (laughter) You saY something, anythin~, and they get more angry. If you say nothing, they get more angry. iou shouldn't live with such a person, because you can't win!

V~;i{N~ B.: it's interesting that it's got "wiI~thout" ypu know, "able to bear insult without retort", because it's some- times in that retort where you lose the energy, you know

~ Miii. Mm.

V~RNt; 3.: iou lose your baiance an~ equanimity.

b'.: An~way, tnat's "great power", you kn0w° patience and for- bearance, or, "~reat power and the acme or briilliance is reached when tne mind is utterl~ ~ur~ed ul immurities and nothin~ false ur~l°oul remains to besmirch its~~urity." "raIse or Ioul~~ - that's an interesting sort Of apposition. It's as though 'ialse ' sug- gests aii tne inteiiectuai OD5curati0ns~ and 'foul' suggests all the emotional obscurations. .

VOICES: Miii. Mm.

so you're doubly purified - you're intellectually purl- f°ied and emotionally purified, ana that's the'acme of brilliance'. ~t"when there is nothin~ from before the formation ofheaven and earth unti~orinanof~thetenuarters of L(' ~

Id~. - S 42 S - 1//.

~.:~cont'd): that you have not seen, heard, and understood: when you have attained your knowledge of everything, that may be called 'brilliance'. So the footnote says - "A mind purged of impurities is nigh°er than the most complete and universal knowledge - that's only'brilliance', but, ah!, the mind utterly purged of im- purities is the'acme ~r brilliance a, the hei~ht of brilliance! So that~~ a quIte in~esting ; but the purity is as I've said, both an intellectual and an emotional purity. I's purifi~tion irom what the 'Mahayana' calls the veil of, ah, 'rec- ognizable' (?), as well as the veil of 'passi~ns' - you no longer have a distorted view of Reality~ and you no longer have a turbu- lent emotional life. Your view of Reality is quite clear and pure and bright, and your emotional life is completely harmonious and positive. When you have these- two together°, then you are thor- oughly purified. That°is the 'acme of brilliance' according to this text. In t7words° of one of the Tibetan texts that has been translated: you are both 'calm' and 'clear'- the 'calmness' referring to the emotional state; the 'clarity' referring to the intellectual state; - 'intellectual' in the sense of 'higher spirit- ual vision'. You areIcalm'and you ~r~~~~ear~~ You are emotion- ally positive, and you hav&, also, the higher spiritual vision that 'sees things as they arel°.

VERNE B.: (Very indistinct)

~Mm?

VERNE B.: Who is the translator ?

~ I forget who thi°° translator is but it is a little book put out by, I think, 'Shambala'. Is it 'Shambala' or "Dharma Pub-' lishing"?

pUI~NA: Tarthang Tulku. I think it might be 'Dharrna PublishingI PURNA & S°.(in unison): Tarthang Tulku - 'Calm and Clear' - it's a° little Tibetan text.

VIJAYA.: ~ipam. (N.B. ~~pam is the original Tibetan writer)

S.: Yes, by !~pam. It corresponds to 'samatha' and 'vipassana' 'samatha', literally - 'pacification', is the state of higher, ~ositive emotionality, such as you experience in the (practice ?) of the mettabhavana and ? bhavana, and so on; and 'vipassana°', in the sense of the higher spiritual insight, which culminates in Wisdom, Transcendental Wisdom. We go into these quite a bit in the seminar, "Dhyana for Beginners". So you've got three things here : you've got patience and forbearance, you've got emotional posi- tivity, and intellectual, or spiritual, clarity. The knowledge that is referred to - which is called 'brilllant' t~seems to be of the nature of a complete, coniprehensive, scien fic understand- ing. You see what I mean ? This amounts only to 'briiiiance'. The 'acme of brilliance' is reached when the mind is utterly pur- ged of impurities: (wh°~n) we have the higher spiritual vision, and complete emotional positivity, on the highest possible level.

~FSli)'EITAPE

189. - S 142 5 - 2/7.

SIDE 2 TAPE 7.

S.: All right, seventeen.

PURNA: TEXT SECTION 17°

~ Mm. In this section the Buddha gives the, as it were, spirit- ual reason for eliminating 'longing and desires' - that they ob- struct the vision of the Truth. This is the real reason. They distort your mental outlook. They render you unable to see straight, unable to see clearly. But it is interesting that he says in the first sentence, "Men who cherish longings and desires."

VOICES: Right. ~es. Mm.

S.: Not simply "Men who have longings and desires". So why do you think that is ?

VERNE B.: the attachment to them, or tne.....

~ 'Cherishing' is more than attachment to them; it's almost a cultivation of them : you don't just have them!

\fOiCI!~S: Yeah!

S.:You're born with them, you can't possibly, in a sense, have none!

~IEGHA:.....but it's good to have them - like, it's saying (afw° words indistinct)

~Mm?

MEGHA: They think it's ~ood to nave them.

~ Yes. Yes. It's almost like saying it's good to have them; almost refusin~ to give them up, refusin to do anything about them. They actively cherish them. o how do you actively'cher-ish longings and desires' ? (rause) Well, you go over and over them in your mind, you.....

VOICES (murmuring)

~ Uh ? (no answer) you cultivate them in your mind, and also, you sort of, ah, deliberately go into those situations where they wili be stimulated. You avoid those situations where they won't be stimulated, even, perhaps. So you don't merely have these iongings and desires, you don't merely entertain them: you actively cherish them, you cultivate them, you look after them, you ~ct them even! Bo,'just as clear water be stirred up with the hand, none of them, luoking into it will perceive thair reflec- tions, so many whose minds° are stirred up by longings and desires wii°i not perceive the Way., So you 'sramanas' must abandon long- ings and de°sires." And here~ ol' course, one should be careful not to take 'abandoning longings and desires" as giving up all energy and all effort, ana ieaving oneself in an inert sort of state. Well, how or why do you think it is, all these longings and desires obstruct the vision of the truth? How does that actually A~p~r' ?

190. - S ~2 S - 2/?

UDAYA: It clouds your percep°tion of things, ilke the old saying, "If a pickpocket sees a saint, he only sees his pockets" - so, you see your reality in terms ol your wants and needs.....

S.: Mm. Mm. Yes.

UDAYA: ... and so it (clouds ?) your perception.....

~ ~es.

V&JAiA: We start setting up boundaries within which we operate.

S.: Yeh. Yeh.

VIJAYA:going towards our limited goal.

S.: Mm. Mm.

VIJAYA:and it is always replaced by something else if we get there.

KEITH DOWNER (subsequently DHA~UWHARA): You perhaps postpone deve~opment until after you've, um... satisfied them ..

S.: Yes, there's that too. Yeh. You sometimes, quite quickly, get taken over by your

longings and desires - in fact, oblivious to everything else. you really narrow your outlook. And also, notice this first sentence says, "Men who cherish longings and desires are those who have not perceived the Way" 1 - because you cherish longings and desires you don't perceive the Way, but also you can say you cherish longings and desires because you have not perceived the Way : the more you perceive the Way, the less you cherish longings and desires - the less interest you take in them. (Some words indistinct because Udaya is speaking at the same time)

LJ1)AYA: you see the emptiness of them....

~ Yes, you see the emptiness of them.

VERNE 3.: you see people deliberately whipping up....um.....

~ Mm. Yes! 'Whipping up' is the term, I think~.

V~~~ B.:to really, you know,for want of some sort of stimulation, thinking that everything is in that limited sphere.

S.: ~es.

VERNE B .quite sad4

S.: ~es, when they get tired of something, they whip up a bit of enthusiasm for it, and very often it doesn't work (physically ?) feeling nothing in particular.

BARBARA G: yes. it's confusing too you think it's the objects of your longings and desires, and not having them fulfilled which is causing the pain and the suffering, when in effect it is the

191. - S ~2 S -

J3A~{3At{A G.(cont'd) : very state of longing and desire which causes the suffering.

~° Ah! Yes! I sometimes refer to a teaching here~ which I think was attributed to a yogini in South India, and she said that : on the fulfilment of desire you feel happiness, and she went on to say that, actually, it is not the fulfilment of the desire that is the cause of the happiness; the happiness is brought about by the cessation of the desire, in as much as the desire, yes, has been fulfilled -you've got what you want -but the happiness is not by having that particular object, but by the fact that since you've got it, just for an instant, the desire ceases, and because the desire has ceased, therefore you are happy.~.....

~~~A~A G.: ~eah!

vvi~iSS: Mm.

~ .....but, you know, it lasts a ~nube, ~cause when yOu'?~ really got what you thou ht you desired, well, you find it's not su satisfactory as you d thought; 50~ back comes the desire £'or sometning else - something different. SO~ you know, one is much more happy when one hasn't any desires. You are°at rest within yourself; there isn't this sort oI° irritable reaching out after something, you know, outside yourself. You're just caim and naijpy. i mean, if something comes along to enjoy, well, maybe you enjoy it: a pleasant meal, eh, but, you knO~, withnout any fuss or bother, and when you've had it, when you've enjoyed it, you just let it go; you don't think about it, you know, that's that, you've had It. You don't start wandering about, you know, concocting another meal. (laughter) Sv~ ypu j~now, we not only nave £ong- ings and desires, we actually cherish them, we try to whip them up; we even try b'O suft of fiog ourselves into feeling something, or desiring sometning, wnen we aon't reaily want to. That's the strange sort of thing under the fliistai~efl impress- ion that unless we are full of desires or enjoying ourselves, sat- isfying tne aesires, ilfe WvUId be rtthter empty and meaningless.

Vj~~~: You know that little articie in the section on lThe desire i-or the Eternal' - it's sort of..... it's only oernapsin contacting tnat higher ~ovei of desire that you can get that lower levei into pers£;ective, anyway.

~.: ieh. Mm. Yeh.

VERNE B.: ....it says: all desires, really, are just tne uniul- rilled° desire tor the Eternai.

~ Mm. Mm. There's also the point that there are certain des- ires wnich diminish d5 you get older. But sometimes,older people are not satisfied to let them diminish.... (Laughter).....~hey ~activate them by some artificial means . (kJause) xou know that's really sort of pathetic: older people, not only trying to recreate their past youth, but trying to sort of restimulate their youthfui desires - not accept the° fact that they have in fact, waned, and that that period of life is past, and that it is time for something else, for some other kind of interest, some other, higher kind of desire.°

1~2. - S ~2 S - 2/7

BARBARA G.: This is very relevant to a woman in a menopausal stage, when it can be seen as a complete release from...from hav- ing to...um...experience her being tied to this...to this cycle in the same way.

S.: Right! Well, it reminds me of the story that is told of So- phocles, the great tragic poet. He was asked when he was eighty, how he felt now he didn't experience,any longer, sexual desires; and he said he felt as though he had been released from ravening wild beasts. (Laughter) Maybe, not everyone would be in a position of having to say that, but that's certainly how he felt.

VIJAYA: I've found it necessary being rair on myself~ just acknow- ledging that I have desires at times when I've felt a ~t dry and alienate~, and letting the desire have a little bit of a free rein so I can experience myself again; whereas, ah, you know, there are times when

you're not in touch with something higher, you're not feeling it, you've been a bit dull, and I think it's only better acknowledged; and I suppose everyone, until they're really quite well on the way', are°.....do have desires, and they can quite easily get repressed, If you're not seeing them, and say.....

S.: When you're in a state of sort of alienation you reel very dry; the temptation is to try and brighten yourself up, you know, by almost sort of stimulating some kind of desire, but what one should really do is stay with that state of dryness, of dullness and allow yourself to experience and accept it. If you stay with that, after a while, you will feel that you want to do something; to go and do something, or just to sit quietly and do something - read a book, or listen to some music!~Sic~ but you must wait for the actual desire to come; you must, sort of, maybe the mental~ that you'd feel better if you could enjoy something, or fulfill° some desire? and go through the motions or fulfilling it before the desire has actually had time to arise. You see what I mean ?

VoICES.: Yeah0

~ You mustn't force the satisfaction on yourself when you're still in that~dry sort° of state,° otherwise it just doesn't work.

BARBARA° G.: It's very painful being in that dull ....in fact, in many ways it's even..... - well, for me, I feel it's even more so, than in a state where°° my feelings are° running quite strong.

~ But still you must accept it; you must stay with it. It's the same with &°~state or boredom: if you reel bored~ don't try to do anything~ about it. Stay with the state of boredom and be Bored, you know, just fully experience being bored, but don't try to sort of escape from the feeling or boredom by doing something to relieve the boredom. Never try to relieve boredom! Experience boredom, and stay with it until you actually feel like doing something; not doing it to escape~ the boredom, but doing it just because you want to do it - you feel like doing it, then you find that boredom will come to an end. But you must give yourself time, you mustn't be in too much of a hurry to bring that 'down', dry state, or the state of boredom down to an end. Allow yourself to experience them. Because, why do you experience boredom ? Why

I33. - 5 42 S - 2/7

S.:~cont'dJ do you experience that dull, dry state at all ? More often than not, it's because you've been having to force yourself to do things that you didn't want to do, so all of the relish has gone out of existence, so, your whole system is geared to doing what you don't want to do so you've got to give it time to rest and recover from that, and you won't do that. If, in the state of dryness and°dullness and boredom, you try to force some enjoyment on your system. You've been using your system in the wrong sort of way. You've got to give it time to reverse itself; that's why you just have to stay quietly with the boredom, or with the dryness, and dullness. And then, if your system is a basically healthy one as most people's is, then it will gradually start functioning in the right way, and you will become conscious of the things you really want to do. But you shouldn't do anything~ to relieve the boredom out of ~ merely

mental conce~t of what \_ would 'be JwI' ~ do etc., before you've had time I before you've given your sys- tem time - to actually want to do it. SO~ unless you know your- self quite well In this respect ..... because, you know, some- times you can be in thi~ bored state, or dull, dry state and you think: Oh, I'll snap out of it with a bit of music - and you put on a very good record and it means nothing to you! It has no ef- fect at all! It's premature! You've got to wait for that state of boredom which is a reaction to doing what you've not wanted to do~for so long ..... you have to wait for it to just come to an end naturally, and i/or your natural sort of feelings to arise. So it's not a bad thing to experience a state of boredom.' Just be bored! Just sit down in a chair and be thoroughly bored! (Laughter) It won't last more than an hour or so, I assure you, ror the system doesn't take all that long to recover! But ~ive it time! And it's inmortant ~ reconnect with one's actual feelin~s~,~ thev mav ha~nen to be.'

tJDAYA.: I actually did that on the, ah, the Convention at Vine- hall. I went through a period of intense sort of boredom and dry- ness, and it was after the ?uja, and everyone else had gone to bed, and I said: Well, even going to bed would be avoiding it just trying to get some sleep but what I did, I just went an~ sa~ downstairs in a chair and, umm,bef Ore I even realised it~ there was sort of, just a little trickle of positivity started flowing.... (Laaightar) I realised my mental state had just sort of changed; had just so~tof passed. I was quite astounded at that!

S.: Well, it does happen!

JIM~.: My children often do thid°~ They come, saying "I'm bored, what can I do ?"

S.: Yes! Well, say, 'I3e bored darling!" (baughter)

JIM S.: I've tried that one, actually.

S.: Or say, "Just sit down and be bored, and then you'll feel like doing something."

BARB~ G.: But, usually, I have foun~ that everything you suggest, they don't really want to do it.

vOiCES.:ies. Right!

I~~. - S '\*2 5 - 2/?

BABBA~A° G.: ~o 6fierei"Jre they do wLiat they want to do - they want~ to be bored4

S.: Yes. Or they've got to give themselves time.....

BARBARA G.: (speaking at same time) ....time....yeah....

~:.....to ailow~that state of boredom to pa°ss, and the natural feeling of what tney actualiyy want t'j dO~ to emerge. Other~ise..... I mean, you can get this with children, especially when they're tired ana they get a bit fretful: - 'Would you like to go out and play ?' 'No'. 'Well,

would you like a sweetie?' 'No.' ~Laughter) 'Shall Mummy sing you a song?' 'No.' You know they don't want anything, and in the end Mother says, you know, I suppose it's a natural reaction, but it's the right one: ~Well, you just get on with it then." And Mother goes on and does something else and the child is left with the boredom for a while; and after a while, you know~ after ~out five or ten minutes, he's playing or doing something, and he's enjoying himself. But you shouldn't pamper the little brats too much, you know : - 'Would you like to do this? - would you like to do that?' ~Mum do this?~ can Mummy do that?'- Just let him stew in his own little juice for a while. (Laughter) he'll snap out of it after a while; but don't worry too much, you know, as parents often do.

S: The (tendency ?) is to find something to stimulate them.

L3.: Yes. One does it with oneself, you know~ you're getting bored, you drive through one's books~ and try to find a book that you think will bring you out of your state of boredom; or the 'right' record; but it doesn't work. You have to experience the boredom and let it pass off. ~naturally, as your natural desire starts to assert itself. All right, eighteen.

VIJAYA: TEXT SECTION Id.

b.: This is very universal symbolism - the symbolism of light~ When you've suddenly understood something, you really do feel like that: a brilliant light has suddenly been lit, and everything is clear and bright and beautiful, and you say to yourself, "how on earth did I not see that before! It's so obvious." Of course it's that." (Pause) And also, the Buddha said: "ignorance is dissipated and insight remains forever. I mean, this is one of the characteristics of insight that it has a permanent effect on the character, that is the difference between insight and~just intellectual understanding .....(with ?) insight you really do see into the heart of things; into the depths, and that permanently modifies your character, alters your whole outlook, your whole behaviour; you really are changed, and for the good, and you never slip back. So insight is essential to 'entering the stream.' All right, let's go on.

DAVE M.: TEXT ~SECTION I.

S.: Mm. The translator says "This passage, whether original or not, expresses the essence of Chan ~Of the highest development or - Buddhism. Possibly, he thinks, this paragraph was added later on.

- S~2 S - 2/7

S.: ~cont'd) Certainly, it might have been so, or it might not be so, But, anyway, what does one make of it? The Buddha says: My doctrine implies thinking of that which is beyond thought; performing that which is beyond performance; speaking of that which is beyond words; and practising that which is beyond practice." So how do you think of that which is beyond thought? Or, can you think of that which is beyond thought? Can you speak of that which is beyond words?

~FISHA: That is getting at the underlying message of things, or why.....

S.: Yes.

MEG~: (A few words very indistinct) they are a vehicle for something.

S.: Yes.

VIJAYA: It's as though their whole standpoint is the 'unconditioned'. It's not on the dualistic level - your expression must be beyond the usual dualities within which we usually function.

~Mm.

DAVE N: Is that saying the same thing as "jewel in the lotus" - that the 'conditioned'.... (pause)..... the 'unconditioned' is in the 'conditioned'?

~~Yes~ One could look at it like that.

DAVE N.: That...that....it's like what you're saying is sort of impossible but it's in the possible, or.. .hah~ ..... ~ probably the easiest bit here is speaking of that which is beyond words".

~iE°~GHA: I~Thi.

~ You can use words in such a refined and concentrated way that you do convey something which is beyond words. You find this~ for instance, with poetry, especially great poetry. They do convey something..... there is something there which transcends the literal meaning of the words themselves. Well, especially in the case of communication~ where you get very close to someone, and you really are both on the same wavelength, and you understand each other very well, then you can use words to put across something which is really not confined to words at all.....

HEGHA: But (indistinct)

S.: ~?

~iE~GHA: I was thinking it was like having an emotional ( ? ) it is not only words that can be offered - just intellectual.... but it is also an emotional experience - (°it's ?) of what you're talking about.

S.: i~. Well, what about: "thinking of that which is beyond thought"?

I~~ - S L\*2 S - 2/7

L)'.~~~cont'd) That's more difficult. How can you think of that which is beyond thought? °ftiat does that mean?

i~ITH DO~JNER ~subsequently DHARi~}IARA) ° (Carrying ?) it into the non-rational ?

~ Mni ?

i~IT~ D.: into the non-rational.

~ Yes, but it does say: "My doctrine implies thinkin of that which is beyond thought." In a sense, you are oingwat is im- possible. So, how do you think of what is beyoiad thought?

AI~ GILL (subsequently SUVAJRI): Sort of no ego-involvement

S.: But is that -ithinkin?

ANN G ~ell it's no..... ~4B.It~s that intuitive ( ? ).....that.....

~ Well, it is sort of, that you use concepts, but you use them in a non-scientifiu 4.. .4.... you use them in a ~oetIc sort of way. You use them with feeling (for them ?), not taking them too lit- erally. In that way, you think of that which is beyond thought.° You use concepts imaginatively, so to speak, to su estthe non- conceptual. You've got to use something, presumaby.And what about "practising that which is beyond practice"? ~~ihich is almost the same as:"performing that which is beyond performance". Well, this is just a sort or spontaneity. If you try deliberately to do some~hing, you can't'do' it. It nas to be done spontaneously or not at all; so, ot's done without 'doing' It, sp to speak. SO~ "Those who can come up to this progress while the stupid regress." It suggests....all this suggests, usin~ the thinking, usin~ the performing, usin~ the the speaking, u~li~ the practising, as it were, ~~~ativel; not taking tnose tnings literally; not taking the thought literally, the word iiterally, but using them in such a way that they indicate or point, or suggest, sometnin~ beyon(t themselves. "The Way that can be expressed in words stops short; there is nothing that can be grasped". That's quite interesting. The Way, the Dharma, cannot be fully expressed in words; there is something that words can't communicate, but which has to be picked ~ somehow, from the words, or with the help of the words, or the suggestion of the words. Words can express quite a lOt~ and the more subtly, the more skilfully you use words, the better you can suggest that which is beyond words, like a sort of echo.

i'UENA: it reminds me of444um..4you talking about Nanjugosha in a seminar in England, about the'sweet-voiced one' expressing that which is beyond words.....

~ Ah! Yes.

~U1{NA:.44444but just'this side'of words.

S.: i4m. 1A~m.

M~GtiA:"The Sutra of Golden Light" is rather like that.

~4EGfIA: it talks about the sutra, but.....

S.: Yes. But sometimes, people want answers in words - the exact words - you know, in the technical sort of way, and they are completely impervious to any 'suggestion', any poetry; so, you can't really explain anything to them.

Vii;RNi~ B.: Um ( ? ) ~hat's the 'transcendental'? ~hat do you mean - 'transcendental'?  
Um....ah44... (laughs)

\fIJAYA: 'That to which words cannot (stick ?) (Laughter)

PU~tNA: There's a quote of Rabindranath Tagore's we put in a news- letter a couple of issues ago, about...ah...something about - Truth reels oppressed in a garb.....in a garb....

\fi!~i{NE B. ....~tbut in a garb of p~%try it's free."

S.: Yes. Yes. I think Ananda'° must have quoted that. It sounds like Ananda.

Vi~i{N~ B.:It's in the newsletter..... iJUItNA ah.....the Auckland newsletter.

S.: Auckland? An! Must be Ananda's(with ?) just a difference. (Laughter and sneezes)

V&{NE B.....1'In f~c~5~~~~~(Laughter)~~~.~fIn facts".....

POitI~A: Oh! That was it: "In facts Truth feels oppressed/In a garb of poetry it feels free.'1

~~. Yes. Yes. I think that is true.

ENi) O~ ~li)~ 2 TAPfl~ ~.

I~d. - S £+2 S -

S.: One could even be paradoxical and say that truth has nothing to do with 'facts'. (Pause)  
"But if you are wrong by so much as a thousandth part of a hair, you will lose the Way in a flash": in the case ? in the case of Truth~ there is no question of approximation!

VOICES: No.

S.: You either, sort of hit the nail on the head absolutely, or you miss It. You either get the truth totally, or you haven't got it at all! it's no question of approximation~

tJDAYA: Something can't be only just perfect.

S.: k{ight.

ODAYA: it's either perfect or it isn't.



~ ine same as in human relationships - if there's the faintest tinge or dishonesty, you know, the communication is blocked, and sometimes it blocks it just as much as if there were quite a substantial element of dishonesty. A tiny little element of dishonesty will spoil everything. Just one word not said, or one slight reservation, or lack of openness and the whole communication is spoiled, (foiled ?); just like in the diamond trade - you've got a beautiful diamond that's got one tiny flaw, it spoils the whole thing. It makes it completely valueless just because of that flaw. It doesn't mean a little bit of its value is lost~ most of its value is lost~ just like with the truth in a spiritual sense. You've either got it or you haven't got it. This is the significance of some of these Zen questions and answers: you must answer these at once, whether the disciple has got it or not, because if he hasn't got it he wobbles ever so slightly, and ever so slightly off the mark. SO~ if you're off the mark ever so slightly you miss it completely. "A miss is as good as a mile", an old English proverb says. It's like the story about the woman who had the baby~ and she was apologising for having the baby, and she said, "Well, it's a very small one." (laughter) The size of the baby made no difference to the fact that she'd had the baby. There's no question of, sort of, degrees or approximations - she's had it! SO~ it's like that when you tell a lie; even a little lie, it's still a lie - you still deviate from the truth. You may deviate ever so slightly, but you are no longer telling the truth; you've become a liar. But sometimes people think a little thing doesn't matter, like a little baby, a little deviation from the truth doesn't matter, a little lie doesn't matter, or a little dishonesty in personal relations doesn't matter, you know, you'll make up for it in other ways; you'll be open and honest on another occasion, but that slight dishonesty introduces that bias and that jarring note, and a lot of things can go wrong because of that. SO~ therefore the Buddha says: "If you're wrong by so much as a thousandth part of a hair you will lose the Way in a flash". You've got to have exactly, perfectly, or else you haven't got it at all! (Pause~ Abb right, twenty.

KEITH D: TEXT SECTION 20. ~ Mm. it's not quite clear what this is really saying, but

199. - S ~2 S - I/.

S.~ (cont'd): perhaps it means something like this: first of all the idea of impermanence is stressed - understanding impermanence represents a kind of insight; in fact, you must understand the impermanence of things to the point of developing actual insight. So this is very, very important: reflection on, meditation on? impermanence is a very important way of developing insight; quite a radical way. So, that is one side of things: developing the insight into the impermanence of the conditioned - heaven and earth, 'the world';-and then, spiritual awakening - 'bodhi'. This is, as it were, seeing the other side, seeing the 'unconditioned', and seeing 'bodhi' as the realisation of the unconditioned as well as insight into the true nature of the 'conditioned'. "This sort of knowledge leads to speedy Enlightenment". If you see the true nature of the 'conditioned', and the true nature of the 'unconditioned', well, I was going to say - you were virtually enlightened then, but, you know~ in view of the previous section, we shouldn't say 'virtually enlightened', (Laughter) well, you are enlightened; at least we get a flash of enlightenment, even though it doesn't last very long. SO~ usually, spiritual awakening is regarded as synonymous with 'bodhi'. ?  
recollect the impermanence of all conditioned things and direct your attention to the higher spiritual awakening which is 'bodhi'; which consists in the realisation of the true nature of

the 'conditioned' and the 'unconditioned'. "This sort of knowledge leads to speedy Enlightenment". When we ~Mal- ayasia recently, I was thinking about the fact that, unlike in 1ff- dia, people in Malayaasia seem to be very prosperous. it seemed a bit like the world of the gods, so the question arises, well, how do you turn peoplers m~ds to the Dharma if they are living that sort of life; if they seem to be living in the world of the gods? It's quite easy in India, in a way, to turn people's minds to the Dharma, because they suffer quite a lot, and even in the West, in different ways, people suffer, but in Malayasia they seem to have reached the point of material prosperity, but without all the drawbacks of a completely industrialised society; so they seem to be living in a world of the gods. But how does one awaken people who live in the world of the gods?

PURNA: Yo,,u play the lute of impermanence. ~1EGHA: II ~~ II II

~ Yes. You play the lute of impermanence, yes. This is the real way. I think this is the only way. You draw their attention very powerfully and drastically, even dramatically, to the fact it can't last, and that one day they've got to face up to the fact of death~ and this, if anything, will make them stop and think, and develop their interest in higher things; develop their interest in the Dhar- ma. So, the music of impermanence - it won't last! All right, on to twenty-one, and I think we'll end with that; and we'll be half-way through.

PRIYANANDA: TEXT SECTION 21.

~ Mm. So how is one to take this ..... how is one going to explain this, especially to the new person? Well, I mean, Budd- hism, the Th2ddhist teaching - 'you have no self'. MTould you say.... would you put it like that?

- S ~2 S - 1/8.

UDAYA: No permanent, fixed, unchanging self.

S.: I4ni. Mm. Well, what you ~hould emphasise is the fact of change, and with change, the possibility of change for the better; that is, the possibility of deveiopment. There's no permanent unchanging self - I think this is a better, and a more intelligible, and a more acceptable and approachable way of putting it; and with that, one's whole idea of growth and development, which is so very important.

UI3AYA: I remember reading something by Baba Ram Das...um...about it7guru, and....um... the impression I was left with after reading that, was, that there was this guy, this old guy, sitting around in this blanket, and there was just absolutely nothing there, un- less somebody spoke to him~ and then, sort of....um....the V0id~ or Enlightenment would just, sort of, speak through his lips, and then as soon as he had stopped speaking there'd be sort of~ nothing there again, just like a big void. I was left with that sort of idea for quite some time. I feel now, that that's not a very good way of putting it....um.....like, I think Baba Ram Das said, "There he is s~tting without a thought in his head~" And I'm wondering whether1o'r not that's quite true.

~ ~m. Well, you ~know, the Buadha said, "in the thought only the thought". I mean, there's nothing wrong in having thoughts, just like there's nothing wrong in seeing forms and hearing sounds, but just t~t - don't make it the basis of any reactivity.

FUi{NA: I...I...think that's related to this conception of people they'll be making of 'not-self' in terms of an insipid, anaemic 'nothing', rather than a full-bodied personality with very much impact.

~ ies.

VOI~E: Yeah!

~ That a full bodied personality is much more likely to go beyond the self, sp to speak, than you insipid, anaemic personality. (Pause) Then you say, paradoxically, selfless people like the Buddha, or like Milarepa, seem to have, judging by the literary records, strong personalities. They don't come across as weak, or anaemic, or indecisive, or nothing very much there, insubstantial: they come across very vitally, and power- fully, as very strong personalities. That is the impression you get. Really distinctive, really standing out really alive! So, one could say, the more selfless you become, the more of a person- ality you become. (~ause) Very often criminals - someone who has done something bad - doesn't have much of a person- ality, strange as (it may seem ?). They might have committed some.... well, say - train robbery, or bank robbery, but when you actually meet him~ (this is what I have heard), he's a very unimpressive little man. Hitler was very unimpressive as a personality, if you just met him, according to what one reads. So (as) Nietzsche say 5, "The criminal is not equal to his deed". (Laughter) Here he is committing this enormous crime, and he's in the headlines, may- be for weeks and weeks. He's done this and he's done that, but when the police catch up with him and arrest him~ he's a funny little man like a sort of bank clerk, or, you know, not a heroic

S.: Couldn't figure or anything like that; just a very funny, weak, pallid little man, with a little moustache you wouldn't even notice if you passed him in the street - "the criminal is not equal to his deed" - he has no personality. I mean, he's full of self, perhaps pathologically so, but he has no personality. The saint, so to speak, on the other hand, has no self, but is full of person- ality. There is a much more powerful impression.

BARBA~A G.: There's something of the 'pseudo' ...

Lj ~es.

~.: ...so little of the false, or the image, and so much of the real.

~: He's filled by something higher than himself, but which nevertheless speaks through him, so you have the impression, the impact of a real, live person. You could never mistake him for anybody else. If you read the life of Milarepa, or read the songs of Milarepa, you could never confuse Milarepa with anybody else, even through the centuries he turns up as a really unique person- ality, even in the ordinary sense, completely unique despite the, as it were, selflessness, the absence of ego. I mean, in the West you get that impression somewhat, say, with the figure of St. Francis, whereas the military conquerors, and those sort of people, very often, as men~ they're not much. This is why, perhaps it's

said: '~u° man is a hero to his valet". Well, there has been something further said about that, but still, that's another matter. In the case of the saint, his greatness is in himself. I mean, not in himself in the ego sense, but in himself as a true individual. But in the case of the so-called 'great Men', only too often, they've simply manoeuv'ed themselves into a certain position, or have arisen at a certain historic moment and seized the opportunity, but they're not truly individuals,

BARBARA G.: They seem to represent a lot of subconscious....um.... projections, and....and....

~ les. Yes. They take advantage of those, and are a focus of those, as Hitler seems to have been.

~liANANDA: They, in fact, derive their personality from the group.... from the sub-group...ah....

S.: Ye. Yes. They reflect and throw back the needs of the group, or even the negative moods of the group.

FRIxANM~A: I can see it very much with politicians, and...4..here in New Zealand...and..... (Laughter)

~ ~hat.' ~ven here in New Zealand ?! That is disillusioning.

J~: They're even worse, I think.' (ijause) particularly nowadays - there seem to be very few politicians O& statesmanlike quality.

S.: Mm. (Pause) So, it's not so much that the self is non-existent, it's more a mirage, it's more that the self is not static,

-S ~2 S - 1/8.

~ont'd it's in a process of constant change, ideally, a process of constant development.

vn'iiN~ B: 'Who says it's not developing .....?

S.: ~° it's not developing it's stagnating. I don't think you can actually stand still! you know~ snort vi 'having attained the path', of 'stream-entry

VERNE B. (indistinct) somewhere I read that if you're not developing you're .....what's the other word?.....

k'O~IA: 'tregressing.'

VERNE B.: Yes If you're not ..... ~ Yes. VER1~ B.: there isn't  
any static..... S.: No. \1~~;R~~ B.: that one could.....4

~ You're stagnating or developing.

VERNE B.: I read in the iast "Dakini" that Dhammadinna said, "If you're not extending  
yourself, you're stagnating."

~ Yes. Right. Right.

VERNE B.: You can't really. (~augh)

S.: Well, ii you're not extending ypurseif, you're regressing. Anyway, let1s leave it there ror  
the moment. We've done twenty- one sections, which is hall. Hopefully we can do the pther  
half later on.

END OF FIRST WEEKEND SE~SiON.

TRANSCRIPTION OF SUTRA OF 42 SECTIONS

(2nd Weekend)

SECTION 22

Ratnaketu text

Sangharakshita: So this question of - ah - a desire for a name - uh? People who seek to  
make a name for themselves, uh? Do you think this is a very strongly operative, you know,  
desire, nowadays? Is this very common? no people want to make a name for themselves?  
To be known by name to a lot of people, uh?

Puma: This explains the main success of things like television and uh, Udaya: No. I would  
see it more in a business sense rather than, than something that's uh, more on - on a sort of  
'holding the baby up' for a particular talent but more in the ah, ah, business sense, speaking  
more of people knowing who they are, and ah, you know, acquisition more related to  
themselves...

Ratnaketu:...through all the aspects of the modern world. I meme~em reading in one book  
that people wanted to make a name in order to become immortal. Because they would be

remembered after they were dead.

S: Well, this was the old, ah, sort of classical idea, that that was the only immortality you had, uh, to be remembered by other people, you know, for ages upon ages, uh. But, ah, maybe it isn't even that. Nowadays, people just want to be widely known now, uh, uh. So, you know, I wonder why this is and I mean, the media is a very good example and because sometimes people are ah known are, as they say, well-known for being well-known, uh. They are not even well-known for anything, they are just well-known, huh. So why a'2 why do people seek to be well-known in this sort of way? Why; why do they seek to have their name 'resounded', you know, by other people, as the text here suggests, huh?

S ~ S -

Aniketa: They haven't sufficient confidence in the fact that they are, and that they just are a being...

S: Um

Udaya: A lack of identity maybe.

S: Well, they have an identity but perhaps they don't experience it, you know, very strongly, and they feel a need of that identity being reinforced, you know, by lots of people and they sort of feed on that. They experience their identity, only when it's sort of reflected back at or to them by lots of other people, huh. I mean, they only realise who they are when they hear thousands of people screaming their name, uh. When they see their name in big coloured lights, they say "Ah! That's me!" and they really experience themselves then, otherwise perhaps they don't. So perhaps it does suggest a sort of poverty of being, uh, if one wants, you know, to be well-known, to be famous. But do you think this applies, you know, in the less spectacular sort of way? Do ordinary people desire to be well-known? Do you think they do, or not? I mean, is it a common sort of human weakness?

Udaya: I think so, if you see something like that - a television news camera at a supermarket - or something - you see people sort of trying to get into the picture, and that sort of thing.

S: Ah! Um.

Dharmadhara: People like to have lots of friends too, superficially.

S: Ah, um - well, some people more so than others, don't they, huh? But does that mean the same thing, do you think? That you are known to a lot of people, you must be someone, you must exist because you are known to a lot of people. Or is it a serious preoccupation of

people, that their name should be known, or do most people not bother, huh? Or is it a question of the scale, so to speak?

Priyananda: I think with the ordinary person, they do seek some sort of security in being known. Maybe not famous, but just being known by friends and relatives.

~ 4~ S -

S: Um or even, you know, in the shops to which they go, you know, to some people one finds that this is quite important - that the man behind the counter in the shop always recognises them, and says, Oh, hello Mrs Brown. Nice to see you today. Or in the case of a man, if he goes to have a haircut, you know, the barber remembers him and knows his name. Sometimes it is quite important to people that they are known, um. At least to a small number of people.

Suvajri: Maybe it's a sort of reaction, because of the impersonal way things are going, you know, things are so big, and people feel so small that they really try to become important.

S: Um, um.

Ratnaketu: They're going about it the wrong way.

S: Um. But this seems to have been, in a way, more of a preoccupation in earlier times, you know, when heroes tried to leave a name after their death. Do you think people try to do this so much now, to leave a name that will live after they die?

Vipula: No, no. I don't think so.

S: Is this so much a preoccupation now? It probably isn't.

Vipula: They might do occasionally, but not as a rule. No.

Megha: More in terms of donations of money, like a memorial, or a particular wing of a hospital named after....

S: Um, um. Ah yes. Right. But that is often done of course by the relations isn't it? Not so much by someone during his lifetime, uh. There is an example of that, though, which probably carries this sort of thing to the extreme, in Dicken's "Hard Times". There's a character, there - I'm just trying to think of his name - there are two of these characters, who exemplify the current utilitarian philosophy, you know, on is, uh, uh. One is Mr Gradgrinder and the other is Mr Boundebury and (Josiah?) Boundebury left all his money, uh, for an old folks' home, uh, for old men, huh, for, I think it was

~O~. - S ~~S

a hundred old men, and it was to be called the Josiah Boundebury Home, and all of the old men were required to legally take the name of Josiah Boundebury. (Laughter) Yes? This showed Mr Boundebury's desire to multiply his own image you know, in this sort of way. And one of his boasts was that he was a self-made man and didn't depend on anybody, had never been beholden to anybody, who had made his way from rags to riches entirely by his own efforts, you see, uh, so you know, he wanted to fill the world, or his little world at least, with all these images of himself, all these Josiah Boundeburies, uh. So that's the same sort of thing, isn't it? It's a sort of will...

Aniketa: Sometimes it seems as if even having children is, although this is something that perhaps was given greater importance in older civilisations, nevertheless there is still apparent today in some people's attitudes, that their children....

S: I think quite a lot of people nowadays, (I mean, this is in the West among Christians and ex-Christians) quite a lot of people believe that the only immortality they are going to have or to experience is through their children. They believe that they are going to die, that there is no life after death, but that they will live on in their children, and even their name will live on in their children. (Pause). So the Buddha said that there are people, who following the dictates of their feelings and desires, seek to make a name for themselves, but by the time that that name resounds, they're already dead. Well, one can say that this isn't quite as true now as it used to be, because your name can resound, you know, all around the world, in all sorts of ways, by all sorts of means, nowadays, uh, but even so you don't enjoy it for very long before you are dead in fact, uh. So "those who hunger for a name that shall long be remembered in the world and who do not study the Way, strive vainly and struggle for empty forms", uh. So why do you think this is, uh? You see, the Buddha contrasts here a hungering for a name that



shall be long remembered - he contrasts that with studying the Way, uh - so long as you're sort of hungering for a name that shall be long remembered, you are not studying the Way, uh, the two are contradictory, they are ~mical.

S 4~~S-

So what does that suggest?

Aniketa: That clinging to a name is trying to make something permanent, and to cling on to something - actually that, that in itself is quite empty.

S: Yes! It's having a sort of fixed idea about oneself and trying to perpetuate that instead of devoting yourself to the task of actually evolving and developing and growing - you're just concerned with propagating that fixed image, uh, which may in fact not even be a true image of you at any stage. It may be your own imagination of yourself, of what you'd like to think yourself as being. So when you're doing that sort of thing you are not 'studying the Way', you're not practising the Way, uh, you are just 'striving vainly' and 'struggling for empty forms' uh? This is perhaps connected with something more general - that we often strive to give other people a sort of false impression of ourselves, uh., We sort of project, you know, an idea that we have about ourselves which may not be the correct one at all but we are quite anxious, quite keen that this is what people should think about us, this is how they should see us, uh.

ANIL~T~TA~i.ormerly B&~3AlIA GltL): Tliis came home sharply to me because...um...during my mother's illness, and towards the end ~about six weeks before she died) she had forgotten my name, and my instant reaction was: 'How COWID she, my own mother...how could she possibly forget my name ~\$id it was after I had gone past that~to realise that she knew~ me, when I was with her - that is the state I was in as I approached her and spoke to her, but she didn't know my name - and which was more important?

S.~ les0 MEN. I noticed when I came back from India, I found that my mother confused me with my nephew - my name, not that she actually confused me .....but she kept calling me by my nephew's name, and my nephew by my name and I was thiiii!ing about this, and, you know, the reason was that she had brought up this nephew, who is her eldest grandson. She had taken him from my sister when he was very young, six months old, and she had brought him up; so she had clearly confused the two of us. It was all so long ago, so the two boys that she had brought up had sort of blended into one, and she wasn't quite sure what the name was. ~Laughter) But you do get this, you see, and it is good to reflect upon this. I can't say that I minded. I was a bit surprised, and slightly amused, you know, that these names, which are not the actual identities, had been confused. I'm sure she'd probably attributed some incidents of my childhood to him and vice versa. That is quite possible. But the Buddha goes on to say: "Just as burning incense, though others perceive its pleasant smell - it is itself being burnt, so desires ~and the rootnote says, "The desire for fame is no doubt specially intended here."..... bring the dancer

S.: (cont'd) of fire which can burn up your bodies in their train." Now what do you make of this? What is the point of this analogy - 'burning incense, though others perceive its pleasant smell it's being burnt up'? So, presumably, the analogy is: others, you know, perceive, or they hear the pleasant sound of your great, wonderful reputation, but you're in fact.....your own true being - is being burnt up. I think 'body' here is not to be taken in the sense of 'physical body', but more in the sense of personality, or identity.

UDAYA: I think I have almost, sort of, perceived some of that with some of the present-day, sort of,...um....famous stars Mick Jagger and David Bowie....

S.: Ah!

UDAYA: .....they've both been in movies, and you almost get this sort of...um...this sort of 'scream', or a wail: "it's"....sort of like..... "It's killing me".... sort of thing.

S.: ies.

UDAYA.....this whole sort of 'fame' thing - it's sort of like their last cry. I think that must be quite common, you know, the thing they strive for so hard, ends up sort of choking them; and they just end up being the puppet of the millions.

S.: Yes. Yeh. Well, one saw that in the case of the leader of that...ah...what was that group?...ah...that punk rock group?... .. Sid Vicious! You're almost encouraged to play up to your mass audience in a way that is destructive to you as an individual. So you may give them a lot of fun, a lot of amusement; you may be a very pleasant smell in their nostrils, but, like the stick of incense, you are being destroyed; you are 'being burnt up'. I'm sure this also happens with some of these 'transcontinental gurus'. I'm sure this sort of thing happens. They lose their personal identity because they are so busy being the leader of that particular cult, or the focal point of all that attention, and they play up to it more and more, and any individual identity or being that they might originally have had, I'm sure, gets consumed in the end. So, it will be interesting to see how some of them end up - some of the more extreme ones - being in 'the guru business' a whole lifetime. It will be very interesting to see what happens to them. Sometimes, of course, they manage by leading a double life - one 'on stage' and the other 'off stage'. Sometimes they get by in that sort of way, as some other public figures do; but eventually, if you keep it up, there comes a time when you're so busy (chuckling) you've no time for any 'private' life - it all has to be 'on stage', and then of course, you may get into difficulties.

ANIKETA: I can see that it could be a great temptation for quite a number of people who have these qualities that.....or who have potential for those qualities, because there are so many people who just want the ? and are all the time demanding them to be ..... demanding the person to be like that.

S.: Yes. Mm. Well, I have said in the past, that one gets the

S.:~cont'd): impression there are tens of thousands of people in the world, maybe hundreds of thousands, who are going around sort of begging to be deceived - 'Please deceive Me'!

ANIKETA: Yeh!

S.: Yes? it sometimes seems like that. I mean, I'm speaking of the religious, or pseudo-religious field.

VOICE.: Right!

S.: If you speak honestly and sincerely, and say what you really think, or what you really feel is good for human beings, in terms of development and higher evolution, they don't want to hear. They are begging to be deceived; they want to hear something else; they want to hear something which is not true. They don't even care if it isn't true! They want to hear what they want to hear something that will please, and tickle, and gratify them, give them a sense of security. This is what they beg you to do - "Please deceive me! Please take me for a ride". But those who do this, you see, they have to pay a price, and the basic price is alienation from one's own being, which is, you know, ultimately self-destructive. You can see that with some actors. I mean, I saw this in Bombay. I think I have given this illustration before. I have a friend who is a well-known Indian film actor; and he was known as the 'Clarke Gable' of India. So you can guess the sort of person he was. And I had a number of conversations with him in the early fifties, in Bombay, and it eventually dawned on me that he didn't know when he was acting and when he wasn't acting. He'd lost the ability to make that distinction; so when he was relating to people in 'real life', so to speak, he didn't really know whether what he was saying to them was what he really felt, or whether he was acting. So he'd lost all that he'd lost the distinction being in front of the big lights, making a film, and actually living his own ordinary life; and he got into some quite extraordinary states, and had some quite odd beliefs about himself. He really believed that through his films, which were quite ordinary films, but which were quite popular, that he was creating a new religion, and that he was the equal of Christ, and the Buddha, and Mohammed, and he used to relate how he had conversations with them (when he was drunk of course, because he often had recourse to the whiskey bottle); and he described to me, once, how he actually had the experience of Christ sitting on one knee, and the Buddha sitting on the other, and the three of them were having a conversation, and they recognised him as their equal! (Chuckling) So this is the way it can go, and some people in the media, and some people in this field - they really do have the most tremendously inflated ideas about themselves. Well, sometimes it's pretty obvious. Well, this was a particularly obvious example. The strange thing is that people who ought to know better, treat them as though they are really great people; when they are actually very 'little' people very considerably inflated; and pretty 'damaged' little people at that! Simply blown up! They think that they're big because their picture has been blown up and put on a hoarding, therefore they are big. It is extraordinary how many people play up to this mainly for the sake of money! Some sort of half-wit, who has made a few successful records, is interviewed with all sorts

[pages 210-219 missing]

S.:b(cont'd) of philosophical questions, as though he's got all the answers. He's asked what he thinks about life, and what he thinks about 'race', and, you know, what he thinks about politics, and the current economic situation, and the interviewers - they sort of listen, open~mouthed, to what he's saying as if he were the Deiphic oracle; and if he says he doesn't know, or scratches his head, or something like that, - uun! that is his sort of wonderful Zen-like response! (Laughter) And all that sort of thing, and they take themselves for a ride in this sort of way. It's extraordinary! It shows the sort of state we've got ourselves into. Sometimes, in another sort of area - successful or well-known footballers are asked what they think about life and this, that, or the other and clearly, they haven't got a clue; it's never occurred to them, but whatever they happen to mumble it's treated as some kind of great wisdom (chuckling), some great insight into life, and into existence! It is extraordinary! But it is just because 'their name resounds', therefore they're considered to be important or significant. It's really a great pity that the media is cluttered up with these 'big' names or really very insignificant people. Even people who can be quite harmful, including politicians. But it is an unreal life they are leading. Think of the fate of people....well, think of the plight of the people who contribute to this process of inflation - who inflate the little, unknown people into big, well-known, even universally known, people; who are in to do it as a business, as a means of making money; who, in a sense, know what they are doing - in a sense, in a way, don't have illusions about it on a certain level; who do it deliberately, not to say, cynically, and who use people in this sort of way, to make money for themselves!

PRIMANANDA: It seems part of the process of inflating these people is - part of the end product is - to deflate them to destroy them eventually. I notice this with a lot of political figures, and, ah...popstar5~ that eventually.....

~ Nin. Mm. Yes.

PEIYANANDA: .....the end result is that they are destroyed, and their 'audience' wants to see them destroyed, in a way.

S.: Yes, because they're also 'newsworthy' then. They may have got a bit tired of their success story, which has gone on too many years - it's no longer very interesting as but what would be more interesting is their fall from that, and their destruction.

PRIYANANDA: Pops tar in drug scandal!

S.: That's right. Yes! i~in. I mean, it was suggested, in connection with Sid Vicious, that he'd almost been encouraged to be~have in the self-destructive way that he did. And when one is told~ or one reads that some of the Hollywood film stars are encouraged by their publicity people to do something bizarre, or something outrageous, if they're going out or the headlines of the movie papers....to do something to hit the headlines; even, sometimes, romances and marriages have been built up, or dreamed up, in this way, by the publicity people saying: 'What you really need is another marriage. Look! You haven't been married for a couple of years. We~, who could we get you married to~ you know, someone in a way that would really make news! 'Well, there's so-and-so; you'd better be seen together

in a restaur- ant a~iew times. We'll write it all up, and spread this specu- lation." This is how it's done. And they, eventually, might get married and whole issues of movie magazines devoted to it; but it's all a publicity stunt. And a year later the ? marriage starts cracking up, so fresh interest ..... tens of thou- sands of people lapping up the details, and all the while (chuck- ling) they might not be seeing very much of each other, except as a bye-product of publicity agents. They might be leading quite different lives, and relating to quite dif-ferent people in dii'- ferent ways. But this has all been dreamed up by the publicity boys for the famished readers or these sort of papers. I mean, it is really terrible!

UDAYA: Yeah. I was thinking about it just the other day....about ...well, I was thinking more or television, but it occurred to me that most of what you see on television, well, obviously, I suppose in a way, is, ah, what you are doing is getting a look into other people's mi~~~~, and I thought, just sort of taking a sort of fresh, unbiased look at the thing like someone who hadn't got used to television, how sort of weird it seems, for people to spend so much time sitting around looking at other people's lives, and it's so obvious that their own must be so empty, that you know,.....of so little interest for them, that they have to start looking at other people's lives, which are (deliberately ? ) more interesting than their own.

S.: But sometimes they look at other people's em~tY lives! Think of this dreadful series they have in England.....

Ui)AYA: Yeah. Coronation Street.

Well, haven't seen that..... it's on the radio - there's

UDAYA: t)h! (~ughter)

MEGHA: Oh, yes. "Archers1,. Yes. (Laughter)

S.: It's been ~oing for years, hasn't it? It's been going on for twenty, thirty years. It's all the same sort of things that

happen to family people - so ordinary people people seem to like to hear aji about their own things that they are doing, you know. It gives them an increased sense, perhaps, of the signifi~ance of their own existence by being able to hear about it~ or seeing it on T.V. Well, that's extraordinary! But, you know, the les- son or this section is quite clear,as I said - There's a price to be paid, whether you do it on a grand scale, or whether you do it on a small scale - it's the loss of your own being. You are literally burned in the process. iou go to hell, in a sense, here and now. So, if one wants t~ bring it really down to earth, and to apply it ~ a way that's relevant to everybody it really means - just live your own life~ e~perience your own life, and communicate honestly to other people, and don't try to build up ~ false picture of yourself, and don't encourage other people to

&.:~cont'd) beil~va in that raise picture or yourself, as an escape from confronting what you really are. Otherwise you will lose your own being in the end. You will become completely alienated from it; you'll no longer be able to experience it. This is what it's saying. ~ou know, you don't have to be a well-known T.V. personality, or a movie star, to fall into this sort of trap.

PU£~A: one can be (        ?        )

S.: Fardon?

PUfINA: One~can be an Order member running a centre.

S.: Yes, indeed!

RATNAKi~£U: ~eople can miss..- the point that they can be great... that, you know, they are themselves ..... they are great in them- selves and they're trying to be great in other people's eyes..... by jus~ being themselves. If they were just truly themselves, and lived their lives, you know~ that's-a great .....

-A-S: Mm. Well, in a way, one could say people must consider them- selves pretty worthless if they need their sense of worth from other people, eapeciaiL£y when it~s on such an unreal basis; on such an unreal thing - just being well-known for being well~known. I remember reading.... I think it must have been Dale Carnegie's famous book~ "How to Win Friends and influence ~eople"; and one of the things he mentioned was, if you're talking to someone~ especially if you want to sell him something, mention his name~as frequently as possible, say: "oh, I'm very pleased to meet you Mr. Smith", and, "How do you like this. n~w brochure, Mr. Smith?" And keep on constantly repeating the name, 'Mr. Smith~', because it gives him a nice sort of feeling of reassurance - you know his name, and you're familiar with it; you are constantly using it, but, you know? if        ?        the opposite sort or thing, well, you say: "Oh~ very pleased to meet you, Mr..... ah.... what did you say your name was? (Laughter) you know, it creates a very di~ferent sort or impression. Or if you call him by somebody else's name.

S~VAJ£t~ \$ I read somewhere, that if somebody gave you importance he had power over you. So, I thought about that, as it didn't- make any sense at first, and then it sort of clicked - well, they do, because they can take it all away again!

S.~: Yes! Right! Yes. They can pull the carpet from under your feet and ~o what they choose.

PURNA: But what I'm interested in trying to tie in, is the ques- tion o-i living your own life, experiencing your own life, and such factors as ( Pali term ) particularly where you're trying to almost live up to certain definite image.... you're tryin~~ to live your lli~e in accordance with what you think the wise will judge such different people by.

~.: ~m. Well you have the confidence in the wise; th~ the wise ~e you more truly than you see your5el~~ and they are~se~sitive to your possibilities, your potential, than you are yo~~r~P~lf, at

-S 1+2 5-

'/9

2/4

S. :cont'd) times; so you use their feeling about you as a sort of guide. Not....again, not that you jolow what they say blind- ly - you try to actually feel, and then experience what they--- ~because they are more wise than you are) actually do see is there potentially in you. You do actually try to deveiop it - you don't simply try to act as though you had it without actually experien- cing it, or without actually attaining it I mean, that is the difference. The wise see you more truly han you see yourself. Well, they are like a mirror in the motorcar, you know, - you lou~ in the mirror, you can see what's coming up behind, so in the same way, the wise can sometimes tell you (chuckles) more clearly than you can see yourself, what's cornin~ up behind, and what's going to overtake you, or catch up with you. So you use them as a sort oi' 'mirror'. w-ej~iiterally, you look in the mirror, and they reflect you back. I's like the 'mirroring1 I was taiking about, but in a sort of more real kind or way. (Pause) It's not tnat the wise nave an ima~e of you: they ~l Lo se~ you more truly tnan you see ~ourselr, and you have the confidence in them that they (L,ors~e~you mo~e truly, and that if they are not very happy about something you nave done, it's because you have fallen short of what you actually can be, and can do. So their 'disapproval', so to speak, - putting the word 'disapproval' in inverted commas - recalls you to yo'ii5el~~ and that's where the 'shame' comes in; that's where you blush, when you sort of come back to yourself, and realise how far you've strayed from your- sell: In doing what ~ou '&ia. Not that you, sort or accept their image or what you are,without,experiencin~ what j'OU really are - Z mean, they, by their unbroken consciousness oi what you are - your own consciousness of what you are having been broken - re- call you to the ~x~Sr~~~~ o~ ~ourselr, and then, when you see how far you've strayed~~oursel~~ and how incom~atible with your true being, you at your best yourr behaviour was then you blush i'or yourseii as it were, an~ that' 5 the ( ~al term Furna used) . Tha~'s the 'shame~ tnat they nave brought about, which is a very positive thing. The shame is a consciousness of how far short what you did, falls, in' relation to what you are. (Paus.) But that is quite a different thing from other people having a sort of image of you which they impose upon you,aa~d'rorce you to conlorm to. That's a quite dil:ferent thing. So, it's more like ~e wise being your conscience, which never sleeps. They recall you to yourself by their continued awareness 01, what you really are~ and their awareness continues even when yours doesn't. That's where the useiulness oi' it comes in. ALL right, let's go on to twenty-three then.

END U~ SIDE I TAff~~' 9.

SIDE TWu T~E 90

ACHJJpA. TEXT ~ECTIUN 23.

S.: Mm. Well, what do you make of this saying? 11Wealth and beau- ty to a man who will not reinquish them, are like a ~WliS oo'rt'red wi~e". I think one has to attach some

significance to the words - "to a man who will not relinquish th~m'.' .....

'rUICES: ~eah. Mm. Right,

S.: iou see what I mean?

-S Lk2 5 2/9.

VOICES: Yes. i~.

S.: It's not that wealth and beauty are being completely out- lawed. Well, I mean~~there1s nothing wrong with the enjoyment or wealth, in a sense. There's nothing wrong with the enjoy- ment of beaxty3 but supposing you won't relinquish them; suppose you insist on hanging on to them - you won't let them go when the time comes for them to go, then it1s as though you had 1taken hold a knofe\*, you know, "cover~th honey11, and trying to lick ~t orf. It's not the enjoyment Of the wealth and beauty in itseli, which is 'the licking uf the honey', eh, 'orf the edge of the knile: it's the unwillingness to relinquish them. (Fause) One has to be a little careful for obvious reasons. (Pause) Do you think it is possible to enjoy wealth and beauty without developing a sort of desire not to relinquish them? Do you think this is actually possible? To enjoy things without clinging,~and then to let them go? Do you think this is very easy?

VOICES: Mm. (indistinct murmurs) ....not easy.

S.: Or does it differ according to what the thing actually is?

~TNAKE~TU: You can enjoy other people's wealth, like going and seeing beautiful scenes....you can't own those beautiful things, the1re not yours, and you have to go home, back to the city again.

S.: Mm. I think when the Buddha is saying 'wealth and beauty' - realising he means~e,'beauty' in the sense of beautiful people to whom you are attracted on account of their beauty. I think this is what he has in mind - 'beauty' in the sense or ~1~~gland, Home and Beauty11 - in that sort or sense. It's the wealth which you personally posieess; or the beauty that you personally possess as an object; or think that you possess - "~i1lno relinauish them, are like a kniLe covered with honey) w~hichq even before he has had the nleasure or eatln~ the honey, cuts the ton~ue or tho ohLld tMt ii~s it. It

ANi~QETA: One can see the amount of money - vast amounts of money - which are spent on the ? of pursuing beauty, or,...um...being in th~ fashion.

S.: Oh yes! I was reading in the paper or a woman who had sued her, ah....I don't know what they call them.....her cosmetic surgeon, you know, because an operation hadn1t turned out quite right, and it transpired that she had had nine operations on her nose alone, you



know, cosmetic surgery, as well as a lace-lift~ and something done to her belly to make it look more attractive etc. etc. So when the operation hadn't turned quite right - apparently the nav.l came out slightly misplaced - (laughter) - she sued for eight thousand dollars.

'riFLJLA:(fl~oud laughter,others joining in.)

S.: I mean, it's like a child very often. I mean, I've noticed thi5~ in the case,say, of small children: supposing a little boy's birthday is coming up, and you say, "Johnny, in two day1 S time it will be your birthday, won't it be lovely? All the presents you'll get'1, and you build the poor little kid up in such a way,

-S LI~2 5- 2/9.

S.~~cont'd) to such a state of tension, that when the actual day comes he can't actually enjoy it. He's so highly strung, and gets actually a bit hysterical, and maybe ends in tears and gets sent to bed. (Chuckles) It's your fault for getting him into that state, rather than letting~him take it calmly. But we also do that with ourselves, you know, we look forward to things so much, sometimes, that when they actually come, we arcr~'t able to enjoy them. or we cling on to something so hard, that we're not actual- ly able to enjoy the possession or it. So this is more the sort of thing that is being rererred to, and 'wealth' and 'beauty' just symbolise, or stand for, those things which we clutch on to so tightly that we're not able to enjoy them, even though~the clutch- ing is supposed to be so that we can enjo~ them. It's like hold- ing a flower in your hot, sticky,little hand, so tight, that you just crush it~ you know, you can no longer enjoy the beauty or the fragrance of it.

ACHIALA: Would that be because we don't see what they are truly, and so our attitude towards them is perverted?

:btn. It is on account or a general sort of blindness, and consciousness. The clutching and the grasping is sort of so

convulsive, and unaware, and unmindrul, so instinctive!

AN£~E1TA.: it1s like you always experience or see what you expect to see and ~xperience~ It's kind of setting something up before- hand so that you don't actually.....

S.:Ah!

ANiE~t:TA: .....that when you're in the experience itself you don't see it.

S.: Yes! Right! You're trying to see your picture.

ANit~~TA: Yes.

S.: ur the picture that you had in advance is not what actually is happening. Well, people do that sort of thing with marriage.

They dream up this beautiful picture of marriage and they're not even seeing the reality, so, you know, as soon as they come up against that with a big bump, and their eyes are opened, then they feel disillusioned, you know, - it hasn't turned out as they expected. Well things rarely do. Even the most ordinary things - a holiday, that's a good example. Maybe you've planned to go away on holiday, and you've got a vision of yourself sun-bathing on the beach, and it rains all the time! Well, instead of just adjusting to the holiday, you're resentful that it isn't bright and sunny, and you can't go and sit on the beach. So~ it's...it's... part of the clutching is this building up of false ideas about people, and about situations; insisting that they shall happen, that they be carried through, rather than just experiencing, or even in even, what is actually happening. (Pause) I really do believe that you enjoy life much more, even in a quite mundane sort of sense, leaving aside any question of spiritual values - you enjoy life much more if you just adopt a more relaxed attitude towards it.

~~UICiSb~: Mm.

~~o. -s ~2 5- 2/9.

S.: This is why I sometimes say that it is very ~irX~Oult~rror young people to enjoy life. You enjoy life, actually, (again from a purely worldly point of view), more as you grow older, because you are more relaxed about it. You know, young people are usually much too impatient, and too much in a hurry, so they miss a lot. I mean, this is why Oscar Wilde once said, "Youth is wasted on the young". (Laughter) It's only the old, or at least the mature, who really know what to do with youth (chuckle). -aah, that's a bit by the way. But you see the sort of general import of all this. Even on a worldly level, without bringing in spiritual considerations, you're much better off just being much more relaxed towards...ah...well, towards the things you enjoy, or would like to enjoy. a'

U£)A~A: ~i course, people, you know, if they are in a difficult situation, and getting really het up over it, and, you know, objectively, energy needs to be put into it, and you say to them, 'Relax, and take it a little more easily', they sniff that negates putting any energy into changing it. But I feel there is a way to put energy into something and work on it - but at the same time, you know, keep a loose rein. I think that's important with most things. - with most situations.

S.: There are some people who create their own objects, just by the unskillful way they go into things.... (Pause)..... or try to get them done.

Ui)AYA: sometimes, some people suggest something that might be an alternative, and they think up so many things that could go wrong, they think, well, I might as well give up already, 'cause - think of all the things that could go wrong, and they haven't even started~

b1~.: Yes. Mm. Well, let's pass on.

FRIYANANDA: ~ SECTION 24.

LA. Mm. Yes! This part puts me in mind, a bit, of what somebody was saying, who came to see me quite recently. He was saying that he hesitated to get more deeply involved with the FW3O because he didn't want to be trapped. He was very wary of being trapped by an organisation. So, I sort of pointed out to him that if he was wary of being trapped by an organisation under the impression that he was free, then he was under a gross delusion - that he was, in fact, 'trapped' already, in all sorts of ways. I mean, as soon as you come into this world as a baby, you're trapped! You're often in a situation that you're not very happy with, very often. Then you're sent to school - again, you're trapped! You grow up and get a bit older, you have to go into some kind of a job. Again, you're trapped! You get married. Again, you're trapped

ped! You're trapped in all sorts of ways, and here you are, being concerned (chuckle) lest on entering - getting more involved with - the FW3O, you're going to be trapped as though you're so 'ree' already! But that's not the situation at all~ But he hadn't thought about it in that way. He became quite thoughtful when I pointed this out. It's a bit like, you know, if you're complaining about religion being escapism, well, life is just one long escapism, in so many different ways: So here is someone, sort of being very cautious about (chuckling~ not being trapped by the FWBO, which wasn't even trying to trap him in the first place, when he's already trapped in so many different ways

~~~7. -S ~2 S- 2/9.

~cont'd It seems so ridiculous, so preposterous, but there it was. As if he clearly seems to feel that he was showing a very sort of, 'spiritual' attitude in being not very willing to be trapped by the FW3O - as, though he was a very 'free' sort of a soul. Well, it seemed really quite absurd. (Chuckling) So, here, the Buddha is talking about people who are trapped. It seems as though he is speaking forth from the unfortunate husband's point of view. "People who are tied to their wives children and homes"

children have no thought or betaking themselves of." Well, perhaps, nowadays, they do! Children do leave home fairly early nowadays, and even wives take themselves off sometimes (chuckling) and then, of course, you realise that you're not pleased at all! In fact, you are quite upset when wives betake themselves off. And then, of course, you realise that you're not tied just objectively - you're tied subjectively too. And maybe, here again, you should emphasise - "We are tied to their wives children and homes." it's not simply

½~av'rve5~ ~ldren an homes that tie you, but it's tying~ourse to those things, and not sitting loose enough to them. And the test is when they do betake themselves off. I mean, many a time I've heard the story, you know~ from someone or other - "Well, I'm not attached to her, but she is very dep~dent on me", but when she actually goes, you're thi one who has the nervous breakdown! I've seen this happen. So, it is true that certain objective situations are more restricting than others, and the domestic situation is restricting to some extent, but what is still more restricting is your own attachment to that situation. (Pause) It seems to be a bit of a mixture of metaphors - "Wh~ dread to lose them? (Otherwise) you are tamely submittin~ to the law~ or a ti~er and ~eli~eratei~ allowin~ yourselves to are~ in the ui ics and o h ch ou have fallen." (Fause) at do you think this means?

ACHIIA: That you're not taking much initiative as regards your own life, and things like that.

S.: Yes. But ii you are in a situation which objectiveky is restric~ing, well, that's bad enough, to star~ with, but a~ least you can make sure as best you can, that it is not subec tivel restricting - that you're not actually, subjectively,tiedto that. I mean, it is quite easy to deceive oneself, or course but there is a distinction between the two things. (Pause) i think, sometimes, one has to be quite sort of suspicious of one- self and or others, when somebody say~ that they're trapped; that they would like to get out but they can't. I think one has to be quite suspicious there.

tJ1)AYA: leh. I've found this...um...I think it is a directly para- llel situation, at the Centre, people say they would like to help, this is sort of ? I've been listening to peo- ple say this for a ong time now. Different people. But I sort of feel those eo plho really want to help, do help, and those that just ~ay heynt to, don't! Rut if pe~e really do want to help they end up helping,~and in a sense, you, as an &ndivid- ual, can't do very much about it, if they don't really want to do it ~ they just talk about it.

S: Well, recently I've been drawing attention to the distinction

- S 42 5- 2/9.

S.:(cont'd) between ~won't' and 'can't'. I've been talking about this quite a bit in England. I don't know if I've mentioned it so far, here. It rirst came to my attention in this sort of way: - supposing somebody had said.... agreed.... to come and see you at a certain time - (this is the way, actually, it all arose) supposing they had said they'd come to see you at two o'clock; supposing they don't come, they don't turn up; but they come very, very late, or they~don't come at all, they meet you later OfI, and they say, "Oh, I'm sorry I couldn't~come." So if you take that literally, 'couldn't' means that they were nhysically prevented. Either they were knocked down by a bu,'~s, or their mother was on her deathbed, or som~thing really serious like that; ofI'they were imprisoned, or under arrest, or something like that.....

UDAYA: Something beyond their control.

~.: ~es, something beyond their control. But actually~ they don't mean that. What they mean is: they didn't want to come because, despite the fact that they promised to see you at two o'clock, the possibility or doing something else arose, which they preferred to do; so they chose not to come and see you but to do that other thing. But~then they say that they 'couldn't~, rather than admitting that they didn't want to. What, in fact, are they doing?

ANIKETA: They are not taking responsibility for all their actions

S.: They're not taking responsibility for their actions. And you find people very often doing this, when they say: "Oh, I'm terribly sorry, I just can't." What they really mean is: "I don't want to; there's lots of other things I'd rather do than come and help you. But they put it in this form of, "I can't", when really they mean, "I won't". And sometimes you find this in this sort of situation - "oh, I couldn't leave my wife", or otherwise.... "Oh, I couldn't, she would be so upset!" You know, "she'd have a nervous breakdown." Or, "I couldn't possibly leave my husband. He couldn't possibly survive without me." Well, perhaps he couldn't, but what we really mean is, "I don't want to. What we really mean is: 'I'm attached!' So I think one has to be very clear, and very honest with oneself here, and distinguish these two things.

PRIMANAN: It's a question, it seems, of integration that there is a part of you which really does want to do that, but there's another part that, well, many parts of you, must do not want to do that thing.

S.: But there's also another factor - fear of other people's opinion. You want, say, somebody to think, well, you are a nice, helpful person, you'd like to help, but the only thing that prevents you is that you can't. So this, again, it connects up with what we were talking about earlier, projecting the false image of yourself. You'd like people to think that you're nice, and kind, and helpful and unselfish. I mean, you want to go and do your own thing, you don't want to help, but you don't like to admit that; you don't like other people to think that, so you say, ever so sweetly, "Oh I'm so sorry, I'd really love to help you; there's nothing I'd like better but I'm so sorry, I just can't. It's impossible!" This is the attitude, very often, that people have. - "I'd really love to come on retreat, but I can't, circumstances

~~9. -s 42 S- 2/9

S.:~cont'd) prevent me.~' Sometimes, of course, circumstances do but not always. So we must distinguish between the objective situation and our own subjective feelings. Are we really objectively tied - are people really tied in this objective way, to a certain situation, or is it that they tie themselves? So, you know, there are all sorts of implications - honesty, frank communication, accepting responsibility for one's own actions, not wanting people to think that you're better than you really are. There's all sorts of implications here. (Pause) ~If you can enter by the dharma-gate - 'dharma-gate' means a sort of insight into this sort of situation - "you'll rise from the dust and become arhants!~.

U£)A~: Just a reflection on this - the ~quicksand...um...analogy or whatever.... it almost seems that...um... well, talking about the relationship ..4um...that seeing it in terms of an addiction, that continually you are being presented with the opportunities whereby you can begin to wean yourself off -that addiction, and if you can't, you are, in a sense, perpetuating that situation, or even worsening it, and that, like the quicksand, you're just allowing yourself to be sucked down, you know, because you can make an effort each moment, or every now and again. I realise people do get opportunities in their lives to do something, even if: ~the sun is shining quite a little, and to move themselves away from their addiction, or whatever. This often the ~ ~Of it ~ they ~ust allow it to be perpetuated.

S.: Yes. One could say that people can be double prisoners. The Buddha says, 'People who are tied to their wives, children and homes are worse off than prisoners. When they're worse off because they are doubly prisoners. I mean, they are like prisoners by being in a restrictive situation, but they are worse off than the prisoners because they are actually attached to their restrictive situation~ so that when the restrictive situation ends they are not able ~to take advantage of it, in fact, they would like it to continue, even though they may say that they are just longing for their freedom.

UDAYA: Well you see this in the bust-up of relationships -then the rebound, then the new relationship; often within the same week.

S.:-- Not to say the same twenty-four hours! (laughter) (Pause) So what it means is that there are two sorts of action one can take - one can take steps to alleviate the objective situation which is restricting, and one can also, in any case~ take steps to overcome your own subjective attachment to that situation so that, as and when the situation does change, you will be in ~the position to take advantage of that, instead of just renewing that situation in some other way. So if you don't do that, you're "tamely submitting to the laws of the tiger and deliberately allowing yourself to drown in the quicksand"3 and then indeed, you're a simple-minded fellow", or person. (Pause) I mean, also, this draws attention to the fact that, very often, people just don't want to be free, you know~ either objectively or subjectively. Your prison is your 'home', and not only is your home your prison, but your prison is your home. 'Prison' in any sense.

~o. -S ~2 S- 2,9.

U1)AxA: Mm. They did a survey, I think, with ex-prisoners of the sort or ~penal ?) ~ind, and they found that there was a high sort of re-conviction rate, and going back to gaol, and one idea was that life was so institutionalised - they were told when to eat, when to sleep, when to go to the toilet, when to exercise - they came out into the outside world of just so much responsibility, that it was the line of less resistance just to go back into gaol where everything was so 'maximum security'!

S.: Mm. 'Maximum security'! (Chuckling) Well, yes, I read something about prisoners coming out of gaol after seven or eight years and not knowing how to use a public telephone anymore. Al- so, I think, it is a question of the old familiar races, so when you come out after

a long stretch, maybe you don't know anybody any more. Maybe relations have died, maybe your girl-friend's got somebody else, your pals have moved away. Maybe some of them are in gaol, and you can't meet them. There's nobody around that you know, So you get back in gaol. You do something silly, so back you are. There's the same old cheery warder or the same old sour-faced assistant prison governor, but at least you know them, so at least they are your 'friends' in that case - familiar surroundings - the same old 'B' Block, you know, in the prison. Even the same old cell, if you're lucky - "Ah~ here we are, home again!" And it's all so familiar - all the cracks in the wall, and the number of bars, you know~ if they still have bars. It's all so familiar, so you feel more at ease, you feel more comfortable. There is a proverb: "Better the devil you know, than the devil you don't know." And that probably applies to situations. I mean, when you're going to a new city, a new country, there's always a little sort of trepidation, isn't there?

VOICES: (Murmuring agreement)

~But if you're going to a place you know quite well, you've been there lots of times, you know your way around. You know where the restaurants are, and where to get the buses, and where the railway station is - it's quite a different feeling, isn't it?

VIFULA: Things can almost work the other way though. With some people a new experience seems to be the only thing that keeps them going. If they are not constantly experiencing, then they get totally bored.

S.: But even then, it's usually a new experience in the sense of the same old thing in a new sort of way. The same old 'pattern' but it's a slightly different 'colour'.

VUICES: Yes.

S'~ A new book, a new film, a new wine even, but it's the same basic structure, but with certain, ah.....

UDAYA: i{ewrapped!

-A-S: Ewrapped. Yes. Same package, the same old deal, but different just in the details. Essentially you're going through the same thing again. All right, let's go to twenty-five.

PtJ~A: TEXT ~IUN2~.

~3I. -S L42 S- 2/9.

PLJt{NA: T~XT St.~TIUN 25.

S.: ~m. I think when the Buddha says, 'If all longings and desires there is none stronger than sex' he means, of course 'worldly desires', because if the desire for the Dharma, or the desire for the spiritual life was not stronger than sex, you could never leave it. There is that to be borne in mind. But do you agree with this? Do you think this

id~necessarily true? -"Of all lon~- in~s and desires there's none stron~er than sex'! I mean, in what sinse does one say this? Is it necessarily true, or equally true in all the difl~erent stages of life? What is one actually saying in fact? ur, in what sense does one understand this term 'sex'? Is it to be taken very literally?

FUItNA: ~rom the following sentence, they seem to be implying the attractive pull of opposites.

~&: Mm. Ah! ~es.

PUi{NA: Between that which is lacking in one, to what complements....

S.: Yes. Right.

tJi)AYA: ur the desire for completeness or unity, or rulfilment - rulfilment .

S.: but by having recourse to something external, which one experiences as completing oneself, and making up tor one's own inndequac~ies. ~n. Min. I think I've said in the past, that sex- ual desire is a sort of paradigm of that, because it illustrates that, in a particularly forcible way - the polarity between male and female, say, is a sort of paradigm or the polarity the gen- eral polarity, the wider polarity, between the 'subject' and the 'object'~ when the 'subject' regards the 'object' as something to be desired.

UDAYA: Could you say then, ...um...like we were talking about the person before ge~ting their sort or °....well, experiencing their sense of identity by seeing it rereflected in millions of fans' eyes or up on a bill-board, or, ~ou know, in just fame? That woul~ be, in a sense,...um...you know, bringing about that sense of fullness, that sense of unity,...um...through, sort Of, exter- nalising ?

S.: Yes. Well~ in that sense, it's illusory, because you're try- ing to sort of latch on to something external, and experiencing it like that, instead of creating it, or developing it, from with- in your own being. Instead of developing those aspects of your- self, in which you are deficient, you just try to latch on to some- thing of that nature, which exists outside ~ou. You try to sort of clasp something to you, under the impression that that will make you complete. So this is the essence or the 'su~ject/object relation from the volitional point of view. So, you know, this is illustrated in a particularly prominent way, in the case of sexual desire. So, perhaps, the Buddha is saying that sexual desire is the ~entativ desire, because it is particularly intense, and you feel in this sort or way in a particularly in- ~t~~nse manner, particularly at certain stages or one's life. kFause)

-S 42 S- 2/9.

S.: So what does that mean? So long as you are in that sort or situation, looking 'outside', with this desire directed outward- ly, you will not be thinking in terms of

ac~l~y~~d.veloping your own being in a harmonious kind or way. ~ou w~ll not be 'relyin~ on the ~universal) OnenessIt~ to put it metaphysically. SU~ "No~ one under heaven is able to become a iollower of the Wa if he accents dualism. That is to say - ir we regard the dualism be- tween 'subject' and 'object' as ultimate; - ir he thinks that what- ever he is deficient in Is to be obtained outside himself, if he is dualistic in this way, he will never be a follower or the Way, because 'being a follower of the Way' involves, essentially, de- veloping your own being, and your own individuality, ti~t supple- menting yourself ~rom 'outside'. iou see what I mean? iou'ra. trying to grow your own riowers, you're not going and picking your neighbours, and sticking them in your vase! (Fause) Again, as before, there is this sort of aspect of alienation from yourself~, in a way. (1?ause)

iSN~i) U~ Sii)JS 2 TAF£ ~

~ iAk~I!.' Iv.

S.:tcont'd) So do you think that this is something that can be overcome or dispensed with altogether? This looking outside one- self for what one needs, as an individual? Do you think this is something that we can just sort or cut off?

ACHA~~: Not in all senses. Not spiritual fellowship, and things like that.

~.: But there is a diffe~~~~, because, as Furna says, there is ~he question oi the attraction of opposites, but there is also an attraction between similars, you see? In this sort of relat- ionship, in this sort or longing , or this sort or desire~ one is drawn towards that which is opposite 01. oneseli": the defiicien- cy is so extreme on your part, that what you want appears as the opposite or what you are. iou see what I mean?

ANIKK.~A: is this ~~actua;L~defici~ncy~ or is it what we riel is a dericiencX in ourselves?

S.: Well, on our present level or experience the two come to the same thing. Ir there i~ the deficiency we feel the deficiency. So we, you know, so we (?). We'e so much alien- ated from out own being in a deeper sense, that what we desire, what we seek after, is experienced, or even is~ the opposite of what we are~sOtheref0~~~Ou get this sort of polar relation- ship, t~ispo~aLisatio~,th your de~ire going to something which is the opposite of what you are~ and what you see or experience as the opposite that is to say, in the case of the sexes - the attractiono the opposite sex - because the opposite sex is the sex which represents, or contains, or has all those qualities, all those things which you just don't have yourself. But in the case of spiritual fellowship, it is an attraction between simil- ars. You have a certain aspiration, after some years, certain feelings for somebody, you recognise that in others, and you wish to associate with them, or you're dra~owards them, so as to enable you to experience more strongly that which is in you already.

2~3 ~s £+2 S- 1/10.

S.:~~cont'd) So that there are these two k%nds of desire, so to speaks there is the attraction which are opposites, and there are the attraction between complementaries, and the attraction

between complementaries is creative~ whereas the attraction between opposites is reactive, because you can't actually hang on to your 'opposite' indefinitely- your opposite has a life of its own, or her own, or his own and sooner or later fades away, so what becomes of your so-called desire or your so-called love? It will turn to hatred~ So its reactive nature is clearly seen, is clearly shown.

ANITA: Yes. It's suddenly recognising that what you think is love that has to be given to youthat no one else . you can't give love as a commodity to any other being - that~ the feeling is something which is from within yourself.

S.: Right. Yes~ Well, if you feel that someone is giving you something, well, you feel pleased that they are giving it to you at the time, and even love them, as you think, for giving it to you, but when they take it away you hate them. You could even try to destroy them, especially if they tried to give it to somebody else instead of you; well then, your rage knows no bounds, sometimes. But if it's a question of complementarity, you're not dependent on others for something that you haven't got, but together, as it were, you have a more enhanced experience of something which you share then, when you are no longer sharing it - supposing it is spiritual fellowship, which does come to an end, unfortunately~ there won't be feelings of resentment and bitterness, maybe a slight sadness that it's come to an end, but you're very grateful for what you have had. So, it's quite a different kind of experience, a different kind of relating. It's creative rather than reactive. So~ here, sex is taken as a sort of paradigm for the sort of natural opposite, and which you think you require to complement, and supplement, and complete your own being.

ACHAIA: It sometimes seems a big jump between the intellectual understanding of oneness, and actually confronted with sex feelings - let the intellectual understanding ? work on the other.

S.:~.

PRIYANANDA: It seems quite strange to me that these two are put so close together.

S.: Yes.

PRIYANANDA: ... within one verse there is sex and there is 'oneness'.

S.: Yes. It is very extreme in a way. I think one should interpret this, not too metaphysically - this 'relying on the 'universal oneness'. One doesn't know what the original Chinese word is, much less~the original Sanskrit. I don't think it's intended that one should have a metaphysical view of a monistic 'oneness'. I don't think that is intended at all.' Perhaps it would have been better to speak in terms of a different kind of relating, even spiritual fellowship. And clearly, for a long time, one's relating is going to be mixed, and not easily sorted out. There's going

S.:Cont'd) to be elements of polarity in it, with or without sex, and maybe, also, elements of real creativity, and real sort of spiritual fellowship; but it's quite clear what one has to try to intensify. So~ you know, this is why, sometimes, we find people approaching the FWBO, as we say, approaching it as a group, and very often, when they approach it as a group., they are looking for something to supplement themselves, and, in that way, when they don't get out of the group what they think the group ought to be providing, then they feel a bit resentful about that. So, "No one under heaven is able to become a 'follower of the Way' if he accepts dualism"s - that is, if he doesn't try to function in this 'creative' rather than reactive sort of way, with regard to desires. So, the note says, "The Buddhist argues that the distinction between 'this' and 'that' are really void, and that fundamentally everything is one. 11 This completely misses the point. "Sex is the extreme example of the negation of this theory, since it depends entirely upon the attraction or the opposites" - Well, that's fair enough, but what one ought to pose as an opposite to that, is not the attraction between opposites, but the attraction between similars, who already have something, ah, who are not, therefore looking outside themselves, but recognise it also existing 'outside' themselves, and recognise that~if they get together and unite their efforts, well each of them can have for himself, and within himself~or herself, a more intense experience of whatever that is. That you take the help of other people who have experienced what you experience~to experience what you experience, more intensely. Well, I think, said that this is the difference between love and friendship - love is the attraction or opposites, this is sexual love, whereas friendship is the attraction between similars, which can be as strong, according to Plato~the attraction between people who share the same ideals. Well, we'll stop and have a cup or something.

BREAK

S.: All right, twenty-six. Who is next? Udaya.

~(J~AiA 1~t~A~~~T ~ION2~

S.: So what does this first sentence, or first two sentences, really say? - "Those who immerse themselves in longings and desires" Presumably meaning these reactive longings and desires, I am like a man who walks in the teeth of the wind~ carrying a torch. Inevitably his hands will be burnt." (Pause) So, why the inevitability?

UDAYA: It seems almost to sort of be going against the grain - the grain of something fundamental in the universe.

~--~es. So what is that which you are going against? \ru1C~: impermanence?

S.: Impermanence. Yes! Because you'd like whatever the object of your desire is, or whatever you are enjoying you'd like it to be there all the time. But by the very nature of things, it can't be; so to the extent that you depend upon it in a neurotic~, unhealthy way~to that extent~you'll suffer inevitably,

S.:~cont1d) in the inevitable course of things. There is a poem or Blake's, where he says something like...um....I'm trying to remember the exact words.....something about 'He who clasps'1.... I can't remember the exact words of the first line - 'He who seeks to clasp joy/ Does the winged life destroy/ But he who kisses it as it flies/ lives in Eternity's sunrise.' You see what I mean? You can enjoy it 'on the wing', so to speak, and no harm done, but if you try to retain it, well, you destroy the thing itself, and you also suffer. I mean, it is not easy to distinguish between this sort of more 'spiritual' attitude, and a sort of cynical, exploitive attitude. Do you see what I mean? But anyway, the Buddha says, "Those who immerse themselves in these reactive, you know~ feelings and desires are like a man who walks in the teeth of the wind - the wind of impermanence - "carrying a torch. Inevitably his hands will be burnt. " Well, maybe the torch itself is the desire, and if you fall in the teeth of the Wind: - if you try to hang on to the desire despite the law of impermanence, well~ that wind will blow that ? and you will be burnt. Anyway, then the Buddha goes on to illustrate his own, as it were, detachment, and he says, "The gods bestowed the jade girl~ upon me" - the 'jade girl' is a Chinese expression. 'Jade' means something beautiful and precious, so, in other words, "the gods bestowed a very beautiful girl upon me in order to shake my determination~ I said, 'I'm full of every kind of filth~ how come he? ~ I do not need you. ~' So~ you know, what does this mean, and what does this ? illustrate, apart from the Buddha's detachment, would you say?

ANIKETA: That the physical presence of a Deingol a person, would..... come to....come to , ah, deterioration, and, ah....

S.: ~n. Mm. This raises the question of the 'astikkhabhavana' that is to say, the contemplation or the unpleasant side of things; the unpleasant side that is not usually regarded. ~o~ instance you see something which you~are normally attracted to in this reaction~ive kind or way; well, how are you to check that desire? Well~ you could do it conceivably, by directing your attention to the less pleasant side of that particular object which you usually ignore. I mean, that is one way of doing it, and this is what we call the 'asat~a~bhavana'. But do you think this is, in fact, a skillful method ; or ~o~ie, especially nowadays, especially with regard to other people? Does it work, even~ Well, would people even think in this sort of way?

UD~: Someone might think, 'Thank God I don't look like that now!'

S.: Do you think it would really be efficacious?

~EITYM~AI~A: Taking in mind out of the...ah... not alienation, I mean~ not out of the layers of alienation and distortion that does take place in our culture, it may be that most of the sort of contemplation or ugliness, particularly in other people, might be quite harmful. I could see it working in a society where people were quite clear, and quite unbiassed about their emotional ... about their relationships.

S.:~es..Mm.pYeh...but as, presumably, they were, perhaps, in ancient India.

PRI~ANANDA:- Yeah.

or perhaps, in Ancient China. Well, then, what are you to do? Just to give you a concrete example - I mean, supposing for instance, you are offered 'a jade girl' by~the gods well, what do you do? iou can, according to this~sort of tra~ition, consider,ltWell, she may look attractive, she may have a beau- tiful skin, and beautiful, glistening ey S, and raven black hair, and ali that sort o~ thing, but what is all like? There's an- other side to it - she contains all sorts or intestines, nasty, smelly things! There's that aspect also. Surely I don't want; to bring myself into contact with all of those!0 So, would that, in Lact, be the best way of counteracting your-natural reaction? Or- if not, what else could one do~in that sort of situation, to help, you know?

DEA~~~~H&~RA: You could do that soDt of thing on the psychological level - she has certain states of mind, unpleasant states of mind.

~~ MEn. YeS, but one could also~ sort of see things in a way, more psychologically, and say to oneself, "Well she does look quite beautiful, and quite attractive, but why ~o I go out to- wards her in that sort of way? - it's on account of some defici- ency within myself. It might be possible to sort of reduce the intensity of your own desire, just by reflecting, that, what, in fact~ you are after, was in ...was within you. Perhaps you could, in fact, generally convince yourself of that. That might be an- other way of doing it. Otherwise in these modern times, people might think you were denigrating ~he other person. It might not be your intention, but it might sometimes sound likD that. There's another objection I've heard - this was fromadoctor friend of mine - he says:'l What's all this about the foulness of the intes- tines!" l {e said, "They're really beautifully constructed!" He said, "As a medical student I remember when I was doing my anat- omy (Laughter) and ? , Oh, i~ was so beau- tiful to trace them. " (Chuckling) He wasn't put off in the least he said. And he really objected to the Budciliists describing all these processes as foul and repulsive. He said they were fascinating! So, here again, you see the possibility of another point of view. (lAughter) And he said, "iou know, the process or digestion" - he was rather going on about Buddhagosha's~descriptiofl oi the process of digestion as part of the contemplation of the loathesomeness of food - he said, " To begin with, Buddhagosha's got his anatomy all wrong! But apart from that" he said, "The digestive process is so beautiful' it's so fascinating!'l It didn't make him feel that eating was a loath- some business at all! And so what is one to say to a doctor or medical student who sees things in this sort of way? Or sees that particular object in that sort of way? I mean, your sort of con- templation of te loathsomeness of the~body, just wouldn't work there, would it?

RATNAKETU: I know for myself, that tnat one about the loathsome- ness of tie body doesn't work at all with me. What I usually d0~ is compare it to similar circumstances in the past, and whether I've been satisfiied afterwards.....

Ah! i{~~ight!

~7. -S ~2 S- Jilo.

RATNAKbTkJ:....and, of course, you never are!

~~ ~m. Mm.' 'S0~ then, you sort of ask yourself, "We~, O.K.~ there's nothing wrong with the desire, so to speak, but is it that, that I really want? is it that, that I'm trying to do; or am I not really trying to capture a unity; or recapture a unity that I don't possess, but which I can possess - or is achieved, if I devote myself to such-and-such. ~' Perhaps that is a better way to look at it. It is, I mean the~way of contemplating, say, the loathsomeness of thiS, tha~, or the other, seems a bit like a sort of aversion therapy!

VuIC~S: (Murmuring of agreement)

S.: ...if you see what I mean.

V~UIC~S: Yes.

~~~ I don'tt ,as Priyananda said: it might well quite all right with psychologically, quite healthy people, but I rather wonder whether aversion therapy is the~reaily~ best way to help people lead the spiritual life, at this time and place.

}&t~~'~£1A: Another way too, is just to look at the relationship you have with that person....um....ror me anyway, the sexual desire can be...um....almost~ even before a decent relationship has been established.

S.: W~ll, that is usually the case!

M~~~GHA: ~eah. And so you look at what is the particular relation- Ship~ rather than something'outside', you know, imagining outside of it.

M~GttA:..... to know the person as a person, rather than ? you have of particular aspects of that person.

S.: Mm. Of course you may discover that you're not interested in that person as a person at all, actually!

\FuICES:. ~es.

D~tAE~tAi)'tiM{A: I thini~ ii a medical person brings up that thing about intestines ana being very pleasant, I..... they seem to have desires in that direction, then they've probably got some duality going on.

S.: Mm. Yes.

i)t{Ai~~ADEA1{A: ... and it's an intellectual appeal of the anatomy, which doesn't hold when tney have those desires in mind.

S.: Well, no. They probably iorget all about those completely. Well~ again, Buddhagosa says, for instance, in another sort of context - he says, that when someone has

killed a cow and cut it up into pieces - this shows incidentally that they did eat meat  
ancient India - and sits at the cross-roads selling them, he - ~~, the concept 'cow' disappears, and  
the concept 'meat' arises.

%3\$. -- 42 5- 1/10.

S.:~cont'd) You don't think that you are buying 'cow', you think that you are buying 'beef' -  
you are buying 'meat'. ~o, in the same way, when the anatomy student dissects the corpse, he  
doesn't connect the corpse, the organs, with a human being, in a sense, so his reac~ions are to  
that particular, fascinating piece of 'tubing' or whatever it is, and he has those sort of  
reactions; but when he is with a human being he forgets about the tubing and the intestines,  
and these objective, scientific interests, and he responds and functions in a completely  
di~ferent way. So there is a sort of duality~ and he's not able to apply one to the other. He  
keeps those two sets of experiences in two separate compart- ments of his mind, whereas the  
aversion therapy depends on bring- ing them together, which is exactly what he doesn't do!

~DAYA: A girl who comes along to the centre, is a nurse, and I was asking her, just in  
conversation, what she'd been doing late- ly - she said she'd been doing theatre work, and  
that day, or the day before, she had done ....ah.... she had assisted on a hip- joint operation, a  
? socket, or something was being put in, and she was telling how. I said, "It must be  
quite amaz- ing, sort of, just seeing the inside of people, working on them, just like working  
on a car, or something, - it must hav~ its ef- fect,al And she said, '1Uh~ everything is  
sectioned of.r"~And she felt, though, ...um... kshe was quite thoughtiul when she said this),  
...that a lot of doctors that have done a lot of that wor~ - it had anected them quite adversely.

S.: Oh?

JDAYA.:.....and I thought that was quite interesting, that she said, even though it's all  
se~tioned off, that she felt a lot of surgeons became quite weird, quite sort of almost  
disturbed.

S.: ur, even in the sense of treating people as organs, and sections of organs, instead of  
as ? human beings.

UJ)AYA: Yas. One thing she said that she thought they became very arrogant, and  
unless patients, or people spoke to them on their terms, they just weren't interested at all, and  
sort of ?

S.: Mil

Df{AitMA1)HAEA: I just ? a few weeks ago, a surgeon was showing us ?  
he says, "Now, I pull my ovary up here, and I pull my womb over here" k words drowned  
out by laughter) . E~e was really identifying with it. Among other things ? like roles  
and personalities, ? money.

S.: but also there is the more general fact~ that we do this in diiferent ways, all the time - we direct our interest only to aections or things, according to our particular desires, and we also treat human being5~ very often, in that sort of way. We don't ..... we're not aware of tnen as total ~uman beings, and we don't behave towards them accordingly. ~~Ie see them in terms of their capacity to fulfil certain needs of our own, whether they are sex- ual needs, or economic neects, or whatever; but we're just as al- ienated , very often, from tne total ~uman being as ~he doctor

~39. -S '+2 S- 1/10.

S.:~cont'd)or the surgeon may become when he's just finished a series of heart or kidney operations, or transplants even. I mean, in that sense, the baby is alienated from the mother. I mean, to the baby, tha mother is just a big, warm, conitortable cushion with a nice nipple, which can be sucked when you want to do so. A lot of adults have this sort of attitude towards other human beings, without being doctors! Maybe doctors are a rather extreme form of it~ and surgeons, in certain respects; but it is a very common attitude to see people only in terms of your needs, your sublective needs. Anyway, there is this sort of old tech- nique, or old wives1 technique, Of~ when they want to wean the child, they smear the nipple with something very bitter. I don't know whether they still do this, or this isn't in a very modern 1baby' book; but anyway, this is what they used to do to wean the child. . . . . ° .

ViF~UbA: Is it an aversion therapy or ..... ?

S.: Mm? Yes. It is a sort of aversion therapy, a very tradition- alone. But one wonders whether this is the best way or dealing with a situation of this sort, - the 'asukkhabhavana' - as a sort of aversion therapy, or whether it isn't really better to just try and have a deeper understanding of what is actually happen- ing, and try more and more to act upon that, rather than , well, in a way, sort of condition your&elf, because even if you dO~ even if you are put off that particular body by contemplating it as a skin-bag full of every kind of filth, you're still not seeing the whole truth - you're still seeing another aspect of it. It's not the whole truth!

UD~: I'm finding that more and more, with my own life...ah... with things other than sexual desire, but, to sort of...ah...work on eliminating bad choices generally; that is, you know~ choices that sort of take us pff'the path', or further enmesh us in con- fusion and alienatiOn~ or whatever, ....that....that....the most effective form...um....of action, in a sense, is just a balanced routine life, and a full life.

S.:~ Yes. Ah!

UD~: .... and in a sense, not even taking into account the de- sires and that, and I find they're far less likely to...um...

~I think, personally, it's a great mistake - supposing you are trying to sort out the question of sexuality - supposing you have come to a conclusion, well, that sexual desire, certainly in an extreme form, is not very conducive to spiritual development - I think it's a mistake to sort of go all out to concentrate on that~ and try to get rid of it, and also, at least, keep it under



control. I think this is a completely wrong approach. I think what one should be doing is cultivating one's positive emotional life in other directions especially increasing one's experience of 'kalyanamitrata', so that, as you say, you have a full satisfying life, and less and less weight, or less and less pressure, is put on that particular aspect. I don't think you should sort of make that the centre of attention, or any other desire, to go all out to do something about it. I think that would be counter-productive.

~4~. -S '+2. 5- 1/10.

UDAYA: It's giving the thing far more energy than it actually deserves, either one way or the other.

~ Yes! It's giving it more already got, which is quite a lot.

VuICES: (Murmuring of agreement.)

Uj~~~: I sort of felt that a graph could be drawn up of somebody's sort of 'efficiency', in a sense, in their life, as to how well they're adhering to 'the path'. I'd find, I think, with my own when I'm getting run-down, or not having enough retreats, or time away, or, you know, ? of activity you know, the 'inefficiency curve' just rises. drani~~tij~~}l~in~ aan~om~ people tend to make poor choices. That is why I have. to keep community situation, the Order members in particular, an eye on each person in the community, and make sure that things aren't sort of degenerating.

S.: Mm. Also, it's important that people are enjoying their community life; enjoying their spiritual life, otherwise they will seek for neurotic or at least, unskillful compensations. I certainly noticed this at 'Suhbhavati' - that you are only able to carry on with your spiritual life, if you get various 'compensations', or even 'rewards' of a worldly nature, from time to time, for carrying on with your spiritual life! You see what I mean? Spiritual life only is sort of bearable if you are permitted certain deviations from it (chuckling) from time to time! You see the sort of approach? You know you can keep up your morning meditation and evening puja, a bit of study, and keep pretty well ? provided you can go on the binge every Friday night. (Laughter) But, you know, I mean, this is not a good approach at all! You see what I mean? Your spiritual life shouldn't be so hard or so difficult that you need something 'pleasant' of a worldly, and even unskillful-type, to enable you to carry on with your spiritual life. It is very important that the spiritual life itself should be pleasant, should be happy, should be expansive, should be enjoyable.

LJi)AYA: Emotionally positive.

S.~~ Emotionally positive, yes.

UDAYA: 'Cause I do detect in myself and others in the community, people want a sort of 'night off' occasionally, and it's because, you know.....

S.: Well, a'night o'f' is all right. It depends entirely on what you do with that night off'. It shouldn't be a sort of compensating thing, to sort of 'make up' for the rest of the week. You could certainly be different, and that is not to say that you could, or should, be working very hard every single day of the week no! you may need a change; but it should not be in this compensatory sort of way. You see what I mean? You should not require something unskilful to make up for the 'skilfulness' that you've been practising all the week.

RATNAKETU: There's also the danger of, if, sort-of, you're pushed too hard, - you push yourself too hard, or you get into the 'role' of the spiritual life, and it's a sort of a drag up-hill, sort of ?

~ I think this is quite dangerous, and especially it's dangerous in connection with meditation. If you think of meditation as something which you've just got to do whether you like it or not, and it's an awful drag, an awful grind, and so on, and you've got to sit at least for an hour, maybe two, and you just sort of start going off it. It is much better, I say, just to have a short meditation, even ten or fifteen minutes which you actually enjoy, at least as a relaxation, because if you enjoy it, you will tend quite naturally to prolong it. I think it is very important to have that element of enjoyment in the spiritual life. I don't think people can really survive without some kind of emotionally positive experience. If they don't get it in a skilful way, they'll surely get it in an unskilful way! If they are having it in an unskilful way the best thing to do is not just to deprive them of that, but to set up conditions within which they can have a very positive, ah..ah..a skilful positive experience, or a skilful enjoyable experience; or one can even say, a truly enjoyable experience! The unskilful enjoyable experience, very often, isn't very enjoyable, just because it is unskilful - maybe riddled with anxiety, or uncertainty, insecurity and so on. So, I think actually, this approach, which is a bit of a Theravada approach I think, is rather too narrow. It might be possible to use it in certain exceptional circumstances, as a sort of rather drastic last resort, but I think not as a general approach. I think it's much better to make sure one has plenty of opportunities of spiritual fellowship that you really enjoy to take the pressure off the reactive side of life. (Pause) All right, twenty-seven then.

DHARMA: TnJC'T -ASECTION2'.

S.: This is the sort of condensed version of a parable we find in the Pali text. You might have come across it. The Buddha said: 'Those who follow the Way are like a piece of wood in the water

which floats along touching neither bank -" So - "a piece of wood in the water which floats along' - what does that suggest?

VIRULIA: Nothing forced about it.

~ Nothing forced about it - it's floating, it's making progress, it's moving. It's so that of 'entered the stream', so to speak. Maybe not 'entered the stream' in the technical sense, but it's certainly got into the current of spiritual life, and it's flowing and floating along. So - "those who follow the way are like a piece of wood in the water which floats along, touching neither ~. Now what do you think that means?

MEGHA: Not going to any further extreme.

S.: Not going to either extreme. Yes. I mean, a particular pair of extremes - that is to say the 'self-view' and the 'annihilation view'. you probably know these - the 'self-view' that there is or 'eternalist' view, that there is a separate self which is unchanging,

~'f2. -S 42 S- 1/10

S.: (cont'd) And the opposite view that, ah...Oh! and that this self will go on after death...and the opposite view, that there is an unchanging self but it will come to an end at death. It just represents two extremes. SO~ "touching neither bank"~ you could say, 'not oscillating between extremes, between opposites. Not reacting as between love and 'hate', 'hope and fear'. One could take it like that. "and which is neither picked up by men, or intercepted by the gods"- what does one mean by that? - "not picked up by men nor intercepted by the gods." There's a bit of a sort of allegorical meaning here.

i)RI-ANANDA: "Picked up by men" would indicate sort of getting involved, enmeshed in worldly life.

S.: Yes.

t'i(Li-AN1)A: ....and in the group.

S.: Yes. Right! - "nor intercepted by the gods" ? Well, this not being reborn in a heavenly world~, and not being satisfied just with that but you could say, - not being arrested by the affluent society, or any sort of happy life which, though very refined and beautiful, is essentially mundane. It could refer to aesthetic enjoyment, or any kind of pleasant, attractive, undemanding situation, where you just sit back and enjoy life, in a rather narrow sort of way. Ah - "erred by floating scum". What do you think this means? Well, it could mean lots of things, couldn't it? "floating scum" is more like the defilements which appear to come from 'outside', or the unskillful mental states - "nor rots upon the way". What do you think 'rotting' means?

MEGHA: Stagnating.

S.: Stagnating, yes. Sometimes the Buddha speaks of 'rotting inwardly' where you're sort of like a big tree. If you look at from the outside the tree seems quite sound, but actually inside it's all rotten. This means when you put on a good show of the spiritual life but there's no real sort of substance to it. So, "who follow the Way are like a piece of wood in the water which I know to be rotting by the time it reaches the sea, hindered by the floating scum, nor rots upon the way. I am prepared to undertake that such a piece of wood will certainly reach the sea. If those who study the Way are not misled by their feelings and desires, not disturbed by any sort of depravity and if they earnestly advance towards the unphenomenal~ I am prepared to undertake that they will certainly attain the Way - ("advance towards the unphenomenal" that is the transcendental, nirvana, enlightenment). SO~ what do you think is the general sense, or general meaning of the

passage?

ACHALA: It's almost like a karmic ? . If you do positive things you'll end up ?

S.: i~m. fes. II. you keep'moving', ii- you keep progressing, sooner or later you w~ll reach your goal.

UDAYA: It's like a sort of slight elaboration on the last words of the Buddha.

2q3. -s +2 S- 2/IC.

S.: Yes.

END U~ SIDE I TAPE 10.

SIDE 2 TAFE 10.

~~'cont'd Don't you think that this sort of parable of the log, or the piece of wood - (the Fall says 'log') - could be developed

a bit further? I mean, what~is a log?

VUICES: (Inaudible) tree.

S.: Yes, but how does it get into the river?

~4EGHA.: It' knocked down.

S.: It (drops ?) down. So what does that sort of suggest?

FURNA: It's left home and I gone forth'.

S.: It's left home and 'gone forth'. (~aughter) It's left all the other trees~ all the ..

VOICE.: The forest.

S.: The jungle - the group, yes. And what about its roots?

FATNA~TU: iseaves them behind.

S.: Leaves them behind, yes. And what usually happens when it's chopped down by men? Its branches are chopped off, So what does that represent, could you say?

EATNAKETLJ: One-minded determination.

S.: Yes. One mind of determination. All the unnecessary forks and diversions are trimmed, and even the bark is sometimes stripped off, isn't it? The outer shell - the conventional, social per- sonality; you could say that too.

PLJ1{NA: Shaving the hair, iii terms of (voices speaking together blots out words) your outward conventional 'caste', if you like.

S.: Yes.

~Ui{NA: Your socially accepted image has been discarded.

is S.:toY~5O of what you have to be careful to do

the 'religious' image - the 'professional' holy man, so to speak!

I mean, in this connection, I sometimes say that we talk about monasti~ robes', but actually in, say~ Pali, there is no such term as 'robes' with that sort of connotation, it's simply 'clothes'. There is no such suggestion of 'robes', in that sort of hieratic sense - just different 'clothes', or clothes dyed yellow. One of my most amusing experiences when I was in India - this was when ~I came down to Calcutta - I was wearing my yellow robes. My yell- ow robes were rather old, and a bit shabby - so I happened to meet

S.:~cont'd) the head monk~ the abbot, so to speak,-though there was nothing abbot-like about him, - in the Mahabodhi Society Centre in Calcutta, and when he saw me, he said, "Oh! ~~Ihy are you wear- ing those Old~ shabby robes", he says, "you mustn't wear robes like that what will people think of us?" ~Laughter) So he pro~uced some nice, new, bright yellow robes, and he insis- ted that I put them on. Didn't like my~old, shabby robes at all! So I thought, "Well! Well! Well! We have come a long way!" (Laughter) He always used to have beautiful, Silk~ yellow robes. Always a very new, spic-and-span one! Anyway - twenty-eight.

SUVAJRI: Tt:XT SECTIUN 2~.

S.: i'tn. This seems to contradict what we're usually told about Buddhism, doesn't it? "Be careful not to depend on your intelli- gence".

WIFULA: intelligence to...ah... (pause).... ah.... to reel that you are able to.... that you are not ? by some- thing - using it in that sort of way.

~ I think 'intelligence', really, is used in ..... if we we~nt back to the original, we would find it wasn't so much 'intellig- ence' as 'mind', or 'consciousness' even, or 'awareness' - that your own consciousness, your own awareness~ is very limited, it's very conditioned, so you cannot rely on it as though it were, in fact unlimited and unconditioned. This is what..... so it is not ~o be trusted, on account of its limitations. SO~ "Take care not to come in contact with uh~sical attractions - such contacts result in calamities." That is to say, you don't know your own mind~ you don't know your own weak~iesses, so be careful not to get into those situations where your weaknesses can be exploited.

UT'AYA: Things aren't always what they seem!

S.:Mm.

LJi)AYA: I've noticed one thing that occurs to me, that...um... sometimes with a particular person, they may do something, and you...ah...they might do something 'funny' or whatever, and you'll laugh, or give them attention in some way, which is quite appro- priate in some situations, but on getting to know that person bet- ter you may see that is the last thing that person needs, and if anything, they need less attention. Maybe it's that sort of thing, that, you know, because you don't see things deeply enough, we tend to make mistakes.

S.: ~tm. Well where it says, "Take care not to come in contact with phYsical attractivns such c~tacts result in calamities'1; Well~ this is the basis, in a way, of having single-sex communi- tie~ and single-sex retreats. This is what we found in England, and this is how these sort of things were started up~ because? as I pointed out then~ people were going away on retreat to get away from distractions, so they were leaving behind their news- papers, and leaving behind their television sets, and their tran- sistor radios, and all the rest of it, but they

were taking on ~~~retreat with them the biggest distraction of all, for most of them,

245:. -SL\*2 5- 2/10.

S.:(cont'd) especially young people, which was , you know~ members of the opposite sex. And that seemed so ridiculous! SO~ eventually it was found, that if one left that particular distraction 'at home', and went on retreat without it~ then one had a much better retreat. So this was the case of "taking care not to come into contact with physical attractions It on occasions like that~ because 'such contacts result in calamities' - they just distract your mind. S~when You've reached the state of 'Aranant'q you You can depend on your own intelligence"~ because they are of your consciousness, your own awareness, and that must be the goal; and until then, you must be very careful, and even distrust yourself in certain situations.

Fi{IYANANDA: It seems that it is implying that one needs to be prepared to give up any idea that one has of oneself as being, perhaps, strong enough to resist temptation. One needs to realise that at certain times and in certain places one is very, very weak~ and volatile, and, ah....

S.: I even sort of, put it more strongly than that - even supposing you are strong enough to resist temptation, even supposing you should not want to ~e always in a situation where you're having to resist external things.....

~.: Yes. It takes up too much energy.

S.: It takes up too much energy - there is too much strain, too much conflict, even if you carried it off successfully. You need to be in a situation, where~you just don't have to make that sort of effort~ and where you can sort of, relax, and be free, and expansive, quite safely. That's also necessary.

ANIM~~TA: This isn't just between the sexes, but even with people who don't know each other very well, for the first time - I know with myself, there is that sort of anxiety, a bit of tension, and it is not until you are with people for a while, that you begin to relax and feel better.

S.: Yes. So it is very important that you have: a situation within which you can completely, without fear of consequences, so to speak, and that is the spiritual community; especially for most people, the single-sex spiritual community. You can relax there and be yourself without, as it were, any fear of untoward consequences. But I think it is important you aren't making a strong, conscious effort to resist external distractions all the time - this is too much of a strain I would say, for most people. And living in a big, busy city can ~e that sort of a strain - you know, you are trying to shut out the sound all the time. You need to go away somewhere, sometimes, to a place where you don't have to do that. But, you know, the important thing that is said here, or that is suggested here, is that the more spiritually de-

veloped you become, the more you can rely on your own conscious- ness, your own awareness, or your own 'intelligence'. As it's said here: the more truly free and independent you become<sup>2</sup> but you can't be independent unless you are free - I mean, like that trap- ped man I was talking about earlier on. You're not free unless you're in a position to do what you want~to do.

PRI~ANAI~i)A: It seems to me that this is directly related back

~b. -S 42 5- 2/10.

~EIYANANDA: to what we were talking about 'kalyanamitrata' : that this awareness is developed only, really, through othcs - that one can't trust oneself absolutely ; one needs to have 'mirroring' from others, in order to find out where one's weaknesses are. One can't depend totally on oneself.

~ Yes. I think this is where the spiritual community, in any sense, - the people with whom yo'~ are in close contact spiritual- ly, on a regular basis, is very, very useful, even indispenBabl~. Even if you're going in the right direction~ i~u remain on your own, it is very easy to develop in a one-sided sort of way<sup>2</sup> just because you miss certain thing~ you're not aware of certain things, you need another person to poin~ out, and, sometimes, spmeone of a different kind, a different temperament, with a different sort of mind, who sees things in a different sort of way. I think, even in practical matters, as well as spiritual matters it is quite important to sort of consult people who think dif~erently from the way in which you think; then you get a different angle on things which enable you to see so~ething that you'd over- ed~~0 one c~ be aware of one's own limitations in a posi- %of~vke sort or way. I mean, one should know those occasions when one needs to consult other people; to consult even the expert when necessary - someone who knows more within a certain area than you know; and you do that in your own interests. One doesn't know everything! One's consciousness is not unconditioned. SO~ £ mean, this is also why it's very important if there is a meeting, especially if it's a council meeting, everybodyY's view is taken on every issue. You don't allow anYbodY ~ remain silent because sometimes people naturally tend to remain silent<sup>3</sup> ~ t~~~ onP of the jobs of the chairman: to ask everybodyY, ~ make sure everYbodY sa~s what theY actuallyY think. I remember in this con- nection there was a statement made by Edmund Burke, the great pol- itical thinker of the eighteenth century, and he said he'd not been on any committee where the least significant member of the committee, or the least important member, had not made some sug- gestion which was really worthy of the cosideration of the whole committee. And I think that that is quite a point to remember that sometimes, a seemingly insignificant or unimportant commi~~ tee or council member, or whatever itis ma~ be able to make a quite worth while suggestion which everyody could take up and adopt. So, therefore, it is one 0£ the chairman's jobs to eli- cit an opinion from everybody present , on any relevant occasion, because very, very few people are able to see every aspect of the question. You usually need to sort of pool your resources. This is very necessary. Even the most brilliant person can't~see every aspect of a ? ° So the Buddha said "Be careful not to depend on your own 'intelligence1- it is not ~o be trusted." So, as I said, this~applies to practical affairs even to provid- ing a Centre, as well as to one's own spiritual ~evelopment. So one should never be afraid to ask for advice or suggestions, or take



all information you possibly can from different sources, before coming to a decision. Always sort of consult others, but, in the end, the responsibility is yours. You have to make the decision, but you should inform yourself as thoroughly as you can by sounding out as many people as you can before you take that decision, and also, there's an art in knowing who you should consult, - (chuckling) I think this is one of the reasons why ancient people5~~~~ often, consulted omens. It's to get the

~4?7. 5 L42 (3- 2/10.

S.: Cont'd) unexpected angle on things to be taken into consideration. It's not that they were such fools that they implicitly followed the omen, but the omen ... like when you consult the "I Ching", it might give you an unsuspected angle on things, which you can then consider, or take into consideration. It doesn't mean you've got to follow it implicitly.

PURNA: You often need to do something apparently non-rational and arbitrary to break you out of a certain way of looking at things.

~ Mm! Well, I mean, in some civilisations, in some cultures they listen very carefully to what mentally disturbed people say; what comments they make, or even the reaction of animals and birds. It does sort of spark off another side of one's mind, and you see things in a more different way. I mean, for instance, you might have thought of something that has happened that's really good you're really pleased, and you're going straight ahead, and suddenly you see something, say, a flight of birds in the sky, that traditionally, is supposed to be a bad omen3 something wrong; that's a bad omen - maybe what is happening isn't so good as it looks; you start thinking much more carefully. Well, because there's been a bad omen, and then, maybe, you do see that, well, there were certain factors you hadn't noticed before, which are not so favourable as you thought they were. But you know, you've been inspired or stimulated to do that by seeing that so-called 'bad omen'. SO sometimes these irrational things can help in that sort of way, but it assumes that you don't follow them implicitly. They just make you think or have second thoughts about certain things, or make you look at things from an unfamiliar angle.

ANITA: Yes. Sometimes it's just a chance remark that even a madman may make, or someone that ... that will, suddenly if you are receptive to it, can suddenly open up a new perspective . .... aspect.

S.: Yes. Mm. A new perspective. Yes. So it is important to consult a number of people, and preferably people of different outlooks, of different ways of looking at things. That's why, let's say if it's all men on the committee, or council, or whatever it is, it is quite a good thing to ask one or two women about that particular issue, because women see things in a different way2 and, vice versa. So if you have a quite different point of view or angle, on things the chances are that they will point out something you have overlooked, which may be relevant. Or, if you are all very young, well, sometimes, consult with an older person, or again, vice versa - if you're very old - well, again some cultures do this - very deliberately

bring in one young person, one person to give his view his approach to something, and as I've said, many cultures do ~e into account what tneementaly un- balanced say; or things which are said by chance, or by accident. I remember reading a sort of science fiction story about some fut- ure , some ideal state, where human oeings nad really assumed per- fection; everything was perfectly organised, and there was a gi- gantic computer, who was, of course, G0d~ just everything. So the whole of this world, wnich was a complete city, was run by this gigantic computer; but the computer .... wnoever had built the computer....ah...into the computer had been built ~n'imperfection factor'. ~Chuckling) So that every now

-S 42 5- 2/10.

S.: [cont'd) and then, every ieuw centuries, something would go wrong. This had~been deliberately introduced, which was to stimulate the whole organism, because if it went on its perfection century af- ter century, it would sort of, flag. Even perfection would flag, so imperfection ~ept the perfection itself in being (chuckling). So there's a lot of truth in tnat: you sometimes need the unexpec- ted factor to jolt you out of what you're doing, even when it~s good, because it might become a bit stagnant a bit stale~ so you need the stimulus o& a iresh challenge; some~hing to cope with; something to deal with, and that's a good thing. W~l, y~ou've seen that in the case of the 'jack-in-the-boxes'. ~chuci~iing) but it would have worked like that even if things had been com- pletely 'ideal' as it were. It ~L~5 good to have a slightly dis- turbing factor, so to speak, which rallies your resources. I mean, this is one of the reasons why people like Nietzsche says that enemies are very ~seful - they prevent you having an 'easy' time; they're always alter you, and that stimulates your own resources, and all the rest of it.

AN~TA: it~ like the grain of sand in the oyster.

S.: Mm. Yes.

AN£~iSi.A: ....which produces the pearl.

S.: Yes. Anyway, anything more on that? I think we'd better go on to the next section this morning. (Pause) Knowin~ one's own limitations.

PttttA: Well, that...um...we will tend to take courses of action that will perpetuate our.. .um. ..neuroses....

S.: Mm. .... your existing pattern, even. It need not even be an unskili~ul pattern; It cotud- be a skilful pattern, but just per- petuation of the pattern aan itself become, nvt ex~ctly unskiliNil, but it may prevent f~ther growth - even the perpetuation of a skiliul pattern, if it's the sam~ old skilful pattern, over and over again, and dothing new. Your whole way of life may be very skilful; you may not be breaking any precepts, but on the other hand~ you may

not be really progressing, just because it is all so regular, and even, and steady.

MEGiA~: Almost creating a permanent situation, really, isn't it?

S.: Because, usually, life itself looks after that, doesn't it? ~G~iA: Yeah.

S.: There is one thing that does tend to bring about a change in any situation, and that is the advent of a new person into that situation. I mean, there's a long story by Goethe, which deals with this, which is called "The Elective Affinities", which shows how almost in a chemical fashion, a new person entering into a situation where there are already other people, has a sort of catalytic effect, and changes them and their relations. And one can see this happening. So the introduction of a new factor, especially in the form of a new person, alters this.

pUk{NA: New Order members.

-S %2 5- 2/10.

L3.: New-Order members, for instance, yes. Even just one has this sort of effect. So that it's a different Sangha. It's not... I mean, it's not, say, new people joining the old Sangha - the old Sangha remaining the same - no! New-people join the, well, let's say, the existing Sangha, (though 'join' is the wrong word), ah... but then the Sangha changes, it is no longer the old Sangha; the Sangha also grows. So, if it were possible for new people to join the old Sangha, and the Sangha absorbed them and remained the same, what would that mean?

A~iJ~Qi~;TA: It was a group. -

S.: It would mean it was a group, because you would be assimilated into an unchanging structure. So the Sangha is not the sort of sum total of the relationships between you, something fixed and rigid into which you fit, which is what the group is. So, obviously, the Sangha is the sum total of all relationships between you, the Sangha, (including your common ideals and so on), well then, when you admit new members, (again to use the wrong term), well, the relationships must change; so that means that the Sangha as the sum total of those relationships must change also. You see what I mean?

ANiiJ~TA: And it's like real communication between two people, when you are ..... and the difference between that and when you're just talking at each other. One changes because of the exchange.

S.: Yes. You may know that when two people are talking and a third person comes into the room and joins in - well, there's a subtle change in relationship between the two people.

M~~~A ies!

S.: li they remain unchanged and go on relating exactly the same as before, what does that mean?

ANi~Li!;TA...: That's completely ignoring.....

S.: iney are ignoring tne ptrier. And, sometimes Of course, peo- ple do tnat~ in a polite sort 01- way, you know, especially couples.

xou notice couples tend to do tnis: they don't adapt their attitude to the advent ol- new people, because they want to insist on being a couple. This is what one finds very often, but actually every time a new person enters in to any given situation, whether it's social or apiritual, everybody within that situation, who is already within it, should change; maybe not radically change, certainly not in a social situation but certainly their behaviour should be modified, and' their at~itude should be modified in....

ANIKETA (bro~ing in) It's like different instruments coming in in an orchestra.....

S.: But sometimes one finds with couples, they don't want you to join in the relationship between them, they want to carry on as before and with you just as a spectator - you are the audience, and they'start even 'playing to the audience'~ and you can even see this. And the fact that there is an audience reiniorses their feeling of togetherness, so they use you as audience to reinforce their feeling of 'togetherness' because they are not all that sure ~f it. They don't admit you in~o the relationship, into the inter-

~O. -S ~2 5- 2/10.

~ont'd -play that is going on between them. You are excluded from that. You are just sitting there as'in the audience'. I can watch these things going on with people. I mean, have you ever observed all this sort of thing?

\TUICi~~~: (in unison) Yes.

PRIYANANDA: You relate to the couples as a sort of one unit, and

S.: Yes! Right!

PRIYANAN~DA: ...and not as two people. I noticed this talking to husband and wife. I'll be talking to the husband and I feel as though I'm talking to the wife as well.

~ Yes.

PRIYANANDA: She could equally answer for him as he could for her.

~ Yes.

UDAYA: What I find disturbing is when you are talking to a couple and then they both start talking ~o you at the~same time, (chuckle) and you're supposed to cope . It can be weird!

S.: Yes.

PEIYANANDA: Especially face to face, and you don't know which one to r~ply to.

UDAYA: But it's that both are talking at the same time to you, and you're supposed to disentangle it.

S.: Or talking to each other .... (interjecting)

UDAYA: .d.&S thou h they're both occupying the same body. They forget there are wo different mouths, and you know.... it's real sort of weird.

S.: Ah! It's a monster with two heads - a two-headed monster! (laughter) I just refuse any longer to see people as couples. I forget the last time I saw a couple as such. I insist now that husbands and wives especially, see me separately. ~Thefact ~hat I'm seeing the husband is no reason to see the wife, and the fact that I'm seeing the wife is no reason to see the husband. (Chuckles) So now what happena, certainly in England... it is sort of recog- nised now, that you don't have to go along as a couple; in fact you can't! It's not allowed! Not so long ago somebody came to see me, or he said he wanted to see me - (he was sort of passing through Norwich, or something) and he turned up with his girl- friend, and the girlfriend took it for granted she'd be 'sitting- in' on the interview, so she was told (chuckling) by one of the boys that she was to wait downstairs while he went upstairs to have his talk with me, and she was quite offended. But anyway afterwards, he explained and she understood. But she took it or granted she'd come up with him, though she'd never met me she didn't know me, or have anything to do with me, and I jus~ didn't want to spend time on a social call; but if he had something to discuss with me I was quite hapyt o discuss it, but not to discuss it with bo~h of them. But his is often what we find in

S.: (cont'd) Social life - "Love me, love my dog"! it's just like that. And there is this weird thing of husband and wife trying to function as one unit, which they are not! So as long as they're trying to to function as a unit they can't function as individuals. It's absolutely impossible! Because practically speaking, husbands and wives have to do certain things together, it's unavoidable - maybe have to go on holiday together, maybe go out shopping toget- her, maybe it's unavoidable sometimes, but the more unavoidable it is the more careful you should be to ensure that when you can, act as an individual, and not assume that your

entire social life must be lived as a couple. So you have couples meeting couples. Have you noticed in certain social situations in which, if you're not a couple, you're not socially accepted?

VOICES: Mm. Yes.

S.: Usually a couple wouldn't invite a single person to a meal, they invite a couple.

ANIKETA: Yes. It came as a real shock to me, when I became a widow, and not being invited so much - there were some wives who, I think, subconsciously thought, 'Oh, she's a single woman now. It's strange.

S.: You mean as though you hadn't been one before?

ANIKETA. Yes, sort of.

S.: As though you were just a half, the half that was left. Well, there's a colloquial expression - "my better half". Well usually, it's said in sort of run, but there is a seriousness to it - that you are just a half, even if you're the better half! I mean, the husband calls the wife "the better half", not that he really believes it! It's his joke. (Laughter)

UDAYA: Something I really noticed, that I thought was quite interesting - we had a newsletter or circular, or something, from another Buddhist group in Auckland, I think a Tibetan Buddhist group, and um...they had, not branches, but sort of representatives in the city, and it was sort of Phil and Glad of so-and-so, and Bob and someone. They were all couples! It was amazing.

S.: Well, I'll tell you something better than that - in ? Roshi's priories in England and America each priory has a Prior and Prioress, and they are married couples. Yes.'

UDAYA: It seemed to indicate to me the level of things that were going on.

S.: Yes. Right! Yes.

UDAYA: Just because one sort of ? naturally the husband and wife were interested, it wasn't sort of individuals individually interested in Buddhism.

S.: But how do couples come to be interested in something like Buddhism? As couples I mean, as distinct from having two independent interests as individuals which they might be even following together. How do couples come to be involved with Buddhism? They must see it as a group activity.

PRIYANANDA: They as a group can join in this other group, which has group activities they can join in ? . But also one is usually stronger than the other - either the husband or the wife, is stronger, and their enthusiasm is great enough, so they influence the other person.

S.: Well, sometimes, it is that one is definitely interested and wants to go along, and get involved in whatever it is, and the other does not feel secure enough to allow that person to go along by himself or by herself and insists on tagging along with them, so as to not let them out of their sight, so to speak. I mean, not that the other partner is interested, say, in Buddhism, but the first partner is interested ? the second partner goes along, not because he or she is interested in Buddhism, but because he or she doesn't want to be separated from the partner, so is prepared to accompany them even to Buddhist meetings.

ANIKETA: Sometimes they come to check you out.

S.: Yes.

ANIKETA: To check out...ah...everything.

RATNAKETU: I noticed at the Centre a lot, some.... one part of a couple comes along for a while .....

VOICES: (Laughter) One part of a couple ?!

RATNAKETU: ..... and they'd be coming along regularly for a few weeks, and ....ah....then you'll notice the other half comes along, and after the other half sees .....they weren't really interested .....(number two that is ? ) so...um...after that they're not so regular, because she doesn't like what's going on, or he doesn't like what's going on and weren't really interested and says, "Don't go along to those things."

UDAYA: Or one half will send the other half to check it out.

S.: But the assumption seems to be that whatever they do, they have to do together. If they can't come along together, well, they won't come along at all; or if they stay at home, they'll stay at home together, but there is no question of one definitely going because they are interested and the other one staying at home and doing something else because he or she is not interested. That seems to be a possibility that isn't usually considered, unless they're, sometimes, quite old and their marriage has lost its sav- our anyway, and they don't mind each other ? other activities. But usually they have to stick together.

ANIKETA: There seems to be a deeply rooted fear of wach becoming an individual, or allowing one or other to become an individual.

S.: Yes. Because if you see them as supplying your need, well, how can you allow them to go off on their own. It comes back to what we were talking about at the very beginning. I really think couples are disastrous as we usually encounter them, from the spi- ritual point of view. I mean, ( ? ) all husbands and wives are 'couples' in that sense, otherwise they'd drive each

S.: (cont'd) other mad. I mean you can find 'couples' that are not husband and wife - I don't just mean boyfriend and girlfriend - you can find cvupies (ol ?)~ maybe, a mother and daughter, or father and son,(though this ?) much more rare, but mother and daughter ? form a sort of couple; or elder sister and younger sister - you finci~this.

t#i{IYANANDA: Two women friends, particularly older womwn.

VOICES: (murmuring of agreement)

S.: Mm. Yes. There is a sort of compiementarity about relation- ships.

UDAYA: And sort of well-established roles.

~.: Yes. b~rn. We did have a father and son coming along to the Centre in i!~flgland~ in £aondon, once, and that was quite strange, because the son who was much younger txian Lne father - I mean younger than sons usually are ~ relation to their fathers - seemed to be tne bO55~ in a way. The father was tagging along behind (he was a widower), and ii' he uidn't come, well, he just sat at home by himself, ~the son was living at home); so he came along, and (chuckling) they seemed quite like a couple. It was quite odd. But that is comparatively rare. In the end the son stopped com- ing, and the old father cLi(fl'l't come anymore either. But for a long time you saw them together ? And we hacL several mothers and daughters come aivng in that sort or way - mother and grown-up daughter.

~~GHA: I was going to say we donlt have any of that here but.... (laughter)..... we have.

VirU~: Ali rive! ?

S.: Well, perhaps we should leave it there for this morning. Someone is going to produce some lunch somewhere I hope.

END O~ SIDE 2 TAPE 10.

~i~Lu-TAPI!i~Il.

~GliA Shall I carry on with verse twenty-nine?

S.: Itight.

~1EG£{A: Tii;XT SECTION 29..

S.: So the 3uddha is ev~denti-y speaking to...ah...men, speaking to monks, and for women or nuns, it would be the other way around. ~~at do you think of this kind of 'therapy', so to speak: t1Think~ ingo~~~oId women as your mothers, those older than than yourselves as elder sisters etc.? Do you tnink this would work very well? I mean nowadays.

~El~ANANDA: I know from my own experience that,...ah...ii l...ah... the way I relate to my sister, (I have one sister), and the way I--relate to her....ah...at ieast it doesn't have a sexual



element

~~. -S 42 S- 1/II.

P~IYANANDA:~cont'd) in it. If I'd relate to lost~women, or to all women in that way, it would be healthy. I'm not sure if what's meant. . . .that's what's indicated here.

S.: Mm. Miii.

FRI~ANANDA: in the brother/sister relationship, there isn't the sexual element, and it-one had that same relationship with a woman without the sexual element it would be more.00...

S.: Yes. Yeh. if for instance, it says: "Think 'I...ah...I' of old women as of our mothers or those older than ourselves as of our elder sisters" - it's as though they~are making use of the conventional inhibitions, so to speak, of incest, so that, if you can associate a woman older than yourself or younger than yourself with the ideas of, say, "mother", "elder sister", "younger sister", "daughter", and so on, because the two ideas cannot co-exist; that is to say, the idea of that kind of relationship and the sexual feeling. By calling forth the image of "mother" and "sister" and so on, you will inhibit the sexual feeling. But what I'm sort of wondering is, well, whether this is the best way to do it, or whether it should be done in that sort of way, because it is using conditioning to drive out another. You see what I mean?

VOICES: Yeah.

S.: And also, another thing I have in mind is that nowada~5~ people don't necessarily think of their mothers~and elder sisters in very positive ways, so you might be bringing~all sorts of~cho- logical complications. You see what I mean?

VOICES.: Yeh. MDI.

S.: So~ perhaps, one has to take those things into consideration too. ? in what sense is there that this can be taken positively, nowadays? It isn't~at the Buddha is saying: 'I tell, in the same way that you treat, say, your sister just as an individual, you treat other women as individuals - it's not saying just that, he's sort of saying: 'Sort of superimpose upon a woman whom you happen to meet, the appropriate idea - if she's older, as "mother", if she's younger, or a bit older than you, say, as "elder sister"; so superimpose that idea upon the actual woman you encounter, so that, instead of responding to her sexually, you respond as you would to your mother ~. etc0 'But if you take that too literally you're not really seeing the person; you're, in a sense, alienating yourself from what you actually see, which is~ perhaps, from another point of view, not desirable, even if what you are trying to do is desirable. So, can you, in~fact, do this? I mean, it depends a lot on the Indian background ~not that the background here is Indian) - in India, people often very easily adopt you and classify you, and make you a member of the family. You see what I mean? It's ~very easy to incorporate somebody into the family as an 'uncle' or an 'aunt,' or an 'elder sister'.

It's a sort of technique, in a way, for sort of neutralising any sort of sexual reeling, and Indians do this very easily; but is it very easy for us to do this? When our family relationships, already, are so weak? We don't have an elder sister, or a younger sister, very often. Can we then, if we meet, say, a woman at the Centre, and we start finding her attractive, can we sort of with any con.

~5.      ~\*2 S-      I/II.

S0:~cont'd) - viction, sort of say to ourselves, tWell, this is really my eldest sister, or my younger sister? Can we really do that? ~or brother, as the case may be. Is it very easy; or is it very realistic?

VIPLILA: Probably not. ~Murmuring or other voices).

S.: And in the Indian family, your attitude towards the new person who is now adopted into the family can be sort of strengthened or reinforced by the attitude of other members of the family. Supposing you bring along some young woman and she's introduced as your sort of sister, as it were, and the family starts treating her as 'sister', well, that encourages you to treat her as 'sister', more and more, and not in some other way. ~in our modern situation in the West, it isn't really like that, is it? So, can we actually do this? Can we follow this advice in this way, literally? Do we slip so easily into this way of actually regarding people who are not related to us as 'brother' ~r 'sister', 'aunt' or 'uncle', and so on? I mean, has anybody actually ever done this successfully, or tried to do it? Or heard of anybody ? doing it?

M-G~: Actually, in Occupational Therapy, we are taught, for young people to relate to old people...um....in a ? maybe you could think of them like they're your grandmother, kind of thing - come across in that way.

S.: Mm.

b~GHA: At least you have some relationship with an older person from ? remember that you can relate to them, you know, older people in general.

S.: Yes.

~in~GhA: But that's to get over the 'generation gap

S.: Yes. Mm. ~erhaps from our modern point of view, from our Western point of view~ it ~robably is more effective just to try and think of, or just see members of the opposite sex, as individuals. i'erhaps in the long run that is the only ~ncin way of doing it.

RATNAKbTLJ: ~ur a sort of 'achievement' orientation - you could look and see whether...um...getting sexually involved with that person would achieve what you wanted to achieve.

S.: Well, that's a sort of rational reflection.

Ut)AYA Some ideas that came out of "Love and Addiction", from Purna's talk the other day, ~coughing) ~ll, maybe one reflection that could be borne in mind is...um...is that really going to help that person, or is it for the ~appiness ol. that other person

S.: Yes!

LJDAYA °.....or is it for our own~~

-S '\*2 S- 1111.

S.: jes! i{ight~ That's true. Yes. I mean, this sort or comes back to the beginning of this section: "ThQ ~Ji~ sa~~4: '~ak~ care to avoid looking on the beauty of women and do not converse with them.' ~' bet's deal with the foot-note first -"this applies only to monks and not to laymen, who may marry1,. ~hat does that sort of suggest to you? t~ihat seems to be the underlying assumpt- ion here in this little footnote~

PUitNA: it's for those that are taking it seriously kto) adopt one type of behaviour, kand) those that want to be half-hearted.....

S.: Yes. Well, it suggests sort of, that the lay Buddhist almost doesn't have to bother. It's a rather extreme sort of differenti- ation between the layman, for whom, practically, anything goes, and the monk, who has to be really strict. But surely this appl- lies in a degree to anybody who is trying to evolve. And you no- tics it even says 'monks and laymen', and doesn't even mention the nuns and laywomen. SO~ I mean, in a very general way, if you don't want to become preoccupied with something, don't want to become attached to something, don't want to become addicted to it, Lo ~ allow your mind to dwell on its sort of ~leasant or iavourable as- ~ects, and to start becomin~ wra~ned u~ in them. iou see what I mean? Eh? i mean the 'beauty or womwn' here, is just one example of that. ~irst of all you see, then you're attracted, then you go on looking, and then you turn it over in your mind, and you start thinking~ "Oh, isn't that nice, isn't that pretty, isn't that lovely, isn't that wonderful; how nice it would be to have a closer cont- act, and then ypu start letting your imagination run wild, and be- fore long your will, your volition starts getting involved. So this is true with regard to anything. It can be true with regard to roodstulfs that you see in a shop window~ or a pretty dress, or a new pair ol trousers, or something. At first you see it~ then you start looking at it, then you start turning it over in your mind, then you start fancying yourself eating it, or wearing it~ then you go into the shop and buy it. It's exactly the same pro- cess, SO, ~ vou don't want t~e end result, check it right at the beginning. Take care to avoid I~oking at that particuiar ~? You just see it, but ii you don't, or really think it isn'tood for you to have that thing~ or to use it, or enjoy it~ or in ulge in it,.don't look a second time2 because then you will start dwell- ing upon the attractiveness of it, and start being drawn by that. I mean this is ~how ?) we allow the process to go on to the point where we can't stop it, instead of sort of nipping it in the bud. in the very early stage when we have it under control. I mean,

this is why, for instance, - to go back to the original example - . supposing you go out with somebody once, and you have a pleasant time; if you ask them out the second time chances are that you're going to get in the habit of it. So the criterion is: if you can just rest satisfied with once~ and that's that. You just have one look at the pretty object, alright, that's that. You know quite well that if you have a second look, you're more likely to have a third; if you have a third you're~certain to have a fourth; if you have a fourth, a fifth~ is inevitable. And if you have a fifth

look, well, you're going to be so entranced with the pretty object by that time you'll have to pluck it, or eat it, or ask it out, or whatever it is, ~laughter) as the case may be. I don't

,~know whether this applies more to men than women - some people

-S 42 5- 1/11.

S.:(cont'd) S Ay that women's psychology is a bit different, but it certainly applies to men. So, these things do happen in quite clearly defined stages, so if you are not very happy with the end result, be very careful how you initiate the early stages. I mean if chance or circumstances happen to initiate stage one, well don't you initiate stage two, if you genuinely feel that going as far as stage four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, are going to be not very skilful for you.

RATNAKETU: It really means being aware of what's happened in the past and taking responsibility for it.....

~ Well, for instance, if you are a man....supposing you are a male Order member, and an attractive girl turns up at the Centre- all right, she's turned up, you haven't introduced her there. ~iay- be you weren't thinking about attractive girls, but one just floats into the Centre, all right~ She approaches you, fair enough, you've not taken the initiative<sup>3</sup> she speaks to you, you haven't taken any initiative; she asks you about the classes, all right! Then you tell her about the classes; then she asks you about the ~WBO, and you reply about the FWBO. Fair enough! You still haven't taken any initiative; but supposing you say, you know after the class, "Ah~ well, you seem quite interested, what about going around the corner and having a coffee and a chat about it all?" Well, do you really know at that moment how your mind is actually working? Are you actually fully aware of what is happening? Very often, not~ You may be kidding yourself that you'd like to feed her more information about the FWBO; on the other hand there may be some other little sort of feeling, (male voices cackling) you know insinuating itself into ? mind. There might be some jittle sort of background plan of action. Who knows? It's very difficult to know one's -own mind. But the thing is, if you really think it is unskilful to get involved with an attractive in the sort of way that one usually gets involved, in the end, well, you must think very carefully about taking that second step. That is to say, the step of inviting her round the corner~ for a cup of coffee and a friendly, private chat! You see what I mean? Because you can check it at that stage but once you've taken her round for a cup of coffee and a friendly chat after three or four classes and you've

got really friendly, and then maybe she invites you back to her flat, for a coffee, well, by that time it's very difficult to check the progression of events. So it's best to check them very early on. And this applies to all sorts of things. If you start looking at something tempting, longing after it, thinking about it ? you're (sure ?) to want to sample it; it's practically certain! So if you don't want to do that, really, or are convinced it isn't really good for you in the long run, well, just don't take any initiative, Just sort of break off in the early stages~ So, in this sense, or with this sort of thing at the back of his mind, the Buddha says, "Take care to avoid looking on the beauty of womenq and do not converse with them." If they ask you a question, all right fair enough, give a reply, but be very careful about sort of initiating anything more! "If you do have occasion to converse with themq control the thoughts which run through ~h ~£~j~~~~nds.It You know, after all, the Buddha had been unenlightened once upon a time, and he knew very well what sort of thoughts do run through men's minds on such occasions, so he ~says ?): "~- tr~ the thoughts that run through your minds." You know, just

~b. -s 42 5 1/11.

S : cont'd just so~t of be aware of the person as a person be aware of at they are saying, because, very often, one isn't~0 You don't really listen to them, you're so busy looking at them that you hardly....(chuckling) °.. you know~ you hardly hear what they are saying, or what they are asking; you know, your thoughts are running way on ahead, heaven knows where! (Laughter) So, 'you must control them~he Buddha says. This sort of thing is happening all the time, and the example with women, you know, is just an example. It happens in so many other ways. "As\_a Sra- mana on coming in contact with the unenlightened world, one must be like the lotus which remains unsullied by the mud from which it grows." It's like what I said in "Mind Reactive and Creative" well, an experience comes to you, a sensation comes to you, and you can either react~ or you can respond creatively. This is a more positive way of looking at it. So if you do meet, you know~ an attractive woman at the Centre, ~to come back to that example, because this is likely to happen, let's say), well, you ? there's the experience, so you can sort of let your thoughts dwell on the fact that, "Oh, she's an attractive woman; it might be nice to get to know her, etc. etc.; or you can think, "Ah, she's (come ?), that's good. She seems to be enquiring, let me give her as much information as I can." Put your mind quite positively on the experience in that sort of way, rather than let it so~t of run away with you. i~~Tha~t'way the response will be creative, and not just a sort of automatic, masculine, reflex action. Then the Buddha says "Think of old women as of your mother~ ? we've already dealt with that, you know, that is a technique or control, so to speak, for some people in some cultures, but perhaps it is better for us to dwell on the fact that members of the opposite sex, also are individuals, and if you encounter them at the Centre, well, when they are there ~ liyL&v; that's why they've come, and one should help them do that rather than distract them or mislead them. (Pause) And~ of course, everything I've said, you know, applies...ah...'mutatis mutandis', as they say, to the women as well. (Pause) But let's go back to the footnote - I'm not at all happy~ about the footnote. This sort of suggests that religion, or spiritual life,...ah...is a sort of 'profession' for certain people. You see what I mean?

VOICES: (~oft murmuring of assent)

S.: ? and others are exempt.

PRIYANM~A: It's almost an academic approach .... that Bloreld is taking, rather than stepping outside Buddhism totally and just taking an outsiders view of it.

S.: ~U'i. MDI.

PURNA: It's away of dismissing it for most people, too.

VOICES: Y~eah!

FU~NA: Or trying to get out of what the Buddha may have been get- ing at - It's only applying to monks.

~: But basically, the Buddha is not dealing with monks or laymen, that ~ ~erondary: he's dealing with individuals; he's dealing

~~9. S ~2 5- 1111.

S.~(cont'd) ~'s dealing with human beings, and especially those who wish to evolve, those who wish to grow. So you can't claim to be a Buddhist and at the same time claim that what the Buddha has to say to you doesn't apply because, technically, you just happen not to be a monk. Well, you get this in~all South-East Asian Buddhist countries. If you say, "Well, you~u know, you're a Buddhist~ how come you're not a vegetarian?~ - "Oh, I'm not a monk." - you know, as if to say, "Well, don't expect me to practice Buddhism, I'm a layman." Well what does being a lay Buddhist mean~ then? It seems to mean nothing at all~ Except, perhaps ~ ~ the monks. All right then, let's go on to thirty.

ANIKETA: TEXT SECTION ~0.

S.: This is quite a thought, in a way - "Those who follow the Way are like straw which must be reserved from fire." So what does this mean?

ANIKETA: It's a very dangerous situation, ah.....

S.: You're in the midst of a very dangerous situation, because you are in the midst of a situation in which impressions are impinging on you from all sides, from all directions, all the time, and there's always the possibility of a reaction rather than a response a creative response; so you're like straw which could be..... which is in the midst of fire, and could, in fact, be set on fire in an instant, if it just isn't careful. So this draws attention to the constant possibility of a~pure~y reactive approach to life; to any experience, or any impression, that occurs to one. ~ou've only got to walk down the street, you know, there's hundreds of possibilities in a few minutes, of your being set on fire~ so to speak, by all sorts of things!

PRIYANANDA: I think, you know~ this is particularly after a retreat.

S.: Mm. Ah! ies~

P~liANANDA: Mou know one part of your mind is like straw, is coi:i- pletely unsullied, an~ there's another part that is totally able to go the o~fler way. It's able~to react without any sort of awar~wss.

S.: Yes. MDI. Yeh. iou notice this especially ir you go into a big, noisy city after a quiet retreat. In the old days I re- member people used to notice it going back into London, at the end of a retreat. So, "Those who follow the WaY are like straw which must be ~reserved from fire.~' I mean, one mustn't take this in too sort of t1precious11 a way, if you see what I mean you Know, not think of oneself as weak and vulnerable, but certainly there is this sort of possibility. You get a bit more of the heroic aspects a bit later in the yext. But one is susceptible.' One has to recognise that. So, "A follower or the Way who experiences de- sire must put a distanceThetween flimSeli and tLi5 obj~cta vi lli~ d~ sire~ Tnis is one of the reasons, on the more negative side, that we have retreats. You're taken away physically into the country where temptations are fewer. I mean, everybody knows this; every- body's experienced this.

RATNAKETO: Also, sort of, not only physic~l distance, you put

~O. -s t\*2 S- I'll.

RATNAKi~~TLJ (cont'd): Sort of mental distances. If your mind is con- tinually on thoughts of growth and Dharma, well.....

S.: ~es! Right~ Yeh.'

i{ATNM~~T~LJ: ..... then it's less likely to be affected.

S.: You could say meditation is like the water with which you sprinkle the straw so that it is less likely to catch afire. ~Fause) And sometimes, of course, our reactions follow our experiences so rapidly that we rarely experience a state of mind which is free from reactions, unless we go away on retreat, or have a really good meditation, because afterwards we're aware of the whole process starting up again. But usually it goes on, at ieast sort of semi-consciously, all the time, constantly re- acting to the impressions that are coming in; and really react- ing, not responding in a positive or creative sort of way. kPause) All right, let's carry on then.

VIFOLA: Verse thirty-one. T~i~XT SECTION ~I.

~ So what do you think the Buddha is saying here?

ACHALA: It's the mental sort of predisposition to get addicted to things , that's.....

~Mm. It's not the particular organ which is at fault. I think this is quite important, in a way, not to blame the senses. You see what I mean?

ANIKETA: Or even the sense objects, because it is...ah...the attitude i~~your mind, in your own mind that ...ah....

S.: Ah! One has sort of sense impressions. One has impressions of light, colour, and all this is sort of 'innocent', so to speak, but it's the way in which the mind interprets all these; or it's the attitude that the mind takes up to these, but the senses as such, in the sense of the eye, ear, nose and so on, which simply register impressions these are quite innocent, and in that sense, pure; so people sometimes inveigh against the senses, but this is really quite mistaken. There is nothing 'wrong' with the senses, they are simply 'windows', as it were ...ah...~windows out, so to speak,~to the objective world. But the trouble is in the m~ind, ah, the mind including the passions and the will and so on; but it is not the 'fault' of the senses. So you don't solve the problem by injuring, or damaging, or amputating any of the sense organs. So, I think this is something people don't always realise: the world of ~erce~tion is quite a ~ure world. There is, not only from this point of view, nothing 'wrong' ~th the world, there's nothing 'wrong' with the perception of the world by the senses. I mean, the distorting factor is the mind itself, especially the mind that thinks dualistically. So there is nothing 'wrong' with seeing light and colour, hearing sounds, smelling scents~ nothing 'wrong' with seeing people, or seeing flowers, or seeing trees. It is the attitude that the mind takes up to all those things, which is at fault; which can be either skilful or unskilful, but the senses are not to blame; the sense organs are not to blame, they are completely neutral.

S.:~cont'd) There's no such thing as a 'good eye' or a 'bad' eye in the ethical sense. So~ you know, sometimes in religious works you can read 'the renunciation of the senses', but that is completely beside the point. The senses do no harm at all!

PURNA: There's an Old Testament thing about - "If thy eye offend thee pluck it out."

S.: New Testament.' This is what Jesus is supposed to have said - "If thy eye offend thee, pluck it out." So supposing you see something nice and you steal it; you take it with your hand'. well, the way to deal with the ~ituation is not to pluck out your eye and cut off your hand, because what harm have they done? They've done no harm at all. The eye has seen that particular object, it's registered it; but it is the mind that has thought, "That's a nice sort of object, it would be good if I could make it my own." And it is the mind which has, so to~speak, 'instructed' the hand to seize hold of that particular object. The hand has not done it of its own accord. So, it's the mind that has to be corrected; and you don't achieve anything by plucking out the eye, or cutting off the hand. They are completely neutral; they are completely innocent. So, you know, this is a point which Blake also makes - that the universe as it appears to the senses is a completely innocent world, it is an Edenic world, and the snake that creeps in on its belly, so to speak, is the mind, the appropriating mind. But~ as I said, a lot of popular religious works denounce the senses as such, but this is, again, rather beside the point.

ACHALA: Some even go so far as to denounce beauty and appreciation or art.

S.: Yes. Well it depends, of course, what art one is thinking of; some art definitely does exploit the sensual mind. I mean, there



is quite a lot of art. Western art, that seems not to be art at all, because the consciousness of the artist seems not to have been disinterested. He did not have that 'innocent' eye, as it were. You can see the sort of sensual mind creeping in. This is why I think Kant has made the distinction between the 'beautiful' and the 'agreeable'. And a lot that we classify as 'beautiful' is simply 'agreeable'. That is, it appeals to the sensual mind, it doesn't appeal to the disinterested contemplation of 'Beauty'.

twEIJANANDA: That would include that there is some 'ugliness' in the higher sense of Beauty - that you could look on something that is not 'agreeable', but it is 'beautiful'.

S.: Yes. MDI. Well, there could be a portrait, say, of a very old woman or a very old man, with lots of lines and wrinkles and grey hair - well, it's not very agreeable, but it could be a beautiful portrait. And there could be a portrait of a young woman, which you thought was very agreeable, but there wouldn't be any beauty in that. (pause) You can see some 'still life' paintings or haunches of venison, and poor old chickens and lobsters and things; well, it seems to be more agreeable than beautiful, if you're not a meat-eater. Well, ...ah... you won't appreciate that sort of 'still life' painting in any way - You might even find it repulsive. I saw a lot of these paintings when I went to Holland. They seem to be very fond of them in Holland, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries - 'still life' with lots of chickens plucked and....

~2. -S ~2 S- 1,11.

VIPULA: Very fine detail work.

S.: Yes - very realistic. But - you know, the aim seemed to be the 'agreeable' rather than the 'beautiful'. There was nothing 'beautiful' in these paintings, whereas, if you went and looked in the same gallery, perhaps there are paintings or, say, Vermeer, yes! There was something very beautiful - a quite different quality altogether. (pause) U~. enough of that perhaps. Some of these points are really being hammered home, aren't they? And then we hammered home a bit more. ~ight. Thirty-two.

EAI~NM~i'U: T~~;XT s~CTION ~2.

S.; ~m. This seems to be rather like a verse of the 'Dhammapada', doesn't it? Well, anyway, what does one think of this: "The sorrows of men come from their passions and desires? is that always the case? Can you think of any sorrow that has come from some other cause?"

k'UitNA: It depends on how big you take causality as being....

S.:

PU~: terms of 'acts of God', natural calamity. But there is the old thing too, even they are, perhaps, deter- mined ..... kpause)..... our previous.....

S.: Attitude.

i(ATNAi~Lfl;TU: ieah~ Yeah& Our desire for liie, and a particular rorm or lire.

S.: What about the connection between 'iear' and 'sorrows'?-1~ear comes from these sorrows' - ~here does fear come from?

fl~~~~~AKI!a'TU: You're afraid of losing them - what you desire.

S.: AnYWay, this relates to the first and second 'noble truths' It is a restatement of those - that suffering exists, sorrow exists, and that the cause or triad is desire. Do you think it is really as simple as that?

PURNA: If you take the sense of 'desire' to be broad enough, yes.

S.:

PURNA: ....the sense of 'suffering' to be broad enough.

VIPUBA: It depends on how far you take it, yeah.

S.: And don't forget that the word used in Pali is 'tanha', or 'trsnā', which is not quite rightly translated as 'desire', because then, 'clever' people say~ well what about the desire for Nirvana etc., etc.? It is 'craving'. rather, than 'desire'. But how would you distinguish, then, between 'craving' and 'desire'?

nATNA~~TU: 'Craving' is neurotic - you're trying to get out of what you can't ?

-S ~2 5- 1/ II. g~i.

S.: Well, for instance, if you have a desire for food, supposing you're hungry, and supposing your organism requires food, well, your desire for food can be satisfied - you can eat, and you can satisfy it. But craving isn't like that - you could have a craving for food, in the sense that you had a sense of, say, emotional deprivation, and you were using food in order to satisfy that; but actually, food couldn't. So you could go on eating food in a neurotic way, and still feel quite unsatisfied. So that would be 'craving' rather than 'desire'; and if you distinguish in this way, 'sorrow' is invariably the accompaniment of 'craving', but not necessarily of 'desire'. There is such a thing as healthy, non-neurotic desire, one could say. In a very refined sense you could say you (moreover that even the healthy desire is itself neurotic, because it boils down to a desire for something conditioned, and nothing conditioned can give you ultimate happiness - you're just looking for the temporary, just the satisfaction of that particular desire in a quite reasonable sort of manner. I mean, you have your supper, you're not expecting Nirvana! you're just expecting a decent meal which will satisfy your

hunger, nothing more than that! If you happen to miss it, well, it's too bad, you don't get too upset about it.

PU~IA: COuld~ perhaps, 'desire' be seen as 'neurotic' or in fact t7 ?      craving, in that, in any form of ~esire there is some element of permanence, subjectively, involved?

S.:      ~.

PUi{i'~A:      Ah... the time factor wants to....you want to 'freeze' it.

S.: ~a'iff~ Not necessarily, because take this ordinary ex&iiiple of eating: you irnow, is tflat what one really feels? I mean, one is usually quite happy to have one's meal and then forget about it, and leave it at that. Of course, there is the question or re- petition, because satiety wears off and you get hungry again, but that is a sort of natural rhythm. There is, again, a genuine need to fulfil it; it is not a neurotic desire that you have then; the organism needs food. But you, perhaps, in another sense, have a refined at7achment to the organism itself, in the sense that you want to persist in a particular mode of conditioned existence. But even this could.... would be only neurotic, if you expected from that what it is inherently unable to give you. If you are able to accept it on its o~~n terms for what it was, that would not be neurotic desire; but perhaps, if you were able to do that, you wouldn't be very far from Enlightenment anyway!

END Oil' SIDE I TAPE II.

SIDE 2 TAPE Ii~

~.cont'd There's probably very few people who can enjoy things for what they're worth and then just 'pass on'; and just let them go. I mean, this whole question of eating in the way we've disc- ussed, it seems quite simple and straightforward, but perhaps, with a lot of people, it isn't. They're always investigating and exp- loring new recipes, and new things to eat. I was reading about this in a magazine a few days ago, about ...ah...in America, a ~woman sort of making a fortune out of holding cookery classes -

~4.      -S ~2 S-      2/II.

~cont'd - all sorts of ~xotic dishes, in some little k though not really little, but quite big), but very dull and 'Philistine' sort of American city, where there was only about two reataurants for a million people (chuckling) - something like that. You know, you are so bored that you spend weeks dreaming up new sauces and things like that. Well, this does tend to be a bit neurotic, doesn't it? Or when yati, eat, or you feast like the ancient Romansregu- larly, have several meals one after the other, and so havnghad one, used to make themselves vomit with vinegar, and then go straight in and have another meal, another feast. Well, this again, becomes a bit neurotic, doesn't it? But I think we have to be a bit cau- tious about the extreme Theravada approach of: desire as such, all desire without exception, being inherently unsi~lful, not to say, evil, and to be immediately extirpated~ and ~hat's the whole of the spiritual life. I think one has to beware that sort of ap- proach. But at ~he SamE time, yes,

one can see, in so many ways, one's own neurotic cravings, that do bring trouble and suffering upon one, and upon other people; but you Probably can't just tackle them directly, and try to get rid of craving one has to develop a more positive interest in life, especially in your own development, so to speak. (Pause) All right, let's pass on to thirty-three.

ACHALA: TEXT SECTION 3~.

S.: ~~~. Well, here's the heroic attitude. So "Those who follow the Way are like one who has to fight ten thousand and who, putting on his armour, steps out of the gate." ~~~at's this gate? The gate of what?

RATNAKETU: Home!

S.: Home.' (Chuckling) You could say, yes, a bit like that cover of the Newsletter, some issues ago -'Leaving home'. "His thoughts may be timorous and his resolution weak~ or he may even turn half-way to the battle~round and then turn round and flee. Again~ he may join battle and be slain. On the other hand he may gain the victory and return." ~~~niat is 'joining battle and being slain', do you think, here?

ACHALA: Dropping out of the spiritual life, I suppose.

S.: ~~~. Or making an effort, but being completely overcome by adverse forces and simply giving up - 'dying' spiritually. (Pause) At least for the time being. But, "The Sramana who studies the Way must have a resolute mind and zealously build up his courage fear nothing that lies before him. and destroy all the demons of temptation which stand in his way, - that he may obtain the fruit (of diligently study~n~) the Way."

RATNAKETU: That has more appeal to me than contemplating somebody as being a sort of heap of bones

S.: (Laughing)

EATNAKETJ: .....and vther, you know, sort of (mumbling a bit) ~heroic, and you have got to go out there and strive and fight.

VOI(J'~S: (Inaudible comments) (Laughter)

S 1+2 S- 2/I~

S.: There's also the question of why, you know, in what, actually, that 'fighting' consists. it could include contemplating somebody as a heap of bones! (Chuckle) It doesn't consist in prancing down the front steps of the building with a saucepan on your head, saying "I'm King Arthur", or "I'm St. George"

ANIKETA: I did have a picture of knights - Sir Galahad.....

S.: Mm. (Chuckling)

AN~bTA: .....who could slay so many because his heart was pure!

~ But it doesn't really consist in any sort of dramatic action, but in living one's ordinary life, ordinary, humdrum life, constantly mindful of the impressions that are surging in and your reaction to them. But I think I mentioned somewhere, that all the.... ah...the greatest, ancient, works of literature see human life in just two or three different ways. The two most common being: they either see it as a journey or as a battle. Have you noticed this? Or have you heard this ?

~: 'The Return Journey.

S.: Yes. For instance, what is the Iliad all about? It was a battle. What is the Odyssey all about? A journey. What is Dante's "Divine Comedy" about? It's a journey. What is Virgil's "Aeneid" all about? It's a battle with a journey in it too. What is Milton's "Paradise Lost" about? A battle. What is "Pilgrim's Progress" about? A journey. So "life is a battle", and "life is a journey" seem to be the two great messages, as it were. I mean, even the epic of Gilgamesh, the ancient Babylonian epic, is a journey - the "Journey of Gilgamesh". So, here, it's a battle. Life is a battle. So, from the spiritual point of view, it's not against forces outside you necessarily, but against your own mind. All this "ten thousand" also recalls that verse in the 'Dhammapadam' - "although one may conquer in battle a thousand men, a thousand times, he who conquers himself has the more glorious victory." But what about this whole heroic aspect of the spiritual life and self-development? How does it work out actually? It's all right to have this sort of picture of oneself (laughter) as a knight in shining armour cutting off the heads of dragons and all that - resisting the advances of the beautiful maiden, after the battle, (Loud laughter) But what does the battle actually consist in, really?

PRİYANANDA: I mean, it's...it's ? the thing about a heroic ideal, and about battles and fighting and journeying: it implies a sort of extraverted activity, whereas the actual struggle is introverted activity, in a sense; it's to do with one's own mind, one's own self. But one can be inspired by the sort of image of the extraverted activity.

~ Mm. Mm. But it just occurs to me to wonder whether this sort of image has the same appeal for women as for men; or does it seem rather really, or ? a sword (Laughter) sallying forth, you know ?

~GHA: ? the image of the Red Dakini is quite appealing.....

-5 42 5- 2/II.

~ ~m. Ah.' es.

NaURA: That's a very battle-like figure.

~ Ifli? She's dancing Isn't she?

\_\_\_\_\_ ? Skull ?

~ Unra? She's not exactly fighting though, is she?

ANIKETA: No. I, I, I don't think it's..... I feel it 'S more..... that it's very much of a....of an energy with which she is free, and which has overcome the difficulties.....

S.: Yes. Right! Yeh.

AN£~ETA:.....and therefore it is joyful. I mean it is.....

S.: ~n the case of the Red Dakini, well, the battle is won.

ANiM~;TA: Yes.

VOICES: Yes.

MEGHA: ? it's very much that the energy has been aroused ?

~ Mm.

UDAMA: I think the 'battle' and the 'journey' sort of similes are quite good, because the attributes, or the qualities that they're pointing to, are quite compatible with the spiritual life.....

S.: i~es.

Ui)AYA: .....nobility of birth, I mean, the fact that we're part of the Sangha, you know, to be born into, not that we're born into it, but we find ourselves in.....

S.: 'Born' into it by initiation.

UDAYA: ies. Um...and...and...you know, the sort of heroic, and, you know, pride...um...in the positive sense, ? and sometimes when you're feeling low, and, and, You're almost swamped over, and then you catch a glimpse of the ideal again, and then, with renewed vows and energy, you sort of make up your mind to sort of strive on again.....

S.: But perhaps it's also a healthy change from Christianity, where you're ? to be always meek, and humble, and apologetic, and crawl, and grovel, kLaughter) (Loud laughter from Ratnaketu) or so it seems: 'I)own on you knees, you sin- ner!

~ATNAKETtJ: I was thinking of 'The meek shall inherit the earth'- that's because everybody has become enlightened and left. (Megha and Suvajri laugh).

DHA~~~~ADHARA: Or that the meek shall inherit the ?

~7. -S £+2 S- 2/II.

~~ Or the 'creep' shall inherit the earth. (Laughter) It sounds a bit sneaky, doesn't it? If you're all sort of meek and grovelly, it's as though you're thinking: 'Well, in the end I'll inherit the earth. I'll be on top.' (~ause)

\(IPLJLA: ? sometimes strange ? battles ? people in battles being heroes, who in fact, should be against ? , in a sense - you shouldn't really look at ? in that way ? killing and that; it's supposed...ah....but probably it's more of a cultural thing -

~ Mm. ieh.

UDAYA: It's sort of the 'idealised' battle.

VIPULA: Yeah.

RATNAKta~U: But it is a simile, it's not really ?

VOICES: Mm. Yeh.

RATNAM~~TU: ... or the spiritual life.

~ Also it applies to ancient warfare, doesn't it?

VoICES: Mm.

S.: When one man, you know, mounted on a horse, and probably armoured could, perhaps, deal with ten thousand even, provided they weren't similarly mounted and armoured.

LJDAYA: There's not very much heroic about war these days - just sort of pushing buttons and pulling triggers, and um...

PRIYANANDA: In ancient warfare they did quite a lot of ? far more personal energy, and ?

S.: Yes. Right.

P1{IYANANDA.....sort of energy within the individual, just physical energy, just to be able to go into battle, whereas today, it's more sort of a collective thing, and the individual is swamped. There's more room for 'heroes' in ancient .9

S.: Yes. Well, the individual's efforts counted far more, well, even if he was only say, a more powerful group member; even if he wasn't an individual in the strict sense, but his sort of solitary effort counted for much more, you know, especially if it was a battle between just a few hundred, few thousand tribesmen. One person could change the whole course of the battle.

PRIYA~ANI)A: 1{ight.

S.: So there was much more room for individual initiative, individual prowess. But there's no room for that, I think~ in modern warfare, as far as I know. (Pause) It's almost a matter of just pushing buttons.

-S %2 S 2/II.

PUi{NA: The old sort of direct combat seems a much more honest way of killing somebody, too, there's always something dishonest about modern warfare. ~eople don't want to be confronted with the fact of what they are doing.

S.: ~n.

PURNA: All sort of removed.

~ Yes. Well, li~e they become a bit calloused to what they see on the television screen. It's removed from them, they're not in the midst of it.

VIPtYLA: ? you certainly ? modern warfare, which is ? , some of it~ anyway. A lot of it is actually guerilla warfare, which is rather nasty stuff.

~ Well, that's a different kind of warfare, and even urban guerilla warfare even that is often pretty sneaky, because the urban guerilla doesn't come out in the open and challenge anybody, he just sneaks~up and leaves a bomb or something like that. It's mildly heroic, perhaps, in a sense, well, he's on his OWN~ and thousands of people are looking for him, but it isn't exactly brave~, would one say?

LJDAiA: No.

RAi1NAMS'iU: He isn't exactly lighting other warriors.

~~ No. Very often he injures women and children with his bomb.

~Pause) All right, carry on to thirty-four then.

Pi{IYANANI)A Ti~XT SECTION ~4.

~ MDI. Well, there are many versions of this little parable. I mean, the basic point is very clear. What do you think that basic point is then?

P~IYANANDA: Well, it seems to be a balance, some sort of balance, between, ah...ah...it's the ...um....spiritual faculties Of~ ah... 'vigour' and 'concentration'...occurred to me. One has to balance those two.

S.; I4m. You should not, sort of, slack; not slacken off effort, but on the other hand, you



should not force your self too much. You need to strike a balance between these two: not too much effort, not too little effort. You can see people doing both, can't you? Or either of them. Why do you think people force themselves? Make too much of an effort?

ACHALA : They underestimate their resources I suppose ?

PURI~: Greed - attainments.

S.: Greed also, yes.

ANIKETA: Very egoistic, wilful...um...driving

~9. -S 42 5- 2/II.

S;: Yes. It can be sometimes due to a very sort of mental approach. For instance, somebody finds that half-an-hour's meditation does them a lot of good, so they reckon, well, an hour's meditation will do them twice as good; two hours will do them four times as much good; so they'd like to experience four times or eight times, or ten times the pleasure or relaxation as they experience, so they force themselves to do that amount of meditation, under the impression that they will thereby get an eight-fold experience. So, this is an example of that kind of thing. They force themselves, because there is the wrong mental idea about spiritual life and development. There is a sort of greed behind it.

ANIKETA: A sort of 'quantitative' attitude.

S.:Mrn. You're thinking of the spiritual gain as a thing to be achieved, not something which you naturally grow into as an extension of what you are now. You go all out to get something and it's so important to you to have that thing that you strain every nerve and muscle, so to speak. You overdo it. One seems to get a lot of this in Zen, at least, in a lot of Zen. I've noticed the sort of people in England at least, who take up Zen very seriously - they're usually very tense, and very nervous, and alienated sort of people. They suffer a lot from headaches.

ANIKETA: It also seems to suggest that it's like an art, the way....

S.: I'm'. Yes.

ANIKETA: .....you approach an art, something which you enjoy doing while you're acquiring the skill....

S.: I~. Yeh. Mm.

PURNA: It's not just Zen. I think it's something that you could apply to the so-called 'Vipassana'.

S.: i~in. Oh yes!

PURNA: ?

S.: Or even to reciting mantras when you attach some magical significance to doing that hundred thousand; and that, you know, you are to recite it a hundred thousand times at all costs, within a certain period, even if you don't enjoy it very much, or not very concentrated, but at all costs get your hundred thousand complete.' It's like the famous story of the boy scout whose doing his good deed for the day. I don't know if you've heard this one, you probably have, but anyway - A little boy scout came back to headquarters one day and was asked to report what his good deed for the day had been, so he said, "Oh~ I helped an old lady across the street." So the Scout Master said, "Well, that wasn't a very big thing to do a very difficult thing to do. He said, "Oh yes it was! She didn't want to cross the street."

(Laughter) So the little boy said ? it was a good deed to help old ladies across the street, so he goes helping across the street regardless of whether they want to go or not.

(Chuckling) Well, this is a bit that sort of, you know, forceful, unintelligent attitude toward the spiritual life.

~7~. -S 42 5- 2/11.

ACRALA: Is there not anything to be said for the attitude of the person trying to solve ? , who is putting - everything, all their being into something in a very wholehearted way?

S.: Mm. In a way; but we're also told that the purpose of it is to make him realise that he can't do things in that way. Maybe some people do have to learn in that way, that there is no solution to the koan, in a sense, and they're supposed to break out in a great laugh.'

(Chuckling) But it is as though the forcible approach is based on the idea that there are certain specific things to be done, which will infallibly, of their own accord, get you where you want to be, and you've only to sort of put as much energy as you possibly can, into those things, and you'll get there. I mean, the attitude and the finesse with which you do it, just don't count at all, according to this view.

PUi~A: It's related to pseudo-technism.

~ Yes. It seems to be connected with the 'silabbata-paramasa1, 'reliance on rites and ceremonies', so-called.

~IEGHA: I often find the way I do my yoga practices very similar - like that as well. Sometimes, like I, when I was quite fit, I knew I could do a particular posture, and I'd go back to it when I wasn't very fit, and I've just got that goal in mind, and what happens, I ? all sorts of muscles, and end up quite sore. S.: Mm.

I~GHA: It's negating the fact that you're supposed to be enjoying it as you do it.

S.: Well, in a sense, this is what the Buddha is saying to the monk, "You should enjoy what you are doing~ He says, "But if he studies quietly and ha~ily he will not lose it. Because, if he is happy following the Way, how can he lose it? He'll just want to go on quite

naturally and spontaneously, because he's enjoying it so much. But if you think of the Way as a goal 'out there' to be attained at all costs by doing certain things, however difficult, then you really miss the point of it. It's a bit, again, like the Zen story - the disciple comes to the master and says, "Please pacify my mind", and the master says, "O.K. Bring out your mind and I'll pacify it." I mean the disciple thinks of the mind as something which can be pacified in some sort of external way, which the master can do. He doesn't realise that the mind has to pacify itself, naturally. But to pursue this point - it is as though people do think of spiritual life as doing something external, as it were to the process of spiritual life itself, and doing it with full force and vigour to get certain results. I mean, sometimes people come along and say, "Well, look, I've been meditating for so long, and yet I'm not getting results". It's as though it's not fair; the meditation's not working properly, it's cheating me. I want that result so much, I'm doing the meditation so hard, I don't get the result. But they haven't understood it's a natural process, a natural unfolding; something to be sort of coaxed; not something that will infallibly follow in a mechanical sort of way, if you sort of with gritted teeth, so to speak, do that particular exercise so many times. But they feel as though it's a sort

~71. -s 42 5- 2/11.

~cont'&) of bargain that they've struck with the practice: 1, Well, I'll do it so many times and then I've jolly well got to have that experience. That's their approach. So this is the sort of forceful approach. So, what's the other extreme? The slack, "Oh let it come, let it happen.

I~GHA: "She'll be right mate!"

~ Mm? "It's sure to come out all right in the end", and, "Don't force things, let them take their course", and "It's all in the mind". That's the other extreme.

ANIKETA: Just 'flow'.

~ "Go with the flow"! (Laughter) (Pause) SO~ it's 'achieving' rather than 'forcing', and it's 'going' rather than just 'flowing'. And then there's an interesting point here: 1, if he forces himself towards it~ his mind will become weary"; ah, "and on account of the weariness of his mind, his thoughts will become irritable." Have you noticed this? If you're weary, if you're tired, you tend to become irritable, and if you force yourself you will~ come tired; so if you force yourself into it, you will also become irritable. SO~ it's very important - I feel this more and more-: in the spiritual life, you must be really in it because you want to be in it, and you enjoy being in it, otherwise there is very little point in it, actually! (Laughter)

ACRALA: ? you don't like the alternative either, you know, the ? (Laughter)  
You've got two choices. (Laughter)

~S: ? Enlightenment is the better of two evils.'

PURNA: It's going to require all you've got, but you don't like the alternatives.

S.: It's something like the choice between the hot and cold Hells - one slightly better than

the other.' But this is from the stand- point of the reactive mind, clearly; but "estudiesuietl and ha~nily, he will not lose the Way." This "quietly and happily" is quite important.

(Pause) But, again, I think our Christian, and maybe, especially Protestant, heritage comes in here, that religious life must be difficult and a bit unpleasant. Well, there is a certain difficulty, that's true, but not quite in that sort o~way: it must hurt in order to do you any good! I mean, anything pleasant and enjoyable couldn't possibly be good for you; it must be 'bad'; it must be even sinful! You must be kept miser- ableso that you can be kept good.' I remember there are some lines in a poem by Alexander Pope - tie's describing the terrible plight of a young lady, who has to leave town at the height of 'the season', and go and stay with elderly and rather dull relatives in the country, and go to bed very, very early, not having done very much all day, anyway. A ~ew of the lines are: "Up to your godly garret/There starve and pray,/For that's the way to Heaven." (Laughter) It's very much that sort of attitude, you know, ? ? the religious ~ife, you know. (Pause)

~~2.. -S 42 5- 2/II.

S.:(cont'd ~hey don't realise that it can be enjoyable. I mean, in the'Dhainrnapada', there are those verses, where the Buddha'S disciples sort of chant or sing very happily while they live among the unhappy. This is how it should be.

UDAYA: ? all the way through,...um...well, in a lot of the scriptures, there's a sort of indirect, in a sense, . indirectly implying that, you know, that unless youf physical, ex- ternal conditions are in harmony - well, it's not saying they ou~ht to be, they've ~ to be - as well as your attitudes.

S.: Yes. Well, the external, physical conditions are also impor- tant; we know that. It isn't just a question of changing your mental attitude - well, in a sense, yes, basically, it is a quest- ion of changing mental attitudes - b~t, at least in the early stages of your spiritual life, it is more easy for you to do that, if cir- cumstances co-o~erate with you. It is very difficult to meditate if~there's lots of noise.ar,ound you~ Maybe~ when you're~enlightened you won't bother all that m~ch, but at present 'it does affect you very much, so you need to seek out a quiet place for your practice; or a quiet time of day. I mean, this is why I constantly say that, as regards the FWBO~ we don't say all you have to do is to change your mind and your menta7attitude,and the whole world will then become all right. No! The two have to go along together: change your mind and change the world also. The more positive the enviro- nment in which you find yourself, the more easy it will be for you to change your attitude, and the more you change your attitude, the more easy it will be for you to bring about changes in your environment. In that way, the two processes reinforce each other. It is very difficult for the average person to change himself in an unchanging world. He needs some support from his environment.

This is why we have such things like (Orders ?) and retreats, and even monasteries, uiet mountain-tops, or even just a quiet room in the house. (Pause) All right, thirty-five and then we'll stop for today.

PURNA: TEXT SECTION ~~.

S.: Well, I mean, this is an example of what I was saying earlier on. I mean, Mahatma Gandhi used to say, "The end is the extreme of means." You go on perfecting the means to the 'end', and you'll have the end, naturally, in the end. So, \ smelt iron until all in1~urities have been eliminated,~before nroceedin~ to make im~lements with it, the im~lements will be of fine qualit~." But if you just make the implements without bothering about the quqlity of the iron - without removing the impurities - then the implements will not be able to function properly; they will break easily and quickly. So, if with this unpurified, sort of, egois- tic mind you sort of launch an all-out attack upon Enlightenment, nothing will happen! You might achieve certain things, you might even develop miraculous power~ but you won't be anywhere near En- lightenment, becaus"" the mind has not been purified - you're seek- ing Enlightenment in an inappropriate way; you're regarding it as an object to be appropriated, not as something that you must grow into , in a natural sort of way. (~ause) I mean, this metaphor of 'smelting iron' is also found in the'Dhammapada', isn't it? 'One should purify the mind little by little just as the smith removes the impurities of silver ?

~~3. -- t\*2 S- 2/II.

S.:(cont'd) It's as though one is saying: if you really want to medit~te you need a different kind of mind with which to meditate. If you, first of all develop the mind which is appropriate to med- itation, well theia, you're already half-meditating. You can't sort of med~tate with your ordinary mind, so to speak. I mean, every- body knows this probably: if you've been functioning in a certain way and your mind has been very active during the day, you can't just sort of sit down straight away, as it were, with that mind, and start meditating. You have to wait for that mind to die away, don't you? And it's as though you need another mind with which to meditate; and it's just like that approaching the spiritual life, or approaching Enlghteinment. You have to approach it with a dif- ferent kind of mind, almost; a different kind of attitude from one's ordinary one of grabbing, and appropriating, and possessing, and so on. (Pause) (There1s sometimes ?) too2 the other way round: when you come out of meditation2 people might ask you a question about this, that, or the other, it might be about your job, and you're not able to answer because the kind of m~xid which deals with those things is in abeyance, and ypu have to wait for it to come back and start opera,ting again, and then you can deal with that question, not before.

PRIjANANDA: It was something I found helpful when I first started meditating, to be told that one needed a space before and after meditation~ just.....well, especially when one is just starting to meditate.

S.: Yes. I notice people tend to overlook this quite a lot.

i~GhA:Quite a lot ? a couple of times when I've got up during meditation to answer the phone, I've felt quite strange.

S.: Yes. I~ght.

ANI1~~TA: Yes. Sometimes I've been asked, "Are you all right?"

S.: Yes. Sometimes people's questions seem very unreal.

MEGHA: Yes, and the answers I give are very short, and to the point, and no dilly-dallying around.

S.: Yes. It's as though you're being unfriendly.

VIPULA: ? sometimes when I have worked late and I arrive home, and I usually try meditation in the evening - it's really quite hopeless just going quickly into meditation before sleeping; it's a waste of time. ? wait half-an-hour to an hour beforehand

S.: Yes. Right. Mm. So that ? busy mind is just not appropriate for meditation. (Pause~ ? look back over what we've done today and see whether there are any points that weren't clear.

ACHALA: I must admit I'm still ? slightly confused about the difference between having ardour for the spiritual life, you know, the sense of going int~ battle, and not overdoing it. I'm n~t quite sure what way to think about it.

~1+. -S 42 5- 2/II.

i/tL~ S.: Mm.

UDAYA: Maybe it's sort of like.... there was this businessman in the paper, wrote a couple of weeks ago, starting off - "I'm will- ing to lose a battle in order to win a war." It might be a little like that, maybe.

~ Or one could approach it like this: what is the particular spiritual faculty which is being referred to here? It's 'viryā', and 'viryā' has affinities with 'right effort', and it's quite clear what 'right effort' is., I mean, i '5 the effort to eradicate ari- sen unskilful mental states, and t eep out unarisen unskilful men- tal states, develop arisen skilful ental states and bring into existence unatisen skilful states; this is, basically, what it is, in practical psychological terms. It isn't sort of ~triking sort t3f dramatic postures in one's spiritual life, so to speak. Though it may give that sort of impression. It doesn't necessarily mean confronting the raging multitude, or any ? burnt at the stake. It doesn't necessarily mean that, but m~ involve that in certain situations, or certain societies.

END OF SIDE 2 Tane II

S~E I TAPE 12.

S.: (cont'd) Basically it means working on one's own mind, because even when one is working with other people, you still have to work with them in a certain way, and with a certain mental attitude, which means working on your own mind. Basically, it means.). ~.'. being heroic means.... developing as vigorously as you can, all positive mental states, and eliminating all negative mental states; this is what it~essentially means, and the 'battle-ground', the 'battle field', is: the 'grdunt' or 'field' of one's own mind. (Pause) It might be qu~te interesting to ask all the women Order members and mitras in the Movement how they see the 'heroic' ideal - whether they do see it in this "Knights in shin- ing armpur" kind of way, or wh~er they see it as 'dancing Dakinis', or whatever?

ANIKETA: It can be seen in that way, but I have found it's some- thing very simple and quite..... in a way would seem very mundane to other people. It's just in my everyday way of dealing with things, like having been very 'down' and depressed, and suddenly 'waking up' and really seeing that the sun is shining, and that the dark clouds and thoughts that have been clou~ my mind have dissipated,.... um.... or even just....ah..... getting out of the rut of just sliding from one day into the other, endlessly; just having things clear so I can get on with doing whatever needs to be done thor- oughly and enjoying it.

\$.: Well, perhaps one could even say that the 'heroic' attitude essentially, is the attitude of taking responsibility, saying to yourself, "It all depends on me", as you in the case of dealing with one's own mind - that no c~ange your tmOinpu~r~if0yr your mind for you; nobody else is going to you; nobody else is going to cultivate your positive qualities, or get rid of your negative qualities. You can only do it for yourself.' Perhaps the 'heroic' ideal is essentially, realising that, and taking responsibility for that, and doing something ab- out it vigorously.

~75. -S 42 S- I/I2~

S.: 'Going forth' and tackling it is your responsibility. I mean, you're the h~ro~~~~fler the battle is lost or won depends upon you and no other! (Pause)

RATi~AI~TU: Like David and Goliath.

S.: Yes, one could say that. Anyone ? who the 'Goliath' was. But you need not think of yourself as 'a little David', you know

PURNA: '~tnaketu' I

~ David wasn't exactly heroic. He was just a smart little lad. He cheated. He had this sling and a stone; he didn't even get near poor old Goliath. (Chuckling) He just hurled his stone from a safe distance, (chuckling) a sharp eye and a straight aim, so he killed Goliath, that's all there was to it. He was a sneaky little lad. But, maybe, as I said, the 'heroic' ideal is essent- ially bound up with the idea of taking responsibility for oneself, or even for others tOO~ to the extent that one can. It's not leav- ing things to other people, or expecting other people to do things. So that involves energy too. (Pause)

~~GHA: Very often ? in me is wanting to lie very still, and not wanting to disturb anything. That's the complete opposite.

S.: 'Playing possum!'

~~GHA: Yeah. ? death ? stagnant.

S.: Well, if you're inert enough, and 'weak' enough, and pathetic enough, someone will pick you up, and do it for you, and you won't have to do it yourself. Well, somebody will act ? helpless. It is said that women are very good at doing this - act all helpless and floppy and

limp and incapable, (laughter) so that some big, strong man will come along and do it all for you and show you how big and capable, and heroic he is, and he'll feel very, very good about having done it, and you'll have got your little job done without expenditure of your own effort. It's the sort of 'damsel in distress' syndrome. I read a little book addressed to women, once, where it said, "If you're a woman driver and your car breaks down, don't think of fixing the engine, just stand in the road looking a bit helpless, and some man's sure to stop, and get out and fix it for you. (Chuckling)

VIPULA: Some of them still do it (for themselves) though.

S.: I gather, in New Zealand~ they're quite a different breed the pioneer breed! They fix it themselves!

VIPULA: Some.

S.: He's away watching rugby. (Laughter) So they jolly well have to fix it themselves! Well, there is this sort of attitude on the part of (some) people; on the part of men too - they also do it.' A button comes off, and they're sort of pathetically hold- i~ the button in their hand, (Laughter) so a woman comes along and stitches it on for them. Or cooking - they're helpless

~~6. -S 42 5- 1/12.

~~~Acont'd In the kitchen; can't even make a cup of tea - t~~J~er~ do I put the tea?" She says, "Oh~ come on, give it to me, I'll make the tea;' go and sit down and read your paper." ? gets it done. These are the things that (some) people are doing all the time, in different ways. But the 'heroic' person accepts responsibility and does the thing himself, or herself, and does for others too. So, there's energy, there's initiative, there's drive there. It's more that, I think, that the Buddha is getting at.

UDAYA ? in the situation of running the Centre, often you have to consciously not do things yourself, and encourage other people to take on things for their benefit and yours, so you can do other things.

S~: Mm. And you sometimes see a rather unpleasant situation where everybody is waiting for somebody else to take the initiative, or to do the job. You sometimes, see this; and people are very resentful if they have to do something for other people, because they want other people to do it for them. So, in those circumstances the 'heroic' person is the one who ups and does it! Any- way who is going to put and make the tea? (~;Laughter) Which 'hero' ?

S.: All right, section thirty-six, page twenty-one. Whoever's

next can read that whole section.

UDAYA: TEXT SECTION ~6.

~ I~. All right, let's take these one by one. "It is hard for one to leave the ~rosser forms of incarnation and be born a human bein~." So, what do you think this is saying? What are the ass- umptions behind the statement?

RATNAKETU: That you can be born something other than a human being. ~~~ Yes. That's one assumption. So what's the next assumption, following on from that?

ACHALA: That it's...ah...a better position to be in than an animal.

~ Ah, ia fun-lln? Yes, but there's an intermediate step, so to speak.

RATNAI&E'TU: That ~ou can develop.

~ Yes, that too; but I wasn't thinking of that. Well, the in- termediate step is that the possibilities of being born not as a human being are very much greater than being born as a human being, because human is only one species, whereas there are thousands of millions of o'ther species of life, so looking at it just statist- ically, the chances of being born as a human being are very re mote indeed. So thi~ is a favourite, traditional Buddhist con templation. So if one takes that literally, well, it's clearly quite a thought! But even supposing one doesn't take it literal- ly, what does it mean? ~t does it suggest? t~at is the state- ment trying to say?

VIPULA: Truly human - being born truly human.

Ah, well, it just says human beings, so let's just take it

~77. -S 42 5- 1/12.

S.:(cont'~ as human in the most ordinary sense. What, basically, regardless of whether you take the statement literally or not, is the Buddha trying to say?

RATNAKETU: We're extremely fortunate.

S.: Yeeesss. But putting it even more sort of clearly than that. "Fortunate" suggests, well, you've had a lucky escape, but you still have this sort of 'mythology', in a sense, of all these other pos- sible births at the back of your mind. But to put it more gener- ally than that?

PUI{TiA ~lake us~ of the present moment.

~ b\ake use of the present moment. I mean, to be born a human being ia a very valuable

opportunity, and the reason why the Buddha says, "It is hard for one to leave the grosser forms of incarnation and be born a human being", regardless of whether that is literally true or not, is just to make one realise what a valuable state the human state is. So why is it a valuable state?

UDAYA: Freedom from extremes, maybe.

PU~A: It's the realm of purposeful activity.

S.: i~? Yes, but putting it, say, more generally than that. Well, it's because the possibilities of development for a human being are so great. An animal is born an animal, well, it dies an animal. But a human being can be born a human being but can do very much more with his life than simply die an ordinary human being. He can die an enlightened human being, or, at least, someone who has made very considerable progress. So what the Buddha is trying to do here is to make us realise that in being born as human beings, we've got a wonderful opportunity for further development which we mustn't waste. So whether we refer, or not, to the grosser forms of incarnation, that fact remains - that the human state is a state with tremendous potential, a potential which we should try to realise. (Pause)
ALL right, what about the second statement? "It is hard to escape being a woman and be born a man."

Th what is the suggestion or implication here?

PURNA: The potential's a lot stronger for a man.

S.: Yes. So do you think this is justified, or not? (Pause) Or 'potential' in what sense - spiritual potential or other potentials?

~URN~ There's biological and cultural factors against being a woman. The mere fact of having a baby means that you can't occupy yourself full-time with the spiritual life.

S.: Well, supposing in some forms of society you're ~an, a father with babies; you have to go off and food-gather for them as well as for yourself.

ANIKETA: Could this be taken in another way, in that...um...in most cultures, and especially way back, a woman was in a far more dependent situation, so therefore anyone who is in that more dependent situation it could be taken in a more general way..... tying up with what Purna was saying also on the actual biological

~78. -S 42 5- 1/12.

ANIKETA: ~actors,...um...and that it is not identifying your being with that particular...or those particular attributes, which you consider to be to a "woman"...um...where they're fulfilled, but nevertheless your whole being is not tied up with just being that, and it's the freedom from those aspects.....

PRIYANA1~A That's almost takin~ it.....

ANIKETA: And it's difficult to do that. It is hard to do that, because there's so much being demanded of you to fulfil th~t role.

~ Though the actual text does s&~ "to be born", and it is pre- sumably referring to literal birth in this life, not to a sort of metaphorical birth within this life, when you move, as it were, from a greater to a lesser degree of dependence on your biological attributes. Do you think this was truer in the Buddha's day, than it is now, for instance?

VIPULA: It was somewhat truer then, yes. Well~ now-a-days you have all sorts of things which can make it easier for a woman.

~ I~. Well, one very noticeable thing is that, in the Buddha's day, and until relatively recently, it was very difficult 'for the ordinary woman to escape having many, many children. It's only recently, in effect, that a woaaan has had a choice between having and not having children. Before, as you can still see in India, largely it was automatic, one after another - eight, ten, twelve.... So this took up so much of the woman's time and energy, and so on, that it was quite a bit more difficult for her to think in terms of spiritual development; but at least, that situation doesn't ex- ist any longer, in that way. There is a choice now. I mean, there was a choice in the past, but the choice was complete celi- bacy, which was difficult for the majority of women; so, in effect, there wasn't a choice, but now there ~ a choice. So one could say that, to that extent, this is less true of women now, than it was in the Buddha's day, and for some centuries after. But do you think it still applies to some extent? Do you think it does? (Murmurs) Because it is interesting though one can't gener- alise from a small number of instances, that, say, in the Order?, we still have far fewer women than men. Sometimes people ask, "Why do you ordain fewer women~than men?" But that's really quite the wrong way of putting it. (Laughter) One should ask ~SWell2 why is it that few~r ~omen come forward and co~ii~t themsejves?" That is really the way to put it.

ANIKETA: I couldn't speak for other women.

S.: I think, on the whole, we have far more women mitras than men mitras, but far fewer women Order members than men Order mem- bers. I don't know whether this says anything.

PRIYANANDA: Perhaps there's been a recent change. Perhaps there's t?een a recent change in that there are now more women interested in ordination.

RATNA~~~TU: Perhaps they just haven't been ordained because there's a-big back-log.

-S 42 S- 1/12.

~ No. I wouldn't say that. There isn't a big ~Ok-log, be- cause one can ask for ordination, as one well knows without be- ing actually in a position to con~it oneself, or ac~ually being committed. So the fact that anybody, male or female, has asked for ordination hasn't, really, any bearing in this respect. It's whether they are actually ordained which has the

bearing. Because at present, in England, there must be now nearly thirty people who've asked for ordination, most of whom are nowhere near going it. There's about twenty men and ten women.

ANIKETA: I don't know if this will explain the differences, why there should be more women nuns at the moment, but I would say that of the nuns who come along a high proportion are married and I would say that, perhaps, within that situation, that just being a wife and mother, stuck in that role, has proven not completely satisfying and that they are looking for something which is far more fulfilling in their lives; and therefore the teaching of the Buddha, which gives you far more of an opportunity to be self-responsible is the thing which I feel has drawn quite a number of them. But that doesn't really answer the question.

S.: No. It doesn't. Because you can have, well in a sense, any number of children, whether as a mother or a father, and still be definitely committed. And on the other hand, I mean, there are plenty of people with no responsibilities at all, who drift along, and drift in and out, who are not married, and who've no children, but they don't even think of committing themselves. So the real question that is being asked is whether there is something inherent in women, as women, which makes them less inclined to the spiritual life. This is the real question.

ANIKETA: I think there is a very great pull. I think there is, very much, the pull of doing things unconditionally for others, particularly one's children or who one sees as 'one's children', where it's not so much for the real benefit and welfare, but very much the inclination to do it passively and permissively without laying down any conditions, which can lead to smothering, or even making that person more dependent, and putting them in a weaker position. I don't know whether this is just a 'family' thing, but from my point of view, it seems that there is this 'smother mother' aspect.

S.: On the other hand you could say that you mentioned the word 'unconditional', I mean very often a mother's care of the child especially is unconditional; so one could say that if one raised that particular quality to a higher, more spiritual level, you would have an 'unconditional' attitude or response to people. You would be kind to them, or compassionate to them, regardless of where they actually were or regardless of their educational background their colour or race, or whatever. You could say that that's that same quality raised to a higher, more spiritual level.

ANIKETA: Informed with wisdom.

S.: More informed with wisdom, yes. I think that the real question to be settled here, if in fact it can be settled, is whether it's a disadvantage, from a spiritual point of view, being a woman, leaving aside cultural conditionings and social conditionings, which may change from time to time - whether there is any sort of biolo-

S.:(cont'd) - gical qualities, or psychological qualities, which are part of the very sort of

definition of 'woman', so to speak, which get in the way, because one mustn't forget the Buddhist background of 'karma' and 'rebirth' - that you're not reborn as a man or a woman just by accident, but because you have already, an affinity for that particular bodily form. So the question arises, "Well, what affinities?" Well, I mean, that you've been embodied at all is because you've an inclination to embodied existence; you want to be reborn; you want to experience, through the physical senses, the physical world - this is traditional teaching, and therefore you have been reborn. So the first great choice is whether you're reborn as a man or a woman. Not a conscious choice, but whether you are led to this particular form, or that particular form on account of this particular desire, or that particular desire. So what is that difference? That, also, has to be borne in mind. You aren't suddenly sort of landed with a male or female form, from the Buddhist point of view~ from the traditional Buddhist point of view without your having done so to speak, anything to deserve it. So if you look at it within the framework of 'karma and rebirth', what are those qualities corresponding to the male form and its associated characteristics, and what are those qualities corresponding to the female form and its associated characteristics? If one understands that, perhaps one can begin to see what the Buddha is getting at here, or what is conveyed here, regardless so to speak, of the literal truth of the teaching of 'karma and rebirth'. So suppose you were~sort of supposedly neutral consciousness hovering in the 'bardo' State, what sort of inclinations do you think would cause you to want or to choose, even, (supposing it was a free choice), to be simply embodied as a woman or as a man?

UDAYA: I remember reading somewhere, I can't remember where, that beings when they reincarnated on the Earth, the more passionate beings became women~ became incarnated as women, and those less passionate became men.

S.: Do you think that is correct? (Laughter) ALL right, so put it like this: nowadays sex-change operations are possible, are they not? They only achieve limited success; a very limited success indeed. Well, let us suppose that surgery, neurosurgery, everything, improves to such an extent that actually, if you had enough money, and could find the team of surgeons~ you could actually be changed from your present sex to the opposite sex. In other words, a human being would virtually have the change of sex, and supposing along with that, it would be a perfect physical transformation, complete in every detail, but also, you would have all the associated biological and psychological characteristics, and therefore, you were in a sort of neutral position. Suppose, when you were sixteen years of age, you were given a choice, "Do you want to be a man for this life, or do you want to be a woman for this life?" SO~ what sort of inclinations do you think would dispose you to choose to be a man, and what sort of inclinations do you think would dispose you to be ~ woman?

PRIYANANDA: One thing that occurs to me is passivity. I'd choose to be a woman through an inclination towards passivity rather than action. That's one characteristic.

VIPULA: Being men, tend to be somewhat more adventurous, in a sense -

VIPULA: seeking more adventure.

UDAYA Even more intense. (murmurs)

RATNAKETU: Made more for 'the battle' and 'the journey'.

S.: In other words, supposing you were a sort of neutral spirit and you wanted to lead an adventurous life, you would be more likely to choose to be embodied as a man, do you think? (Murmurs) But what stops a woman nowadays, leading an outward-going, adventurous sort of life? Is there anything stopping that?

SUVAJRI: I still think that it's the biological aspect.

~ I-. Because that's part of the whole deal isn't it? So do you think that the biological nature or even ~unction of woman inclines her, or is associated with the qualities of passivity? (Murmurs of agreement) And is passivity, therefore, necessarily a less spiritual quality than activity?

ANIKETA: Not passivity as such, once it is the more truly receptive and not the sort of dull, inactive kind of passivity, but raised, thwre again, to this higher state of active receptivity. As you were spealfng I was thinking, well, for me, I mightn't choose to be either a man or a woman from the biological point of view; it would be a kind of in-between state.

S.: Yeh, right! So the Buddhist tradition is that if you are a sort of spirit, as I said, hovering in a 'bardo' state, and you don't want to be either a biological man or a biological woman, you wouldn't be reborn on Earth probably. You'd be reborn in a deva-loka, a heavenly world where there is no distinction of gender. (Laughter) You see? But if you're to be reborn on the human-plane at all, it would appear that you have to be, biologically at least, either the one or the other unless you're a case of hermaphroditism, which is apparently - true hermaphroditism - very, very rare.

UDAYA: Now, I remember getting a letter from Cintamani, I think it was, and he was talking about 'passivity' and 'receptivity', and he said the difference was that 'receptivity' was active, it was reaching out, whereas 'passivity's' just sitting, sort of waiting, and he didn't see that as being very positive, but he saw 'receptivity' as something active and going out, as being something quite positive.

S.: So one could say, therefore, that the biological equipment of the female predisposes the female to a greater degree of passivity, as distinct from receptivity, and that is less favourable to the spiritual life? Could one say that?

UDAYA: Only I think, if you're accepting that the biological ~affect ~he psychological.

S.: Well, presumably, it does!

UDAYA: Yes, ~ll I was going to say, just a body in itself - I don't 1;~now whether it would make much difference either way. I~

~~2. -S 42 S- 1/12.

UD~YA: depend on your mind. But I think the biological does affect the mind, so you know, that's something. I feel they are inseparable. It's a psych(physical) organism, not just a

physical, and then sort of mind as separate and distinct.

ANITA: I think the biological does have a very strong affect, because I think, even having the choice of not having children during fertile years, there is always that deep-seated inner conflict over the precautions or kind of precautions that are taken, whatever it is. I feel that there is still a deep-seated conflict within a woman between conscious and unconscious intentions, and so one part of her is divided against the other.

S.: So this is really the essence of the matter isn't it? But also it seems to me, that one can look a little further ahead, that when, for instance, that is fulfilled, and especially, for instance, when a woman has passed the child-bearing age, that problem, in a sense, is no longer there; and she has, in fact, she has in the meantime, fulfilled that, then she's completely free to go ahead. In a way she doesn't have a choice, because there's only one path open to her now, really, and it's a spiritual path, or at least a path of individual development and responsibility. She can't have any more children; at best she can 'i~other' or smother her grandchildren. What is she going to do with her life? This is a question which really does confront her. I mean, it doesn't confront a man in that way until he reaches the age of retirement at sixty-five. That's rather late, but with luck, a woman can be confronted by this sort of question in her late thirties, or certainly in her early forties, when she's in her prime, and has a good twenty or thirty years left free from these conflicts, if in her earlier years she has fulfilled herself in that particular way. So probably one could say that there may well be, in the case of the woman, a handicap in the earlier part of life, but there isn't a handicap in the later part of life. If anything, in some respects, a woman is in a more favourable position under modern conditions in the later part of life, than a man, who has to go on working, under normal conditions. But a woman who is leading a quite ordinary life in the world, is relatively free by the time she's forty. If she's married her husband's still going out to work, he's supporting her; her children have left home; she's practically got her time to herself and there's all sorts of things then, which she can do with her life. I think the great problem is or the great difficulty is the purely practical one of bringing these facts to the attention of such women, and pointing out to them that they've reached an extremely favourable time in their lives. This is why I said quite a few years ago that probably the people who were in the most favourable position for individual development were single men in their mid-twenties and married women who'd had their children, and said goodbye to them, and who'd reached the age of about forty. I think these two categories are in especially favourable situations.

ANITA: It's very sad to see, though, how many women just feel their whole life is over by the time their children have left home.

S.: Well, it is over, in a sense. You could say that their life as women in the narrower sense is over; their life as human beings begins. And I think it is a great advantage to women to have a

~3. -S 42 5- 1/12.

S.:(cont'd) definite time when that change takes place, if it hasn't taken place before - I mean, it may well take place before, in some cases, but if it hasn't taken place before, well,

she's had even five, or six children, or seven or eight, by that time she reaches her early or middle forties, that whole child-bearing cycle is over, she's seen her children grow up. What's she going to do with her life? You know, that question confronts her, and if she's fortunate, and makes the right contacts, then she can realise, "Well now I begin to live as a real human being, yes? Biology doesn't bother me any more; that's had its necessary fulfilment. Here I am. I'm going to devote my whole life to being a human being, to being an individual, and I'm going to grow beyond the boundaries of the family, even the boundaries of the extended family~ And a woman in those circumstances is in a very favourable position indeed. You know, as I said, for a man under conditions of modern life who has to go working until he's sixty-five, it's rather difficult if he hasn't made his choice very much earlier. Well, retirement does bring him up against - "Well, I've ended my working life; what do I do with my life?" You know, just as a woman is brought up against it when her biological life, so to speak, ends, and then she's brought up against, "Well, now what do I do with my life?" But she comes up against that in her early forties, perhaps, but he has to wait till his middle sixties, so, in a sense, he's in a more disadvantageous position.

RATNAI-TU: I think that a lot of men, when they do retire after forty years' work, it really hits them. They start to realise, especially if they haven't done anything other than their 'forty-hour' week, really, it hits them home - their life has just gone by, they've wasted it, there's nothing left.

S.: Well, you could say that the woman is fortunate in that nature retires her as a woman when she reaches the age of about forty-five, but nature does not 'retire' the man. He has to wait until society retires him, which it may not do until he's sixty or sixty-five. But of course, if he's sensible enough, he can retire himself at any time he pleases just as a woman, in fact, can retire herself as a woman at any time she pleases. She doesn't have to wait until she's had ten or twelve children, or before she's retired by nature. You know - she can retire herself after having two or three, if she pleases, and start being a human being in the full sense right from then. In the same way a man can not only retire himself young, he can even not start working at all, (Laughter) which is even cleverer. (Mere Laughter)

U-AYA: I must admit I had that sort of feeling when I found out about Buddhism, when I was about seventeen or eighteen, that, in a sense, my life was over, which seemed quite strange, being as how I was so young, as though a big weight had been lifted off my chest, and that a whole thing - sort of finished, and something completely new, and quite different from virtually everyone - well, from everyone I had ever known - was going to happen to me. A different kind of life altogether.

RATI-AITU: It was really like that when we started the community, I went home and told my parents that I'd retired, and wasn't working for money anymore. I'd finished wage slavery!

UDAYA: So you think Bhante, that we - I'm thinking -

~~. S 42 5- 1/12. W1~.

UL)AYA:(cont'd) - especially from a woman's point of view, that not fulfilling the function that so much of her biology is equipped for, that this sort of leave - a gap, or you know, leaves

them un- fulfilled in some way? Or only as a woman, and can that be made up for by developing as an individual?

~ Well, first of all, one has to say that one can't sort of a hundred per cent generalise about women, because there's a whole range. You could say, maybe you could generalise about the middle spectrum, but there are women who say in all aincerity that they have got no biological urge to have children. There's a few such women. They come right at the end of the spectrum, at one end of it. There are other women who have an insatiable hunger to have more and more and more children, who just want to go on breeding, and have a dozen, fourteen, twenty, if they could. They'd like to be surrounded, you know, just like the old woman who lived in a shoe, by tribes of children; and if they can't have as many as that, they like to be teachers in nursery schools, and always be surrounded by children. Well that's the other extreme. But I think, in the middle, there are the vast majority of women who, probably, would not feel truly fulfilled, or at least not very easy, and not very happy, if they hadn't had at least one or two children. But that urge, or desire having been fulfilled, in some cases by having one or two children, in some cases three or four they can then g~t down, if that is what they want to do, to being ~ full human being and a real individual.

END OF SIDE I TAPE 12.

SIDE 2 TAPE 12.

~ont'd .1 1~an, At's just like in the case of some men. You know, for a few years they need, so to speak, to go out to work, to earn a living, to have a jOb~ have money. It's probably not so deeply ingrained biologically as the urge to have a child is in a woman, but it is quite strong nevertheless, and some feel the need to do this for ten, fifteen, twenty years; for others a few days is sufficient.' I think that this whole question raises the much more general question as to what extent you need to fulfil worldly desires - biological, psychological, cultural, before getting onto the spiritual path. I mean, some men will say, "Well, I want to get onto the spiritual path but before I do that I want to make a whole lot of money; I want to be a success, and then I'll get onto the spiritual path. And others dilly-dally with the arts. They think, "Well I need to fulfil myself as an artist. I need to paint I need to draw~ I need to csulpt~ I need to write; and then gra~ually I'll get onto the spirituai path. You see what I mean? This is the sort of wider question, in a way, - to what extent you need, even from the spiritual point of view, to fulfil yourself as a human being in the narrower sense, before getting onto the spiritual path proper, Or , even, you could raise a dif- ferent or broader question altogether - are the two to be so sharp- ly separated as that? Do you see what I mean?

UDAYA: I sort of....um...see the questions you've just mentioned, as being a sort of long~circuiting of the spiritual life. It's sort of indirect, sort of long way of getting on with it.

~: lirn. ~Ir[1.

PRIYANANDA: In a way, you need to choose what is connected with the spiritual life and what is not.....

S.: Yes.

PRIYAM~M~A: What worldly activities, biological, psychological, can actually help you, and (see) what can hinder you.

S.: M~ii. Yes. There is the distinction of 'skilful' and 'unskil- ful' after all. I think the basic question is whether the fulfil- mwnt of a basic human urge, whether biologically, or culturally, or psychologically conditioned, - whether the fulfilment of a ba- sic human urge - can be considered, in a way, as part of one's de- velopment as an individual.

ANIKETA: Well, I feel that you cannot develop spiritually from a state of deprivation - that if you feel..... no matter how much intellectually "you can tell yourself what you should be doing, or what you could be doing2 that, emotionally, if you are deprived, one cannot get on~ anything like the spiritual path.

S.: Yes.' Right! In other words, spiritual development does not merely consist in sort of depriving yourself of satisfactions, when in fact, you still have a hankering after them. Well, no doubt, you have to grow out of these sooner or later, but it is a quest- ion of deciding how you're going to grow out of them, and reall grow out of them, and not merely deprive ypurself of them, wit the possibility of sharp reactions later on. I mean, supposing you do have this urge to paint and to draw, well, it might be some- thing you feel so strongly about, that even if you tried to put it aside, you're quite dissatisfied, and you just can't get on with anything else, because you keep harking back to that all the time. So it may weil be that you have to take up that and get into it, and explore it and maybe even use it as an instrument of your spiritual development. So I think a lot of people will be faced with problems ~nd choices of this sort. I've noticed, for inst- ance, especially in the early days of the 114riends1 in England, that people coming into the 'Friends', especially those who are thinking in terms of putting their qualifications or abilities, or skills2 at the disposal of the 'Friends'2 not finding a situa- tion within the 'Friends', where their qualifications or skills could be used, just giving them up, sometimes with a bit of a wrench, and just saying, as it were, "These skills can't be used; these qualifications are useless, well, just let's forget about them~ it's a pity, I used two or three years acquiring them," - and then they got into their spiritual life, in the sense of con- centrating on their meditation and studying, doing for the 'Friends' whatever needed to be done, but in many cases~ if not all, practi- cally, by now, after two or three, or four or five years, the sit- uation within the 'Friends' itself, having expanded, their qualifi- cations and their skills were required, not only required, but needed. S~ they took them up again. So perhaps one has to..... perhaps there's also needed, an element of ~llingness to renounce, if nec- essary. You see what I mean? t mean, perhaps, in the confidence that at some time those particular skills or interests of yours will be of value. Perhaps you shouldn't think too ~nuch in terms Qf, well, a more self-indulgent attitude towards self~development.

~~on~~~ Though we have~ reached~ a stage where you could have a baby for the Movement! (Laughter) Well-, who knows?

ANIKETA: I think it would be highly suspect! (Laughing)

~ Well,if..... not necessarily; it depends who decided. If at an Order meeting, or a Council meeting, a Centre decided that, in the interests of the whole Movement, somebody ought to have a baby, well, I'm sure she could go ahead and have it with a clear conscience. (Laughter) (Pause) You know, as a noble fulfilment of duty.

PURNA: It's quite a difference, though, between taking up a basic urge in some form like ? , form of 'career' situation within the framework of the spiritual life, and doing it as something divorce(1~from the spiritual life.....

S.: Yes! Right!

PURI~: the two are quite different things. It's not a case of giving up meditating, retreats, etc., while you get back into your art work.

S.: No. No.

PURNA: Or anything like this.

~ No. Then you're in a position to integrate² in a much better way, whereas, before, it was a situation of choice and conflict.

PRIYANAI~A: I feel it is a situation where you need the feed-back from other~. You need to know what is appropriate for your growth - that you're not just doing it as a sort of...um...as a sort of ec- centric behaviour, in a way³ just sort of going off by yourself and doing this certain thing because you feel like doing it.

~ Well, there is this old so~t of 'hippy' or 1pseudo-hippy' attitude "Whatever you feel like doing, whatever you get into, well, it's all your own development" - which is, very often, very far from being the case. You know, you feel like strumming on your guitar for a bit - O~. it's part of your development. You feel like getting into 'acid' for a while - it's part of your development. You feel like going on a macrobiotic diet - it's all part of your development. You feel like demonstrating in the streets in support of some cause - O.K.~ that's O.K.; or you don't feel like doing anything, just like sitting around smoking dope - (Laughter) well, it's all in your development, you're ~eve- loping in your own way. I think this is one of the great 'miccha- ditthis', that whatever you happen to be doing, well, you're just developing in your own way! So, yes, you do need the check, 'o'to speak, of the real spiritual community who can distinguish between a valid getting into what you feel like doing as part of your own development, and just self-indulgence and going round and round in circles.

DHAWtADHARA: This question of the difference between men and women...ah....I was wondering if there are different forms of Buddhism which appeal to different people....?

S.: Ummin?

DIIRIADHARA: ? I was thinking of the Dorgje Chang in New Zealand appealing more to women it seems.

S.: Oh?

D~iADHARA: I was wondering if it appeals more to the intuitive, magic, and mystery side of things. Whereas, in the 'Friends' there's a 'Theravada' front at first.

S.: Mm?

PURI~A: I suspect there are other factors other than the type of Buddhism ? the level of commitment, the type of people running them I would think are the overriding factors, to the type of Buddhism.

~ ~n. For instance, I've seen in London, that some of the Thera- vada groups, and professedly 50, and wishing to be nothing else, seem to attract a majority of women. So it is difficult to see why. But, for instance, a lot may have to do with the level of the particular movement, and the particular persons who are run- ning it, or leading it, b~t, on the other hand there may be it may be, that, as presented in the West at least, some forms of Buddhism do appeal more to men, and others more to women.

UDAYA: It seems as though, like what Purna ~s suggesting, we wouldn't be able to see, though, whether or not, you know, what was really happening, because of the other influences. If they could be re- moved or controlled in such a way, then you could see...ah...yes, that form of Buddhism does attract more men or more women, or whatever.

S.: I~. Yes. Right.

UDAYA: Tlat would be a little hard to set up as a sort of clini- cal experiment.

S.: Right. So do we come to any sort of conclusion about this statement? This statement, "It is hard for such a one t~ae being a woman and be born a man".

PURI~: It's interesting that they're almost implying that it's the normal course of action to become a woman. (Murmurs) It's not just a case of~ "You should avoid being a woman and become a ma~," but that "It's hard to escape being born a woman".

S.: Well this suggests that your natural tendency is that, and ~you regard being born as a woman lower than being borfl as a man, well, your natural tendcicy is always to the lower rather than to the higher. Your natural tendency is to be reborn as an animal, but if you can escape that and be born as a human being, then' you are very lucky.

~TNE~~TU: So there's one thing I've heard said about things like this , is that it sort of was called a 'cultural ex- cretion'.

S.: Mni?

RATNAI~TU: That, besides, I don't think it's totally ?

~~8. -S 42 5- 2/12.

~: ,No., °~ipi.

PURI~TA: I don't quite get you.

RATNAKETU: Well, I've heard it called that there are such things as that, you know, as that saying here, that - "It's hard to escape being born a woman and be born a man" - ah...that that is 'cultu- ral'~ that that is a part of the culture of India, and it has no application at all in the 'West; but it doesn't seem to be totally that.

S.: Mm.

PRIYANMtDA: In other words, one of the conclusions we seem to have come to, is that it is something inherent in the higher evolution, ah... that it isn't (?) inherent in the Dharma - the question of biological, of sexual distinction does play a part in the 'higher evolution'.

S.: I~. ~~. Well this is a point of view which is quite unaccept- able to some people nowadays, but it is2 in fact, ? what the Dharma does say: that the distinction between the sexes is not merely, as it were, horizontal, but also to some extent, ver- tical. I think one could also add to that, that at the present day, for various reasons which people are well aware of, it's pos- sible for someone born as a woman, at least when she reaches mid- dle life2 to make that transition from 'being a woman' to 'being a man', in the sense of being less preoccupied with her biolo ic- al role as 'mother', as 'genetrix' and 'mother'. You see wha I mean?

ANIKETA: Even going back to the biological factor - it's also true, too, that biologically, the chances (of being born a woman) are greater, because there's the ...um...sex difference is depend- ent on the man who has both 'x' and 'y' chromosomes, while the woman has only the...ah... S.: Only the 'y', yes. There's also another point, though it's

only marginal

DHAf~IADHARA: (Indistinct)

~. Mm? Sorry?

DHA~~AI)HARA: No. There's only the 'x' in the woman.

~ Ah! Yes. There's also a marginal factor in as much as there are more women in the

world than men, so from that point of view it is more difficult to be born as a man, statistically, (chuckling) but that's only very marginal. But I think this is, for some people, quite a tricky area. I do know from my own experience that quite a few women will resent any sort of appearance or suggestion that they are in any way inferior; (probably it's unfortunate the word 'inferior' is used, or has to be used~ or even any suggestion of any 'disability'. So one certainly doesn't want to exaggerate any disability, one doesn't want to accept any disability that is merely cultural; and there are some disabilities that are merely cultural; but when there is a bedrock, so to speak, biological disability, whether it is for a woman or whether it is for a man even, one is not making it any easier for oneself to evolve if one

~~. -- 42 5- 2/12.

S.:(cont'd) insists on denying that, and resenting any reminder that it is actually there, because if you have any disability of any kind, whether biological, or whether psychological, or of any kind whatsoever, whether you are a woman or a man, the only way in which you can progress is to recognise it~ and then deal with it; or at least, take it into account, otherwise it is going to get in the way, because it is an unacknowledged factor then. I think this is the greatest difficulty. So if a woman, as a woman, has a disability, it is much better to acknowledge it and say, "Well, yes, it is a disability, but never mind, I'm going to take it into account, and I'm going to progress nonetheless;" but by denying it, and saying, "Oh no! I haven't got a disability. Who says women are inferior to men! " One is only blocking the path of one's own development. And just the same in the case of men, if there is in their case also, any specific disability.

ANIKETA: ~es. It builds up lots of resentment, and it blocks good communication.

S.: Yes.

UDAYA: The important thing is that, development and enlightenment is possible!

~ Yes! Indeed! Because in the case of Buddhism, there was the categorical statement by the Buddha, you know, (no doubt traditionally, Buddhism has said that, yes, women have certain disabilities as women, which men do not have), but on the other hand the Buddha has also said, when challenged directly by Ananda, "Yes, women are capable of the highest spiritual attainment." He's said this quite categorically, and we have examples in Buddhist history, of women, who, whether young or old, have attained enlightenment, so therefore, one knows that it is possible, and one might further say, that even though Buddhism has recognised that women have certain biological disabilities, it is only Buddhism, among all the major religions of the world, as far as I know, that has stated categorically that women are capable of the highest spiritual attainment. The question isn't even asked in Christianity. Women can be saved, and you have women saints, but if you start talking in terms of a woman 'Saviour'.....

VOICE: Or even a priest.

~..~ even a priest, you start raising difficulties; but in the case of Buddhism 9

it's always been said that women are capable of the highest spiritual attainment, and have achieved that historically; I mean, among the Buddha's disciples, and later on among the disciples of Milarepa, and so on. And also, women have been able to occupy any spiritual position that men have been able to occupy. You've had not only 'bhikkhus', you've had 'bhikkhunis'; and you've had not only male gurus, you've had female 'gurus'; and there's nothing in Buddhism to prevent a woman exercising any spiritual function whatever, and this is the only religion, I think, of which you can say that. I mean, in Christianity, women usually cannot be priests, cannot administer the sacraments; usually, in Islam, a woman cannot lead the congregation, prayers, and in Hinduism, though there are the occasional woman guru, they do not usually play a very important part in things,

290. -S 42 5 2/12.

S.: Qc0Tht2Adin the spiritual life; but in Buddhism it is quite different. So Buddhism has this double attitude -, it is very realistic and at the same time it is very idealistic. It does say that, 'Yes, there are certain biological disabilities for women but on the other hand it says, 'Well, never mind.' Women too, can gain enlightenment, and whatever spiritual path or function is open to men, is also open to women. So I think one has to take both of these together. (Pause) And one can also bear in mind that the specifically feminine, or female qualities, like the specifically masculine qualities, are capable of being exercised on a higher level, in a so to speak, refined and purified form. For instance, masculine competitiveness can be refined and sublimated into a sort of healthy rivalry, and the feminine nurturant qualities can be refined and sublimated into something like compassion - care for life in a broader sense. So, on the one hand one doesn't want to discourage women, on the other hand one doesn't want to be unrealistic; because, sometimes, people have said to me in England, if you mention that women have got these disabilities, that's very discouraging for women, but I think actually, in the long run, it's more encouraging to recognise the disabilities, but also to emphasise that if you really want to you can transcend them.

ANLIKETA: It's a sure foundation that you have to build on....

S.: It's a sure foundation, yes.

M'LIKETA: . because it is built on the truth....

S.: Yes.

AINETATA: on things as they really are.

~ i{jght~ And this is what Buddhism essentially is - seeing things as they really are, at every possible level. I am. I'lln'.

UJAYA: Do you see any areas of the spiritual life that a woman would need to be more specifically careful of or maybe, need to develop more specifically, then? Can you speak about it do you think, in more specific areas?

S.: Well, I mean, women as I've encountered them, a~~ Y~m not go- ing to generalise too much, but women as I've encountered them in England mostly, in the course of the Movement, need to develop their independence more~~ ~iidependence and initiative. This is not to say that men are always full of independence and initiative but I think this is something women need to concentrate on developing; for even apart from any biological factor, social and cultural prac- tices and interests do encourage women to be not so indepe- t not to have so much initiative; less in fact, than they could - mally. So I think we are going to have to sort of concentrat~ on this. It's not even a question of being more ~~~nendent, or even becoming more independent at first, but Of~ what shall I say, of nnt prr~nt~ng [°t~ ~,rn~t~t,nn~,jTh~r'b society nlaces uon their indepe- nce, because, in many ways, they are indepenent already, but are not allowed by society to be as independent as they could be, Women are not such weak, dependent creatures, in many ways, as society very often sort of makes them out to be. So I think

S.:(cont'd) the first thing they have to concentrate on is, sort of reclaiming their independence, and effectuating it. Well then they can think of terms of developing it, and being it more, but I think, in many cases, women already have the capacity for inde - pendence, which they are not allowed by society, to exercise. So I think this is an area that needs special attention by women. And this is where the women's communities I found, in England, are so useful, because they remove completely, the illusion that a woman is a poor, weak creature, a sort of clinging vine that needs to be propped up by some strong man - she can't live on her own.' So many women have realised this with delight - that they can do everything themselves, they are quite independent, they can look after themselves in every respect, that they don't need a man to do it for them, which doesn't mean that they 'go off' men, or start disliking them or hating them, no, they get on with them bet- ter than ever because they relate from a position of independence and not dependence and clinging, and they don't have to play little games to get their own way. If they want their own way they insist on having it, openly and straightforwardly. (Chuckling) So - "If you won't go along with me in this respect, O.K. Bye-bye, I'm not dependent on you." So that is much better than having to wheedle, and do things indirectly, and all that sort of thing, which is, sometimes, very unpleasant for both men and women. So this is what I'd say - that this is an area that women have to give special attention to, under the conditions of Western society, probably other societies too. Just claim back their independence and insist on being independent, because they're able to be independent already, in many cases, up to a point, without any further evolution or development. They are more independent than people usually think. Any women disagree with this?

VOICES: No.

S.: (Chuckling)

UDAYA: One of the difficulties is that the roles are so well re- hearsed that it's ... you know, the two parts involved the men often don't give the women a chance; they're too willing to go and 'help'.....

S.: Yes, because it flatters the masculine ego. This is what hap- pens which is not good for the men anyway. The masculine ego be- ing big enough as it it! (Laughter)

UDAYA: Yeah. I've found in Auckland, well, especially sort of before, and during the early days of the women living together at Francis Street, some people tended to 'mother' the women's commun- ity, or the women's side of the Movement, where I sort of felt, possibly the women's side of the Movement should be ? taking care of itself, and finding out about itself, you know, and sort of 'leave it alone' a little.

S.: Yes. There is truth in that, though of course, at the same time, you know, whole sections of the Movement need sort of 'spirit- ual' care of the whole, as distinct from a sort of just psycholo- gical 'mothering'. The women, though they may be living in commun- ities on their own, developing their own independence, shouldn't be made to feel out on a limb, spiritually. This has happened a little bit in England, just because the women, and the women Order

2q2. -S 42 S- 2/12.

S.:(cont'd) members were so few, at least, some years ago. This doesn't happen now.

UDAYA: No. I was thinking of quite mundane, practical things.....

S.: Yes. Right!

UDAYA:you know, where anyone could do then - a woman could do them, so, in a sense, they should be left to do them.

S.: Yes. In this sort of way there doesn't seem to have been a problem in England. There have been capable women in the communi- ties with quite a few skills, including the ability to maintain their own vehicles, at least, up to a point, and this is all for the good. I think, you know, both men and women actually, from a purely social and cultural point of view, need to be more inde- pendent from each other. I mentioned yesterday the helpless male who can't~ even sew on a button on his shirt, well, that's the other side of the picture. There are certain things that men tend to rely on women for, instead of providing then for themselves. I mean, there are ordinary things like neatly darned socks, and nicely cooked meals, but also a certain atmosphere or aura of comfort and homeliness. You know what I mean? Something you can relax into. Whereas men should actually try to provide that for themselves, and not just rely upon women to provide it for them. Women may get fed up with providing it, may have other things to do, other fish to fry, so to speak, other than creating a homely, warm, re- laxing atmosphere for him to sink into after his hard day's work. (PAuse) I was talking the other about someone having referred to the mitras, on the occasion of one of the Order con- ventions, and referred to the fact that the mitras were doing all the cooking, saying they shouldn't be treated like servants, over- looking the fact that the mitras enjoyed doing it and wanted to do it. I think, also, there is something of that sort as between women and men. Some women in the West nowadays, 'liberated' women, seem to feel that a woman shouldn't get any enjoyment out of doing anything for anybody else, especially out of doing it for men; that in doing things for men she is humiliating herself, and being sub- servient, and not being herself. So this is something that one really needs to look at, say, in Thdia, well, if you watch the wo- men, they do practically everything for the men - (I'm not now con- sidering whether that's good for the men or not, maybe, maybe not) but you notice when the women serve when they serve food, when they prepare food, when they dish it up, they thoroughly enjoy

doing it, and they do not feel subservient, and this is a ? I think, that, very often. in the West, is overlooked - that when, say, women in a country like India, or a culture like that of India, do these things, they do them because they want to do them, they enjoy doing them, and they do not feel that they are knuckling under, or being used, or being subservient. They would just laugh if you suggested that to them. They do it because they want to do it. You might say, even, that they don't do it because the men want them to do it, they do it because they want to do it. One of our upasakas found this on retreat, the women were doing all the cooking, and this upasaka being a fair-minded young upasaka felt, well, that's not quite right; well, men should be prepared to take their share of the cooking as well as the women, so he sort of mftried to help, and even insisted in doing a bit with them, washing

293. -S 42 S- 2/12.

S.:(cont'd) a few dishes; but, he said, it was quite clear, they did not want...they genuinely did not want him to do these things; they genuinely enjoyed doing all that on retreat, and in the end he had to accept that that was the situation, and there ~as noth- ing he could do about it; and he felt, "\~hat a different attitude froin that of many women in the West." ? it is not that you necessarily are not fulfilling yourself in performing what are, traditionally, regarded as 'feminine' roles0 You mustn't sort of throw them all aside automatically in order to be an individual; this is what I mean. Being an individual goes further than all that, but it doesn't necessarily exclude that; otherwise it is like trying to ttranscend the fact that you're a woman by cutting off your breasts, or in the case of the man, by maltreating yourself, or by aniputating parts of yourself, in other ways, as we saw yes- terday. This doesn't help at all! So you can sort of 'amputate' yourself psychologically if you're not careful, in order to grow, but it doesn't really hel p you. S0~ if as a womaza with a real urge to serve, well, O.K., serve and enjoy it! Don't feel, "Oh~ I mustn't serve because that means I'm being subservient, and if I'm being subservient I can't be an individual." If you don't feel subser- vient, well, you're not subservient - you're doing it because you want to do it! So I~think there is a lot of muddled thinking in the West - in modern'liberal' circles - on such questions as these. So sometimes a woman really feels like doing something, but she checks herself, inhibits herself, because she thinks, "Well, if I do that, people might think I'm just an old-fashioned, womanly type, (chuckling) and sort of look down on me if I enjoy, say, making a cup of tea for a man, or something like that. On the other hand, one must also say that with s~me of the so-called 'liberated' men, (and one sees this with 'hippy' men), they real- ly do treat the women-folk as handmaidens, and expect to be waited on hand and foot; that is also not good. It's not good for the men, even if the women do it happily. So I mean, on the one hand, yes, men and women must be independent of one another, and not de- pend in a weak, helpless way on each other, but that doesn't mean you can't do things in a happy, joyful, willing way for other peo- ple, including members of the opposite sex, without any loss of your own individuality. It really does seem that spiritual devel- opment is full of pitfalls, eh, especially those created by wrong views! (Pause) M~ybe we'll stop here and have our tea or coffee before going on to the next. Let's see who's going to be 'Mother'; or has that already been (decided)? (Laughter)

TEA*BR~~i DISCUSSION.

UDAYA (First part of the question not on tape, but the question was to do with integrating 'the feminine' aspects in men, and asking for clarification between 'effeminacy' etc. and androgyny) in myself.

S.: ~. I think it is quite important to make a distinction here between rising above the sexual polarity and the, as it were, incorporating both poles within oneself, and falling below them because one is inadequate to either role.

VOIC~S: I~. Yes.

~: You see what I mean? i~or instance, I think this is probably more~noticeable in the case~of men than in the case of women. You

2q1+. -S 42 5- 2/12.

S.:(cont'Ad can find men who are sort of, maybe intermediate, in a way, but it is in such a sort of weak way ..

VOICb~: Yeah.'

S.: ..it's as though they haven't been able to be men, and that perhaps they find that the role of being a man iWthe modern world is so daunting and so demanding they just don't feel equal to it; they are just too weak, so they sink back into a sort of passive attitude, which is like that of a woman, though only sup- erficially, bec~use they won't have a woman's strengths at the same time, they won't have the strength of, say, genuine passivity; and they may even adopt sexually, a somewhat feminine sort of role, but they will have sunk below masculinity, rather than have risen above it, much less to have integrated both!

VOICES: Yeah.

S.: So I think this is where you get the unisex idea. The unisex idea is the sort of idea of, almost inability to cope with sexu- al differentiation - you're unable ~o be a man, usually3 sometimes unable to be a woman, so you sort of sink back into something sort of undifferentiated, almost in a sort of childlike, or childish pre-genital sort of way. (Murmurs of agreement) It's almost regressive. I think it's a great mistake to confuse this with a genuine synthesis, psychologically and spiritually, of the sexual polar opposites. You see what I mean?

UDAYA: That's why I, ah.....

S.: So a man of this sort, a weak male, as I sometimes call him, (chuckling) the weak male is not a man who succeeds in dev- eloping his female side, or his feminine side, no! that's a great bluff. (Laughter) He's a man who's not been able to be a man! He needs to work on being a man, then he can think of de- veloping his feminine side if he likes; but he is not the one ~(0 has to renounce the masculine role, and is very integrated, no! no! he's just unable to fulfil the masculine, well, not just role, but un- able to be a man he's sunk below

the level. So you could say~ that there was..... ~hat the 'weak male', perhaps complemented by the "strong~, inverted commas ~oman, you know, the man who is unable to be a man, and the woman who is unable to be a woman, who have a superficial resemblance to some sort of androgyne psychologically, but it is not the ~ine thinr; then you've got the next level - the ~eal polar male and the real po~r female, and then at a higher level, the more integrated individual who is still biologically, either male or female, (it is not a question of physical hermaph- roditism), but who, in the case of the biological male, has devel- oped and integrated his feminine side, and in the case of the bio- logical female, who has developed and integrated her masculine side - so, they remain differentiated biologically, but they are integrated as individuals, and even though they are biologically still polar- ised, there is not that extreme psychological polarisation, there- fore they get along much more; they get along much better and more happily as individuals together; relate more as individuals, des- pite the continued biological polarity, which isn't~~o important as it no longer reflects a real psychological polarity. They un- ~erstand each other better, just because they are both more individuals.

2q~° -S 1+2 S- 2/12.

S. :(cont'd) You see what I mean? So it is important to disting- uish these three levels, and v~ry often the first is mistaken for the third.

VOICE: Yeah. Especially by people who are like that.

S.: Yes0 So, sometimes, you find those who think ~f the third in terms of the first, trying to dampen down a man's natural mas- culinity, and restrain it, and discourage it~ under the impression that they are thereby making him more 'integrated!! That 5 non- sense! In the same way there are some who try to encourage a wom- an to give up her more womanly qualities, sort of denature herself in that way, and make herself into something neutral and sexless, under the impression that she is becoming thereby, more of an in- dividual0 Well, ypu could say it's possible to be a real indivi- dual, and at the same time a real bouncing female.

VOICE: ~m'!

S.: (Chuckling) On the other hand it's possible to be an individual and a real man. S0~ again, you don't sort of develop by impoverishing yourself. You go further, and you integrate the 'old' rather than discarding it. So in pseudo-spiritual circles you see quite a lot of males, ? who are very weak and spineless, and not real men at all,in any sort of way at all, but th y are under the impression, apparently, that they've trans- cendehe sexual polarity, whereas the truth is they haven't even approached it!

VOICE: No.

S.: They are very childlike in some ways. They may have sexual relations with the opposite sex, or even with the~same s~x, but if they have relations with the opposite sex, or if they are mar- ried, even have children, they are still not men! ~ev are still not men.' Really! And

you see so many of them in what I call pseudo- spiritual circles. They are just weak creatures; they haven't reached the level of manhood yet. They have to try to be men, and emphasise the heroic side of the spiritual life more; but unfortunately in many cases? they and maybe their friends too, are sort of under the impression that they've risen above all that, but they haven't! They've fallen short of it. So one doesn't become more of an individual by becoming less of a man, or more of an individual by becoming less of a woman. You just grow further on. But there's a lot of confusion of thought about this. I've thought about this quite a bit; I think this is the first time I've sort of expressed myself clearly on the subject, that is why I asked to have the tape- recorder on. But I think you all must have met, in pseudo-spiritual circles, these sort of men. I think~ anyway, this whole trend this 'unisex' trend, at present, I think it concerns men more than women, actually, or is worse for men, or more dangerous for men, than for women? because, in a way, the male is in a much more vulnerable position in modern times, under the conditions of modern life - there's so many more demands made upon him. I mean, if you look at the ordinary, conventional family, well, the woman, if she chooses, usually can stay on at home. She isn't exposed to the wear-and-tear of modern, competitive industrial life. Even if she gets a job, it's usually a fairly easy little job just round the corner; maybe physically demanding, but not really demanding

296. -S 42 5- 2/12.

S.: (cont'd) of her as an individual; not requiring worry. She has a little cleaning job~ or goes and does some typing, or something like that; she doesn't usually take on real responsibility, and she doesn't have, usually, unless of course it's a solo parent family, the responsibility of the family, in the way that the man does .

END OF SIDE 2 TAPE 12.

SIDE I TAPE I~.

(Some of the discussion is missing)

AI~IKETA: It seems that it's with artistic interests - something I've noticed is that there seems to be a very 'precious' sort of quality about it; a sort of effete aestheticism, not.....

S.: Right.' Effete! There's nothing robust about it, like the genuine artist has it's just a sort of 'fiddling around' with it. (Laughter) ~ou know what I mean? It's a dilettantist - they don't really do very much. I've ~t hundreds of the~e people. We've had them flocking around the 'friends' in the early days. They dabble. They produce little drawings, or bits of paintings or half of paintings; they never really do very much, but they're ~nto the arts'. That's a means of not getting involved in the hurly- burly of the world. I'm not saying that the hurly-burly of the world is a very positive sort of situation, and it's a pity that they've been so discouraged that they've just opted out; maybe if the world had been a more positive place or more positively organised, those 'weak males', as I've called them, could have fitted in, and could have strengthened themselves but as things are at present, it is too much for them; they can't cope. So~ as I said, they either remain, very often, ? ; they either respond to the situation

by overdeveloping their masculine features, which cuts then off from their 'feminine' features, which is the real tragedy, - they become more one-sidedly masculine even than nature intended them to be, which means also, their relations with women are excessively polarised, which makes for greater tension; or they just opt out, and they just give up trying to be men, even in the way nature, apparently, intended them to be. And if in their childhood they were 'Mother's little darlings', well, then, Heaven help them! You can just predict what is going to happen to them. But the practical point I'm stressing is, yes, integrate the masculine and feminine by all means, but not by sort of falling short of both in this sort of weak and watery, and negative, and as you said, very effete sort of way. I mean, there is a corresponding thing for women - 'the woman who won't be a woman' sort of thing; but this is I think, much less of a problem. It is a small-scale problem compared with this of men, who just can't face competitive modern life. I mean has anyone observed this, or thought of this before?

PURNA: I've particularly seen it in more...um...relationships where people consider themselves 'liberated', particularly the woman tend to be strongly feminist.

S.: i~. Yeah.

PUFAITA: I know of two or three cases of this sort of situation with

2q?. ~S L~ S~ 1/13.

PUFAITA: (cont'Ad with a quite weak man)

S.: So you've got a man who's not succeeded in being a man mating with a woman who's not succeeded in being a woman, in a way; which is not a very healthy situation, is it?

PRIYANDA: Do you think, bhante, there is a...ah...I mean, there are.....there is a possibility of couples in our society doing that very successfully - the man being fully a man, and the woman being fully a woman, and yet...and still relating as man and woman, and yet they're both going on developing.?

S.: Yes, I think it is possible, but I think it is quite difficult. I don't know that I've met any perfect examples of this, but I think it's possible, but it's an option for a very small number of people.

UDAYA: Mni. And if both of them had synthesised their other half, it's only technically that it would be a man relating to a woman and a woman relating to a man.

S.: Yeh. Right!

UDAYA: you'd have individuals relating to individuals, even if it was sexual.

S.: They wouldn't bother whether one did the cooking, and one went out to work; they could change it week by week; it wouldn't matter; psychologically it wouldn't be of any importance~ it would be just according to convenience. But what I was going to say was that I noticed this sort of thing in connection with the evolution of the 'Friends' in England, when the whole Sukknvati project started up; because what seemsone of the things that seem~d to be ha~ pening was that those who were involved with the 'Friends', that is to say, some of the men, were forced, in a way, to be men through that project. You see what I mean? Before, they were, many of them, in this sort of effete state, or effete condition; had opted out through weakness, not through high spiritual ideals; just through weakness; but getting involved with the work of Sukkhavati gave them an opportunity of developing their more masculine, and more, if you like 'aggressive', or more constructive qualities, and therefore developing to the extent that they became men, having not been men before, or, you know, having failed to become, or resisted becoming, men. And then they could start thinking in terms of developing their 'feminine' side, but not before. So this is one of the reasons why I see Sukkhavati as representing a real step forward in the Movement, for many of the men. Well, there were some for whom it was not true - people like Subhuti, who took the lead, but it was true of quite a lot of the men who did get involved, and who were helped in this sort of way. But I think it isn't quite the same for women, because, ah, except to the extent one can say that if society produces these exaggeratedly masculine men~ because that's the only sort of male who can function in certain situations in the modern world, ah, as the complement to that, presumably, you'll tend to have the exaggeratedly feminine woman, you know, if he is ? masculine, by way of compensation, he will want an exaggeratedly feminine woman; so women who are in connection with, or trying to relate to such men, ah, presumably, will sort of exaggerate their feminine characteristics~ which, again, is what one finds happening. There are the secondary sexual

2~8. -- ~2 5- 1/13.

S.:(cont'd) characteristics all exaggerated, all in a sort of comic way sometimes, and if the man is ever-so, ever-so capable and strong and the great provider, and all the rest of it~ she has to be the silly, fluffy, feather-brained little thing who can't even knock a nail into a wall. You see what I mean? The two tend to be complementary0 So, probably, indirectly~ it's not very good for women either0 But I think there is less direct~pressure from the social environment in this way. She still can remain a woman, if he's unable to remain a man. But I think from the point of view of women, the danger is, ah, that you get women who are denying their femininity due to some kind of 'micchaditthi.' For instance, one notices, say, in the women's movement~, very often the involvement is led by 'masculine women', for want of a better term;- -You see what I mean? - women who are naturally 'masculine', and for them that's right; that's what it should be, but they seem to think that they're the norm for all the women, and that the 'feminine' woman is some kind of pathetic creature who is being conditioned into being~feminine woman by the social environment, and she's ~not to be deconditioned, and therefore they try to make women feel~bad about their femininity, and to encourage them to give it up, and to conform to a sort of~ well, virtually 'unisex' sort of pattern. So I think this is how it happens to women, though I think there are not very many women who are deeply influenced by this; but there are some at least, who think that it's betraying the 'Feminist Cause' if they are sort of feminine. And one, you know... at one feminist conference, great exception was taken to the pretty hats some of the delegates were wearing~, because this was catering to the stereotype of women where, apparently, some of

them came wearing these sort of flowerey hats because that's what they wanted to do, and they liked doing that; but they were told, rather sternly, that it was against 'the line', as it were, you know, so they had to sacrifice their hats, and in their future conferences were hatless. So in the same way, a woman shouldn't make herself attractive, or shouldn't dress prettily, etc. etc. If she doesn't want to, fair enough, but a lot of women want to but are told it's the result of social conditioning and they shouldn't try to be feminine, in fact being a female is something completely superficial which you should just ignore, it is entirely the product of social and cultural conditioning - this is what some of the feminists say, - 'I look exactly the same as a man; there is no difference at all, really, it's all social and cultural conditioning, so throw away your so-called femininity~ it doesn't really belong to you. ~1 So some women go along with this and try to suppress their natural femininity, and they are just in the same position as those men who aren't able to express, or to accept their natural masculinity; and the results are often, equally disastrous. But I think there are far fewer such women than there are such men because, I think~ in the case of men, the influence is social, therefore quite big, quite extensive. In the case of women it seems to be more a type of ideology. So I think it is important for those trying to be individuals, and trying to develop, (after all, everybody starts off with one sex or the other, whatever you end up as), is to understand clearly the three levels. This is the main thing; and also, that you don't necessarily advance simply by negating or falling short of your existing sex, masculine or feminine, male or female. So therefore, if you encounter these 'weak males', as I call them, what one should do is encourage them ~ to be men, not compliment them on their spirituality, and all that

2~. -S 42 S- 1/13.

S.:(cont'd) sort of thing! And in the same way2 if one encounters these artificially masculinised women, as distinct from those who are genuinely like that, well, just encourage them to be more feminine, though, at the same time, to be individuals. Perhaps there are some men who are actually born as 'weak males', who can't really change much in this lifetime, but they shouldn't be taken as a sort of norm for healthy men, much less still~ regarded as people who have risen above the polarisation of the masculine and attitudes. And this is quite an important point.

VIPULA: As you find women who have strong masculine characteristics, surely you would find men who have strong feminine characteristics to some degree.

S.: Again, of course, it depends upon what one means by 'masculine' and 'feminine'. I wouldn't say, in a real sense, one is less of a man just because one is gentle. One could still be strong, and even aggressive when necessary, but have very gentle characteristics too. That I'm thinking of is the man who cannot but be gentle; he is unable to be strong; he is unable to be dynamic, he is unable to be aggressive, even when the situation requires it~ so he, I would say, is not truly a man. He hasn't really got the feminine qualities. You shouldn't allow yourself to be misled and think someone who is very big, and well-built and aggressive, is necessarily more of a man than someone who is slightly-built, and doesn't talk so loud! See what I mean?

V DICES: Yeah.

M~IfZETA: ~When you use the term 'aggressive', Bhante, what is implied in that term?

S.: I'm using the term here in a quite neutral, descriptive sense - 'the capacity to break through and overcome obstacles', and even getting a certain kick out of doing that.
(Chuckling) (Laughter) This is what I term 'aggressiveness'

M~1I~TA: A kind of self-confidence, and, ah...being self-assertive, but in,ah...a positive way ?

S.: Well, as I said, I use it neutrally. Aggressiveness can be negative, it can be positive, depends on what you're breaking through, with what motive.

~ATHA[ETU: ~Jhat would you see as the qualities of a sort of the 'ideal, true' man, you 'mow', in the 'man' sense, not so much of the enlightened individual, just the sort of 'basic' man ?

S.: Minus the 'feminine' qualities as it were, you mean? ~\$~~~~).bAt the stage..... the sort of polarised man, the sort of

S.: Well, he must be active, outward-going, able to take responsibilities, courageous, intelligent. Not that women aren't intelligent, but it's a different kind; maybe the man's is a more 'executive' type of intelligence, rather than the more 'sympathetic' type of intelligence that you get with women. But I think, actually, everybody knows what is meant by 'being a man'. I think everybody knows that. You also can recognise the caricature. I mean this South American type 'machismo' is absolutely laughable! (Laughter)

30.0. -S 42 5- 1/13.

S.:(cont'd) ? these little men, their moustaches, and sticking out their little sparrow chests; it's comical! It's just like the 'siren' type of woman, sort of spreading herself over a settee and her hair flowing all over the cushion, and looking at you with goopy eyes; it's comic.'

M~ThSLTA: I think of James Thurber's pictures.

S.: Well, really, these sort of caricatures that one sees around, of both men and women are just laughable. So one should just watch one is not conforming to either of these stereotypes, or caricatures, or exaggerated versions. You sometimes actually meet them.' It is quite amusing. You see then, of course, in the ads all the time, don't you?

UDAYA i~~. 3ig ?

~.: but this is largely the result of a social deformation. This is quite pathetic~, really. But one doesn't need to throw away the baby with the bath-water. One doesn't want to be exaggeratedly masculine or feminine; on the other hand one doesn't want to negate those features. Have them, but rise above them. Anyway let's carry on. This has all come out of this little saying: "It is hard for such a one to escape being a woman and be born a man." It's really much more complex than that, isn't it?, because it is also a question of being a woman.

If you find yourself a woman, be a woman; if you find yourself a man~ be a man; accept it~ develop it; make much of it in a true way, but gradually rise above it, and incorporate it into something more completely human, more truly individual. If the world was a unisex world it would be very dull, wouldn't it? If you really couldn't distinguish men from women, if they were complete, just for....except for slight and not very noticeable an~tomical differences, it would be very dull, because it would mean that certain qualities had been depressed, and you need to develop them and han~ionise them, not get rid of them. All right, what's the next? (~rd. statement - section ~6) "It's hard for such a one to be born

with all his or~ans in Derfect~tion." Well, this sug- gests that people do not have all their organs in perfect condit ion, and traditionally, Buddhism attavhes great importance to be- ing born with all your organs complete : not born lame not born blind, not born, of course, mentally deficient above ail else; having all your organs co~plete. I think, perhaps, now-a-days, we don't realise in the West, how many people are born without their organs complete, because if they're born without their organs complete very often, they're hidden away in hospitals and ~homes'; You don'~ see them but in India you see them.. ...you see people.... wandering about wi~h one arm or one leg, or with no legs² or you see them wandering about, blind, and begging for their living; whereas in England, or in the West generally, we tend to hide them away. So there are a lot of people who are born not with their organs in good condition, and you are fortunate if~all your organs, internal and e~ternal are in perfect working condition, so you don't have to bother about them otherwise, if you are ill, if you're sickly² if you're deprive, there's so much energy and so much attention that goes away from other things, especially from your development as a human being. You know that when you fall ill, even just for a few days. What use are you then, usually, to anybody,

301 -S 42 S - 1/13

~cont'd least of all to yourself ? So if you've got your arms and your legs, and yoflrhands and your feet, and you've got your two eyes able to see, and a nose able to smell, a tongue able to taste, an~ a skin able to feel and ears able to hear you're very very lucky! And as you get older, of course that will be less and ess the case, but by that time you should have enough wisdom and understanding to be able to cope with things. But meanwhile, if all your organs are complete you're very lucky. An~ this also draws attention to the importance of the physical or gani sm in the spiritual life according to Ruddhism. You notice that Buddhism doesn't regard it as a good thing to be physically incomplete; it thinks hi~ily of perfection on that level. You see what I mean? So it should be your aim and object to keep yourself in good work- ing condition; keep yourself healthy³ keep yourself in trim, and so on; whether through yoga, or another form of exercise. I remember...~

UDAYA (interrupting) Good diet.

S.: Um?

UDA'iA: Good diet.

~ Good diet, yes. A healthy way of life. I remember I had a friend in India - when I knew him at first, twenty~five years ago, he was about fifty-five then, and he was a sort of yogi - he had been a doctor, and he had his own religious organisation - and he told me one day how ~d got into it all. He told me that when he was a teenager he was obsessed with body~building, and he had to have the best physique in Bombay at least, preferably in the

whole of India! And he used to put on, when he was seventeen, eight- een, nineteen2 demonstrations of the perfect physique, and of G~reek poses and thnigs like that, at local theatres - the Discus Thrower, and all that sort of thing - and he showed me photographs, and you would never have recognised him by the time I knew him, when he was about fifty-five, potbellied and all the rest of it (chuckling); but anyway he said that was his youthful obsession - to hava a per- fect physique, and this is how he got into medecine, and what led him to be a doctor. But then he started thinking it wasn't en.ugh to have a perfect physique, you had to have a perfect mind; so he took up the study of psychology, and he took up the study of arts of various kinds, and then he started thinking that mental develop ment wasn't enough, you have to have spiritual development , and this took him into religion and philosophy and so on. So, he said, that at every stage of his life the perfection on this level and then on that, had been his ideal : first, physical perfection, then the intellectual, mental perfection~ and then the spiritual per- fection; which seems very 'Greek' rather than Indian~ thou0~h he was a Parsee, he wasn't a Hindu, by birth; so this might have had something to do with it. And this is, in a way, very much in con- sonance with Buddhism, and this is why, very often, in the Buddhist iconography you see, usually, the Buddha represented, certainly in Indian Buddhist iconography, with a good physique. So Buddhism doesn't believe in sort of maiming the body in order to help the soul, so to speak, to develop. You find this a bit in Christ- ianity, but here, Buddhism is much closer to the ancient Greek I deal : this sort of perfect development on every level. ~ou see what I mean? And this is why Buddhism thinks it is a good thing for one to be born with all one's organs in perfect condition,per~ fectly functioning. This is a sound basis for the spiritual life.

i3c)t2. - S ~2 S - 1/13

~cont'd So, you know, you should not neglect the body under the impression that you are thereby leading a spiritual life. Some of the peiople I was talking about a little while ago - the 'weak malvs' as I called them - I once created a bit of a disturbance in England when I first started using this expression, because so many of our men members started wondering whether I waa referring to them, and whether they were weak males, and some of them got really worried about it, especially when I started talking about some being men and some being boys! got them more worried. But, any~~rny that's, sp to speak, in passing. I've lost the thread of what I was saying now. What was I referring to originally?

PURI~A: I think you were going to suggest that 'weak' men are also physically

S.: Ah! Yes. They neglect themselves physically. This is what I noticed. You know, if you spoke to them in terms of physical development, and you thought they really were sort of weak and skinny and ought to build themselves up a bit - Oh! they were quite offended by that suggestion, you know, they were above all that! They were nighly spiritual! It may be that in certain stages of your spiritual life you are like ~~larepa - you are so absorbed in samadhi, and you're so deep into meditation you neglect the body. It may be; but people of that sort are not in that condition - they just neglect the body, either if they don't care, or because they are under some misapprehension, thinking that that is~a 'spirit- ual' sort of thing to d0j or it shows that they are 'spiritual' because they are neglecting themselves' or just living in the midst of dirt and so on; and this is not goo°So vou ~ ~ adeauate sniritually2 just ~

being inadequate ~ ~ ~rs of ordinary life. A~~e is not the raw material - worldly failure is ~ the raw material for spiritual success. I mean, I've seen again and again, that those who are able to be successful in worldly life are those who are able to be successful in spiritual life. Of course, there are some who aren't interested in worldly life very generally, from an early age, that's a different sort of thing.

PRIYANANDA: I was thinning, this is really brought out in the itang ala Sutta.

S.: ~. Right. Yes, yes.

PRIYANANDA: the building up to the spiritual life through one's healthy, human life.

S.: Yes. Right. Yes. The spiritual life is not a soft option for the social failures, or social wrecks, no! I mean, some people really seem to think the spiritual life is a soft option : if you don't feel like working, don't feel you particularly want to look after a wife and family, and you feel -'Oh, that would be a drag" you know you think - 'Oh, well, clearly I'm qualified for the spiritual life!" If you're useless, and don't know how to do anything, well, clearly, you're fofl the spiritual life!

VOICES: Ivimni'.

303 - S 42 S - 1/13

S.: But, you know, it's amazing how many people think in this way! I mean, the younger, pseudo-hippy sort of generation - they actually do think like this, whereas, as they discover if they really get into it2 once you get into the spiritual life you have to work at least twice as hard (chuckling) as you are used to working in the ordinary secular life.

ACHAI~A: If you take the example of somebody who is not able, say, they are crippled or something, there is a limited scope for them to overcome that compared with the psychological thing.

S.: I would say, in a way, it's the other way around; because if you've just.....suppose you've only got one leg, it's a definite limited liability that you learn to deal with, but if you've especially if you've got a robust sort of mind, and you're reasonably optimistic, and especially if you're born that way, you've already been like it, you've never known anything different, you adapt quite naturally, and you do what you can; but if you've got some sort of psychological weakness I would say that is more difficult to deal with.

VOICE: ~imni.

S.: You see what I mean?

ACHALA: Except, sometimes, the person without the leg had a chip on their shoulder~ and, ah ...

S.: I think this depends very much ...(Laughter) ~his de- pends very much on how they're brought up. I think, if when they were a child they were completely accepted by their family and friends, I think, it doesn't bother them, but if, for instance, they were taunted at school and made to feel there was a differ- ence, they may have a chip on their shoulder. But I think, a child who is born with that sort of limitation does not naturally have a chip on his or her shoulder, anymore than we have chips on our shoulders because we don't have wings and can't fly.

VOICE: Mni.

S.: We see little birds flying every day but we don't have chips on our shoulder because nature has provided us with wings, because we are so used to doing without them. So I think it is very much like that with physically handicapped people who have been like that, especially from the beginning, and who have never known anything different, and who are not made to feel essentially different by the unwise behaviour or comments of their family and their friends. I say, with that proviso, it is less of a handicap and less difficult to cope with than some mental disability² which is some sort of intangible and requires a real development within one- self to adjust to, or to cope with or deal with. You read all sorts of wonderful examples of children who are deaf and dumb and blind, and it seems, they manage to cope. They seem to lead a worthwhile life, in some cases, even when they're so badly handicapped. And children who are merely crippled, and who have merely lost the use of this arm or this leg, it doesn't seem to bother them very much. I was reading about the case, not so very long ago,

~J4. - S 42 S - 1/13.

S~:(cont'd) of a woman who had been born I think she didn't have any arms and hands at all, or else they were completely rudimentary, and she had to use her feet for everything

VOICES.: Yeah.

S.: But she had children and was bringing them up.

ANii~TA: Driving a car and threading needles and making tea it was amazing what she could do with her feet.

S.: Was this in New Zealand?

ANIKETA: No. Well² I don't know whether this was the same person you are talking about.

I saw a documentary on Television. She wasn't a New Zealander. But~ obl it was amazing; it was ~ncred- ible what she could do with her toes!

S.: I read about it~ I think, some months ago. It must have been in an English paper.

ACHALA: Physical limitations didn't sort of hold her back?

A1~1I&ETA: No! I think she developed far more. She was a far more independent person. She wasn't dependent on~1~ughter)....

RATNAt~~TU: I remember . There's been a few running stars, you know, people running for New Zealand, and a few of them have had handicaps from when they were small.

S.: Nrn.

~A~~TU: Atid it is sort of like they °....they've sort of strived to be that, in order to prove themselves, sometimes, but, you know, the have actually done it.

S.: Yes. S0~ sometimes it seems, handicaps have a stimulating effect - like people who are born with stutters, or have stutters when they are small, and they become first-class orators and pub- lic speakers. I think you find there is a natural tendency to re- store the balance. I don't know what truth there is in this, but it has been said that women who are very beautiful are not very kind and considerate; they don't develop those sort of more appeal- ing human qualities because their beauty just enables them to get away with anything; they don't need to be bothered with being agree- able or pleasant; but women who are rather plain by birth, and who can't use their good looks in any particular situation tend to de- velop qualities which will make them very popular, you know, of a more human sort, by being kind and attentive, and receptive, and a good listener, and all that sort of thing. So it's as though there's thi5~ almost built-in, tendency for the human being to corn- pensate for any deficiencies by developing in other ways. I mean, sometimes it's said that genius itself, artistic genius, is the sort of product or the result of an attempt to compensate for cer- tain human or even psychological deficiencies. (Pause) But an~iay, clearly, the Buddha here, is suggesting that to be born or to be, or to maintain oneself as a physically perfect human being is something desirable rather than undesirable. It is preferable

3~5. - S 42 S - 1/13.

S.:(cont'd) to be physically adequate and physically well-developed, than the ~ther way around. And it's as. if there's nothing wrong with the organs as I was saying yesterday, nothing wrong with the senses, nothing wrong with the sense perception; it's the underly- ing mental attitude that counts. The sense organs are quite inno cent0 So it is very important to emphasise this in contradistinc- tion to the traditional, especially mediaeval Christian attitude - for instance, that there is something particularly holy about dirt, you know, if you didn't wash it was a sign of special sanctity and holiness, especially if you didn't wash for years on end, or you wore the same clothes for years on end until they just became shreds and tatters~ sanctity, ot that you emaciated yourself : ~t was a sign of sanctity. Well Buddhism

doesn't believe in self-indulgence or anything like that, but it doesn't go to the opposite extreme, it follows the ~'l~ddle Path. So the same with the body - look after the body, have as well-developed a body as you can, that's a good basis for the spiritual life⁰ It is quite interesting to compare the difference between the physical types for the Buddha and, say, for Christ. I mean they may or may not have a historical bas~s, that is a little difficult to say; but the Buddha is always upright and well-developed and manly looking, so to speak, whereas Christ i~ usually a bit emaciated, isn't he? Especially when he is crucified - a bit skeletal even, sometimes. It's only very recently, I think~ in America, they've tried to make him look a bit manly, but in a rather exaggeratedly blue-eyed and flaxen-haired, Anglo-Saxon sort of way - straight out of the movies. Anyway, I thixii~ that point has been emphasised sufficiently. (4th. ~ement-section⁶ "It is hard for such a one to be born in a central country." Here 'central country' meaning, according to the footnote - 'a country within reach of the Buddhadharma.' It is hard because the area where the Buddhadharma is inaccessible is greater than the area where the Buddhadharma is accessible⁰ Do you think this any longer holds good? Or does it hold good, perhaps, in a slightly different sort of way?

PURNA: being born in a 'middle country'. Even being born in New Zealand is a disadvantage.

S: ~ni.

RATNAKETU: I don't think that at all. (Laughter) I think I'd much prefer to be born here than Tha~and for instance, because I think if I was born in Thailand I wouldn't at all be attra~ted to what I saw there, from what I~ve heard .

PURITA: But we're talking about the 'border regions' as to say at this point of time anyway.....

S.: Ah! but then the question arises : what is the real 'middle country' where the Dharma....within reach of the Buddhadharma? It doesn't say within reach of Buddhist culture you know⁰.....⁰

P~~A: Which would make it England

S.: So it may be

PURNA. 'the border regions'.

3Q6e - S 42 5 - 1/13.

S.: Yeevse~n ~I~t~~~~~b~~~ t1Yaout is ~ay region', ~e.~s~ a you

'middle country' to some extent, because the Buddhadharma is with- in reach here.

RATNAi~TU: Yeh. I think people are quite..... we are making..... 7~uddhism is being felt in New Zealand : making its presence known.

UDAYA: England has only ten years over New Zealand ~ft'~?aY, in terms of meeting Buddhists.

S.: ~ni.

P£4IYAN~4T)A: Perhaps, more in terms of just our strength, or strength of Buddhism here, it is on a narrow footing, on a small basis in comparison to England, but 5till~ in that sense, at least in Auck- land and Wellington, it's.....

S.: Well, in England it is on a very small, very narrow basis con- pared with the total population, and so on.

UDAYA: So here, in that sense, the total population, we could be stronger.

S.: Actually you are! Because you're sixteen to three million rather than - I don't know the exact figure for English Order Men- bers, but let's say a hundred which is probably a bit generous - a hundred to fifty million. So if you take that (Laughter) so in what - (have you got your pocket calculators?) Yes, a hundred is not quite fair~ let's say eighty-five, because we must deduct India and New Zealand and Finland - say eighty-five Order Members in England and Scotland that is. So eighty-five to fifty(million compared with sixteen to three (millio~~~ (Vipula working out figures on calculator with assistance from others!) This is arith- metic not maths! (Laughter) (Pause)

ACHALA: Calculators kept pretty

UDAYA: Shall I stop it? (i.e. the tape recorder)

END OF SIDE I TAPE 13.

SIDE 2 TAPL~

~ IThat were the figures? We'll have to repeat this.

PUi~A For, ah.. .

PRIYMiANDA For England it would be one-and-seven-tenths Order Members to every million, for New Zealand it would be five-and one- third Order Members to every million.

S.: Mm. ~m'~. So there is a higher ratio (Laughter) isn't there? Population-wise. And Finland IS, of course, halfway between - they've got half the number of Order Members,

possibly eight or nine to a population of about four million, so they're nearer to New Zealand in that respect, than to England, population-wise; though they're centred also in Helsinki, much as English Order members

307. - 5 42 5 - 2/13

S.: (cont'd) - bers are mainly based in London - the greatest number there. But anyway with regard to this question of accessibility of the Buddhist Dharma, or the Buddhist Dharma being within reach, one must also consider literature. Because in the past, in the Buddha's day, and centuries later there wasn't any book production in the way that there is now. So in virtually every country of the world you have access to Buddhist literature, and that will usually give you a few addresses, and they may lead you into real contact with the Dharma, may lead you into contact with the FWBO in some cases.

PU.: I wonder, in practice, how easy that is in, say, countries like Central America, Catholic America, and countries with Islamic beliefs?

S.: Well there are many people who wouldn't even be looking; but at the same time I think there are many who would be looking, but who just don't have the opportunity of making the contacts, and this is where it is important that, not only the literature should circulate, but that the message (in our case the message) should be widely known. I think this is quite important. So that if anybody does ever get interested, even though in their own locality maybe, there is no book on Buddhism available, or nobody to talk to that maybe they heard on the radio the announcement of some activity, some celebration of a Buddhist group, so that they know there is a Buddhist group existing; or they might even hear the name of a Buddhist group in that way or even see a poster and may even be able to follow it up from here. So I think publicity aimed at the general public that has never heard of Buddhism before, is quite important, bearing in mind that there will be such people around who have no means of access to Buddhism, certainly to any Buddhist group, or access to other forms with people who actually practice Buddhism. In this respect we're not really nearly well enough known in England. We're better known in Finland, actually, strange to say. We have much more publicity there than in England in terms of newspaper and magazine coverage. There are quite a few articles about the FWBO and about , mostly written by a Friend of ours who's a quite well-known journalist. (Laughter) He writes in both Finnish and Swedish.

PU.: You know, there's something a bit artificial here though, that's related to New Zealand as well - that in Finland you may have only five magazines for instance, instead of about two dozen, and your impression is that you are getting better coverage, when, in fact, in England, you may be reaching more people.

S.: Well, that's true. The absolute number may be more, because as I've said, a lot of activity is concentrated in London. I think probably, in London our name is getting to be well-known, but not in Britain as a whole. No. No. Perhaps it's in its absolute numbers that we're well-served.

cover an area as such.

S.: Mni. No. That may be a rough guide as to how well you're doing. But the idea is to cover as intensively as possible, you know, to get into contact with as many people as you possibly can, or to be known to as many people as can, so that when they do start

308. - S 42 S - 2/13.

~cont'd feeling in need of you, or what you have to offer, they know where to go.

PRIYANMA~A: I've felt this more and more : the need for effective advertising, to us~ that word - advertising - in New Zealand and in England. I've felt we need to look at it very closely, and have several Order Members working on it - if we can project ourselves, and be quite competent about ourselves.

S.: Yes. Right.

PRIYANANDA:as a Movement.

S.: I think it is very important also, to spread around the publications, because, very often, they are what a person comes into contact with first, especially if they are spread around the book-shops. (Pause) And certainly, in recent years in the West, the situation has improved very much, because the Buddha-dharma was not within reach at all, virtually; but now, even if you leave aside the FWBO, Buddhism generally, is certainly very accessible to people practically everywhere in the West. The only places where it hasn't really penetrated in the world, (and there's quite a lot; perhaps more places where it hasn't than where it has). There's practically the whole of Africa, there's the greater part of South America - it hasn't penetrated there. I was going to say there's also Communist China, in a sense³ it has, of course, penetrated traditionally, but maybe in more contemporary terms, it hasn't penetrated effectively - it's just a part of their ancient culture, which they associate with their feudal past, and which a lot of them, no doubt, are glad to get rid of. In India it has started repenetrating - it is available now, in India. And~ of course, there are the Muslim countries : it isn't effectively available there; in fact, they're quite anti-Buddhist to the extent that they know anything about it at all. Years ago I met somebody in India who came on a pilgrimage, a German Buddhist who was living in Teheran - he was working there as a doctor - and he said he had a difficult time because it was known that he was a Buddhist . He wasn't sort of propagating Buddhism² though he talked about it with anyone who was interested, but it was known that he was a Buddhist, and this created difficulties for him. This was about twenty years ago, so I don't suppose it would be any easier now. You might get a few people at the University knowing about Buddhism in a quite academic sort of way, but I've never heard of any Buddhist activities, I think, in any Moslem country, though I have got as far as giving a lecture in Egypt, in Cairo; but I think that was only under the auspices of the Indian Embassy because the ambassador was an old friend of mine, and he arranged a lecture for me when I was passing through on my way back from India to England in 1967. So I was sort of cautious. I didn't really speak of Buddhism - well, I didn't give the title as Buddhism - I spoke on Indian philosophy, you know, in a general sort of way; but I spoke mainly about Hinduism. I got quite a good audience there, quite a good reception, a very cosmopolitan audience - Arabs, Turks, Israelis, Greeks, Armenians, Egyptians - all

sorts of people, mostly diplomatic and academic sort of people, about a hundred, and they were quite interested. So, you know, that's the only sort of Buddhist activity I've heard of in any Western country. I think one has to really do it like that through sympathetic ambassadors; or have a certain sort of, not exactly 'diplomatic immunity', maybe that wouldn't be

3~. - 5 42 5 - 2/13.

S.:(cont'd) necessary, but someone who can get wway with some- thing if it's done under their auspices. Well, it's in the inter- ests of good international relations!

VOICES: (L~rmurs of agreement

Udaya~: It's all very 'cultural.'

S.: Yes, all very cultural.' At that time, that particular ambassador was trying to create a littimmutual bloc of India, Egypt, and Yugoslavia, so there was quite a bit of conferring between the three going on, and this sort of 'fitted in', I imagine. You see, that in Egypt, there sh ~ld be a lecture on Indian philosophy.' But one has to take advantage of little opportunities like that. But there are still areas, yes, where the Buddhadharma is not access- ible, not within reach, what to speak of the i'~~~I3O, you know, even now, that isn't within reach, except in a few areas : within Fin- land, fortunately, in Great Britain, and in New Zealand, and in India, and a wee bit in in places like Holland and Sweden; but not really much more than that, though we hope there will be an expansion shortly. I think, within New Zealand, there is the need to proj- ect one's image much more positively and powerfully~ and I think, as soon as possible, there must be Order Members going around to the different, say, smaller cities, the second and third (tiers ?) and maybe~ having the odd-public lecture, the odd seminar, the odd retreat, and with quite a bit of local publicity. Don't consider oneself as necessarily based just on Auckland, or responsible just for Auckland, or wherever one happens to be 'based', so to speak. Be like John Wesley, who said he took the whole world as his par- ish. So each Order member here, should regard at least the whole of New Zealand as being under his or her jurisdiction~ That's why I was a little bit amused, earlier on in my visit, when there seemed to be the sort of impression amongst some of the ?riends that when Bhante went down to South Island he'd be handed over to the F~PDO tauthoritiesi there, by the 'authorities' of the North Island because their 'jurisdiction' didn't extend any further than Picton appar- ently. (Chuckling and general laughter) But it didn't turn out like that, did it? It turned out that North Island had quite a long arm, didn't it? (Laughter)

PU~iA: I never had any doubt that Christchurch was under our 'jurisdiction'. (laughter)

S.: But anyway, no Order member need feel inhibited about function- ing an~where~ If any New Zealand Order members want to come and start up a Centre in Great Britain they'll be only too welcome to do so. Anyway, so much for 'the central country' then.

~ethb~orSnt~ti~mre~cttly section ~6.~) is hard for such a one to What is meant by that do you think? Notice it doesn't say 'born as a Buddhist'. It says, "Born directly into Buddhist surroundings". Can you in fact be born a Buddhist?

VOICE: No.

S.: You can't really. At best you can be born into Buddhist surroundings. That does that mean? Does it mean born in a single-sex community? (Laughter)

RATN~r~TU: Thorn next door to a single-sex community. (Laughter)

~to. - 5 42 S - 2/13

PUi?NA: Thorn somewhere where there is talk of an ideal of enlightenment.

S.: Yea. Mni.

PURNA:and the possibility of growth towards that.

Al~t~v~TA: Where the whole economic structure is based on Buddhist attitudes.....

S.: iv~. Yes0

~~~~TA:....Buddhist way of life.

S.: I mean where there are people who~ when you are old enough to understand, can actually talk to you about the Path~ and can offer you practical help about following that path; this is what it really means.

UDAYA: Where you can really influence it.

S.: Yes, and where social and economic and cultural conditions, and even political conditions

UDAYA: For example, you were saying once, that it is much easier to be in an alternative life-style in New Zealand ? than Finland.

S.: Yes0 Right.

UDAYA: And it is a little more difficult in England than it is here.

S.: Yes0 tight.

UDAYA: And probably it's easier in the States than even in New Zealand.

S.: In some parts of the States. i~. The situation in Finland incidentally, seems to have changed a little bit. Their economic position at present isn't nearly as good as it was, but from our point of view, you know, from the point of view of the possibility of living ifl alternative ...0or following an alternative life- style seems to have certain advantages

RATNA~~TU: I remember seeing something in a newspaper about Japan - how people are so serious about business life there, and one fam- ily, it was a father and son business, and they'd gone bankrupt, and they owed two million dollars in debts, or something, so they shot all their family including the grandinother and all their children, and shot themselves, and it seemed that they were so tied up, and although, superficially, you'd think there was a lot of money around and everything like that, and spare time to get into Buddhism, but there was so much pressure and that, that there was no time for Thuddhism because you had to be a success.

S.: It might be that Japan is even a more extreme example than Finland, despite the little pockets of traditional culture here and there. That is the impression one gets - as though they can't stpp working; where I think, in Finland, one aspect, one feature,

3~I. - S 42 5 - 2/13.

S.: of the positive side there now, is that, for instance, they have got people out of work now: they are not able to provide full employment. This is one of the results of the d~teriorating eco- nomic situation: there is no longer full employment in £~inland. There is a lot of ~employment, so what does that mean? The gov- ernment can't just allow these people to starve; it has to put them on the dole; the dole therefore becomes a possibility for those who have got job5~ but who don't particularly want to work , now give up their jobs - (after all there are people who are only too willing and eager to take them), and to ~o on the dole, which means they can devote some of their time to other things, which was not possible bef0re~ because before, not only ~s there full employment, but everybody had to work, you couldn't avoid it; so now, due to the deterioration of the economic ~ituation, there is the possibilitY of the alternative life-style. (chuckling) You see what I mean? To some extent a possibilitY, you ~w, not completely but at least a crack has app ear ed in the economic

VOICE: (M~rmurs)

S.: So it's one o'clock. I think in that case we'd better aall a halt and carry on this afternoon. We haven't done very much this morning, but in another way we've done quite a lot~ haven't we? We've done just a few clauses.

Bi~~[~~'~

~.: All right then, let's carry on from where we left off. 6th. Statement - Section ~6 - "It is hard for such a one to come in contact with the Wa~" What do you think is meant by this? There seems to be a distinct- ion between being born directly into 3uddhist ~rroundings and coming in contact with 'the Way'. So what do you thiril this dis- tinction is, or what does it mean - 'to come in contact with the Way' ?

PURiNA: To deliberately take your development into your own hands, ~asopposed to being a passive.....

S.: To have an actual experience.... you could say that 'the Way' represents the experience of ~dividuality or spiritual development; but a way, not just 5omething you come in contact with as though it was 5omething external, as though it was an object. 'The Way' is something you actually develop - you ~ience it. You come into contact with it by developing it, flLb yourself becominF that.

iNi1~GHA: It's almost like experiencing a

S.: Yes, you could say that.

M~iiQETA: In one sense, you can't really appreciate that there is a Way~~ or the Way, which is being taught by others, unless to a certain extent you can recognise it with some a~~rene55~ within yours~

~ i~m'. I mean, also it is important to realise that though one speaks of 'the Way', and of the Path, though they are a good 'fig- ure of speech', it isn't perfect, because if you think of it as 'the ~~~'~ or 'the Path', you can think of yourself as the person

3t2. - J 42 5 - 2/13.

S.:(cont'~ treading the path, treading the Jay, and that, there- fore, is something separate from you: you are treading it~ you ~6 going along It, but the Path is one thing and you're another, and actually that is not 50, because to 'enter the Path' means that your own mental events, s~ to say, are included in the Path. You see what I mean? The sequence, or stream of your own mental events, your po~itive, healthy, skilful mental events is the Path, is the ~iay. The Jay is not something separate from you which you 7read, or you follow. 5~t~ is what ~ meant ~'~~.~&~iILc0~~ tact with the W&y~ that those mental e~~ ~he continuwLt of which constitutes the Path, become ~ced within your d~rn ~; or not even within your own mind, they are your own mind. (Chucitling) Your own mind is the Uav& the Jay is your own mind. There is just a series of skilful mental events which, from one point of view~ is 'the Jay' more abstractly; from another point of view, is you following 'the Jay'; from another point of view,

perhaps, even more accurately, is you at that particular moment, that particular time. So it isn't easy to develop those mental events with~ or in one's mind which constitute 'the )~y'. That's the next sta0~e on, and th~ns is sort of underlined in what follows - ?th. Statement - Section ~6 - "~~j~~~d for such a one to~~ v~aithinhismind" This is more detailed, because what did we find out about 'faith' in studying the '2ositive Mental ~vents' ?

ACliALA: It's transcendental.

S.: ThinI~ng of something wven more basic than that - where you have the list of the skilful mental states, the skilful ;ontal events, where does 'faith' come in?

PUi~{A: First.

S.: First! There's no skilful mental state without an element of faith. I think we went into that in that seminar didn't we? So it's as though faith is the most essential of all the mental events. If you get that, all your other positive events start clus- tering around it.

PRIYANANDA: It's 'sradha' isn't it?

S.: 'Sradha', yes. So how does one cultivate faith? Supposing one hasn't got faith, and one recognises, at least intellectually, the need for faith, how do you go about producing it? How do you go about cultiv~ing it? Can you do like that? Can you approach it like that, even? ~~lhat must you do?

ACHALA: I suppose a combination of, um, intellectual and ? reality, and any devotion, if there~~~....if you do have that

S.: ~~hat else do you think could help?

DHARMADrTiARA: ? rewards, or ? fruits of any practic

S.: 3ut also, here, spiritual fellowship comes in; that is to say, in this connection - fellowship with those with faith. Because what is faith? 'Faith' means they are acting, they are behaving -as though, say from your point of view, something actually existed

~i3. - 5 42 S - 2/13.

S;~ont'd) which you cannot see, they see it, but you don't . They have faith in that, they experience that in a way you don't, but you can see what the effect of that is on them. You, though you don't experience that, though you don't have faith in that, can, so to speak, have

faith in their faith in that, and something of that may rub off on to you, and you may eventually develop faith. So association with spiritual friends who have faith is quite important here. Well, you know the opposite thing also works, doesn't it? If you associate with people who are fairly cynical, well, what happens to you? You take on that cynical sort of tone. Have you ever noticed this when you're with people who have a sort of cynical attitude toward religious things, or anything spiritual? It is very difficult not to go along with that, at least in conversation. I think cynicism is a particularly negative and unskilful mental state, because it precludes the possibility of any kind of faith. There seems to be a few years ago among the Friends in England, quite a little epidemic of cynicism, which was quite unpleasant. It seemed to centre more...or with certain people, I noticed that whenever they got together they happened to speak and talk about everything in this very cynical, 'clever-clever' sort of way, and it sometimes affected other people who came into contact with them. So I developed or rather, I devoted quite a lot of time and energy to eradicating this because it seemed particularly unpleasant. You know what I mean, I think? It was being cynical about people, being cynical about people's motivations, being cynical about life being cynical about spiritual things just cynical about everything, cynical about your cynicism! It is a very corroding sort of mental attitude, and quite the contrary to faith. So just as you can develop cynicism by associating with the cynical, so you can develop faith by associating with the faithful, or at least it can help.

8th. Statement - Section ~6 Then - "It is hard for such a one to attain the 'Bodhiheart'. The note says - 'the fully enlightened heart', which is ridiculous! This is the 'bodhicitta' So the 'bodhicitta' is even more difficult to attain to than faith. So what does one understand by the 'bodhicitta'? Is it possible, in fact, to understand it? (Pause)

ACHALA: I suppose with concepts we can only sort of model...make models of the experience, which is always ? .

S.: Mni. Yes. Well, perhaps I'd better refer to my lecture on 'The Awakening of the Bodhiheart', or whatever it is called in the 'Bodhisattva' series. But it is something which is quite difficult to envisage. And then - 9th, Statement - Section ~6. - "It is hard for such a one to attain to the state where nothing is practised and nothing manifested. which is the state presumably, even higher than that of the 'bodhi-citta'; either a higher 'Thodhisattva' state, or even a 'Buddha-like' state, or perhaps a Zen-like state - perhaps this is one of those Zen interpolations - 'where nothing is practised and nothing is manifested'. So what do you think this means, very roughly. What is happening here? What is going on here?

UDAYA: The individual no longer relates in terms of somebody doing something to something - the subject/object distinction has been sufficiently sort of refined to seeing things in those terms

3~4. - S 42 S - 2/13.

UDAYA:(cont'd) being not quite accurately ?



S.: One could say that this is the state of complete spontaneity. You don't need to practise anything or deliberately manifest anything, you just function freely and spontaneously. It is clear that nothing very much can be said about that. You notice the further one gets along the Path, the less there is, really, to say. We had a lot to say about being born a human being and all that sort of thing; quite a lot to say about escaping being born a woman, (Laughter) and quite a bit to say about having all one's organs in perfect condition'. but gradually, there was less and less to say, which is only natural, because one is clearly more concerned with the stages which are sort of here and now within reach.

PRIYA~AI~A: i3hante, one thing that occurs to me, um, well just in reading the last section: it correlates very well with the levels of 'Going for refuge'.

S.: ~mn? In what way?

PRIY~ANDA: Ah, the third...well...not the one of 'the central country', and 'Buddhist surroundings' correspond to the.....

PUi-il~: Cultural

PRIY~Ai~A & S.: .....cultural 'going for refuge'.

S.: Yes.

P1~IYANA~A.... and even the provisional 'going for refuge'.

S.: Right. Yes.

PRIY~M~A:... and perhaps 'contact with the Way' is something more like 'the effective going for refuge'. After that I don't know if there's an exact correlation, but it seems to be some sort of deepening levels of . . . . .

S.: Well, one could correlate in this way : 'being born in a central country' is just being in a...just living in a country where you could, if you wanted to, go along, say, to the ~\~O3 then, (let's work backwards) 'being born directly into Buddhist surroundings' would correspond to being a friend, wouldn't it? And 'coming into contact with the Way' would correspond to being a mitra, and 'cultivating faith in one's mind would correspond to being an Order member, and 'attaining the Thodhiheart, the Bodhicitta, would be the harmonious co-operation of all those faithful and committed Order members. See what I mean? So, yes, there could be a sort of correlation here, in that sort of way. (Pause) All right, on to thirty-seven now.

SUVAJRI: TEXT SECTICIN ~7

S.: i~. ~JI~t is the Buddha talking about here, really?

Ai~IiJ~~A: 11hat it is the practice that's important not just the intellectual knowledge.

S.: He's talking about real contact, isn't he? Real contact is

~j5. - 5 42 5 - 2/13.

S.:~cont'd) not physical proximity. The word 'contact' is 'con- tact of minds'. Real contact ~sniriti~al contactj spiritually in contact, with the Buddha when you follow his teachings1 that being in his immediate physical presence doesn't necessarily 'mean that you are following his teaching, and simply being in hi~ phys- ical presence without being receptive to his spiritual influence is meaningless. So one could also look at that in terms, not only of space, but also time, because what is the use of living in the days of the Buddha and being able to see the Buddha if you don't even follow his teaching. It's much better to live at a differ- ent time from the Buddha, and a different age, and different period, and follow the teaching; (then) you're spiritually in contact with the Buddha. Well, you could apply this to relationshipp with peo- ple. I mean, what is the point of being in physical contact, or physical proximity if your minds are miles apart; and this very often happens. I mean, I sometimes quote a little story here~ which is actually a prose 'poem' by , I think, Baudelaire. Have any of you ever heard of it? ? of how peo- ple can be close together physically, but far apart ~entally and spiritually, and the prose poem goes something like this - A young man and his fiancée in £\~ance, in Paris, are having coffee together in a restaurant somewhere, or a cafe2 and they're very, very much in love. They're sitting there gazing into each other's eyes, and holding hands, and they're so close he feels that they are just one heart, and one 'mind and one soul, and he says it's a so wonderful, heavenly state because of that, and just as he's thinking that, he looks through the cafe window, and he sees, out- side, a poor beggar woman, and she's so poor and so miserable - it's a cold, wet day, and she's outside there, begging. So he feels terribly sorry for her, and sort of, his heart iS filled with compassion, and just as he's thjn~dng that he ought to try and help her, and do something about it, his beloved suddenly says in a sharp, angry voice, "~JI~y doesn't that wretched, horrible wo- man go away; why does she have to stand there?" And he realises that he and his beloved are n~iles apart mentally. He'd thought that they were so close, but actually, they are in, so to speak, different worlds, and her thoughts were not his thoughts, and 'vice versa'. So that's the little prose poem. So sometimes you can be very close physically, and even think that you're close mentally, but something happens to show~that your mental o~utlcoks are completely different completely incompatible. I mean, I have had that experience myseif2 in several ways. For instance, meet- ing, say, Buddhists in India, being so happy to meet them, and so glad to see them, and talk to them because they were Buddhists, but after, maybe, after a few hours, or a few days, you realise t}iat they're not really Buddhists at all, certainly not the sort of Buddhist that you are, or that you try to be, and even though you both are, in a sense, Buddhi5t5~ actually your thoughts are miles apart. Maybe their thought~ are running entirely on opening insitutes of Pali studies, or something like that; or political rights for some particular group of Buddhists. Perhaps they don't think about enlightenr~nt, or spiritual development, or meditation at all. In fact, sometimes, they might even tell you that is 'old hat', and out-of-date, and you're wasting your time, as i have, in fact, sometimes, been told. (Chuckling) I remember when I was

writing my 'Survey' in I-lirjipong - (I can remember this very, very clearly; I can remember all the details of the incident) - I was writing away at 'my little table, one afternoon, and I was actually writing words to the effect that the development of 'sila' precedes that of 'samadhi', and that the development of 'samadhi'

- S 42 S - 2/13.

S.: (cont'd) preceding ? is necessary to the development of 'prajna'; and I was writing this - you see, and I became aware that there was someone standing just behind me looking over my shoulder, reading what I was writing, and he was a very elderly, a very 'senior' Indian bhikkhu who spent most of his time in Ceylon, and was very 'Theravada' inclined, and very rationalistic - and he said, "You're not wasting your time writing all that old-fashioned stuff, are you?" (Laughter) So his way of looking at Buddhism, though he was a bhikkhu, was so different from mine. I've always remembered this incident. ? his attitude. ? , you know, it's not just a question of living in a close proximity with someone, the important thing is to be mentally attuned to them, mentally in tune with them. It's better to be mentally in harmony with somebody and living apart, rather than not be mentally in harmony with them, and living together physically. So your real friends are the people with whom you are in some kind of mental synthesis, some kind of mental contact. Perhaps also, physical contact, but that is secondary. (Pause) This section also shows that the Buddha was not interested in sort of devotee-like people, just sort of 'hanging around'. I mean - what do you think is the difference between that sort of attitude, or that sort of practice of 'hanging around', and actually enjoying spiritual fellowship? ? not necessarily ?

P-TNM-TU: You've got to go out and put it into practice, not just....

S.: Yes - but even leaving that aside, you know, would there not be, in some cases, something to be got simply from just staying in the Buddha's proximity, just being near the Buddha, even without talking - 'darsana' ? So what would be the difference between that 'darsana', and just 'hanging around' the Buddha, so to speak?

VOICE: I?ceptivity

S.: Receptivity, I think, is the big difference.

VOICES: Yes.

S.: And if you're just 'hanging around', the chances are you'd just be 'hanging around' to get something.

VOICE: Yeah!

S.: And there is a difference between trying to get something from somebody and being receptive to what they have to offer.

£~'~Ij~TA: Yes. °~his brings to my mind an incident from one of the sutras where Ananda was saying, 'Here I've been with you all these years, and listened to everythin~ you have said, and yet I have been thinking that you can give me salvation, that you can do it for me~;and suddenly realising that it was something he had to do for himself.

S.: Yes. All right, on to thirty-eight then.

DitAi~b~£)liA~mA: T~~ SECT ION ~~ 8.

3~?. - 5 42 5 - 2/13. ~rJ4

S.: 1~1 So what did the Buddha mean by that? ~ite straightfor ward, really. 0

DHAI~W~HARA: The urgency.....

~.: i~. You can't r~ally rely on being alive for more than a mo- ment, even a breath ? . A very breath could be your last; something could happen while you breathe out~and you don't breathe in again, and that's the en~ of you virtual y, I believe, barring a few minor details - convulsions, ~eath-rattles (Laughter) and all the rest of it, ? you've only got to get a little, I believe...what is it ?.... a bubble of air in the blood stre~n and it goes to your brain. How long does it take to finish you off?

D~IAi~"IA0li~P~: ? a few seconds.

S.: ~Ta~ll, your life is no longer than tha~.

~i~IYMtAt'MA: It can actually be a single bubble?

DliAI~iAi)HAP~ ? about a syringe-full, about two c.cs, straight in - it's instant death, yeah!

Pi~IYAi~AiMA: Is that right?

D1tiL~iADi-IA?~: Yeah. In the bloodstream.

~~DOFSIDE2TAPEI.

SIDE I TAPE 14.

S.: ~ell, human life is very precarious. I mean, ? you've only got to get a speck of dust in some vital part; you've only got to get a tiny little needle, or something like that, making a little hole in your skin, and enough blood has only to flow through that, or just a little thin cord has got to be put round your neck, (Laughter) and tight ened, and ? in just a very few minutes, and thats the end of you!

AiIIi~TA: Or something poison the air.

S.: Or something poison the air, or something poisonous in the food~ or a brick drop on your head, or even a dear little motor- car coming round the corner, or a nice little wee doggie biting you and he's got rabies. (Laughter) ~here's the end of you! There's so many sort of threats to your life, it is amazing that we survive from day to day, in a way, isn't it? And in modern times, though in some respects we are protected, in other ways we are exposed to perils that didn't exist before. We are not very likely to be eaten by tigers or even be trampled by mammoth, or snapped up by a dinosaur. ~his is no longer very likely to happen, but there are all these thousands of motorcars whizzing around, and there are all these electric wires - you could get electrocuted. There're all sorts of things - you could swallow some detergent by mistake, perhaps, if you were a little child. So probably, it's less safe to live than it's ever been before in his~Or7,

3~3. - S 42 5 - V14.

S.:(cont'd) in some ways. I think it would be very difficult to strike a balance. So human life is really very short, and very precarious. (Because ?) you can take this too~ in a way, too seriously, or seriously in the wrong sort of way - it can paralyse you; but, usually, we are so sort of~ blind and so insensitive to the fact that life is precarious, that even putting it in this very strong way will have a very minimal effect upon us. It won't ~analyse us.' I mean, actually it should~ in a way, because we've not really planned doing very much beyond the next breath, being fully aware that each breath could be our last, but we're so insensitive and so impervious, we could read this sort of thing all day, but immediately after ? we start planning our summer holiday without a thought. But, in (another ?) way, that's fortunate, because we can't reflect too much upon these things, otherwise we'll (completely ?) paralyse ourselves. However we must reflect upon them sufficiently that we do realise, when we think seriously, that human life is precarious it is short and we ought to make the best possible use of our ~ime.~Tha Buddha has to put things in this extreme way to make us ponder, or reflect or be a bit serious-minded at all. I mean, there are some spiritually, very sensitive people who have been so appalled reading a passage like this, they just go away and give everything up on ~he spot, and go straight into a monastery, or something like that~ but they are very, very few - one in several millions! At best, in the case of most people, it will make them just think a little or be a bit more serious, or maybe they'll plan their lives a little less confidently. For now-a-days, of course, people do plan their lives, and that's, in a way, an irony because life is more precarious than ever~ but you've got it all planned out more than ever - right up to the age of retirement! I mean, some men (I don't know about women) - some men can tell you when they're~ going to retire, and on what pension; it might be twenty years ahead, but they've got it all worked out, and they know exactly what they're going to do. They've got all their mortgage ~payments calculated, and they 'mow just when they're going to end, and when they're going to be free to buy a new car, or when they're going to ~be able to sell their old house and buy a new one, ~nd where they'll be when they retire, etc. etc. They've got it all worked out well in advance. But then, maybe, when they are forty-two, you know, half-way through, they have a coronary, and that's that for the time being if it's fatal.' It might make them think a bit, slow them down a little bit, if they listen to their doctor's advice. But despite the precarious- ness of life it is all (planned ?). This is one of the sad things about modern life, perhaps, for a lot of people, that it is all planned; you know exactly what is going to happen year by year; there's no sort of adventure left in it. It isn't very open-ended. When

you're about eighteen, if you're a young man, you~re put on the track, so to speak, you're 'railroaded' quite literally, and you go 'steaming' along at a greater or lesser speed, for the ne~t forty, fifty years. (Chuc1--ling) jearly (fifty ?~ years in some cases, and then you retire with your pension and your pro- verbal gold watch or clock, or whatever it is that they give you, and that's that, your life is over! You just potter about your garden after that, or do things to the car, help your wife with the washing up.

M~ li~'~TA: There are these 'vocational guidance' people who go ar- ound to the schools and.....

3~). - 5 42 5 -

\_\_\_ Isn't it extraordinary that people need guidance in how to spend their free tii~.

(Transcriber's~note - There is a difference in what 'vocational guidance' is and the point Thhante makes about 'leisure time (free time)' activit~es (hobbies) guidance - the point being made about ~vocational guidance' was a criticisni ~f the 'railroading' process directed at young people before they left school.)

Ai~li~TA: They call it vocational guidance, but that is a euphem- ism really, because.....

S.: ..... just a way of passing the time, I think isn't it? You go along and listen to talks about interesting hob~ies, but usually don't take up any of them, you just go along and listen to more talks. And, after all, by that tii~e - sixty-five - you take it for granted, because this is what you've been taught to believe that you are, there's not much that you can do except wait to die, and the sooner you die the better, then people can inherit what you've left. I mean, sometimes, I've got the impres- sion that, in England, the feeling of a lot of people is that once you've retired, and you've led a retired life for two or three years the best thing you can do is die, you kn0W~ pass on, and leave your space fred for other people to occupy; and if you've gathered any of the world's goods, just distribute them among your kinsfolk; you've no business to be hanging on to them and lingering and en- joying them yourself - it's selfish taking up room which, maybe, younger people could occupy. This is very often the attitude, or the feeling - that your working life is over, just like the work- er bee, you kn0W~ once his working life is over he's stung to death, I believe, and thrown out of the hive'. she or it, because it hasn't even got a sex!

PRIYAI~M~A: It's a sort of sel~imposed euthanasia.

S.: i:~tti.

Pi~IYANM~DA ?

S.: It's vdry interesting that the man, usually, dies way before

the woman does

VOICES: ~irnrn.

S.: ....0but apparently not in Finland. Th~t is a bit different, and that is because a high percentage of women go out to work there; so I think a higher percentage is exposed to the wear-and-tear of working life. So what does this suggest? That the male of the species is not naturally shorter-lived than the female - his life is shortened by the life he leads out there in the world, which, in most cases, the woman does not have to lead. His life is act- ually shortened, perhaps, by as inany as five years, by the stress and strain of earning a living and working under modern conditions. So it is teally strange, and in a way, ironical, that women are allowed to retire earlier than men. I mean, this is a great injus- ti~e to men, you could say, and men have to go on working those extra five years, when, in any case, their life is being shortened by five years due to the stress that they undergo.

3~O. - 5 42 S - 1/14.

MEGHA: I thought the factor was more of the will for life - like their job is giving them some excuse for life, for living, and once they've stopped their j0b~ they've got no work so what's the point of living. It' just their whole.....

S.: Oh, yes, this is true. This is true with many, but I think, even those of whom it is true would rather not have to work in that sort of way, with that sort of stress which ~5, very often, necessary. They'd rather have a job which is more relaxed, which didn't obli~e them to strain in the way that they very often have to - a very different job altogether, perhaps~but very often there isn't much choice, if you're going to be inhe world, and work at all reason- ably successfully. I think there aren't many jobs which are'right- livelihood' in that sort of sense. (Pause) Maybe you would be willing to take a job at a lower salary with less responsibility and less stress; but maybe your wife eggs you on to take ~e higher paid job; maybe she wants extra holidays, or a bigger house, or a nicer car, or something like that. Anyway, how did we get into this ~ - the span of life - Oh yes - plan- ning for your retirement when you're about twenty.

VOICES: Mmrn.

S.:..... being unmindful of the fact that life is very precarious, so any forward-planning can , really, only be tentative. One has to make forward plans, but one should not be too sort of rigid about them; and if they do fall through, not to be too disappointed; even plans to do good things and positive things don't always come to pass. In some ways, of course, impermanence is a blessing in dis- guise becaus~ there are a lot of unpleasant things which just pass if you wait long enough you know. They aren't permanent, you just have to be patient and wait; they do go away. So there is the pos- itive side to it : if there wasn't such a

thing as impermanence, if there wasn't such a thing as change, there wouldn't be such a thing as development either. Right.' Thirty-nine.

iEE~GiIA: TEXT SECTION ~9.

S.: Imi'~. So what do you think this means? I mean, the example makes it clear that it isn't a matter of blind faith divorced from experience: "Just as when you eat honey, you find every drop of it (i.e. the Buddha's words) is sweet, so it is with my words."

UDAYA: Maybe it's getting at um, the sort of point that, ah, before you come into contact with the Dharma, you're discerning, you discern that the Dharma is a true teaching, and once you've found it~ in a sense, you are still discerning, but, you know~ at the same time you're staying open; you're not sort of .... it's sort of like, um, doubts of the wrong sort, not honest doubts, but sort of 'vic;L kicca' C

S.: ~. Yes, ( ? ) doubts.

PURiThTA: How does one determine what is the word of the Buddha?

S.: ~m'~. This is a question which probably didn't arise for Lash- yapa, or whoever compiled this particular text. Indeed! How does

one determine what is the word of the Buddha? Because it says, "Those who study!a~ of the Buddha should believe and follow all that i~ said~by the Buddha. Just as, when ~ou eat honey, every drop, of it is sweet, so it is with my words." Well, how are you to determine what is the word of the Buddha?

1~TNAi~TU: If it's sweet it's the word of the Buddha. If it works; if it's conducive.....

S.: Well what is the criterion of its working?

RATNM~TU: If it conduces to integration ?

S.: SC) where did you get that idea of integration from? (Laughter) So what has to be the starting-point, do you think?

VOICE: The 'going for refuge'.

S.: Yes, but you 'go for refuge' to the Buddha~ so you have to decide first of all who is the Buddha, because there's lots of people whom you could 'go for refuge' to; lots~of things, lots of institutions.

PURi~: I think the starting-point is your own intuition that there is such a thing as an ideal of Enlightenment.

S.: i"jm'~?

PURi~TA: . ~at that does; what response that strikes in you.



S.: Yes. It has to be that, whether right or wrong; and you can only observe whether what you are attracted to is confirmed within your own experience by that experience.

RATh~A~~TU: Also by observing other people who have practised that, and seeing what they are like.

S.: Yes; though that still does suggest or imply a sort of criterion at the back of your mind as to what is desirable and what is undesirable. But maybe it's not really as complicated as it is because everybody can recognise if others are happy and carefree and positive. It is its own recommendation that is accepted by virtually everybody, as a good state to be in, so if they appear to be in that good state compared to the state you are in, then naturally you have some faith in whatever it is that enables them to be in that sort of state. I think, in real terms, perhaps, right at the beginning, you cannot recognise anything more than that certain people with whom you are in contact are genuinely in a better, a more positive, a more skilful, if you like, a higher state than you are, and that you would like to be in that state; and can be, you hope, in that state if you follow whatever it is that they are following; whatever it is that they are practising; and you extrapolate from that.

M~LKETA: In a sense, yes, it is being open and receptive to the quality or that being, of what it feels like to be in their presence.

S.: Yes!

312. - S ~2 S ~ I/I~.

ANIKETA:.... and then the other things seem to follow on from that.

S.: I~. Yes. You just have to open yourself to them and let whatever influence comes from them carry you wherever it will; wherever it carries you!

UDAYA: It can be a little dangerous; or it could be a little dangerous.

S.: Oh yes!

UDAYA: From my own life, between your last visit to New Zealand and this present one, before I was ordained, there was a . . . quite a sort of long, dark night, where I was experiencing, I suppose, a positive disintegration, or maybe it was a growing awareness of how sort of hollow I was, how confused, and also how alone I was; and at first I experienced

that as intense loneliness; but less so now~ it's more just being alone now; but I remember at that time I did have some contact with 'the Children of God'~ and they were very bubbly, and very, very positive, and they seemed so buoyant and light and happy; and there were bits of me that would have just loved to have not known anything about Buddhism, but my head knew that I was heading in the right direction, but it was quite sort of tempting to want to share that in some, kind of way.

S.: Yes. Iftnni. Right. Well, it might be in other ways. ~u might see a whole group of people who seem very happy, having a good time, say, going to parties and all that sort of thing - you might say, well, maybe they are in a better, more healthy state than me. If one has any real doubts, the only thing you can do is to try it and see whether, in fact, it is a higher state, or even if it is a higher state. whether it is the highest which is available to you, and whether it is permanently satisfying; whether it points to something further or not. There are quite a few of these spiritual groups which offer cheerful ? friend- ship, hearty handshake, a slap on the back, and all the rest of it; or gentle holding hands and gazing into eyes, and soft~ sweet music, (Laughter) chant bits of chanting, and all the ra~t of it~ so that, maybe, in relation to certain people's states of mind, are a bit better, a bit more healthy, but the question is whether it's able to lead on to something more, or whether it points ahead and ahead all the t~e. It has, also, to be a genuine posi- tivity, not just a superficial bubbiness and sentimentality, but real solid positivity.

UIGE: Yeah.

A~JITTA: There's a sense of balance in the one that is truly fol- lowing a complete, um, 'way'.

S.: Mm.

Ai~IITTA:... which doesn't seem to go to extremes, and doesn't ex- clude, and~say 'This is the way, and this is how it sho~~LJ. be done.

S.: Yes. Very often, in some of these groups, though in a way they are positive,-in certain respects they are positive - you do find an ingrained fanatical streak which is rather unpleasant when

3~3. - S 42 S - 1/14.

S.:(cont'd) you become aware of it~ It's as though they have a big emotional investment of a not very healthy kin~, i~ that par- ticular sort of statd, or that particular sort of experience; and sometimes you can see they're almost pretendin~ to be in that when they're not. With certain groups, with certain traditions even, it is 'de riguer' to be blissful all the time, so you have to act blis~ ful, or it's 'de riguer' to be overflowing with l~ve all the time, so you have to act as though you're overflowing with love, and sort of welcome everybody and talk to everybody in that sort of way; though sometimes, underneath, that person is actually be- ing quite 'snappy', but he or she is having to keep up this thing of overflowing with love. It's the style of that particular group, or that particular tradition. I mean, there is the 'style' of some

groups that 'everything is One', and 'it's all One', and they see their own self reflected in everybody they meet; that's their 'style'. It's not their realisation, but it's their style. So one has to sort of distinguish. Some people can have 'positivity' as their style, rather than have true positivity. You must be careful that you don't have 'mindfulness' as your style. (Laughter) Well, we do meet sometimes, people who go around very 'mindfully', and everything they do is very 'mindful'. Even if they forget something, well, they forget it mindfully, (laughter) but they actually forgot that they didn't..... they were quite mindful of the fact that they'd left it behind!

AN11~TA (laughing) I'm thinking of myself in similar circumstances.

S.: So you know, this is a point: that one must be very careful that one doesn't make the specific practices of one's tradition which one ought to be actually practising and experiencing the fruit of - one must be very careful that one does not make them into a sort of almost aesthetic style, do you see what I mean? You can act very positive when you're really not positive, and you can be very mindful when you're not being very mindful, though that is perhaps more difficult because (you have to be mindful ? ) to act mindfully. Or you can have the 'style' of loving everybody, and see in God in everybody, and all the rest of it. All right, on to forty then.

AiNIKETA: TEXT SECTION 40.

S.: I~. Yes. So there's a note that Professor T'ang Yung T'ung takes this, ~presumably the last sentence - for a Ch'an or Zen substitution. We'll see about that. So t~dhasaid11A~sram- ana studyin~ the Way- (which also implies practising the Way. I think the Chinese idiom 'studying' also means 'practising' ) - should not be like the ox turning the mill-stone which, though it performs the necessary actions with its body, does not concentrate on them with its mind. Well, this will be a sort of ~lavara~paramarsa, wouldn't it? - if you're just going through the motions. It's a bit like what I was talking about just now : just having the 'style' of your tradition rather than your mind being imbued with the spirit of your tradition. It's very easy to do that, even with the very best of intentions, because we know that our actions don't always correspond with our intentions, they usually fall short; or sometimes, on intellectual grounds, we convince ourselves a certain course of action is right and desirable, so with the best of intentions we try to carry that out, but it

3~4. - 5 42 5 - 1/14.

S.:(cont'd) may not be corresponding to what we actually think or feel at all, but we aren't thereby just hypocrites - we are genuinely trying- but I think what is dangerous is when you can no longer distinguish between the two, and when you sort of think or feel that if you are performing rather beautifully - you know - all these sort of stylised actions which express alleged the spirit of your tradition, that that is sufficient, and that you are actually experiencing and practising. (Pause) For instance, within Buddhist tradition,

you could be so mind-ful and controlled and meek and quiet, but in your mind you could be very different indeed0

7~T1NAI£~TU: ?

S.: Yes, right. I mean, I~ve encountered 'born again' Christians who talk a lot about the love of God, but they don't really seem to feel it at all. 'The love of God' is just a phrase. So 'the ox goes on turning the mill-stone'. You know what the arrangement is like, don't you? ~he feeding bag is put in front of his nose; he doesn't want to turn the mill-stone, but he just follows the bag, and he just goes round and round; or else he's whipped, so he goes round and round. So your ;3iiddhism mustn't be like that. Your study, or your practice of the Way, mustn't be like that. It's a bit like the monks in some Buddhist countries who just conform outwardly to the monastic rules and all that because that is what is socially required, but they're not really making any spiritual effort at all. They've been put into the Sangha, maybe, by their parents. (Pause) Sut I think this business of what I call 'style' is more insidious because you can genuinely deceive yourself in that sort of way; whereas if you're just sort of conforming for the sake of social opinion, you usually know that. Very few people are such fools as not to realise it~ at least in their most honest moments; but you can get into the 'style' which seems appropriate to your tradition without experiencin~ the spi-rit of that, or spirit behind that, in a very real sort of way. Your 'style' could be 'tolerance', and you know, 'being open-minded', but actually you're not - your mind can be very closed. I mean, one of the 'styles' I found very common and popular in India was the 'style' that 'everything is the same', 'everything is One', all religions are one, so it doesn't matter which one you follow - follow any one you like! But I soon discovered that that 'One' had to be a particular form of Hinduism! (Laughter) I knew, once, some Hindu Swamis who were very very strong on 'all religions are One', but when they discovere~ I was, in fact, more interested in Buddhism than Hinduism, and was going to become a b~ddhist monk, they were very, very disappointed indeed,e~en though they'd been saying, 'All religions are the same, and they all lead to the same God,'but they seemed to care very much that I wanted to follow Buddhism and not Hinduism0 So their 'style' was toler-ance and universalism, but it was only their style. So,~heW is followed in the mind, of what use are actions?" ~ihat does one say to thns? (Pause) Does it mean that actions are use less? (Pause)

PURi1A: I presume 'actions' are being used as opposed to 'mental activity'. The mental activity is there, presumably the actions will follow.

S.: Mes. Right.

- 5 42 - 1/1L~~

PUPJTA: But it is useless trying to concentrate on a~tions as actions divorced from mind.

S.: P~ight. But it doesn't mean, if you follow the Way in your mind you can do anything

you please~ as regards action. I mean this is the way it's often interpreted, and, I think, being in~er- preted in the United States in some Buddhist circle~ - 'it doesn't matter what you do if the mind is all right; you can do anything you please.' But why should you please? w~lch means that you end up following the one hundred per cent American way of life, but claiming to be a Buddhist, and to be interested in Buddhism, or even to be well on the way to Enlightenment , because 'It's all in the mind' - it's your mind that counts, not your actions!' I think there's some tendency in this direction in some of the Tib- etan Buddhist groups.

i~TNAi£ETU: You don't have any of the morality, just.....

S.: ~~uun. Well, in a sense, you don't need any morality, because if your mind is thoroughly moral, s~ to speak, and imbued with skil- ful mental states and skilful mental events, your actions will nat- - urally follow. You can't reallyY separate the two. So you can't claim to have s~ilful mental events and to be able to perform act- ions which are clearly based on unskilful mental events.

i[~TNA~~TU: If you, at the beginning, and you don't have any skil- ful events and you've got to start with the skilful actions .

S.: Ah! You have! Because the skilful actions, even if performed more or less by force, at least have got a tendency to help you to create skilful mental events or at least they will prevent you from creating too many unskilful mental events. All right, let's go on to forty-one.

VIPULA: TTi'?'~T SECTION 41.

S.: ~. So what does one think of this? (Pause)

PRIYM~AI~A: There's a danger of disregarding all emotional life whatsoever, and thinking that this is follo~iing the Way. Ah... that is the danger I can see in that.

S.: I~in. ~ltli.

PftIYMT~MiDA: Perhaps it hinges on the definition of 'feelings and desires'

S.: i~. It seems to ignore the ~~osltive mental events.

PUi{iT4A: Presumably they mean 'unskilful ?

S.: l~l. But, "Those who follow the W~y are like an Q?~ beari~~ a heavy load and walkin~~ throu~i dee~ mud. " I mean2 is that really an adequate picture? It may be when things are going real- ly badly, and you're trying to press on despite the load of unskil- ful thoughts which you can't get rid Of, but nonetheless, you press on; but it isn't ~s l41~e~~~~ is it? I mean, there are skil- ful mental states Present~~h you feel very light and buoyant, and

~~ont'di and as though you had wings, at least for the time being, ~here's that experience t00~ isn't there?

PUM~~: Perhaps the point of the paragraph is the seriousness with which the ox regards the mud. If he stops or gets waylaid at all, he'll get stuck!

"\TOICES: ijinin.

PU£J~: He can't afford to give t~n ~uch.....he can't afford to stop wh&~ ne's doing.

S.: Yes. C)nly on emerging from the mud can it revive itself by resting; and so long as you are burdened by ..... it does say "fol- lowing the 4ay is like an ox bearing a heavy load,"which gives a one-sided picture of the Way..... but it is true so long as one is burdened, as it were, by negative mental even~s, you can onl~ plod on along the Way, trying to get rid of them0

PUIIA: In a sense, your priorities are mindfulness of purpose and getting on with it.

S.: I{ni. Yes. You M~ow , however deep the mud is, you're not just to get i~mersed in it, or lie down in it, but just to keep plodding on and realise that what you have to do is just to get out of it! But it is not so much the Way itself which is the heavy load, it's the unskilful mental states that you have to deal with in follow- ing the t~~y0 (Pause) One could also look at it as meaning: - "Those who ~~~lo~wflwreWa are like an ox bearin~ a heavv load - 'following the ~~y' is 'carry- ing, as it were,a very heavy respon5ibility~; I mean, a respons- ibility towards yourself and a responsibility towards others, and at the beginning, no doubt, that load, that responsibility feels very heavy, and you have no time to do anything else except to make sure you discharge that res~~onsibility properly, even though it may be very difficult.

VIPULA: It's as though one can't do it part-time - a pprrt-time occupation.

S.: £'m. It does rather seem like that, doesn't it?

PRIYM~~DA: The ox can't take a rest and put do~ni the load and climb out of the mud, just has to keep on pressing Of~ slow, moving through.

I~TN~~£UTU: There's always the dange of falling back and ? the mud.

S.: i~. It means you can't really afford to relax until you are TWa position to relax in positive mental events. If there are no positive mental events present, you nust press on and on until you emerge from the negative mental events, and only then are you able to take a rest, and allow yourself to be borne along by the positive mental events. Until that point you are only struggling, you are only bearing a load. Following the ~y is very difficult, and fliay~e, not even very pleasant . You can onlv afford to relax when you can relax L~o~ivel. I mean this is what you very often find with people - we find it in the FWBO; we find it on retreats ~

~coAwt'd - people find the going rather hard, so they ~iant to relax, and since they haven't, say, attaine~ a meditative state in which they can relax positively, skilfully, they relax in other ways which are w~skilful instead of pressing on. You see what I n~an? ~hey ~iant a bit of 'fun' to compensate t}iem, so to speaTh, for the hardships of following the and thi"~~ is~fatal.' ~re talked about this a bit yesterday, didn't we? So you should allow yourself to relax only when you can relas~ in a skilful ~~~y. If that is not possible you :mlst press on, and plod on. 1~elax inno- cently, shilfully, by all means; relax in meditation, relax in positive coiwinnication, but don't relax in an unshilful ~iay. I mean I have been told by friends who have been to Japan that at the en~ of a 'zasein' in some Zen monasteries....at the end of a really gruelling 'zasein', where it's been really hard for everyone, esp- ecially the masters, the ~asters, the Zen masters, at the end of the 'zasein', when it's all over, they're so thani~ul they~relax~ open their robes and get drunk! You see? (Laughter) ~d this apparently is quite acceptable, it has become a~niost a tradition! But this suggests that, first of all, they were perhaps, conducting the 'zasein' in the ~~~ong sort of way, and certainly they were relaxing in the ~~~rong sort of way. I mean, relax skil- fully, yes, but if your 'spiritual' life, inverted co.~aas, has been so demanding and so gruelling that you're compelled to relax in an unshilful way, chances are that your whole approach has been wrong.

C?

S.: Yes0 )~£~t0 Indeed. (Pause) So an~~y, one should go on making an effort, but never overdo it in such a way that you react to the other extreme, and need some unskilful enjoyment to keep you go~ng. It's being in a very dangerous sit- uation when the energy that keeps you going on the spiritual path is derived from an unshilful source. Do you see what I mean by that?

ACliAU~: It's analogous to the idea of the spiritual c0iAri1un~t~ be- ing economically supported by the group and ? resources.

S.: Yes0 )~ght~ 1s~. (Pause) Let's go on to the last section, which is a nice long one.

1ft~T1'~£~£ETU: T£~ ST~CT 1Q~~%?A

;~~I~D OF SIDL£? I Ta~e~I4~

SiD~~ 2 TAPt~ ~

LJ. So what is the leading idea here?

PUP~W~: i?~al worth0

S.: 2~eal worth! The Buddha, the ~nlightened mind, doesn't see things as ordinary people see things. In fact he sees them in the reverse way. It is what ;eitzsche aalls 'a transvaluation of all values'. The Buddha says: :!I look u~on the state of kinZs~and ~riW~ceJ&~~as\_\_\_\_ the dust ~whiq~~~JQThows throu~h a crack. I mean~ most teo-o~ e would value the state of kings and princes very hig1£Tly indeed. Tlle Buddha doesn't value it at all. L~5 values are quite different. Lis scale of values is quite different. So he goes on lil~e that; he looks on ornaments of gold and jewels as wpon rubble.

3~8. - S 42 5 - 2/14.

S.:(cont~ So things which the world regards as highly valuable, the %Ni~dha regards as completely valueless; ai~ in the same way, things which the world regards as v~lueless, the Buddha regards as highly valuable. On the other hand - ~I look u~on exp~edient methods leadinr to the truth as uton s~p~n~heasof°ewels. ~kuton the sureme vehicle as uw~9n a dream of abunQaj~~~W~~eal~" And so on - things which the world values highly, the Buddha doesn't value at all; things which the world doesn't value at all, spirtt~ ual things, the Buddha values highly. So in this way he has an i~~~artial attitude.

l{ATl~~£TU: The following says: "I look uton neresY erected as uton six dra~ons danci~l'

S.:

P~TU~AiWBTU: T~ji~at does he mean there?

S.: Well there is a little footnote there, isn't there? iTumber nine - lThese six dragons are the six sense-organs, including the mind, which are not only the organs through which we are deluded, but also those throu~h which we perceive the means to Enlightenment. The idea conveyed by 'dancing' is that part of the movement or change resulting from conversion from the phenomenal to the non-or super- phenomenal." That's not very clear is it? "The idea conveyed by dancing is that part of the movement or change resulting from conversion from the phenomenal to the non- or super- phenomenal. " In other words, it might be interpreted as meaning that where ordinary people, ordinary Buddhists might see heresy - that is to say a wrong use of the six sense-organs, - the Buddha sees the possibility of the ri~ht use of the six sense- organs; in other words, Enlightenment. One could look at it like that.

Ai~Il£~TA: I get the feeling here too, that it is the things some- times that you undervalue and can see from .....um.....can see from another way are..... um....change and have more significance. The sort of idea of seeing the whole nimverse ? in a grain of sand.

S.: I~. Yes. But anyway, the leading idea seems to be just going against your worldly values; reversing the value system; and perhaps, people don't alirays realise thi5~ you know :to the extent that one is jeading a spiritual life, to that extent one will be reversin~ ordinary values, and one's life will be, maybe, quite incomprehensible to people who are not doing that, who accept worldly values in the usual way. I mean, we irnow we 've encountered this from time to time, if you tell some of your 'square' friends who attach great importance to having a good, safe, sOlid~ regulat jOb~ with good pension prospects at the end of it ....if you



tell them that you are giving up your job~ and that you are not looking for another job, they'll find it, perhaps, quite difficult to understand why you are doing this~ or the sense of it~ especially if you had a good job and seemed to be launched on a quite promising career, to be quite a promising young man. I mean, has anyone experienced this in any way?

ACIAU~: I've experienced it. Um...well getting, ..um....

9 C? Ann's parents were horrified that I was not sort of upholding family values,  
said: and you've even lost interest in your job!" (laughter)

3~. 2/14. - 5 42 5 -

S.: Ah!

ACIALA: .....you know, as if that was really bad.

r~u.f.LThT.A: It's like being down on 'skid row'.

\TO£CbS (Inaudible comments)

S.: I remember hearing one woman say when her husband got interested in Buddhism and spiritual life, and you know, was thinking of leaving her because of that, she said, "I wouldn't have minded if he'd left me for another woman." (Laughter) So you see that wouldn't have challenged her sense of values, you see what I mean? Because at least it was for another woman - it's the same values in a slightly different form, and if he left for Buddhism, it was a complete reversal of values!

lu~i~UAL£TU: I remember reading an article about sex and it was saying if you were in a heterosexual relationship that's all right, even if you're in a homosexual relationship, that's all right, even if you're in some sort of group marriage, or something strange like that, that's all right, you know, by the group, but if you're celibate that's a complete threat to everything else.

S.: Mni. That's completely abnormal! (Pause) I've noticed in England that parents get worried when sons begin to get interested and involved in the F~?O; start giving up promising careers, or their preparations for promising careers. They get very worried and disturbed like that.

l~TNAi£TU: ~ parents are quite worried that I don't have any money I don't have any possessions, and what if I want to pull out of this group in a couple of years' time~ I don't have any security.

ACiTIAi~: There's a sense in which it's quite fun~ sometimes~ to shock people. (Laughter)

S.: Especially if you've been conforming for a few years.

ACtALI~: From their point of view you've got everything~ made, for somebody else has

got it really set up and then - T~oosh ... (Laughter)

S.: Ome coul~ have a lot of fun telling the in-laws ?

Pf~ThANANDA: I think there's something about wanting to -see..... (I've noticed this with my parents)....they want to see it in their terms, like - what is ordination, and what is spiritual community ? They need to see it in something they can understand, in their case, in Ghristian terms, in terms of a monastic order, priesthoo~10.....

5.: Ah.' Jell, the priesthood is a career, it's a profession, it's a very respectable career.

PThft)~TA: It ex;~lains why you're not getting marr~ed, why you're not interested in jobs.

S.: ~Jell, you've ~ot a j0b~ you know, you've got a well-paid job -- which ~l tide you throu~h life~~ £f you are a priest, this is

330. - 5 42 5 - 2/I~.

~.:cont'd wi~t they really think.

Pl~IYANAi~A: Something that's recognised.

S.: You're recognised, as well as you'll be looked after, and you'll be a useful member of the con~unity.

UDAYA: They can ? you.

DHA~U~DHA~: It's sort of like having an upper class job. (Laughter)

S.: i~. I've noticed that there have been Buddhists in England, English Buddhi5t5~ who have wanted very much to be regarded as priests, and ~~e a great point of that, with some kind of ordination in some cases.

PU~A: The Reverend Jack Austin!

S.: Ah! ~ight. He's very particular about this. He's changed his sects several times, but he's never changed the Reverend bit, or the priest bit.

#&7~~~c~~Uof~ I remember 5 een a photo of the Bishop of the Buddhist America!  
(Laughter)

S.: That's right. I had a visitor when I was in Kalimpong, years and years ago, - he came

from the Buddhist Archbishop of New York (Laughter) of whom I'd never heard. Yes. It was someone who styled himself, apparently, the Buddhist Archbishop of New York! And then, of course, there are, on a humbler level altogether, those famous words of Christmas Humphries to me when I took on the 'incumbency', as it was called, of the Han~stead Buddhist Vihara. He said, you know, in the kindness of his heart<sup>2</sup> that I should regard myself as the Buddhist equivalent of the Vicar of Hampstead. (Loud laughter).

Ai~Ii~TA: ~Jhat did you say, Bhante?

S.: I was pretty speechless. (Laughter) The Buddhist equivalent of the vicar, not even the Bishop of London....(laughter) the vicar of Hampstead! He was my opposite number. I met him some time later. He was downing his port, and surrounded by his wife and daughters. I don't know what Mr. Humphries would have said to that, if I considered myself as the equivalent of the vicar of Hampstead in that sort of sense!

Ui)AYA: ~Jho do you suppose Christmas Humphries had himself figured out for?

S.: Ah! )Thll! Well! You'd need to be a very wise man to know that! I think~ in those days, it was more what it is. Humphries considered Mr. Humphries to be! (Laughter) Some 'naughty' people did call him the Pope of Eccleston Square behind his back. But there is this: people want to make the familiar.... the unfamiliar into the familiar, don't they? They want to feel sort of comfortable with you. They want to feel that they know where they stand with you, which means finding a place for you in their familiar world.

331. - S 42 5 - 2/14.

Pf~IYANAi~A: In a ? study, the statement that nothing really changes, or nobody really changes, and that you remain the same from a certain point in your adolescence right through your life - I notice this with friends and family, that they'll make a statement that, well, that they'll want to see you as an unchanging entity...um...that's part of the sort of value system... the value system of .

~.: Yes! People don't want you to change. I notice this in several very simple ways. For instance, I forget how it happened, but there was a Friend of ours<sup>2</sup> a quite elderly woman, who used to entertain me from time to time, and I used to visit her - go to see her whenever I was in her area, and she used to come on retreats sometimes ....I forget the exact details....but she had the sort of idea, the fixed idea, that I always had a certain number of cups of tea - let's say for the sake of argument it was three, that I always had three cups of tea - anyway, she poured me two cups of tea one day, and I drank the second cup, and she was about to pour me a third cup of tea, so I said, ~~~~ thank you Margaret"; so she said, "Oh~ but you always have three cups of tea", very indignantly, as though, always having had three before I wasn't permitted to have two any more I couldn't change! And that really struck me ; even in little things like that, you must always be the same! You must always be predictable, even to the number of cups of tea you have.

l~T~Alin£~~TU: I think there is the thing that people don't want you to change because -

why are you changing? You must be dissatisfied with what you are, and if you're changing perhaps that means, "I must change", and they don't want to recognise that.

S.: ~im~.

UDAYA: Puma and I were visiting Priyananda's Mum and Dad once, while he was in England, to arrange something, and they were talk- ing a bit about Priyananda, asking how he was getting on, and Priy- ananda's Mum said, "Oh well, as long as he's still our pe~~~~~ (Laughter) An Puma said, "Oh, I think you'll find he's quite changed." And the look of (laughter obscured word) on his mother's face ..... Puma had to reassure her he hadn't changed that much!

PU1~A....just in a few basic areas.

UDAYA: She still looked a bit worried for a while.

~.: Well, this is why sometimes, I think, within the marriage sit- uation, one partner doesn't like it if the other partner develops new interests which the other partner doesn't share, or doesn't want to share, as though they've got to do everything together. You're not allowed to lauch out on your own into anything new, or to change really in any way. (Pause) Any way, to come back to the section, I mean, the Buddha is really talking about the different values spiritual people have from or- dinary people; specially the ~iffernet values of a 3'idha.

AC1~T.A: Jould it be true to say that values keep on changing or ?

~~2. - 5 42 5 - 2/14.

S.: Yes and no. Once you have sort of got on the Path, your, in a sense,.... your values can't radically change, or at least, not in theory, but as you go from stage to stage, you may experi- ence very great changes, but they won't be chan~es in values, you know, in quite the same way as before; not theoretically anyway, even though, as I've said, it might well feel like a very big change indeed. (Pause) I mean, for instance2 just to take that first statement; "I look upon the state of kin~s and princes as upon the dust which blows throu~h~a crack." Well, one's changed sense of values might be expressed by, say, "I look upon the best paid and highest regarded job as upon the dust which blows through a crack." (Chuckling) This is, in fact, what you are saying to your parents, perhaps, when you give up your job~ or you tell them that you're giving up your job. "~ look upo~ or~aments of ~old and jewels as upon rubble" - "I don't care about pretty dresses or smart suits anymore. I don't want to have a big, shiny new car. It doesn't appeal to me anymore., And maybe your friends and your parents won't be able to understand it. I mean, the sort of contentment most people experience with their worldly life and worldly possessions is really a sort of stagnation. There's no sort of real enjoyment, very often, esp- ecially as you grow older. You just devote yourself to looking after your possessions - washing your car down, or dusting aspi- distas! That's your life! I mean, I have known women, ( I don't only select women as a special example, it's simpl~ that this one occurs to me) - I've known women who are so meticulous about look~ng after their house, and having everything absolutely spic-and-span,

that they won't allow other people to use the sitting-room, because it would disturb the arrangement of the cushions. I've actually known people like this, known women like th~s. So what are their values? You cannot go and sit in the sitting-room, or the draw- ing room, because it will disturb the cushions!

ANII~TA: It's a terrible feeling in a place like that. You sort of sit on the edge of the chair and feel that you're sort of al- most desecrating it!

S.: Yes.

Dij~~A,DHAHA: b~ike the dog or the kids or something.

S.: It seems extraordinary doesn't it? And the whole of a per- son's life can be devoted to looking after their home with no thought beyond that - a few llittle improvements occasionally per- haps. I know another woman - (sorry to mention women again - Well, she didn't allow her husband to sit in the sitting-room un- less she preceded him and spread a sheet of newspaper on top of the settee, and she made him sit on that, (Laughter) just in case his suit was a bit dirty, or his trousers were a bit dirty and he'd soil the cushions in any way. Of course, usually, he was completely spic-and-span, but just in case,, she'd hasten in front and spread a sheet of newspaper and ma~e nim sit on that. (Pause) I'm trying to think of some husbands, but I can't at the moment0 You'll have to take them as 'read'.

PU1~~: ~ou get men like that with their yachts, or their big, flash cars.

VIPULA: In cars particularly, where men never take off the plastic

333. - 5 42 S - 2/14.

VIPULA:(cont'd) off the seats0

VOICES: Yeah0

S.: Ah!

Di1A1~iAi)11ARA: until they sell them.

VOICE: That's right.'

VIPULA: There's tattered plastic over the seats, which is qui~te useless to sit on. (Pause) S.: Anyway, any further point about this section? Or anything that we've done th~s afternoon?

PPtliANAl~DA: I was wondering about that very last sentence, Bhante, I didn't quite understand about - "conversion to the Wav as upon chan~es ~~er~one b~ a~tree."

S.: There's a note there too, you know -"~leven ? 7neivable changes. i~~very being is

said to possess within itself the power of becoming, or realising its identity with 'Buddha', in the sense of the personifications of the ultimate reality which lies behind the illusory appearances of phenomenon0,, So how does

of the four seasons.)" In other words 'I look on it as inevitable.' This of course, shouldn't be taken too literally. Conversion is not inevitable, though the possibility is there all the time. Just as the possibility, all the time, that the green leaf will just turn yellow - that is inevitable - so it is possible for "fl" all the time, to turn to the Way, and follow that; but it is not literally inevitable. That is one of the great heresies according to early Buddhist teachings.

PUj~T~A: Would it be possible to completely scrub John Blofeld's interpretation, and regard change as regards the tree, as a thing of wonder and beauty?

~iN~o You could, but then the changes undergone by the tree are essentially cyclical - the seasonal changes - whereas the changes undergone upon the Way are essentially~spiral. One could look upon one as an analogy of the other

AIJi£I-TA: And also that it is a very natural and organic process.

C.. But again, one must be careful of using these expressions, because it might suggest inevitability, or even cyclical nature0

P~~Y~~~jqTj~~ Perhaps, it's sort of one aspect of the tree's changes as being paralleled with conversion. Perhaps one aspect is that it's a total change, that the whole tree is changing, the whole appearance of the tree is changing.

S.: Or, perhaps, you could take a whole sequence of four seasons and regard them as progressive, ignoring the fact that~those four seasons would be repeated. First there's winter, then there's

~4. - 5 42 5 - 2/14.

S.:(cont'd) spring when the buds come, then there's sunnier with the flowers, then the autumn with the fruit. In this way, the Way is constantly changing; you are going from perfection to perfection; you forget, of course, that in the course of nature, autumn gives way to winter; you leave that aside; you don't include that in the comparison; you could look at it like that.

PURHA: 'Conversion' also, presumably, means 'stream-entry'. There are points

S.: Yes. ~%~ght~

PURNA: leading to Enlightenment, corresponding to the four

~ea~on~..... S.: ..... That's true.

PURi~: .... changes. The change is inevitable upon the point of conversion.

S.: Yes. ~itn. One could look at it like that, but of course, there would not be any cyclical movement - once you'd had your fruition, well, it would go on. You would get fruition again and again, more and more. But this last sentence does seem a bit more 'Chinese' in outlook or in idiom, doesn't it? It doesn't sound very Indian. It might be one of those Zen additions. ? in some ways John Blofeld's little notes aren't very helpful, are they? One could say that the changes due to the conversion to the Way are natural, in the sense of not being forced - if you provide the right conditions the changes will take place, just as when the weather changes, the season changes, the climate changes, the appropriate changes take place in the tree. (Pause) Is there any further point, or is that all? (Pause) ALL right, maybe someone will put the kettle on then.

**END OF STUDY ON  
“THE SUTRA OF FORTY TWO SECTIONS”  
NEW ZEALAND. 1979.**