

EU Session Transcript

Meeting 37

Attendees: Robin, Ronald, John, Michelle, J O'Donnell, ++

Michelle F.: Does he really explain why the wild wild beings.

Michelle F.: Like he said, on page 252.

Michelle F.: that in their presence was crystallized a special function that he will explain in detail. Did he?

Robin Bloor: There's later on in the tales.

Robin Bloor: Explains that certain two brain.

Robin Bloor: beings.

Robin Bloor: Their natural antipathy to man.

Michelle F.: Mm-hmm.

Robin Bloor: I don't know exactly where that is, but he does explain that, so I think he does keep his promise to some degree.

Ronald: Two themes that jumped out at me were the tendency of people who believe something to isolate themselves from people who don't believe the same way.

Ronald: which happened in our work group as well as in foreign sects. And the second one is the role of women.

Ronald: who's or who.

Ronald: It's the only time I can think of that women are given high esteem here. They seem to have a lick of common sense, whereas the men don't.

Ronald: And that's different from most or some of the presentations of women anyway.

Ronald: And I don't know.

Ronald: If he's talking about the.

Ronald: active and passive within single people, or genders, or the genders, or both. I mean, obviously.

Ronald: it's to scales. It would be both.

Ronald: and assuming that we're taking male gender as active and female as.

Ronald: passive or receptive.

Ronald: It's...

Ronald: It raises the stature of the receptive.

Ronald: passive or denying, denying, carrying a lot of baggage in our culture. Anyway, the whole denier. Oh.

Ronald: So those, those struck me as interesting and I can't, I don't know really where to go with them.

Robin Bloor: He could be making a distinction between the emotional part and the intellectual part, because that's a phenomenon as well.

Ronald: And the inclusion of the phrase and their families, or maybe it was families, especially their wives, makes me think that youngsters have.

Ronald: or either closer to their.

Ronald: Essence, or at least still maintain a lick of sense, as well as the women.

Ronald: On page 254 near the top, these wild beings, particularly the smallest of them.

Ronald: We're at that time already, also, of course, owing to the abnormally established conditions of the ordinary being existence of the three brain beings there.

Ronald: perfected as regards apprehendingness and cunning up to the ideal.

Ronald: Um, the fact that their apprehendingness and cunning.

Ronald: was the result of three brain beings.

Ronald: abnormal conditions leads me to think that in part, anyway, they are negative emotions.

Ronald: rather than external animals.

Ronald: that have become.

Ronald: cunning.

Ronald: Especially the small ones.

Robin Bloor: Well, I can go with that.

Robin Bloor: We can take...

Robin Bloor: If we pursue that, we can take the idea of daytime.

Robin Bloor: being characterized by a level of presence.

Robin Bloor: And nighttime being characterized by a level of.

Robin Bloor: Sleep or lack of pleasant presence.

Robin Bloor: And it is during the night time. We aren't subject to negative emotions when we're present. We're subject to negative emotions when we're more mechanical.

Robin Bloor: So that works as an allegory for this.

Ronald: Uh, that would dovetail with the quotation marks around nights in nights lodging. We asked to stay for the nights lodging. If it was just night, there would be... doesn't seem like there'd be quotation marks around it.

Robin Bloor: Yes, that's well spotted. Very good.

Robin Bloor: There's also the question as to.

Robin Bloor: He undertakes this without a caravan.

Robin Bloor: There has to be it. This has to be a.

Robin Bloor: a journey, or if you like, an experience that really you can't do with ordinary people.

Robin Bloor: You see the...

Robin Bloor: The sectarians who live in Tibet.

Robin Bloor: They are obviously occasionally migrating there, and if they went in a group good, you could have.

Robin Bloor: accompanied them in their, what you would call, traveling group, if it wasn't an actual caravan.

Robin Bloor: I think caravan implies trade. I'm not sure, actually, whether it does, but I think it does.

Gwynne Mayer: I'm reading up on that right now.

Gwynne Mayer: A lot of the Tibetan monks.

Gwynne Mayer: started hiding out in caves. They were running from persecution.

Gwynne Mayer: And that became a real...

Gwynne Mayer: Isolation. They were forced isolation.

Gwynne Mayer: And so I'm wondering how much of that is a backdrop to some of this.

Gwynne Mayer: And if it... if they're running from the wild as well.

Robin Bloor: I mean, Tibet is the root of the world. There isn't a higher place.

Gwynne Mayer: It's also, though, a place of...

Gwynne Mayer: Isolation.

Gwynne Mayer: Retreat.

Robin Bloor: Well, yes, it is indeed.

Gwynne Mayer: Going in, yeah, going into...

Gwynne Mayer: oneself in a way that is not communicable to others.

Gwynne Mayer: I kind of wonder, um, and I've really tried to research some of it.

Gwynne Mayer: If...

Gwynne Mayer: Gurdjieff.

Gwynne Mayer: some...

Gwynne Mayer: high-level monks that he was working with at some point.

Gwynne Mayer: Are you aware of any of them?

Robin Bloor: Well, there's a book that was produced recently about Gurdjieff and Tibet that I read bits of.

Robin Bloor: I didn't read the whole thing, but there was a guy that appeared in New York.

Robin Bloor: And, um...

Robin Bloor: He attended one of Gurdjieff's meetings. He recognized Gurdjieff as somebody he'd encountered in Tibet.

Robin Bloor: And it is said...

Robin Bloor: And I think this is possibly accurate. It said that Gurdjieff was acting on behalf of.

Robin Bloor: The Russian government.

Robin Bloor: In his interactions in Tibet.

Robin Bloor: which was before the revolution, so it'd be the Tsarist Russian government.

Robin Bloor: And it was at the time of the young husband attack.

Robin Bloor: Attempt.

Robin Bloor: Um, to take over Tibet, and Gurdjieff served as an advisor directly to the Dalai Lama of the time.

Gwynne Mayer: So, following that thread, I can't not believe that, because then, if you look at his.

Robin Bloor: Yeah.

Gwynne Mayer: his lectures before...

Gwynne Mayer: The Revolution.

Gwynne Mayer: And after.

Gwynne Mayer: You see some differences in there.

Gwynne Mayer: some awakenings, and I'm just...

Gwynne Mayer: I I just would like.

Gwynne Mayer: What book is it that you're reading, Robin, that...

Robin Bloor: I'll find it. I'm not reading it. I stopped reading it, but I'll find it. It's somewhere.

Gwynne Mayer: Then I want to know why you stopped reading it.

Robin Bloor: I got bored

Gwynne Mayer: Oh, come on!

Robin Bloor: Didn't think it was worth my efforts

Gwynne Mayer: Oh my god

Robin Bloor: So this is the book.

Robin Bloor: See?

Robin Bloor: It says, go jump into bed.

Gwynne Mayer: Okay.

Robin Bloor: And it's a hardback.

Gwynne Mayer: Okay.

Robin Bloor: And it goes on for.

Robin Bloor: 500 pages.

Gwynne Mayer: And it's written by whom?

Robin Bloor: By Lane Negrin. That's L-A-Y-N-E.

Robin Bloor: And the surname is...

Robin Bloor: Negrin.

Robin Bloor: N-E-G-R-I-N and it was published in 2025.

Michelle F.: It's worth to read.

Michelle F.: It's really worth to read.

Gwynne Mayer: Yes.

Gwynne Mayer: I can imagine.

Gwynne Mayer: So, my hunch is...

Gwynne Mayer: connecting him to Tibet, and also Rodney Collins.

Gwynne Mayer: to Tibet.

Gwynne Mayer: is very interesting.

Gwynne Mayer: See, I think there's a link to some of these disciples of his that go back to Tibet.

Gwynne Mayer: Do you see that, Michelle, since you have worked with Rodney Collins' material?

Gwynne Mayer: Can you pick up on that thread?

Ronald: A tacit no.

Robin Bloor: Rodney Collin investigated the Tibetan Book of the Dead, but anyone can do that. That was published a long time ago.

Gwynne Mayer: But you have to want to do that, Robin. You don't just go, I want to read about the Tibetan Book of the Dead for nothing.

Robin Bloor: No, no, he wanted to read about that, needed to read about that, because of the theory of eternal life that he was producing. He needed to have the direct translations of various things that had been said by various, let's say, experts in the field.

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah.

Robin Bloor: He leaned on Greek texts and early Christian texts for that book.

Robin Bloor: And other things that I don't even know about, you know.

Gwynne Mayer: Well, I know that, um...

Gwynne Mayer: that, uh, Gilgamesh and, and the stories his father told, Gurdjieff's father told, and then.

Gwynne Mayer: Uh, I connected Ashiata Shemaj to Zoroastrian.

Gwynne Mayer: some of the Zoroastrian language.

Gwynne Mayer: And so...

Gwynne Mayer: That's where my head's going nowadays. I mean, I'm not gonna bore you with more boredom, but that's where I'm headed, you know?

Gwynne Mayer: Into the unknown.

Robin Bloor: Well, you do well with Zoroastrian, but the Zoroastrian stuff is difficult.

Robin Bloor: Are you reading Corbin for the Zoroastrian stuff?

Gwynne Mayer: Some of it, some of Corbin, but not, um...

Gwynne Mayer: So, I started reading the Zoroastrian material back in the 60s.

Gwynne Mayer: And got very embedded with it with a Zoroastrian person in England when I was in England.

Robin Bloor: Oh, really?

Gwynne Mayer: And so he got me very interested in it.

Gwynne Mayer: And, um...

Gwynne Mayer: I don't know. You know, you have to follow the threads in my brain to...

Gwynne Mayer: know where I'm going with this, but I do believe that Gurdjieff had much more to do with it.

Gwynne Mayer: then we give credit, because I can see it interwoven in some of his lectures, especially.

Robin Bloor: Well, I think one of the things about Gurdjieff is that it's quite clear even from the tales, if nowhere else.

Robin Bloor: That he had them.

Robin Bloor: very strong relationships with people in Iran or Persia, if you want to call it that.

Robin Bloor: And, um...

Robin Bloor: I was in contact with a man called Mojahid.

Robin Bloor: Um, who was an Afghan who was in.

Robin Bloor: Was actually for a period of time in the seminary.

Robin Bloor: In, um, Iran.

Robin Bloor: And he had a teacher.

Robin Bloor: And the teacher was in the tradition of the Shiites.

Robin Bloor: And he sent me a picture of his teacher, and actually a picture of his teacher's teacher.

Robin Bloor: Now, his teacher was very old. He was, uh, I don't know, in the time that you sent me that picture, he looked to be about 18.

Robin Bloor: And the teacher's teacher was a dad.

Robin Bloor: But he said that his teacher had said that his teacher's teaching new geje

Robin Bloor: And that would be very as an Armenian, you could walk in and out of Iran at the time. That wasn't really a difficult thing to do. Iran.

Robin Bloor: you know, parts of Iran and the northwestern part of Iran is really part of the Caucasus.

Robin Bloor: And so, you know, the Kurds and the Iranians and the, um, the Yazidi, they all mixed together in that area.

Gwynne Mayer: So that you see these have.

Gwynne Mayer: maintain more of a purity of that thread.

Gwynne Mayer: in their material. So I'm wondering if that, um...

Gwynne Mayer: Because he does mention in the tales that you see these at some point, I can't remember where.

Robin Bloor: We mentioned that in in meetings remarkable men, but the.

Gwynne Mayer: Oh.

Robin Bloor: If you look at the religion of the Yazidis.

Robin Bloor: There isn't to my knowledge.

Robin Bloor: um, any scriptural texts from that. It appears to have been passed by word of mouth, so it could be some... it's... it's reputedly Zoroastrian, and that's one of the reasons why.

Robin Bloor: When the, um...

Robin Bloor: Uh, the ISIS, Islamic, whatever they were called.

Robin Bloor: enslaved the Yazidi females. They had no respect for them, because they weren't Islam.

Robin Bloor: They were of a different faith, if you like. So they were regarded as, I don't know, subhuman or whatever you want to.

Robin Bloor: Whatever particular stupid.

Robin Bloor: framing you want to use on people that just aren't of your culture.

Gwynne Mayer: Well, my nephew is a navy seal, said that you see these help them out quite a bit, and the and when. He he was saying that.

Gwynne Mayer: They are Zoroastrian, and they can very easily, um...

Gwynne Mayer: connect to Christianity because of the Jesus figure.

Gwynne Mayer: And Zoroaster. So, um, but he said that they were highly intelligent, they lived, they got a lot of information from them.

Gwynne Mayer: And could work with them.

Gwynne Mayer: Especially through the cave.

Gwynne Mayer: series up in Afghanistan.

Robin Bloor: The, the, the thing that happened to Zoroastrianism.

Robin Bloor: was that it was absorbed into Shia.

Gwynne Mayer: Yep.

Robin Bloor: Muslim, the Shia Mohammedan.

Robin Bloor: Religion, but...

Robin Bloor: It wasn't absorbed in the sense of being suppressed. It was absorbed in the sense of

creating a whole line of thinking that didn't really

Robin Bloor: exist as part of Sunni Islam

Gwynne Mayer: No.

Robin Bloor: And that's why

Robin Bloor: You really need to...

Robin Bloor: And go into, um.

Robin Bloor: You know, the French guys that I've now forgotten. Corbyn, his writings, because they're partly Islamic and partly Zoroastrian

Robin Bloor: But mostly that...

Robin Bloor: There's a. You could call them a sect of.

Robin Bloor: Shia Islamics called the Twelvers.

Robin Bloor: And it's the Twelvers who are Zoroastrian.

Robin Bloor: And they have a belief that.

Robin Bloor: The there were 12.

Robin Bloor: Major.

Robin Bloor: Teachers since Muhammad.

Robin Bloor: And that the last one is happening now. And that that last one will in some way or other unite with Christ and there will be a second.

Robin Bloor: Visitation or something.

Robin Bloor: There will be no more profits is one of the things that, um...

Robin Bloor: I don't know whether the Sunnis believe that, but the Shiites definitely believe that because they referred to Muhammad as the seal of the Prophet. That is that they're that.

Robin Bloor: that the line of prophets was sealed with Muhammad and there would be no more.

Robin Bloor: So the idea of having a prophet in our time requires.

Robin Bloor: something like the return of Christ, which is, of course, also a myth or a legend within Christianity, and also is supposed to happen now.

Gwynne Mayer: We'll see.

Robin Bloor: Or in according to very superstition.

Robin Bloor: I don't know, it's like, you know, he hasn't been...

Gwynne Mayer: Well, I don't... I don't see it, though, as a form of a prophet in form of a human

being. I see it in... of the prophet in the form of the group.

Gwynne Mayer: consciousness.

Gwynne Mayer: So there is no.

Gwynne Mayer: I think we get caught up in thinking it's going to be a man, a woman, it's...

Gwynne Mayer: I don't believe that. I can't believe that.

Gwynne Mayer: It's got to be a form of consciousness.

Gwynne Mayer: that...

Gwynne Mayer: Pluto represents, for instance, in Aquarius.

Gwynne Mayer: So the Aquarian type of humanity.

Gwynne Mayer: is the 12.

Gwynne Mayer: The group of 12, you see?

Gwynne Mayer: Anyway...

Gwynne Mayer: Enough of that.

Robin Bloor: So the Orthodox Hierarchy and the Katoshi Hierarchy.

Robin Bloor: Hyderaki means...

Robin Bloor: Idiot. Stupid person.

Robin Bloor: It comes from Dorak, which is Russian for a stupid person.

Gwynne Mayer: Well, so, what is a stupid person in that context?

Gwynne Mayer: Does a stupid person really mean non-intelligent? No.

Robin Bloor: Yeah, yeah, it does in that context. It means entirely non-intelligent.

Gwynne Mayer: It means not intelligent.

Robin Bloor: Yeah, because Durak doesn't, it isn't, it hasn't got a double meaning like Idiot has. Durak means something as clever as a donkey at best, you know. That's what Durak means. It's an insult that Gurdjieff actually used.

Robin Bloor: On people when they were stupid.

Robin Bloor: So it it it doesn't have any kind of.

Robin Bloor: Uplifting meaning it. It's all downhill.

Robin Bloor: The Katoshi.

Gwynne Mayer: So you're an ass.

Robin Bloor: Haidaraki. Katoshi is a Russian word for potato. So these guys were vodka-based Haidarai idiots.

Robin Bloor: Orthodox idiots in.

Robin Bloor: Vodka based idiot.

Gwynne Mayer: There is a difference.

Robin Bloor: Well, there certainly is.

Gwynne Mayer: Toast to the idiots.

Gwynne Mayer: So what is... what are the poisoned arrows?

Gwynne Mayer: What effect do the poison arrows have on us?

Robin Bloor: Well, I could never work that out, and I have to say.

Robin Bloor: I've spent time.

Robin Bloor: Trying to work it out.

Robin Bloor: So, um...

Robin Bloor: I couldn't get anywhere with it, I couldn't even find, you know, I couldn't find any kind of allegorical meaning, symbolic meaning, I couldn't... it just...

Robin Bloor: It just didn't work for me. I couldn't find anything from El Naparra. I wasn't really sure what poison arrows actually mean.

Gwynne Mayer: Could they be the beings? Could they be the beings? The poison arrows be the actual beings that come near the camp?

Robin Bloor: No, they were fought off using, well, I don't know what the text seems to imply that they were fought off.

Robin Bloor: Using the poison arrows of Alma Parra.

Stefon☺: Are there any particular characteristics of the Al Caparra?

Stefon☺: That might allude to.

Robin Bloor: I can't find any meaning for the term, so I can't really help with that. It's... I'm hoping someday that, you know, someone will come up with something here, and...

Robin Bloor: free me from this list of words I've got where I've just got no clue what Gurdjieff's going on about.

Gwynne Mayer: Well, when we come up against that, um... I think what we're searching for is the ideology of the word, and the...

Gwynne Mayer: The problem is, I think it's more the ideology of the relationship of the word.

Gwynne Mayer: It's not so much the definition.

Robin Bloor: You can also help me.

Robin Bloor: Because in the previous paragraph before the mentions of, uh, mention of El Nepara.

Robin Bloor: He...

Robin Bloor: the gathering of.

Robin Bloor: These wild beasts would form around the camp at night.

Robin Bloor: Um, having come there to provide themselves with something suitable for their first food, that's sensible.

Robin Bloor: A meeting rather like an assembly of your favorites during what is called the quotation of stock prices.

Robin Bloor: So we don't have open outcry now, but certainly when we did have open outcry, um, if you ever attended any of those markets, which I did when I was working in London once.

Robin Bloor: Went to see the markets in action.

Robin Bloor: Uh, it's really difficult to understand what the **** is happening.

Robin Bloor: Except, you know, prices are going up and down.

Gwynne Mayer: Well, or maybe it's like we're trying to understand Bitcoins.

Robin Bloor: No, it's not really like that, because as soon as you stop, as soon as open outcry stopped.

Robin Bloor: This doesn't make any sense anymore. This writing can't make any sense.

Robin Bloor: because he's talking about an assembly of people. And as soon as it, you know, all of these automatic and computer driven markets got nothing to do with an assembly of people crying thing crying out.

Gwynne Mayer: Right.

Robin Bloor: Or joined an election of representative to some society or other.

Gwynne Mayer: Maybe he's foretelling the AI phenomenon.

Robin Bloor: I hope he isn't.

Gwynne Mayer: Well, leave it to him to figure out something like that, you know.

Robin Bloor: Oh, I think that he he knew stuff was gonna happen, and he may even have known the nature of the stuff that was gonna happen. But I don't think.

Ronald: The, uh...

Robin Bloor: You know, I don't think he had any clear.

Robin Bloor: Vision of how that was gonna go.

Ronald: The poison arrows were beyond setting up a protection of a building or of lighting fires.

Ronald: They're poison, they're meant to kill, I would guess. And it, Claire, it says.

Ronald: It's against their religion, uh, the...

Ronald: biped workers. And so it is an example of going against one's religion in order to save one's life.

Ronald: which is...

Ronald: Part of what we're dealing with here, as we find out in the next chapter, this practice of theirs.

Ronald: ends their life.

Ronald: because of their beliefs, and and it is what the women rebelled against the children.

Ronald: They're going into a...

Ronald: crypt and and waiting to die. The biped the biped servants.

Ronald: The ability or the they they went against their teachings kill these.

Ronald: dang wild beings. This is... doesn't get into the metaphor of negative emotions, this is just...

Ronald: on the face of it.

Robin Bloor: Well, it's the destruction of two brain beings, yet again, so there's that little echo.

Gwynne Mayer: Do you think anybody ever goes crazy reading this stuff?

Robin Bloor: Oh, I think it happens very frequently, and I think that these meetings are a gathering of such people, all of whom pretend to be talking about something meaningful, but in actual fact, we're all out of our minds.

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah.

Gwynne Mayer: Well, you have to be out of your mind in order to read this.

Gwynne Mayer: But not psychotic.

Gwynne Mayer: And not an idiot.

Gwynne Mayer: Good luck.

Ronald: What do you mean, then, out of your mind? You mean you need to let go of intellectual constructs?

Gwynne Mayer: I think so. Let go of intellectual orthodoxy.

Robin Bloor: Oh, yes, that's very, very.

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah. Okay.

Stefon☺: Well, at certain times, to actually, um...

Gwynne Mayer: Dog.

Stefon☺: Forego having them. Relinquish.

Stefon☺: Did the whole faculty of logic and reason and understanding.

Stefon☺: But in that mix, it seems like there's some kind of alchemy. If we don't get caught in the cracks, and lead to... lend towards the propensity, the default, to want to figure everything out.

Stefon☺: And maybe flow.

Stefon☺: And with the allegory and the metaphor and let it wash rather than trying to grab it.

Stefon☺: And trying to contain and understand it. Because I definitely asked that question, and I see... I see that actually happening, and after the reading, I see it a lot, and you could feel the dumbfounded.

Stefon☺: this permeating where it's so much, it's so dense.

Stefon☺: And then it's so much piled on so much.

Stefon☺: In a short amount of time to when when it's over, it's like.

Stefon☺: We've given up up. Something's been given up, and now we try to get them back.

Stefon☺: Through the very thing that got us in a disorder. So it it's it's it's it's.

Stefon☺: It's a heck of a process, but navigating and figuring out how to approach, how to perceive.

Stefon☺: I think it's more important, and as he said in the beginning of the reading there, work is nothing. It's not how much work you do.

Stefon☺: It's the depth.

Stefon☺: it's... it's the... how do you... how do you go into it? What are you experiencing? How is it moving you? Not that you're looking for it to take you somewhere, basically.

Stefon☺: Because ultimately.

Stefon☺: It's the inside world.

Stefon☺: I think the work is all about that.

Stefon☺: What are we doing inside of us?

Stefon☺: cosmos of our consciousness.

Stefon☺: in our hearts.

Gwynne Mayer: And I think when we put the work in an orthodoxy-type way.

Gwynne Mayer: Like, what you're saying is, if you keep it at the now chemical process, you're fine.

Gwynne Mayer: But the minute you start putting it in some kind of orthodox system, like the work, for instance.

Gwynne Mayer: I've been in groups where the work is orthodox. No, you do it this way.

Gwynne Mayer: This what?

Gwynne Mayer: And that becomes the poison arrow as far as I'm concerned.

Gwynne Mayer: So, to me, the poison arrow is the opposite of what you're talking about, Steven.

Gwynne Mayer: Or Stefan.

Robin Bloor: Well, that's interesting, because now you've got me thinking, Gwen, so that's an interesting, um...

Robin Bloor: Twist on the poison irons.

Gwynne Mayer: Well, what are you trying to kill?

Gwynne Mayer: What are you trying to poison? What are you trying to...

Stefon☺: Eliminate, maybe.

Gwynne Mayer: Eliminate.

Gwynne Mayer: And what do the wild have to do with that?

Gwynne Mayer: And I don't know the answer.

Gwynne Mayer: But I know that my lion inside me.

Gwynne Mayer: growls a lot at all of this.

Robin Bloor: There's a kind of, um...

Robin Bloor: little detail that is irritating me somewhat. When he starts talking about his.

Robin Bloor: he starts talking about wild one-brained and two-brained beings. Well.

Robin Bloor: I understand the two-brained beings thing, because two-brained beings move.

Robin Bloor: And they can. They can have an area, if you like, in which they live, which is very large.

Robin Bloor: But one-brained beings don't move.

Robin Bloor: I mean, they're not stationary, but they don't move very far. They are like...

Robin Bloor: You know, mollusks.

Robin Bloor: So you know, if I was traveling to some place at night, and I was told.

Robin Bloor: that you'll be surrounded by wild mollusks, I wouldn't care.

Robin Bloor: I would find that not at all disturbing.

Gwynne Mayer: Well, so right now my kids are getting ready to go see the gorillas and the mountains, the silverbacks. So I've been doing a lot of studies.

Robin Bloor: Oh, really?

Gwynne Mayer: of the Silverbacks, and what they do is they literally form communities where the sons vie for the... and try to kill off the father.

Gwynne Mayer: I mean, they literally act out the myths.

Robin Bloor: Really? I didn't know that, sir.

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah, so these are the silverbacks, and so these are up in the mountains, and so I'm watching the innate.

Gwynne Mayer: archetypal energy of the Silverbacks.

Gwynne Mayer: And I even know a few silverbacks that aren't apes, but they, you know.

Gwynne Mayer: their friends.

Gwynne Mayer: Because, I mean, it takes a certain amount... I mean, really? We're 98... they're 98% us.

Gwynne Mayer: So there's only 2%.

Gwynne Mayer: That's that we have a difference there in the brain.

Robin Bloor: So, so they run their families.

Robin Bloor: By when the son gets big enough and strong enough, he kills the father.

Gwynne Mayer: No, they vie for our territory, and then they will kill and take over the mother of the... some of the females of the father.

Gwynne Mayer: Which, which, oh yeah.

Gwynne Mayer: So, I mean, I'm seeing this from a union. My kids could care less. They think I've gone crazy. But I said, they're living out these, uh, Greek myths.

Gwynne Mayer: It's like Olympus, Olympus.

Gwynne Mayer: In the mountains.

Gwynne Mayer: of Uganda.

Robin Bloor: It's the mountains of Uganda where this all goes on, isn't it?

Gwynne Mayer: Well, and they operate at a high altitude level. So it's like, really.

Gwynne Mayer: When people go... so when David... my kids are going over there.

Gwynne Mayer: they are allowed to go in, but you cannot look at them directly. You can go in, but when they come toward you, you turn your back toward them.

Gwynne Mayer: Or they will attack you.

Gwynne Mayer: So, um, they're learning how to do that.

Gwynne Mayer: Very interesting. And you can't communicate...

Gwynne Mayer: With the other world, while you're with the gorillas.

Gwynne Mayer: So, I think we ought to take this whole group to the mountains and study the group.

Robin Bloor: Well, I think that's quite correct, but one of us, a number of us, would just definitely look at the gorilla and get smashed to pieces, I'm sure.

Robin Bloor: I would personally take my own poisoned arrows.

Robin Bloor: If I couldn't find the El Naparra brand, I would find some other brand.

Ronald: The one the one brain beings in being included.

Ronald: Uh, in the, the reading is, uh, curious. It's not easy to fit in.

Ronald: Although the, uh...

Ronald: One could say, if you go back to the metaphor of, or the translation of scale into negative emotions, there can be very small, simple things.

Ronald: that exists within one that can do great harm. I mean, that's just trying to read it.

Ronald: that he really meant to put one brain animals in there as a wild thing.

Ronald: Uh, the other thing was that the... the, uh...

Ronald: People left Atlantis.

Ronald: one group seeking one brain beings and one seeking 2 brain beings, the the deer and the and the pearls.

Ronald: and it could be hearkening back to that that our relationship with one brain and 2 brain beings are.

Ronald: monetary commercial use of them the mythical and useless horns. That really was a deer that.

Ronald: Didn't differ in any way from any other deer, etc.

Ronald: that one needs to be wary of those as well. I'm actually trying stretching. Why include.

Ronald: One-brain beings in this reading, and holding on to the fact that it can't be.

Ronald: a mistake. It can't be just habitually.

Robin Bloor: No, it's not. No, it's staying deep.

Robin Bloor: He went through this too meticulously for any of the words to be errors.

Robin Bloor: The the there may be the kind of mistake that occurs when.

Robin Bloor: the final translation, uh, had a typo in it or something. That kind of error may have occurred. There were certainly things pointed out about that, but not much.

Robin Bloor: You see, the the one brain beings, but by and large, the um.

Robin Bloor: The insects are regarded as one-brained.

Robin Bloor: Although it's very difficult to even classify the insects because most of them are not individual.

Robin Bloor: collective. So, you know, ants are collective, termites are collective, bees are collective.

Robin Bloor: But they all...

Robin Bloor: None of them are vertebrates, they're all invertebrates, in the sense that they're...

Robin Bloor: Skeleton, insofar as they have one, is an exoskeleton. Pretty much all of the insects.

Robin Bloor: I think that is all of the insects actually, maybe what defines them.

Robin Bloor: But I don't know what you would do if you were attacked by wild bees.

Robin Bloor: I don't think any arrows would help you at all.

Gwynne Mayer: I would become a mollusk real quick.

Robin Bloor: Mollusk, yeah, that's good.

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah, they they're not gonna check a mosque.

Gwynne Mayer: So I was looking on AI about Poison Arrow.

Gwynne Mayer: And...

Gwynne Mayer: It did not explicitly use a poison era metaphor.

Gwynne Mayer: but related double-headed arrow in self-remembering, and then it goes on to a single arrow, is ordinary attention.

Gwynne Mayer: Double headed is the divided attention.

Gwynne Mayer: And I guess the poison arrow.

Gwynne Mayer: According to AI.

Gwynne Mayer: Because you're...

Gwynne Mayer: They evidently skipped that part in their studies.

Gwynne Mayer: It says, um...

Gwynne Mayer: belongs to one of the most famous discourses of the Buddha, the Kula Malakyabada Sutta. It assesses an issue that Gurdjieff also despised, useless intellectual overthinking.

Robin Bloor: Oh, really?

Gwynne Mayer: Yep.

Robin Bloor: Oh, I'm pleased about that. Useless intellectual overthinking.

Gwynne Mayer: So there sure are.

Gwynne Mayer: There's your orthodoxy. Yeah.

Stefon⊗: We were thinking about arrow, poison arrow.

Stefon⊗: And as Gwen just read that, what came to mind in my mind was the piercing aspect of an arrow.

Stefon⊗: To Pierce, not necessarily, you know, then he's adding the poison and non poison.

Gwynne Mayer: Yep.

Stefon⊗: What appears to go through to a break.

Stefon⊗: The skin to break through something.

Stefon⊗: To get through.

Stefon⊗: And then maybe to poison, to poison our negativity, to poison the things that maybe we need to get rid of.

Stefon⊗: And then the other one's just to pierce through.

Stefon⊗: To go through what we think we know.

Stefon⊗: What we think is the truth.

Stefon⊗: According to our experience, but we think it's the truth for everybody.

Stefon⊗: Piercing.

Stefon⊗: Going through.

Gwynne Mayer: So, in the Buddhist story, the piercing of the arrow, you had to be...

Gwynne Mayer: In order to remove the arrow, which would go along what you're saying, Stefan, the man is shot by a poison arrow. Before he allows the doctor to pull it out, he demands to know who shot him, what cast... this is the analysis of the arrow.

Gwynne Mayer: what cast it belongs to, how tall they are, what wood the bow was made of, or the bow was made of, and what feathers were used on the fletching. So, in the piercing.

Gwynne Mayer: As long as we're pierced with that arrow, we have to also understand what allowed the piercing and what the piercing has caused.

Gwynne Mayer: Within us. And it, it's not just an intellectual thing, it has to be censor, has to be, um...

Gwynne Mayer: And he said the lesson of the Buddha in this story, the Buddha notes that the man will die before getting his answers.

Gwynne Mayer: The priority must be removing the arrow and treating the poison.

Gwynne Mayer: The parable warns against wasting time on theoretical, metaphysical questions.

Gwynne Mayer: When the urgent task at hand is escaping human suffering.

StefonⓈ: The is is always more significant than the why.

Gwynne Mayer: Yes.

StefonⓈ: If you want to cut to the chase. If you don't want to do mental gymnastics and...

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah.

StefonⓈ: Yeah, that's very interesting. I've heard that before. I don't know what the context was.

StefonⓈ: Or you'll die, but you want to know before, you want to know what caused your death.

StefonⓈ: And maybe it's alluding to the fact that what within ourselves.

StefonⓈ: Do we have to recognize?

StefonⓈ: that is killing us or that's causing us disharmony.

StefonⓈ: It seems like introspection is the deep... when you're talking about the Buddha, introspection came to mind. Deep introspection. And when you're going to die, and I've been there a few times, right before.

StefonⓈ: You realize what doesn't mean anything. It's amazing how the common denominator comes to light.

StefonⓈ: When the light is ceasing to be, very shortly. But we can do that without being in that position. That's what the work, that's what us looking into this is, not to wind up on a goose chase.

StefonⓈ: chasing our tails. But to get to a point where we can recognize our own inner selves enough.

StefonⓈ: to navigate past our own fetters, we're our own problem.

Gwynne Mayer: Well...

StefonⓈ: Well, on my own. Maybe you guys got it figured out.

Gwynne Mayer: Well, it also says to what you're saying, Gurdjieff held this exact same view as the

poison arrow parable. He frequently mocked intellectuals who wanted to discuss higher planes of cosmic reality.

Gwynne Mayer: While remaining completely unable to control their own basic emotions, tempers, or attention.

Gwynne Mayer: Both teachings urge the seeker to stop theorizing and start doing the practical, immediate work of awakening.

Gwynne Mayer: And Stefan, I had two out-of-body experiences through an accident, so I know what you're talking about. There's total peace at some point.

Stefon☺: And then we forget, and we opt for torment. Until the next appointment.

Gwynne Mayer: Yep.

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah.

Gwynne Mayer: Well, the only thing it removed, I have no fear of dying, you know.

Stefon☺: With 10,000...

Stefon☺: Well, I'm not looking forward to it. But then we got Bells Rivers Tales. Gurdjieff, you just quoted Gurdjieff.

Stefon☺: Then you've got Belzebur's Tales, where he's taking us into universe... he's taking us on an intergalactic goose chase, in a way. You know, all of these planets, and you know, he's saying one thing...

Stefon☺: But hit the book. It takes us into these.

Stefon☺: Into these realms that ohh.

Stefon☺: Hard to fathom.

Stefon☺: So it's a back and forth, and you say that he's very clear, and everything had a purpose, but then it also... it's also noted that we're somebody else every half hour.

Stefon☺: And this eye is shifting. So, we latch on to one thing.

Stefon☺: And the other ones trip us up. There's something, a common thread in all of it.

Stefon☺: perhaps looking at details, or maybe not rewriting them, but summarizing certain things and trying to bring a cohesion.

Stefon☺: That would take away that.

Stefon☺: That thing of drawing one on the brink of insanity.

Stefon☺: To try to get it to where, you know, and we're doing that with the work, you know, the exercises, realizing the, you know, remembering the self, these are all things that help immensely in my life.

Stefon☺: But there's something with the tales that maybe we could get the gist of certain things and

have a culmination of that, because as it goes.

Stefon☺: It's, it's pretty...

Stefon☺: It's mind-boggling.

Stefon☺: Oh, we're tenacious!

Stefon☺: Keep going.

Gwynne Mayer: Robin, I'm going to send you the AI. I did quote out of the first time in Tibet, and AI talked about the parable of poison arrow linked to that.

Gwynne Mayer: that particular paragraph.

Robin Bloor: I'll put it in the... I'd done that myself, given that you were using AI, so I'll put it in the chat.

Gwynne Mayer: Okay, okay.

Robin Bloor: And there is, um...

Robin Bloor: The AI has also come up with the possibility that Elna Parra... Elna is the subjunctive future stem of an Armenian.

Robin Bloor: verb meaning to rise, to go out, to emerge. And para, of course, is the Greek. Well, it's a well-known prefix, isn't it?

Robin Bloor: which means beside, beyond, or contrary.

Robin Bloor: So, to emerge contrary, and that seems to me that you could apply that to the Buddhists.

Robin Bloor: the Buddhist story, and that actually might be it.

Robin Bloor: That would be a stunning thing for us to have uncovered, because I had resigned that I would never know that before I died. I just figured that that would be...

Robin Bloor: that on my deathbed, an angel would come and whisper the meaning of that in my ear, and I would finally know.

Robin Bloor: But I wouldn't know before then.

Gwynne Mayer: I'll be waiting for you. I will be waiting for you.

Robin Bloor: So I can only saloon.

Gwynne Mayer: And we will form another group in another galaxy. Yeah.

Stefon☺: Yeah!

David Aguirre: I was looking at the etymology of Para, but in Sanskrit, it's not much different. It goes to beyond, or last, or ultimate, but I think maybe, like in Paramita, but I think it might be a little bit closer to the Tibetan story than just Greek, but...

Robin Bloor: Good.

David Aguirre: It doesn't make, like, a big big difference at all.

Robin Bloor: I'm glad everybody's doing the right thing here.

Robin Bloor: I'm trying to focus on the meaning of the, uh, of the strange words, because it...

Robin Bloor: He didn't invent those words for no reason.

Gwynne Mayer: I put my AI indulging thing that he goes on to talk about remarkable men and the whole thing in AI, and I put it in chat, so.

Robin Bloor: Oh, right, good. That's great, because I put the chat in the notes as well, you know.

Robin Bloor: So that'll get added to a note for those people that read the note.

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah.

Robin Bloor: But the, I mean, the thing that I've got.

Robin Bloor: is that I've got the notes from four different groups studying the tales.

Robin Bloor: Um, on one day, I'm going to...

Robin Bloor: Drop them into AI and ask it to actually just.

Gwynne Mayer: Put it all together. Yeah.

Robin Bloor: put it all together and remove all the steep, stupid comments that various people, including me, of course, may have made at various points in time, and just...

Robin Bloor: Boil it down to things that make sense.

Gwynne Mayer: Well, I'm telling you, I can put it like I could put exactly what I just wrote into AI, tell them I want to put a PowerPoint together with that, and you would be amazed at what they come up with.

Robin Bloor: No, I wouldn't be amazed. The reason I wouldn't be amazed is right now I'm using AI to create PowerPoints, so I wouldn't be amazed, but everybody else would be amazed.

Gwynne Mayer: Yes.

Gwynne Mayer: Oh, okay. That's why I'll wait for you on the other side.

Robin Bloor: Well, it's true, it's good.

Gwynne Mayer: So we don't have to amaze each other.

Robin Bloor: When I die, I'm going to take PowerPoint with me so that we can work together on PowerPoint on the other side.

Stefon☺: You know, and you mentioned the part that the person would rather die than go against their religion. Uh, I remember about Gurdjieff, where he grew up, where he was...

Gwynne Mayer: Oh, yeah.

StefonⓈ: where he was as a child, uh, it was that... that was getting taken over quite frequently by different, uh, armies, religions came in, and just like the Druze, uh.

StefonⓈ: You know, you keep going.

StefonⓈ: And you maintain within yourself what you are, but you don't go against the prevailing powers, but that's not necessarily giving up your religion.

StefonⓈ: You see, you could you could make it. It's like you outwardly you go along.

StefonⓈ: So that you could prevail. Because if you die, that's the end of your religion, that's the end of your... that's it for you.

StefonⓈ: So, you know, it makes sense. But the women saw that and men didn't understand that.

Gwynne Mayer: Well, I think he alchemicalized, just like you said. He was in that area where everything was merging. It was a melting pot.

Gwynne Mayer: And he just alchemicalized all of that into his thinking.

Gwynne Mayer: and into his writing.

StefonⓈ: I'm referring solely to the fact that there were different armies taking over the place. They wanted different roles, not necessary religions. He stepped out, and he did that, you know, he investigated, and he traveled, but I'm just saying, where he grew up.

Gwynne Mayer: I understand, but there were different beliefs.

StefonⓈ: There was no stability and it was very harsh environment also.

StefonⓈ: Aside from the fact of all the warring factions and getting taken over, it was very, uh, inhospitable.

Gwynne Mayer: But he was raised on Giglamesh. You have to understand, he was raised on Giglamesh.

Gwynne Mayer: So that, in itself, had to teach him how to react.

Robin Bloor: There was a...

Robin Bloor: The, um...

Robin Bloor: Militarily difficult times.

Robin Bloor: Armenia, in actual fact, and most of the area of the Caucasus.

Robin Bloor: had, um...

Robin Bloor: From the religious perspective, had a very strong.

Robin Bloor: impulse of tolerance, and and because of that, and it still occurs. Actually, you had.

Robin Bloor: In, in Iran, you had various, um.

Robin Bloor: Jewish groups.

Robin Bloor: that when Israel was founded, they stayed in Iran, you know, that they'd been there for ages.

Robin Bloor: the Islam was a tolerant religion in the sense that while they tried to convert everybody to the religion and gave you advantages if you converted.

Robin Bloor: They never tried to destroy other religions.

Robin Bloor: So while there are two things, one is when armies come in in the effort to steal and destroy.

Robin Bloor: And when empires expand, but they're not intending to do that, they're just intending to take ownership of the... of the place, you know, the

Robin Bloor: The Persian Empire has, um, breathed in and breathed out for 5,000 years, I think, you know.

Stefon☺: Concord.

Robin Bloor: Ever since the original Sumer.

Robin Bloor: But the, um... what happened with the Russians?

Robin Bloor: And.

Robin Bloor: Uh, the Turks in the, um, First World War.

Robin Bloor: There was just murder all the way across that land, but particularly an attempt to destroy Armenia.

Robin Bloor: Um, uh, and, uh, a genuine.

Robin Bloor: Genocide.

Robin Bloor: Millions, over a million Armenians were killed.

Robin Bloor: And the Turks still pretend it never happened.

Stefon☺: So out of the reading today, Robin, along the line of what I put forth earlier.

Stefon☺: What do we come away with?

Stefon☺: As... just some basics.

Stefon☺: Something.

Stefon☺: from this reading.

Stefon☺: To add to our one.

Stefon☺: A work.

Stefon☺: Within.

Robin Bloor: Well, I mean, I think that the the most promising aspect of this is is to be able to use the um.

Robin Bloor: The story here is an allegory for the way that the emotional parts, the wild emotional parts of you.

Robin Bloor: I mean, one of the interesting things.

Robin Bloor: To me, at least, about negative emotion is that.

Robin Bloor: You have...

Robin Bloor: In you. I mean, I saw, for example.

Robin Bloor: Rina Hans, who is, as far as I am aware, a conscious individual.

Robin Bloor: I saw her at one or two points in time.

Robin Bloor: get upset and and therefore be, let's say.

Robin Bloor: Subject to a negative emotion. I saw that.

Robin Bloor: And yet, this was an individual who, um, as far as I'm concerned, after, you know, it was after she died when I thought about it.

Robin Bloor: She was absolutely a conscious individual. But, you know, that happens. I don't think that the, um.

Robin Bloor: impulse to negative emotion disappears simply because someone becomes conscious. I think they consume negative emotion in a different way.

Robin Bloor: Um, they transformed, so...

Robin Bloor: But it's...

Robin Bloor: As soon as you start talking about people who are higher.

Robin Bloor: than your level.

Robin Bloor: You basically are speculating.

Robin Bloor: Really, you... I saw things that I...

Robin Bloor: knew that a conscious individual would do.

Robin Bloor: And I saw Rina Hands do them, and it was like.

Robin Bloor: If I thought there was, um...

Robin Bloor: An event where she could.

Robin Bloor: Um, uh, embarrass you, just effectively strip you away from your personality covering.

Robin Bloor: She did, and she did it with extraordinary skill.

Robin Bloor: And she would just do that. And it was like...

Robin Bloor: When you experienced that, you never got angry with her. You, you became grateful that she'd created an event in your life that would not have happened.

Robin Bloor: What would happen if she hadn't stuck a leg out to trip you up?

Robin Bloor: And she used to do that. She used to do it on. I, I have so many stories from people that I knew or people that I still know from Rena Hammerstein.

Robin Bloor: About her doing things like that.

Gwynne Mayer: Well, that really is the only way you learn, though, Robin.

Robin Bloor: Oh, it's absolutely the the problem was, I mean.

Robin Bloor: The problem, really, with that is not the quality of the teacher, it's the quality of the student.

Robin Bloor: You know, I mean, the thing that always struck me is that she was giving these people the opportunity and a lot of the time they just wanted to buffer it. They didn't want the opportunity.

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah. So they just externally projected on her that she's the culprit.

Gwynne Mayer: I was gonna tell you that...

Stefon☺: They look at that arrow.

Stefon☺: They look at who shot the arrow and fall short of perceiving the piercing.

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah. Okay.

Stefon☺: And what's being opened up.

Gwynne Mayer: Yep.

Stefon☺: what's being exposed. And that's the strangest thing. So, Robin, you're saying she was highly evolved, yet sometimes at certain moments, she was unguarded.

Stefon☺: And she would give way to anger.

Stefon☺: Right?

Robin Bloor: I would say the following, that she was unguarded all the time.

Stefon☺: So it...

Stefon☺: Uh-huh. Okay, that's what I was gonna get to. So she wasn't... so what happens when...

Robin Bloor: She was never guarded.

Stefon☺: when one is evolved to a certain point, that... that doesn't seem to be able to play a part anymore. Giving way to the emotions, or letting something outside pull you.

Stefon☹: When you're that...

Stefon☹: Centered.

Stefon☹: What what what happens there? Is it a different person every half hour, you know, or I'm not exaggerating, but you know that that something else is happening at that moment and a button got pressed and the person had no access to the panel even though they built the panel.

Stefon☹: And they're well aware of all of these dynamics with it.

Robin Bloor: You're trying to think through something that you can't really think through, that you can only experience by observation. It's like, you know, yes, you can try and work out what an individual like that is, but you get it wrong.

Robin Bloor: There was an event, for example, during a summer week. Well, you know, during the summer weeks that we used to have.

Robin Bloor: There were certain people that surrounded.

Robin Bloor: Rena Hands.

Robin Bloor: Who would, wouldn't be able to take the, um, uh, this, this stress of work, of working so close together because basically it strips your personality. Well, when people's personality is stripped.

Robin Bloor: then what's underneath is what comes through. And if what's underneath isn't actually particularly well organized or even sane, then that's what comes through.

Robin Bloor: So there was a woman, I won't name her, it doesn't matter because it would never get beyond this, but on, it was a Tuesday or a Wednesday of summer week, which is the time by which everything was already, your clothes had fallen off.

Robin Bloor: And she started getting hysterical.

Robin Bloor: Marina Hams turned around and, with a full sweep from the shoulder, slapped her hard across the face.

Robin Bloor: And everybody who was there gasped.

Robin Bloor: But Rena knew what she was doing.

Stefon☹: Yeah, she snapped her out of it.

Robin Bloor: It's like, you know, the idea that in some way or other, you're going to be able to predict the behavior of somebody who is above a level.

Robin Bloor: and that has capability that you don't have. It's like, I can't.

Robin Bloor: I've seen it and I can't, so I don't know who adds the code.

Stefon☹: Hmm.

Robin Bloor: She would get upset sometimes, so she would get upset. That's called an emotion, you know, the idea that it was...

Robin Bloor: Um, negative.

Robin Bloor: is...

Robin Bloor: I mean, I, for instance, once a...

Robin Bloor: It must have been a couple of years after I joined the group, but I basically had come back from.

Robin Bloor: The the barn a weekend meeting and I just talked to her about the people.

Robin Bloor: that surrounded her, and I said, you know, Irina, some of these people worship you.

Robin Bloor: And she teared up and she said in.

Robin Bloor: Emotionally, um...

Robin Bloor: Well, really sorry, boys.

Robin Bloor: I know and I can't stop them.

Gwynne Mayer: Well, Gurdjieff was like that too, Robin.

Robin Bloor: Oh, Gurdjieff was more so. He's even more difficult to understand.

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah, I mean, he was more ridiculous. So, I feel like...

Gwynne Mayer: If you can handle the Gurdjieff group, and it's a tough group.

Gwynne Mayer: Then you're in a good group.

Gwynne Mayer: You know, but if you have some feelings about, oh, well, this is bad, this is something I don't need to do, blah, blah, blah, blah, then your ego just can go its separate way and do its thing. And by the way, I was looking up who did a more deep dive into the Tibetan monk.

Gwynne Mayer: was Joseph Assisi. I was looking up some of the sources.

Robin Bloor: All right.

Gwynne Mayer: Okay, so... so he did the, um... in that particular chapter, he did some writing on that, just so people can know to go to that.

Stefon☺: Gwen, there's been a shift in your energy.

Stefon☺: It's, it's, uh...

Stefon☺: It's quite nice.

Stefon☺: It's been a shift. I noticed a shift in your energy. It's something that's calmer.

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah, I'm going back to my old cell. Yeah.

Stefon☺: Um, whatever you're doing...

Stefon☺: Okay, yeah. And, and, Robin, um...

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah, well, don't, don't, uh, don't count on it. That's all I can say.

Stefon☺: I know, I know, I know, Jack is always in the box. But, um, Robin, did you meet Nyland when you were at the barn?

Stefon☺: Was he there when you were there?

Stefon☺: You talking about Warwick?

Robin Bloor: Different barn. The the barn that I went to was in just outside Settle in North Yorkshire.

Stefon☺: Oh, a different bond. Oh, okay.

Stefon☺: Oh, okay.

Robin Bloor: And...

Robin Bloor: Nyland was dead by the time that I joined the Gurdjieff group, so, you know, I could never have met Nyland.

Robin Bloor: Which is a pity, really, because some of the nylon stuff is very useful.

Stefon☺: Oh, man. The archives are phenomenal. He has all his discussions archived.

Stefon☺: I think some guy, Wayne, in another state, they're really phenomenal.

Gwynne Mayer: Robin, I sent you, in that box, I sent you of all the writing, some of his stuff's in there, because he worked with that.

Robin Bloor: Oh, is it? Okay, I better look through the box then. It's just sitting around. I haven't opened it because what am I going to do?

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah, just if it's in there.

Gwynne Mayer: I don't know, I guess you just put it in the PowerPoint.

Robin Bloor: I should give it to give it to an AI and tell them to make sense of it for me.

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah, just...

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah.

Stefon☺: But is this AI and all of this speed defying what was in the reading when Gurdjieff mentioned it work is nothing. It's not how much work you do.

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah.

Stefon☺: It's how in depth, how you work.

Stefon☺: This speed in which we get information and it, it used to be that getting the information was part of the, the, the whole uh embracing and, and, and grasping. But now we don't have to do that. We just go right boom.

Stefon☺: So that comes, so now our brains have to hold more. Also, we just keep going back to AI,

and we can empty out our brains.

Stefon☺: But I don't I see something diminishing.

Gwynne Mayer: Well, I think it's the way you question AI. AI is only like looking in a dictionary, and it's what you're looking for. And if you can be specific in your questions, then you get specific answers. Other than that, you get *****

Robin Bloor: Oh yeah, of course I do.

Robin Bloor: No.

Robin Bloor: There are people who, um...

Robin Bloor: Yeah, there's a dividing line in terms of the use of AI, and it's important to understand that there's a dividing line here, because.

Robin Bloor: First of all, the AI is just the most brilliant formatory apparatus that anybody ever had. So if you want formatory information, there it is.

Robin Bloor: Right. And it can do various kinds of, um, decoding of things that would take you.

Robin Bloor: Days.

Robin Bloor: Now, I, for instance, have written a book.

Robin Bloor: But it's not true to say that because AI wrote the book.

Robin Bloor: But there's a book.

Robin Bloor: That needed to be written to ex uh to.

Robin Bloor: explain a particular programming language, which I invented, but actually, I didn't invent it, AI invented it, but I knew what it was intended to do.

Robin Bloor: And this book runs at the moment to 250 pages.

Robin Bloor: And this is probably 300 words on every page.

Robin Bloor: So, you're actually talking about 75,000 words, or more than that, perhaps.

Robin Bloor: And it wrote it in an afternoon.

Robin Bloor: And I haven't even read it yet.

Robin Bloor: But I know how it works, and I know what I will be able to determine, and I know what I'll have to correct.

Robin Bloor: No.

Robin Bloor: To write a book about that length, 250 pages, that takes about 3 months.

Robin Bloor: And it did it in 3 hours.

Robin Bloor: And it's put me in a situation of being able to just edit it, well, to edit a book.

Robin Bloor: like that I could probably do in a week.

Robin Bloor: If I didn't have software to help me, I can probably do it in a couple of days.

Gwynne Mayer: So have you thought about collating some of your material in chapters and putting it on AI and then having it, I mean, what it's doing is focusing you in on what you already have written.

Gwynne Mayer: You see what I'm saying?

Robin Bloor: Yeah, I'm, you know, because of something else that happened.

Robin Bloor: I've been, um...

Robin Bloor: You could say diverted away from what I was working on because I'm working on two things ultimately in the work. Aside from the work that I do in groups, I am working on being able to explain objective science.

Robin Bloor: As best as it can be explained in the light of the knowledge that exists right now.

Robin Bloor: I did the 1st half of that, and I'm going to do the well. I probably did the 1st 3rd. I'm going to do the rest of it before I die.

Robin Bloor: And the other is, I'm going to produce a definitive commentary on all of Goethe's writings before I die.

Robin Bloor: And, but...

Robin Bloor: If at this point in time I could make that go fast, but I don't actually.

Robin Bloor: want to make that go fast. I think the work is best done slowly.

Robin Bloor: You know, so I don't want to go tearing through it like I've just, um...

Robin Bloor: Received, I don't know.

Robin Bloor: financial endowment that can help me do it all faster than the speed of light. I don't want to do that.

Stefon☺: Yeah, actually.

Robin Bloor: You know, but I do want to do what I am doing with AI, which is actually producing.

Robin Bloor: software products and explanations and presentations and things around software products.

Robin Bloor: I'm interested in doing that because that's going to that most people can't deal with AI because there's a big learning curve in how well.

Robin Bloor: you can use it, but some people who have understood to some degree what AI is doing can actually use it. There's two types of people, people that can use AI and people that can't. People that can't use AI are going to be.

Robin Bloor: made into idiots by it.

Robin Bloor: Because they'll think they can and they'll do various stuff and they'll come to various conclusions and it'll be wrong.

Robin Bloor: But you know.

Gwynne Mayer: Well, but I'm telling you, you know, basically I'm using it when I'm teaching and training my people.

Robin Bloor: Yeah, I know. I think you can use it. You understand.

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah. And but the biggest problem is, I have to train them to ask the right questions. They can't ask their specific questions.

Gwynne Mayer: Because it's only as good as your specificity of your thinking.

Gwynne Mayer: So, um, you know, when you...

Gwynne Mayer: you look at... for instance, I'm doing... I notice you're doing Substack. I'm doing Substack. So if I'm writing an essay. I have to tell it everything I want to say in this essay.

Gwynne Mayer: You see. But what I was going to ask you about your program for software, do you think you'll ever get to a point where you can put the translations of the Russian.

Gwynne Mayer: version, the Greek...

Gwynne Mayer: and the... in alignment with the English. So we can see, in all of his writings, the difference between the Russian.

Gwynne Mayer: Translation.

Gwynne Mayer: Because that's always and that's that.

Gwynne Mayer: weighs on my mind. I'm sure it doesn't weigh on other people, but...

Robin Bloor: You need to talk to Michelle. Michelle is doing precisely that. She's got a website.

Gwynne Mayer: You know.

Gwynne Mayer: Yes, yes, she...

Gwynne Mayer: And she's sharing it.

Robin Bloor: where... where you can go from one to another, and that... that's a piece of work that will continue to get more and more sophisticated. And she's going to add... she's done it for the tail, she's going to add to.

Robin Bloor: I think at the moment it's um.

Robin Bloor: English, German, French, Russian.

Gwynne Mayer: So, is she doing the software part?

Robin Bloor: It may be Spanish and Italian as well, those are going to be added in.

Gwynne Mayer: So, okay, so Michelle, I've got Michelle's stuff on, uh, right now, on, uh, Rodney Collins, but... but what...

Gwynne Mayer: What I'm talking about is the software that would then say.

Gwynne Mayer: like, if I could go in and program the English version of what Gurjo said, and ask my software.

Gwynne Mayer: What does this say in his Russian version, and how is it different? That's the kind of software I'm looking for.

Robin Bloor: Well, that's partly, I mean, you aren't going to get anything.

Gwynne Mayer: Okay.

Robin Bloor: that's definitive in those terms, because that's what we're doing in the Tuesday group we've got, which looks at the German and English versions.

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah. Okay.

Robin Bloor: And what you discover, which is an interesting thing to discover.

Robin Bloor: is that the English version isn't necessarily definite, and sometimes, mostly, the English version is the better version.

Gwynne Mayer: No. Okay.

Robin Bloor: But sometimes the German version is the better version. When I say better, it's that.

Robin Bloor: When you consider what's being said.

Robin Bloor: And you take the German approach, the words that have been chosen because they exist in the German language and don't exist in the English language.

Robin Bloor: are actually...

Robin Bloor: In my opinion, but also the opinion of the people I'm working with, more appropriate.

Robin Bloor: And if you could do that with 4 or 5 or 6 languages, that would also be a good thing to do.

Robin Bloor: Now you can get AI to do this for you.

Robin Bloor: But if you get AI to do this for you.

Robin Bloor: It doesn't know any of those languages.

Robin Bloor: It's just able to mimic them, it doesn't know them, so it doesn't appreciate the difference of a nuance between one word choice and another word choice.

Robin Bloor: It can't know that.

Robin Bloor: It's beyond its capabilities, so.

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah.

Robin Bloor: What you're actually.

Robin Bloor: hoping for would require many different groups working together and creating notes.

Robin Bloor: You know, because the AI ain't going to cut it, at least not the current AI.

Gwynne Mayer: Well, that's why I was asking that, so...

Robin Bloor: It's I am so.

StefonⓈ: That's my point, Robin. That's my point, is that...

StefonⓈ: We're relying on something that doesn't have that capacity.

StefonⓈ: And we're relying on it so much, and it's becoming such an intricate part of what we utilize to accomplish something, we're diminishing that very faculty.

StefonⓈ: Within ourselves, by not exercising it.

Robin Bloor: No, that's not the way that it works. It works in a different way. First of all, there's this.

StefonⓈ: These are the things that .

Robin Bloor: Uh, really more than 90%, probably more like 95, 96, 97% of human beings are actually moving centered.

StefonⓈ: A what?

Robin Bloor: Moving centered. They're centered in the moving center.

StefonⓈ: In the moving center, okay.

Robin Bloor: And most of those people, their intellectual center doesn't really exist. It's a formatory apparatus that just repeats things.

Robin Bloor: AI does no harm to those people, because they're already hopeless.

StefonⓈ: Well, I'm not talking about them. I'm talking about us. I'm talking about you.

Robin Bloor: Well, and then there's another set of people, and those are people that properly understand the capabilities of the various centers, and AI can do no damage to them.

Robin Bloor: Because those people actually understand the way that a proper intellect works.

Robin Bloor: And AI actually has no appreciation, for example, of emotional meaning. It has none whatsoever. Its actual appreciation can be... it can be expressed by the number zero.

StefonⓈ: Right.

Robin Bloor: So all of those people have got a dimension to their intelligence that AI can never hope to in any way, at least in its current incarnation.

Robin Bloor: AI is just a neural network. It's a pattern recognition system. It's not... it's something that I understand, because I understand the software that creates such things.

Robin Bloor: Now, the fact that it has been, in one way or another, um...

Robin Bloor: stretched to its current level of capability is something that I would never have predicted.

Robin Bloor: I really wouldn't have expected that to happen. I knew that it was going to be...

Robin Bloor: in terms of photo recognition, it was going to be better than a human being. In certain aspects, it was going to exceed human being capability.

Robin Bloor: But I would never have thought that it would be able to articulate meaning in the way that it imitates. It doesn't really do it, it imitates.

Robin Bloor: But there again, here it is.

Robin Bloor: So among those people that actually are capable of understanding AI, those people are not going to be damaged by it in any way.

Robin Bloor: And everybody who who is lazy.

Robin Bloor: Whatever they are, they're going to be damaged by it, because they'll start to come to, um, depend upon it in the same way that they've come to depend upon cars to go from one place to another.

Robin Bloor: You know, in the same way that they've come to depend upon. Um.

Robin Bloor: soundtracks in order to listen to music, rather than to experience music in a live environment. Uh, you know, they don't sing anymore, they don't participate in choirs, all sorts of things have been destroyed by.

Robin Bloor: the gradual encroachment of the modern world.

Robin Bloor: But luckily.

Robin Bloor: I hope Gurdjieff writes about this.

Robin Bloor: Good, you've said that, um...

Robin Bloor: Beelzebub's tales will be read out in the time of no electricity.

Robin Bloor: I look forward to that.

Robin Bloor: That's why I'm a doomsday prepper.

Stefon☺: It's amazing you have time for so many meetings and things. I feel somewhat guilty consuming some of your time with these tasks that you have set up for yourself before you expire from this here level of, uh...

Stefon☺: existence. That's phenomenal. And I'm happy that you have AI because it will help you to achieve some of those things that would seem to be superhuman or impossible.

Stefon☺: To, uh... To serve.

Robin Bloor: Oh, difficult, yeah.

Stefon☺: put together. So you have a little help from your friends at the technical sphere of the word of the world.

Stefon☺: But I did send you the thing when the guy, the godfather of AI.

Stefon☺: when he got the prize, and what he talked about is he won the Nobel Prize, and he, uh, he gave a speech, and he was very concerned.

Stefon☺: And then he gave another one a couple of years later, and he is really concerned. And it's not basically what we're talking about, but the fact that it... people are putting it in a position at the Pentagon and these various places to make decisions.

Stefon☺: And it makes decisions lacking.

Stefon☺: It's one thing we're saying it's never gonna have.

Stefon☺: And... and that's, uh... you know, it's like a gun. As long as it sits on the table, loaded or not.

Stefon☺: But when you pick it up, it's what you do with it. Do you go target practicing, or do you shoot the people who you're upset with? It's sort of like that. It's what are we going to do with it? But what's happening with it, like you said, it's happening so fast.

Stefon☺: Um, that the firm just didn't want, they took away the contract billions of dollars from the Pentagon because they were programming it to make decisions at certain times without human input, which was, it's, it's, they're turning it over.

Stefon☺: To AI, in other words.

Robin Bloor: Yeah, I mean, human beings will, you know, human beings will abuse everything eventually. I mean, that's just not at all a surprise, and if they...

Robin Bloor: That happens in our time, that's fine, but it makes no difference to anything else. It's like...

Robin Bloor: I've listened to the, you know, people who are depicted as the fathers of AI.

Robin Bloor: And they've all in one way or another given their information about what they think AI is achieving currently, or is what it may be capable of achieving.

Robin Bloor: And not one of them understands the work.

Robin Bloor: None of them.

Stefon☺: Huh.

Robin Bloor: So, you know, Nobel Prize, they can have 100 Nobel Prizes. If they don't understand

the work, they'll not understand what's going down here.

Robin Bloor: You know, and of course, if human beings are given really powerful weapons, they will abuse them. It's the most amazing thing at the moment, at this point in time, and it's been well over...

Robin Bloor: We're coming up 70 years.

Robin Bloor: Is it 70 years? Yeah, we're coming up to 70 years.

Robin Bloor: The only country that's ever used an atom bomb militarily is the United States.

Robin Bloor: And that's just a complete amazing thing to me. I would have thought that we'd have had lots of that stuff happening by now, but no, it's still just the United States that's a super criminal that used that bomb.

Stefon☺: That's what's keeping the peace.

Robin Bloor: Yeah, of course it was keeping the peace. That's absolutely. It's a you couldn't be any more justified than that to destroy 80,000 people with a single bomb. Not a problem.

Stefon☺: I use it, I use it, we're both gone.

Robin Bloor: It's time to go. Sorry.

Robin Bloor: End of story.

Stefon☺: Thank you, Robin

Chat

13:21:09 From Robin Bloor : The poison arrow comes from one of the Buddha's teaching stories — the parable of the poisoned arrow.

The setup is a monk named Māluṅkyaputta, who grows frustrated that the Buddha refuses to pronounce on a set of grand metaphysical questions: whether the cosmos is eternal or not, whether it is finite or infinite, whether the soul (self) and the body are identical or distinct, and whether an enlightened one continues to exist after death. Māluṅkyaputta effectively issues an ultimatum — answer these, or I'll abandon the training.

The Buddha replies with the simile. Imagine a man struck by an arrow thickly smeared with poison. His friends fetch a surgeon, but the man says: "I won't let this arrow be pulled out until I know who shot me — his name and clan, whether he was tall or short, dark or fair, what town he came from; and what kind of bow it was, what the bowstring was made of, the type of shaft, the feathering, the arrowhead..." The man would die long before any of that was settled.

13:21:28 From Robin Bloor : The point is that the metaphysical questions are like the wounded man's demands: they are not prerequisites for the work that actually matters. Whether or not the universe is eternal, the Buddha says, "there is birth, there is aging, there is death, there are sorrow, lamentation, pain, grief, and despair" — and it is the ending of these, here and now, that he teaches. He calls the speculative questions "undeclared" (avyākata) because answering them "is not connected with the goal, does not belong to the fundamentals of the holy life, and does not lead to disenchantment, to dispassion, to cessation, to peace, to direct knowledge, to enlightenment, to Nibbāna."

13:24:49 From Robin Bloor : The piece that jumps out — given Armenian etymology work — is elna-. That's the subjunctive/future stem of Armenian (elnel): to rise, to go out, to emerge, to exit, to ascend. Pair it with a -para element (whether you're hearing the Greek para, "beside/beyond/contrary," or an Armenian suffix, or one of Gurdjieff's own compounding syllables) and the word leans toward something like "that which rises out of / emerges beside / goes beyond." If that's anywhere near the sense you're carrying, the parable takes it well in three different directions.

13:26:49 From Gwynne Mayer : 1. What Actually Happens in "Beelzebub for the first time in Tibet"

In this chapter, Beelzebub travels to the elevations of Tibet to observe the descendants of the lost continent of Atlantis. He investigates how a misunderstanding of the cosmic energy Kundabuffer has affected human behavior. [1, 2]

The primary story in this section describes how Tibetan Buddhists practice "intentional suffering". Beelzebub notes with deep sorrow that instead of practicing this work in daily life among others, the monks mistakenly isolate themselves: [1]

They lock themselves away in remote meditation huts.

They have the doors bricked up completely, leaving only a tiny slot to pass through a piece of bread and a cup of water.

They spend years in darkness trying to master their inner nature in complete solitude. [1]

Gurdjieff uses this story to critique human error. He argues that real spiritual crystallization

cannot happen in a vacuum—it requires the "friction" of interacting with other difficult human beings. [1]

2. How the "

13:35:28 From Gwynne Mayer : about the Tibetan Monks in this chapter AI

13:35:31 From Gwynne Mayer : In Beelzebub's Tales to His Grandson, Gurdjieff describes how Tibetan monks in isolation completely mismanage their intellectual, emotional, and moving centers, leading to "wrong crystallization". The monks' lack of external, real-world experience causes their three brains to operate in a disconnected, distorted, and purely subjective state, preventing true inner development. [1, 2, 3, 4]

The monks' intense, solitary suffering actually strengthens their ego, creating a rigid and false inner stability, which is a key concept explained in. Ultimately, Gurdjieff concludes that true transformation requires the simultaneous and balanced development of all three centers, rather than the artificial, single-centered focus of isolation. [1, 2, 3]

AI Summary Meeting 37

EU Session

Quick recap

This was meeting number 37 where Robin Bloor read Chapter 22 of Gurdjieff's "Beelzebub's Tales" about Beelzebub's first journey to Tibet. The group discussed various interpretations of the passage, including the symbolism of wild beings, the meaning of "poison arrows," and connections to Buddhist sects. Participants explored how the story serves as an allegory for negative emotions and the challenges of spiritual practice, with particular focus on the role of women and the distinction between intellectual understanding and genuine inner work. The conversation also touched on Gurdjieff's possible connections to Tibetan Buddhism and the use of AI tools in studying Gurdjieff's writings, with Robin sharing his plans to create software products and translations while emphasizing the importance of maintaining human intellectual capabilities rather than relying solely on AI.

Next steps

Gwynne

- Send Robin the AI-generated content about the parable of the poison arrow and its link to the "Beelzebub's Tales" paragraph.

Michelle

- Continue developing the website for aligning translations of Gurdjieff's writings in multiple languages (English, German, French, Russian, possibly Spanish and Italian).

Robin

- Add Gwynne's AI content to the group's notes/chat for others to read.
- Look through the box of writings sent by Gwynne for material related to Nyland.
- Consider using AI to collate and make sense of notes from four different groups studying the tales.

Summary

Tibet Journey and Sect Teachings

Robin Bloor led meeting number 37 and read Chapter 22 from Beelzebub's teachings about a journey through Tibet. The discussion covered the challenges of traveling through dangerous terrain, including encounters with wild animals and the need for nighttime protection. The conversation ended with an explanation of the sect called Self-Tamers who had migrated to an isolated location and later split into Orthodox Hayadoraki and Katoshki Hayadoraki factions due to disagreements about their special form of suffering.

Text Analysis and Interpretation Discussion

The group discussed themes from a text, including how people who believe different things tend to isolate themselves from others who don't share their beliefs, and the unique portrayal of women as having common sense compared to men. Ronald noted the text's emphasis on women and the

role of negative emotions in relation to three-brained beings. Robin suggested interpreting nighttime as a state of mechanical behavior associated with negative emotions, contrasting with daytime presence. The discussion also touched on the significance of undertaking a journey without a caravan, implying it was an experience not suitable for ordinary people.

Gurdjieff-Tibetan Connections Discussion

Gwynne and Robin discussed connections between Gurdjieff and Tibet, including a book by Lane Negrin that explores Gurdjieff's possible role as an advisor to the Dalai Lama during the Tsarist Russian period. Robin mentioned that Rodney Collin had investigated the Tibetan Book of the Dead as part of his research on eternal life theory. The conversation touched on various historical and textual connections, including Gurdjieff's background and influences from different religious and philosophical traditions.

Zoroastrianism and Related Traditions Discussion

Gwynne discussed their long-standing interest in Zoroastrianism, which began in the 1960s with a Zoroastrian contact in England and their belief that Gurdjieff had significant influence on the tradition. Robin shared insights about Zoroastrianism's relationship with Shia Islam and mentioned their contact with Mojahid, an Afghan who had a Shiite teacher in Iran. The conversation touched on the Yazidi religion's connection to Zoroastrianism and its oral tradition, as well as Gwynne's perspective on the potential return of a prophet in the form of group consciousness rather than an individual person.

Gurdjieff Text Interpretations Discussion

The group discussed interpretations of Gurdjieff's text, focusing on the meaning of "Durak" (stupid person) and "poison arrows" from El Naparra. Robin expressed uncertainty about the meaning of poison arrows, while Ronald suggested they represented dangerous beings that biped workers killed against their religious beliefs to protect themselves. The discussion also touched on Gurdjieff's possible foresight about AI and financial markets, though the participants were unsure about these interpretations.

Intellectual Engagement with Complex Material

The group discussed the nature of intellectual engagement with dense material, with Gwynne suggesting that truly understanding complex work requires letting go of intellectual orthodoxy rather than forcing it into systematic frameworks. Stefon shared insights about the importance of experiencing work at a deeper level rather than focusing solely on productivity, emphasizing the value of allowing material to wash over rather than trying to contain and understand it immediately. The conversation concluded with Gwynne sharing observations about silverback gorilla behavior and their 98% genetic similarity to humans, though the transcript ended before completing this discussion.

Mountain Gorilla Behavior Discussion

The group discussed the behavior of mountain gorillas in Uganda, with Gwynne explaining that these animals operate at high altitudes and must be approached carefully, requiring participants to turn their backs when gorillas approach. Robin and Ronald explored the concept of "one-brain beings" in a text, with Ronald suggesting this might refer to insects or other simple organisms, while Robin noted the author's meticulous attention to detail made errors unlikely. The discussion concluded with a brief mention of poison arrows and their metaphorical connection to attention and self-remembering.

Buddhist Poison Arrow Parable Discussion

The group discussed the Buddhist poison arrow parable, which Gwynne explained illustrates the danger of intellectual overthinking when facing suffering. Stefan connected the parable to the concept of piercing through illusions and recognizing inner causes of disharmony. Gwynne noted that Gurdjieff held similar views, mocking intellectuals who theorize about higher realities while failing to control basic emotions. Robin shared an AI discovery suggesting that "Elna" in the text might be derived from an Armenian verb meaning "to rise" combined with a Greek prefix "para" meaning "beside or beyond," potentially providing a new interpretation of the parable's origin.

Etymology and Cultural Origins Discussion

The group discussed etymology and the meaning of words, particularly focusing on Sanskrit and Tibetan origins. Robin mentioned plans to compile notes from four different groups studying tales into AI to create a consolidated summary. The conversation also touched on Gurdjieff's background in the Caucasus region, where different armies and religions frequently clashed, and Robin provided historical context about religious tolerance and the Armenian genocide in the region.

AI and Consciousness Discussion

Robin discussed his observations of Rina Hans, describing how even highly evolved conscious individuals can experience negative emotions and how they handle them differently. The group explored the use of AI in their work, with Robin explaining his approach to using AI for software development while maintaining control over the creative process. Gwynne inquired about translating Gurdjieff's works across multiple languages, and Robin recommended contacting Michelle who is working on multilingual translations, noting that current AI cannot fully appreciate the nuances between different language versions.

Meeting #37

US Session Transcript

Present: Robin, Sandy, Stephen, Derek, et al.

Stephen Frantz: One thing that one generalization.

Stephen Frantz: that occurred to me in terms of what he's saying about the whole... all the teachings of Buddha.

Stephen Frantz: And what he's about to say about the Tibetan version...

Stephen Frantz: It seems as though.

Stephen Frantz: The huge mistake they made, the huge distortion.

Stephen Frantz: or deviation from Buddha's real teachings, is that they're almost...

Stephen Frantz: Either denying the existence of the involutionary process, or somehow feeling that it is so...

Stephen Frantz: Uh, threatening.

Stephen Frantz: that the only way to get rid of Kundabuffer is to almost abnegate the entire process of involution, or to separate yourself from it, in order to live in this kind of...

Stephen Frantz: evolutionary updraft.

Stephen Frantz: Hoping that you will arrive in heaven without having to deal with any of the messiness of earth.

Stephen Frantz: Which is certainly...

Stephen Frantz: one way of practicing Buddhism that I have seen. I don't think it's true to the teaching, I mean, or to the way it's even presented today, but I've seen certain people take it in that direction.

Sandy W: That's a big topic, and I'm not sure...

Sandy W: That we addressed it enough here.

Sandy W: in the reading that we did today.

Sandy W: I don't know how far to take discussion of it.

Sandy W: Because of that, but if what I'm hearing you right is that.

Sandy W: You know Buddhists who...

Sandy W: don't want to participate in the messiness and the suffering of the Earth, and it's like, I know lots of people that don't want to participate in.

Sandy W: the suffering of the earth, and yet I think it's unavoidable.

Sandy W: And, uh...

Sandy W: You know.

Sandy W: What we're going to come upon in.

Sandy W: The monastery here is beautiful.

Sandy W: It's really bizarre. If you talk about —.

Sandy W: Intentional suffering. Boy, that's some pretty ***** stuff, but we're not there yet, so I shouldn't say anything about it.

Sandy W: But what we can talk about, the wild beings, I think they seem to be...

Sandy W: so prominent in these first few paragraphs.

Stephen Frantz: What do you think their metaphorical meaning is, Sandra? Does anything occur to you?

Sandy W: Well, yeah, I'm looking for it inside, yeah, it's sort of like...

Sandy W: There gotta be eyes in me that are these wild beings.

Sandy W: That, just.

Sandy W: Kill off, say, the horses, which are, you know.

Sandy W: emotional centers. And.

Sandy W: So, um...

Sandy W: Almost, uh, pick one. Which one do you want to be? A lion, a tiger, a bear?

Sandy W: But they seem to be more vicious in Sanctuatorza.

Sandy W: Not to mention, that's a really unusual name, Bobby.

Sandy W: Cinco Torres.

Barbara Pennock: Yes, it is.

Barbara Pennock: I think the neologians, the Greek says, it is the union of two against a third.

Barbara Pennock: To rule together a settlement.

Barbara Pennock: And then we had something else along the way. Maybe I'll come across it for it.

Barbara Pennock: But the paragraph that...

Barbara Pennock: got me about the wild beings on the first paragraph on 254.

Barbara Pennock: These wild beings, particularly the smallest of them, were at that time already also, of course, owing to the abnormally established conditions of the ordinary being existence of

the three-brain being there.

Barbara Pennock: Perfective regards apprehending this and cunning of the ideal.

Barbara Pennock: I'm trying to have a hard time about this small thing. I don't know.

Sandy W: That struck me, too, in terms of —.

Sandy W: Perfection of cunning.

Sandy W: And it's all... it makes you kind of shudder.

Barbara Pennock: Like you said, yeah.

Robert Posen: It sounds like to me that those small beings are microbes.

Robert Posen: Um, causing all dysentery and all those dengue fevers and all that stuff.

Barbara Pennock: Oh, good.

Robert Posen: What's interesting to me is that it seems like we've taught them this.

Robert Posen: He talks about crystallizing the function in them, and he. Then he just dumps it. He doesn't say, I'm gonna. I'll talk about it later.

Robert Posen: But have we... have we taught these two... one and two brain beings.

Robert Posen: Um, our own cunningness, so they have to fight back.

Derek: Beelzebub tells us about that later on pages 877.

Derek: in 878, where he says that cowardice by humans is perceived by.

Derek: one and two brain beings as enmities and thus a menace to themselves.

Derek: I think there's something weird with the lists of the wild beings, too. Like, there's... first, he gives us...

Derek: Poor, like, beasts of burden.

Derek: And then.

Derek: 3 of.

Derek: predators. And then and then there's similar lists later in the book on like 795. There's the list of eight creatures.

Derek: that are dangerous to humans. And then on 877, where he talks about human cowardice, um, there's a list of seven creatures, and it's repeated twice.

Derek: So I don't know what's going on with that.

Sandy W: Name the creatures for us.

Sandy W: Or is it in front of you?

Derek: I I could find them pretty quickly.

Sandy W: Okay.

Derek: So...

Derek: on 795...

Derek: They are.

Derek: Hyenas, cats, wolves, lions, tigers, wild dogs, bogushis.

Derek: frogs, and many others.

Derek: I neglected to look up Bugushis. Like I came across that and I kind of ran out of time to find out what that's supposed to be.

Derek: And then on 877...

Derek: They are.

Derek: Tigers, lions, bears, hyenas, snakes, phalanges, scorpions, and so on. And then he mentions that list again. Phalanges is as in meetings, which is what Pagosian gets stung by.

Derek: Gurchief says it's like a type of yellow tarantula or something.

Robert Posen: That Pegosian reminds me that he talks about a score, which is 20 of beings that he...

Robert Posen: What's the word? He curates or procures, I guess. 20 is the amount of fingers we have and toes.

Robert Posen: And, um...

Robert Posen: How did I get to the 4? Yeah, um...

Robert Posen: Is there a foreignness somewhere he talks about? I don't have my book in front of me.

Robert Posen: Um, but, um, it sounds like it's the moving center somewhere.

Robert Posen: Kaspagosian did always work with his moving center, and I thought that this was kind of like an attack on...

Robert Posen: these wild beings on our moving center, or a moving center on ourselves. Something like what we... we have to... the wildness of our own desires.

Robert Posen: somehow attack us.

Robin Bloor: One of the things that seems to make no sense to me is when he talks about.

Robin Bloor: Wild, one-brained beings.

Robin Bloor: You know, like snails and slugs.

Robin Bloor: Coming at you at speed towards you.

Robin Bloor: Armed to the teeth, if they were but to have teeth.

Sandy W: Would that refer maybe to Robert's microbes? Are they one brain beings or no brain?

Robin Bloor: They're not one brain. The the the scheme.

Robin Bloor: of, um...

Robin Bloor: of one brain, two brain and three brain beings is.

Robin Bloor: the one center, two center, and three center. So one brain being has got a, um...

Robin Bloor: A moving center, an instinctive center.

Robin Bloor: And they normally have, well, they don't have an internal skeleton, they don't have vertebrae, they aren't.

Robin Bloor: They're invertebrates. They normally have an exoskeleton of some sort or other.

Robin Bloor: Insects have exoskeletons, but so do mussels and...

Robin Bloor: Crabs and whatever.

Stephen Frantz: Well, to pick up on what Sandy was saying earlier about wild things being the things within ourselves which prey upon us, or...

Stephen Frantz: Resist our becoming more conscious when he one brain beings. Could he also be talking about us when we when we behave as though we only had one brain? We have three brains available.

Stephen Frantz: But we don't use them.

Stephen Frantz: uh, properly, or in a balanced way, and sometimes we don't even use all three of them at all. So are there times when I am behaving like a one-brain being.

Stephen Frantz: In which case.

Stephen Frantz: If the one brain... if the first brain is all about moving center, but also just about physical survival and the external world.

Stephen Frantz: To what extent do I let that brain.

Stephen Frantz: Completely predominate.

Stephen Frantz: to the exclusion of the other two brains and govern my behavior. As though there's always something to be worried about in the outside world, or there's always some unseen threat that's about to get me.

Stephen Frantz: When in fact there isn't. It's just the one brain being behaving as though without having any conversation with the other two brains at all.

Barbara Pennock: Regards apprehendingness and cunning up to the ideal.

Stephen Frantz: Yeah.

Stephen Frantz: Yeah I mean is there any link between that and frequent references to the ways we make mountains out of molehills?

Stephen Frantz: Or let the smallest things hijack us.

Stephen Frantz: And create exaggerated fears in us, like the mouse and the bedclothes.

Stephen Frantz: That's a one brain reaction.

Sandy W: This whole passage is peculiar and nightmarish, I think.

Sandy W: Uh, right from, uh...

Sandy W: a get-go.

Sandy W: And it's like, yeah, I never really wanted to think about Tibet as being a nightmarish place.

Sandy W: That sets it up for me.

Sandy W: And that, uh...

Sandy W: What you say about regarding it up to the ideal.

Sandy W: That is particularly, uh...

Sandy W: Not something you want to think about.

Sandy W: one or two brain beings doing.

Sandy W: Uh, as having that much coming.

Sandy W: Up to some.

Sandy W: viciousness that is an ideal that.

Sandy W: Maybe a three brain being would help.

Sandy W: I just want to read this one more time because it's like I haven't absorbed it yet.

Sandy W: It's about four, four little paragraphs. It said wild beings there were at that period particularly dangerous, both for the three brain beings there and also for those forms of quadruped beings there, which are favorites.

Sandy W: With the cunning proper to them.

Sandy W: had already been able to make slaves. Okay, I get it now. It's, um... we made slaves of the quadruped beings, and compelled them to work exclusively for the satisfaction of our egoistic needs.

Sandy W: Okay.

Sandy W: That wasn't sinking in. Now I understand where the slavery comes, the enslavement of

animals right there.

Sandy W: And the wild things were particularly dangerous then only because there was being crystallized in them just at that period.

Sandy W: In the presence of such wild beings, that special function which arose in them also owing to abnormally established conditions of being existence.

Sandy W: of the three brain beings there, and about which special function I will explain to you in detail.

Sandy W: So, the wild beings were undergoing a change because of something that the three brain beings are doing, as well as the, uh...

Sandy W: Quiber pets that are being enslaved.

Sandy W: I think I just made things more complicated and stranger.

Stephen Frantz: Well, as I listen to your talk, Sandy, I'm wondering whether there's an analogy between quadrupeds and the carriage.

Stephen Frantz: Because a carriage tends to have four wheels.

Stephen Frantz: When he talks about the quadruped beings that we've made our slaves, is he talking about the way we've made.

Stephen Frantz: The body, the slave.

Stephen Frantz: of our own egoistic tendencies.

Stephen Frantz: And, um...

Stephen Frantz: Distorted personalities.

Sandy W: Well, and the horse is the quarter fed too as well, so.

Stephen Frantz: Yep.

Sandy W: I just wasn't able to make that, couldn't quite make that work in my mind, but I think you are.

Barbara Pennock: Well, it leaves us to wonder what this special function is. How long will we have to wait? I don't know.

Robert Posen: Derek said page 800 where she talks about cowardice.

Barbara Pennock: Okay, you're good.

Derek: It's 877.

Derek: Also, though, I wonder why Beelzebub doesn't try to correct the self-tamers.

Derek: Like it seems like he could easily do so like he messes around with inserts his own fictions into religious teachings and other stories.

Derek: So why didn't he, like, help them out?

Derek: Tell them what the Buddha's true teaching was.

Robin Bloor: It's not really in his nature to interfere unless he's got a...

Robin Bloor: Attach.

Robin Bloor: It's also the case that he doesn't appear to have.

Robin Bloor: Any interest at all in the perfection of them?

Robin Bloor: three brain beings directly in the sense of wishing to help them out. What he normally does is turns up, tells lies and stops them from.

Robin Bloor: basically sacrificing two brain beings.

Barbara Pennock: And here, maybe the schism balances it out.

Robin Bloor: One of those things, you know, when...

Robin Bloor: You're out in the wilds of America, camping out, and you hear noises in the night coming around, you know, the campfire, and you all huddle up in front of the campfire.

Robin Bloor: And all of these strange sounds. And what do they sound like? It sounds like the stock market.

Sandy W: Yeah.

Robin Bloor: Well, scary.

Robert Posen: So, Robin, that's greed, right? Stock market greed, and the other one was, um...

Robert Posen: These guys that are running for office, and that would be, um...

Robert Posen: Something like lying or flattery?

Robert Posen: So those are all things that we have, those kleshas, those...

Robin Bloor: I don't know. He's very vague about the office they're running for.

Robin Bloor: It's not like they're going to be President of the United States or anything. It's they're just running for the office of something or other.

Robin Bloor: You know we're gonna elect a president of the.

Robin Bloor: I don't know, the, um, the local committee for keeping the golf course clean, or something like that. I mean, you know.

Robin Bloor: It it it doesn't give you the feeling of having much meaning, whereas at least the stock market is is kind of a.

Robin Bloor: a clear indication of something.

Sandy W: Well, before we go much further, this is.

Sandy W: Different from what we're talking about. A-E-I-O-U-E-A.

Sandy W: Makes an appearance here.

Sandy W: Not in connection with remorse.

Sandy W: Or is it in connection with remorse?

Sandy W: Proceeds in the active element, Okie the Noke.

Sandy W: And I didn't remember that it ever proceeded in the act development. I'll keep a note, but I don't tend to remember that process very well, so.

Robin Bloor: You can take, if you want, you can regard the wild beasts as just.

Robin Bloor: Negative emotions.

Robin Bloor: You can regard the night time as being when you're.

Robin Bloor: Not present.

Robin Bloor: And you can regard the daytime as when you have presence, when you, let's say, are self-remembering or able to self-remember.

Robin Bloor: Then the whole thing is, um...

Robin Bloor: as such an allegory.

Robin Bloor: For working on yourself.

Robin Bloor: Uh, and that would mean that, um, in that case, the IOLO is, is remorse.

Robin Bloor: The feeling of remorse that you get.

Robin Bloor: You see, there are things here that just don't really make much sense, and that's not unusual for the tales, but...

Robin Bloor: If all of these crazy people that have been in Pearland are all going up to Tibet.

Robin Bloor: to establish these monasteries.

Robin Bloor: Then why would it be the case that he couldn't find a caravan?

Robin Bloor: Because there are people going them.

Robin Bloor: So that doesn't make a whole set of logical sense.

Robin Bloor: He might not have wanted to travel with them, but that isn't what he says. He says nobody's going in this direction, and then away he goes.

Robin Bloor: We're also...

Robin Bloor: We're going up the mountain here, so.

Robin Bloor: Metaphorically speaking, we're ascending.

Stephen Frantz: Also, there's this juxtaposition of these wild things.

Stephen Frantz: and taming. The wild things can't be tamed, and yet he's come across the self-tamers.

Stephen Frantz: So...

Stephen Frantz: He's... he seems to be...

Stephen Frantz: Saying that the self-tamers.

Stephen Frantz: We're trying to subdue the wild things by isolating themselves or building a wall, a monastery wall between them and the wildness.

Stephen Frantz: Whereas...

Stephen Frantz: that particular methodology doesn't work and in fact the bipeds were forbidden to even kill the wild things with these ill Nasapi and I can't I can't see the word so I can't remember the pronunciation but those those arrows so.

Stephen Frantz: The wild things can prey upon you, but at the same time, it's forbidden to kill them.

Stephen Frantz: And at the same time, those who have tried to.

Stephen Frantz: Deal with them by isolating themselves from it have become something.

Stephen Frantz: Um, rather grotesque.

Robert Posen: Stephen, I really like what you said. And it's the women that are also trying to change them.

Robert Posen: They are taming the men, aren't they?

Robert Posen: or something.

Robert Posen: Um, there's one wild thing that I came across this week, and that was, you know, in the story of Gilgamesh.

Robert Posen: The wild man was Enkidu.

Robert Posen: he was searching for a friend who was a wild man, and Enkidu was friends with all these wild beasts. He couldn't be tamed until he slept with the woman.

Stephen Frantz: Yes.

Robert Posen: Uh, who was a priestess, kind of.

Robert Posen: And then the wild beast.

Robert Posen: said, okay, we're not friends with you in Quito anymore, and that's when he became civilized with Gilgamesh.

Robert Posen: So there's something to do about the female *** in that story, for sure.

Stephen Frantz: Yup.

Stephen Frantz: That's funny you should mention that because this is a little off the off the mark. But I was listening to an interview with these two women, one Israeli and one Palestinian, who have come up with a new model for how to solve this problem in Gaza and Israel.

Stephen Frantz: Uh, called Land for All, and as they began to talk about it.

Stephen Frantz: you realize that they weren't really coming up with some new policy model that has not been proposed before. What they were talking about was the absolute necessity of bringing the conflicting parties into relationship with each other. And I thought to myself, that's what women do.

Stephen Frantz: instinctively that men don't do, and it's why I've often thought we'd be much better off if women, rather than men, tended to run governments.

Stephen Frantz: Because their first instinct is to say, we've got a difficult problem here, and it's messy, and it's not going to be easy to deal with, but the only way we're going to be able to deal with it.

Stephen Frantz: is to bring ourselves into relationship with it and with each other even though we are at this point enemies and we can't predict what the process will give forth but at least if you don't do that we know one thing and that's that nothing will ever change.

Stephen Frantz: So, it's like, these women that created this schism are like saying to the men, until you come into relationship with these wild beasts.

Stephen Frantz: You may think you have tamed them and tamed yourself, but in fact, you have not. You simply haven't dealt with the problem. And so, there's no third force. Nothing new can happen.

Robin Bloor: the wild beasts, then, in... in that, um, interpretation, which I think is fine.

Robin Bloor: The wild beasts correspond to the unpleasant manifestations of others.

Stephen Frantz: That's very good. Yeah, which picks up on that theme that that's what Buddha taught. Yep, that makes a lot of sense.

Robin Bloor: I'm going to read something out, and the reason for reading it out is...

Robin Bloor: I had never up until today.

Robin Bloor: made any sense of the poison arrows of El Naparra.

Robin Bloor: The poison arrow comes from one of the Buddha's most quoted teaching stories.

Robin Bloor: The parable of the poisoned arrows.

Robin Bloor: Found in some Sutra aura.

Robin Bloor: The setup is a monk named.

Robin Bloor: Malung Hiappuka.

Robin Bloor: who grows frustrated that the Buddha refuses to pronounce on a set of grand metaphysical questions.

Robin Bloor: Such as whether the cosmos is eternal or not, whether it is finite or infinite, whether the soul, the self, and the body are identical or distinct.

Robin Bloor: Whether an enlightened one continues to exist after death.

Robin Bloor: So Malinkeputta effectively issues an ultimatum.

Robin Bloor: Um, he says, answer these questions or I'll abandon the training that he was receiving.

Robin Bloor: I'll take my I'll take my ball and go home.

Robin Bloor: The body replies with the simple with the simile.

Robin Bloor: Imagine a man struck by an arrow, thickly smeared with poison.

Robin Bloor: His friends fetch a surgeon, but the man says.

Robin Bloor: I won't let this arrow be pulled out until I know who shot me.

Robin Bloor: And his name and clan, whether he was tall or short, dark or fair, what town he came from, and what kind of beau it was.

Robin Bloor: Um, what the bowstring was made of, the type of shaft, the feathering, the arrowhead.

Robin Bloor: The man would die long before any of that was settled.

Robin Bloor: The point is that the metaphysical questions are like the wounded man's demands. They are not prerequisite for the work that actually matters.

Robin Bloor: Whether or not the universe is eternal.

Robin Bloor: The Buddha says, there is birth, there is aging, there is death.

Robin Bloor: There is, uh, there is sorrow, lamentation, pain, grief, and despair. And it is the ending of these, here and now, that he teaches. He calls the speculative questions undeclared.

Robin Bloor: Because answering them is not connected with the goal.

Robin Bloor: Uh, does not belong to the fundamentals of the holy life, and does not lead to disenchantment.

Robin Bloor: to dispassion.

Robin Bloor: To cessation, to peace, to direct knowledge, to enlightenment.

Robin Bloor: And then we've got the word El Naparra, and it appears that Elva.

Robin Bloor: is the future subjunctive stem of the Armenian verb.

Robin Bloor: To rise, to go out.

Robin Bloor: to emerge.

Robin Bloor: To exit, to ascend.

Robin Bloor: Pair it with para, which is Greek.

Robin Bloor: Uh, which means beside, beyond, contrary, or an Armenian suffix, one of Gurdjieff's own compounding syllables. Uh, and the word leans towards something like that which rises out or emerges besides.

Robin Bloor: It goes beyond.

Robin Bloor: That is a philosophical speculation.

Robin Bloor: So my assumption is that Gurdjieff knew this. Um.

Robin Bloor: story of Buddhas, and he's thrown this in.

Robin Bloor: In the most obscure way you can imagine.

Robin Bloor: But if someone's got a better explanation, I am eager to hear it.

Robert Posen: Robin, I can't go beyond that. That's wonderful. The Buddha says, Bhagati, Gati, Pada, Gati, Pada, Samgati, Bodhisatt.

Robert Posen: Beyond, beyond. I've gone beyond the other shore. That's wonderful work.

Robin Bloor: I'll put that in the, um...

Robin Bloor: English text share.

Derek: From what I looked up, Elna's from ancient Greek and linked to like a shining light or a bright torch.

Derek: So I thought they were like flaming arrows.

Derek: Also, how does the Buddha's position fit with the third conscious striving to know more and more about the laws of world creation and world maintenance?

Robin Bloor: Well.

Robin Bloor: There isn't really a lot that's known about Buddha's teaching, his direct teaching. It's the eight rightful paths.

Robin Bloor: And you can interpret those in whatever way you want.

Robin Bloor: But it...

Robin Bloor: It makes no sense.

Robin Bloor: direct reference to knowing ever more and more about world creation and world maintenance.

Robin Bloor: It just doesn't.

Robin Bloor: But to know exactly what the Buddha taught, well.

Robin Bloor: We don't know, really. We only know what has been written down. And Gurdjieff is insisting that that's mostly garbage.

Robin Bloor: Robert, are you going to say what the Durakian are?

Robert Posen: Oh, yeah, yeah. Deraki means fool in Russian.

Robert Posen: Duraki are fools, so these Orthodoxy and whatever the other one was are fools.

Robert Posen: Orthodox fools and pure fools. I think the other... I looked up the etymology of Katosh... Katosh... Katoshki for, uh, Hyderaki.

Robert Posen: So the HY...

Robin Bloor: Satoshi means potato.

Robert Posen: Potato, yeah.

Robin Bloor: The potato idiots and the potato idiots in Russia are the ones that live off vodka.

Robert Posen: Right.

Robert Posen: Katoshki, that's right.

Robert Posen: Robin, in a sense.

Robert Posen: Going beyond here.

Robert Posen: I'm in the Armenian.

Robert Posen: We go beyond speculations and.

Robert Posen: The thought behind it, like trying to blame somebody, is that the beyond that you were saying?

Robin Bloor: I don't know, actually. I mean, this is just... this is etymology. I'm trying to twist etymology to imply a particular meaning.

Robin Bloor: But we have a context, so we're going to twist it towards the context, but it might not be that.

Robert Posen: Right.

Robin Bloor: It's just one of those things. It's um.

Robin Bloor: It isn't such a tight fit that you can say very definitely what this is.

Robin Bloor: It's just that at least it's something.

Robin Bloor: The the females objecting.

Robin Bloor: It may just be there's a distinction between the intellectual side and the emotional side.

Robin Bloor: Um, it might not mean specifically females. I mean, it could mean females, but.

Robin Bloor: Normally when you've got a mention like that in the tales, you can also throw in the emotional side.

Sandy W: These are two really minor points.

Sandy W: In the 1931 edition, he consistently calls Pearl Land Jim Chania.

Sandy W: I'm wondering, why did he switch?

Sandy W: Was there any particular reason to?

Robert Posen: Say that again, Sandy. What was it?

Sandy W: In the 1931 edition, he consistently refers in this reading to Pearl Land.

Sandy W: as Jim Chania. So 1950, it's Pearl Land.

Sandy W: But he still...

Sandy W: Sticking with that rather more, I think, romantic term, gymkhanian sounds just so pretty to me.

Sandy W: So, uh...

Sandy W: I'm sure that's not what affected him at all, but there you go.

Barbara Pennock: I see in the next couple of pages, he brings in Jim Chania again, and, like, I just... I don't understand. Did he just slip it in?

Sandy W: Yep.

Barbara Pennock: Do you have an idea, Derek, how that happened?

Derek: I'm sorry, but what happened?

Barbara Pennock: where he...

Derek: Oh, no.

Robin Bloor: Oh, no.

Derek: I don't have any ideas.

Sandy W: I do. What she... what she's trying to say is, why is he using, uh, Jim... Jim Chania.

Derek: Oh.

Sandy W: and Pearl Land interchangeably.

Sandy W: Uh, in this, in, in this, in these pad, in these pages.

Derek: Yeah, I don't know why he would do that. I did notice that there's a lot of, as I have already told you, as I have already told you in this passage.

Derek: And.

Derek: sometimes that's a way that, um, Beelzebub lies to his grandson, because he'll tell him stuff... he'll say that he told him stuff that's not quite the case. But I don't think that's... that's happened in these passages.

Sandy W: Feels well, boys.

Sandy W: Well, my other, uh, point is just a clarification for me. Did we not say a couple of weeks ago that the same Buddha that we're talking about recently.

Sandy W: Uh, it's not necessarily... it can't be the Buddha that we talk about.

Sandy W: In modern times.

Sandy W: Beelzebub Saint Buddha is another Buddha.

Sandy W: Did we... and did I get that wrong, or...

Sandy W: Did we agree to that?

Derek: How would we know if his actual teaching was never transmitted?

Derek: Cheers.

Sandy W: Yeah.

Robin Bloor: The problem is that the word buddha means enlightened.

Sandy W: All right.

Robin Bloor: So there could be any number of buddhas, but the...

Robin Bloor: The placing of this in Poland at the time of Merrill Placey and.

Robin Bloor: Uh, particularly Amish.

Robin Bloor: is well before Sumer, and Buddha was well after Sumer, so it's anachronism.

Sandy W: Well, I thought that was the case, and uh...

Sandy W: What would be the significance of that, if any?

Sandy W: I mean, in some sense, none, because...

Sandy W: Oona is, uh...

Sandy W: It's sent from the absolute and doesn't matter when he came or how many of them came.

Sandy W: The message might still be the same whenever.

Sandy W: I'm just speculating on that.

Sandy W: Would the teaching have been the same?

Robin Bloor: There isn't anything in the Buddha's teaching that is, um...

Robin Bloor: Uh, about bearing the unpleasant manifestations of other people. Specifically, those aren't... that isn't an idea that emerges.

Robin Bloor: The money thing I read when I had an interest in Buddhism.

Sandy W: That's one thing.

Sandy W: I brought that one to mind.

Sandy W: That's one that...

Sandy W: I think.

Sandy W: Don't we use that one a lot?

Sandy W: In the work.

Stephen Frantz: Use what a lot, Sandy?

Sandy W: Uh, bearing the unpleasant manifestations of others.

Sandy W: Don't we use that one a lot in the work?

Barbara Pennock: I'd like to say yes, but probably not as often as we should.

Janet M Mitchell: And maybe a small point, but to this point about the \$8 million.

Janet M Mitchell: The Eightfold Path. The description of right effort is diligently cultivating positive qualities and abandoning negative thoughts and actions.

Janet M Mitchell: So there might be some relevance here.

Robin Bloor: There's an awful lot of quotes being put around things here that makes you think that in one way or another.

Robin Bloor: Something else is mentioned. The word wild is always quoted.

Robin Bloor: They came there from very remote parts of the continent, Ashdod, for the purpose, as it said there, of hunting, but hunting in quotes.

Robin Bloor: And then later.

Robin Bloor: Um, punning is in quotes.

Robin Bloor: We have by day and night. We have night in, quote, state called sleep. Oh, cold. When it's cold, that's okay.

Robert Posen: Could the hunting refer to beings that are hunters?

Robert Posen: Like, remember when they were, uh, the hunters were in Pearland, they came from somewhere else.

Robert Posen: In order to hunt these beings.

Robert Posen: I know he's called them 1 and 2, and we're, uh, thinking that they're, um...

Robert Posen: animals, but maybe the animals are human.

Robin Bloor: Oh, well, I mean, I suppose if we're going to take them as, um, negative emotions, then they are human.

Barbara Pennock: Right, we're not having any.

Robert Posen: And would those negative emotions be hunting us?

Stephen Frantz: Yeah, it's interesting. What what in me does do my negative emotions use as food?

Stephen Frantz: What are they consuming in me for their food?

Stephen Frantz: Keep in mind.

Robert Posen: When we keep accounts, we're eating ourselves, basically.

Robin Bloor: Pretty good.

Stephen Frantz: Yeah.

Robin Bloor: When we come across.

Robin Bloor: A paragraph like like the following on.

Robin Bloor: And the adherents of any sect are sectarians for other beings only so long as they have no guns and ships. But as soon as they get hold of a sufficient number of guns and ships.

Robin Bloor: Then what had been a peculiar sect that once becomes the dominant religion?

Robin Bloor: Well, I read that, and I think that it's this is just um.

Robin Bloor: a mundane.

Robin Bloor: observation that that.

Robin Bloor: The faith that belongs to the people with power is the faith that tends to predominate.

Robin Bloor: I can't, and I...

Robin Bloor: presume there's another meaning involved in this, or another way of looking at this.

Robin Bloor: Because that's just too mundane and it's been said before and so on.

Derek: Well, I think the mention of, well, guns at least.

Derek: sets us up for what happens later in Tibet.

Derek: with like a European invasion.

Robin Bloor: English invasion.

Robin Bloor: Get your prejudices right.

Derek: Does it say it's English, really?

Derek: I thought it was just European.

Robert Posen: No, Young Husbandman was definitely British.

Robert Posen: Francis' young husband, he was British.

Robin Bloor: You see, the thing is that the guns and ships are in quotes.

Sandy W: Well, then I guess we have to ask ourselves.

Sandy W: What is the metaphorical meaning of guns and ships? Guns? Death?

Sandy W: Do they have any other function?

Sandy W: In ships, transportation.

Sandy W: Not necessarily death, but the means of carrying.

Sandy W: one place to another, moving one place to another.

Sandy W: So guns, getting rid of guns.

Sandy W: The other sectarians.

Sandy W: sect ideas.

Sandy W: And

Sandy W: Chips

Sandy W: Transportation, always useful.

Sandy W: Transporting your own.

Sandy W: Ideas.

Sandy W: feelings to.

Sandy W: Other people, or other... other groups.

Sandy W: So it becomes a means of war. Guns and ships become a means of mutual destruction.

Robin Bloor: And those ships are battleships and cruisers, aren't they? They're not cargo ships.

Sandy W: Doesn't say so, but definitely.

Sandy W: Definitely have to include the battleships.

Sandy W: Basically, they're means of destruction, then.

Sandy W: and destroying the other sects.

Sandy W: No sooner does a new common Havatner, Brennoni, or religion.

Sandy W: arise, then it breaks up into sects. Well, it arises from... what does it arise from? It arises from...

Sandy W: These ideas and direct instructions from the Buddha or.

Sandy W: What other, uh, whatever other...

Sandy W: Person has been sent down.

Sandy W: From the, I can't think of the word, sorry.

Sandy W: Colin, Colin, where did you get this?

Sandy W: The other advisors from, from, uh...

Sandy W: From the Almighty?

Sandy W: Sent down.

Sandy W: And...

Sandy W: No sooner are the instructions sent out than they become...

Sandy W: Corrupted?

Sandy W: by the sectarians.

Sandy W: that formed the religion of the ideas.

Sandy W: And then set out to destroy each other.

Sandy W: and become the dominant sect. I'm sorry, I need to stop talking.

Janet M Mitchell: I studied that section as well, and in terms of the...

Janet M Mitchell: the AI agent that I worked with to sort of understand that a little bit. I thought these were interesting observations. And that exact same paragraph, Sandy. And three observations is what Claude presented.

Janet M Mitchell: First, the schism is universal and automatic. It's a feature of how distorted human psyches receive any teaching, not a bug of a particular tradition.

Janet M Mitchell: Second, that, um, sect is always applied from the outside, never from the inside. This is an observation about the impossibility of self-evaluation from the inside of a belief system.

Janet M Mitchell: And then the last one being, um, the difference between a sect and a dominant religion is purely military and commercial power. Orthodoxy is a function of conquest, not truth.

Sandy W: Wow.

Barbara Pennock: Great.

Barbara Pennock: You can.

Sandy W: Very good, Jan.

Janet M Mitchell: Well, I'd love to take credit for it, but...

Sandy W: Very well said, very articulate, very helpful.

Janet M Mitchell: I had a kind of funny thing that I wanted to share, and I don't want to take us off track, but I will share it. You know, I kind of... I... because, as you all know, I haven't read this before, so we start at the beginning, and there's, like, this big stop sign about the book, right? Arousing of thought. There's a warning on the door of the house, right? Do not enter.

Janet M Mitchell: Right? And I kind of understood the paragraphs about arousing of thought. The conversation was super helpful. You know, okay, I get it. I kind of kind of get it. It's dimly lit and it's a haunted house, but we're walking in, right?

Janet M Mitchell: Now, the last, like, 3 weeks, and I know I've missed a few because of travel and business and whatever, but I feel like we're in pitch black now. I have no idea what... what he's talking about. I mean...

Janet M Mitchell: I can't even... and I know I'm supposed to look at it from the Ray of Creation and the Law of Three, and it's an allegory for the work, and the, like...

Janet M Mitchell: I don't know. Is this fun for you guys?

Stephen Frantz: Well, is this your first experience of the tales, also your first experience of any sort with Kurzyev's ideas? I mean, if you're in search of the miraculous and all the basic...

Janet M Mitchell: No.

Janet M Mitchell: I have read In Search of the Miraculous, yes, and I've read The Fourth Way by Ouspensky, and The Commentaries, and...

Stephen Frantz: Yeah. Okay.

Stephen Frantz: Okay.

Janet M Mitchell: Other things. So no, but I'm relatively new to the work. Probably I couldn't remember whether this is my third year or finishing second. So it's.

Janet M Mitchell: I find the fourth way intelligible.

Janet M Mitchell: I can understand that.

Janet M Mitchell: At least to the extent that I think I can.

Janet M Mitchell: within my own sect.

Robin Bloor: It needs to be understood that Gurdjieff.

Robin Bloor: Was well aware of the problem that comes with any particular doctrine of any kind

whatsoever is that.

Robin Bloor: It pretty soon after its introduction, irrespective of the.

Robin Bloor: The desires of the people involved.

Robin Bloor: Ends up living in the formatory apparatus and gets repeated as though it was true, but anything that's repeated from the formatory apparatus isn't true at all and can't be.

Robin Bloor: By its own definition.

Robin Bloor: This is what the formatory apparatus is.

Robin Bloor: So Gurdjieff did...

Robin Bloor: He created one line, and he depended upon Ouspensky to create that line, and that was the line of.

Robin Bloor: As if it was a scientific narrative kind of line.

Robin Bloor: And then he created another line, which is the tails where.

Robin Bloor: It absolutely isn't a scientific narrative, and not only is it not a scientific narrative, it never says anything directly.

Robin Bloor: that you could use, um, as, uh, let's say a statement of fact in respect of the work. There isn't any of it in the tales at all.

Robin Bloor: And the tails is structured to be.

Robin Bloor: An inevitable struggle between one part of you and another.

Robin Bloor: As you start to see the various.

Robin Bloor: apparent inconsistencies that are in it.

Robin Bloor: And you try in some way or other to make the work inside yourself.

Robin Bloor: It's you all.

Robin Bloor: The let's say.

Robin Bloor: You are the book that's missing, and you have to become that book.

Robin Bloor: And that's just the way it is.

Robin Bloor: And there isn't any...

Robin Bloor: I mean, I could say, perhaps.

Robin Bloor: the writings of Ibn Arabi, if you've ever come across those.

Robin Bloor: might be...

Robin Bloor: Similarly.

Robin Bloor: Mysterious.

Robin Bloor: But I can think of no parallels in the whole of human writing, human scripture or anything. There is nothing like this.

Robin Bloor: you could say, if you wanted to, that the Torah.

Robin Bloor: The the five books of the Old Testament from her.

Robin Bloor: A Christian point of view.

Robin Bloor: Have four separate meanings.

Robin Bloor: That it has the literal meaning and it has.

Robin Bloor: Um, the metaphorical meaning, and it has.

Robin Bloor: Meaning by pure allegory, and it has meaning by number. And it's the only book I'm aware of that claims to have meaning by number.

Robin Bloor: And if you know what meaning by number is, then you are a better person than I am.

Robin Bloor: Because I've looked at that and realized that there's something there.

Robin Bloor: But I have no idea how to touch it.

Robin Bloor: But it still isn't creating.

Robin Bloor: The division within yourself.

Robin Bloor: That the tiles create.

Robin Bloor: So yeah, if you are only a little dark, then you haven't gone far enough. It ought to be completely dark by now.

Janet M Mitchell: Yeah, and I... it is, it's totally pitch black, for sure. But then, what was interesting, because as you recall, when we started, at least the first group that I was in the first time was...

Janet M Mitchell: I forget the question, but it was something like, what did you read first? And I read the author's note. I read the end.

Janet M Mitchell: I actually feel like I kind of understood it. And I don't have my book in front of me because I'm displaced right now. But the author's note —.

Janet M Mitchell: is much more intelligible than where we are right now.

Robin Bloor: Yeah, that is, um, an addendum to the book, just like the first chapter is an addendum to the book.

Janet M Mitchell: Yeah. Yep.

Robin Bloor: The book exists between those two things and they certainly.

Janet M Mitchell: Separately.

Robin Bloor: The from the author chapter that consists.

Robin Bloor: of verbatim at least one lecture that was read out in New York, I think.

Robin Bloor: Um, and another piece.

Robin Bloor: That was somewhere in some of the lectures that Gurdjieff gave, so.

Robin Bloor: He had, um...

Robin Bloor: This was the sandwich.

Janet M Mitchell: Mm-hmm.

Robin Bloor: The arousing of thought and from the author and the bread in the sandwich, but the meat is in the middle.

Janet M Mitchell: I have read some Ibn Arabi, particularly the story of the heliotrope.

Janet M Mitchell: That's... that's worth studying, but I agree, that's pretty dense as well.

Janet M Mitchell: In a different way.

Stephen Frantz: I certainly share.

Stephen Frantz: You're feeling that everything is pitch black sometimes and incomprehensible, and notice that you use the word intelligible in order to contrast the part of the book that was, quote, more easy for you to understand than the other parts of the book.

Stephen Frantz: And I found this.

Stephen Frantz: I, you know, I mean, we're all... you come up against this over and over again in this book, but then if I make myself continue to read what his intent is.

Stephen Frantz: To destroy mercilessly, without any compromises, without any compromises whatsoever, in the mentations and feelings of the reader, the beliefs and views by centuries rooted in him, about everything existing in the world.

Stephen Frantz: I wonder, and I'm just talking to myself now, not to you, when I feel like this is just completely unintelligible, this is non... I have no idea what he means. Is that experience...

Stephen Frantz: one of the first experiences I have of having things truly begin to crumble within me, in terms of the belief structure that I have lived by. In other words.

Stephen Frantz: is if somebody is trying to destroy all my beliefs.

Stephen Frantz: one of the first things I'm likely to say when this person attempts to do this is, what you're saying to me is completely incomprehensible. It makes no sense. That's my defense.

Stephen Frantz: Against letting whatever he's saying in.

Stephen Frantz: even though it seems to be incomprehensible. I'm not being very articulate about this, but I think that the conflicts that we've...

Stephen Frantz: feel or the emotional resistance to this book must have something to do with.

Stephen Frantz: trying to...

Stephen Frantz: in some ways that I'm not even conscious of, trying to hang on to things that I believe that I do not want this book to destroy.

Stephen Frantz: Because I don't want them destroyed. Because what it feels like when they're destroyed is complete lack of certitude, and that is a very uncomfortable position.

Stephen Frantz: to be in. And I just happened to notice today, I looked up the etymology of cunning. Cunning comes from the same word that the Proto-Indo-European word is GNO, means to know.

Stephen Frantz: Cunning is a way that the part of me that that clings to this certitude that I am able to know.

Stephen Frantz: of conning myself.

Stephen Frantz: Uh, it's... it comes from me convincing myself that that can't be true, because I already know that it's not true, and I refuse to let go.

Stephen Frantz: Of my knowing that. And I think that book is doing this to me over and over again.

Stephen Frantz: Um, so I guess what Robin's saying is right. If you're only... if it's even half opaque.

Stephen Frantz: it's still... it hasn't done its total work. It hasn't done all the damage it has yet to do. Um...

Janet M Mitchell: Well, I wish, I actually, just responding to that from my own experience of it, I wish it were...

Janet M Mitchell: contradicting or challenging a belief that I have. It's... when I say unintelligible, and we sit and we talk and we say, well, we're not quite sure what he meant by that.

Janet M Mitchell: So I would love — I don't feel like I have any point of view or philosophy or belief system that I'm rubbing up against. The friction that I'm rubbing up against is, what does he really intend here?

Janet M Mitchell: If he wants to... for a while there, about 2 months ago, he just... chapters built on each other, where it was just mechanicality, mechanicality, making... got it. Totally get it. Now... and then, I know Sandy mentioned it, because if you go...

Janet M Mitchell: down another page we get into a couple of other concepts that just.

Stephen Frantz: Yep.

Janet M Mitchell: Blow my mind.

Stephen Frantz: Okay, I'll say one more thing and then I'll stop talking because this happens to me every time I read this book and I manifest it in our discussions in this group. I want to bore into this with my philosophical dialectical mind, which has been trained to deal with close arguments

and see the contradictions.

Stephen Frantz: If I let that thought process go, suppose I just let the word taming.

Stephen Frantz: float in my mind and go wherever it will go. Taming. And sort of ask myself, what does that word mean to me? It starts to... it starts to create all sorts of associations I didn't expect to have, such as...

Stephen Frantz: Hasn't our whole life been a process of taming? Hasn't the wild in us that we...

Stephen Frantz: were able to look at and not judge as children, wasn't that tamed out of us by the social... by the socialization process? Isn't every step in our education a form of taming against our will, if we even had a will, which we didn't? So it just happened to us. We sort of knew that something was happening.

Stephen Frantz: But had no power to resist, at least that's my personal experience. So this word, taming, starts to take, wow, in what sense have I been tamed? In what sense have I tamed myself.

Stephen Frantz: So that people would not think ill of me. So that I could pretend to be more domesticated than inside I truly am. What is my essence really going to reveal about the wild beast in me?

Stephen Frantz: If I were really able to let my essence come through and accept it without any — with complete, quote, impartiality, without any — and I'm just free associating now. But I mean, you asked — this is just such a very good question you're asking.

Stephen Frantz: And I so admire your honesty in saying this book is making sense to me, but that's... that's... that's the thing to deal with in this book, I think. That's the crux of it.

Janet M Mitchell: Well, I'll make one more comment and then I'll hush up, but...

Janet M Mitchell: I love the fact that you brought up the taming, because when I read self-taming, I immediately felt what that meant, and just how we...

Janet M Mitchell: play these games with ourselves of justification or identification or.

Janet M Mitchell: whatever egoistic, protective veil that I would throw up in some, you know, situation. So I... I do read it that way. So, for example, and the one thing that I thought of is... I thought it was very interesting, that part when he talks about shuddering.

Janet M Mitchell: And, you know, how the experience of what he said that made him shudder. And I was surprised in my bot agent work that a shudder... and I was wondering, do you all feel like a shudder is a mechanical reaction? I took it more of a... as an emotional thing.

Janet M Mitchell: Claude said, no, it was just a total mechanical reaction. I thought it was one of the few emotional expressions from Beelzebub saying, this makes me shudder. That is so upsetting to him. I thought that was emotionally very powerful.

Janet M Mitchell: So, yeah.

Robin Bloor: But I don't think Claude understands emotions very well.

Robin Bloor: Just a thought, it's not...

Robin Bloor: You see, most of what's written about emotions is ***** from the intellectual center.

Robin Bloor: And Claude is, has been programmed with all of the emotional, intellectual emotional writings that human beings have ever made in the whole of history. So he's basically full of **** as regards emotion.

Sandy W: You said Claude?

Robin Bloor: Claude, the AI.

Sandy W: Oh, I have no idea, Claude. Hey, I had a name, and it was Claude. Too close to God.

Robin Bloor: Well, not really. When you experience it, it doesn't remind you of God at all.

Sandy W: Certainly not.

Sandy W: No, it's the sound, just purely the sound.

Sandy W: Uh, but I did want to ask about the author you mentioned earlier that I haven't, uh... I don't know that author, and I'm not looking for anything more complicated than Gurdjieff to read, but I'd like to know that name again. I thought I heard you say Eva Norevi.

Robin Bloor: Huh. Yeah, but IBN...

Robin Bloor: Right? Space. Arabic. Arab with an I on the end.

Sandy W: Arabi, okay. Evan Arabi, okay.

Sandy W: Thank you.

Robin Bloor: So...

Robin Bloor: There's, um, a question, and it's a question... oh, it's not really one question, it's several questions, but it needs to be...

Robin Bloor: faced in one way or another at a certain point in time. You come to... you come in contact with the work, and you meet with various ideas, some of which are actually quite transformational ideas, and they alter.

Robin Bloor: The a number of attitudes that you have in order and that you use to understand the world.

Robin Bloor: But there's something very basic that has to go on.

Robin Bloor: And eventually you get there.

Robin Bloor: Right, or maybe some people never get there, I don't know, but my assumption is eventually everybody gets there.

Robin Bloor: And the question...

Robin Bloor: Of what am I comes up.

Robin Bloor: And when good is going to try and destroy.

Robin Bloor: Everything inculcated in you through centuries of ***** from various people.

Robin Bloor: All of that disappears.

Robin Bloor: If you actually acknowledge that you don't really know what you are.

Robin Bloor: Uh, and hand in hand, um, like Hansel and Gretel, I think.

Robin Bloor: With that goes.

Robin Bloor: What do I want?

Robin Bloor: And when we ask the question, what do I want, we aren't talking about any kind of organic desire we may have. I would like to have a hamburger right now.

Robin Bloor: with fries, and I want some tomato ketchup to go with that.

Robin Bloor: That isn't an answer to the question, what do I want?

Robin Bloor: Because it's an existential question.

Robin Bloor: And if you get to the point of asking these questions.

Robin Bloor: Then an awful lot of.

Robin Bloor: conditioning that you've experienced in your life starts to fall away.

Robin Bloor: Because this conditioning simply does not apply to those two questions.

Robin Bloor: Just doesn't.

Robin Bloor: Beelzebub leads in the direction of what am I and what do I want? It just leads you all into that direction.

Robin Bloor: There isn't anything definite there, and neither is there anything definite in you.

Robin Bloor: I'm speaking to all of you.

Robin Bloor: Well, I managed to frighten Stephen away.

Robert Posen: Robin, he said that he had to leave prematurely today.

Robin Bloor: I know he did. That's that was why it was a joke that I came out with.

Robert Posen: Thank you.

Sandy W: Well, you can take your marbles and go home, I'm gonna take my dialectical brain and go home.

Sandy W: That was a joke, but not a very good one.

Sandy W: I liked his use of that term when he was talking about how that's the thing he wants to hold on to, and when he sees things crumbling, it's, uh... you do think about what's crumbling.

Sandy W: of the beliefs that, uh, Gurdjieff says he's going to destroy. What is crumbling? Do I see them crumbling? That's another way of saying what your, uh...

Sandy W: Saying, what do I want? Do I want to see things crumble?

Sandy W: And it's that one thing I want to see crumble, and that's a hard one for people to give up. I think especially people in the work, both they're very smart people.

Sandy W: And tend to be highly educated.

Sandy W: And those brains just hang on.

Sandy W: to the ideas.

Sandy W: The actions, which might be, I'm just thinking in terms of active, passive, and neutralizing, that might be the most active part.

Sandy W: The hardest part to, uh...

Sandy W: Too tame.

Sandy W: And one of the things I was thinking earlier is.

Sandy W: Are we really taming something?

Sandy W: And that idea of...

Sandy W: The self-tamers and the wild animals.

Sandy W: The self-tamers were...

Sandy W: I thought trying to.

Sandy W: reduce the effect of the Gundabuffer in themselves. That, that was the point.

Sandy W: of their extreme actions.

Sandy W: Which seems a little bit different from.

Sandy W: Taming something like a wild beast.

Sandy W: But I don't know where to go with that idea.

Sandy W: And it's an idea.

Sandy W: Just an idea, just an intuition, intuitive idea.

Sandy W: Somebody else give me a soliloquy.

Robin Bloor: The soliloquy.

Sandy W: Yeah, that's what I felt like I was falling into a soliloquy there. Forget about it.

Robin Bloor: Well, I think that...

Robin Bloor: One of the things that I mean, I was taught a long time ago.

Robin Bloor: What you actually really need to do is to generate questions.

Robin Bloor: And the, you know, the, um...

Robin Bloor: The road.

Robin Bloor: to any kind of freedom comes from questions.

Robin Bloor: And one of the effects of Beelzebub that is just almost a side effect.

Robin Bloor: Is that it does generate a lot of question.

Robin Bloor: I mean, if you, for instance, we could, we could pose the following question.

Robin Bloor: If, um, something higher, maybe even the absolute themselves.

Robin Bloor: Or himself.

Robin Bloor: is sending these messengers down from above.

Robin Bloor: How come they're so *****

Robin Bloor: How come that after a couple of generations, none of it's working anymore?

Robin Bloor: If it was something that you'd bought from Amazon, you'd be sending it back.

Robin Bloor: And the question is really, what is human beings? What are we?

Robin Bloor: And as soon as you actually ask that question, we can certainly, one way or another.

Robin Bloor: We can get together in a group and discuss somebody we don't like and rag them down in one way or another, but really, if we're going to find out about human beings.

Robin Bloor: The only evidence that we've got at all is ourselves.

Robin Bloor: We haven't got anything else. Everything else is suppositional, um, rush to judgment, or whatever. Everything else is just made up crap.

Robin Bloor: That you don't really know, you don't have any idea.

Robin Bloor: About any other human being, in respect of any act they carried out, because...

Robin Bloor: And you can, you know, pick up any event you want to, good or bad, uh, in any, uh, anything that you want to consider, and you will have to admit.

Robin Bloor: That you have no idea what the subjective state of the person that actually carried out that act was. You don't know.

Robin Bloor: And you might, in some way or other, say, well, he's behaving just like I behave when I do this, that, or the other. And you can say.

Robin Bloor: I have a theory.

Robin Bloor: But that's all you got.

Robin Bloor: So we we have read.

Robin Bloor: A number of times we have encountered this.

Robin Bloor: organ cunderbuffer, we encountered the story as to how it was introjected into human beings. We.

Robin Bloor: um, read the story of how it was taken out. We've read a number of times about the consequences of the properties of the organ condom off, and a question that's really worth acting... asking is.

Robin Bloor: Do you believe any of that?

Robin Bloor: Is it true?

Barbara Pennock: I think it's probably verifiable that.

Barbara Pennock: Response by imitation is very prevalent for us.

Robin Bloor: Ah, yes. Well, that's. You've got the same advantage that I've got.

Robin Bloor: In the We've Had Kit...

Robin Bloor: Um, if we were at all aware of the behavior of children.

Robin Bloor: And it isn't necessarily the case that we would be.

Robin Bloor: Some people are not that interested in.

Robin Bloor: The, you know, the thing that crawls around on the carpet all the time.

Robin Bloor: But we would notice if we bothered to take any.

Robin Bloor: notice at all about those children is that they learned by imitation.

Robin Bloor: That's what they did. They imitated.

Robin Bloor: And you don't really need to spend much time with a child before you realize that that child is imitated.

Robin Bloor: Now, I verified this in a very unusual way.

Robin Bloor: I was, uh, my daughter is the eldest of my children.

Robin Bloor: I used to play a game with her.

Robin Bloor: Which was to send the ball towards her.

Robin Bloor: So we had some kind of plastic ball, small.

Robin Bloor: But I would put my foot down on top of it, and therefore I would push it forward with backspin.

Robin Bloor: So it would go towards, uh...

Robin Bloor: and then come back towards me.

Robin Bloor: And I thought that was very amusing, but it turned out.

Robin Bloor: To be remarkably, that was the way she learned to kick a ball.

Robin Bloor: She imitated.

Robin Bloor: Putting back spin on it.

Robin Bloor: I'm just doing the obvious thing, which was, uh...

Robin Bloor: hitting it with your foot. She didn't do that. She put her foot on top of it and tried to put quackspin on it. That was her first act. So it's like, that's what they do.

Robin Bloor: They imitate.

Robin Bloor: So the momentum, it's like.

Robin Bloor: I looked at myself in the mirror one morning and realized that there's something about me that's like my father, because I recognized my father, and I have no idea what that was. It doesn't really matter.

Robin Bloor: Because he was the only person I could attribute that to.

Robin Bloor: But if whatever that was goes back 10 or 15 generations.

Robin Bloor: Then maybe it does. I don't know. It's being we all impersonated.

Robin Bloor: Somewhere else.

Robin Bloor: And that's what we do. So the consequences of the properties of the Jurgen Kunderbuff are very easy to understand.

Robin Bloor: The child growing up sees a little bit of Kunder buffer and says, I'll have some of that, and away they go.

Robin Bloor: Another question, if you want to disturb, if you want to continue to disturb your own calm, another question really is, what is it about me that can be undone?

Robin Bloor: You can spend time observing yourself in various situations. It doesn't even need to be organized. You are going to, at various points during any particular day, catch a glimpse of yourself doing various things, and you are.

Robin Bloor: going to sometimes notice it. So, in one way or another, without making much effort at all, you will notice things about yourself.

Robin Bloor: And and the question is.

Robin Bloor: Are these things that I notice?

Robin Bloor: Unchangeable.

Sandy W: That I'm thinking is a tricky question. I'm not really sure.

Robin Bloor: Yeah.

Sandy W: What's meant by undone? What can be undone in me?

Sandy W: I'm done.

Robin Bloor: You see, if every morning when you brush your teeth, you brush your teeth with the right hand.

Robin Bloor: It is only necessary for you to take the decision to, from now on, always brush with the left hand.

Robin Bloor: For you to undo something which is probably a habit that goes back.

Robin Bloor: decades and decades with you. So that can be undone.

Robin Bloor: But the way you speak.

Robin Bloor: The accent that you have.

Robin Bloor: Undoing that, that would be a bigger trick.

Robin Bloor: And so on, you know.

Robin Bloor: Do you want me to continue to give you things that will disturb you? I'm sure you're all enjoying it.

Sandy W: I'm more thinking...

Sandy W: In terms of being undone.

Sandy W: That's really an interesting thing to consider, but it seems like aging itself does a lot of undoing.

Sandy W: And not things that you want undone, so.

Sandy W: Question might be, what do I want undone? What do I not want undone?

Sandy W: And I can recall having a lot of wanting undone when I was younger and not being able to undo it, but uh...

Sandy W: That's just getting complicated.

Sandy W: But life itself does a lot of undoing for you.

Sandy W: Aging does.

Sandy W: And then there's the big one, the rascalorn. Oh, that'll do a lot of undoing for us.

Robin Bloor: Yeah, that's, um...

Robin Bloor: That will be.

Robin Bloor: For all of us, that will be our undoing.

Robin Bloor: One of the things that I think is really...

Robin Bloor: Worth it.

Robin Bloor: In terms of one's own behavior is to try to work out.

Robin Bloor: How you relate to other human beings.

Robin Bloor: And in order to to work that out, you actually need to have contact with new human beings.

Robin Bloor: Because almost certainly, if you're talking about the various people that you're always interacting with, then.

Robin Bloor: That is probably a dyed-in-the-wool habit by now, so you actually need to expose yourself to new human beings.

Robin Bloor: Which you can do. You only need to change your dentist or go to a different restaurant. And you do get the opportunity to.

Robin Bloor: To interact with somebody different, but the question isn't.

Robin Bloor: The question is, what am I in relation to?

Robin Bloor: the person that greets me when I go into a restaurant, or...

Robin Bloor: I had... I went to the dentist today, that was a jolly thing to do.

Robin Bloor: So the, the woman who dealt with me for the first, I don't know, 15, 20 minutes.

Robin Bloor: She was chassis beyond belief.

Robin Bloor: I mean, it was just...

Robin Bloor: And I decided to be chatty back.

Robin Bloor: Because, well, she was new, you know.

Robin Bloor: So that became a really entertaining interaction that had nothing to do with the dentist, except, of course, I was sitting in one of those chairs. But, you know.

Robin Bloor: That was interesting.

Robin Bloor: Do. What do you notice about other people?

Robin Bloor: The, the lighting that...

Robin Bloor: dealt with me, the final person to deal with me was.

Robin Bloor: An interesting woman.

Robin Bloor: Who I asked her about her children. She had two children.

Robin Bloor: Now, the reason I asked her whether she had any children was that she wasn't wearing a wedding ring.

Robin Bloor: And my thought was, wow, okay.

Robin Bloor: She not only wasn't wearing a wedding ring, but she didn't have a mark on her finger where she would wear a wedding ring. Maybe she's the kind of person that doesn't wear wedding rings.

Robin Bloor: I don't know anything about it. I didn't have any particular judgment for her, but I just noticed that.

Robin Bloor: I was actually, because she was a new person to deal with.

Robin Bloor: I was actually more aware than usual and was looking.

Robin Bloor: Uh, acted as if she was a...

Robin Bloor: A wholly new species that I'd encountered.

Robin Bloor: So that's just an interesting thing from today, but there is a question as to.

Robin Bloor: How do you react to people and.

Robin Bloor: Well, it's almost, if you like.

Robin Bloor: Cheating to go to.

Robin Bloor: the health service in America, and talk to people, because.

Robin Bloor: Each of them is trained.

Robin Bloor: to deal with you.

Robin Bloor: In, uh, in a very...

Robin Bloor: Well, they would say professional, I suppose, but certainly in a very pleasant manner. It's always a good experience.

Robin Bloor: Unless, of course, they've got bad news to tell you, in which case maybe that's, um...

Robin Bloor: A difficult thing, but mostly it's just these people are just lovely to spend time with because they have to be nice to you.

Robin Bloor: Isn't that weird?

Robin Bloor: So that's something you can check up. How do I relate to other human beings?

Robin Bloor: When they ask me about myself, do I tell them the truth?

Robin Bloor: This woman today, she said, um, what do you do? You're retired. I said, no, I'm not. I'm a writer.

Robin Bloor: Yeah, when writers don't retire and.

Robin Bloor: And she said, what do you write about?

Robin Bloor: And I lied, because I didn't want to tell her that mostly I write about the work, which is an obscure and rather strange set of beliefs that I'm sure you don't really want to know about, and.

Robin Bloor: I don't really want to tell you in case you suddenly don't feel good about me anymore.

Robin Bloor: So I don't tell people I'm in the world just in case they've got an association with it. They heard.

Robin Bloor: Oh, that Mr. Gurdjieff, he wrote a book about the devil.

Barbara Pennock: So what do you say you write about?

Robin Bloor: Oh, and mathematics and computers.

Barbara Pennock: Of course, yes, good.

Robin Bloor: Which is also true, so you know.

Robin Bloor: Anyway, I've talked us to death. It's actually 7 o'clock. Has anybody got anything final to say about this? Or would someone like to burst into tears or something like that, dramatic? That'd be nice.

Robin Bloor: No?

Barbara Pennock: Well, about ships, could maybe he talk about relationships?

Barbara Pennock: I don't know. Okay.

Robin Bloor: Oh, weird. Relationships, yes.

Sandy W: Better than battleships.

Sandy W: Uh, but the other question is, uh, are you going to be away 3 weeks? Are we going to be meeting?

Robin Bloor: Uh, yeah, there will not be any meeting next week or the week after, but the week after that, I should be back.

Robin Bloor: So, there'll be two missing, but I'll send emails out that tell you that there isn't a meeting.

Robin Bloor: just to remind you, in case anybody has got into that, that they're so programmed on a Wednesday that they can't do anything other than go onto Zoom and try and log into this.

Barbara Pennock: I don't know what we'll do.

Robin Bloor: So I'll be doing that.

Robin Bloor: And it's the same with the German thing. That'll be all. It'll be the same with everything. I'll be gone. Who knows if I'll return?

Barbara Pennock: Okay.

Barbara Pennock: We'll come back.

Robin Bloor: I'm going to that dangerous, that dangerous continent, Europe.

Barbara Pennock: Be very careful of wild things.

Robin Bloor: They're full of wild. I'm going to Germany. They're all wild in Germany.

Barbara Pennock: Oh, wow.

Robin Bloor: All of them.

Robin Bloor: Thank you, everybody.

Barbara Pennock: Thanks.

Sandy W: Thank you

Chat

16:59:37 From Stephen Frantz : Am I the only one having trouble with sound?

16:59:48 From Janet M Mitchell : nope

17:00:07 From Janet M Mitchell : I don't hear anything either

17:00:07 From Robert Posen : No sound too

17:57:04 From Robin Bloor : The poison arrow comes from one of the Buddha's teaching stories — the parable of the poisoned arrow,.

The setup is a monk named Māluṅkyaputta, who grows frustrated that the Buddha refuses to pronounce on a set of grand metaphysical questions: whether the cosmos is eternal or not, whether it is finite or infinite, whether the soul (self) and the body are identical or distinct, and whether an enlightened one continues to exist after death. Māluṅkyaputta effectively issues an ultimatum — answer these, or I'll abandon the training.

The Buddha replies with the simile. Imagine a man struck by an arrow thickly smeared with poison. His friends fetch a surgeon, but the man says: "I won't let this arrow be pulled out until I know who shot me — his name and clan, whether he was tall or short, dark or fair, what town he came from; and what kind of bow it was, what the bowstring was made of, the type of shaft, the feathering, the arrowhead..." The man would die long before any of that was settled.

17:57:42 From Robin Bloor : The point is that the metaphysical questions are like the wounded man's demands: they are not prerequisites for the work that actually matters. Whether or not the universe is eternal, the Buddha says, "there is birth, there is aging, there is death, there are sorrow, lamentation, pain, grief, and despair" — and it is the ending of these, here and now, that he teaches. He calls the speculative questions "undeclared" (avyākata) because answering them "is not connected with the goal, does not belong to the fundamentals of the holy life, and does not lead to disenchantment, to dispassion, to cessation, to peace, to direct knowledge, to enlightenment, to Nibbāna."

17:57:53 From Robin Bloor : Given your Armenian etymology work — is elna-. That's the subjunctive/future stem of Armenian (elnel): to rise, to go out, to emerge, to exit, to ascend. Pair it with a -para element (whether you're hearing the Greek para, "beside/beyond/contrary," or an Armenian suffix, or one of Gurdjieff's own compounding syllables) and the word leans toward something like "that which rises out of / emerges beside / goes beyond." If that's anywhere near the sense you're carrying, the parable takes it well in three different directions.

18:38:51 From Stephen Frantz : I regret that I must depart prematurely today. Thanks to all, and I'll see you next week.

AI Summary Meeting 36

US Session

Quick recap

Meeting 37 was a book discussion group reading "Beelzebub's Tales" where participants analyzed Chapter 22 about Beelzebub's journey through Tibet. The group explored metaphysical interpretations of "wild beings" as negative emotions and psychological states, discussed the concept of self-tamers as individuals attempting to control their own negative aspects, and examined the allegorical meaning of guns and ships representing power and transportation of ideas. Participants shared difficulties in understanding the book's dense narrative and philosophical concepts, with some expressing that the material had become increasingly unintelligible compared to earlier chapters. The discussion included etymological analysis of key terms and comparisons to other religious texts, with participants reflecting on how the book challenges their existing beliefs and mental patterns.

Next steps

Robin

- Send emails to the group reminding them that there will be no meetings for the next two weeks.
- Share the explanation about the "poison arrows of El Naparra" in the English text share.

Summary

Tibet Travel and Buddhist Settlements

Robin and Stephen conducted meeting 37, with Stephen serving as the reader for chapter 22 of Beelzebub. The discussion focused on the challenges of traveling through dangerous territories in Tibet, where wild animals posed threats to the group's safety, particularly at night. The travelers encountered a small settlement of self-tamers, a Buddhist sect that had migrated from Pearl Land to practice a special form of suffering in isolation. A schism had occurred among the sectarians, leading to the formation of Orthodox Hidaraki and Katashki Hidaraki groups, with the Orthodox Hidaraki maintaining their monastery near the original settlement.

Buddhist Teachings Interpretation Discussion

The group discussed interpretations of Buddhist teachings, with Stephen suggesting that a significant distortion occurs when practitioners deny or avoid the involutionary process in favor of an evolutionary path focused on reaching heaven without engaging with earthly suffering. Sandy expressed uncertainty about how much discussion this topic should receive and noted the prominence of "wild beings" in the text, while Barbara provided a translation of the unusual name "Sanctuatorza" and read from the text about these beings' cunning nature.

Gurdjieff's Brain Development Concepts

The group discussed Gurdjieff's concepts of one-brain, two-brain, and three-brain beings, focusing on how wild beings and microbes might represent threats to humans. Derek identified inconsistencies in the book's lists of dangerous creatures across different pages, while Robert and others explored the idea that one-brain beings represent primitive survival instincts that can dominate when humans fail to use their full three-brain capacity. The discussion concluded with questions about why Beelzebub doesn't directly interfere to correct the self-tamers, with Robin

suggesting it's not in Beelzebub's nature to help three-brain beings achieve perfection.

Buddhist Teachings on Emotions

The group discussed interpretations of Buddhist teachings and allegories, particularly focusing on the concept of "wild beasts" as negative emotions and the role of taming versus isolation in spiritual development. Robin suggested viewing wild beasts as negative emotions and daytime as periods of self-remembering, while Stephen connected the theme to how women naturally bring conflicting parties into relationship with each other. Robert shared a parallel from the story of Gilgamesh about how a wild man named Enkidu was tamed through interaction with a priestess, which Stephen related to a modern peace initiative by Israeli and Palestinian women called "Land for All."

Buddhist and Gurdjieffian Terminology Discussion

Robin discussed the Buddhist story of Malinkeputta's ultimatum to the Buddha regarding metaphysical questions, which the Buddha answered with the parable of a man refusing medical treatment until knowing irrelevant details about his attacker. The group explored etymological connections between Buddhist and Gurdjieffian terminology, with Robin suggesting a possible connection between "Elna" and Armenian concepts of rising or emerging beyond. Derek asked about the compatibility of the Buddha's position with Gurdjieff's third conscious striving, but Robin clarified that there is limited direct knowledge of the Buddha's original teachings beyond the eight rightful paths.

1931 Edition Text Inconsistencies Discussion

The group discussed inconsistencies in the 1931 edition where the term "Jim Chania" was used interchangeably with "Pearl Land," though no clear explanation was provided for this variation. They clarified that the historical Buddha mentioned in the text could not be the same as the modern Buddha due to chronological discrepancies, and explored potential metaphorical meanings of "guns and ships" as tools of destruction rather than literal weapons. The discussion also touched on how religious teachings might be corrupted when sects gain power and how negative emotions could be metaphorically represented as hunting beings.

Gurdjieff Study Discussion

Janet shared her experience studying a section of Gurdjieff's work, presenting three key observations about sects being universal, self-evaluation being impossible from within belief systems, and the difference between sects and dominant religions being based on military and commercial power rather than truth. Janet expressed frustration about finding the current section of the book completely incomprehensible, contrasting with her initial understanding of the author's note and end of the book. Robin explained that Gurdjieff intentionally created different layers in his writing, with the "Tales" designed to create internal struggle and division rather than providing straightforward scientific narratives, while Stephen suggested that feeling lost in the book might indicate the destruction of deeply rooted beliefs and mental defenses.

Book Discussion and Reflections

The group discussed their experiences reading a book, with Stephen and Janet sharing their thoughts on how the text challenged their beliefs and caused them to reflect on concepts like "taming." Robin explained that the book aims to help readers question their fundamental existence and desires, suggesting that genuine transformation occurs when people confront the questions "what am I" and "what do I want." The discussion included a brief exchange about emotions and an AI's understanding of them, as well as a recommendation for further reading.

about Gurdjieff's work.

Gurdjieff Concepts Discussion Meeting

The group discussed concepts from Gurdjieff's work, particularly focusing on the "organ Kundabuffer" and how human beings learn through imitation. Robin emphasized the importance of generating questions about human nature and challenged participants to consider what aspects of themselves could be "undone" or changed. The conversation ended with Robin announcing he would be away for three weeks, with no meetings scheduled for the next two weeks, and he promised to send emails confirming the cancellations.