

Meeting #039

EU Session Transcript

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

Vanya: What I... what jumps at me when I hear you reading the text is... There's a lot of... The word descending is used a lot. I mean, this is also something which we work on now after the summer week, the descending octaves. Maybe it's, that's why I'm. I'm concerned about it more, but. First, he is descending for the fourth time to the planet Earth. Then his friend is descending from Saturn to Mars. And then there's this discussion. if the human beings descend from the apes or other way around. So... I'm just thinking if probably or maybe. There is something which we could learn about descending octaves in this bit, even though it doesn't seem so obvious to me. What is it? Which... We could.:

Ekant: It's amusing how he describes how someone. Becomes a learned being of... New format. It also sounds more like a descending octave than an ascending one.:

Robin Bloor: He uses that expression of new formation many times throughout the tales. I think it lines up with the idea of the formatory apparatus. You do get these periods of time when one particular, let's say. set of ideas decides that everything that went before is. Wrong, or at least inferior to the set of ideas they now have. And because of that day. have a tendency to just. Ignore. What went before? You can see this in one of the, I think, an interesting area of all of this is medicine. Because there's a... Emerging from the 19th century, butchers, they were really. Initially in the UK, but, you know, all over Europe and America. You have the modern. Approach. To, um... health medicine. And yet you have extremely well established. I'm well used. Chinese medicine. and Ayurvedic medicine from the Indian subcontinent. as well as the remnants of, um. I guess you could call it Greek medicine, but it it was. taken up in the Middle East. So there's a kind of. Iranian and Arabic. medical tradition that was based upon the Greek medical tradition that was, um. adopted from. In that area was very, if you like. strongly influenced by the writing of the Greeks, and particularly by Plato. and Pythagoras. So there's that. So there are at least three. Other medical traditions which are normally. ignored or. At least talked down to. By the medicine that dominates our culture. And that's just the way it happens in one way or another.:

Gwynne Mayer: As you know, I'm very enthralled with the apes. I feel like I bring them up all the time, but his use of the apes really... Um, I've tried to do deep studies of it, and... on one level, and I know it was in the time of Darwin, and he, you know, I know all that stuff that he didn't agree with all that, but one of the things that, um... What happened to the instinctual nature? When humans... When we get stuck in our linear thought mind, what happens to the instinctual nature? of our... ape-like energy, our gut energy, just our physical, sexual energy. that comes out of the root chakra. You know? I mean, I'm questioning myself, I'm not demanding an answer, but it really appeals to me, and then his connection to the cosmic. Connection Mars and Saturn, of course, means everything. As far as I'm concerned. But when I'm working with someone who has a Mars-Saturn conflict. They basically have trouble connecting to their instinctual nature. in their activity. It becomes totally linear. So, again, you know, it's just... My obsession, my OCD with the apes.:

Ekant: Gwynn, what do you mean this becomes linear when the instinct is not included or neglected?:

Gwynne Mayer: Well, apes are not... apes are not linear. First of all, they're instinctual animals. But, um... I'm recently, I'm obsessed with, for instance, the mountain gorillas, the silverbacks. The

tribes of the bonobos. of really studying the apes. And their instinct for tribalization, their instinct for... Territory. I've been on this journey for at least 15 years with the apes. And the, you know, basically... There's kind of a collective. Mutation. What does this have to do with the perturbations, Robin? Somehow, can you link that? Or am I linking anything?:

Robin Bloor: What do you mean? What do you want me to link? I'll try.:

Gwynne Mayer: Okay, try.:

Robin Bloor: Yeah, but what do you want me to link?:

Gwynne Mayer: The perturbations, um...:

Robin Bloor: You mean the various perturbations on the planet Earth that occur?:

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah. Okay.:

Robin Bloor: I mean, that comes in the next reading to a certain extent, so we shouldn't really be discussing it in any... in any great depth here, which is...:

Gwynne Mayer: Okay.:

Robin Bloor: This, um, the origin of the apes from the, um... the interaction between females and. Four-brained, two-brained beings. And nuts. Because of the loss of Atlantis. that that occurs. So there's a relationship in that, I guess.:

Gwynne Mayer: Yes.:

Robin Bloor: Something that it's worth pointing out is that Gernaher Haha can't travel. From Saturn. to Mars, but he can exist on Mars without any special. Um, the systems.:

Gwynne Mayer: I wonder how that happens.:

Robin Bloor: Well, it doesn't happen in a normal spaceship, because that makes no sense whatsoever. You would just have. the atmosphere of. Sun or Mars in the spaceship and Kernaher would be okay. It's not a normal spaceship, it's... And this starts to address the mystery of what good, good ship actually means by spaceship, I suppose.:

Gwynne Mayer: So, what is the spaceship's relationship to Mars and Saturn? If the spaceship is his Tescoano.:

Robin Bloor: I don't think the spaceship is this test go on them because it does no indicate we would it would use it as the same word.:

Gwynne Mayer: Okay.:

Robin Bloor: The Tescoano course is also a mystery because. It was necessary for Gurnaher Harhawk, too. come to Mars in order for that Tuscano to be possible. Now, the line of thought that I'm having is that. Gunaha Haag represents a high manifestation. of the intellect, although. Not so high. Uh, as to be... part of the second or third body. So not so high to be an aspect of essence, but as high as it gets within the planetary body.:

Gwynne Mayer: And it won't go to the fourth level, fourth dimension, the fourth. Octave.:

Robin Bloor: It won't go beyond that. At least that's what the text is telling us. He can be. But the thing that is just a fact in respect of the work is that. People in the work attend after a particular point of time when you start to realise a number of things. I'm trying to reconcile the intellect and the emotion. And here we've got this story of the intellect and the emotion of the physical body being reconciled on Mars. And with... The ability of going to her haha, which is clearly intellectual. They. It was possible to invent a Tuscana. which enabled the. observation of all of the others. Planets of the solar system.:

Gwynne Mayer: So, um... I'm still... I'm still trying to get Saturn to go to Mars. without being from Mars, without the experience of Mars. in my head. So I do think it's kind of, it's this cosmic allegory he's always going into that confuses me. Because I have my own mind made up about certain things, and he comes in and throws a bomb into my brain.:

Robin Bloor: Well, that's really, I say, impolite.:

Gwynne Mayer: Yes, and he, it's like he intentionally, he intentionally does that.:

Robin Bloor: And we should all tell him off.:

Vanya: Of course. What I was thinking with this, um, connections... There's one he's saying after... Beelzebub descends to Earth. He ascends to Saturn. And then afterwards, he invites Gonna Hoe Ha Hag to descend to occasion. And then go to mass. So... There's no straight direction from Saturn to Mars. And there is something like a need after being on Earth to ascend to Saturn. Whatever that means, but it's something which. Which keeps me busy now.:

Gwynne Mayer: So is it an avoidance or assimilation? See, I'm wondering if it's... In the planetary body, if we don't have a sense of Mars. what would we be like? We would always be thoughtful, and the Saturnian mind would be pretty wise. in a sense of a higher mind. But the thing about it is. what's he trying to do with that switch that you mentioned? Uh, you go to occasion. That's what made me think, okay, we're going to change the Tuscana, or we're going to change the perception. I don't know.:

Vanya: Mm-hmm.:

Gwynne Mayer: That don't even make sense, so.:

Robin Bloor: There's another question, and it only makes things murkier, but we might as well ask the question. Why is it necessary to go to Earth and capture some apes and bring them? up to Saturn for examination.:

Vanya: Yeah, this is something I wonder.:

Robin Bloor: I mean, why is that necessary? It seems to be a little bit of, um... Well, it's severely inconvenient.:

Gwynne Mayer: Well, I think he is trying to dispel, because at the time, wasn't Darwin's theory, isn't he trying to do some kind of dispelling of theory and intellectualization of science? Compared to human development. Or do you... I mean... Robin.:

Robin Bloor: It's that it's. The time that he wrote this. coincides with the time of the Scopes trial in America. So there is this overlap, and it's... Robert Posen pointed this out to me. It's quite a coincidence in a way. This is where Beelzebub starts talking about Alitu Chambros. which appears to have all the um. All the characters who recorded radio message. You can't see anything in the

Litu Shambhosh. You can't observe anything that's going on. You can only hear. And that it will be. something that Gurdjieff heard about and the Scopes trial, no doubt, on the radio in America. And it all kind of goes on around this time.:

Rod Thorn: Sorry, Robin, what's the Scopes trial?:

Robin Bloor: It's the famous trial in America about whether we descended from apes or not because there was some legal action. I'll look it up because I don't got the details here. It's only in my head as the Scopes trial. So let me try and find out.:

Gwynne Mayer: I think he's very... he's bringing in the Scopes trial in the way of allegory rather than, um... I mean, we're not naming it. We're not naming certain things that then confuses my overly analytical mind, you know?:

Robin Bloor: Okay, so I'll put this in the. I'll put this in the chat so that everybody's got. Far too much detail, but basically. The state of Tennessee versus John Thomas Scopes, popularly known as the Monkey Trial, ran from the 10th to 21st of July in 1925 in Dayton, Tennessee. The law, Tennessee's Butler Act, March 1925, made it illegal in state-funded schools to teach any theory denying the biblical account of creation, and holding instead that man descended from a lower order of animals. So that's it's always useful when they legislate to tell you what's true. I'll stick that in the chat.:

Gwynne Mayer: Well, and it's only been recently, in the last 20 years, that they've included the theory of evolution. I mean, the theory of, uh... Darwin's evolution theory. And then they did that very slightly. And then the educators decided they want to know the whole story. And so now the kids know the whole story. The kids that know anything, you know. Studying Clarence Darrow and his life is a real trip, too.:

Robin Bloor: Stayed on the books until 1967. I remember that year. Everybody was throwing parties because now we can celebrate the fact that we're descended from monkeys. How drunk we got.:

Vanya: I wasn't there yet.:

Gwynne Mayer: I've met a few. I'm telling you, if you start watching. Like, I told y'all my kids are getting ready to go study the mountain gorillas in Uganda. And so, of course, I'm studying them. beyond belief. I can't believe the similarity in the collective consciousness of the. Apes. the mountain gorillas, and then to contrast them with the bonobos. which is a matriarchal society of X. Where the silverbacks would have no say in anything. You say? Y'all know what I'm talking about.:

Robin Bloor: Really, so does, uh... There's a species of monkey where the women are on, uh, in command.:

Gwynne Mayer: Oh, bonobos. Yeah.:

Robin Bloor: That's my kind of monkey tribe. I want to join that one.:

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah, I love them, yeah. You don't see many of those in the zoo, you know? And the, the, the studying the silverbacks, the mountain gorillas, they even do this. You know, so it's such a patriarch, you know? And then on top of that, the sons of the leaders come back to compete with the father, like Oedipus. I mean, it's hilarious. It's... and Oedipus has his say with the father, and then the... I mean, it's... it's so mythologically correct. that it's hard to understand.:

Robin Bloor: Who taught these monkeys Greek mythology?:

Gwynne Mayer: How they... They just had it before we did.:

Robin Bloor: They had it before we, I can believe them. I mean, it's one of those things, who... who... which male doesn't get up in the morning and beat their chest? I mean, we all do that, we just don't tell all the females that we do that.:

Gwynne Mayer: No, in fact, you hide it from the females, because they'll beat your chest if you let them. It depends on how much you want to hide. But I thought the sons and the fathers of competitiveness. And, you know, so Beelzebub's talking to his grandson. And I've always wondered. Why not the son? But the grandson plays a very important part in mythology. Very, um... because grandchildren look up to their grandparents as wisdom.:

Robin Bloor: That's true.:

Gwynne Mayer: And sons look up to their fathers as competitors and role models. I mean, that's instinctual. That's just born into the system. So, to me. I had a father who took us camping, taught us to fish, did things on the physical level. He also taught me how wrong I was about everything, because basically he was always right, you know? But the things that I remember the most. are the physical... the camping every weekend, the fishing, the hunting, and all of the physical things he did, which I think, as a father. That the mental part of what you tell your kids. gets kind of thrown away, especially from the father. The mother can say almost anything. So a good father, in my estimation, psychologically, as a therapist, would be a man who really buddies up to his kids, takes them on adventures, takes them kind of like a pioneer, let's go explore. And teach them, teach them survival instincts. Worry about survival. In other words, keep his mouth shut and just teach how to do that. I'm redoing my father nowadays, now that he's gone. Poor guy.:

Vanya: In this in this section where the. Where the ethereogram comes. I find it, um... Um, remarkable that he's saying, at this point, of Beelzebub's tales. It's somehow a... a strange way of saying that this is happening, and it's like he's taking himself out of the story and saying that this is the tales, he's... it's not... He could have said, at this point, he was giving the ethereogram, but he's not. He's saying, at this point of Beelzebub's tails, as if he is looking. edit somehow. So... This comes very un...:

Ekant: But this... but this... this notion we have from time to time, that he... yeah, if...:

Vanya: Mm-hmm.:

Ekant: all the paragraphs start with a double quote. This means it's all a tale. And from time to time, he breaks out of this and just gives a little comment, so it's... To me, it sounds not very, uh...:

Vanya: But that he's saying at this point of Beelzebub's tale, is he saying that also in other parts?:

Ekant: Special. Yeah, yeah, there are other parts. At this point of his tales, Beelzebub smiled strangely and continued. So, these things...:

Vanya: Yes, yes, that I know, okay.:

Ekant: Yeah, there are quite a lot.:

Vanya: As if he's changing the, um...:

Ekant: Perspective.:

Vanya: The perspective of the...:

Ekant: Well, he wants to remind us that it's just a tale what is going on.:

Vanya: Yeah. And that he's describing the atherogram is quite new at this point. Normally, there were atherograms before, but not how they look, and with a special metal plate. And let... What is this?:

Ekant: It's a WhatsApp message.:

Vanya: WhatsApp message.:

Ekant: It's a spoken WhatsApp message. Not the written one.:

Vanya: Hmm, okay.:

Ekant: So for us, it's very, very normal, very usual. It's true that there have been a few of... messages coming in, and often he does not say what is there. Yeah, he just... it was just, say, after Beelzebub listening or reading the text, he continued his story, so not telling what... Exactly was there.:

Vanya: Mm-hmm.:

Gwynne Mayer: He really knew his astrology and the meaning of it and how to connect the dots astrologically. so that to me. helps me understand all of this much more.:

Ekant: Before, we had the question why he had to go and to catch some apes, and for me, it seems to be quite obvious that there are things we cannot, uh... understand by just observing we have to experiencing them so. Many things, they are good... we can. get a certain knowledge or understanding even by just observing them from the far, but some things not so. This seems to be one of those things.:

Robin Bloor: Why not do it on Earth?:

Ekant: Probably because there is not... there is not the laboratory which he has on Saturn.:

Vanya: Maybe Gonna Hook one more.:

Gwynne Mayer: When you're acting out of Mars and instinct, you're not observing. And occasion, see, that's why when Vanya mentioned occasion, that's why I think occasion is the observation. He wanted Gunnar Harkak, I always think, I can't say it. to observe.:

Ekant: Yeah, all to experience.:

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah, I don't think I don't think he can experience Mars. Seriously.:

Ekant: When he comes... but he... but... but he...:

Vanya: Earth. Yeah, he cannot go... he also cannot go to Earth. Beelzebub is going to Earth to bring up the apes to Saturn. So it needs to be something in between to bring this together between Saturn and Earth.:

Ekant: Yeah, this would be another question. When going to a hack? anyhow goes down to Mars, he could also go down with Beelzebub to Earth to see directly. But there's not a question here.:

Vanya: They had a very serious exchange of opinions before. Very serious. He says that a few times. It's a very serious thing, but he's not going. Also, he's first emphasizing the seeing organ with the tespuano. In the German version, it's even more... he even calls it, um, Sie, uh, Seins, Sie Organ. And then he's... and then the acerogram is coming, which emphasizes the hearing.:

Ekant: It's a Lie 2 chambre, not an Eterogram.:

Vanya: Yes.:

Ekant: Yes.:

Vanya: But he's hearing it.:

Ekant: Yes, hearing or... yes, of course.:

Vanya: He's putting it to his organ to hear.:

Ekant: Look, it works like this. You take this machine, put it here, and then you can hear something.:

Vanya: La la la la.:

Ekant: Just to demonstrate what is meant. Very obvious.:

Gwynne Mayer: There is no ape in this machine.:

Vanya: Hmm.:

Ekant: Maybe I have to send you the noise of the ape. Yeah, maybe Gurdjieff was a visionary.:

Gwynne Mayer: You think? I think he was beyond, he's almost like a allegorical prophet.:

Ekant: Yes?:

Gwynne Mayer: In a way. That's why, you know... When I read, this, everything he says connects to everything he's already said and what he will say in the future. So, when you read chapter by chapter, or page by page. There is no way, especially those of us who've read it over and over again, that doesn't... it doesn't associate with other parts of the. the book all the way through, so he never loses his train. He doesn't contradict his train of thought. Which is amazing for a writer. Amazing. And think of the amount of attention and focus he had to have. In order... To get it down, not only in his language, but in every language. To make it understood. So, like, when I'm working with somebody who's read the Spanish edition, their understanding is different. Sometimes, but it's not... Opposite mine. It's just different. I wouldn't argue with him, you know.:

Ekant: I agree, and in the same time, when we read it, we are somehow forced. and trained to also do it, to keep the. the track and, uh, don't lose ourself in the side stories or side notions and always coming back here.:

Gwynne Mayer: Well, and if you take it to psychology or child development or anything, everything we do is connected to everything we've done. You see? But when we get fragmented and when it's out of the ordinary, when it is not connected, that's when the dysfunction happens.

So, it's like... From the get-go, if you can't backtrack. All the way back. And see the behaviors. Repeat it over and over again. And then they talk about transformation and consciousness and all of this. Well, it's learning to bridge that gap and go with the flow of what you were born with. To me. Being aware of being aware, you know, that's to me, it's quite simple. But when you're acting out of the ordinary of something that is totally not you. like Garnet Harcourt, if, let's say, I had no Mars in my chart, I'd be totally not able to be born here on Earth. Because Mars is very close to earthly body. And it represents the earthly body.:

Ekant: Yeah, it's interesting. I have no... not much...:

Gwynne Mayer: Well, I mean, it's like...:

Ekant: experience with, with, yeah, I just want to say it's interesting when you tell like this, I don't have much knowledge and information about the disconnection to this.:

Gwynne Mayer: Well, let's say, Akam, that you...:

Ekant: Kind of one.:

Gwynne Mayer: you act a certain way, and you are a certain way. Although, you know, people who've known you all your life. It's the essence. Your essence has a stream of consciousness in it. that kind of molds behaviors and conditioning and blah, blah, blah, blah. I think it's mostly said in a conscience and acquired conscience. I think basically. That's where I'm getting some of this. But let's say you fragment, which he never did. See, he doesn't use fragmented... things that aren't connected to something else. Even in his travels and even with, um... uh, in all his books and his writings. However, when you read the lectures from wartime lectures and the, um, all the. lectures, early talks, I have the 14, 1931, 1914, 1931, he does change some of his perception. It doesn't change what is in what he's written and said. It's his way. of perceiving and explaining. I think that happened with, um... Ouspensky. I think that's what happened with Ouspensky. He no longer saw it. And both of them have the gift. They both have the gift. Aspinski teaches us his system. But... The way he would go around it. I would much rather somebody write a. how to do, how to work with Gurdjieff's work through just the Beelzebub's tales. And Russ Shriver once told me he did that. He does that, and he did... Russ has tried to do it. But I still don't get the purity of it. Robin, do you have any of his new stuff, his new works, Russ's book?:

Robin Bloor: No, I haven't, actually. Maybe I should get a hold of it.:

Gwynne Mayer: Well, I don't want you to get a hold of it and just put it on the shelf. You have to read it.:

Robin Bloor: Oh, really? Is that is that how it works with books? So how do you do the reading? Do you open it, like, from left to right, or from right to left?:

Gwynne Mayer: I open it. Yes. No, I open it where I...:

Vanya: You put it on your ear.:

Robin Bloor: Oh, yes. Well, I think that's the kind of book I would like.:

Ekant: under the cushion and then sleep on it, then it goes directly in the subconsciousness.:

Vanya: Yes.:

Gwynne Mayer: Well, I have a friend who was in some of our Beelzebub tales that he did that with In Search of the Miraculous.:

Vanya: Yes.:

Gwynne Mayer: And he really believes he got it all. Of course, he's...:

Michelle F.: But Gwyn, which book of Ross Thriver do you mean?:

Gwynne Mayer: Helen.:

Michelle F.: the the exercises.:

Gwynne Mayer: It's called 210 Psychological Explorations.:

Michelle F.: Yeah, okay. And he told you that they are just from...:

Gwynne Mayer: He was just... he... in the process of writing it, I was in his groups, and he said, I'm trying to use stuff out of Beelzebub's tales.:

Michelle F.: Yeah. Okay.:

Gwynne Mayer: And so in the book, he'll take a quote and relay it to Beelzebub's tales, but he too is a psychologist, so he's looking at specifically that. Uh, the psychological.:

Michelle F.: Yes, I read it, and I made these exercises, but I never realized that it has to do with the taste directly, you know? Just with the work, but not with the taste.:

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah. Well, that was his intention, Michelle. I don't know if... you know, I don't get how I would have done it, but then I didn't do it, so I'm sitting here, you know...:

Michelle F.: Yeah, yeah.:

Gwynne Mayer: Criticize it.:

Michelle F.: Okay.:

Vanya: Why is that Korean?:

Michelle F.: So I would like to add something about the ethereograms and the lead to chambers. Because, you know, when I was born, my father was on sea. So I have at home, because I'm not at home right now, I have at home the telegram text that he received that I am born. So... So it's actually at that time it happened. It happened like somebody has to tell something to someone who is. on a journey. So he buys a telegram and then it goes to the coast guard and then from the coast guard to the ship and then from the ship to the person who should receive it. In that case, it was my father. So I think he took this idea, what he experienced when he was on this liners to travel to America, that he saw that he just added. the spoken radiogram. But actually, I was searching to show you, and I found a picture, and there is really written a radiogram. So in a minute I will bring you that picture of it of it. Marine radiogram.:

Gwynne Mayer: How do you compare that to the gastrogram?:

Michelle F.: Because it goes through the air as the ethereogram. It's...:

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah, but it also is typed out in kind of a code.:

Michelle F.: Yes, it's done with the Moors, and he loved Moors, as you know from the movements. So... I learnt it this summer week. Two mores.:

Ekant: Four of us learned it.:

Michelle F.: So. We are all of us, of course, but here I speak of me.:

Ekant: Yeah, yeah.:

Michelle F.: My goodness. Actually, I have to share it because I can't find it anymore. So it was in that style. I found a picture. So, marine radiogram, for example. And here it is written, shore to ship, ship to ship, ship to shore, and so it happened. And I remember from some movies how this cabin where the Morse person was, was very interesting. I always thought, ah, I would like to be there. just turn all these buttons on it. So, but in this way, my father received notice that I am born. And he loved Morris, I know.:

Vanya: Thank you, Michelle.:

Ekant: Now, we have another question. Why he... does Gurdjieff or Beelzebub not mention Morse in his... Famous book. As he mentions, quite some persons. But not moss. Or maybe it's encoded somehow.:

Michelle F.: Is it, Robin? Is it encoded somehow?:

Robin Bloor: I don't think so, but if you can find it, let me know.:

Michelle F.: Yeah, okay. Well, somehow, I have the impression he only mentioned people who... who were, uh, learned beings of the new format, who... who have changed... the... the thinking of the humanity, but in a bad way and not in a good way. Maybe he liked Morse. He found it's a good thing.:

Ekant: But he also mentions Pythagoras, and the two brothers who found out have this Law of Seven, so also a few positive figures.:

Michelle F.: Oh, that's true, that's true, yeah. Yeah, I'm wrong, I'm wrong. As human beings are, just see the negative things. Gwyn, what are you looking for? I see you.:

Ekant: She is working out a chart for this evening. To understand why we do what we are doing. I find this sentence just interesting. You see my boy, what coincidences occur in our great universe. So it appears to be just a by sentence, but as. As I more and more observe, can observe what really, what strange coincidences occur. It's also an important sentence to me. It's like a confirmation that it is like this, that is not as arbitrary as modern science sometimes says, that everything is lawful in a way. And this is. Just one notion of it. And often it happens and we don't believe it or we don't can, can see or make connections. Vanya has a certain gift. She always, she, she, she realizes something in herself, but yet it is still too much. I would say covered or colored by subjective states But the thing is there. After when we can see Strange what somehow is there:

Gwynne Mayer: But that observation, her observation, helps make that connection to change. You see?:

Ekant: Yeah, yeah.:

Gwynne Mayer: So it's like. Think how many times you've observed the same behavior with someone, your projections or whatever, before you literally can internalize your own change. And quite honestly, because you and Vanya are so close and intimate, it's more able to change. Like, you can't do that, which is... people around you that aren't close to you, aren't intimate with you. It's a constant struggle.:

Ekant: Yes, and especially the last.:

Vanya: There's something else which... He's giving a hint how. Uh, the state of agitation is... happening. That he's saying... that... Ah, no, I lost it. The beginning of that agitation of mind. There was the wise anchoring of a certain learned being of new formation, then named Mani Kel. And then he goes on to explain how this agitation of mind is... um, developing. And if I grab this idea which Robin gave, that the learned being is somehow or other the formative apparatus. then this would be an indication how. we could deal with. Agitation of mind, but what is actually happening? that the formative apparatus takes over the... Initiative, yes. And that from there, this agitation of mind is going to crescendo. He's also giving me these pictures.:

Ekant: Yeah, in a way, Gurdjieff says implicitly, don't. fall in the trap of this. this periodical, uh, agitation. But, when I now look, it's interesting that he, receiving this information, somehow. takes this as an impulse to... to research himself about the apes, so he... he somehow got caught by himself. He could say, ah, crazy humans, again, the old question, and just doing his normal work, but he says, no, let's go and... catch some apes, we want to find out what is really the truth.:

Gwynne Mayer: Well, I think there's a difference between investigating like he's doing. He's investigating. He's, um... It's an experiment with him. And... It's it's interesting that. Some people will investigate up to a certain point and then make it dogma. You see, he doesn't do that. He's constantly looking underneath everything. So there's no, to me, there's no dogma in Gurdjieff. No dogmatic. Other than observing oneself. You have to observe yourself, but that's it, you know.:

Rod Thorn: He says that the... the reason for collecting the apes was something that he observed alongside Gorno or Haark. When he was staying with him. And there was something about the behaviour. these favourites of his. That started an exchange of opinions between them, which had to be resolved by... these elucidatory experiments. So there was something that they observed. in us. Which had to be resolved by looking at the apes in more detail. Which seems to me to be an interesting thing. to say.:

Ekant: I thought... That what they observed were the fact that the humans were concerned with the apes question. I'm not sure if you bring a completely different aspect in, but this would be something which I would... just assume when I read the text, but I'm not sure.:

Rod Thorn: Well, he's... this is on page 270, he says, um, we were once together observing the existence of these favourites of yours. A certain fact, which we happened to notice, was the cause of a very serious exchange of opinions. So, I took that to be... That there was something that they noticed, not particularly the ape question, but something about... what people were doing. I mean, maybe... Um, could it be a particular element of human nature, for example? Maybe could be resolved by looking. studying apes. The other thing that I don't understand... about the ape question is, later on, he talks about this thing. that, thanks to Manette Cowles. idea... Um, that became... I'm fixed in the instincts. people at that time. Another addicted dictatorial factor. Which made people think that the apes were sacred. Um, and that seems... I didn't know about that. I mean, were apes considered sacred? He seems to be saying that it lasted for a couple of hundred years, and then... Went away.:

Ekant: I don't know about, uh... the notion of being sacred, but I... I know there was a tendency. that people assigned quite high capabilities to apes, almost assuming there are. Poor humans who have just, uh, raised in the, in the jungle. And if you teach them and give them the right education, you would almost have a, have a, have a human being some, somehow like this. And even with this, a little bit of. I missed the word of... this... this idea... I don't find the adjective... this idea that apes even are more innocent and have more capabilities than humans, somehow. Yeah, so because everything is more pure in them. And when we take, uh... take Gurdjieff, then it is very clear, which I find more reasonable, that the apes. have not the same capabilities like a human being. Even if there might even be a kind of... Uh, overlapping of some human beings and some ape beings, who knows? But in general, in... But about being sacred, I also have no information, no idea. You can look at this.:

Rod Thorn: The only thing I could think of was, um... sort of tradition of things like Yeti and Bigfoot. Um, and... And perhaps also a connection with the Orang Utangs, which I think are... are considered to be, sort of, wise forest beings. I don't know if they're counters. apes in this meeting. But, I mean, do apes perhaps stand for something. Um, maybe, um, as Gwyn seemed to be suggesting, a sort of, like, an instinct, something like that, or... I'm not sure.:

Ekant: I just asked AI about... I put what I have. Got there's an answer.:

Vanya: Yes, I found the same thing.:

Ekant: Yes, actually, what are you asking for?:

Vanya: I was asking also for. The apes. A little different.:

Ekant: It's an ongoing motive that he... explains in very nice and humorous ways how. those, uh... learned beings arise and what, how they became famous or learned or so many on, on, on several occasions in the. In the, in the book. I cannot take much more out of these descriptions than he makes his jokes out of them, but maybe something is encoded. in these descriptions. passage where you wrote, say it with this. sacrilegious impulse. It's an interesting... He says there is a maleficent, a maleficent idea. Then it is fixed in the instincts. Then it is... becomes a dictatory factor. And then this raises a feeling that the apes are sacred. Yeah, so he brings different layers together, so I think he describes with this something which. Might be interesting to... To connect to our psychological study and to mechanisms running in ourselves. We could understand this. This periodically coming, the urge to know from where. They come somehow, and we could say this is a very degenerated, uh... expression of the connection towards the higher. Somehow.:

Rod Thorn: So isn't the, um, the argument... Um, of whether people are descended from apes, or... Apes are descended from people. Is that a sort of... Evolution versus involution. Kind of argument, but... If we're descended from apes, then... We're kind of evolving from apes, maybe. Whereas the other way around would be a sort of... Um, an involution that... That people go wild. So that indicates that sort of descending. I don't know, I don't really know where that leaves us, but it's maybe the thing about seeing the apes as sacred. I mean, that sort of seems contradictory to... If apes are descended from us. Why would they be sacred?:

Ekant: I thought these different perspectives somehow describe. what we could call a materialistic worldview and a... So, so... In a way. Could also simply say an optimistic or a pessimistic one. So everything arises somehow, evolves, or everything just degenerates and... Yeah, decents. Not understanding that both happens at the same time and there's a deep interrelation between.:

Rod Thorn: I mean, in fact, doesn't Darwin say that we're not really descended from the apes, but... We have a common ancestor. So, there's a sort of... it's a bit more... It's neither one nor the

other, directly. But would Gurdjieff say that, I mean, apes, presumably. we would say are two-brained beings. Um, and... Does... does that kind of... I'm not sure whether that kind of evolution is... is included in... Beelzebub's, uh, scheme of things that... or in Gurdjieff's scheme of things. So is the... Um, in the cosmology. are three brain beings just formed separately from two brain beings? Or can... Would we say that three-brained beings can develop from two-brained beings?:

Robin Bloor: Gurdjieff was asked that question, it's in some of the books, maybe it's later he ever wrote, but he was specifically asked that question and his response was no. Two brain beings cannot create a three brain being, period. And that we are from another line or another mechanism, if you like. We come down from higher.:

Gwynne Mayer: So I think what's interesting is that we're only 3%. Correct me if I'm wrong, Robin. There's only 3% difference in human beings and apes in the DNA structure.:

Robin Bloor: Yeah, there's a problem with that because it at this point in time there's no accurate. There's no accurate statement of what DNA actually does. So you, you, you find, if you start to use percentages of DNA, you discover that, you know. We are strongly similar in terms of the. genetic makeup as an octopus or something, you know? And you can come up with all of that stuff, and it doesn't mean a damn thing. And the problem with DNA is that DNA doesn't determine form.:

Gwynne Mayer: So, what about the DNA with the Neanderthals? Have you gotten into any of that study?:

Robin Bloor: I haven't actually looked at that at all, but it it's. The my assumption is all of the things that are taken to be human species are in fact three brain beings.:

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah, thank you.:

Robin Bloor: And the there's I don't think there's any point in going to the DNA for any of this, because. What happened? was, uh, I don't know what name, that Crick was one of the guys, wasn't it, of the DNA, one of the two DNA guys, but their intention. when they published was to destroy completely any idea that there was any religious line to the creation of human beings. And they figured that having created the science surrounding DNA, they'd wiped out God. And it's it's it's a statement by one of them that was made, you know, and and it's like. They started to make claims. Um, as though they kind of knew. The various encodings on genetic encodings led to specific outcomes, but there's no evidence for it. So it it's like. The problem with DNA is that. There isn't anything in the DNA that indicates anything systemic. So, while you might, in one way or another, be able to say, well, this, um... This nose has these characteristics in DNA. You can't link the blood circulation to the nose. with anything in the DNA. Or the... the relationship between the nose and the lung. There isn't... none of the relationship, one thing to another, which is the form of the human beings, essentially, has ever been demonstrated in DNA. It's not that. Um, it would appear... The third factor is what we would think of as. the envelope of essence that determines some of this. But anyway, it's not a settled question, and it's something that maybe I should try and get to the bottom of. Because an awful lot of damage has been done, as it often is in science, has been done by people trying to load on top of a genuine scientific discovery. all sorts of their own speculations.:

Gwynne Mayer: Well, I don't know that studying it or even evaluating. The academia. around it even answers a question. You know, it's like... You can pick anything and start your comparison process. And it depends on what your study involves, you know that. It's like... I think that's the unique part of Gurdjieff. You know, I think... say, uh, in what Rod was saying, I said, I think all we

can surmise is it's the instinctual body, you know? That's it. It goes, that's all it can go by. You see? So, it's like he, he really is approaching the centers. in all of his work and the development of the centers and their interconnectedness to a collected state. So, I mean, on a positive level, I think that's what he wants is the getting us to a collective state. By pointing out the, um... Disconnect. I would have liked to hear him. Write a summary of, um. assessment of the Stokes trials and the... because he had to have gotten that from over here. You know, because it wasn't in Europe. At the time, was it?:

Robin Bloor: I mean, it made the newspapers in Europe, but it was in Europe. It was just.:

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah, but he had to have known. He had to have known about it to some degree.:

Robin Bloor: Oh, it was probably in America when it happened, you know, I mean, it's. Or at that kind of time, you know. But it made the newspapers in Europe and those wacky Americans are doing strange things with their odd approach to the law.:

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah. Yes. We're still doing strange things. Nothing's changed about that.:

Robin Bloor: I like the fact that in Texas you're forced to have the Ten Commandments on the wall in all schools. I think that's just wonderful.:

Gwynne Mayer: Isn't that nice? And the kids don't even know what the boards mean.:

Robin Bloor: No, because it it's. The problem is that there aren't any video games that include the Ten Commandments, so how would they ever know?:

Gwynne Mayer: Well, so that's it. Somebody's gonna make it a video game, the Ten Commandments. I think that's great.:

Robin Bloor: I think so too.:

Gwynne Mayer: The burning tree and everything. Yeah.:

Robin Bloor: I think that would be, I think that would make an excellent video game. I just need somebody to write it for me.:

Gwynne Mayer: I do too. Leave it to the Texans, I swear to God. I swear to God.:

Vanya: Yeah, according to the objective reality of these theories, he gives, in the end, a very clear statement of Muller-Nasreddin, so... I mean, as far as Muller-Nasreddin's statements are clear, but... He's giving at least a hint how. Objective. The real they are.:

Robin Bloor: I mean, that's probably... he probably is trying to indicate some very specific form of meaning with that. I mean, I looked at it and tried to... Decode it. In finding the authentic godmother of the incomparable Scheherazade on an old dunghill. I can't work out what it means.:

Gwynne Mayer: It's a bonobo.:

Robin Bloor: He doesn't mention bonobos, but I'm sure you're correct.:

Gwynne Mayer: The godmother of the apes.:

Robin Bloor: Actually, I mean, maybe it does make some kind of sense. It depends how you symbolize Scheherazade, you know.:

Gwynne Mayer: Well, that's one of the tales he was raised on. So, you know, he goes back to Gilgamesh, Sherazade, all the things he was told as a child. We just took it to a different level. I think the art of storytelling has really gone lacking. I love storytellers. I love good storytellers, and... At one point, we did a thing at the libraries here in Texas. We did storytelling for the kids. And you had to be able to tell stories. You had to be able to be a good storyteller. And it was kind of a volunteer thing. But the kids loved it, other than, like, not reading from the book. So Gurdjieff was raised on storytelling. And only later, you know, in his school years did he go to. School. and read books. So his formation as a child was. Those that his grandfather's father taught him. Well, totally. And interesting enough, back in the, you know, the Celts, I'm sure every culture had, in the beginning, storytelling. That was the way they passed information. It was all oral. In an ethereogram.:

Robin Bloor: I mean, the old, um... First Nation in the United States, they had people who were designated to be the tribe storyteller. And called them twisted hair. And they had a strange thing, they wove the stories into their hair. So that they, every time they unwound their hair and washed it, they would remember the stories. And it was. Battles between the First Nation. Uh, various tribes. The twisted hair from each tribe would just sit on a hill and watch the battle. So that they could tell the story, and it was regarded as, um... A criminal act to kill the twisted hat.:

Gwynne Mayer: Well, and also, um, back in the day when I was in graduate school, there was a graduate student at Rush University that studied piano and the music of the Russians. The script, uh... of the theory. the theory in Russian of writing the music, they did spy... they... they did special messages, spy messages, through the... the music itself. and it was through the theory. And so he did that with the Morse code and the the. going through dance, that it's the same thing, same type of thing, the movements. is to send a message. It's a, um... So, and in the Persian rugs, you know that, you know the rug people.:

Robin Bloor: Yep.:

Gwynne Mayer: Um, and the Navajos. The Navajos recently are running out of people that know how to do that. They have not taught their kids. It's the last generation is. Um, I visited somebody in New Mexico that's their last generation. They... the kids don't know how to do it anymore.:

Robin Bloor: Well:

Gwynne Mayer: It's so sad. It's very sad.:

Robin Bloor: Well, it is with the Navajo because they're the largest tribe that remains in terms of owning land and having wealth. So they're the ones that you would hope. I still don't get this sacred thing. I kind of... I keep... my mind keeps worrying it, but it doesn't go anywhere.:

Gwynne Mayer: Yeah, it is. It's going into the cosmos.:

Rod Thorn: But if he's talking about it lasting for 200 years. after Mani Kal, then we should be thinking. I don't know, sort of Babylonian times and stuff like that. Maybe there was some early indication of... I don't know, did they even... know about apes in those days.:

Robin Bloor: I don't know how you'd find that out. Cuneiform tablets, do they mention apes? It's about all you've got, isn't it?:

Rod Thorn: Yeah.:

Robin Bloor: And really, he talks about this being tickly Amish, which is. Really a long time before

Summa. But, you know, it's in Gurdjieff's or Beelzebub's terminology, so. I don't know how you count the years, really. What do we think the seventh in turn great general planetary process of reciprocal destruction was? That, that sounds like the Seventh World War. Why the fact that he calls them Mr. Apes? I read Darwin. I don't remember Darwin referring to them as Mr. Apes. It's appropriate. Given the context.:

Rod Thorn: Why is it appropriate?:

Robin Bloor: Sorry?:

Rod Thorn: Why is it appropriate?:

Robin Bloor: Because of the meaning of the word mister.:

Rod Thorn: No, still haven't got it.:

Robin Bloor: Well, a mister means a master. The original meaning of the word Mr. is actually a master, somebody that knows how to do something. So calling them Mr. Apes would imply that they were very intelligent apes.:

Rod Thorn: But doesn't he use Mr. Like This as a... sort of poking fun at something, almost. I can't quite get the... he used...:

Robin Bloor: Well, no, it works if it's poking fun, because it's not true, but if it were true, they would be master apes. You know, so it has that It's elsewhere in the tales where he refers to. I think it's when Gurnaher Harhart's first introduced, and he says that the word Gurnaher means. Mr. Um, and then he says there's the... I can't remember his exact words, but it's important to understand that there is meaning in the word mister, as he says, you know. So I remember looking at the etymology of the time. At that time when I read about it, so. It's all of a muchness. I mean, one of the things about Gurdjieff is that a lot of this. Um, language that he used is he, he used when he was talking to people. I mean, not all of it, but some of it, you know, some of it was invented for the book, but some of it's just the way he talks about things. I guess we've run out of time. Anybody got anything else they'd like to add?:

Ekant: Yeah, I thought when we, with the Mr. Apes, it seems like a contradiction when he says that Darwin says we were descendant from these Mr. Apes, but he says this is an evolution. We evolved from the Mr. Apes.:

Robin Bloor: Okay, thank you everybody.:

Chat EU Meeting

2026-08-19 12:45:36 From Robin Bloor to Everyone:

The Scopes trial — formally State of Tennessee v. John Thomas Scopes, popularly the "Monkey Trial" — ran from 10 to 21 July 1925 in Dayton, Tennessee.

The law. Tennessee's Butler Act (March 1925) made it illegal in state-funded schools to teach any theory denying the biblical account of creation and holding instead that man descended from a lower order of animals.

The setup. It was a manufactured test case. The ACLU advertised for a teacher willing to be prosecuted, and a group of Dayton businessmen — led by engineer George Rappleyea — took it up largely to put the town on the map. Scopes was a 24-year-old science teacher and football coach who had substituted in a biology class; whether he ever actually taught the evolution chapter is doubtful, and he later said he wasn't sure he had. He didn't testify.

The principals. William Jennings Bryan, three-time presidential candidate and populist crusader against Darwinism, joined the prosecution.

2026-08-19 12:46:09 From Robin Bloor to Everyone:

Clarence Darrow, the era's most famous defence attorney and an outspoken agnostic, led the defence. H. L. Mencken covered it for the Baltimore Sun and did much to fix its image as rural fundamentalism on display.

The famous moment. Judge Raulston excluded the defence's expert scientific testimony as irrelevant — the only question was whether Scopes had taught the forbidden thing. Darrow's counter was to call Bryan himself to the stand as an expert on the Bible, and to press him on Jonah, Joshua stopping the sun, and the age of the earth. Bryan conceded the "days" of Genesis might not be 24-hour days. The exchange was struck from the record the next day.

The outcome. Darrow asked the jury to return a guilty verdict so he could appeal. Scopes was fined \$100. In 1927 the Tennessee Supreme Court upheld the Butler Act but voided the fine on a technicality — sums over \$50 had to be set by the jury, not the judge — and pointedly recommended the case be dropped.

2026-08-19 12:46:32 From Robin Bloor to Everyone:

The outcome. Darrow asked the jury to return a guilty verdict so he could appeal. Scopes was fined \$100. In 1927 the Tennessee Supreme Court upheld the Butler Act but voided the fine on a technicality — sums over \$50 had to be set by the jury, not the judge — and pointedly recommended the case be dropped, which killed the appeal the ACLU wanted. Bryan died in Dayton five days after the verdict.

Aftermath. The Butler Act stayed on the books until 1967; the US Supreme Court struck down such laws in *Epperson v. Arkansas* (1968). Worth flagging for research purposes: *Inherit the Wind* (1955 play, 1960 film) is a Cold War allegory about McCarthyism, not a reliable account — it invents characters, motives and events wholesale, and Edward Larson's *Summer for the Gods* (1997) is the standard corrective.

2026-08-19 13:26:57 From Ekant to Everyone:

In Hinduism, the monkey god Hanuman remains one of the most widely worshipped deities. Temples with monkey colonies are treated as sacred, and the animals are protected and fed. A related figure is China's Sun Wukong, the "Monkey King" from Journey to the West, venerated in folk religion.

In ancient Egypt, the baboon was linked to Thoth (god of wisdom and writing) and also appeared as the deity Babi. Baboons were mummified and kept in temples; their seated posture with raised arms was read as worship of the rising sun.

In Japan, the monkey (saru) served in Shinto as a messenger of the gods, especially at Hie shrines; the monkey god Sarutahiko is a kami. The famous "three monkeys" (see, hear, speak no evil) come from this context.

Among the Maya, monkey gods were patrons of scribes and artists — the twins Hun Batz and Hun Chuen in the Popol Vuh.

2026-08-19 13:27:59 From Vanya to Everyone:

The three wise apes

The motif likely originated in Japan and is best known from a carving on the gate of the Tōshō-gū Shrine in Nikkō (17th century). However, some researchers suggest older roots in China—linked to Confucian teachings on proper conduct—that may have reached Japan via the Tendai school of Buddhism.

The names and their meanings

I call them:

Mizaru (見ざる) – "not seeing"

Kikazaru (聞かざる) – "not hearing"

Iwazaru (言わざる) – "not speaking"

The clever twist: The suffix "-zaru" sounds like *zaru* (猿), the Japanese word for "monkey"—a play on words lost in translation to German or English. The monkeys physically cover their eyes, ears, and mouths with their hands.

2026-08-19 13:28:07 From Vanya to Everyone:

Traditional meaning

Originally, the image conveys a positive moral message: one should consciously shield oneself from evil, wrongdoing, or malicious speech—adhering to the principle of "see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil" in order to remain virtuous. It is about consciously distancing oneself from what is bad, not about cowardice.

Shift in meaning in the West

In Western usage, the interpretation has changed significantly; today, the motif is mostly used negatively. It serves as a symbol for deliberately looking the other way, suppressing awareness

of wrongdoing, or passive complicity ("I saw nothing, heard nothing, said nothing"). This interpretation is often applied critically, for instance, in discussions regarding civic courage or the refusal to take responsibility.

2026-08-19 13:28:49 From Michelle F. to Everyone:

In Ancient Egypt baboons did have sacred significance. They were particularly associated with the god Thoth, the god of writing, wisdom, and knowledge. Thoth was depicted both in the form of an ibis and as a baboon. Baboons were also associated with the rising sun; their morning cries were understood as a kind of greeting to the sun god.

AI Summary Meeting 039

EU Session

Quick recap

The meeting focused on a reading and discussion of Chapter 23 from "Beelzebub's Tales to His Grandson," specifically the fourth personal sojourn of Beelzebub on Earth and the recurring "ape question" among humans. Robin read the passage, which described Beelzebub's interactions with his friend Gornaher Harhart and their observations of Earth's inhabitants, leading to a discussion about the origins of humans and apes. The group explored themes of descending and ascending octaves, the role of intellect versus instinct, and the allegorical significance of Mars and Saturn. Gwynne shared her fascination with apes and their instinctual nature, drawing parallels to human behavior and development. The conversation also touched on the historical context of the Scopes Trial, the limitations of scientific theories like Darwin's, and the symbolic use of storytelling and ethereograms in Gurdjieff's writing. Participants reflected on the interconnectedness of ideas in the text and the periodic agitations of mind among humans regarding their origins.

Next steps

Michelle

- Share the picture of the marine radiogram with the group.

Robin

- Consider obtaining and reading Russ Shriver's book "210 Psychological Explorations" as suggested by Gwynne.
- Investigate further into the question of DNA and its relation to form, as mentioned in the discussion.

Summary

Beelzebub's Fourth Earth Sojourn

Robin read chapter 23 of Beelzebub's tales, describing the fourth personal sojourn of Beelzebub on Earth and his friendship with Gornaher Harhart. Beelzebub explained how Harhart's assistance helped create a famous telescope that enabled observations of remote cosmic concentrations. The discussion concluded with Beelzebub describing how the "ape question" about human origins periodically fascinated Earth's three-centered beings, with theories proposed by both Menakel and Darwin becoming part of their cultural discussions.

Planetary Relationships and Cosmic Allegory

The group discussed the concept of "descending" in their text, with Vanya noting its frequent use and potential connection to descending octaves. Robin explained how new ideas often dismiss previous knowledge, using medicine as an example of competing traditions. Gwynne shared her fascination with apes and their instinctual nature, connecting this to the discussion of Mars-Saturn relationships and the impact on human linear thinking. The conversation explored the cosmic allegory of Gornaher Haha's journey from Saturn to Mars, with Robin clarifying that the spaceship used for travel is not a normal vessel and represents a reconciliation of intellect and emotion within the planetary body.

Apes and Evolution Discussion

The group discussed why it was necessary to capture apes from Earth and bring them to Saturn for examination, with Robin questioning the practicality of this approach. Gwynne suggested this might be an allegorical reference to the Scopes trial, which Robin confirmed was a famous 1925 trial in Tennessee about teaching evolution in schools. The discussion concluded with Gwynne sharing observations about the collective consciousness of mountain gorillas compared to bonobos, noting similarities in social structures.

Primate Social Structures Discussion

The group discussed Gwynne's observations about primate social structures, particularly focusing on bonobos and mountain gorillas, and how these relate to human family dynamics. Vanya and Ekant analyzed literary techniques in a text about Beelzebub's tales, noting how the author uses perspective shifts and special formatting to distinguish between narrative and commentary. The discussion concluded with observations about how direct experience is necessary for understanding certain phenomena, rather than relying solely on observation from a distance.

Gurdjieff's Writing Style Discussion

The group discussed Gurdjieff's writing style and its interconnected nature across different editions and languages. Gwynne described Gurdjieff as an allegorical prophet whose work maintains a consistent train of thought throughout, while Ekant noted how readers are trained to stay focused on the main themes rather than getting lost in side stories. The discussion touched on Gurdjieff's emphasis on observation and experience, particularly regarding Mars and Earth connections, though specific details about characters and settings remained unclear.

Gurdjieff's Teachings and Communications

The group discussed Gurdjieff's work and writing, particularly focusing on how his perspectives evolved over time and how different authors have approached interpreting his teachings. Gwynne shared insights about Russ Shriver's book "210 Psychological Explorations" which uses material from "Beelzebub's Tales" for psychological applications. Michelle contributed historical context about Morse code, explaining how her father received a marine radiogram announcing her birth, and noted the connection between Morse code and Gurdjieff's interest in communication systems. The discussion concluded with a question about why Gurdjieff didn't mention Morse in his famous book, despite mentioning other individuals.

Gurdjieff's Observations on Human Behavior

The group discussed Gurdjieff's observations about learned beings and their impact on human thinking, with Michelle initially suggesting negative effects but later acknowledging positive figures mentioned like Pythagoras. Gwynne explained how personal observations and intimate relationships can facilitate internal change, while Vanya described how Gurdjieff's writings indicate that the formative apparatus can lead to mental agitation. Rod shared insights about Gurdjieff's experiments with apes, noting that these investigations were triggered by observations made with Gorno or Haarhark about human behavior regarding favorites, and raised questions about whether apes were considered sacred during a specific historical period.

Apes and Sacred Capabilities Discussion

The group discussed the notion of apes being considered sacred or having special capabilities, with Ekant explaining that Gurdjieff's work suggests apes do not have the same capabilities as humans despite potential overlaps in some individuals. Rod mentioned traditional concepts like

Yeti and Bigfoot, while Vanya and Ekant found references to apes in Gurdjieff's writings, particularly regarding malevolent instincts and degenerated expressions of connection to the higher. The discussion explored how these concepts might relate to psychological studies and mechanisms within humans.

Human-Ape Evolution Discussion

The group discussed the relationship between humans and apes from a philosophical and scientific perspective. Rod questioned whether apes are descended from humans or vice versa, while Ekant suggested different worldviews could be optimistic or pessimistic about evolution versus degeneration. Robin clarified that Gurdjieff believed three-brained beings cannot evolve from two-brained beings and come from a different line, while Gwynne mentioned the 3% DNA difference between humans and apes. Robin expressed skepticism about using DNA to determine evolutionary relationships, arguing that DNA doesn't determine form and that scientists like Crick may have overstated DNA's role in attempting to eliminate religious explanations for human creation.

Gurdjieff's "Mr. Apes" Interpretations

The group discussed Gurdjieff's work and interpretations of his writing, particularly focusing on the concept of "Mr. Apes" and its meaning. Gwynne suggested that Gurdjieff was referring to an instinctual body and the development of centers, while Vanya noted that Gurdjieff provided a clear statement about Muller-Nasreddin's objective reality. The conversation also touched on storytelling traditions across different cultures and how information was originally passed down orally. The discussion concluded with Ekant pointing out a potential contradiction in Gurdjieff's writing about evolution from "Mr. Apes."

Meeting #039

US Session Transcript

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

Federico Balsa: Just one minute.:

Robert Posen: I fed the monkeys. I was looking for spiritual enlightenment.:

Federico Balsa: Yeah. But you must have perceived something there. Special.:

Robert Posen: Nothing. Nothing.:

Federico Balsa: Oh! Oh.:

Stephen Frantz: No, they're very annoying. There's a monkey temple in Kathmandu. I went there to visit my brother when he was in the Peace Corps.:

Robert Posen: That's it. That's it.:

Federico Balsa: Oh, you too. The more I think, the worse it gets. Everyone's been everywhere.:

Stephen Frantz: Yeah. I was there. You're the only one. You're the only one who hasn't been there. Federico, you're the only one who hasn't been there of this whole crowd. We've all been to .:

Federico Balsa: Yeah, that's... That's the world conspiracy against Argentines. It's a world conspiracy against Argentines. Well, anyway, no tennis tennis.:

Stephen Frantz: But. Yeah, well, they become a little menacing.:

Federico Balsa: I want to hear it. I want to hear a bit. Come on. What did you do there?:

Stephen Frantz: No, there's not that much... there's not that much to say, except that it was not a sacred experience. The monkeys, uh, can actually become a little menacing. Um, yeah, you sort of want them to keep their distance, because there are quite a few of them.:

Federico Balsa: Uh-huh.:

Janet M Mitchell: So going back to this question of pawnshop progeny. If we go to the... The page before, 272. And we parse through the content, the context from, and the other terrestrial beings of that period, and we process that all the way through to the dictatory factor.:

Federico Balsa: Yeah.:

Janet M Mitchell: Is that setting up what he's... Now, I totally agree with Robin's point, right? I mean, pawn shop progeny doesn't sound like a compliment, so I think we can kind of know somewhere he's going. But in terms of the way it's set up on 272. Is that telling us what is really intended there? How do you interpret that setup?:

Barbara Pennock: Which paragraph are you speaking about, Janet?:

Janet M Mitchell: Well, I start with, you know, the Mentakil saying, you know, more or less what are called people who became wild. So is that the trade that's taking place at the pawn shop? And

this is the progeny coming out of this wild trade. that are somehow believed to be auntie's darling, and then seventh in turn, great general planetary process of reciprocal destruction. Um, what is this whole setup, like, meaning to you all? Um... And then thanks to this Maleficent idea, um... There's still another abnormal, the dictatory factor. Creating the false feeling that these ape beings are presumably sacred. I don't know what he means.:

Stephen Frantz: I don't either.:

Janet M Mitchell: I've discovered part of my frustration with the book is I've fallen victim to how he set it up in the beginning, in terms of the wiseacring and the intentional frustrations. I sort of fell for it. Um, so I went back during our two-week hiatus, and I studied all 22 chapters prior to this. So, I'm a little... more knowledgeable, more stupid, but, um... It's also really hard for me, and this is just my own contextual thing, it's really hard... we're... we're gonna... we're gonna read this chapter alone for seven weeks.:

Barbara Pennock: Okay.:

Janet M Mitchell: And so, it's like, okay, why did he write this? What does it mean as a whole? How does it fit with the narrative arc? We're... for me, I feel like I'm so close up to the bark in this book, I can't see...:

Stephen Frantz: Yeah.:

Janet M Mitchell: But then Robert, you know, pops in with these things of, like, um... meant to kill, or how you say that. I'm like, that blows my mind from the Book of Daniel, and you can just Google that, and it immediately pops up with the meaning of what that whole thing was. It's like, wow, that's brilliant. So if there's all these gems in here... Keep going, keep swimming.:

Stephen Frantz: Yeah. I mean, I don't know if I need to say anything. I don't know whether you're looking for a response, but just to... to say I feel your pain, and my... my... my strategy. with this book now, I... there's a tremendous, tremendous temptation, and it's so, so ingrained in us because of our education. to try to understand a truly new idea in terms of ideas we already understand. Because in order to make them comprehensible. We have to relate them to something that we already. justifiably or not, think that we comprehend. And so I'm constantly trying to wrestle something that seems really unusual to me into some kind of a logical relationship. But it always feels false and not like a very useful activity to do. And so in this case, when I read this thing, I didn't know there even was a theory that apes had descended from humans. And I did a quick AI search on it. What Derek said today was totally news to me. And I didn't find that in AI. The only thing I found was that in certain branches of Islam, if you have transgressed and broken the laws of the Creator, some people were turned into apes. And then there are certain animist traditions in Africa that believe that the apes were people who stayed behind in the forest. When humans emerged onto the savanna and started to become bipedal. Uh, and that the others stayed behind. But that's all I could find. So, I... I have no idea... why he introduced it, why Minitkel is relevant, what it's got to do with pawnshops. And... Why he would even bother to say it, because it would seem like it would be enough to say the humans have been wrestling with this question of apes because of their famous Darwin. That was enough. That was the main ape argument in the United States. And the people that found Darwin offensive were not people that felt that apes were descended from humans. They were people that felt that humans were created directly by God and could not possibly have evolved from lower animals and shared that many characteristics with them. So, I don't know what Manitka is doing in here, and all I can say is that as we read on the book, maybe some remote part of my brain that is now not able to make that neural connection will suddenly understand it. And so, you know, I... I don't... I don't... I don't know... you just

always raise these very interesting questions, Janice, about what... how should we deal with our incomprehension, and the fact that this book seems... opaque. Chapter by chapter. And I think that somehow it's not very comforting to say that the discomfort is part of the ride. And if you don't feel uncomfortable and you don't feel like you don't understand it, you're not reading the book correctly. That's fine.:

Barbara Pennock: Can I see?:

Stephen Frantz: But, um, I also think that there's this strange thing called comprehension, which is so to take place, or understanding. But I have no idea how that's going to occur. But I certainly know I can't force it. I don't even know why I needed to say all that.:

Federico Balsa: It's something that that helps me is there's a Spanish proverb that says, *el que habiza nuestra idor*, which will be he who gives fair warning is not a traitor. And the man gives fair warning. I'm here to destroy the... your whole way of thinking, and the pathetic processes that you call thinking. And because I'm here to teach you how to think. And, uh... And it has to do also with. This, uh... I think there's a moment in which Jesus. Is being questioned by the. by the elders of of the synagogue or and or I don't know which where he says that one must be born again. And they ask him, but how is a man to... does anyone remember the quote? How is a man to enter into his mother's body and then be born again? As an example of literal. interpretation. I should have looked it up. And so what he is. Asking us is to be born again thinkers. I don't know. So in my case, I used to believe in Darwinism as anyone who is superficial in scientific matters. and all kinds of matters. And I found it shocking. All the things he said. That there were other ways of thinking about it. Just that, just that. What I was taught at school was not. necessarily the truth. But at the same time. I the the idea that. God created man directly, and he is the maximum of evolution. I think what he does is he... He rubs our noses into our belief. In all the... many of the ridiculous things he says people in the past believed. But he's telling me what I believe in, and he's telling me how pathetic it is that I believe those things. I heard, I was hearing today an audio. And we said, nobody has a belief. Everyone... believes everyone is sure that what he has are facts. And you ask them, do you have a belief? No, no, I go by the facts. But the facts are what you believe are facts. And, uh, Mr. Gurdjieff doesn't.:

Stephen Frantz: Yep.:

Federico Balsa: Okay, I talk too much, I'm...:

Stephen Frantz: No, I don't think so. I like what you said. I think you're on the mark. And the last thing I'll say, and I really am going to shut up, but I mean, if you want to build a new house, you have to tear down the old one first. And after that old house is torn down, you're looking at a vacant lot with rubble in it. And that is not. a very fun experience, especially if you're not sure that the kind of house you want to build, you're not even sure what the nature of it will be. You've just been promised it's going to be a better house than the one you had, and one that's closer to reality. But you don't know what it's going to look like. All you know is that you no longer have a house. Uh, and you're waiting for the new one to arrive. And I think that's the way I have to experience this book.:

Janet M Mitchell: So, let's go back to the exegesis of this text, right, in terms of what we're trying to do. So, if we take a look where he... and Robert, how do I pronounce this? Mentakel. Is that it? Is that... what's... give me the right...:

Robert Posen: Well, but I would say it's Mena, Mena, Tekel. So just go Mena, Tekel.:

Janet M Mitchell: Benetecho. Mena:

Robert Posen: Yeah, he's got an I in there. It sounds like Mena... Mena Kell, but I say Mena Kell.:

Janet M Mitchell: Echo. Echo. Okay, awesome, thank you, that's helpful. So, if we go back to where Meniteco is first introduced on the bottom of 271, and we read from the bottom of 271 to when he pays it all off.:

Robert Posen: Mena Manateca, whatever that is.:

Janet M Mitchell: To the said pawn shop progeny. Is there something to learn there? I mean... Is that annoying to ask? Or is it... Or do you not care? Like, do you not read it in that way to get to that? Or, like... like, I'm not quite sure how we want to, you know... unpack it, if you will.:

Stephen Frantz: Well. Well, ask the question again. What's the precise question you think you're trying to answer?:

Janet M Mitchell: I'm back to what is the meaning of pawnshop progeny, and the setup for pawnshop progeny begins with the, um...:

Stephen Frantz: Okay.:

Janet M Mitchell: the bottom of the content on 271. The beginning of that agitation of mine, there was this wise anchoring of a certain learned being of a new formation, their name Menakel.:

Stephen Frantz: Yep.:

Janet M Mitchell: whatever. And then it goes on. So what do we interpret that to mean? Isn't that the point of kind of how we unpack this, or no? I'm sorry, I got meta before. I'm getting specific now in terms of what...:

Stephen Frantz: Well... No, I think it's useful. All I can do with Pawnshop, there's nothing dishonorable about running a Pawnshop, but it is a business that's based... that only exists because people are in extreme financial circumstances. It performs a useful service. But its clientele is people who are so down at the heels or so at the margin of existence, they have to start to sell their own belongings in order to get enough money to keep living. And the way it works is that you either go in, you get your item. appraised, and the pawn shop owner will pay you maybe 60-70% of what the appraised value might be. So at that point, you have a choice and say, nope, I'm going to go try to sell it on the open market. Fine. But how soon can you do that? Can you find a buyer? How fast do you need the money? He's going to give it to you right now, no questions asked, even though it's going to be a fraction of what the item's worth. Or, if you don't want to sell it to him. You leave it there, and you take out a loan based on the value of that, what he thinks he can get for it, and you pay a very high interest. And you can't get your belonging back until you've paid off the loan with the interest. And there's usually a time period for when you get to do that. So it's like any of these market mechanisms that allow really needy, desperate people to get their hands on some cash very fast with a minimum. of, of, of, of outlay of energy on their part. So, and he is the progeny of that, of, of a business that's built on that relationship to, to people. Whether you think it is immoral or not is like a different question, but that's a fact. That's how it works. I don't know whether that's relevant, but he chose pawnshop for some reason.:

Federico Balsa: Well, he said...:

Barbara Pennock: Well, by etymology, by Latin, pawn means a pledge or a security. You know, it's... Kind of non-threatening.:

Federico Balsa: Yeah.:

Gary Reynolds: Is it possible in a pawn shop, can somebody else come and buy your guitar or whatever?:

Federico Balsa: But... Oh, yeah, I think so.:

Barbara Pennock: After.:

Federico Balsa: Now, uh...:

Janet M Mitchell: Right, and in the text, oh, sorry, Rodrigo.:

Federico Balsa: It that is. No, I just wasn't going to say that. this is what I think... I think in the States you call character assassination. He is presenting the author of this theory as someone who's disreputable. And he wrote out of his theories out of boredom because he could afford to. But what he inherited was not exactly blood money, but it was theft money, or swindling money. That is, he... he... he wants to present him as someone disreputable, who was just bored, and was clever to come up with. six theories, and that was all there was to it. I think that... That is the reason. And I think, Janet, you were saying, okay, all the thing of the universe and the changing of the mind, but why does he say? Pawn shop. And so I think trying to do the homework that is being assigned here, it was quite relevant. Pawn shop is something. Not prestigious. Definitely. And someone who writes just because he can, because he's bored and he's got the money to do so.:

Robin Bloor: It's. I hate to do this, but it's more complicated than that.:

Federico Balsa: Okay, this is where the fun starts.:

Robin Bloor: It's not that I'm disagreeing, it's just that there are some details here that are not in that narrative you just came out with. First of all, he is not the child of someone that runs a pawnshop. He is a nephew of someone that runs a pawn shop.:

Federico Balsa: Yeah.:

Robin Bloor: To call him progeny is taking the widest possible definition of progeny, which has to do with family line. Right. He's, um... He has been favored by his auntie and his uncle. And his uncle is someone who runs a pawn shop. Right, so he's pawnshop progeny, but it's almost by proxy, really, isn't it? It's not exactly pawnshop progeny. I'm just saying it just doesn't make it any easier. It just might as well go with the literal words that are used.:

Derek: I think I think his aunt is childless because because I I don't think that. her chief was, was cruel just to like bring that up for no reason. Like why would that be relevant at all other than to say she doted on this?:

Federico Balsa: Yeah.:

Derek: Manit Kilgai. I think it means that she doesn't have an inner child and then. Being raised in a pawn shop is kind of con... It would kind of like lend itself to seeing things as far as like, you know. What is its value in terms of monetary worth? So kind of an uncaring, emotionless atmosphere that poor Minute Kill had. And then I guess we can maybe contrast him with Darwin, who I think actually believed in his theory rather than the nickel. He just was having fun. and trying to make money.:

Robin Bloor: Oh, that's an interesting contrast. I hadn't thought about that. Yes, Darwin is presented as somebody. Not as bad as me. But not much better, but not as bad.:

Derek: But I think it's an appropriate theory to attack because in a sense, it's not — Darwin's theory of evolution isn't really a proper scientific theory. In terms, it would be really hard to falsify it, and it doesn't make any predictions, so I think Beelzebub's correct to critique it the way he does.:

Robin Bloor: That's very that's very well said.:

Derek: Thanks.:

Robin Bloor: What's happened with Darwin's theory of evolution is. The term the survival of the fittest has been used. Um, repeatedly to justify anything. in terms of the existence of various species. So why does this species exist? Well, because they're the fittest. And the problem there is that what actually Darwin is doing, he's using. one of the six different processes to explain all of them. Right. He's using that particular process. Whereas in actual fact, evolution almost certainly happens via three separate processes because it's. uh, evolution. Possibly, or there may be degeneration, in which case that happens by six processes, you know. So it depends, really. But, um... Darwin's theory is bunk. And as Derek says, you know, there isn't anything that can be proved because it doesn't make any predictions. It's self-justifying. It's like, how do we know that these particular, this particular. Uh, species is, um... has dominated. Well, we know they were the fittest, weren't they?:

Gary Reynolds: I may have this wrong, but I thought that. I guess it was Darwin, you know. He he he found the finches in the Galapagos, or something like that, where the finches that. that moved to another island developed bigger beaks because the fruit there was needed a bigger beak. And that was. It kind of extended that to the whole theory.:

Robin Bloor: Yeah, well, I mean, that runs into the problem of, are you looking at acquired characteristics through breeding, or are you actually looking at the creation of new species, which is a very different thing. You can certainly.:

Gary Reynolds: Very different, yeah.:

Federico Balsa: Yeah.:

Robin Bloor: Um, in one way or another, you know, if you... if you take all the giraffes into places in Africa where there isn't any low-hanging leaves, the taller giraffes are gonna do better.:

Gary Reynolds: Yeah.:

Robin Bloor: And after a while, you'll end up with taller giraffes. It's just the way it is.:

Gary Reynolds: Thank you.:

Federico Balsa: I discovered that with gnats. This is not a very prestigious thing to share, but hey. I have this... vice since childhood of... is it swatting? When you do that, is it the verb to swat? Of swatting gnats that tend to occur in the bathroom. And at first. They, they... Well, I was gonna say they die like flies, they die like gnats. I mean, it's so easy. But as you progress, it gets harder. And sometimes it's spooky because it seems that they see you and they know. So this only goes to prove survival of the fittest. Because there's no way you can swap them. And they are going to pass on that trait, because they are the ones who are going to reproduce. And not the ones that I swatted.

But again, I never made the connection with what Robin just said. That only proves an acquired characteristic within a species, but it does not prove anything regarding the origin of a new species.:

Gary Reynolds: All right.:

Barbara Pennock: Looking back at the text on 272 in that area where Janet was questioning. In quotation, this... and existed right up to what is called the Seventh Intern Great General Planetary Process of Reciprocal Destruction. Anybody have a grasp on what that could be? Or when?:

Robin Bloor: I'm thinking it was a big wall.:

Barbara Pennock: Yeah, me too. The seventh intern. I don't know.:

Robin Bloor: That's, I mean, that's completely off the wall. There's only been two world wars as far as we're concerned, and when he wrote this, when he wrote the original script, there'd only been one. So, you know, to say that there was seven is some kind of assertion that. Somewhere in the past, there were many more world wars, and, you know, the First World War was perhaps the seventh.:

Barbara Pennock: Okay.:

Federico Balsa: Uh, I think when he speaks of electricity. Doesn't he say that there have been... Nine civilizations that have become extinct. With, through misuse of electricity, I have a vague recollection of that.:

Robin Bloor: It certainly says something like that. I don't know the exact quote, but it's like. It's a sort of warning. In one way or another. But there is a conversation between, I think. Maybe Catherine Hume or Salita Solano in Gurdjieff. When they're driving through the town of Vichy. in Gurdjieff's car, and the town has recently put up streetlights. And, um... One of them says. It does this. Is this an indication of. Abuse of electricity. Uh, or some question like that, and he says... The more they do it, the worse it will be. So that's that doesn't sound good, does it?:

Federico Balsa: Not very, no.:

Robin Bloor: If you look at the. The map of any country, pretty much any country nowadays. At night, you see that the, it's all lit up. Everywhere it's lit up. It's only places that are not inhabited that aren't lit up. So, you know, if there really is some kind of... Negative consequence to the use of electricity, then. We're going to suffer the consequences. Children are, or our grandchildren are, but you know. Not a good thing.:

Barbara Pennock: So this says Winston Churchill considered the Seven Years' War, which was from 1756 to 17... 63 to be the first true world war.:

Robin Bloor: Really, I don't. I'm not aware of that war. I think it's.:

Barbara Pennock: It was the Anglo... the Anglo-Prussian.:

Robin Bloor: I didn't do that.:

Barbara Pennock: Coalition.:

Robin Bloor: Not really.:

Barbara Pennock: It meant a victory for Great Britain and Prussia, who defeated their main rivals, France and Austria. I don't know. But... It's the only reference I can find it. On this little phone.:

Derek: And tickly Amish, I think. Let me find the page number before I mention this real quick. Yeah, in Tikli Amish, there was a society, it was on 1063, there was a society. of people trying to stop war called God is where man's blood is not shed. And then. Putting that together with. what, uh, the remnants of Tikli Amish being covered by black and red sands deserts, and, like, adding those together, that suggests that that's how that society ended was through some. giant process of reciprocal destruction. Because it's, yeah, it's covered now in the Crimson Desert is how I would, I think of it.:

Robin Bloor: It is. I did a sweep in the days before AI. I did, um, a Google question as to... the... existence of any year in history when there wasn't a war going on. And I couldn't find one.:

Stephen Frantz: No.:

Robin Bloor: Now, there are... you lose yourself in prehistory, so once you've gone, you know, past about... A thousand years before Christ. Then the. the historical record is so uncertain that you can't really say much. Um, but every, every year since then, it's just been, there's always been more, you know, so. Gurdjieff is right to point this out. There are various. I think optimistic. there certainly was where I grew up. There are various optimistic organizations that think they're going to bring peace to the world, but when it actually... when you actually get down to it, you see their ability to generate... to create peace appears to be absolutely zero. It just doesn't happen and it's.:

Stephen Frantz: Yep.:

Robin Bloor: It is the case that war isn't very nice.:

Federico Balsa: I remember reading that the, uh... By the time the power possessors realize the horror of war and that they could. do something to stop it. They're too old. and Braille to be effective, and that the only hope was through Osciano. to educate the power possessors.:

Stephen Frantz: Hmmm.:

Federico Balsa: I don't know.:

Stephen Frantz: So...:

Federico Balsa: Get them to join. Gorgeous groups.:

Robin Bloor: Yes, that's. I'm always writing to my congress and congressman and senator asking him to join the Gurdjieff group so he can stop the war with us. And I recommend everybody to do that, no matter which part of the country or which country you're actually in.:

Stephen Frantz: Oh, yeah, I think so. I call my congressman weekly and say, are you practicing being parked old duty yet? And if not, why not? I kind of want to get back to the theme that Janet raised, because I'm interested in trying to trace as best we can the continuity in this book, not that it's written in a linear way, of course, but... But to try to sort of trace a through line and integrate so. This question of Manetko. raises a lot of questions of what has come before. I mean, we... before the Fourth Descent. We had Beelzebub down there talking people out of animal sacrifice. You should not sacrifice lower animals. And then, at one point. He convinces them so much that the pendulum swings in the opposite direction, and they began to worship those animals, as we may remember. And then finally, we culminate in the self-tamers, humans who are trying to tame

the animal in themselves. through these bizarre ascetic practices. And now we're at the fourth descent, which seems like a discontinuity, but maybe it's not, because... Because this maniacal... There's just a lot of stuff that doesn't make sense. He says, um... So he proves his theory. And people accepted it without any essence criticism whatever. And it became a subject of discussion and fantasizing right up to the 7th and turn planetary process. Whatever that is, World War 1, doesn't matter. But he says this goes on for 2 centuries. Well, first of all, I have never been aware that people. that there's been a great debate about who was descended from whom. Certainly not one that lasted for two centuries. So this is complete... falsification. I mean, this is... this has no bearing on... on our reality, so why... but he's trying to say something with it. But then. He goes on to say that thanks to this Maleficent data, fixed in their instincts. It began to engender in their common presences the false feeling that these eight beings were presumably sacred. And the abnormal factor engendering this sacrilegious impulse, also passing by inheritance, has reached the instincts of very many beings. So here we are back to people thinking that apes, that the so-called... that other animals, non-human animals, are sacred. Again, perhaps in a way that they don't even think humans are sacred. So it's a repeat of the idea in different clothes. But it does seem to be... Connected. And I'm not exactly sure what to do with it. But I wanted to point that out.:

Federico Balsa: Yeah. Okay.:

Stephen Frantz: I mean, this question of who descended from whom has become crystallized. in the part of the presence. That's not true.:

Russell Turner: What's not true exactly? You mean the... The first one, the first idea.:

Stephen Frantz: Well:

Russell Turner: They're the first guy, I mean, before Darwin worked.:

Stephen Frantz: When's the last... when's the last time you had an honest debate with... a debate with anybody about whether humans were descended from apes or apes were descended from humans? Not once in the course of my peculiar education has that. issue ever arisen. As a topic of conversation. But he's saying that this is like. you know, fixated us. Why is he saying this?:

Russell Turner: Oh, we have. We have. We've debated it. And one of the things that comes up is.:

Stephen Frantz: Oh!:

Russell Turner: And I'd really like to know if anybody knows. Because we... Don't we have the... I mean, maybe I'm totally wrong, okay? And I'm not a scientist. But I want to be a scientist, but I'm really not. But don't we have the DNA ability now to actually resolve this thing? That you can go back far enough with the DNA and find a human. Mother.:

Stephen Frantz: Chimps are 99% identical DNA, supposedly.:

Russell Turner: No, I mean, I'm sorry, with apes, you take an ape DNA even with a mouth.:

Stephen Frantz: Maybe a little more.:

Russell Turner: you know, uh... DNA, and I mean, you just keep going back and going back, and I don't know how they do it. I wish I did. But... Is this a matter of national security? I don't know. I'm just blunt. I find it a conspiracy theory.:

Stephen Frantz: Yeah, I kind of think it is.:

Russell Turner: I really think it is. I really think we're not allowed... there's gotta be a law in the books. You are not allowed to study the DNA of apes, and if it comes out. That it is a female, a human mother. You have now completely wiped out all the basis of materialism, which is what Gurdjieff is trying to do already. He is undermining... The the materialist religion. I mean, he's destroying centuries rooted. real, you know, ideas, and he doesn't just do it to materialism. I mean, I'm throwing materialism, it's really not, it's... should be separated, probably. into Darwinism or something, the belief that we came from apes. But we were taught that in school, I'm sure you guys were too, right? They had a picture of the, you know. the Neanderthal and the... the Cro-Magnon, I forgot which one was which... which one's first, and then... I don't know how that all worked out.:

Stephen Frantz: Well, all I'll say is that if I sincerely ask my question, if I sincerely ask myself the question, how different are you? Really from an ape. I can get myself into some very uncomfortable postures with that one.:

Russell Turner: Well, okay.:

Stephen Frantz: Because I'm not too different. If I look at the things that take the impulses that take me through my day, how different are they from the impulses that guide the life?:

Russell Turner: Yeah.:

Stephen Frantz: of the average silverback gorilla. I don't think too very different, except that they get to lounge around a lot more than I do, because they stayed in the forest and we were stupid enough to hit the plains, you know? But other than that, it's food, sex, and uh...:

Russell Turner: Right.:

Stephen Frantz: And trying to stay safe, trying to stay out of trouble.:

Russell Turner: True. But check this out. There are people that have, and I don't know much about this either, but I really want to find out. And that is that... Apes have shown... uh... incredible length... now, they can't speak, they don't have the vocal cords. But they have... Sign language. And This is, I'm assuming, you know, I mean, if you're just to take it on face value. You would think, well, if he did take apes, and this was a true story, which, of course, it can't be a true story, because we, you know, there's just so many reasons. But... that apes have advanced language, or do they? That's what I'm asking. I'm not saying that they do. I think it's being. We're not supposed to know that, you know, if, you know, it's not part of our belief. That we come from apes. If it turns out apes have advanced language skills. You know.:

Robin Bloor: Look, the... I don't... It's way more complicated in terms of the way things are, in terms of what science kind of knows about things. It's just way more complicated. First mistake, thinking that DNA determines something. It doesn't. DNA is a way of explaining certain characteristics, but they have achieved the following thing. They've achieved a worm. It's a fairly small worm. And they've managed to make it. have two heads. And the worm that has two heads has got the same DNA as the worm that has one head. And the worm that has two heads can also reproduce and create other worms with two heads. And it's the same DNA. I mean, it's not similar DNA, it's identical DNA. And there's loads of various low-level experiments like this. There's nothing in the DNA that actually explains how any of the processes of the body work. Right? The DNA seems to determine to some degree form in the way that, for example. You might have a nose shape that's similar to that of your grandparents or something. Those kinds of things appear in one way or another to be passed on characteristics. And they appear possibly to exist in DNA, but. When DNA was originally discovered, the. The original protagonists. The two guys that, um... got

the credit for discovering it quicker than somebody else. One of them, his major ambition was to remove the whole idea of religion from science. So he wanted to have a theory that demonstrated that human beings weren't anything in terms of creation from something higher. And what he did, and what a lot of those people associated with the original. DNA works, they started to make claims that are quite honestly completely false. You know, so at this point in time, it isn't known precisely what can happen in DNA and what won't happen in DNA. But the idea that DNA determines what you are is just completely wrong. It has a hand in it.:

Russell Turner: Okay.:

Robin Bloor: There's three, if you like. There seems to be three things that are involved. So that's something that has to be taken on as kind of important.:

Russell Turner: Well, they can't Robin. They can determine. Who your, oh, well, your grandparents. I guess you have to have samples from...:

Robin Bloor: They can... look, you've got two kinds of DNA in your body. One is female DNA, and that's in the mitochondria, and then there's your natural DNA, and of course there's all the DNA of all the things that live inside you, which is the whole bio-community.:

Russell Turner: Your grandparents or I'm not sure exactly.:

Robin Bloor: So, you know, if you were to... Remove the biological community that lives within an individual where you couldn't actually do it. But if you could, the individual would become very sick indeed, because an awful lot of what's going on is being performed by things that are not really you at all, you know.:

Russell Turner: Hmm. Okay.:

Robin Bloor: They just happen to be, in one way or another, symbiotic. It's a complicated situation. It's probably the best thing to say that nobody properly understands it. It's like. You have... I mean, and here's something that nobody really gets, and I don't get it either. It's not like I've got some magic key here. There is estimated to be about, well, it's between 2 trillion and 30 trillion cells in your body. And that's the same, um, in one way or another as the rough estimate of the number of galaxies in the universe. But, you know, if you wanted a similar. And counting to go forward. You see... Once upon a time. You were one cell. And you have become trillions of them. And if you can explain that to me, I'd be really interested to hear the explanation as to how that is at all possible, and what is the relationship between the original cell that was you? And what you are now. Is there any relationship? Apart from a continuity over time, which seems to be difficult to disprove. There's too many things we don't know in order for us to be certain about much, you know.:

Russell Turner: Well, I'll keep asking the question. I mean, with these guys that are supposed to be researching all this. I don't understand it, but you obviously...:

Federico Balsa: Well, there's a book.:

Russell Turner: understand it way.:

Federico Balsa: By a by a German.:

Russell Turner: Better than I do, so...:

Federico Balsa: I mean, there's a book by a German, I think it's Thomas Kahn, and he says. how... scientific revolutions happen, and he says that it's just like a palace coup. You get a bunch of scientists. and they decide on a theory. So then they are the ones who happen to be in contact with governments or whatever, and they do not apply the scientific method. to testing new theories. What they do is, anyone who presents a theory that threatens their established theory, they persecute and eliminate, just like Gurdjieff describes. They don't analyze each new theory according to its merits. He's a guy who invented, I think. They say the word paradigm. And he said, scientific paradigms of what is true is all purely political. And it's not that science advances and therefore paradigms change towards more advanced. No, it's all politics. Uh, well, uh...:

Robin Bloor: This is good, actually.:

Federico Balsa: Sorry?:

Robin Bloor: There's something kind of important because the way that science behaves. is the way that normal human beings behave. We pretend we know things, but we don't. But we've got some great stories about how we know things and we convince other people that we know things, but actually we don't. One of the things, if you really want to investigate what you know, then you ask yourself the question. What do I know for sure? And you go into that with great attention to detail. And then you'll discover that there are layers and layers of knowledge of different kinds and the various, the extent to which you can trust any particular knowledge that you've classified within yourself in one way or another. It just varies. There are people who are reliable. Right. When I went to. I spent some time in Hong Kong. I think it was three weeks. And I was told. Um, usefully, there's a guy that, um, I was doing work with in the Hong Kong Jockey Club. He gave me some really good advice, and one of them was, don't ask for direction. You say, go and get a map and work out where you want to go, but don't ask anyone for directions, and here's why. Because if you ask someone for directions, a Chinese person for directions. If they don't know. They will feel that they've lost face. So they'll lie. Rather than lose face, which is a terrible thing to happen to a Chinese person. They will just lie to you, so you'll get lost. You'll find yourself up down some dark alley where people with knives want to cut you up or something. You just don't do that. And that for me has always been the best example. Nothing special about the Chinese. We have got different forms of lying, but we lie just as frequently as they do. My sister went to Hong Kong as well. She tried to buy some shoes. They had in the window green shoes, and she wanted red one. Same. She wanted the same. Style, but in red. She was in there an hour. While they tried to persuade her in whatever way possible that actually she didn't want red shoes. Because to admit that they didn't have red shoes, they would have lost face. They were never going to do that. No, I'm not just as bad. We just do it in different ways.:

Russell Turner: Don't you find it?:

Robin Bloor: Except Argentines. The Argentines know and tell lies. That's true, isn't it, Federico?:

Federico Balsa: Of course not. We do not. It is... Only when God has us. Uh, the hand of God helps us. I, uh... Oh, I was just making a connection. Uh that that one notices. How often? People will lie in the middle of a conversation. They will say something. And then... You have to be very careful not to catch them, not to expose them. Because, uh... I don't know. I'm sure you've all experienced this. They hate you. If you do that, they can't handle it. That is, we are trained. to being exposed by others. in our inner work and to study well. How is it in the book of the psychology of? man's possible evolution, that psychology is the study of lying.:

Robin Bloor: Very good.:

Federico Balsa: So we are very much trained in that, but they are not. And I think sometimes we take it for granted.:

Russell Turner: Yeah, I remember...:

Federico Balsa: I'm just... Yep.:

Russell Turner: Remember, well, I was just going to say, remember. the whole idea of wearing a mask, you know, coming into the Perrier or the School for the Harmonious Development. If you're gonna be a student, you know, I mean, if you're not, you're not just a guest. But you're going to be a student. He had... Students that were, he was an expert at taking down people's masks, but he had trained other people to do it as well. You know, and I think that isn't that part of it? I mean, this mask we wear. But anyway, it's getting off the subject. No, you're right. I mean, lie all the time. An average human lies. 20, at least 20 times a day. Thought that was psychology. That was just a common psychological. Fact now or something. TEDx lecture.:

Federico Balsa: Just to give you more fuel for Argentina bashing. In our in your schools in the first world. You say cheating. He cheated on the exam. We don't say he cheated. We have the word cheat, but we don't use it for that. We say he copied. Now, copied is like sort of a prank. It's harmless. There's no moral issue there. And and and if you are speaking to a to a person of the. as Churchill used to say, the English-speaking cultures. Just, I don't know, it's not ethnic, but it's more, and you say. You're a liar! Instinctively, he'll... Les Hagen, You're insulting him. They they can't even joke about it. But you tell, uh... An Argentine and even an Italian. You're a liar. Well, yeah. Think of Zorba the Greek, for example. With, who was it? Alan Bates? No.:

Robin Bloor: Yeah, it was Helen Bates.:

Federico Balsa: Was that Anthony Gwynn? Was that Adam Bates? But anyway. Nothing.:

Russell Turner: Hey, Robin! Robin?:

Robin Bloor: Yeah, yeah, I'm here.:

Russell Turner: Oh, sorry. You know that there's a growing number of... I know you're gonna laugh. Okay, don't worry about it. You can laugh. It's all right. of people... That claim to have been to Mars. Outright. boldly in your face, even claiming they were running for president, you know. Not that that makes any difference. I mean, there's not just one, there's... Carrie Cassidy, Project Camelot. interviewed various people, like... and so is Coast to Coast. I don't know if you guys ever listen to that stuff, but... I find it fascinating. And then there are. You know, there's no way to tell, but... Supposedly you, you know, you could. You can tell if someone's lying after, like, you know, ten minutes to a half an hour or even a few minutes, actually. I'm not an expert in that either. I kind of believe that that's true, but... I couldn't verify anything they're saying, of course. Nobody could. Another thing that came out recently. I don't know if anybody agrees with this, but. there's some in... I'm gonna get some more information, and I'll send it to you if you're interested, but... The bosses that. run NASA and these probes that go to... Mars. Intentionally, now this is just what I've heard. intentionally. Put certain filters on these cameras that end up. Eventually getting to the public. That are not what the regular eye sees. And somebody in there, this is just a rumor, but try to find out where I heard this rumor, this terrible, terrible. stab on... NASA, which represents the very ultimate science that we have, which can never be questioned. And that somebody. When the boss was out of the room, they turned the filter off. and put it on the regular thing. And Mars had a blue sky. And when he came back in, he was furious. He was just furious and yelled, I'm going to try to find out where this guy got this information. But I don't want to throw out names, but I just. I kind of felt like, wow. And then there were supposed to be. You know, a pyramid on Mars

and I always thought, God. Maybe that's the pyramid that Gurdjieff built, you know, the Tescuano. You know, that's that's ultimate naivete, okay? No. Self respecting scientists would believe that. But how do we know? that they're not keeping us in, you know, you know what I mean? I mean. how do we know these whistleblowers are all lying? I mean, how do we know there hasn't been transportation or tele transportation from Tesla or. Uh, advances in... like... The, you know, you could go on and on. I mean, I got different sources. It doesn't prove a darn thing. Okay. But the Steinmetz antenna, which was the takeoff. Of the, you know, the longitudinal wave idea where, whereby you tune one antenna. If you stand under this antenna, and you stand under this antenna. and you... there are these antennas, the coils of which are tuned to the exact same frequency. You are simultaneously. Whatever's under this antenna is. Under this one, you turn this one off, and now you are here. It's theoretically possible. That we could have already. So, so all this, you know, there's a whole bunch of people that believe that. you know. I mean, they're quacks, okay? They're out there. I'm not sure. I guess I kind of wonder if it's not true. But anyway. And I know Basiago said that. There's breathable. He went to. through a... You know, what do you call it? one of these Jumps, they call it a jump to Mars or whatever. But anyway, and then, of course, you got the John Carter movie. I don't know if that's a Hollywood tell or not. You can't I mean, this is on the fringe, but it it supports Gurdjieff. If nothing else.:

Federico Balsa: Well, in Argentina, it's a widespread belief that the United States never landed on the moon, and that it was all filmed in... in Hollywood and they give all sorts of proofs and so on. And there are fun things too. I don't... I don't believe it, but what I'm saying is that. It's like when they ask Gurdjieff, is reincarnation a fact? And what did he answer? He said, look, you got enough to worry about in this life to think about. I'd say we got enough to worry about on this planet, and. But what one could say, if this were a series, and this episode of what these people told you, it would be, there's more than meets the eye to this issue. Ha ha.:

Sandy W: So I got a lot to think about between now.

AI Summary Meeting 39

US Session

Quick recap

The group discussed a reading from Gurdjieff's "Beelzebub's Tales to His Grandson," focusing on the fourth personal sojourn of Beelzebub on Earth and his interactions with Gornahur Harhark. They explored the allegorical meaning of traveling between planets like Saturn and Mars, interpreting it as a metaphor for higher intellectual and emotional centers. The conversation delved into the "ape question," comparing historical theories about human and ape origins, and critiqued Darwin's theory of evolution. Members shared personal insights and associations, such as the reference to pawnshop progeny and its potential symbolic meaning. The discussion also touched on broader themes of human reason, belief systems, and the limitations of scientific understanding, particularly regarding DNA and evolution. The conversation ended with reflections on the nature of tall tales and allegory in literature.

Next steps

Robert

- Research and provide more information about the rumor regarding NASA intentionally altering Mars images and the claim of breathable air on Mars, and share findings with the group.

Summary

Beelzebub's Earth Descent Discussion

Robert read from Beelzebub's tales about his fourth descent to Earth and his friendship with Gurnahor Harhark, who helped design the Tescvano telescope that made Beelzebub's observatory famous. The discussion focused on how the "Ape Question" about human evolution periodically agitated three-centered beings on Earth, particularly in America and Europe, with theories proposed by Menetkel and Darwin. Beelzebub noted that while these theories were based on logical reasoning specific to humans, they represented an abnormal factor that persisted for centuries and influenced human instincts about the sacred nature of apes.

Cosmic Locations Discussion Challenges

The group discussed challenges in understanding certain aspects of a text, particularly regarding Gurnahor Hawk's ability to exist in specific cosmic locations like Saturn and Mars but not in the spaces between them. Robin clarified that these locations represent the highest parts of normal intellectual and emotional centers rather than completely separate higher centers. The discussion explored questions about why Gurnahor needs special atmospheric conditions in his ship and why Beelzebub can traverse these spaces without similar limitations.

Space Travel and Adaptation Discussion

The group discussed a passage about space travel and adaptation, with Sandy noting that the vehicle needed to be adapted rather than the spaces themselves. Derek suggested that apes could be present on Saturn based on scientific experiments mentioned in the text. Robert was unable to fully participate due to technical issues, and the discussion ended with Robin questioning the meaning of "marvel of being reason" in the text.

Being Reason vs Formatory Reason

The group discussed the concept of "being reason" versus "formatory reason," with Robin clarifying that being reason is higher than formatory reason but not necessarily measurable. Stephen provided a working definition of being as an increased awareness of existence and speculated that certain types of mentation might be unique to this quality. The discussion included references to biblical passages about seeing and hearing, and Robert shared a connection to the Scopes trial of 1924-25, suggesting it might relate to a radio broadcast mentioned in their text.

Lytochambros and Beelzebub Analysis

The group discussed a theory about Lytochambros and analyzed references in Beelzebub's writings, including a Martian ethereogram and connections to the Book of Daniel. Robin explained that the ethereogram was sent from Mars and occurred three to four years into the journey, while Stephen questioned why apes became a focus of interest between Beelzebub and Gornaher Harhark. Robert shared his interpretation of "manic cow" as a reference to the biblical writing on the wall from Daniel, suggesting it relates to the division of kingdoms, which the group found significant as potentially intentional encoding by Gurdjieff.

Text Interpretation Discussion Meeting

The group discussed interpretations of a text, focusing on the phrase "pawnshop progeny" and its meaning. Robert expressed uncertainty about whether the reference to apes in ancient Babylon was accurate, while Robin questioned the derogatory nature of the pawnshop reference. The conversation shifted to personal experiences with monkey temples in India and Nepal, with several participants sharing their visits. Janet then returned to the text's context on page 272, suggesting it might be setting up the intended meaning of "pawnshop progeny" and asking for interpretations of this setup.

Book Comprehension Challenges Discussion

The group discussed challenges in understanding a book, with Janet expressing frustration about the complex narrative and unclear references, particularly regarding the Mentakil saying about apes. Stephen shared his strategy of not forcing comprehension and suggested that the discomfort and confusion might be intentional aspects of the reading experience. Federico offered perspective by referencing a Spanish proverb about being warned before one's way of thinking is disrupted, and explained how the book challenges conventional beliefs about evolution and creation.

Pawnshop Progeny Text Interpretation

The group discussed the meaning and context of "pawnshop progeny" in a text, with Stephen explaining that pawnshops serve people in extreme financial circumstances by offering quick cash for items at reduced values or high-interest loans. Federico suggested the term might be used to portray the author as disreputable and bored, writing theories out of leisure. Robin clarified that the character is not directly the child of a pawnshop owner but rather a nephew, making the connection more indirect. The discussion highlighted the complexity of interpreting the text's meaning and the importance of considering the literal wording over broader interpretations.

Critique of Evolution Theory Discussion

The group discussed the critique of Darwin's theory of evolution, with Derek and Robin explaining that it lacks falsifiability and predictive power, though it can explain acquired characteristics within species. They also examined a reference to the "Seventh Intern Great General Planetary Process of Reciprocal Destruction" from text on page 272, with participants speculating it might refer to a series of world wars or the misuse of electricity leading to

civilization extinction. Derek shared insights about a peace society in Tikli Amish that may have ended through a process of reciprocal destruction, connecting this to the text's reference to black and red sands deserts.

War and Evolution Debates

The group discussed the historical presence of war and its continuity throughout human history, with Robin sharing insights about the lack of peace in recorded history. Stephen traced connections between different parts of a book, including themes of animal sacrifice, worship, and self-taming, while questioning the accuracy of claims about debates over human evolution from apes. Russell and others debated the scientific evidence regarding DNA and evolutionary relationships between humans and apes, with Robin explaining complications in DNA research and its limitations in explaining biological processes.

DNA and Human Behavior Discussion

Robin explained that DNA's role in determining human characteristics is not fully understood, highlighting the complexity involving both cellular DNA and the trillions of cells in the human body. Federico mentioned a book by Thomas Kuhn discussing how scientific paradigms can be politically driven rather than based solely on merit. The discussion concluded with reflections on human behavior, including cultural differences in facing embarrassment and the prevalence of lying in human interactions.

Cultural Perceptions and Scientific Theories

The group discussed cultural differences in perceptions of lying and cheating, with Federico noting how Argentine culture views copying as harmless while English-speaking cultures consider it dishonest. Russell shared conspiracy theories about Mars missions and NASA, including claims about camera filters and whistleblowers, though he acknowledged these were unverified rumors. The discussion concluded with Stephen reading from a text about scientific theories and their limitations, particularly regarding Darwin's work, and the group briefly debated Scheherazade's role in storytelling, with Robin and Janet defending her as telling allegorical rather than purely fictional tales.