

Personal Lecture Notes Used by Richard Rose

Richard Rose used the following notes during one of his public lectures. For years, Rose toured the United States, addressing such topics as Zen, dreams, moods, miracles, psychology, self-definition, perception, intuition, and many more. If you like the dynamism and spontaneity of Richard Rose as speaker and teacher, please read his books, which are available at www.rosepublications.net or www.tatfoundation.org.

* * *

The present trend in Sociology is sexology, and productivity.

1. Keep the guy titillated so that he can produce or pay taxes.
2. Momentary peace of mind is the rule, not long range mental health or philosophic insight.

Philosophic and religious insights are considered diseases by many psychologists since and including Freud, and modern sociologists ridicule any individual attempt at self definition, -- they are only interested in herd-compatibility.

Many modern psychologists ridicule the whole field of theology and transcendentalism by unilateral and unscientific denial of a mind other than a brain, a personality pattern, or a behavior pattern.

They do not have to define that which they claim or infer does not exist, -- so they abolish religion and esoteric research all at once.

When I first read Frankle I thought he was something besides another attempt to serve as a utility.

But what are we, -- if we are more than reaction-pattern?

I believe our ability to get proper answers depends on the manner of searching.

Our philosophy is either generally analytical or synthetic, or it might be called deductive and inductive.

Analytical thinking makes the mistake of having too many accepted bases or axioms.

Synthetic thinking or that which I call concept-structuring, -- generally works from questionable or unfounded postulates, and often has a fairy-tale result. But the worst thing about both systems is the arrival at conviction without adequately scanning all factors that might effect the deduction.

One example is the determination of God by the use of Thomistic cleverness, not by personal experience of higher or highest influences.

Both systems generally depend on the senses for evidence.

Modern psychology denies the mind and ridicules the soul, -- mainly because of a claim of lack of sensory evidence that they exist.

This is as absurd as denying the existence of electricity, -- or a virus. We could say that electricity is wire behavior when the wire is conditioned in a certain manner.

The absurdity on the other side of the psychological scale is the refusal to accept as factors such witnessable phenomena as levitation, exorcism, thought transference and ESP phenomena.

When we talk about being rational we talk about being limited and perhaps admittedly incomplete and hence irrational.

Too often we fail to distinguish between honest examination of the facts and an argument to retain cherished desires and desire-beliefs.

When we agree we pretend to use facts -- but what are genuine facts -- and what are mere postulates disguised and strengthened by one-sided statistics.

In Zen, when a man states that man exists, -- we might immediately reply "Where?" or "What is existing?"

This type of approach seems silly to some -- but the only sensible way to evaluate is to weigh all possibilities -- not just the possibilities that sound good.

Man may not exist as he wishes existence to be defined.

Nor do we say that man has a 90% chance of being existent and a 10% chance of being non-existent.

We hold all possibilities in our head at all times. Buddha spoke of three steps, -- 2nd being to think of all things.

So that man can be two things, three things, or many things or one thing.

Zen is interpreted as being a nowhere path, -- this is a mistake caused by faulty translations and by Alan Watts' (do nothing but experience) brand of Zen.

If man shows a possibility of being many things or having more than one identity we must hold that evidence as data in mind, -- placing the absurder concepts at the last priority and placing the most probable data at the first priority.

This I call thinking by reversing the Vector.

Using a subtractive system rather than an additive system.

Synthesis and analysis may be additive, if we pile up data or statistics to prove a wishful point while forgetting other seemingly neutral or contrary data.

Now all of this says that we cannot advance upon the Truth, big "T" truth, by argument because Truth must be found before carelessly defining it. And we cannot aim at an undefined target of Truth except by retreating from all that is or seems to be untrue.

And even while doing this retreat in a tentative fashion, -- we should always be backing away in a less than direct manner (at times perhaps not deliberately planning to follow a path).

Zen's mysteriousness is nothing more than Zen's honesty about not postulating things in advance. Which brings us back to:

- What do we know for sure?
- What are we?
- Are we a sex-machine, a body only, a soil fertilizer?

I must agree that most human behavior indicates that that is all we are.

I would have to agree that studying the sex-lives of insects such as the praying mantis and black widow spider give little importance to the individual [unreadable word] of the reproductive functions.

But are all the factors in that would damn us forever to be nothing but phalluses with phallic extensions which we call heads, or stomachs for feeding those phalluses?

Watts might claim that there is nothing to do but he reads Zen wrongly. Zen clearly states a discovery called enlightenment, -- not a mental cul-de-sac.

But Zen in being subtractive is misunderstood.

Zen in being always conscious of all is never properly explained.

Zen does not believe, but attacks belief.

Zen does not practice utilitarianism. It has nothing to do with social living, -- getting along.

It does not aim at peace of mind except in perhaps a vain hope that finding the final answer will bring peace or a cessation of uncertainty. It pays little attention to things because they are popular.

- It aims not a healing until healing is defined.
- It will not promise health or wealth.
- It is not a business (or it should not be).

Zen asks:

- What is thinking?

- What is sanity?
- Who thinks (or are we forced)?
- Is thought synaptic?
- Chemical?
- Electrical impulses?
- What is the relation between the evident or physical aspect of thinking and thought itself, -- the nature of thought?
- In other words what is the relation between a synapse and awareness?
- Who is aware of the impulse?
- Where are we aware of it, -- all over the body, in the head or outside the body (these are all theories)?
- Is EEG current awareness? Does it lie in the nerves?
- What is awareness?
- Is it the quality of being individually conscious, or is it a universal consciousness limited by individual bodies?

Modern psychological sciences and its extreme deliberate naiveness can be demonstrated by the usual reaction of any layman or village idiot to pertinent questions about thought and life. For instance we ask the question, -- Who are you? (with implication that evidently transcends mere body identification) and we get flippant answers. The fellow says, "I am the guy you are talking to," or, "The guy you are seeing." The psychologist has the same answer, though pretensively scientific. He says, "I am a body together with all behavioral peculiarities of that body."

Of course there are exceptions by exceptional psychologists like Jung but they are not looking to be funded as social herd-drivers.

We ask another question, -- where does thinking occur? And the layman answers, "In my head." I doubt if you will get such a direct answer from the psychologist.

He will prefer to list the various theories unless he is still pretending to offer a simple, natural but scientific solution via behaviorism.

Then he is likely to label thought as reaction only and refuse to tie it to awareness.

But he will be talking of body-reaction only and the indication that body-reaction is our sole function returns us to the theory that thoughts come from or exist in the head. This is demonstrated by physical elimination. Legs, arms, are severed and the thinking continues, so they say. The torso can be paralyzed and still the person thinks. The heart stops and for a minute the brain still lives.

But all this says is that the brain is the communication headquarters. Heart, liver and other body tissue can be kept alive without the heart, but there is no communication without the brain, -- so we still do not know about any awareness qualities of heart and liver or other organs.

The point that we miss about this business of locating thought by elimination is the neglect to note that we are not eliminating possible thinking parts of the body as much as we are eliminating body-communication centers and abilities to communicate above thought.

When we cut off the arm or leg we can no more say that that arm or leg had no consciousness or thought.

We are saying that it will never be able to testify by wiggling toes or fingers.

Dissecting the body will not isolate thought. Though it may stop it.

The behaviorist wants to predict conduct because he wants to pose as scientific and science required prediction.

So in order to be socially functional and fundable he has hurriedly concocted a "What you see is what you get" psychology, -- eventually getting around to denying that which he does not understand. And in so doing goes a little beyond the layman or village idiot.

Village idiots have a sixth sense and a respect for that which they do not know. They are more apt to believe in devils and witch-doctors, and in inspired healers rather than the pontifical healers who are discounted even by the sixth sense of the village idiot.

If you ask a behaviorist about demons and exorcism he will deny their existence and play childishly with questions such as: What devils? What proof is there for these things? Have you ever isolated one of them?

In this manner the ultra scientific behaviorist renders himself useless by cutting off means of learning and communication.

So that unless the village idiots gain some method of communication with behaviorists, -- some method of awakening in them some intuition, then we will continue to be cursed with a mental mafia that is dangerous because it refuses to communicate except with a language that is restricted to the needs and limitations of that mafia.

Why do they talk of conditioning? The implication is that individuals are unable to manage or survive collectively because they are too individualized and at the same time too automatic (having bad habits). Automatism or robot-behavior is implied when the pretence is given out that conditioning will make us react in a predictable manner. Individualism becomes a sign of a social criminal who does not wish to have predictable reactions.

The behaviorist complains that our inability to cope lies in not being an individual enough to resist conditioning contrary to his prescription. Not surrendering to the robot existence of his conditioning.

The ironic fact behind all this farce of behaviorism is that even though we admitted to being helpless robots we are still surrendering to the conditioning of another robot, about whom

behavior characteristics such as sexualism and suicide outstrip in frequency statistics all other professions.

Another ironic thought is the possibility that total population submission to conditioning may do massive harm. We have no knowledge of what the results would be.

Until we know more about man's cause and destiny, -- we run the risk of running afoul of infinitely greater environmental factors than food distribution and social compatibility.

* * *

Richard Rose used the above notes during one of his public lectures. For years, Rose toured the United States, addressing such topics as Zen, dreams, moods, miracles, psychology, self-definition, perception, intuition, and many more. If you like the dynamism and spontaneity of Richard Rose as speaker and teacher, please read his books, which are available at www.rosepublications.net or www.tatfoundation.org.