Introduction.

The introduction gives a brief overview of the essential content of this book in a very condensed form.

What is this book about?

This book deals with a crisis that humanity is facing. This crisis started a long time ago but it is getting much worse. The crisis is potentially very dangerous because it threatens the survival of mankind and perhaps even all life on this planet. We should, therefore, give it serious attention to see if anything can be done to stop it.

The nature of the crisis.

We begin by explaining the nature of the crisis. We have the constant danger of war, we have increasing ecological destruction and, worst of all, we have a psychological crisis connected with the meaninglessness of life.

The danger of war comes and goes, At times it is very critical, at other times, like today, it seems to be receding a little, but nevertheless the danger is always there, at least in a potential form. It could flare up again quite easily.

The ecological aspect of the crisis also has its ups and downs. We occasionally hear of some improvements but by and large, the situation gets worse all the time in spite of numeruous international conferences attended by lots of scientists and politicians.

The psychological aspect of the crisis has a lot to do with the loss of meaning. It expresses itself in symptoms like aggression, depression, apathy, alcoholism, drug-taking, smoking, excessive eating and drinking, as well as excessive leisure-activities in, entertainment, social affairs, politics, religion and sometimes even work and family.

Many people are aware of this crisis because they talk about at times. It's not something new but apart from some temporary improvements here and there, we do not seem to be able to find a real solution. We still continue to destroy the world and ourselves in spite of all the sincere attempts by a fair number of people to stop it. It's somewhat like a nightmare, where we are being drawn towards the edge of a ravine and the more we struggle to stop it, the faster we slide down.

The origin of the crisis

As we have said, people are generally very concerned and they also try to do something but even so, we feel that the deep root of the crisis is being ignored or not being properly perceived. It is, of course, extremely important to prevent the outbreak of wars and to stop the destruction of the environment on which our lives depend, especially when it gets very critical but in the long run it is even more important to find the origin of the crisis i.e. where it all comes from. If we don't find the root of the problem then the crisis could go on forever, if we had so much time left.

Part of the problem is that the crisis has already lasted for ages. It has always been with us and therefore it is hardly considered a crisis. Perhaps, most people think it is a normal or an inevitable part of life or they may think that the problem is far too enormous to stop it. Views of this kind help to sustain the crisis. In this book we take the view that the

crisis is constantly being regenerated by a kind of "source" in the consciousness of human beings.

The crisis is not caused by some natural disaster, such as epidemic diseases, earthquakes, hurricanes or floods. On the contrary, once the initial panic is over, disasters and emergencies have the interesting effect of making people help each other, even when they would under normal circumstances be more inclined to make life difficult for each other.

Irrationality and self-deception

The crisis is the result of people behaving irrationally and engaging in deception and especially in self-deception. Generally speaking, people can not remain reasonable when their personal interests are being threatened. "Number one" always comes first, as they say.

When one is personally effected, awareness narrows down to focus on one's own self-interest. In such cases one can only consider one's own point of view, which is usually in opposition to somebody else's point of view. This prevents people from making coherent problem determinations and finding consistent solutions.

Even very sincere people, who are trying very hard, do not seem to be able to bring about the results they intend. Some other factor seems to be involved that causes unintended results. We claim that there is something wrong with our consciousness, which keeps on generating new problems and effectively prevents us from solving social problems. As long as we do not find out what is wrong with us, all sincere attempts to improve things will not work in the long run. Eventually these "improvements" will also get drawn into this confusion and in the end they will have made things worse. The brain works very well with things that do not concern us personally very much, but it fails precisely when we need it most with personal problems.

We are probably capable of dealing with natural catastrophies, but it is much more complicated when our own consciousness itself is a catastrophy. All this destruction that is taking place in the world unfolds from a common source, which is in our own consciousness. So, we are the problem.

Thoughts and feelings

In this book, we investigate what is wrong with us i.e. why thought becomes irrational, self-deceptive and, ultimately, self-destructive. In our view, irrationality and self-deception are seen as manifestations of a deeper disorder in consciousness, which is caused by a disturbed relationship between the intellectual and the emotional levels in the brain.

There is a kind of disharmony between the movements of thought and the emotions. Thoughts can stir up emotions and they stir up more thougths. The disturbed thoughts disturb the emotions even more, etc. until they get themselves trapped in a kind of runaway loop where the emotions and thoughts feed back into each other. In engineering, this kind of situation is called "positive feedback". A computer programmer would say, the program is looping. What is missing in such a case is some kind of super-vision, which can see what is happening and do something about it. Not just in technology, also in biological systems like the human body, there are many organs that feed back into each other. In all cases, however, there is some intelligence "supervising" it, which keeps the whole system in balance to prevent it from running wild.

The history of the disorder

The emotional-intellectual disorder seems to have been inherited from early days. Mankind always has had this disorder in a potential form but it is in our modern days of high-technology that the destructive potential of this disorder fully unfolds itself. In "the

history of disorder in civilization" we give a brief history of how it all started and how it has gradually worsened.

Egotism and identification

The emotional-intellectual disturbance itself is the result of a yet deeper psychological disturbance, which we call egotism. Egotism is partly natural and comes originally from the sexual instincts and the instincts needed for survival. But, with the advent of the intellect, it comes increasingly from an identification of concepts with the self i.e. the natural instinct of self-preservation is now, inappropriately, being linked with certain intellectual concepts such as name, reputation, social status or class, education, position, religion, nation or anything to which we could say, "that's me".

These concepts are called "identity". Unfortunately, our identity is usually not seen as a concept but rather it is seen as a fact or reality or truth. Identity has the interesting effect of making us feel good if we "are" it or it makes us feel bad when we loose it. This effect is also called "self-esteem". Since we can feel identity so intensely, it is considered very important and must therefore be defended. This, in turn, has lead to the idea of self-defense. So, when challenged we find ourselves defending our reputation, position, religion, nation or whatever it is because "that's me". My identity must be defended otherwise I am no longer me. Interestingly, the word identity means "to be the same thing". So, identification means that the ego, which is me, has become the same thing as those ideas.

All this means, effectively, that people have started to make their ideas come true. Our "existence", i.e. what we are, now depends on what other people think of us and what we think of ourselves, which is really a very strange kind of existence.

Proprioception

Egotism, in the extended sense of identification with the concept of "me" or "mine", is a consequence of a failure to be aware of what is going on inside the brain. Something is missing in awareness and this is the reason the brain usually goes in a kind of runaway loop even under normal living conditions. Without proprioception, the brain does not know what it is doing. As a result it can not maintain an harmonious order between the emotional and the intellectual levels of the brain. This leads us to say that the brain is in some sense incomplete. This missing facility in awareness is called proprioception.

The word proprioception is used in biology and medicine and means essentially the same as self-perception or self-awareness. It is more or less the same as what technical people call "feedback". In a psychological sense, proprioception amounts to a kind of awakening of awareness to itself i.e. awareness becoming aware of awareness. Proprioception means that awareness now also considers its own operations as something to be taken into account. Apparently there are not many people who have an awareness that includes awareness as being something to be aware of.

The reason that proprioception is so important is because it enables awareness to see the effect that "facts" have on the emotions and vice versa. In a way, it senses the movements (or activities) of the thoughts and the emotions. Awareness develops a sensitivity of what is going on inside the brain. It begins to discern relationships and differences to which is has been blind before. The 'unconscious' drives and urges that have been hidden so far will then be raised into consciousness. They can no longer have such strong control over the intellect because this super-vision sees why thought becomes irrational and why it engages in self-deception. Seeing how this comes about changes the operations of the brain because it can not consciously be unconscious.

Passion

If we had proprioception, the brain would recognize the effect of what it has done. Intelligence could operate and as a result, it could now entertain the idea of passion. The notion of passion is explained in detail in this book but for the time being we would just like to point out that passion is just the opposite of action, like passive is the opposite of active. The word "passion" is from Latin origin and has the root "pass", which means "let". So, passion means to let it be, or to let it happen or to let it go. Instead of passion and action we could equally well speak of do and let. Proprioception would show us when it is appropriate to do something or when it is appropriate to let it be.

Passion is required for when the time comes when we have to make a decision that runs contrary to our self-interest. Without passion, the brain cannot think straight when our self-esteem or our self-interest is in danger. We would be compelled to defend ourself or do something, which is action.

Suffering and sorrow

It is clear that the ability for passion is closely related to the ability to suffer. The word "suffering" also means to let it happen, so it has the same meaning as passion. It is important to distinguish suffering from sorrow. Suffering is another word for passion but sorrow is a state of mind which resists suffering. Thus, sorrow is really a kind of action. In this sense, sorrow is really the opposite of suffering. When we turn to passion then sorrow would automatically end and then suffering doesn't matter. We would never be able to stop suffering altogether but we could end sorrow. In the common language, people do not normally distinguish very well between suffering and sorrow, these two words are used almost interchangably. But in our view, this is very unfortunate because this confusion is one of the factors that perpetuates sorrow.

Intelligence

Proprioception, together with passion frees the mind from the intellectual-emotional disorder and therefore "heals" it from irrationality and self-deception. The intellect becomes orderly, rational and clear and, therefore, will become intelligent as well. The emotions also will begin to express a more subtle response to true and meaningful feelings, such as love. As a result the human mind will be creative rather than destructive. This amounts to a transformation of human consciousness on a deep level.

Creativity and love

With creative intelligence operating in the human mind we may finally begin to deal with the crisis that is threatening the survival of all mankind and the rest of the world. We need intelligence in order to know what to do. We need creativity so that we can break through destructive habits. We need love so that we can all get together to do what is needed in a non-violent way and we need passion to avoid unintented results.

Summary:

1.- Without proprioception there will be no passion
2.- Without passion there will be no harmony in the brain
3.- Without harmony in the brain there will be no intelligence
4.- Without intelligence there will be no rationality.
5.- Without rationality there will be no solution to the crisis.
6.- Without solution to the crisis there will be no more us.

The crisis.

This chapter explains what is meant by "crisis".

What is the crisis?

Most people would probably agree that, throughout the world, humanity is facing a crisis, which is becoming dangerous. This crisis has numerous different aspects e.g. we have the constant danger of war, we have increasing ecological destruction and, worst of all, we have a psychological crisis connected with the meaning of life or rather with the meaninglessness of it. There are probably many other aspects too but we'll first take a closer look at these few that we have just mentioned. We than consider the numerous approaches that have already been tried out. We say that although many of these approaches are important and necessary, they still don't go far enough. Apart from trying to do something about these problems we should also find out what generates them, otherwise new problems are being generated at a faster rate than people can solve them.

Danger of war.

By this we mean especially the possibility of nuclear war, which threatens all life on this planet. There are enough bombs in existence now to destroy every city many times over and there are enough socalled patriotic people around who are willing to defend their country with these bombs. There was a program on television once, about underground rockets. The officer said that he would "of course" push the button, if necessary, to save his country if it is being attacked. It sounded as if he would "save" his country even at the expense of destroying all life on Earth as a result. The sovereignty of his country is more precious than human lives. One finds this way of thinking again and again, not just in politics and among the military.

The danger of nuclear annihiliation seems to be receding a little at the moment partly due to political changes that are taking place in the Soviet Union, but it can easily return. Besides, there are by now an increasing number of smaller countries with nuclear bombs or chemical bombs and probably it won't be long before somebody enriches his civilization with biological bombs.

When we think of all those socalled "countries", each one defending its national security or its territory or its religion or its honour or whatever else they may be defending then it is hard to suppose that there won't be a terrible accident sooner or later. The more each particular country builds up its own national security the more dangerous it gets for the world as a whole.

Ecological destruction

By this we mean the destruction of forest and agricultural land, pollution of the atmosphere, rivers and the seas. Compared with the size of the problem only minor steps are being taken. A considerable number of people are concerned and some of those are also trying to do something about it, but it is far too little in respect to what is needed.

Many people are in fact doing exactly the opposite by being concerned primarily with economic growth. However, the faster we grow economically the quicker we destroy the

planet. Industry burns up more oil and coal resulting in too much carbondioxide in the air and this raises the temperature of the atmosphere, etc. Alternatively, they build more nuclear power plants, which can be even more destructive.

The political and economic reforms in the socalled second world may perhaps also increase the industrial productivity , which makes the ecological crisis even worse. If the people in Eastern Europe want to be as prosperous as the people in the West then the world's resources are going to be used by many more people and that will speed up the destruction even more. It is probably true that there is less danger of war when there is more mutual interdepence between "eastern" and "western" economies but the next problem is immediately apparent. Besides, there is still the socalled third world. If everyone in all these worlds were to achieve the standard of living they would like to have, it would be like a swarm of locusts descending on the Earth.

The proper handling of the ecological crisis depends on everybody working together. It is a worldwide problem. The pollution, destruction of forests, etc. have a worldwide effect. No single country can solve the problem of acid rain alone. There is no way to do it seperately. It is not easy to stop what is going on because it is going on all over the world in so many different countries, each one regarding itself as sovereign. As long as we say, my nation is a sovereign state, we won't get anywhere. But people won't give up the idea that their country is sovereign. Their thought resists that. "We won't let anybody tell us what to do", they say. They believe in "independence" and "freedom" and that "nobody should interfere in internal affairs". These ideas don't change very much. Slowly perhaps, much too slowly for the pace at which the crisis is developing. The speed of the destruction has become greater than the speed at which people can solve the problems.

Loss of meaning.

This is shown, for instance, in people taking drugs, the increase in meaningless violence, crime, terrorism, the wars that are constantly going on, all those socalled religious and spiritual groups with their phantasised meanings. There is generally a sense of dissatisfaction with all kinds of things.

The quality of life is dropping. Nowadays, people don't seem to have much hope that life could be made better. It's not all that long ago, perhaps one generation back, people used to think that life is going to get better. Their main problem was poverty but they believed that industry, technology, science, hard work, etc. would end poverty in the long run and that everbody would feel better and be happy. Now, nobody believes that anymore. Even when they do make a lot of money, people nevertheless don't believe that things are going well. There is still a lot of trouble of all kinds.

People don't have an optimistic outlook the way they used to have. They used to say; "we have had a very tough life but our children will have it better". Now, very few people would say that. They would probably be regarded as crazy if they did.

In some way, civilization seems to be sliding downwards. The impetus of our civilization is concentrating on making money but even there it is very shaky. Who knows what is going to happen to the world economy? There are so many places where it is shaky, that nobody can really be confident about what is going to happen in the next few years.

What can be done about the crisis?

Most people are aware and very concerned about all this but some people seem to be suppressing their awareness of what is happening and don't like talking about it because it's too depressing. We probably all know consciously or subconsciously that our lives depend entirely on an economy, which is destroying the basis of our lives.

An opinion poll held in Germany in 1989 showed that the majority of people now believe that they are going to leave a desert to their children! This shows that people know they are participating in their own self-destruction, but nobody knows what to do about it.

Even if all this could go on for another hundred years or two hundred years perhaps, it is still hard to imagine that there won't be a real catastrophe at the end. We hope, at least, that there will be another hundred years or so left. It may take much less but whatever time it takes, that is what we have left.

When we consider all this we have to say that things are not really going very well even though almost everybody is trying to make things better or at least believe that they are doing the right thing.

Some people go back to the old religions. They are disappointed or frustrated with the "modern" way of live and think that it helps to return to the Bible or the Koran or whatever socalled "holy" book they may have. There is an increase in religious fundamentalism, which is however a considerable increase in the danger of war and violence and oppression.

Some people have tried various other things like, we must stop war, we must disarm, we must stop pollution, we must save the whale, we must save the rain forest, we must save the gorilla, we must give food to the hungry, we must develop the poor countries, etc. We're not saying that we musn't do all these things, on the contrary, far too little is being done. The situation would be much worse if it hadn't be for all those brave people who have already prevented a lot of killing and destruction. But all these are only detailed approaches to the problem. They are only temporary improvements but no real solution. All these problems are being approached seperately in the hope that it will help. It does help up to a point, but it won't get to the root of it because these problems are themselves only symptoms of a deeper disorder. The main problem is that something much more important and fundamental is being ignored, which is the missing awareness of where it all comes from.

The origin of the crisis.

The crisis didn't originate in the environment or in the ecology, it originates in us. It originates in the way we think and the way we feel and the way our consciousness works. If we continue with the same consciousness and just try to solve problems that arise then it will not be very effective. It may slow them down a bit, if we're lucky, but it will produce another crisis. We may improve some things here and there but they are going to be swept into this mess sooner or later. We may improve the political situation somewhat by electing somebody with a different policy but it also gets swept into all the fighting that goes on around this confusion and the general corruption that develops no matter what you do. An disorder of this kind can not "cured" by just doing something about its symptoms.

It is like a river that is heavily polluted and you live somewhere downstream not knowing where it all comes from. What we have been doing is to try to clear up the pollution where we find it, instead of going upstream to see where it comes from. We are not seeing the origin of the pollution. The pollution is constantly being poured in at the source, which is upstream. What is the point in purifying the water downstream when it is constantly being polluted elsewhere? If we were in a satelite we would get a view of the whole stream and we could see where the pollution occurs and what is happening all along the stream. As a result, we would understand better what the problem is, whereas if we were just sitting by the side of the river saying "this water is dirty, we have to get a purifier" then it is not going to be very effective. In fact we will be contributing to the pollution because the attempt to purify it, will add more chemicals further downstream.

People can not produce the results they intend. Instead, they produce results that they didn't want. People may have the intention of doing something good but they find they can not actually do it when the time comes to do it. By and large, even rational people can

not carry out their good intentions. If you go through history you'll find that people generally couldn't do it. It is like saying "the road to hell is paved with good intentions".

Consider the French revolution. They had very good intentions, like liberty, equality, fraternity, etc. It all sounded very nice but when they actually staged the revolution they weren't doing any of those noble things. They were engaged in something quite different. The same thing happened with the Russian revolution. The leaders of the Russian revolution had read about the French revolution. They said we're going to make sure that it doesn't happen to us. But they couldn't help it. It happened nevertheless, even worse so.

The root of the problem is us, it's in the minds of human beings. Therefore, we should stop calling it an ecological problem or a drug problem, or whatever. The drug problem is in the minds of human beings, not in the drugs. The drugs themselves are innocent. People are paying a lot of money to get those drugs. When they pay so much for them, they must need them; therefore we should look into the question of why they need it. Other people are producing and selling those drugs to make money. So we ought to look into the question of why they are so desperate for money. Similarly, the socalled ecological crisis is not caused by the ecology. It's not even an ecological crisis, strictly speaking. The ecology was working perfectly well by itself. Or else they say we have a problem with the environment but it would be more correct to say that the environment is having problems with us.

The word "environment" is really a very poor word. It makes it sound as if the environment is just something around us and we live in the middle of it. The environment is not just something around us, it is the very basis of our lives. The air we breathe, the water we drink and the food we eat are all part of the environment but at the same time they are also part of our body. There is no real sharp distinction. The environment is inside of us all the time and we are part of the environment. Saying that the environment is something around us, is the same as if the brain were to say; this body is my environment and I could perhaps sell one of the kidneys to raise my standard of living. In a similar way, we seem to be sacrificing the quality of the air we breath, the water we drink and the food we eat in order to raise our standard of living!

We haven't really understood the cause of the trouble. We are not facing it, generally speaking. First we must see for ourselves if we can understand what is going on. Even if we do understand it, we would have to be able to communicate it and explain it in such a way that it can spread but there doesn't seem to be much time for it to spread. If we had enough time then eventually a way would probably be found but this crisis is developing very rapidly.

We need some creative action very soon, otherwise everything is lost. We should go to the root of the problem, not just play around with symptoms and make some little improvements here and there.

The process of thought.

The root of the problem is in something that is going wrong with the process of thought. The problem is our whole way of thinking, which has been going on for at least five to ten thousand years.

The problem has not fundamentally changed over the past few thousand years. It has had its ups and downs. Some things got better, other things got worse. But on the whole it has got more and more dangerous with the growth of technology because by now we can destroy ourselves all together. Even in the past we were fairly destructive. The Roman Empire almost destroyed the entire Mediterranean basin by turning large parts into desert even with the limited technology they had at their disposal. With our modern technology we can now do it much better. In fact we are creating a number of deserts in various parts of the world, right now.

The crisis

Thought has been our main instrument for doing almost anything. Everything we see when we look around us is the result of our way of thinking. The cities, the buildings, the roads, the cars, the trains, the aeroplanes. Even most of the countryside is the result of thought. We call it nature but it has all been arranged by us. The whole country practically. In fact, even the Himallayas by now have been heavily effected by thought. They are being deforested as a result of people's way of thinking.

Thought, or the intellect with all its knowledge, has been the great pride of the human race. We say, this is the highest achievement of evolution. We produce wonderful things with our thoughts such as medicine, technology, art, science, etc. So, if we say thought is the cause of the trouble than it sounds very unlikely. Can our highest and greatest achievement of which we are most proud be the cause of our downfall?

You can see why thought has not thought about this very much. We can, in fact, sense a feeling of reluctance when our attention goes in this direction. We don't like it. Something inside of us generates an unpleasant feeling. Thought doesn't like to be thought about. There is something repulsive about thinking about thought. It comes up with all kinds of reasons for not doing it, like "it's too abstract" or "too theoretical" or "too philosophical" and "what's the use anyway?".

Nevertheless, we must ask how could thought do all this mischief. Besides being able to do all these wonderful things, it can do harmful things as well, like weapons to kill people, killing animals or treating them like merchandise, destroying forests, pollution, slavery of people and other more subtle forms of oppression.

The problem with thought is this. The natural intelligence at the animal level is suitable for functioning in direct contact with nature, where it really works well. But it doesn't work well with thought. Thought is too tricky to be handled properly by the instinctive processes. Thought is a bit like a snake. Even Krishnamurti used to say, "living with thought is like living with a poisonous snake in your room". The snake is very quick and very tricky. In fact the snake is the symbol of subtlety in almost all cultures. What we need is something which can outdo the snake.

Whenever something comes up that concerns us personally very much then thought tends to become irrational. It begins to make false arguments in order to protect or to defend something that it considers more important than being reasonable. Or otherwise it begins to search for justifications for doing something that it wouldn't normally do. A neutral person would call this kind of behaviour irrational and even self-deceptive.

In this book, we take the view that irrationality in the human mind is the root of the problem. In other words, the many different aspects of this crisis are just manifestations or symptoms that unfold naturally and almost necessarily from irrationality taking place in thought.

As we have said, we generally think that thought is the greatest thing we are capable of. We're very proud of it, but it is also very dangerous, a fact which we haven't fully realized. Having developed thought, humanity now faces a challenge. There must be something which is more subtle than thought. A new kind of intelligence is needed, which can outdo thought. To awaken this intelligence is the challenge of humanity.

Sorrow and passion.

This article deals with sorrow. It investigates what it is, how it comes about and whether it is an inevitable part of life or if we could do away with it. Sorrow is not just something unpleasant but it is even very dangerous and a way should be found of ending it. Passion is suggested as a way of ending sorrow. Although passion ends sorrow, it doesn't end suffering altogether; it only takes the edge off it, so that it doesn't matter so much. The psychological hurts themselves can also be dissolved but that is a much deeper question, which requires proprioception to investigate the subtle movements of thought and the emotions. Thus, the ending of sorrow requires passion and the complete dissolution of hurts requires proprioception.

Preview.

We start by considering hurts and pain, first in a physical sense and then in a psychological sense. Pain is nature's way of informing us of a hurt. Thus, pain is a signal that requires a response. The awareness or feeling of a pain is what we mean by suffering. The physical hurt usually requires some active response to remove the cause of the pain, but the psychological hurt usually requires a subtler response. Most people, however, respond to a psychological hurt in more or less the same way as a physical hurt and this is what causes sorrow. Thus, sorrow is seen as a wrong way of suffering a psychological hurt.

Sorrow is a danger to humanity. It causes most of the trouble in the world. Many problems arise as a result of people trying to avoid it. People can not think straight because they are afraid of getting hurt. The fear of sorrow turns into self-defense and even self-deception, resulting in irrational behaviour. If we could find a way of ending sorrow then we could think in a more rational way. As a result, we would be able to solve problems rather than create them. It is, therefore, very important to investigate the cause of sorrow.

As we have said, sorrow comes from the incorrect suffering of a psychological hurt. To explain this point, we make a sharp distinction between suffering and sorrow and then expand a little on the notion of passion and action, just to be clear about the meaning of the words.

A very effective way of not getting hurt, is to develop proprioception, which is discussed in another article elsewhere in this book. Proprioception enables one to search into the depths of one's mind and investigate what it is that is being hurt and what causes it. So, if you're interested in proprioception you might want to read the other article too. In this one, we continue by investigating the nature of sorrow and which factors contribute to it.

An investigation of this kind naturally leads to something, which we call "identity" or "ego". Identity is something we think we are. We literally think our identity. Things that make up our identity include our name, reputation, social status, class, education, ancestry, position, religion, nation or anything that "we are". These things are called concepts about the self. The concept of the self, which is the same as identity can be very useful for some practical purposes but if it is taken too literally it can be become dangerous. Unfortunately most people take their identity not as a useful invention but rather they think that is what they really are. This mistake has far reaching consequences.

There is a rhyme, which says, "sticks and stones can break my bones, but words can never hurt me". At first glance, this rhyme doesn't seem to make much sense, because words can hurt much more than sticks and stones. However, when we discover the nature of "what I am" then the psychological hurts take on a different meaning. As a result, they loose their strength. The change of meaning of what I am, changes my being in such a way that indeed no words can ever hurt me.

While reading this article, it may be useful to keep the following order of unfoldment in mind:

1 The fear of being nobody or meaning nothing leads to the desire for an identity that provides self-esteem.

2 Identification implies the possiblity of getting hurt when somebody doesn't like me

3 Being hurt turns into to sorrow

4 The fear of sorrow implies the need for self-defense

5 Self-defense is often only possible by becoming deceptive and self-deceptive

6 Self-deception is already being irrational

7 Irrationallity creates severe problems for all humanity and leads to the crisis in the world.

It follows, that if we were not afraid of being nothing then this sequence of unfoldment would collapse at its root. We must, therefore, also investigate the nature of being nothing or of being nobody to see if anything can be done on that level.

Hurts and pain

As we have said at the beginning, we start the investigation by considering ordinary pain resulting from physical disorders, hurts, wounds. Pain is common to all human beings and animals. Feeling pain, in a physical sense, is very important for reasons of survival; it informs us of some damage or disorder and it warns us against doing something harmful. Whatever causes pain is usually harmful to us. In that sense, pain can be regarded as a kind of alarm system that is telling us something. It's informing us of a hurt. So we must pay attention to it.

There are people who are unable to feel pain because of some defect. This inability has very damaging consequences. They inflict wounds on themselves or hurt themselves in some other way without noticing it. Those people wish they could feel pain. On the other hand, there are also people who always feel pain because of some other defect. In either of these extreme cases the system does not serve a useful purpose. To be meaningful as an alarm system, it has to be somewhere in between.

Pain, seen as an alarm system, seems to have been carried over from the physical realm into the psychological realm. Thus, we also have psychological wounds and hurts, together with the corresponding mental pain. We can be hurt psychologically and feel mental pain. In the case of physical pain, the body is hurt and in the case of mental pain the ego is hurt.

What is particularly crucial is how we respond to the pain. In the case of physical hurts it would be appropriate to do something about it, e.g. by removing whatever has caused it or by moving away from it or otherwise making sure it doesn't happen again. When we carry over the physical hurts and pain into the psychological realm we also carry over the responses that go with it. However, in the case of psychological hurts these responses may not always be as appropriate as it seems at first sight. The psychological hurts are often more subtle and hence also require a more subtle response. The relatively simple

response to physical hurts may not be adequate with respect to psychological hurts. Even with physical hurts a more subtle response would often be better.

Suffering and sorrow.

Hurts and pain imply suffering and, if we're not careful, also sorrow. The common meaning of the words suffering and sorrow is usually somewhat confused. We generally use these two words almost interchangebly but according to the dictionary the word suffering means "undergo, endure, tolerate, allow".

The word sorrow means "mental distress". It's the sense of grief that results from a psychological hurt that is being sustained when insufficient attention is being paid to the pain. Sorrow comes from an inappropriate response to a psychological hurt.

To find out what is the appropriate reponse to a psychological hurt we need to make a proper distinction between suffering and sorrow. We do not normally make that distinction, but it would be better if we did. The failure to make such a distinction is one of the factors that causes sorrow. The distinction is essentially the same as the difference between passion and action. This may sound a bit strange at first, but we'll unfold the meaning as we go along.

Passion and action

Passion is the opposite of action, just as passive is the opposite of active. The root of passion and passive is "pass". It means to let it pass, to allow it to pass by without interfering or resisting. But that is, more or less, what the word suffering means also. So, to be passive means to suffer. It really means, in some sense, let it happen or let it be, don't resist it, let it pass. Passion is the ability to be passive and to suffer in its proper sense.

Passion is the most intelligent kind of response to psychological hurts. It is the attentive energy needed to be passive, which is to be able to let it pass through, without resistance, so it can go away. If you don't resist it then in some mysterious way the pain passes through and its intensity fades out. One must have experienced this for oneself to know what it feels like. It's really very effective.

We normally tend to react to psychological hurts as we do with physical hurts, but in the psychological realm this is rarely an appropriate response. Reaction, in the sense of counter action, is the opposite of passion. By reaction we mean doing something to counteract it. Resistance is a kind of action. If you resist the pain then it can not pass and therefore it stays there and perhaps it even builds up. Sorrow comes from resisting psychological pain. Even physical pain can be reduced to a certain extent by allowing it to pass or by accepting it, as it also called.

The point is; to suffer a hurt properly we must be completely attentive to the pain and even be interested in learning the meaning of it. After all, pain is a signal trying to make us be aware of something. If we are active towards a hurt then it becomes sorrow. Thus, sorrow or sustained mental grief, could be regarded as a failure of intelligence. The intelligence fails when the brain is not attentive enough. The attention is missing because it is being distracted by the action against the pain. Attention is now misdirected towards the action. Action against psychological pain is really a kind of inner conflict, which, like all conflicts, absorbs a lot of energy. A conflict means a collision of two opposing currents of energy. On the one hand we want to keep it and on the other hand we want to get rid of it. The colliding energies cancel each other out. As a result, a conflict drains the brain of its energy and should therefore be considered a danger. For the brain to be in a state of high energy it needs to be free of conflicts. Passion, not some action, dissolves conflicts and this is what recharges the brain with the intense energy that liberates us from sorrow and grief.

Sorrow and passion

In the Christian religion, passion is an essential part of the symbolism of Jesus, the Christ. It is said, his passion, was so strong that he allowed himself to be betrayed and tortured to death. He could easily have avoided it, if He had wanted to, but He preferred to demonstrate his passion and was very consistent about it, which shows that passion must have been a very important part of his teaching.

Passion is indeed a much more effective response than action. You could verify this next time you're suffering. When you feel lonely or, for instance, when somebody doesn't love you or leaves you or dies. There will always be enough occassions for suffering. You don't need to go out of your way to suffer. It doesn't mean that one should deliberately suffer or glorify it because that would be another form of action, although perhaps a subtle one. But when something hurts, psychologically speaking, one could try to direct the attention towards passion rather than action and see what happens.

Self-defense

In almost all civilizations, self-defense is regarded as normal and necessary and, probably none of these civilizations would exist today if they hadn't had that notion. On the other hand a number of civilizations have also gone down as a result of too much self-defense; they refused to give way. We don't want to argue about the necessity of self-defense in general but rather focus on a particular kind of self-defense, which is the defense of the ego or the defense of one's own self-esteem.

One of the strongest concepts we have, usually hidden in an implicit form, is that we should defend ourself. Self-defense is an action or rather a reaction. It runs contrary to passion and therefore causes sorrow, which in turn makes people self-centered and even self-deceptive, thereby causing a lot of trouble for themselves and for others. People defend themselves so as not to be hurt. So, they are really afraid of being hurt. But what is so terrible about being hurt, what causes it and what is it that is being hurt anyway?

With a physical pain, it is usually very easy to identify the cause of the hurt because we can feel where it comes from. But what is the cause of the psychological hurt? We can feel the pain, but where does it come from? An investigation into this question clearly requires a well developed skill in proprioception so one can trace the hurt back to it's origin.

Identification

Psychological hurts are often a consequence of identification. Identity, i.e. our sense of what we are, is usually based on what everybody tells us we are from birth onwards. Our identity is one of the "thought-things", causing serious trouble when it is taken too literally. Identity is a kind of thought i.e. we think our identity and we believe in our identity and everybody else confirms it. This is an example of collusion. People collude each other, i.e. mutually support each others' phantasies to make them more "real". Thus, identity is a "fact" made up by human thought. Our consciousness can be considered a factory of facts. One of the facts manufactured by thought is the "fact" that we really are what we think we are. Consciousness manufactures a number of intellectual concepts such as name, ancestry, position, responsibility, status, class, reputation and things like that. Subsequently, consciousness supresses the awareness that it has just made up these beliefs and that is how people make their ideas come true.

If I really were what I think I am then I would be very vulnerable to what people think of me because that determines my identity. The opinions of other people are, therefore, very important. This dependance is often experienced as a constant danger. We are often worried what other people may think. Fortunately, we are really only an illusion, so that we don't have to worry, but if we don't see that, then we could get hurt very easily. So, let's be clear about what we are.

Identification is the process of linking my belief or sense of identity with the instinct of self-preservation. When that link has been established we have egotism. Egotism is partly natural and comes originally from the sexual instincts and the instincts needed for survival. Human beings, along with all other species, are born with certain instincts needed for survival. As little babies and small children we are very dependant on our parents and others. So, it matters what they think of us; we might not get something to eat or we might get treated badly. As we get older, this dependency should gradually become less and less until, finally, we are grown up and feel independant. When we are independant, we should disconnect the link between our identity (or ego) and our instinct of self-preservation but for some mysterous reason this is rarely done. Even as adults, most people continue to believe their identity as a given fact of life. To be sure, identity is useful for practical affairs and hence there is no need to drop it altogether, but its significance should now be related to its usefullness. This would enable one to "become" somebody else if it were better for some reason. One may think of identity as a useful invention, like money, but something goes wrong when it is being taken too literally. When identity continues to be linked with the instinct of self-preservation then the system is compelled to self-defense when somebody disagrees with me.

If I have identified myself with a particular theory or belief or ideology or opinion or any other 'thought-thing' and somebody comes along and attacks it then I experience that as a personal attack on me. This is because the thought-thing, whatever that may be, has become part of the ego, which is me. So, I am that. When that is being attacked then I may get wounded and, thus, I am hurt. It, therefore, seems natural and necessary to defend my beliefs and opinions.

Our knowledge, opinions and beliefs are actually just suppositions, which means they are simply assumed to be true. The trouble comes when we forget that the "truth" of them has only been attributed. We treat the assumptions as actually and literally representing the truth or reality and therefore they have an importance and value that they wouldn't have if they were seen as being just assumptions.

People are generally willing to discuss assumptions but anything that is "really true" can not seriously be questioned. It doesn't make sense. It's a waste of time questioning something that is really true. If my sense of identity is equated with something that is really true then I would be safe. But when the truth is being questioned then I beginn to feel uncomfortable. If the truth is not really true then I am not really me. So, "please don't confuse me with facts", is what is implied in the defense-reactions. To avoid the collapse of my identity, I must be sure that whatever I am is absolutely true and can not be changed. Remember, the word identity means "to be the same thing".

A person, who thinks he <u>is</u> something usually holds non-negotiable assumptions about himself, which he calls absolute truths, so that he can always remain "the same". It's not only that this limits his mental freedom but he is also forced to resist anyone who disagrees. He must also resist evidence that doesn't fit his views (confusing facts) and even suppress his own insights. That resistance, being a reaction, is contrary to passion.

Identity is one of the factors that prevents passion because it misdirects attention to the self-defense of the ego. The confusing facts and insights may be a danger to the ego and therefore they stir up the crude energy in the emotional-intellectual system in the memory, which in turn denies love and intelligence. We consider love and intelligence at the end of this article.

Identification is really quite dangerous. It was probably meant to make us feel more secure or more valuable or to increase our sense of being when we feel neglected, but the price is too high. The price is that one becomes irrational and self-deceptive, which means, we create problems for ourself and others. So, identification is not a good idea if you think it through.

The ego.

Egotism, which is causing a lot of trouble in the world, could be thought of as being caused by a kind of confusion about what is meant by the ego or the self. The English language has two basic words for the self, which is the "I" and the "me". In addition, there is also the reflexive term "myself".

The root of egotism lies deep in our consciousness and is expressed in the structure of the language, where "I" is the subject and "me" is the object. So, the self is at the same time the subject and the object. The nature of the confusion around the self as a subject and the self as an object is somewhat similar to the question of the dualist notion of the unlimited and the limited.

To avoid contradiction and incoherence in thinking about the limited and the unlimited, we need to drop the "either/or" attitude, which is characteristic of the logical or dualist way of thinking, and adopt a more holistic way of thinking, such as expressed by the "supersystem, system, subsystem" world view or by the "holographic" world view, where each part contains the whole in some sense.

Rather than thinking that the world is made up of seperate objects, such as atoms related by laws of nature or individuals related by relatives, we would be more coherent by thinking that everything is part of a larger whole as well as being the whole for it's constituent parts or better still, that each thing actually is the whole, in some sense. In the case of the limited and the unlimited, this would mean that all limited things are included in the unlimited and ultimately all limited things are the unlimited. So, as well as being seperate on one level, each thing is still basically an integral part of the unlimited. Since, there can be only one unlimited, which includes everything, all limiteds are internally related to each other through the unlimited. This relationship is much more fundamental than the relationship through "laws of nature" or "blood of relatives" or similar theories.

One could perhaps think of the unlimited as some kind of general background out of which comes all limited things as particular abstractions. In this view, the general generates the particular. This would make the general the most concrete and the particular the most abstract.

The true being of all the limiteds is the unlimited or, the unlimited is the ground for all limiteds. One could also say, the ground of every thing is "no-thing" because "no-thing" is another word for unlimited. So, if we pursue this a bit further than we can say ultimately "everything is no-thing".

When we apply this way of thinking to the self, we could say that the "me" is an object of thought and is therefore a limited thing. The "I", on the other hand, is the unlimited subject which contains everybody's limited me (as objects of thought) including it's own me (which is also an object of thought). There can be only one unlimited. Thus, everybody is related to everybody else through the one I. Everybody is a limited body but the unlimited I is not limited by a body. Therefore, the unlimited could also be called the "no-body". So, the true nature or the ground of every body is "no-body". Putting it slightly differently, we could say ultimately "everybody is no-body".

Egotism arises, when we can not accept ourself as being a limited me but would rather like to be the unlimited I. Taken by itself, this is not necessarily wrong. We are born as the unlimited I and it's only afterwards that we become limited.

We have been given a name, a nationality, a religion, a role, position, title, money, possesions, relationships, responsibilities, etc, but each of these things defines us more and more. So, as our definition grows, the more we are being limited. The confusion arises because we do not normally see this as a being a process of limitation. Rather we think it's the other way 'round; that we are born "small" and it's only because of these

definitions that we become "big". This is a mistake that has far reaching effects. If we don't see this mistake, then we are in serious trouble. The small me will than attempt to expand itself, to become bigger, better or higher by adding all these definitions to it's name. Egotism than becomes inevitable.

The mistake is in the meaning of what is nothing and what is a nobody. This is what puts us on the wrong track. Ordinarily, we use words like nothing or nobody in a very negative sense, as something of no value. Nobody wants to be a nobody. We don't want to be nothing but neither do we want to be a thing.

The nature of thought, especially literal thought, is such that it prefers definable things so it can think about them. Anything that can not be clearly defined is difficult from the point of view of thought. So the intellect has a natural repulsion against the unlimited and an attraction towards the limited. Thought is the operation of definitions and can only operate on defined things.

Literal thought can expand the scope of it's operations almost indefinitely by making more definitions but it will still be limited. Thought participates in the creation of more definitions and the definitions participate in the creation of more thought. It's a self-creative process. The creator is being created by the creations that it has itself created in an on-going process of creation. So, even literal thought is actually creative or participatory. If thought is aware of its participatory nature then it could be really creative, but if it assumes to represent the reality as it is, in a literal sense, then it will more likely be destructive.

When thought is faced with the undefinable then it can't handle it. Words like nobody and nothing are notions of a very high degree of abstraction. They are absolutes. An absolute is a notion with no limit on its validity, therefore it effectively points to the unlimited. We use words like nobody and nothing all the time, but what exactly do they mean? We suggest here that it makes sense to regard nobody and nothing as ways of pointing towards the unlimited. In this view, we turn the common meaning upside down and regard "nothing" as that which contains or includes everything and "nobody" as that which contains or includes everybody, so they are just alternative words for the unlimited. When we view everything through this changed meaning then everything changes its meaning.

Depending on the context, we could also use the word "non-manifest" to point to the unlimited. The manifest is literally "what can be held in the hand", which is clearly a limited thing. The meaning of the manifest has of course been extended to "what can be held in the eye" and even to "what can be held in the mind". Thus, the manifest is what the mind can behold or grasp and the non-manifest cannot be grasped.

We have a natural urge towards the unlimited, inspite of the limiting nature of thought. Thought doesn't like the unlimited and begins to limit us but when we are born we are the unlimited. As a baby everybody first conspires to make us feel the centre of the world but later, when we behave accordingly they say, "who do you think you are?" They put us in our place, which is not nice. We don't want to be put down. We resent being treated like an object, which by itself is a proper response. People should not treat us like a thing, because after all we are "no-thing". We are unlimited, like everybody else, and therefore, we all participate in one another. As St. Paul said, we are all members of one another. We are fundamentally related by being "no-body". But when we have a false notion of what is nobody, we begin to develop an urge to become somebody, which is a serious mistake. A false notion is especially dangerous. A false notion is not just an incorrect notion but, more seriously, it is also misleading. A false notion of "nobody" misleads us into the wrong direction.

At first, the child is in a very confused position. She/he (it) has a sense of being unlimited but this sense of being is made limited. He "is" the unlimited but "knows" he is limited.

The "I" is what he feels he is and the "me" is what he knows he is. Sometimes, they ask a child to count the number of children in the group. It is said that at first a young child tends to count all children except himself. From one point of view this may be called modest but from another point of view it may also be called arrogant. The child, unconsciously, takes himself as the unlimited subject who sees all other children as objects. Of course, later the child is forced to realize that he is not above it all and that he has to count himself as an object too, but it's never really accepted.

The "I" is the unlimited subject, eternal and almighty, while the "me" is what we think we are. Instead of sticking with the unlimited, which we already are, we first accept the false notion of nobody, which makes us feel miserable and aggressive, and than naturally reject it by trying to become somebody, if need be through violence and senseless destruction. There is a confusion about what we are, resulting in a contradiction in thought, which in turn results in egotism leading to a lot of unnecessary conflict in the world, which we can watch almost daily in the news on television.

The "I" takes itself to be God, but that is not what causes egotism. The "I", is unlimited and therefore eternal, almighty, etc. When we take this seriously, then we would have to say that everybody is the same "I", because there can be only one unlimited, which includes everyone and everything. It must be same "I" otherwise it would be limited by whatever is not included. It's only logical. That is how everybody is related to everybody else. The problem is, the unlimited "I" is mistaken for what I think I am. What I think "I am" is really the operation of thought, which creates the little me and everyone's little me wants to become the great unlimited.

First, we seperate ourselves from the unlimited by saying who we are, which is a form of limiting ourselves. Then, after having convinced ourself that we are seperate individual beings with a definite identity, we now want to expand our sense of being by adding more to our name, which is of course self-contradictory. Our sense of being now depends on what we think we are and what we think we have. A title adds to our sense of being or some possesion or some special relationship. E.g. money adds to our sense of being and more money adds more. People want more power or a higher position for the same reason.

If we are very rich we could surround ourself with friends who tell us how great we are. It is more convincing when somebody else tells us how great we are. If we could get rid of everybody who doesn't agree then we would be really convinced. But the expanding ego inevitably runs into other expanding egoes, which limits him again. The history books are full of mighty kings, emperors and dictators destroying everything that limits them and it's still going on.

In the view, presented here, egotism is seen as resulting from a kind of mistake or confusion of what is the limited and the unlimited. If we would see that the limited "me" is just what we think we are or what other people think we are then it is clear that the me is just a product of thought. What makes me feel so real is the unfortunate fact that our emotions are so tightly connected with thought. Our loyal instinct of self-preservation is trying to protect "me". Thoughts about myself stir up the emotions and these can be felt very intensely. These emotional reactions are very real and taken as proof that the me really exists. Even a discussion of this kind which questions the value of myself can stir up the emotions, which add (appearently) to the proof.

Religion has tried to resolve the problem of egotism by saying, the unlimited is God and you are just you. So, just accept your limitations and stay in your place. It is true, of course, that if we could accept our limitations then there would be no problem. But, unfortunately, this trick doesn't work either. It can not work, not even theoretically, because the instinct of self-preservation is against it. Thought, or the intellect, creates the concept of what I am and the emotions supply the proof. It is not sufficient to just drop the intellectual part of the concept because the emotional part will recreate it again.

Similarly, even if the emotional part is in a state of equilibrium then the intellectual part will recreate the concept again. It is a bit like cutting off parts of a tree while leaving the roots intact; the tree will just sprout new branches where it was chopped off.

What is needed is to provide a different meaning of "what I am" i.e. identity to the instinct of self-preservation. If my identity is seen as something that may be useful but, other than that, not worth so much then the instinct of self-preservation will not protect me either. This requires an insight on a very deep level, which includes the intellectual and the emotional side at the same time. The ending of "me" means the ending of all psychological hurts and sorrow. Sorrow can also be ended by means of passion, but an insight of this kind does away with psychological hurts altogether thus, there is nothing there that could be hurt.

Love and intelligence

When the ego no longer exists, or when "the mind is empty" as Krishnamurti says, we could consider the question of love and intelligence. It is not easy to define what love is, at least not in a literal sense. This is partly because love is of the unlimited and can therefore not be defined very well. Trying to define love too precisely is like trying to put limits on the unlimited. But speaking in a more poetic sense, we could perhaps say, love is a bit like light and warmth, like the energy from the sun. Love includes a warm feeling and also the energy for intelligent perception.

Love also includes a feeling that can be sensed, but it's of course more than just that. On a biological level we could think of it in terms of hormones. If love can be sensed then there must be some kind of hormone that is producing the feeling. Something liberates the hormone, which produces the feeling. The hormones are liberated by the glands that respond to the energy of love. This energy liberates the hormones harmoniously and this is sensed as love. The sense of love also energizes the intention and will to do something. But it's all in harmony because it comes from the unlimited and is also intelligent. In a poetic sense, we could say the energy is love and intelligence.

Hormones can, however, also be liberated by the energy in the memory. But memory is the intellect, which is not only limited but usually driven by the emotions and hence energy released by memories is not necessarily intelligent. There is nothing wrong with hormones, we have to have them, it's only when they are liberated unintelligently by memory, that there is trouble. If the energy just comes from the intellect, there is no reason that it should be in harmony.

The disharmony in the world is created by people whose intention and will to do something are energized by their intellectual and emotional concepts, which is the activity of thoughts and felts in the memory. If their intention and will to do something were energized by love and intelligence then they would instead create harmony in the world. So, 'all we need is love' as the Beatles say. Also, Jesus of Nazareth, called the Christ, is reputed to have said that people must have love for each other. There are probably very few people who would want to dispute this, but the trouble is that this love is drowned by the many concepts in the minds of the people, which they won't give up.

The emotional charge stored up in the brain is very strong and crude and it can easily flood the subtle energy of intelligence, which does not originate from the brain. The condition for the operation of the subtle energy of intelligence, is the absence of the crude energy of the memory. That means, an emotionally and intellectually still brain is required for the subtle energy of intelligence to be able to operate.

If the brain is full of emotionally charged hurts and memories then there is no room for love. This is because the emotional energy calls for thoughts (i.e. concepts, beliefs, opinions) to find a way to release the energy. That means thought has to find an aim

(target, purpose or victim) towards which to direct the energy and it also got to supply a justification for doing it. That means the brain operates on it's emotions and intellect and can, therefore, not be responsive to intelligence.

When the brain is cleared of all thoughts and felts then there is very little of myself left. Krishnamurti said; "eventually, you'll find that the mind is empty". But one of the concepts we have says that emptiness is bad. Being nothing is bad. "You must be something". That concept causes trouble, it produces a felt that makes one feel uncomfortable and we'll get an urge to do something against it. We have to suffer that felt of discomfort in its proper sense and not act to relieve it, otherwise we're driven back.

As long as all these self-excited brain activities are going on then there is no way for the intelligence to act on our consciousness. There is no way for it to come in, because the brain is busy with itself. It cannot respond. We could say, the brain is not responding to the subtle energy of intelligence

We could also say the brain is rejecting the unlimited or whatever else you like to call the unlimited. One could call it unnameable or unmanifest or cosmic or simply all. Religious people tend to call it the "holy spirit" or perhaps "God" or whatever. Using religious terminology we could perhaps say, the brain rejects God. Most religious people maintain a somewhat complicated structure of concepts, such as Hell and Heaven, devils and angels, sins, last judgement, etc. Almost all of these ideas are highly charged, emotionally speaking. When these religious metaphors are taken too literally then the brain will be flooded with fear, guilt and hope, eventually leading to subtle brain damage. That means the subtle energy, or the holy spirit or God as they usually call it, can not come in and therefore there can be no love. It's precisely their own belief system that arouses the emotions which keep the religious people caught in this limited thought-felt cycle. So, unintentionally they are actually keeping out the very thing that they would like to let in. Fortunately, many people don't seem to take their religious metaphors too literally, so the stupifying effect of literal thought is not total, allowing for a certain amount of permeability to intelligence and love.

The rejection of the energy of love and intelligence (God) effects us not only individually but also in our relationship to each other. Intelligence and love is missing and therefore there is all this chaos and misery in the world. We need the intelligence so we know what to do and we need the love so we can all get together to do it. But all these religious belief systems and political ideologies and whatever other ideas there may be around to "help" us, actually just add to the problem. That is because they claim to represent reality in a literal sense, which has a stupifying effect on perception. Our notion of reality effects perception, so we usually see what we believe. Thus, providing the (apparent) proof of its correctness.

The Beatles are perfectly right, "all we need is love". The directive of Jesus, the Christ, that we must have love for each other, is also very true. But the fact is, the love is not there. It's not there, not because it doesn't exist but because we are rejecting it. We are rejecting it unintentionally because we don't know what we are doing. There is a defect called Down-syndrom, more commonly known as Mongolism. It effects, among other things, the intellectual capacity of the brain. People who have this disease are less capable of sustaining emotional excitations by means of thought. So, they are in a better position to receive the energy. When you watch young Mongoloid children, they are usually very lovable children. That is because their thoughts are not (yet) very well developed. If everybody were like those children, in this respect, then the Christ's directive could work.

All this would seem to suggest that we have to find out how the brain manages to sustain emotional excitations and irrational belief systems. It is clearly a very stable cycle that is not easy to break through, so we first got to look at it very attentively to discover how it works and then perhaps we can find a weak spot, where there is a certain amount of

permeability to intelligence. A cycle of this kind has the charactisitics of having no particular cause and no particular effect, but rather each point in the cycle can be considered an effect as well as a cause, depending on how you look at it. From one point of view it is the effect of a previous cause but from another point of view this effect is now the cause of the next effect, etc. Each end is a beginning and each beginning is an end. There is a succession of cause-effect processes that somehow leads back to where it was before and keeps on going round and round in a loop.

The loop is essentially the same as what we also call 'me' or the 'ego'. So, the loop is myself. This loop is very stable and this provides us with a sense of identity. Remember, the word identity means 'always stay the same'. So, if we want to look at this loop, we have to look at ourselves. It's the loop that wants to stop itself looping. If we want to look at the loop with the purpose of breaking out of it then we are effectively looking at ourselves with the purpose of breaking out of ourselves, or putting it somewhat differently, it's me who wants to finish myself. There is something self-destructive about this intention. It goes against our instinct of self-preservation. Most people are struggling to maintain their sense of identity and they will defend it when it is threatened. So, the idea of breaking out of this loop may sound very interesting but the instinct of self-preservation will prevent us from doing it. The instinct generates fear causing the intellect to find reasons for not doing it, which means we are still looping.

Clearly, before we can change ourselves, we got to be convinced that it is not worth defending ourselves otherwise it arouses the instinct of self-preservation. How can we do that? It seems that what initially sounds like a good idea, can in fact not be done.

We don't want to be pessimistic and become depressed or something but we must be aware that this problem is an extremely subtle one. An investigation into the question of why intelligence and love is missing requires the energy of intelligence and love, which however is missing.

It seems much easier to change the world then to change myself. So, the whole thing is a pretty hopeless enterprise. This explains perhaps why people haven't changed after thousands of years of Taoism, Hinduism, Bhuddism, Christianity, Mohammedism, etc. On the contrary, the state of the world is getting progressively more dangerous. If we don't find out soon what is wrong with us then it may well be too late forever.