

This is a free online .pdf version of the (first form of the) many (but far from all) chapters in the book, "Dances of Mindfulness", published in 2018 (in connection to Avenuege event June 15th 2018), by S.R. Weber, with ISBN 978-82-996977-9-8, published by The Avenuege Library by Yoga4d:VRGM together with dance art. You can reproduce this text when kept whole and unabridged, with at most light grammatical editing, on condition that the reference [www.avenuege.com](http://www.avenuege.com) is included as well as author's name, S.R. Weber.

[The Q & A form is often preferred by this author, since it allows a conversational style in which the themes are somewhat less dogmatically touched, and in which a more musical note can be achieved. The emphasis is on each text rather as a 'jam session' in which the original flow is maintained and, as with impressionistic art, any after-editing is kept at a minimum and spelling issues and all such are handled with tolerance as long as meaning comes through, in order to protect the soul of the text.]

[NOTE: many of these chapters are in their first, raw form before even the first hint of editing. For the somewhat more proof-read version, get the printed book, which has many more chapters and beautiful illustrations. This work has, as always by this author, been done in the G15 PMN B9edit editor. The present PDF was released June 2017. The printed book contains prelude and color photos of ballerina paintings on the cover. New books from this author are only sold in Avenuege shops (and at events).]

## The Interconnected Whole

Q: What is meditation?

A: It may be so much, much more than merely to come to a peaceful warm silence within one's mind. I mean, that's roughly the dictionary definition of it. I think that we ought to delve into it slowly, so we get it right, for meditation may just happen to be the most important thing in life.

Q: How can it possibly be that important? After all, life is full of experiences and challenges, some of which may be more important, no?

A: But for all these experiences and challenges to make sense, you must have your heart at peace, your mind at ease, otherwise the experience will be empty.

Q: So, are you saying that meditation in a way is a foundation for everything else?

A: Yes.

Q: The next question, I suppose, is whether you see a conflict between science on the one hand, and going into spiritual themes on the other.

A: I don't see any conflict there. I mean to say, I don't think that there is a conflict between the most well-reflected and rational approach to the study of the universe, in the spirit of Einstein, Popper, de Broglie and other great scientists, and the study of the depths of your own mind and heart. We can go into this a little bit here--but I do think that I have done a rather good bit of foundation work on this in the book, "The Beauty of Ballerinas: awakening non-artificial intelligence". It's important but tough going for most, because science isn't easy. Like ballet, science cannot be easy. It requires a great deal of work. Here, my suggestion is that we go into meditation and such more--your first question--because that's also something worthy of study and passion and work and time and energy.

Q: All right. Can we do this, ehm, enquiry into meditation without setting up a set of beliefs about the world and God and so on? Or is it open to anyone, no matter belief?

A: The easy answer is that it is open to anyone.

Q: And the more complex answer?

A: Well, to do meditation involves that you have a look at what causes peacefulness within, and that you also are

willing to challenge your ideas about the world and your own role in it. The structures of your thoughts have to be looked into, to some extent anyway, otherwise meditation won't be going very deep. And so, anyone who is studying meditation for a while is likely to find his or her opinions to be affected.

Q: I see. Would it help to be a Christian, for instance?

A: But that word means a hundred things, at least. But I suppose we will have to go into questions touching on this --I hope, in an undogmatic, explorative, dialogic way, if we are at all to go deeply into how meditation can be a foundation for a good life. These things aren't all unrelated. Your vision of the world does affect your mind all the time, and this also even if you don't know what that vision is. For many, it may be something nonverbal, something that consists of so many things that are taken for granted and have been taken for granted since they were consciously picked up during early childhood. This worldview or vision or myth of existence dominates us in every second, and so any adjustment of it is likely to strongly affect the peace of mind.

Q: For the better?

A: The quick answer is that if we are full of illusions, then, as a rule of thumb, the mind is keeping itself under pressure to maintain these illusions against the evidence of reality. Such a pressure is unease. And so, if we are

able to change the most significant of these illusions into a more reality-friendly opinion, we may find that it is easier to meditate. Easier to keep the mindfulness flowing when it isn't occupied by chatter to maintain its illusions.

Q: But some illusions may help create energy and enthusiasm, isn't it so?

A: There are illusions and illusions. Some of them may be little more than slightly unrealistic expectations, and we may find that these can be fruitful to have, even if there may be moments of distress when they have to be switched around, so to speak, so as not to become disappointments. They have to be flexible, so to say. Other illusions may be like wrong maps--apt to guide to entirely pointless pursuits and should be replaced completely, and as fast as can be, so that more harmonious living is possible.

Q: How do we know which illusions are in need of change?

A: Well, that's the vastness of this enquiry into meditation: how well do you know yourself? How well do you know what's going on at all levels in your mind? And how much time do you have, let's say each week, and month, and season, to study this? Surely, this is something that isn't done merely in five minutes. It may have taken a decade to get all the thoughts you have at present. It may easily take another decade to get to know these thoughts, and work out suitable new intuitions about them, such that

those that ought to change will change. This is, indeed, something of the nature of personal work so as to deepen meditation. Meditation cannot merely be repetition of a word-sound, or attention to certain images or body parts, or some other rhythmic practise, whether related to breath or emotion or some imagined divine guru. Meditation is this great work, and a part of it can be some more repetitive practise or some sort of technique, but that's just a part of it; a part of the passion, the zest for insight into meditation, and part of the hunger also for getting a bite of the real substance of meditation. The joy, the love, the compassion, the overflowing abundance of feeling that all life is an interconnected dancing whole--that's what the pursuit of meditation ultimately is about.

Dialogues and Groups

Q: How do I recognise an enlightened master?

A: An enlightened master? If you, with wings of wax, fly near to the Sun, you recognise it by the fact your wings are melting!

But more seriously, it takes an absolute master to recognise an absolute master.

Q: What then when a hundred or a thousand disciples claim of a guru that he or she is soooo enlightened?

A: If they were absolute masters themselves, would they be disciples? No. So, they are not absolute masters. But then they won't recognise an absolute master either. The hundred or thousand voices count for nothing, because they see but partially, but claim that they see fully. Of course there may be tremendous hypnosis in such repetition --what we also call "conditioning". People get conditioned for years to say of such and such that he or she is a "master". It becomes part of their worldview. But take any one of these masters and make of them one who has to fight to get a job and to feed hungry children at home and get them to school and kindergarten and what not, and their carefully cultivated smiles and apparently psychic stares and what not will, likely as not, fade and they'll be as

neurotic as anyone else. When people have as a job to appear enlightened in front of a group, and the group pays them to fulfill this role, it's a theatre play. It has really very little to do with enlightenment. In this light, we can understand how J. Krishnamurti chose to say --a bit harshly perhaps, but he had a point--that "the guru destroys the disciples and the disciples destroy the guru."

Q: In buddhism, there is not just the guru, but also the dharma, the dedication and the cultivation, that matters.

A: Yes. If you permit me to use again this metaphor, that I so like: if you fly around with wax wings, you must be carefully to not go too near the source.

Q: Right. Okay so how is this relevant here?

A: I mean that the practise of meditation, prayer and all sorts of things ought to take place without any much contact with the fountain of all energy. Otherwise it may burn out the brains. You see, in India this has long had a name--"kundalini overblow". The energy is visualized to be as a serpent, coiled up in root chakra--near the genitals, you see--and ready to flare up. If this happens 'prematurely', it wrecks the person. And so, when people cultivate harmony and silence together, perhaps do yoga-like exercises and what not, then should this be done in the presence of somebody who is absolutely enlightened?

Q: How serious can this energy affect people?

A: I have been around for long enough to see a number of cases that brain scientists couldn't make head or tail of. Oh sure, they have their books with diagnostic labels, but it is easy to tell when they are fumbling. The human brain is a vulnerable instrument--it is meant to meditate, but it must be done in moderation. And if you go deeply into the worldview of classical medicine, you find that it has not much grasp of that which can be called "SOF", and which nevertheless may play a pivotal role in all mind and consciousness. This concept of SOF is suggested in our super-model theory, but it really comes entirely naturally if you, as a philosopher, taking time to do it well, seek to reflect over all the findings of modern science in one sweep.

Q: What is SOF again?

A: It refers to the way in which not just subatomic processes, but, in a certain interpretation of facts, all processes organise themselves. There is something about this organisation--the "O" is for Organisation, you see--which goes beyond the speed of light. So light--lumens--is superceded. Super-luminal. So that's the "S". And the "F" is of course for "Field". This is just one way of summing it up, but what I show with super-model theory is that by means of such SOFs we can account even for the effects shown by Einstein in his relativity theories, but without giving up, as Einstein does, on a common time and

a common space. This is a long story, and worth exploring for everyone, and I refer to the "Beauty of Ballerinas: awakening non-artificial intelligence" for more and more understanding of it. But, in short, there is something about brain functionality which is not merely a question of cause and effect as by classical chemistry and such. And when we explore the concept of SOFs, we are led to a sense in which all existence may have many inter-related levels, not just one level; and in which present-day physics is merely a scraping of the surface of a vast investigation that, in a sense, has just begun.

In this light, one can understand that brains may undergo drastic changes when they explore things which activate these SOFs. These drastic changes, in small doses, may be glimpses of enlightenment, and elements of progression in enlightenment, understanding, the sense of wholeness of all existence. In larger doses they may kill a portion or even all of the brain.

Q: Gosh. One mustn't go too fast, then. Meditation energy can be something dangerous.

A: And so I playfully (borrowing from comics) sometimes call it "cryptonite".

Q: The green shiny stuff Superman can't stand?

A: Exactly. But this is here used simply to indicate the degree to which one has been exposed, or even over-exposed --to the energy of meditation. Put simply. To be in touch

with this may elevate your life into greater joy. To be over-exposed may give an even greater joy, as no doubt some drugs can do, but, like drugs, these even greater intensities come with a price, and the price is that there is some reduction of function afterwards. It may be an addictive joy, but it's a self-destructive one if over-done. A very athletic, young person who is still in a process of growing up can handle much, much more than one who has settled in adulthood: for the cells are constantly forming and can handle challenges of this kind much more easily.

Q: But this cryptonite effect, as you call it, can also sometimes affect children?

A: Yes, even they can be too strongly exposed to the energy. But typically they recover. So cryptonite is a term that can be--playfully, and yet very seriously--a word of reminder to adults, to not go too near the Sun, as it were.

Q: More generally, when we speak of meditation and its importance and all that, do we do this in a way which is, for instance, perfectly buddhist?

A: Buddhism, like Christianity, Hinduism, Daoism, and Islam--to mention some--are bundle concepts, containing sharply different strains of thought. But if you look at some of the core texts in Buddhism, you find that the Buddha urged people also to doubt him, as part of Dharma:

Dharma, not just as dedication, but also truth, or to find out about truth. If one comes to a point in which one sees that the Buddha was wrong, well, then, Buddha was wrong and Buddhism is supposedly at ease with this. In this regard, one finds that Buddhism has a certain streak of noble scientific attitude about it.

Many people regards J. Krishnamurti as perhaps the foremost exponent of a Buddha-like logic of thought. It is therefore interesting that when Krishnamurti, after more than half a century of talking in a rather pantheistic and buddhistic fashion, in which there was no concept of any personal God, spoke with David Bohm in the book "The Ending of Time", published in the 1980s a couple of years before Krishnamurti died, he broke with himself.

Q: Who? Krishnamurti broke with himself? How?

A: Well, in my perspective, Krishnamurti was not at all absolutely enlightened--this is not given to mortal men. But he may have been the most enlightened--let's say, about 70 percent so. (I prefer normally to use permille, but for ease, now, let's use 'percent'.) He wasn't very clear about sexuality, and so the teacher who called himself "Osho", had a few points to make that Krishnamurti didn't make, but Osho seemed to have some other forms of foolishness--some over-boiled greed for wealth and such. I suggest Osho comes to perhaps 30 percent. And then those who have their cults, their sects, their groups, their little religions--the gurus of all genders who are all over the place--they are in the region of perhaps ten to

twenty percent. Whereas the average person in the street may have a mere couple of percent enlightenment.

Krishnamurti, then, scored high in being fairly willing to challenge also himself, and to be noncorrupt. He turned away from the very wealthy Theosophical Society when they wanted to announce that he was their World Teacher, and he steered away from making too foolish organisations around himself. His language is full of simplifications and half-truths uttered in exaggerations. But it is a poetic language, and, as art, stands up.

So on this background, when Krishnamurti, who, since he was in Oslo in the early 1930s spoke about opening oneself to the harmony of Nature as greater than any belief, dogma or church, suddenly took a different line altogether in the 1980s, some people wondered whether he was getting too old. But it may have been a real noncorrupt insight, a fruit of his exploration for such a vast period of time.

Q: So could you summarize what he came with then, in this "Ending of Time" book?

A: Sure. Put simply, he stated that he had a particular deep meditation one night in India, in which, touching what he felt was the essence of all, he encountered some sort of essential being. In other words, when he went as deep as he could, and stared into the abyss--or ocean--of pure meditation, he found somebody staring back. A person. A sort of godhood if you wish.

Q: A personal God, in other words?

A: Yes, in the sense that, as of this point, it seemed that one could no longer label Krishnamurti merely a "pantheist"--in the typical buddhistic sense of there being something divine about all existence without there necessarily being a God creating it. All of a sudden, he produced a God. That wasn't a logical step. In a sense, it was almost inelegant. But it may have been a truthful step --a factual step. Bringing him closer to reality. That is my intuition--that what he did in "The Ending of Time" was honest work, and, much as people around him perhaps would have preferred that he stayed on the assumedly 'purer' path of pantheism, he had a real glimpse there, of sorts.

Q: Do you mean to say that he in a sense got Christian or the like?

A: Now, that's an interesting theme. What is the typical God-concept found in most forms of Christianity, say, as that which is propagated by the Vatican? This is centered around the Latin idea of "Deus", which was a Roman word drawing from Greek origins, in particular from the Greek word for the God of Gods, Zevs. Now Zeus--this I have also pointed out elsewhere--is a completely different type of God than that expounded by some teachers in Christianity including St. Paul and St. Augustine. True, he is all-powerful, a fearless judge, stern but also fair, rational, yet personal and also loving. There are many similarities. But in contrast to the Deus concept, Zeus is also full of natural sensuality and sexuality, and in several myths he

transforms himself into animals so as to not scare away beautiful girls of his world that he then seduces, in the transformed shapes. So you see, that part of the idea got clipped away from the Christian Deus, or God concept, and instead they built up an "anti-God" concept which had all the animal and sexual features that they had removed from the Deus concept. In that way, and this lives on to this day, in Italy, those who are much in love with free sexuality find themselves aligned at least as much to the concept of Satan--the adversary, you see, to the Christian Deus concept--as to Deus or God. And this is a problem for most of Christianity--this savage clipping of the source of existence into two. Not the clipping of the source, but the clipping of the concept of the source.

Q: In China, Japan, Korea, India, Nepal, Sri Lanka and so on they don't seem to have this clipped concept as much.

A: That's right. So the far east spirituality typically has a more generous attitude to sensuality and sexuality. However, they don't necessarily have a well-developed concept of the personal God either. The polytheism of the typical Hindi easily becomes much like merely a variation of pantheism. Monotheism is a different type of concept. And here you must develop your own intuition, and not merely go by tradition or assert that 'all traditions are equal'. Of course they are not. Of course some are nearer truth than others. Of course these things matters immensely.

Q: Does it have to be a male God?

A: I have read thinkers say such as, "We've had three or even five thousand years of male Gods from Jahve all the way down to the present time, and it's time we recognise the divine feminine as source of all." Now the statement has much to it, and politically one may easily have some affinity to it. But we mustn't let politics decide worldview. Worldview isn't about what goes in and out of fashion, if we are serious about it. Worldview is our map, however sketchily, of "what is". This map may be boring but if there's a mountain between, say, three lakes, then the mountain won't go away just because we're bored with mountains, right? It will still be there! But if our maps are revised according to politics, we cannot navigate by them. So the map, the worldview, has to be accurate.

And how do you find out--is there a feminine source, a masculine, a transgender source, a dualism, a trinity, a twelvesome--or pantheism, just a soup without any personal beings at the core? Or is possibly atheism and the idea of random mutations through survival of the fittest the map with a better contact with reality? All these things--and more you generate by negating various assumptions--must be examined closely. And we must make decisions, not just drift, and not just wait for friends to advise us.

Q: Well, what do you consider is the best worldview?

A: Let's first ask: how do we work to get intuitions about these things ourselves? So that it is not merely "my

opinion" and "your opinion" and "we're all entitled to our opinions" and "let's respect the different opinions". That's all very nice as democratic starting-point, but surely we can advance one step, and explore together, if we find in ourselves the instrument to match our maps, if only bit by bit, against reality. And intuition is what we then need, in addition to using our best logic over the whole of scientific findings, and our own experiences also, perhaps.

Q: Right. To get an intuition one needs to do what--empty the mind of assumptions?

A: That's quickly said but what does it really imply? If you have no assumptions do you then have any question? So some assumptions must be kept for others to be questioned. That's only logical. But now, one of the most important things, that prevent intuitions, is wishful thinking: that your desires imposes itself when you ask. So you need to love reality more than desire, even if you don't know what reality is and may wonder how to relate to reality when you begin to find out. So, a hint here: for each desire you have as to what you wish the answer should be--for whatever reason--could you as it were pretend to desire also the opposite?

Q: A kind of mind-dance, or self-hypnosis?

A: A counter-hypnosis, I would say. Desire is its own hypnosis. And so you playfully bring yourself to a

flexibility you may not feel comfortable with--but you do so to reach a sort of equilibrium between the arrows of desire, an equilibrium from which you can connect to 'what is'. Right? For you must have a balance in your emotions to be open to these impulses from beyond yourself. From a deeper field than the ego-field--from a deeper SOF, we might say. You may desire much to find answers in line with what you have been thinking the past decade, or taught by your caretakers or favourite books or recent spiritual acquaintances, or written in your own diaries. So here we need to assert that we are wanting to cultivate a friendship with facts, as something more important than cultivating a repetition of past thoughts and hopes and loyalties, ideologically, politically, religiously, whatever. When we assert this, we must then go towards yes/no questions with an entirely open attitude. We formulate questions and we look at them and we see if we get a response, perhaps the gentlest of whispers from within, or a nudge from the gut feeling--perhaps as a slight temperature increase--or a gentle lift of a thumb or index finger to indicate a "yes"--or we are walking in Nature and find that we can associate a "yes"-answer with walking straight and a "no" answer with swaying out to the sides. We communicate with our bodies, let our bodies be as antennas to a greater reality. Then we must have harmony in body, harmony in mind.

In this state of harmony, do you notice emotions, an eagerness to jump at an answer, rather than be open about it? Then you must work on your desires before trying to answer, and that's where you can try and pretend that you

desire the opposite of what you desire, so that you create a space within your mind for intuition to operate.

And, of course, to ask a good yes/no question is itself an art--how to do it without presuming any too much, etc.

Q: Okay, so suppose I ask a question about--beauty, truth, love, God,--and I find myself feeling that I want the answer to be in a certain way. Then what? I tell myself to wish the opposite?

A: Exactly. And playfully! Suppose, for instance, you put a question about whether there is a God and, if there is a God with a gender, whether this gender is male. Suppose you got through the first part of it without a hitch, and you got an intuition, at least a temporary intuition--subject to later scrutiny by more meditations--that there is a God. Then when you ask whether the gender is male, you might find yourself feeling suddenly very political, and somewhat stirred. You may find that you want the God to be a woman, or a feminine spirit. And you realize that you are now political. Then, to fulfill the enquiry, you must work on looking at yourself as beyond politics.

Q: How do you do that?

A: You are naturally beyond politics but your mind may be affected by various forms of conditioning and chattering. It comes up when you wish to ask such questions. So, let's say you draw up a political line on a piece of paper and put your finger somewhere and say, "I am there." But then,

in order to enquire into the greater meta-physical reality you must be everywhere, not just on one point of a line. So you must explore your antipathies against the other points of that line, and, at least for some minutes, try and say that it could be that you could have some affinity for this and that point after all. You make a game with yourself, in your own mind, in which--free from guilt, and not having to tell anyone--you entertain the idea of liking ALL political viewpoints, no matter how absurd or rotten they usually seem. After a few minutes of this, you may find yourself completely at ease. If so, you proceed to ask again, the question which so evoked political emotions. Your mind is now quiet. You can now reach more of a real intuition, but you must check another time, and then another, and then yet another, and not be too cock-sure. You don't have to tell anybody of your switching of political loyalties in such a mythic moment. You have privacy. You have to be loyal to, and listen to, your own perceptions. And so you cannot have the internal censorship that ensures only politically correct and legally safe points of view. As a spiritual human being of integrity, there is no such thing as a forbidden thought.

Work on this and you get to the right harmony.

Q: Right. So I work on getting a harmony and balance of mind by imagining I'm beyond any political standpoint. But this may not work at first. What then?

A: Then you put it aside and cook some food or do some work or read some fiction and take it up again next day or

later in the week or so and no doubt it will be easier next time. Psychological progress is a real thing when you push at it, many times pr month. It is not just an illusion. You chisel away your conditioning. Then light can come in. As light comes in, conditioning may not that easily accumulate again. Or compare it to a flower that works hard on penetrating a barrier in order to sprout and flourish in the Sun. It must keep up the push. Never give up.

Q: Right. Well, that's optimistic. Can this be done together with others, or does it have to be an individual lone path towards more and more enlightenment?

A: In every serious pursuit in areas of insight into life, including a quest into enlightenment, there is the work done by oneself, and the work done with others, socially, as two necessary ingredients. They always go together, to some extent, in normal circumstances.

Q: The individual and the social complements--not "compliments"--but complements one another?

A: Yes, mutually. So do use groups. Explore together. Find quietness together. Find meditation together. Find out about prayer together. But if it so happens that someone gets too self-important, form another group. So groups may have to be practically coordinated. Bohm, for instance, suggested that one can form dialogue groups, with fifty people or so, with some facilitators. These make it easier

--"facilitate" means that--to have dialogue. But if the facilitators claim or seem to have the air of wanting to be very superior, some sort of absolute masters, then it won't be much of a dialogue, it will just be a continual conditioning for these assumed masters to get confirmation of their self-image, their wish to be seen as divine or something. A tiny bit of it is probably ok, but if it gets intense, it wrecks the coherence of the group. And so, also, if any member in the group is very famous or very rich, as compared to the others, the radiance of power from this person may be too strong to allow any real dialogue to arise. David Bohm, when he engaged in thinking about dialogue in the last decade or two of his life, was such a celebrity in the international philosophical scene that he deeply affected any group he partook in--more than most others anyway. And as a result, he didn't get experience of the full set of challenges of such groups. Perhaps this prevented some of his theorising over dialogue, perhaps it wasn't as eminent as some other parts of his thinking. Then again, it's no question that Bohm blazed new trails in dialogue thinking--speaking of it as a "social meditation" and speaking very clearly on such as "hidden or tacit assumptions" as well as "suspension"--of judgement, thought, and emotion.

Let's be aware though, that Bohm had personal troubles in his past two or three years, and one of his closest friends (P. de Mare), who had encouraged the practise of dialogue groups, and who was a christian, advised Bohm--especially after Krishnamurti died--to open up for faith in a personal God. And so, perhaps, to Bohm, Krishnamurti

had a role as some sort of father figure--perhaps he had placed Krishnamurti rather in the "parental myth" slot of his mind? So, after 1986, up until Bohm's death in the early 1990s, Bohm was a bit at sea in various ways. I know, for I visited Bohm when he was at the hospital of King's College, London, after he had got electro-shocks.

And this is, indeed, as I see it, a commentary on the challenge that many rather buddhistically inclined groups exploring deeper concepts of meditation together have: when they don't have an enquiry into the core of existence as a foundation, then people may be looking for a father or or a mother figure in the people around themselves. This quest for a parental figure may then create too much emotional noise for meditation to go any deep.

Then, if a person starts out more personally, by walks and by meditating over the seashore waves and so on, and coming to some sense of what the source all being may be--perhaps a Christian God modified towards the original Zeus concept, so that sexuality is no longer abstracted away--then it may be easier for this person to find other like-minded people who can explore this even more deeply together without the temptation for anyone of these persons to stand up and claim absoluteness. Such a "committee of Zeus" may have a better chance of providing harmony when they, a bit like the Quakers, assert that silence is a better teacher than anyone of them, and that fellowship in silence can be both friendly and have a character of something of a divine pursuit.

Q: I see. Not that talking is banned?

A: There must be the use of logic, talk, thinking together, exploring intellectually also. Everything cannot be silent meditation! With the emphasis that there is a unity in orientation towards a beyondness which is equally available to all, and directly so, and not requiring any particular "Lama" or "Teacher" or "Leader" or "Master" to "represent", then there is a humility due to that common, shared concept of beyondness, the divine source. Once a priest pops up and places himself between you and the source, skip the group and form another! Or stand up and read the priest the rulebook of the group. Either way, the group is there for ego to be dissolved so that a greater light can come through, rather than for ego to be strengthened, and this without sectarianism getting too strong.

Q: Some say that it is due to karmic influences that a leader is a leader and therefore the leader must be more spiritually awakened.

A: Well, maybe two percent more. Or five. Or ten. But in every backyard across the world from Tibet to New York you find the little selfish wealthy leaders and their large groups, in which the leaders claim more or less total and absolute enlightenment, and that's not due to karmic influences--that's certainly only due to their lack of development. It's a theatre they play. Buy a ticket to some other, better theatre, with more honest presumptions.

Don't give one whit for these lamas or imams or what they are called! At least, that's how I honestly perceive the structure of the world. Not every setup is what it pretends to be. And most apparently humble leaders aren't very humble in their own mind.

Q: Shouldn't one be respectful of traditions?

A: Wouldn't the traditions love that! Should you be respectful of established science when it is established in a false path? The whole point of the scientific spirit is to challenge paradigms, not lay new ones. When a paradigm has come wrong, then, for decades, science may produce quasi-support for it, but the true spirit of a more awakened, enlightened individual is to have an independent spirit. And this is so in the avenue of quest into physical reality. In going deeper, into the mental and more spiritual reality, we have a related set of challenges. To support tradition may be a sound advice of a country leader wanting stability in own country, but if you are interested in truth, you must feel entirely at ease with challenging falseness, or else you're not even a starter in the game of life.

And so, religion is an enquiry into reality and it has to have something of the best of the scientific attitude in it: it isn't a box or a brick, but the advances humanity makes over billions of years, and through incarnations.

Q: Well, what is then really enlightenment? How do you get

into touch with the idea itself, or the best part of it?

And how can you tell whether another has got it?

A: You watch a person do things, over some time. Over a great deal of time. You watch how the person appears, and what types of things the person gets done--to what does this person sign his or her name, as it were. You look at the trail of actions. Causes and effects. And then you must apply intuition: is it all somehow done because the person massages his or her own sore ego? It's a terrible question to ask to them, personally, so don't ask it! You rather ask it of yourself--about others, and, also, about yourself. You must doubt what is going on. Doubt the pretence. Then when you see some people do something which appears to be not of the ego, then is it out of some fixed ideal? An easy belief? Or does it flow from a sense of insight into life, with love in the heart, and genuine playfulness--not the smile of the guru that the guru wish to project as a possible sign of enlightenment, but the smile that has the symmetry and ease of a touch of truth. The smile that comes from knowing that we don't know, knowing that we're in the same boat, knowing that reality is in flux and humanity is always a child of something much vaster than it, against which it can set nothing. So do you find a person who has a sense of choiceless presence--not taking own choices, but rather that the choices from a sense of direct contact? From harmony, silence, intuition within? That is what, as I see it, enlightenment is about.

Q: Well, then, do you have it?

A: Do I have what? Enlightenment?

Q: Yes. I mean, when we explore it this way, and suggest percentages and all sorts of things about the so-called masters all over the place, then that is one of the natural questions to ask, is it not?

A: I suppose so. May I dodge the question?

Q: Completely dodge it? Avoid it?

A: Yes.

Q: No. Don't dodge it, please.

A: Suppose I said: the energy that works through me is so that too much of it is cryptonite and that, perhaps, since I work solely out of intuition, I cannot be any one of your leaders when you explore these themes. I can only encourage. Then, suppose I answered all this, would you believe it? Would you see the implications of what I say? Would you think it is self-important, pompous to say it, or to go near dodging the question? But there is something about my enquiry, which is very clear to me: it doesn't harm me. I can take any dose of this intensity. But I have so far not seen anyone else who can. On the contrary, I have learned to be careful, not pushing any too much of the meditative intensity into conversations, or into art.

You see it in my paintings and photographs: they do not try and radiate energy as much as possible. They are rather shaped so as to show it in moderation. So it becomes handleable, so to speak. Not that I cannot handle it stronger--you see the difference? I can handle any meditation intensity at all. That's the substance of the answer I wish to give. And then I can add: explore that in your own intuition, when you have the time, and if you find it interesting. Perhaps I am pretending all this, or fooling myself, or half-way fooling myself. Find out. Is it so that I produce what I produce solely from intuition, and a real one, as I say? Is it so that I really can handle any intensity? And so have to be very careful in how much I radiate to anyone at any point? Now, this is not easy to theorize over. I myself have spent much time doing so, perhaps too much I don't know, and you see the results of that in my published works, at least in digital form, and in how it has evolved, since the intimations of understandings of this when I spent a year and a half, about in New York, at the turn of the century.

Q: All right. Another thing: you mentioned a different sort of God-concept than that which is found in conventional christianity, and indeed--if I understand you correctly--in mostly every branch of every religion there is. Are there anyone anywhere practising some sort of faith in such as more Zeus-like God-concept?

A: There are groups in India that have extracted this or

that god from the polytheist spectre of gods and who claim that this god is God, ie, the God of the gods; and some of these have sensuality, playfulness and many Zevs-like qualities as attributes to their God-idea. Then, of course, there are those who practise the cultivation of the whole set of the original Greek gods--from Zevs and downwards to the other, lesser gods underneath him. These call themselves, sometimes, "paganists". And there are some elements in coptic christianity, some elements in the rastafari religion, some elements in zoroasterianism, and so on and so forth also to daoism and buddhism, which lend themselves to such an interpretation. And some christians have probably, though not perhaps in a very explicit or public way, done their own reinterpretations of the God concept. But if you ask: is there a sort of strikingly clear-headed spiritual approach of the kind we have indicated above, taking place in groups? Then I think the answer is: surely there must be, soon. But it takes a bit of conceptual work and this conceptual work hasn't, it seems to me, been done in this world so full of science and its supposedly noble 'scepticism' on the one hand, and the zillion traditionalist groups on the other hand. This is a third path, for which there has never been any real tradition; and so, it is a path which hasn't got any 'master'. And if I have interpreted facts correctly, there isn't need for this concept of the 'master'. No need for there to be anyone who stands between each in a group and the divine level. It's direct access through silence and meditation and dialogue, and that's the hard and beautiful work that will begin.

Wholeness of Life, Physics and the Athletic

Q: Suppose I want to explore a holistic worldview, I want to explore how to think about existence spiritually. But suppose also that, while I have an interest in such as physics and perhaps also biology, I haven't yet had any much time to come to grips with these subjects. What would you suggest I should do? Skip the scientific aspects, or is there a way in which a summary can do the trick? Or must a lot of time be given to science to deal with it properly?

A: I think first of all we should have a sense of respect for the complexity of the scientific questions. These questions open up, whenever they are asked--such as, how did life arise, what is mind, what are the laws of the universe as a whole--they open up a number of additional questions. Each of these again open up yet more questions. And so, when somebody has worked much with them, he or she may come to entirely different results than that which other people have. Sometimes, people claim that one must be completely without rationality if one believes such and such: but the fact is that one can logically argue for a lot of widely different worldviews. And there is really little reason to get hotheaded or cocksure about it all.

So, I would suggest, let's begin with respect for the complexities involved.

Then, since so many people seems to be interested in the question of the origin of life, and whether life evolved by means of steps of evolution in which there were somehow chancelike or random mutations driving it, it could be as well that one looks into that first. It will make it easier to look into physics if one has got a little bit grip of the questions involving how life arose--at least, that's a possibility.

Q: All right. The theory of evolution--survival of the fittest after there have been random mutations--and some more thoughts of this nature--how would you reflect over this? I take it you wouldn't just say that it is false.

A: Well, I would appeal to reason. When Charles Darwin was doing his nature observations on the Isles of Gallapagos and such places, he thought he found little system to it all, he found chaos and conflicts and evidences of past forms of life that perhaps didn't make out so well. And he reasoned that Nature sort of experiments and some of these experiments seem to turn out to create more cabable results. The 20th century then saw the birth of the field of biology, in which more and more of the astonishing complexity found even within every human cell has been sought to be mapped. With each decade, more and more of the mapping of the marvels of naturual life in general, and the human body in particular, has gone on.

Then, in the last decades of the 20th century and more strongly in the first decades of the 21st century, it seems that the cells of the human being and of many

parts of natural life are not only advanced machines in a sense that completely outperforms all manmade machines, but natural life is also full of what seems to be uses of what can be called 'quantum wierdness'.

All this suggests that if Nature indeed has come forth with all these results entirely by random mutations, there must have been a lot of random mutations indeed. And so biologists suggests that random mutations over a certain number of billions of years is adequate to explain all life on Earth.

At present, a very large majority of those working as professional biologists, or in related fields of science, claim to believe in that take on the creation of life. But for outsiders, it surely does seem more and more incredible: how can a mere set of billion of years be enough to make all this fantastic, amazing structure, that so elegantly makes up that which we call life? How can even a trillion years, or a trillion trillion years for that matter, be even nearly enough to come up even with a single of the cells that make up the human body and brain?

So, for thsoe who are not professionals, who are so to speak paid to be loyal to the establishment of biology, it must be fairly easy to compare the situation now and the situation around the completion of the 19th century, and say: surely that which seemed rather likely to Mr. Darwin is now not looking all that likely anymore. Not only have we all these maps of what life is about--and the maps keep on getting more and more detailed, refined, and perplexing, many of them--but also, we have computers able to do random graphics and random patterns a vast

quantity of times in just a few seconds. And these computers never seem to come up with any considerably interesting structure even if they spin away with their random or semi-random changes for quite a while. So now we know a lot more about 'random' than what was the case at the completion of the 19th century, and we know a lot more about life than we did then. We don't find that random is so hugely interesting, and we find that life is hugely complex to an extreme degree. And so, all in all, a person who is not part of an establishment where a statement of non-belief in darwinism of some sort is a sort of farewell to a career ought to be given a chance to think it all afresh: is it really that likely, what Mr. Darwin said, or what his successors have said? Or is it rather requiring a fantastic leap of faith--in the power of randomness especially--even given billions of years--and that it must be possible to look very seriously indeed for something to supplement any such principle of 'survival of the fittest' and 'random mutation'.

Q: Can we do this without denying survival of the fittest and without denying random mutations?

A: Survival of the fittest is a concept that is almost true pr definition. No need to deny that! When it comes to mutations, there is much, plenty, evidence that bacteria and such do mutate and do so indeed quite often. But is it random? That is one question. And what is random? The mutations are all a question of certain re-arrangements of atom structures and indeed biologists find themselves

speaking of 'quantum tunnelling' as a pathway to mutations whenever we speak of the DNA core in cells and their replications. And is this random? But that requires an understanding not only of what random is, but also an understanding of where the quantum fluctuations come from, and whether they are truly random or not. And so that is almost a meta-physical question.

Then, it must be possible to ask: do we really see enough of evidence of mutation in highly complex organisms such as animals, to explain all the progression from, let's say, bacteria all the way over to the human being? I mean in the sense of regularly occurring mutations in a random manner.

As soon as we question the randomness concept, and also ask pertinent questions about whether 'mutations' are exactly enough, we find that the evidence is much more flimsy. And so, there's a vast spectrum of possibilities to anyone who is logical, rather than tied up to a certain definite pathway of thinking.

Q: You seem to be saying, though, as though one who believes in some form of darwinism isn't logical.

A: Look, all I'm saying here is that the field is very complex and that while one can understand the approach to thinking about life that darwinism involves, there are questions involved here that sheer logic can open up more and more. So we must respect that there is a complexity. Rational people can believe in darwinism of some sort-- neo-darwinism or whatever--if they don't have much time to

think about such as the true nature of randomness, or the true nature of time, for that matter, or the complexities of quantum tunnelling and other quantum phenomena. That must be respected. So I'm not saying that it is directly illogical to believe in darwinism. I'm only saying that by applying logic one may find that its foundations aren't all that clear, and gradually one may find that, if one is spending time with it, that there are key features of life that defies explanation in that way.

Q: All right. Then over to physics.

A: No, wait. I wish to say that once we loosen up on our assumptions about the evolution of life, we are then in an area in which a fantastic number of alternative evolutions or alternative forms of evolvments of life can be imagined. Evolution can be, for instance, guided by subtle formative principles. It can be also that it has unrolled in a process dimension not parallel but rather perpendicular to our time experience, by means of such organising fields that an advanced form of physics easily speaks about. It can also be that there is a combination between some forms of chaos and some form of even planned creation. One can imagine a vast landscape of scenarios once one realizes that atheism is chiefly founded on the notion of classical physics, not founded on a full summary of all of modern physics. This is not part of present mainstream science but then science changes, from one century to the next, and as individuals seeking to find out more about life, we ought to feel as free as possible

in exploring these questions with maximal integrity and utter freedom from pressures of fashion and career and loyalties to professors and what not.

Q: Right. So atheism, you say, is mostly a thing of classical physics. But surely many of those who have gone through courses in more modern physics, such as quantum physics, are still atheists. How can that be?

A: That has to do mostly with Einstein, I think.

Q: Say on. Isn't it so that Einstein was almost religious, though?

A: In a way. Personally, perhaps. He read Spinoza and so on, who spoke of God and Nature as two sides of the same coin. But the fact is that Einstein spoke very strongly in favour of the view that only processes that are near one another can affect one another. He argued very effectively, and in a way that has influenced extremely many people, to this day, for a view in which the speed of light is more important than either that of a common space or a common time. That is to say, to Einstein, there is a unique sort of past and future to each moving observer in the universe. This works out wonderfully well in his equations, and his words and his equations and his masterfully charismatic personality, and the early success of these equations in predicting certain cosmic observations, all added to up a formidable package.

So when evidence began to arise that subatomic phenomena

somehow don't quite behave in a way that was restricted by the speed of light in the same way, there was a stir and a sense of confusion in the field of physics. As a kind of solution, Niels Bohr and his group proposed that subatomic phenomena oughtn't to be analyzed very much, but rather that the equations just predict measurements and we needed try and visualize these phenomena when they are not measured. In that way, he avoided confrontation with the einsteinian paradigm, the einsteinian universe. Bohr suggested that when we do measure something subatomic, we find results that are 'classical'; but when we don't measure them, we have equations but we don't need to assume that these equations refer to anything but what Bohr and his group, the so-called Copenhagen Interpretation called 'probability densities'.

Q: But isn't the whole point of quantum theory that it says that the world is both wave and particle?

A: That's the easy, popular presentation of it. But the way Bohr summarized the works of the many physicists--including Einstein and de Broglie and Max Planck, who sort of started most of it--but also Heisenberg, Schroedinger, Pauli, Fermi and so on--the waves of probabilities don't correspond to any real wave out there. I can go on indefinitely about this theme, if you ask me, but let's try and sum it all up this way: Bohr sought to rescue the worldview of Einstein by avoiding to discuss how it came to be that the subatomic processes behaved according to the peculiar equations that they did

behave according to, wavish or not. Then, fast forward many decades, and the quantum processes no longer just concern subatomic pheomena but are found to be present in large structures also--some utilized commercially like supermagnets--and very clear-cut, consistent and logical forms of visualisation of what goes on between measurements were suggested by people like Louis de Broglie and David Bohm and others.

Q: But these visualisations, they didn't change the worldview that Einstein had initiated?

A: No, they didn't. And one of the reasons is that the phenomena that Einstein discusses so well are really hard to explain--they are wierd. My own proposal is that they can be re-explained so as to rescue common time and common space, by seeing the effects centered around the speed of light as a particular brand of quantum wierdness. This is part of that which I call "super-model theory". Now, this all got quite involved. You wanted to keep it easy. I am sorry it got complex, but can I suggest a picture to explain the situation?

Q: Please come with it.

A: Imagine that atheism is about seeing the world as if it is made of particles of sand, which bump into each other, according to dumb rules. All right? That is one picture. Now Einstein comes in and fortifies that structure, gives it an extra dimensions and some curvature and so on, but

it is still sand and it still bumps. On the other hand, when we visualize what must underlie the quantum wierdness we find that there must be something superluminal. Imagine that the sand is moved by water that flows tremendously fast, and in a way that resonates better with some grains of sand than with other grains. That would lead to 'wierd' motions of some of the sand, but not all. And so that seems to be a bit like the world we live in.

Q: Right. The fast movement of the water--would that be the superluminal organising fields you speak of? The SOF?

A: Yes. We can also say 'q-field', or 'super-model'. For these fields are as if modelling what is going on, and the models can themselves be modelled, and so on in many levels. And finally we can say that the grains of sand themselves are nothing but such models--they are, as it were, 'mini-SOFs'. So the world is made of one thing and it has the wierdness inherent in it. The speed of light is then but one of a range of features that determine this wierdness, and one must do quite involved calculations to understand better some of the patterns involved--and all this I begin to indicate in the 2017 book I have mentioned before. The point, now, that I wish to make is relative to atheism. Atheism, then, seems to not to take into any serious consideration the fact that the worldview of Einstein really can't handle quantum wierdness. It has broken down. Initially, this was sort of concealed by the approach of only speaking about probability densities in relation to quantum theory, but it didn't work out very

well in the long run. And so, atheism doesn't have such a firm ground as it perhaps seemed to have around 1905 or so, when it first came into world fashion.

Q: Is there any hint of spirituality in all this? I mean, in the worldview in which we not only have grains of sand, but also some sort of superluminal organising field?

A: As I see it, there is something distinctly mental-like about these fields, and while modern physics hasn't in it any vocabulary or measurement instrument or calculation technique to begin to speak seriously about mind, many people feel that quantum theory is the first indication from physical measurements alone that the universe may somehow be throbbing with something mental or mindlike or lifelike underneath its surface, so to speak. It is a pointer. But to what? So, as I see it, in super-model theory we try to put together that which seems to be the most obvious summary of the whole new universe picture, at the level of physical measurement. What seems to come out of this is in a way that the universe may be as if it were a grand visualisation by a master being--at least, it isn't contradictory to such a solution. And this is, in a way, very near what Bishop Berkeley suggested some centuries before Einstein.

Of course this isn't something one can prove from within neither mainstream physics nor from any new form of physics such as super-model theory. But I believe it is fair to say that it is very much a logical possibility. In this picture, the four or more dimensions that Einstein

spoke about have new names--they are not 'time' exactly, but rather they are time-like. We can perhaps say 'process dimension'. And in this sense, there may be ways in which the universe engages in a use and a change of something past-like and something future-like for organising events in the present. You see, one of the complications for Einstein's worldview in meeting with super-luminal processes is that when each observer has its own time, its own past, and its own present, such processes break down the divisions and it would seem like the present of one observer changes the past of another. In such a view, then, the past is no longer the past, in any conventional sense of the word. But the effects that Einstein described are very intricate, it is not merely a question of tossing words around. That's why I suggest we should do new forms of visualisation in which a computer language designed for the purpose can help us--not mathematics, because it is full of infinities and these infinities cannot be as easily reasoned over as some more defined and finite structures, such as those used in computers--because they we both get new words AND we also get a sense of the complex interrelationships between such as the speed of light measurements and the movements of what is measured when it is not measured on.

I don't know how easy this sounds, but, again, I think that when the super-luminal--which also includes the phenomena spoken of as 'nonlocal' and exhibited during such as 'entanglement' and related to the coordination which is called 'quantum coherence' and of which such as 'quantum tunnelling' is an extraordinary exhibit of--when

this super-luminal is coupled with a sense of the peculiarities of the speed of light phenomena, we get a worldview which is deeply entwined, a wholeness which has an order which is fascinating and in which it is utterly easy to imagine that the spiritual has a place, in some way or in another way.

Q: You quite often speak about coherence, don't you?

A: Yes. In super-model theory, it makes sense to say that the chief difference between situations in which the particles seem to operate on their own and the situations in which they particles seem to be moving according to quantum wierdness is the extent to which they are coherent or part of a coherent field, a field which is at least potentially super-luminal. And so the notion of SOF arise.

Q: Is this coherence in physical theory related to the idea of harmony in the mind?

A: If we take a step away from all the discussions of the physicists, and ask this question of ourselves as personal philosophers, in the spirit of using our own hearts and minds, then I think that we are most probably getting to say 'yes'--in other words, 'yes, coherence and harmony are related, and it is when we have harmony in mind that we also may have the best intuitions, intuitions that may possibly leap beyond that which is in the brain physically and beyond our experience, locally.'

Q: Is this is harmony a key to how one can explore getting intuitions while avoiding mental turmoil? For it would seem that those who are questing the spiritual sometimes more easily get into states of possible breakdown.

A: It could seem that way, maybe. Although there are other forms of mental breakdown than those related to spiritual quests, and some of them may be caused by the denial of the spiritual dimension. I think that people shouldn't talk too intensely about their dreams or intuitions and that they should go moderate about these things--portion it out, do it in mild doses each week. And get good sleep, plenty of sleep, on good beds, with meaningful use of vitamins and so on, every day or night: for the lack of sleep would quickly mess up the coherence of intuitions.

Q: Talk about lifestyle. Perhaps best not to use coffee?

A: Well, it's sort of 'old school' to say of coffee that it is bad. In fact, some form of coffee are found to be extremely good for the brain, when used in the first part of the day and in a form that doesn't have too much cholesterol in it. Much coffee stimulates a certain flow of creativity that can help visual art. It can be a challenge to those who are anxious, but then it may also help them to find out about this anxiety to shake it up a little bit and do so in the happy frame of mind that coffee can make. Add to this daily use of such mild drugs as coffee potent vitamins--which really are but food-concentrates--of the whole spectrum, but with an emphasis on such as B12, and

you may have a fantastic platform for both work and meditation, free from inclinations to both heavy drugs like cocaine and to hangover-making drugs like alcohol; and still some use of alcohol, like whiskey or possibly wine, may on occasion stimulate, and have interesting creative after-effects. As can tobacco, cannabis, etc.

Q: Suppose somebody says, it's all well and good what you say but I make finely little progress, I feel, each month and in the meantime I would like to have a partner with which to handle the struggle of life. Is all seeking for a partner an illusion?

A: No, not in this society. No, I wouldn't say so. I can understand it perfectly. And in some contexts of work, too, the inclinations towards one or two or three or more people as steady companions, to get them to collaborate with you to do things, is understandable, and reasonable, quite often. When it comes to progress, to spiritual progress, I think that we shouldn't try too hard and not too little either: but in both cases have flexible expectations, and consider things on the level of soul and spirit and in timescales such as millions of years rather than getting everything right within a decade or so. To think reincarnation makes good sense once you admit that matter particles isn't all that is and that there may be subtler forms of existence than that which is the measurable body as part of the life of the body. And in this perspective, we have to let go of partners, of course --but we also come around to get new. So it has a laughter

and a playfulness and an optimism in it. It has dignity to think in terms of reincarnation.

Q: To push this theme a little bit--about collaboration--suppose one wishes to have dialogue with people who seems obsessed with throwing around accusations. Can one do something to create dialogue when conditions are bad for it?

A: Dialogue typically becomes bad when people are going to do things, and there are many motives involved, only some of which are spoken about and several of them may go in different directions, and, in addition, the burden of decision is shared amongst several. Can one then implement dialogue, as it were? Miracles do happen. But dialogue is much more easy when personal interests aren't at stake; and then, when action is really important, hierarchies are typically used in societal organisation, right?

Q: What do you mean? Hierarchies?

A: I mean, in any military establishment, for instance, it may be that some sort of coherent action is better than nerve-wrecking internal conflict. And this action is then implemented by means of top-down decision-making, hopefully after a period of from-bottom-up listening. This requires dialogue in the head and heart of the leader: and if the leader is stupid, so will the action of this whole hierarchy be stupid. But it might be even more stupid to get split to pieces in competing factions. So a hierarchy

is usually a way to have some measure of harmony, however slight, when it comes to things which involves personal interests. If the hierarchy is without wisdom, it may however evoke an upsurge of distress around itself, and this is the trouble of stupid institutions acting in the middle of populous societies. I don't think there is ever going to be any master recipe here, except to realize that as long as there is the fact of absence of absolute enlightenment, there are going to be different takes on the world by different people.

Q: Is there ever going to be absolute enlightenment?

A: Is the Sun ever going to eat up the planet? It is not for manifest humanity to dabble in absolutes. Relative enlightenment can come, collectively, after a great great deal time--will come, I feel, I'm sure of it. And it can always be more of the relative enlightenment. But will it ever sort of rush into the infinity of wisdom that is the characteristic of the divine source? No; and I think it would be the worst of hubris for humanity to intend such enlightenment.

Q: Yet Krishnamurti, whom we have already referred to a little, spoke of absolute insight as possible for all.

A: Well, yes, but he wasn't extremely keen, as I remember it, on calling this 'enlightenment'. And in any case we have here many different shades of possible meanings of these words; and add to that the tendency of

Mr. J.K. to simplify complex matter and put things with a poetic ease that didn't exactly match, adequately, what was spoken about. I asked Bohm, when I first met him, about whether insight can come gradually or whether it must come all at once when it comes. He seemed to favour the approach of gradual insight, to some extent anyway-- and I pointed out that it seemed that Krishnamurti would have it otherwise. Then he said something about there being a "problem with clarity" about what Krishnamurti said. This was the guy who had produced a number of books together with Krishnamurti, remember. Or at least several books. It can stupefy the mind to read Krishnamurti as if it has inherent in it some form of life solution. It is however a great antithesis to the guru-cultivation that quite recklessly has been going on and is still going on on large parts of the planet, and this without ever getting trapped into silly atheism.

Q: How can a person who is interested in spiritual living also make a living, economically--perhaps in a context of a society which isn't particularly interested in caring for anyone, but which seems to be rushing onwards, coldly, on no one's errand?

A: Well, planet Earth is chock-full of beastly societies, and that includes beastly democracies and beastly non-democracies and all forms of structures in between. How can anyone survive in this with any decency? Mostly everyone who tries to make money while at the same time doing things entirely by soul and according to heart

either don't get money or don't get the soul and the heart to be in it. It seems that one must here be quite ruthlessly practical and divide the two, at least to some extent: find out what can be done to gain the income, the cash, the money that one needs, which is at least not entirely destructive and entirely unethical and not entirely incompatible with spiritual living; and then give time to spiritual enquiry and artistic unfoldment and healthy athletic practises and good-natured sexuality insofar as you are capable, having handled the economical spheres.

Q: How should one know when to moderate one's approach to spirituality? I mean in terms of this 'kundalini' force or what you spoke of, somewhat playfully, as 'cryptonite'.

A: When emotions get cold or feverish or too strong to handle, cool every spiritual enquiry process down for a while. That, I think, is a key. Strong anger is almost always a sign that the brain has some form of potential challenge in its processes--which is really unrelated to what one is angry at--at least when we speak of spiritual people in relatively peaceful surroundings.

Then, attend to physical health. I think that those who are most capable of pushing the spiritual aspect of themselves very far without danger are those of exquisite health and who are preteens, or teens, or without the first half-decade after they have been teens. They have bodies which can so to speak 'eat up' the spiritual energies, and turn them around--at least if one isn't too

fanatical or too fundamentalist inclined in one's mind. If one does yoga, for instance, that's fine, but can one do these exercises without getting fundamentalist about it--without abstaining from every drop of alcohol served, without getting fixed, funny ideas about what sort of life is divine and what sort of life is horrible? A playful, sensual and also sexual mind is then possible, and in this free-flowing spirit, will kundalini that easily get stuck somewhere in the gut or forehead or wherever and wreck that person's sleep or general coherence? Not so easily. The dancing, healthy, young, slender individual can explore, should explore, and a good society gives the powers of adulthood long long before they are at the end of their teens. In most societies on this planet, children can't vote at all, they have virtually no right until they are out of all childhood. But the adults have shown themselves to be utterly incapable of making harmonious societies anywhere. Adults are stiff, hysterical, prejudiced, unwise people compared to many children. Spiritually, too, would it be more likely or less likely with wars if children could sit at the control spakes? Some would claim that children can be very violent and they can: but they can also learn fast, they can change their mind faster than adults. They have a flexibility and it is just this flexibility that is the rescue when strong spiritual energies play in their limbs.

That's another theme--the question of how to structure these societies--but in any case, open-minded spirituality should be given to everyone at school, not be something

which one waits with until one is having a very mature brain indeed, a brain that one must watch over, day by day, that one doesn't soak it too much in spirituality. Does this make sense? Or do you think it is nonsense?

Q: To me it makes sense. I haven't your experience in meeting all that many people of a spiritual inclination, but I can quite imagine that it is a risky pursuit for quite a few.

A: It isn't that spirituality is only for some, but the intensities sought--too often through drugs, through drug-oriented music also--by the up-growing generations could really be more fruitfully invested into far less harmful explorations into natural highs, the natural highs of meditation. The intensities are the same, but the brains of children and teens are pliable and can handle much of meditation, much more than they can when they are long into their post-teens. But if drugs are the only way into intensities, they will take them, easily, and the drugs eat up of the brains and make the brains more calcified early on. The unsympathetic coldness that is the unintelligent aftereffect of much cocaine, for instance; or the nervous seeking for 'one's own space' in the potheads who have been high on cannabis every day for a year or two; or the self-important load self-pity of those who cannot sleep without an ethanol intoxication;--and so the list goes on and on. Drugs make really disgustingly unsympathetic people. But the IMPULSE to take them is, at least in many cases, the same impulse as could have

fruitfully opened many spiritual doors. And so the idea of athletic disciplines come in here, to the rescue: for any person engaged in beautiful athleticism such as dance care much for finer coordinations and so on and don't want mood-affecting drugs with their imbalanced effects on their well-tuned athletic nerves.

Control or Not? Following Intuition

Q: Some people seem to talk of intuition as something one can "use": one can use it to more swiftly pick out the right people to party with, one can use it to create masterful art, or gain money by the right transactions. But then, it's always possible that it was luck or just a sort of qualified guess, perhaps flowing out of the sum total of one's experience subconsciously--and not any paranormal or extra-sensory intuition at all, at play. And then I read what you write about intuition, where you almost seem to say that intuition is about giving up on greed and giving up on control.

A: Quite right.

Q: Well, could we explore this theme of intuition more deeply?

A: Let's do so, but in awareness that there are many uses of the word. You have mentioned that in some cases, people may use it for little other than the sort of impulses which, perhaps without much conscious thought, arise from oneself as a whole person. In this, there may be a lot of logic, only perhaps not the typical conscious reasoned thought--more subconscious or unconscious thoughts. Now, as I see it, there is for each human being a possibility

of going beyond experience and thought and prejudices, greed and all that. And then flashes of a sort of intelligence of love or direct insight or intuition or what we want to call it can arise. I don't think it is necessary to be allergic to the word 'intuition' just because it has been used a bit cheaply before. All the words, including 'intelligence', are sometimes used cheaply but when we look at the dictionary definition, it is certainly room for a meaning to intuition that involves something that goes beyond experience and thought, beyond prejudices and opinion, and beyond mere guess, and not merely a question of luck. All that is possible. It is a vision of the human being as capable of being more than a machine, more than merely a conditioned apparatus, we're here touching.

Q: Would you say that this vision of the human being could be fruitful in creating more harmony in the world?

A: As one of many necessary ingredients, yes.

Q: And what would the other ingredients for more harmony in the world be?

A: It's obviously a vast question, that one. Was Plato right, that only when a grand philosopher is also a benevolent dictator, that there can be harmony? Was he right in saying that democracy is nothing but a license of the ego to throw its weight around in an unrestricted way? But what with the absence of enlightened philosophers

the democratic option may be a better one: it's hard to find any clear evidence of greater harmony arising anywhere as a result of a nondemocratic leadership.

If we are going to go into questions of intuition and so on, we will no doubt also be able to find new pathways into thinking about politics. I don't think we can begin about thinking about politics--except to say this: in order to make use of intuition, you must identify as little as possible with any particular group or position or ideology. These identifications forces themselves into the decisions we make in daily life. To be loyal, as it were, to intuition, means giving up on having any higher priorities than it. And that brings us back to the starting-point you had, as question: namely,--in other words--can you give up control so fully that you let your higher self, or higher insights, or intuition, take over the rulership of your life? And would you want that?

Q: Should I want that? I mean, should I dare?

A: Yes, but let's understand something of the close connection between logic and thinking and reason and experience and such on the one hand, and intuition on the other. In order to use intuition you need to prepare yourself by exercising the power of thought and language. Unless we speak of the intuition of the toddler to lift a certain toy at a certain beneficial moment, we are talking here of the use of intuition--say, for instance--when you ask yourself a question. But the asking of a question means that you are using thought, language, experience,

logic, you have education behind yourself to enable you to shape good questions, and so on. All this is part of the life of intuition. In fact, you must to some extent love the order of language, and thinking, and logic, and the orders also associated with numbers and so forth, in order to create the most superb conditions for asking good questions. And once the question has been put forth, then, if you suspend judgement, there is silence. In that silence, when you have harmony in your body throughout, there is a sensitivity to something beyond thought. This sensitivity may somehow resonate with a knowing, a direct insight, and you may get a quiet nudge from within, in one way or in another, as a dance of the body perhaps, that is suggestive of an answer. When you have done this not just hundreds of thousands of times, you will begin to see that you are getting more order in your mind but also that when you are prejudiced, it is not always easy to see at first, to detect in oneself at first. Prejudice may become clearer later, when you remember that you were leaning towards one opinion even as you thought you were asking your intuition. It's an art of the dance of the mind, to penetrate to intuition.

Q: Right. So intuition is not just to go around trying to achieve an "empty mind".

A: When you have listened to great music, or read a great piece of fiction, or watched great dance, or done athletic workouts with elegance and finesse, or created a piece of writing that reflects some important thoughts for you--

then, in the wake of that, you may find yourself thrilled to be both very peaceful and very awake, but awake in a flowing way. In that state of mind it is, I think, correct to say that you have more coherence and more access to the 'fields of coherence', the SOFs (talked about in earlier chapters). So there is an emptiness of mind that is also a fullness of mind, a nirvana or samadhi like state of mind we might say, using ancient Indian concepts. Or we may say that you are nearer the dao, source of both the yin and the yang, rather than being trapped in either yin or yang. Your thought is flowing; or, like ice, thought structures have dissolved in the ocean. And the ocean is telling you something when you don't impose yourself on it.

Q: Suppose it tells me something that I fear.

A: Well, then, with luck, you have then the possibility of taking days or even weeks to explore the grounds of that fear and apply intuition there, too. Gradually, or by sudden steps, you may find that your logic and your feelings come to back up your intuitions, or that what you thought were your intuitions change when you look more deeply into it. Remember that sometimes it is fruitful and right to act according to a preliminary plan without exactly knowing just how preliminary it is. It creates a series of fruitful actions, and then, long before you come to fulfill that plan, you may find that it is, in some cases, the right thing to do to make another plan. And so, by improvisation, by a collaboration between intuitively

laid preliminary plans and intuitively modified plans, you may find that you can more and more trust this process.

Q: But you have said that absolute enlightenment isn't available to humanity--therefore, presumably, not any absolute intuition either.

A: Yes.

Q: So how can one let oneself fully trust intuition?

A: But you can learn to sense the differences between the types of intuitions, or impulses, you get. Let us call it 'impulse' if we are not certain about whether it is a good strong intuition of something real and true. So is this answer an impulse, merely, or is it an intuition? You will learn more and more about sifting these impulses. You get better and better. It's not about reaching a state of the absurd idea of infallibility. There is a learning. And while absoluteness isn't available for any mortal body, we can certainly say that infinite progression is available.

Q: Sometimes one must act, one cannot wait to explore yet more of whether an impulse is an intuition.

A: Every day we do act. So we are already making decisions --even if we are acting according to habit, that's still a kind of decision, the decision to do things according to habit. And if we are alive and healthy enough, that means that already we have some harmony in how we decide things.

The quest, then, is to introduce more intuition there, without doing it recklessly--let's say, at first only where it feels safe to vary. Then gradually these zones of variation according to intuition can expand to cover more and more areas of life.

Q: How can I tell whether a lot of what a person is doing is done according to such grand intuition?

A: It takes a playful mind to recognise laughter of the type that has a hidden strain of something forced about it. It takes a mind full of love to recognise a mind that is running around with self-centered ambitions. It takes a mind and a heart not bound up in habit and thought to recognise when another person has a mind and a heart open to the intelligence of love or intuition or what we call it. That's why we shouldn't automatically cling to anyone claiming to do things pr intuition, but rather get hold of the ways to evoke this more in one's own life. Then one will also develop the antennae for the people who are, whether by training or spontaneously or whatever, doing the same kind of thing. And with them, obviously, one can and will do things. Collaboration when there is a shared sense of the higher goals, and a certain respect also of the individual spaces and individual pathways involved, can be very stimulating and valuable indeed.

Intuition, Fairness, Art, Moods, Events

Q: I take it that you are saying that intuition isn't a tool to get typical goals, rather it is something that decides both goals and pathways for you, and it may or may not match with what society calls 'success'. Is that so?

A: More or less that. In a certain sense, impatience is important, because it creates action, and action calls on resources, creates coherence, movement, organisation, and encourages health and admits of fun and parties and what not. In another sense, patience is important, because some very important things can only unfold if given a lot of time and opportunity in which one cannot be fixated on petty forms of success. Intuition, in its highest sense, definitely is all about success, but success in terms that matters--deeply--and that may be very different from the success that is easily measurable and obvious. The slow growth of the flower beneath the soil may take a lot of time without anything to show for it! And then, when it begins to emerge, it may still look like nothing astounding at all--just a green blade, like any weed. But then, by patience,--which, for a gardener, means also that the potential flower gets proper water, gets light, gets protection from rough weather, and so on and so forth,-- what is inherent in the genetic library in that feeble

weed-like plant can sprout into full bloom one day and be the most fantastic plant, a flower of colors and orders not seen for a long time or anywhere around.

This process of shaping such grand things flows through all the universe, I feel. And I feel that it also flows through each individual, but this may be in ways that may not at all be how individuals--with misplaced impatience, you see--would like it. So people fight intuition, thinking they are doing themselves a good turn, but the only way to really live is of course to let intuition, in its truest and most refined sense, take over.

Does that answer your question?

Q: Well, I suppose so. But how can one know these things, whether intuition is intuition or not? I mean, if it's pretty impossible to judge by outer success?

A: I asked Bohm that type of question one of the first times I met him, in his messy physicist office at Birkbeck College, London. He answered with a smile and a counter-question: Don't you know? In other words, he asserted that we do really know. I accepted that answer. And still, we must be able to say something more than just that. Clearly, some of the most obviously talented thinkers may get into horrible doubt about almost everything at some point in their lives, and we must be able to do better than just say, again and again, 'surely you know what's what'.

How do you know whether a success is a success, as judged by the deepest parts of yourself?

I may invite a thousand people for a supposedly grand event, and make it costly and well organised and well manned and then none at all comes to it, because they wanted to go to the beach instead, or be home reading a book, or go to some other event or a party or they had too much work to do. And so, by almost every superficial standard the event is a total failure: but it may still be an absolute success in terms of spirit and soul. How can that be? Because success, that something meaningful comes from it, follows from it, succeeds--as succession--involves almost infinitely many parameters. There may be much greater things ahead, much greater events, where maybe a thousand people comes though only ten are invited, taking quiet shape out of the high quality processes which are perhaps only possible when there is much silence and much space and very few people indeed.

When a hundred people are together, they typically make a lot of noise, it may be fun but little may come off it. Right? But when two or three people come together, they may be able to solve some mental/spiritual question that can lay the foundation for a great and beautiful activity. If you have a mind that is not tied up to definite assumptions of how things must be in the external world, but which can have harmony with what happens also when it is different than what was easy to expect--you can then connect to these more subtle forms of success. You can go deep when you have to, because your mind is not noisy, you're not going around with an angry or sad or frustrated attitude, just because your petty expectations didn't work out.

So do have expectations but make them very flexible indeed. Make arrangements but judge them from within, whether or not the outer fits with the standards of success that society may happen to have at the moment.

And if you find that it's difficult to have such flexibility and tolerance, that's something to work on, something to call for insights into. This is just such a thing that it is about to make progress towards relative enlightenment, or make progress in relative enlightenment, after it has come.

Q: Will it come?

A: As I've pointed out some other places, I feel that relative enlightenment--which is to say, enlightenment which is not full, not absolute, but more than given to any mortal person ever before--is still far ahead in the future, far far ahead, but that there is progress quietly going on.

Q: Reincarnations?

A: Yes. That's a big theme, how to study the questions of what is beyond the mortal body without getting tangled up into any dogma or religion. But I do feel that there is a common learning going on in humanity and that collectively there are infinitely many progression points to come.

Q: But the first relative enlightenment will come only very far into the future?

A: Yes. If you think a millenium is a long time, let me suggest that, with the complexity of getting insights into enlightenment, it's a very small time. I think a thousand millenia ahead is roughly what it takes before relative enlightenment comes to humanity, and then it comes rather simultaneously to all, as a result of much careful cultivation of these small and often almost invisible successes in insights and meditations. After that, there is are more steps, infinitely more, and I feel that each step takes about that much time.

Q: What about the phenomenon you called 'cryptonite'? I mean, if there is enlightenment all over the place, won't there be a lot of that energy?

A: But enlightenment means that a little more of that energy can be related to without harm. Chiefly, enlightenment is about insights, whereas the energy of meditation is taking shape while flowing through these insights. There must always be carefulness about the intensities, of course. Compare it to weather: after sunny days a little rain may freshen and cleanse everything outdoors; but torrents of rain are never without issues.

Q: Say something about art in this regard, like painting. Your paintings.

A: The easiest understanding of them is, I think, through the insights that can be summarized under the phrase or

slogan "muse impressionism". You don't want to smear abstract stuff around on a canvas even if it's appealing to the fashions of a society if you feel it would go contrary to health. Muses are the archicons of health, they are glowing coherence, also sexual coherence, at the subtler realms. They must come forth, but not so strongly that there is the cryptonite issue all over again. So they get clothes on, generally, and the colors are mild and relaxing, like bluish skies and waters. Something can and must be abstract for the freedom of movement to be there, but the ultimate form of the dancer's athletic anatomy speaks directly to mind and body of all observers: this is a thing that is much, much more important than questions of trends and fashion. But a healthy society makes that which is right into its fashion and has it as its trends, and renews this emphasis continually.

Once you grasp the notion of muse impressionism--which is approached by the ballet dance concept when it comes to as for what girls liking and loving bodily flexibility can cultivate, especially when done from very early on--then your job as a painter is to make yourself available to express that which, put simply, the muses want to express. You must be a sort of "secretary"--and your job, your duty, is to fine-tune and hone your skills by constant drawings, by having some first-hand contact with the canvas-making process (at least to some extent), and to watch and enjoy ballet dance directly and through photos and in imagination--and then just be open and receptive, in a meditative process. What comes forth then has something to it. It may then be a painting that gets

finished as a painting, or it may lead to explorations that, somehow or other, leads to a painting even if much must be overpainted and such.

Part of the process is to be around the paintings after they're done, what with their layers and all that they generally take some days at least, though many other things can get done in between. And after they're done, you may come to see unintended features--that animalistic ungainly shape there, lingering in the shadow, has to be overpainted, and that one color shift in the thigh or wherever can have interpretations that too easily lend themselves towards less than full health, and has to be worked on. As these things are worked on, the whole painting may have to be redone, or it may be easy and in just a few minutes of improvement, the intended painting is suddenly complete.

When it is right, it deserves a chance to be experienced in society, for it will speak from its own depths, so to say.

Q: So you are not afterwards discussing the styles of the paintings and trying to figure out a better way to reach people or the like, if people can't figure it much out at first?

A: Well, the concept of this form of impressionism--which relates to what impression, as Kandinsky said, the painting leaves on your soul--came after a discussion process over, well, many years. For instance, it took time to work out that the natural sexuality of the muses are

too much in terms of the cryptonite effect to be shown as nude bodies: and so, the coupling of this playful idea of 'cryptonite' to sexuality in visual art had to come forth clearly. Not everything is obvious at first, even given extremely high-integrity conditions for exploration. Much the same can be said for the development of that which eventually became the G15 PMN programming language and formalism for super-model physics. But when something is feeling like a fresh seabreeze even after living with it for a good while and keeping up the work on it, it means that the intuitions have been matched at very many or even (I would venture to say) at all levels. There is no discussion then.

Q: Right. Well, perhaps it's so, then, that the value of a painting only really can be judged by the same process by which one judges enlightenment in another--as we talked of earlier. I think you say that it requires an absolute master to recognise an absolute master. And so it takes, perhaps, infinite artistic capacity to recognise whether an artwork has, well, such an infinity to it.

A: That's right and to the point, I think. Likes and dislikes, what one is infatuated in and intrigued by--all these things come and go, as moods and interests change. But the deep intuitions, when they are well-tuned, will have a stability as to what is a good artwork.

Q: Suppose I am working towards enlightenment.

A: Everyone is, no?

Q: Yes, yes. But I mean, can an artwork on the wall have a helpful function? Or is it a meaningless question.

A: It's not a meaningless question. Nature can have a function in a spiritual quest: so also can art, obviously, have a function in a spiritual quest. Of course. Now one of the virtues, for instance, in having a library of some good fiction of various types is that you can find some parallels in your own working and love life, here and there, and thus some guidance, and pathways to getting a sense of reflexive awareness relative to own emotions-- not to take own emotions too seriously, but to come to a greater peace, seeing that such and such is really not something one should worry about.

Q: Why are you bringing this in? That's surely something more a function of literary works?

A: Yes, but they, too, are works of art, and a painting, or a set of them, in your living or working rooms or in public spaces, can remind you, deeply, on things that otherwise can, in some moods, be hard to connect to.

Q: Such as?

A: Well, take now the ballet dancer's anatomy and her gift of projecting effortlessness even as strong, graceful

muscles are used. That is a wonderful teaching--to be effortlessly engaging effort, so to speak. Sort of a paradox. It is all conveyed really very well in some paintings. So you can get a reminder of the sort of strength of integrity of spirit when things do not go all that well 'on the surface', so to speak. This has some parallels in, for instance, how J.R.R. Tolkien speaks of a character like Aragorn--eventually a king, though for most of the story cast in the character of someone who is practically a homeless wanderer--and you'll find it all over the place. How Ian Fleming describes Bond's thoughts in meeting with circumstances that could lead Bond prematurely to give up. Fleming uses language with a lot of self-cursing, sometimes--but it does work, it has an emotion effect. In Dr. No, for instance, Bond tells himself, "Get up, you bastard! Count your blessings! Nothing is really damaged. Think of the girl"--etc--and so he achieves a strength of spirit by talking himself up, --which is a form of spirituality through thinking. These reminders do not say that one should fear death but they do say that sometimes pain should be endured, even if it is so strong that it seems to make everything else rather illusory and pointless.

So the human mind goes through moods and it would be very childish to pretend that there aren't any moods.

Q: Also after enlightenment there are moods?

A: Obviously! It's not a static thing, it is rather the capability of the mind to arrest its ego-growing seeds

very early on. The energy of the brain has cycles of all sorts and these must be respected; and these cycles are affected by all we do, think, eat, all that we experience, everything that people say and so on. When there is any strong desire, or strong hope, or strong fear, or strong pain, this strong emotion has as it were its own mind. It can dominate the feeling of life even if only for a minute or hour or day. But the mature mind can tell itself--and here art, paintings, books, music, exercises, nature--can help: when that strong emotion, that pain or whatever it is has gone, then you will feel life open very fully again and there will be deep harmony--do wait taking decisions, especially important decisions, until the emotions have calmed themselves. I believe Spinoza sought to indicate that some emotions, even if intense, are rather 'local' in the organism, while others--generally nobler feelings of generosity and spiritual strength and freedom of action--concern the whole organism.

So, in a way, art can suggest to the organism, when it is dominated by a local emotion, a fragmented feeling, that there are whole feelings and holistic states of mind, waiting just around the corner if you stick it out.

Q: Suppose one has to talk with others when one is in a strong and not altogether positive emotion. They may not be aware of this mood. Or they may perceive that one is in a mood and ask--what's going on? And take it onto themselves, perhaps.

A: Yes. Those who have a standard code of behaviour where

one is generally polite and generally honest and sticks to agreements, and in which one tries hard to avoid saying things which cause any needless frustration in another, will cling to this standard code when there is emotional pain, or physical pain--like a headache--or worse, both. This code will perhaps "get one through" the social necessities and one can then find a private place in which to produce as much self-healing that one can. The better and stronger code of conduct one has, the less there will be to clear up afterwards, socially. And it is typically possible to apologize and point out that one has a headache when one has it, you know.

Q: You are right. But suppose, then, that there are things of importance to be done, and one has to engage in conversation despite such pressures, such pains. Will a person of enlightenment never shout? Never insult? Never raise voice and quarrel?

A: I think the whole spectre of behaviour has a place, but some of it--like the things you point out--very rarely do have a place when someone is enlightened. Yet there is no action that can either prove nor disprove enlightenment. Enlightenment, surely, can only be judged by looking straight at the intention level, and this itself requires enlightenment to do. The intention level may be clear and harmonious and luminous but the action, in some contexts, may appear--appear, mind you--clumsy and hard and needlessly brutal. Still it may be right. But if it is right, it will generally be possible for anyone in

possession of most of the facts to piece it all together in the following days, weeks, months, and maybe longer times--seasons, or still longer. A wise action is a wise action even if it is not judged so by those who are clouded with ego-emotions. A wise action may be very sharply condemned by people who are full of false assumptions. But then time comes in, and there is the natural inherent interest in everyone to sooner or later get to grips with facts, and the wisdom eventually will emerge, even for those who may have claimed that they could never under any circumstances come to approve of the action. So time, here, is something we have got to trust. It can do very important work. It can allow deeper processes--of natural self-dialogue--to arise in people who are full of action and judgement, not necessarily the right judgement. And this touches, of course, on the idea of 'suspending judgement'. Not to take judgements too seriously, unless one has checked for a very long time and with care not to impose any hidden bias, that the judgement flows from intuition.

So, you see, in the Olympic scenario, it is said that Zevs has the totality of insight--omniscience--and so that --when you combine this with his instinct of fairness--his judgements are right. They may be hard, but they are right and are seen as fair. And this sense of fairness is a form of trust in cosmos--the greater order--a trust in some deep wholeness pervading life. But fairness is something that may hide itself. It may be very hard to see how anything that happens to anyone can be, must be fair. And so, the claim that "God is unfair" is the most typical

type of sentiment that has led to the popularity of the idea of denial of God, summarized in the idea of atheism. Surely, they say, if God exists and God is fair and God is omnipotent and omniscient, then such and such could never have happened. And so they say, therefore God cannot exist. And so they go on to develop some kind of cultural morality concept and cling to it as their new kind of God, trying to transfer all the emotions over to this. And the mind then looks for some father or mother figure which can fit into the now apparently vacant "God-slot" in one's mind--and so we get the phenomenon of fantastically popular musicians or political leaders. It is merely a transfer of hysteria from one part of the mind to another.

Lasting peace of mind, I believe, can only come when we appreciate that to any mortal, ignorance of most of the universe is much more the actual case than anything else. And so, to even vaguely go in the direction of casting a judgement over cosmos or the God-source is, in a sense, worse than ignorance: it is ignorance that one isn't aware of as ignorance. So in being aware of own ignorance, there is a potent source of the wise approach to life.

Q: Is this craving for fairness something timeless and universal and part of all human life, or is it a thing seen particularly much of in some cultures?

A: Another word for 'fairness' is 'some meaningful order to events'--where 'meaning' suggests that life has some meaning to it, that things do not merely happen entirely out of their own accord. So when somebody tries to imagine

that all events happen rather by chance, they are trying to say that meaningfulness is merely a subjective sort of illusion, something imposed on life, not really part of life as such. Do the people who think of life this way succeed in ridding themselves of some sort of passion for fairness? Perhaps to some extent. And one can then imagine whole cultures that do this, perhaps supported by certain pills or drugs that keep unwanted emotions down. And no doubt we can have many forms of imagined fairness--for instance, some will want to see fairness across many lives, while others look to fairness from one month to the next, and so on. There are all sorts of takes on fairness, but as soon as any quest into larger patterns of meaning and order in one's life begins, this sort of concept, in one form or another, is bound to re-emerge. Isn't it so?

Friendship, Code of Conduct, Jealousy, Generosity

Q: It's a theme I have sometimes pondered on. Perhaps it's not the most positive of themes.

A: Well, what is it? Maybe it can lead to something positive, if we relate to it well enough.

Q: Sometimes the theme is too near, in a way, that I can reflect on it, and at other times it seems a bit abstract. I'll try and put it in careful terms: everybody, one would think, wants to appear attractive to worthy others. Is that fairly clear?

A: I should think so!

Q: Well, then, let's then say this: to appear generous is typically attractive. One reacts spontaneously in a positive manner when somebody is generous to oneself in a way that makes sense. Again, do we agree so far?

A: Yes. Come to your point, please.

Q: The point is this--the question--is then why this generosity isn't coming more to the fore, more often. I mean, surely it isn't that difficult to be generous.

A: It can be, you know. There may be strong habits

involved. Fears of what generosity might lead to--being taken advantage of, and so on.

Q: Yes, but take the case of friends--this is a theme that I find it hard to go into, without getting patronizing or what it is called. What I mean to say is that some people seems to crave friendship so much that they make it utterly impossible to be friends with them.

A: Why?

Q: Because they are so rigid. They want to be number one, and if somebody else appears to compete for being number one, they act jealously.

A: Ah, ja.

Q: Right? And my question is: why do they do it? Because jealousy is one of the ugliest things. When one detects that it underlies a series of actions, it just reeks. Why can't people just make the best of who they themselves are by being maximally generous? They would be so much attractive that way.

A: But you see, the ego may not think that it is playing a false game, or a stupid game. The ego may think that it can win by shouldering others away. It may not work relative to you, because you see through it, but it may work relative to some people some of the time, enough to make it a habit.

Q: Yes. That must be it. But then,--what? Isn't all this quest about dissolving ego? And I mean, suppose we're talking of people who are in fact engaging at least a little bit in questions of going beyond the littleness of self and all that. When the very same people practise the games--as you say--I would call it infantile games. They belong to kindergartens, if anywhere. In the shadows there--the games of jealousy and pushing away good folks in order to try to win a master friendship. It is so childish. Why can't we just let go, go with the flow, and be the most generous we are?

A: The question reflects a noble quest. I don't think it's a stupid question. But remember what pressures of life may have done to a brain. The brain may not have enough, shall we say, abundance and elasticity, to be able to listen to the deeper insights when it comes to daily life social relations--even if there is some time spent every now and then in meditation and all sorts of things like that. People are people, even if they confess to being on a quest of some higher nature.

Q: But it would seem that at least, there would be some extra hesitance in putting such petty emotions as jealousy up.

A: So you are saying: is there not a great behavioural code, some code of conduct, that would make one conceal jealousy and push it away so it doesn't interfere with

social relationships? But then this code may be weak at some points, and jealousy may have grown into some kind of obsession in some. It may shape the view of humanity-- that everyone who looks so and so are bad people, or stupid, or cannot be trusted,--just because one has got one or two or maybe three experiences that rocked one's self-confidence and shook one's self-image. Such shocks may be hard to recover from.

Q: That code of conduct seems to be a valuable thing to discuss. Surely we need to cultivate such codes in order to foster for instance friendships?

A: Yes. To make agreements that one holds, to not hold out promises that one doesn't hold, to not wilfully distort the depiction one gives of reality to others unless it is dire need of such distortion, to be ready to congratulate on other's triumphs, however small or great, and however much one would have liked them to be one's own! That sort of thing.

Q: Yes. Those who get into the habit of lying all the time--hard to have a friendship with them, even if both parties want to. But what is friendship? Spiritually?

A: One way to view it is that people have something in common that they want to do, and so find a kind of magnetism in being together because they find a stronger power in being together when they think of doing it--which is to say that friendships are forged also because we have

plans, intentions, goals, aims. Not that there is nothing to the friendship but common goals but the common goals create a kind of attraction field, makes friendship easy.

Q: Enduring friendships? Ever-lasting?

A: A friendship may have something extremely comforting about it--as if nothing ever can break it. Now if we can be realistic enough to allow friendships to exist, and also to dissolve to some extent, without unrealistic expectations of each other, then perhaps we can find that there are always new and interesting friendships possible. But people's plans are seldom entirely aligned. And so one must figure out how not to disrupt the plans of friends even as one is doing things together and they help your plans to be fulfilled. A sensitivity here means that one doesn't assume too much, expect too much.

Q: Friends rarely have equal amount of resources, such as money.

A: Yes, that's easily leading to tricky questions. But if one looks at a flower garden, there is no virtue in all flowers being equal. Let some have the goyon of having much of money. There may be other things that you have much of.

Q: Goyon being what?

A: I find it a lighter word than the Indian 'karma'. The

'good yoni', the 'going-on-energy', the goyon I imagine is a good word for the deeper balancies in life,--the fairness we have talked about. If we think in the Greek terms, Zevs and his supreme beings--let us for simplicity and modernity of language call all the others for muses (despite what the 'pagan religion' says)--they have knowledge of intents and actions and effects and all that. And so things are put into force, which, from the Olympic perspective are fair. Now I just bring in this perspective because how can a poor fellow collaborate well with a rich one if the poor fellow all the time wants everything and everyone to be equal? By accepting these differences, even loving them, there may be ways in which the poor eventually can get richer and rich enough, without there being any moment in which the poor guy takes on the role of a beggar. Because a lofty perspective allows that beautiful thing to arise--generosity--as a force that can be much, much stronger than the little, local emotions such as envy.

Q: Right. Now imagine five attractive girls--but one of a radiant, stunning kind--the others not obviously so--can they all be generous to each other and that also when it comes to relating to yet more people? In the sense that they don't all try to pretend that they are equally stunning, but are generous to the radiant beauty, too.

A: That would be pure intelligence. And that's why the whole quest of the girl-lovingness--girls loving beauty, loving also girls' beauty--as artistic exploration that

each young person ought to undertake can lead to a spiritual deepening of friendships of this sort. There is something objective about the beauty some radiate, at least when they are at their best, which is both objective and striking. So let's all rejoice in it, to use one of the favorite words of Lewis Carroll. That would be true friendship. But this requires a brain that isn't run-down --rather, it requires some of the greatness of spirit that playfulness combined with youthfulness can bring about in some people, especially when they are exercising and not overly doped or drinking. Dope and alcohol often lead to self-pitying emotions. For friendship to flow, there can certainly be something of drinking and dope but I suppose the foundation should be clean of it, so that a greatness of mind, of shared mind also, can prevail.

Q: It would be stepping out of grudging and the lot. Can all do it?

A: Surely, in a million years or so.

Q: Haha. But what does it take? To get the intelligence of generosity--can we say that?--the intelligence of love going?

A: Mindfulness.

Q: To give attention?

A: It's about the playful mind, aware of its tendency to

come up with silly emotions, and passionate that only the more powerful yet more subtle feelings shall prevail and come forth. Full of meaning, full of mind.

Q: That's the foundation, to cultivate mindfulness?

A: Well, cultivate the insights and art and actions that nourish your mind and its depth. That includes the grace of dance, and other exercises--martial arts, whatever; it includes sharpening your thought, writing or programming or reading or whatever. Dialogue, the flowing of insight between several, and the dialogue with yourself, allowing playfulness in thought while you give attention. And not ever declare that you're finished. You're progressing, but things may look otherwise sometimes; and there's infinite progress, and that for all. It won't ever get anything "absolute": to be mindful is to be alive, and that's a process.

The Importance of Dance--Now, and in the Future

Q: In all important developments in humanity, as far as I can tell, there's something universal--or at least I think there is something in these developments that goes beyond the immediate surrounding culture.

A: Quite so.

Q: Some scholars in dance, point out that ballet has, so to speak, learned from a variety of cultures--french, german, british, danish, russian etc, and, in recent decades, indeed from all over the world. There are impulses from India, China, Japan, Africa, South America. But can we say that ballet is, or has become, universal?

A: I think so.

Q: How? Why? When did that happen exactly, at the beginning or just now or when?

A: You didn't mention one of the most fascinating cultural developments and influences on ballet in the 20th century.

Q: Which was?

A: The celebration of the independent woman. See, at the time of Marilyn Monroe and Brigitte Bardot, in the USA and in France respectively, one of the sexy features of a woman was that she had 'slim shoulders'. Then Ian Fleming came around and spoke about the fierceness of the gypsy women, the strength of character of the Italian girls, the longlegged athletic russian Tatiana Romanova--educated in ballet--and, politically, males began exploring their socalled 'soft' sides and females their socalled 'hard' sides. In the completing two decades of the 20th century, the first black or mulatto supermodel shot into star focus on the cover of Time Magazine--which at the time was culturally dominant, before the advent of the Internet--we're speaking of Naomi Campbell. Her legs were like a racehorse's--and there was suddenly no conflict at all with the athleticism shown, much earlier on, but not with the same pride, by the ballerinas of Russia and other places. This led to an appreciation that muscles aren't a masculine feature specifically. That there are feminine and masculine ways of cultivating muscles. That the slim hips of the tomboy look, so often found in many ballet dancers, can be fantastically feminine.

So you see, with all this women liberation--or the liberation, more precisely, of the thinking about what consititutes feminine and masculine--suddenly ballet was able to throw away its last fears of portraying the athletic, beautiful, strong, longlimbed woman as all that.

The stretches became more total and the dresses naturally, in this more enlightened area, more clinging to the body, and that athletic principles worked out in earlier centuries became distilled into purer, and more radical, principles.

Q: The way you put it, it is almost like the rest of the society learned from ballet, more than the other way around.

A: But it wasn't only from ballet they learned. The affluence and the new forms of communication, the more far-reaching liberties in political and religious thinking, and so on, that technology and increased population sizes and increased transport made possible, set free the stigma of the woman as an add-on to men: she became herself, she could vote, she could choose to be interested in women, she could choose, if she wished, not to be an object, not to be hunted for, but rather then hunter--and so on and so forth. A hundred tendencies, some conflicting. Of course ballet influenced some of this. But importantly, ballet retained its grace. Its femininity. Its understanding of the gentle, majestic curves. The tendencies of long lines and yet the rounded lines to meet and go beyond the dictates of gravitation. The elegant stretching of youth to embrace what's up there in the sky and the just as elegant portrayal of loss and defeat and then, in some way or another, raising from it and again breathing life.

Q: So you are saying, are you not, or implying rather, that ballet could only get fully ripe when the rest of society was willing to give up its old women ideals.

A: Absolutely. Now Bardot, for instance, did ballet, of course, and even tried to teach old Pablo Picasso some ballet steps in his atelier. And she influenced a whole generation of cartoon drawers--the new super-women, the Barbarella concept--which became a famous movie with Jane Fonda--and she even managed to transform herself towards the hippie looks when those years came around and then, uninhibitedly, played a seductress relative to another beautiful woman. And Monroe of course also did ballet. Marilyn Monroe also portrayed the idea of the stupid blonde who really is exceptionally clever--she was able to --as it were--show that several thoughts about the woman can be thought, and lived, at the same time. She was happily endorsing the stupid blonde concept as a radiance when it suits her, and yet, in her being, she was clearly clever, intelligent, and, if you like, also cunning.

This is a new take on the woman concept, and important for ballet, where the radiance is cultivated to be smooth and shining and positive and relaxed but with stern, hard, powerful and even sometimes merciless discipline behind all that. The woman can take on the clothes of the sexual object and do so wonderfully and then take them on. This is the birth of the subject-object, but we can also put it in gender terms: the man-woman, the boy-girl, the man-girl --the tomboy woman, or the liberated feminine concept.

Q: Right. But when scholars in ballet say that ballet has learned from cultures--well, has ballet done that?

A: Of course. But there are infinitely many dance songs to be sung. The particular dances, the overall structures of the choreographies, all that reflects ideas, trends, motions in society, what hopes and pressures and so on do exist, as well as what types of emotional patterns are expected. For instance, to make a comparison with literature--great books were written by people experimenting with the varieties of hippie cultures in the 1960s and early 1970s and these have passages which may be said to be masterpieces, enduring classics, all that. But yet we can see that though these parts are universal, they very often, as the books in these periods do, end rather disasterously in the completing chapters. So you see, the overall structure of the novel is more culture-bound. But the great passages are beyond that structure. They stand on their own. In a somewhat similar way, when you look at the moments of ballet--and here, of course, the fact of the existence of the camera has helped a lot--they concern something that point towards the most universal in ballet. Then add the music of this or that composer, alongside this or that story, Nutcracker whatever, and the way emotions are showed, and we are looking at overall structures which, in the very long run indeed, may not be as important as the interplay between the forces of momentum, gravitation and the dancers' own muscles and radiant athleticism in ways projecting effortlessness and tendencies to as if were float in the air and all that.

They are showing the human being a kind of transcendent  
distillation of what the human being, the human anatomy  
is all about, in an unbridled sense.

Can Choreography be Universal? Muses, Gravitation, Ballet

Q: When there is music, there's usually rhythm, unless the music somehow elegantly breaks with rhythm--what you call the 'arrhythmic'--and then we have dance, tied into it. Or is that the wrong word, 'tied'? And why is it that classical ballet--which I think you regard as something approaching a rather timeless standard..

A: ..quite, timeless.

Q: ..yes, but why is it that classical ballet typically tends to go together with just one brand of music, the so-called 'classical music', whereas, when newer forms of music are applied, the tendency is to leave the classical ballet repertoire as well? Not always, but this seems to be the case. And this leads us into questions of choreography.

A: Right. Now classical music is characterised by a lot of things, and most of these things, in my opinion, concern the status of the technology at the time. But a few things --such as the sense of the urgency of striving upwards to the light, the spiritual quest--is shared with spiritual people of all times. But when technology is different--and

more advanced--such as the wide repertoire of the digital synthesizers in the 21st century--the very same intent can express itself much more richly. And let's bear in mind also that recording technology only came about, for real, in the 20th century. So the mechanism for storing music is part of what shaped the music that we now think of as 'classical'.

Q: Granted, but we have what's called 'contemporary dance' which, to some extent like 'contemporary' art, seems to have mostly let down on the spiritual urge towards light and lightness and all that.

A: Yes, yes. The fallen flesh and all that. The attempt to make art out of some vague reminders, some associations, with some other cultural event or with some personal trauma or some kind of societal change.

Q: You don't care much for that sort of contemporary art, do you?

A: It's false play, of course. Let's not waste time talking about it. But nobody owns these natural concepts, --"contemporary", for instance. That means art that we have right now. So when somebody does classical ballet or paints a ballerina now, that's art, obviously, and it is, in a perfectly genuine sense, contemporary. Let's not accept the language trap that anything contemporary is by some sort of definition materialistic, unspiritual, some sort of ode to the fragmented and thwarted. The false play

of elevating to art that which isn't art is akin to the false play of elevating to science that which isn't science: it happens when a lot of people have a couldn't-care-less attitude about the foundational, noble ideals providing structure and meaning to a field. These people may refer to one another, give each other diplomas, and further one another's careers; they may get a lot of power and create a scholastic way of talking about their little productions. It's for these people a sort of game; but at the same time, these people may have no game at all unless they were allowed to play this game. Let's just focus on art as a genuine thing, and things will fall into place.

Q: All right, let's do that.

A: Which means, we must ask: what is art? And we must ask it afresh, and without reference to an authority, and connect to the question as a child would do--with innocence and perhaps also playfulness.

Q: So what is art?

A: Consider it intuitively. Imagine an 'artless' life. You have nature, you have books, talks, food, exercise, and so on. Sometimes nature lifts you up. But then there is rain and nighttime. You naturally want something that can have effects on you similar to that of a golden sun shining and reflecting itself and dancing on the waves in myriad ripples. Art that provides a sense of protection, wholeness to the insides of a house.

Q: But we are presuming, aren't we, that we have a spiritual approach--for instance, that we are meditators?

A: Something we have got to presume. But isn't the child worthy of being called a 'spiritual being'? Measurements of the EEG brain waves of children--be it a superficial form of measurement, but there it goes--shows that it is often similar to that which adults reach during deep meditation. So these children may experience a wholeness of life by their very naturalness. Adults may go around trying to persuade each other, by endless chatter, that the nonspiritual is the only life. But there is nothing genuine about that. This is something worthy of a lot of exploration, I know. But I feel that we can say that a spiritual approach, if by that we mean inclined to sense something of the awe, wonder and maybe even divineness of life, is that which characterises a healthy, normal individual of integrity. And art naturally is there for this person to enhance that and not make it more difficult. It is difficult enough as it is!

Q: Yes. So let me get this straight. Are you saying that if a person of a natural spiritual attitude, when choreographing dance, would--regardless of which form of music is selected--would choreograph ballet, classical ballet forms of expression?

A: Well, such a person, naturally spiritual, would certainly not select just any type of music. The music has

to have a light shining through it. Now when music is locked to a strict rhythm, it is more like a machine, it is more hypnotic in the sense of putting something of the person to sleep--maybe not all of the person, but still. And so while I certainly sense the spiritual attempts in such as in many forms of classical music, I think it comes better forth in the best expressions which are found in the wake of the electronic area, and with girls singing in ways that had to have a feminist liberation behind them for the girls to be daring enough. And these expressions may not only bend rhythm a little bit, they can completely go beyond rhythm at times, especially when music is digitally remixed in suitable ways. This we can call, for instance, Futuristic Muse Impressionist music, or FMI music, or HMMH, Harmonious Messy-Mix House dance music, or something else. Whatever label, this can genuinely let a sensual form of spirituality come forth.

Q: Right. Now talk choreography.

A: Well, so, the word choreography, shaped in connection to ballet in the 20th century, plays on a Greek root, namely Choreia, referring to some sort of circular dance such as people at the time of Plato were talking about in ancient Greece. The suffix -graphy merely means that it's written down in some way or another. The first part of the word 'choreography' thus refers to a glimpse of that which was to become ballet many centuries later, to put it in a linear historical perspective.

A way to memorize this root is to read it this way, for

fun: the first five letters, 'chore', is as the first five letters in 'choreography'. The next two letters, 'ia', are the reverse of AI. So, it's anti-AI, namely, the negation of artificial intelligence!

Q: That's a good one.

A: Alright, that's a bit of fun with the letters. But seriously, dancers are doing something that, when all works out well, when the choreography is well-done, somehow shapes the minds not only of themselves but also of the audience so that there is a reconnection to the spiritual, or etheric, realm. This is plain obvious to all who have ever had any serious mystical or meditative experience--and, according to brain studies, everyone has had at least glimpses of such in childhood. But it may be hard to get at those memories for those who have grown up among atheist people, who may have given scorn at any attitude that is in denial of a certain fashionable political sentiment or suchlike.

Q: But how can dance achieve this reconnection you're talking about?

A: A way to think about it--but this shouldn't be made into a formula, but rather be enquired into afresh, often, is this: the heaviness of the flesh, and how things fall apart, that's the material realm; and the childlike points towards the pure concept, which is never quite realized in the material. In the ethereal realm, gravitation isn't an

issue. So there, directions and lines and pure shapes and pure forms can unfold in a sense that is characterised by infinity. Matter is always finite, right?

Q: Right. Then the ballerina, who effortlessly stretches upwards--with apparent effortlessnes, but there's tremendous athletic power in her disciplined motion--provides a sort of pointer to the ethereal realm?

A: Yes, or the spiritual, or the realm of pure being or pure presence or whatever we want to call it. I'm not talking inside a system, kabbalah or tantra or acupuncture or this or that. You see that the dancer is strong, but not needlessly strong: she's eminently well able to function in the realm of gravitation, but not loaded with muscles so much she reminds us too much of matter. Her thighs bulge but in a gentle and elegonated way; her torso may be as a diamond, not given over to fleshy tendencies such as with loads of this or that. Her feet are elegant and able to maintain great balance by their feminine curvature, and so she is a golden mean between matter and spirit. Can we say that? She is the line but also she is matter. She is the elegant elongated curvature--she has, in THAT sense of the word, 'curves', and these mimick the spiritual, the cosmic, the presence of the muses who float as much as they like in the effortless, deeper, subtler multiverses. These words come easy to me because I intuit that's how the universe is made. So the dancers gracefully exist materially but with a carefully cultivated and not over-cultivated bunch of beautiful muscles to be able to

project graceful effortless in pure directedness, in lines suggestive of light and meaning.

Q: Can they do this without choreography?

A: Now you see, the muses can do that! Because they have as much telepathy as they want. They are superior beings-- see how this ties neatly in with some parts of the thoughts of the ancient hellene, and therefore the greek reference to Choreia is a lucky one--they exist in the olympic ether. They rule it and can project patterns of anything they can imagine, be it flowers or leaps in sudden symphonic moves of some other kind. The music of the spheres is in the background, and it can be arrhythmic, and ever-fresh, and yet they know, beforehand, how it will sound the next instant and they don't have to have a predesigned choreography. Mortal beings of flesh, even if as well-trained and luckily shaped as the best of dancers, don't have any too much of all this. And so the music, especially if arrhythmic, must be well-known and trained to over perhaps a rather long time. The choreography can then provide symmetries and coordinations to these beings of flesh, so that they can show to themselves, and in themselves, and to and inside the audience as well, the motions of the muses. That's really what ballet is all about as I see it. And choreography, in that sense, is a most spiritual practise, and a difficult one.

Q: Hah. Say, is arrhythmic music more attuned to this approach, then? Is that what you would advice those who

are expert in classical ballet but so far mostly have used the old music with its definite rhythms, that they go beyond all this?

A: Yes, yes. Obviously. They have been stuck on the piano and the notes, too many of them. There are those who have experimented with other forms of music to classical ballet but somehow they have got less attention because of the fashionable concerns of the majority who wishes their children to view such and such wellknown piece. But as far as I am concerned, I'm not in doubt: the universal aspect of ballet, the circularities, elongated, the curves, the lines, the upflowing-ness as it were without gravitation, --tremendous effort, really, but carried out with the smile and with playfulness, even if there is some pain in some of the movements--all this comes much more to its full right if coupled with really well-made house or electronica or something like that, but of the arrhythmic kind. Don't let go of the ideals of the patterns. The flower-like shapes, the sense of the ultimate concept of the human muse-like being, all that. There is no necessity to say that modern culture or contemporary culture--that word again!--necessarily is 'post-hiroshima' or 'material' or whatever they say. There's great and astonishing harmonies in selected bits of the 21st century night-time dance and cafe music: it fits perfectly beautifully, when done consciously and arrhythmically, with the majestic beauty of ballerinas in ballet. Free from mechanical rhythm means also free, in a way, from matter. So it is even more floating, even more spiritual; and, generally

speaking, freed from the sentimental touch that is part of mostly all classical music; a sentimentality that is, however spiritual intent the composer had, entirely a self-centered and "heavy" thing. Tied to this is the classical idea of what constitutes a 'melody', something which the best of contemporary pop music has successfully transcended, especially when pop began learning from house and electronica and all that.

Then choreography can be truly timeless, and in that sense universal, when it takes the most sublime shapes of human dance movement and combines with the freest journies into music by means of the freedom of the digital. Choreography can then be fairly strict, but not so strict it excludes improvisation at the points where the pure forms aren't too much upset.

Q: Is this universal choreography somehow also quantum physical?

A: Spare me that word, 'quantum physical', if you please. There is no 'quantum physics'--it was a bunch of equations, suitable for engineering, not suitable as a real theory of cosmos. Physics as part of philosophy is, as far as I can see, the only physics worthy of its name. And philosophy means to perceive. So there is no quantum physics. There is a theory inside physics made by Einstein --as you know--but this theory didn't fit with the deeper ramifications of the findings suggested by these equations summed up as 'quantum physics'. That's why I have proposed the super-model theory and it has its PMW, a Principle of

a tendency of Movement towards Wholeness. And, yes, to answer your question after all these qualifications--the PMW made explicit, as dance, becomes ballet, especially when unfolded over a time stretch that is akin to the length of a meditation--not too short, and not too long, not more than some twenty or maybe thirty or maximum forty minutes--and then in a way that creates a form of what we can call 'reverberance', a sort of flowing wholeness.

Exploring the 21st Century Cultures of Poly Relationships

Q: Throughout world history, it seems that those in charge of religious scriptures and religious communities have been more than willing to meddle in people's private relationships--regulate them, in some cases in much detail.

A: Yes, quite.

Q: Now, though,--in waves, at least if we consider Europe and USA and countries much influenced by them, since early on in the 20th century, at least, and with great pulses in the 1960s and 1970s, and perhaps new pulses in the 21st century, there's much more liberty in how people organise their private life. At the same time, there's still the presence of religions, spirituality and meditative practises.

A: Yes.

Q: So could we enquire into all this? I mean, does the intuition of a person who has had time to train his or her attention and mindfulness and awareness, give any directions here?

A: Yes, I think so.

Q: So did the hippies, for instance, in the 1960s and 1970s have as much contact with reality as many of them seemed to think that they had?

A: "Contact with reality" is an interesting concept. The earliest forms of the hippie culture were celebrating many new little revolutions or liberations or discoveries-- new music, new technology to spread music, new drugs and new availability of drugs, much relative wealth compared to just some decades ago and at the same time, the scare of possible annihilation of all the planet any day either because Russia and USA would bomb each other by a-bombs and h-bombs, or because the large, nasty, capitalistic companies would over-exploit and pollute the environment in their reckless greed to fill up their already fat wallets. It was a fantastic combination of possibilities and pressures. Did they have "contact with reality"? Some bits of their approaches did for sure have contact with reality.

Indeed, perhaps we can say:

Much contact with reality is a rare thing for anyone. The difference between a scientist and a non-scientist is that the scientist--if that person is really worthy of the name--admits that his or her contact with reality is very small.

Q: Then I can think of many scientists who are not worthy of the name!

A: Quite so. Arrogance clothing itself in a scientific jargon, the scientific status used to pump up the apparent validity of ideas--that's one of the many forms of corruption in society. But the noble scientific ideas, as we have also outlined as neo-popperianism, still hold up. And what's more, we don't name this as a 'profession': rather, it is, like the concept of 'philosopher'--a lover of wisdom--something to aspire to, no matter background, education, profession. To aspire to during communication, writing, programming, and in life. Not something achieved and which can be hung up on the wall like a certificate. To be a scientist is almost identical with being enlightened--and we all know how hard that is!

I think we should explore these concepts and questions you are raising. Perhaps we should, first of all, remember that if we take human history seriously, there have been very many trends indeed and very many events and but a tiny subsection of them have been recorded in historical archives. Having said as much, it may be fairly easy to imagine that the presence of both much electrical technology and many people certainly call for new and more flexible concepts than that which perhaps were useful in times where people were fewer and electricity absent. One could appreciate the stability of pair-relationships such as marriages as 'building-blocks' of society when coupled with many other institutions allowing for some form of peaceful civilisation. It is then not strange spiritual practises had to connect to these concepts. In the 21st century--but of course it began much before--there is much use of the notion of 'poly' in connection to relationships

--including such concepts as 'polyamori' and 'polyamorous'  
--to indicate a loosening up of twosome relationships,  
while still having some degree of stabilities.

Q: Is polyamori the new hippie? Hippie with a new name?

A: I think that it's a little easier than that. The hippie concept has many features--including music, and it's related to 'hipster', which suggests beat and dance and movement from the hip. The notion of bridging 'poly' and words for love or relationship is simply a recognition of the fact of the pluralistic mind, which exists naturally, I would say, when given conditions for it. And these conditions involve many people and a generally freer type of culture, with less condemnation of other types of sexualities than the classical ones, coupled with such technology as gives people time to mingle and time to explore. If you look carefully at historical records, you'll find this sort of thing existing practically everywhere, always, only that now we have some new names for it. And these names come along with new respectability for these approaches to love and sex, and with that respectability also comes easier approaches to explore the challenges inherent in relationships and sex and love and all that--including how to deal with one another's tendencies of jealousy and so on.

Q: Well, that's certainly a great theme, isn't it? Do we see in the 'poly' approach some sort of solution of jealousy?

A: No, jealousy is part of the structure of the human mind, part of its ego-potential. It cannot be killed. That's not the object of the poly-concept. But such as jealousy can become part of a bundle of emotional frustrations when we cannot even begin to discuss the underlying facts in a decent language. Much dishonesty, for instance, to cover up a polygamous or polyamorous state of affair and pretend that it is mono-amorous, typically can make quite a mess of emotional problems between people. The respectability associated with the newer concepts, from hippie and onwards to polyamori and beyond, may create conditions for clearer thinking, for better communication, for more realistic expectations, and so on. In this, some cover-up and dishonesty will still go on and may still have a value, so as to protect sore egos so to say, but, with luck, much less than before. It's one of the things that make relationships more possible, if one already is at heart rather a pluralist when it comes to attractions. And those who pursue an artistic orientation very typically are!

Q: Is this concept of the polyamorous relationships some sort of solution to something that I have seen some statistics on--namely, that the more technology that young people use to, as it were, 'connect' them, the more they seem to be lonely and have tendencies of getting depressed and feeling that life is meaningless?

A: All that is an enormous theme. But there is little

doubt that some of the technology that is sold in to people on the premise of creating connections may, after an initial wave of enthusiasm--say, for such as 'social media'--found to be not truly meaningfully connecting people after all. To be connected is something much more than merely to be able to send and receive a few hints of approval of one another. It cannot be second-hand only, not for long, anyway: a young person, bursting with hormones, may feel--and rightly so--that this is a state of being in which much is possible but it is best done now or at least before too many seasons have passed, otherwise the pulse of life may not be that strong in the body anymore. The threat of withering away is with all human bodies, right? And so, there is the pressure within--surely there is something of value that can be done, must be done, and done together--and then there is the looking ahead and the uncertainty of whether anything significant can be done at all. Whether life is just wandering from one boring task to the next and then time bites hard into the body and before long it's gone and was that all?

Q: Some people unite under various slogans--I have seen the word 'transhuman' being used--for the active use of technology to improve on humans.

A: As if they know what it is to be a human being! It's such a hubris, such a reductive attitude to the human being, the body, the life of the mind and its feelings, to even go near imagine that manmade technology has anything significant to offer the body or the human life

except in terms of external machines and food production systems and so on. These people probably think that the human body and the mind are mechanical. They have no understanding of the roots of feelings. And so they cling to the idea that by blending the machine of the human being with more machines, other types of machines, they can get somewhere. But it's a phony idea, just another atheist religion, just another form of fanaticism, born and bred of the lack of willingness to explore the true subtlety of the human life.

Q: All right, I can see that. But what tale do we have to tell to the depressed person?

A: Depression can mean many, many things. It can be composed of a lot of factors. But let's try and say something, because obviously it's a theme that comes up very often if one talks in any depth with anybody. This is a planet full of so much development in the outer, but, as meditators never tire of saying, little development in the inner.

Physically, a person may have to look at his or her energy condition before exploring the emotions and the thoughts and doing something mentally. The person may have to chew a lot more vitamins, go for a lot more walks, and have a softer bed and get more hours of sleep and do more morning exercises, as well as having better quality music, artworks, and literary works available and part of daily life. For some, they are not in an economical position as yet to regulate all this themselves, but then they must do

as well as they can. This also means exploring what foods are good to eat, and not eating large dinners in the last portion of the day, but early enough that the body can work through it--so that sleep becomes more rejuvenating, clarifying and spiritual.

So suppose the ground energy, physically, of the person is going fairly well. But there is still depression.

In order to explore this mentally one must try and totally avoid every kind of drug except the vitamin pills and light whiffs of tobacco and occasional drops of alcohol and such. Any daily intake of mood-modifying pills must be done with, otherwise one won't get hold of the real emotions.

A depression in its core always have something in it of the lust to connect to people in the future and the sense or idea that this isn't going to work out. There may be a hundred other thoughts and hopes woven into it, but at the core, life wants to connect to life and if it feels it can but somehow also feels it cannot that becomes the locked-down emotional state associated with depression.

Q: Is there a way out?

A: Of course. But first of all one must stop blaming the environment and also try to widen the time perspective. It may or may not help to say, as Buddhists recommend, that really there's little an individual can do to change the world and moreover we have billions of years to do it, but that playful and vast perspective--if we can get even a little bit into ourselves of it--it will help.

More concretely, as I see it, all genuine forms of work have in them some sense of connectedness to future life-- to significant individuals, whether in the near future or, as in writing, at least in the sense of connecting to 'the children of the future'. One can do a lot of work and then build up hope that others connect to it and if they appear not to, one might say: 'then all this work was wasted'. But typically, such outsider judgements of work aren't right. Work has joy in it when it gets absorbing and this absorption contains a real insight into future life and connectivity there.

Q: But suppose I'm not a great writer, and I work in a bar or something, and I'm trying to sort out my feelings. And there's sex, too.

A: Yes. So, well, one must be realistic. It does take time, and it requires a sense of some form of insight, to move beyond a depression. One mustn't be too greedy about a solution. Labelling one's emotion as 'depression' or such may not be very helpful. Rather, it is possible to take the somewhat longterm approach, and say to oneself, again and again: I am working to find out what the right and meaningful goals are, and I am working to find out how to plan the upcoming weeks and months and seasons so as to fit with these goals, and when I'm far enough into this, I'm sure the emotions will sort themselves out positively. In other words, emotions have a message, but sometimes the message is: sort out a lot! And spend much time on it! And THEN check back with your emotions.

Q: Some say that depression comes from too great expectations.

A: Yes, but that's surely too simple. It can come from too small expectations as well. Depression involves a sense of locked-up energy. There is such a thing as natural and right things to do, and when one does more of them and less of that which isn't right to do, happiness comes into being, spontaneously.

Q: So how do you find what is right to do?

A: Well, that's what this whole quest of enlightenment is all about, isn't it? But, seriously, in the short term, more concretely: you have certain talents, you have certain skills, certain aptitudes. They deserve some attention. You are in a certain life situation, have some resources, much of some, perhaps, and little of some other types of resources. All that deserves attention. Then society is this way or that way, and your travel opportunities, and movement opportunities, are so and so. All that deserves attention as well. You have, in addition to all this, some spiritual sense of life, yes? Some intuitions about some really far-ranging goals that you feel are right and good? So this is a fantastic equation. It deserves a figuring out. So you apply logic, you use a notebook or so, and make concrete plans. It may seem to solve itself out, but then you see new factors--perhaps such and such project is much more resource-demanding than

you first thought. Is there some other way it can be done? Perhaps it must be given more time. Perhaps much more time.

Now in this process, you are focussing on the future and on the opportunities in the present and on the processes of what is right to do. You are not chained to giving attention to blackness of feeling. You are moving on, even if it feels to be a too-slow process sometimes. And you must attend to healthy exercises, meals, having clean clothes, getting your baths and showers, upholding your jobs and duties, maintaining social contacts, and more such, in between and around all this exploration. This isn't the time to do much of alcohol or of drugs--because you must have good sharp memory to carry the process through, even if you have help from notes here and there. You must have sleep as well, good sleep, because the brain then connects to deeper levels of your being--the soul level, the spirit level, and comes up with new results, from perceptions that touch on reality in rally good ways. All this lifts a person up to a more elevated sense of existence.

Q: As enlightenment?

A: There are glimpses of enlightenment, at least, when the largest perspectives are involved, and a deep connection to reality. Not that 'first I must become enlightened, then I'm going to sort out my life'.

Q: What if one has children to rear in the process--is

there something one can say about proper child-rearing from the perspective of enlightenment?

A: At a later time I will talk about this from own experience. At present, I will give some suggestions that may or may not be helpful, from what we can call a more intuitive stance.

First of all, I think that adults should remember their own childhood and consider that the thoughts of youth are rarely understood by adults. Adults see the expressions of feelings of children, but there may be very complex cognitive processes underlying them that they know nothing about. They may guess at one or two bits of the process, but they're likely to get much of it wrong.

Second, the adult caretaker sometimes should apply the idea of 'control' relative to very young children in order to prevent them from inadvertently harming themselves. But control is something that adults may fall in love with, and it can very easily indeed be taken too far. I believe many researchers have pointed this out, but it's a rather compelling attraction for some adults to try and rule over every detail of the children they are caretakers for, and this tendency should be seen for what it is--it is a rather childish trait in adults to want to control children perfectly.

See also what control easily leads to: it leads to the speculation of the adult as to what the child is up to, and the repeated attempts to get the child to admit that the speculations are right. In that way, the controller limits the controlled person, because there may be many

features of the controlled person that are overlooked by the controller. But the hypnosis of the controller is such that the motivations, the assumed, speculated-on motivations, rather implant themselves on the child, and so limits the child. In turn, this sort of overdone control stupifies the adult. There is no genuine relationship--nothing of what Martin Buber called "I-You" relationship; rather, control is all about "I-It".

So the controller limits the controlled person, and the controlled person limits the controller.

This theme must be explored together with adults fighting their tendency to be envious of youth--youth having the future ahead of them, adults sometimes feeling, especially when they aren't thinking in terms of reincarnation, that the future is more behind them. This envy can conceal itself in an attempt to live life through the child. The child may be outrageously against it and yet powerless to protest in a meaningful way,--but this builds up an emotional wrath that, unless healed, can become a malicious intent when the child grows up.

Q: That's quite a picture. But suppose we would like to go in the opposite direction--no control at all. Could that work?

A: No. Control has a role. But only when it is called for and only when it is combined with a sense of the greatness of the life of the Other Person as a unique and, in a genuine sense, an infinite individual. Not to be confined or construed within the shallowness of a restless and

potentially envious or jealous adult, an adult who perhaps is concealing a greed for being loved in the insistence on 'doing children good' by controlling them.

This is a complex theme, and very much more should be said about it--how to care, not over-care, how to generously contribute to 'leading out' rather than 'pushing in' the potentials of life in the young other; and how also to combine this with living in a more polyamorous society, in which diversity of care-giving and care-receiving between children and adults opens up for new possibilities and also new challenges.

Q: Right. But say some more about this theme of envy or jealousy. Is it fair to say that this is a dominant factor in society?

A: Well, obviously. At least the societies we see here, on this planet, in the 21st century. People are structuring their careers around their petty emotions; though some are genuinely in touch with their generosity; and yet others are alternating in their daily life. Feeling pushed and pulled by lower emotions, but looking towards that which is spiritual and connecting to it. Then there are those to whom socialism and such have taken the role of God, and they get a particular set of tenseness in their bodies and in their faces; a tenseness that for some lead to pretty severe diseases. Socialism talks of what we can call 'sideways care'--from one fellow human being to the next, and including also nature--but is, historically at least, afraid of the vertical axis--afraid of anything that looks

like eminent or beyond, whether spiritually or in terms of having greater beauty or radiance or whatever. And to this fear we have, typically, a whole structure of envious thoughts, that wrap themselves around a person politically and strangle that person's perceptive organs.

Q: Can this be healed?

A: Everyone can cultivate a light in themselves. But they must be realistic about how far they may be, given what they have become, in expressing this light. But there is the ancient phrase: Ask, and It Shall be Given! Nobody is doomed to be stuck forever. But it requires patience, and a spirit of playfulness.

The Intent of Painting and Dance, and the Future of Art

Q: Considering such as the last decades of mainstream art, including painting and dance, some would perhaps say that the voice of wholeness--as we have talked about earlier--is scarcely heard. Instead, there seem to be a cultivation of fragmentation and of the machine concept.

A: I think there has been a development. No doubt much is as you say: people are talking up something that is rather worthless, making of it something that can be bought and sold again on a market which is resembling something of the worst we see as for stock trading. At the same time, there has been a growth of diversity of approaches. Not all is bleak. There is both capital and genuine interest connected to real wholeness, as found both in painting and in many forms of ballet and here and there in some other forms of dance.

Q: Nevertheless, the glorification of the mechanical and also of decay, and mere empty concepts referring to some social chatter as if it were art is going on strongly.

A: Quite. There is no denial of that. Now in this regard,

--regardless of how it is at the present, which we may find annoying or lamentable or pleasing--I think it is of some value to look much ahead, and ask about the intent of art. And, without getting stuck into moralism, but with a sincere interest of relating art to what we sense is the right type of worldview, we could perhaps work out some sentiments, some phrases, some arguments which could help art in the future and strengthen as it were the 'immune system' of art, so it doesn't get infected by the virus of enthusiasm about disease nor about the mechanical view nor social references--and such stuff is perhaps most of what has been going on in the name of art has been for quite a number of decades.

Q: Yes, exactly. Would you say it is a form of a culture in which, on purpose, the opposite of light is cultivated? That art is a form of what some would call "satanism"?

A: To some, perhaps. But the concept of satanism is really quite simple--rather ridiculous. The starting-point is a childish hope that God takes care of everyone's little pleasures at all time; and when it doesn't seem that God does so, then God becomes accused of being self-centered and some other divine power is sought, that is more giving in terms of support of the ego, and less demanding in terms of moral duties. And in particular, God is accused of being boring, whereas a demon is invoked to justify free sexuality and total recklessness relative to moral standards. All that is certainly dominating the psyche of some people, but it is conditioned on a very shallow idea

of God, life and the universe. Anyone with a more nuanced view of all this wouldn't bother to consider satanism worthy of intellectual depth and they would find that the freedom they want either is already provided, and is completely in line with a more Zeus-like God idea, or it's at odds with the society they are living in, and then this society, rather than God, should be blamed; and there is no true power in any satan figure for God is sovereign. That is a simple intuition.

Q: What is here subjective and what is here objective?

When many people believe in a thing, doesn't that sort of makes it part of society and in that sense objective?

A: Well, yes, a shared illusion is objectively a shared illusion; and human society may be shaped according to subjective stuff. Human society is, of course, part of objective reality, but that doesn't mean that what human society, as for a majority or a minority, re-affirms as the fact about the universe has anything to do with the universe. The myths may resonate with something of the universe, but not by virtue of a plurality of people reiterating these myths.

Q: But if you judge whether a myth has something to do with the universe by your own intuition, doesn't that in some sense make it "subjective"?

A: Only in the sense that it has to do with you as a subject. But in the sense of illusion, no. Not if you have

a real intuition. That is indeed the only time that the mind can really have any realistic chance of touching something objective--when it has a glimpse, beyond its own ego, beyond desires and hopes and fears, of something utterly beyond one's little life. So the quest of the mystic inner silence, or, as the medieval thinker Meister Eckhardt phrased it centuries ago, the quest of, or into, "the cloud of unknowing", is also the quest into God, or reality, or the essence of reality. This has little to do with the chattering of the masses. But if the chattering of the masses one day happen to reflect reality, that's of course a good thing, and it would mean a sort of meeting between some form of subjectivity, or intersubjectivity, and the objective. And indeed that is something of what art can bring about, with luck.

Q: When art doesn't do this, is this due to some kind of overuse of "Occam's Razor" in how the results of science are being talked about?

A: Well, that's a complicated issue. I certainly see that mainstream science and mainstream art may share in their vast embracing of fragmentation. And "Occam's Razor" is a phrase that usually covers some of the methods, or principles, or assumptions, used to distinguish between better and worse scientific theories in mainstream science --and, I agree that it may be at the core of much misplaced arrogance against entirely interesting theories. It's a long story. Though I do not talk much about this so-called "razor" in the Beauty of Ballerinas book from

2017, I mention it, and, while mentioning it, I also bring a number of arguments in favour of doing science in a very different way.

Q: Could you summarise what you have against Occam's Razor in new words? And then we go over to talk about art, as visual art, and as ballet and dance and so on, afterwards?

A: Yes. Well, as a starting-point, let's playfully bring in how the fictitious character Sherlock Holmes solves his cases. He observes, and then he deduces things, and from these deductions he create alternative theories. From these theories he is led into additional investigations and observations, which lead him to discard some of these and settle with, usually, one theory. Even if it is an improbable one, he sticks to it if the other theories are pretty much excluded. Of course this is fiction, and so success is easy there; but when the same author, Mr Doyle, set out to employ these methods himself, in real life, about spiritual phenomena, he didn't nearly get any similar success. Rather, he was led astray by fake photos of fairies and such. Much as we sympathize with his intent, his idea of the scientific method seemed a little immature.

As for theorizing over the universe, the facts are few, and the number of theories that may account for them many. To some extent the books of various religions may also be said to offer some theories, and, when rephrased in a reflective metaphysical way, they may be more compatible with physics than that which perhaps is commonly realized.

Some theories lead us to expect certain additional results. This, as you know, they call 'predictions'. So mainstream science credits such as Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle, which is part of the bundle of equations they loosely call 'quantum theory', with having had success in making 'predictions' that led to investigations that seemed to confirm it, at least somewhat. When an approach to pilot wave theories such as by de Broglie (after he had read D. Bohm's hidden variable interpretation of quantum theory) accounts for the same phenomena without leading to 'new predictions', then mainstream science may dismiss the theory as rather uninteresting. The idea of 'new predictions' however may overly credit a theory that had successful predictions just because it came first. And so scientists really must look for other criteria as well. Certainly, there is no reason why the first theory may be the best one. It may be that the 21st theory is the best. This may be obvious when a thousand years of additional measurements have been performed, but how do we right now land on the best theory?

Q: Yes. That's where Occam's Razor comes in. It says, doesn't it, 'cut away everything unnecessary--let the simplest theory win'. At least, that seems to be the gist of what a philosopher of this name, Occam, suggested.

A: Yes. Now consider this: nothing is more complex than to decide which theory is most simple.

Q: Hah! I can see the point, but couldn't one just list the assumptions for a theory, and see which one has the shortest list, and the snappiest sentences?

A: Let's imagine that we do list up all the assumptions for three or four theories that account for the same measurements. These lists are entirely shaped out of our language context and worldview background and the phrases are made according to what we are familiar with. For instance, before Goedel made his famous incompleteness theorem, and before computers came about, to say of such and such that it is 'nonalgorithmic' required many more words than to one who is acquainted with these results. And so we can say for every one of the key phrases and indeed for the structuring of the whole list of assumptions associated with every one of the theories. Simplicity can easily be totally subjective.

Worse, simplicity can cover up prejudice. It may be emotionally complicated for a hotheaded mainstream person whose profession is to fulfill a scientific job to accept certain interpretations of certain measurements. And so a theory that gives these interpretation no credibility may to this person feel to be much more simple than a theory that leaves the door open to alternative interpretations of a kind that directly is in contrast to this scientist's worldview. And so, when interviewed, the scientist may say that it is according to "scientific method" that we have such and such view of the origins of life, and that everything else borders on irrationality or worse.

To change such prejudice seems to me to require a

complete re-education, and that takes several years of hard work--not merely an occasional round of 'group dialogue' or some other feeble activity like that.

You see? Occam's Razor is the perfect instrument for the worst kind of arrogance to assert itself. It is true it may be used against foggy-headed, weakly reasoned out theories as well. But it may so easily ditch truth in favour of prejudice, and proudly so. It's an arrogant type of concept of method to invoke in any case, what with the word "razor" in it--when we are talking of something so sensitive instruments as our minds, and how we decide things.

See also how the author of Sherlock Holmes books, when wanting to argue in favour of a spiritual point of view, couldn't bring himself to see fake material as fake material--this happened when he published the book on fairies--the originators of the photos later said that they had manipulated the photos--and it seems he was led astray in some other cases as well (ectoplasm). He seemed to be feverently inclined to find some evidence here or there in favour of a theory that he doggedly believed in, and, while the theory--that life isn't merely matter, but that there is a life force and beings beyond the level that can be measured, and all that--may be right, his eagerness to find facts let him have an arrogant attitude to alternative theories or at least alternative assumptions as regard definite measurements. That these could be fake was overruled by his mind. In his quest for simplicity of a certain kind--viz., the simplicity of matching what could be facts to what he has a worldview--

he arrogantly debunks the sceptical attitude as to these measurements. That's a kind of Occam's Razor, too.

Indeed, it is the very tendency of the human ego to select all sorts of things that fits it, that makes it into such an error to have 'simplicity'--or some other convenient, fast word or phrase like that--as the principle of decision as for which theories are good,--which maps, in other words, cover the territories or domains they presume to cover.

So, in *The Beauty of Ballerinas*, I say that it is only after a great deal of contact with all the nuances of all the phenomena involved that one can meaningfully look for the 'simplest' theory. Now this is then something entirely different than the practise typically associated with "Occam's Razor". The latter method or principle is used as an excuse to avoid getting entangled into in-depth studies of phenomena which could contradict existing paradigms. So Occam's Razor as method is often nothing but a paradigm of theories defending itself against change.

Q: Let Occam's Razor be dismissed, then. What, then, is the way to select a good theory when we have many to account for the same set of measurements?

A: First of all, we must admit to the immensity of the challenge of perceiving anything at all, and most of all the universe as a whole. This is a gigantic quest. Every theory and even everything we call 'measurement' are as if nodes in a vast, living network of thinking-perceiving and to hope that we can, in our minds, connect to something of

reality may be meaningful but it is only meaningful if we together realize that it is enormously complicated. That's number one: it isn't easy. And I can give you several quotes and references also to great thinkers on the theory of science in support of this--but let's just agree, you and me, it isn't easy.

Q: We agree.

A: Good. Next, let's then agree, if we can, that we may easily bias our selection according to personal prejudices and that this bias must be fought within ourselves if we are going to have hope of coming, together, towards the truly best theory in any situation.

Q: Also agree. Bias, the tendency of selecting emotionally rather than rationally, is the egoism that everybody has.

A: Then, let's consider also that all measurements--when we sum them up, using that word, 'measurements'--may have within them a little or possibly a lot of hidden or overt bias, further complicating the whole quest. In other words --we must be willing to look afresh at measurements as we experiment with various grand theories to account for them, in a process that somehow spirals onwards.

Q: I can see that. Measurements aren't just given in a cut'n'dried form. They may be an expression, in part, of what we want to see.

A: Yes, yes. Then, given all this complexity, we must then allow time, and mental space, energy, all that, for the enquiry--it cannot be solved at a single conference or any such thing. Nor can be it automatically regarded as something to be solved by different individuals building up vast theories and publishing them in conflict with one another. It is a quest, a gigantic quest, like building a gigantic kind of societal construction--to make a good theory. This theory, as it begins to emancipate, may change. It may not be any one of the original candidates, or it may be one of them, but then it may not be quite what we think it is--because each mind is full of ideas and these color how we think about the very same sets of sentences.

Q: Yes, I can see that.

A: So, when the theory is selected, is it selected according to 'simplicity'? But that's just a word that indicates, at best, a kind of esthetical judgement, an artistic evaluation--what is necessary and what is not, --the painting may have many lines and yet it couldn't be one less line in the painting, they were all necessary--you follow? So simplicity, beauty, ease of being, ease of thinking about it, and with it, wholeness, intuitiveness, a sense of light--all these esthetical judgements go into the process. Which is to say, we do not select according to a formula. We let the innermost self of ourselves, of, we can say, the silence in our minds, have a say. And so, you see, you must put the theories into your meditation,

and be quiet about them. It's not up to the ego to pick any one out. That's not what it is about. It's about coming to a sense of gut giving its quiet nod to one theory, that it is, or may be, better than all the others.

Q: You are saying, in effect, that instead of Occam's Razor, you must use intuition.

A: Yes, --only that's a word that for some may sound like a formula, but I don't intend it to be a formula at all.

Q: Granted. Is this then what you call the "neo-popperian" approach to science?

A: It's part of it. Certainly. This trust in intuition, you see, is shared with many of those who worked with what they called "pure mathematics"--they saw it as an appeal to reaching togetherness by virtue of personal intuition. That doesn't mean that they got it right, and, in particular, intuitions into infinity do differ. But it is a belief very many people have had as to mathematics in its classical sense. Now we are saying that this idea that numbers are something we can have intuition over, is interesting, all the more so if some features of some of type of number algorithms can be imagined to underlie some of the structure of matter. This needn't be in the way Pythagoras said, but the ancient greeks certainly touched on the matter. So, this type of intuition may be right relative to the selecting of theories. But where do we draw the line as for the use of intuition? Some

theories, when they are experienced as simple and often confirmed, are called 'facts', and in a sense provide input in the form of 'measurements' to other, new theories we make. So once you accept to use intuition to select some theories rather than some other theories, then you're in practise also accepting to use intuition as a source of additional measurements, in addition to sensory experiments. And now that requires a whole lot of training and thinking into how to move beyond bias and come to real intuitions, beyond desires, fears and so on. But then we are led onto a new way of thinking about science as a whole, and this is neo-popperianism, because it goes beyond the approach of Karl R. Popper, but builds on him and others as well. And super-model theory is, we can say, the personal result of working in the neo-popperian way for just about decades on the questions of the universal processes and flows of energy and beyond.

Q: Well, that's quite a different take on it all than the quick atheist "Occam's Razor" method, isn't it?

A: It is. Now, let's go to the questions of art and dance again, and the intent of all this, and why it seems to be so easy for contemporary art to fall into the groove of glorifying decay and machine. Why is this a danger, and how can we say something about it that, at any point in the future, may serve to heal and aid those artists and dancers who are wanting to pursue a more natural, more holistic approach? I think this is a better question than to be too focussed on whatever we have around us, in this

or that society, because there's so much that can change in just a few years. For instance, every society has its heroes, and the arts are no exception; but after a mere quarter of a century these heroes may be completely forgotten and new heroes are made. New names. And they may or may not represent something new and genuinely whole, but in any case, there doesn't have to be any continuity in the existence of false forms of art. To use that phrase --which is perhaps in these days not politically correct exactly, so we have to give it a more precise meaning.

Q: Yes, can we speak of false and true relative to art?

A: Now art is different from science in that what it projects doesn't have in it the presumption that it is going to be a map of any territory. So, in that sense, art has greater freedom. But all the same it is projected for other human beings, in some way or another, to respond to. And in that way, art is a form of behaviour, and in the case of art that is displayed to many, it is a form of behaviour that is highly influential. Since it is influential, then, if we are spiritual enough to regard that actions are right or wrong, then for such big actions as these, they are mighty right or mighty wrong. In that sense, true or false. So, you see, we must explore spirituality at the same time as we explore art.

Q: Is it possible to speak of right and wrong of actions, unless we take a spiritual worldview?

A: No. If we aren't spiritual, then what's left is merely what is the social contracts, written or tacit. Some can try and raise these social contracts up and say that they reflect 'universal human rights' or similar such, but if human society isn't anchored in a realistic sense of the universe as a whole, then it is merely an insignificant detail in the universe, and this detail has no real right in claiming that its little rules are 'universal'.

Q: So in a sense, there isn't any rightness to secular art?

A: The word 'secular', fortunately, is more complicated than that. It may mean, for instance, that society is ruled in a way that leaves room open for personal religion to exist, as long as this personal religion doesn't lead to conflicts with the governing of society. An artist may in this sense be secular, without being in the slightest in denial of the spiritual; and in this sense, spiritual art can be produced by a 'secular' artist. And so 'secular art' can be spiritually right.

Q: But can we reach a sense of what is spiritual that presumes as little as possible of agreement in worldview?

A: What do you mean?

Q: I mean, spirituality is, is it not, a rather large concept. It can, for some, mean any type of worldview or approach to life that isn't simply atheist. And that

includes a very large number of possibilities indeed.

A: You are right. No, I don't think we can completely avoid talking about worldview if we're going to say something about meaningful spirituality. But we can try and appeal to the beginnings of some spirituality that is, as it seems, pointed to in science when summarized the supposed unbiased way we attempt to do in *The Beauty of Ballerinas*, in the super-model theory in particular. For instance, we can suggest that it does seem that there is a real degree of interconnectedness between all processes, including all living processes, and very possibly including also our own brains and beyond. This is one of the things that most critical thinkers of the 20th century, as I see it, easily agreed upon: that the new physics indicates a need for a concept of wholeness to be taken very seriously indeed, even if it is not exactly the same type of organic wholeness as was pervasive for instance in the writings of Aristoteles. But it may not be all that different, either. So wholeness is one of the very general points of fairly broad agreement amongst those who have been exposed to the best of modern science.

Q: Right. Wholeness. That the idea of local particles and forces playing stupidly on them isn't all that there is.

A: Exactly--except, of course, that the latter idea is popular amongst the many who have had less time to think philosophically about science, but who are in contrast impressed with such as its child, technology--which is,

typically, a very mechanical thing, and which leads itself to be taken into support for atheism, which we can also call 'localism'.

Q: Is there anything more we can say than wholeness?

A: If we are going to stay very near to that which a broad philosophizing over results of logic and science in the past century or two suggests, I think that we can add a few concepts. One of them is 'non-algorithmic'. This type of thinking is suggested by the well-known results which we discuss in the aforementioned book connected to Kurt Goedel. But it is also suggested by the HUP, the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle, which does, informally and imprecisely, seem to put a premium upon the notion of 'not always having to know', or, put briefly, 'unknowing'. And if something is part of a process of unknowing, then it follows that it isn't a recipe, a formula, and not algorithmic either. So in this sense, it vaguely does seem to support a notion of the non-algorithmic.

Q: Can we also say 'process'? Or 'movement'?

A: Yes. Entangled processes, non-algorithmically unfolding. That kind of stuff is certainly very easy to come to after even a brief contact with all these results.

Q: It still seems a long way from there to argue in favour that such and such action is more right or worthy than another?

A: Yes, but we are getting towards something if we take the leap into trusting that, in this process of flowing wholeness, it seems that through this wholeness, there can be insights, perceptions, intelligence, or, as we can call it, 'intuition'. And that this intuition may be connected also to feelings that, put briefly, life has for one another, and in particular to such holistic feelings as generous love, compassion, radiant admiration for beauty-- as wholeness in form and function and potential--and so on. It takes but a little reflection and a little intuition to go from the general concept of wholeness to all these additional concepts. And that includes mindfulness, or the gathering of the forces of flowing attentiveness at many levels, as well.

Q: Some teachers who have been preaching awareness or mindfulness have also suggested that the human thought process often is divisive and in the way of this flow. And that thought needs to give attention to its own tendency to fragment life, so that it stays away from doing it.

A: Yes. Thought is immensely flexible. This flexibility means that it can shape all sorts of plans, ideas, concepts, stories, and so on, and these can get wrapped up into emotions, perhaps loads of emotions, and sort of sink much of the mind, take away the mindfulness and the contact with reality, and substitute for it an entirely subjective process that but at few points, such as at questions of money or fame, have any reality touch. I will

go further and say that for most over twenty-five years of age, they have little contact with reality except in this way. And so in order to explore what art does to us, we should also take into consideration what children want as art and how they respond to it--perhaps more honestly--and how those who are above twenty-five years of age can be more as children relative to these questions, children who have plastic brains, and who haven't yet got stuck in a groove.

Q: Could we say, then, that an action that supports a child's mindfulness in a positive manner is more likely to be right? I mean, to try to reach an as neutral expression as possible about what is right?

A: It's a tempting thought, and certainly it can be right on occasions, but what is or what isn't supporting a child's mindfulness in a positive manner certainly isn't something that adults need to agree upon in the least. No, I think we need to have in our minds a sense of reverence for the vastness of cosmos and also, noticeably, for the personal capacity in each and every human being, young as old, to touch on intuitions into what all this is about--even if just in glimpses. This reverence, this wonder, will itself do much to dampen the prejudices and arrogant attitudes that easily can form in the minds of those to whom some form of art is, for the time being, a profession, a way of earning a livelihood. If we can share in this reverence and share in the sense of the majestic opportunity combined with the great complexity involved in

getting good intuitions, then we have a common ground.

Q: Well, why then is this sceptical wonder about the universe, this reverence, so unusual--at least at times? Why does that which we call 'art' so easily become a breeding of mechanical notions and a wallowing around in themes connected to conflict and illness, or centered around trivial ideas of what's neat or socially recognisable--having a social reference?

A: One answer is that it is the human ego expressing itself. This ego isn't simple: and it is to some extent constantly reinventing itself so as to avoid easy detection. Essentially, the motive level--the highest goals each person have typically lead to a lot of disappointments, a general level of frustration. Then art is perhaps looked to as a tranquilizer, just as an angry person may put on very hard and rough music very loud in order to soften himself or herself. A sort of shadow-boxing.

Q: What are these or this highest goal?

A: For a truly young person, it may change several times pr year--but for someone who has got into a pattern, it may take months and months to change it. Most people who have got stuck in a highest goal has a goal that somehow connects to a fighting of the pain of loneliness. Perhaps they want a flock around them--the guru-goal. Perhaps the lone person wants a partner. And the goal can be deduced

by others who notice what this person does and where this person has energy and emotion, and so on. These goals make the person's emotions centered around the troubles of getting there, and this prevents the light and genuine generosity of the person of coming forth.

Q: Is there a right highest goal?

A: If you push your intuitions far, and you sense that there's a reality to life on subtler levels than what we can see, and that life has an intelligent, person-like source, then obviously it would make sense to have as a goal to serve no less than this, directly.

Now that is easily said, but such a goal may be very hard to attain to for someone who for years have been stuck in a self-centered goal. You can see it on their faces. The self-centered goal is not a beautifying factor. So it would require daily hard work, daily self-commanding we might say, for months and months for a person to as it were re-direct his or her own 'spaceship in life' as the level of the highest goal. But when it is done, that person would find a meaning in dedication that has its own joy, regardless of whether it gives money, popularity or any flock around oneself.

If this is done without sticking to any narrow bible text, nor to any text by any St. Augustine or Martin Luther or any Advaita Vedanta or Rumi or anything else, then it would be a genuine light. And I do think that the intuitions would lead one to explore a little of the ancient greek myths around the Zeus concept, which became

the Roman 'deus' concept and which was made into the unhappy, sterile God of the early roman christian church. Zeus, who created the muses, was everything of the Christian God but not the petty moralist, nor the denier of sexuality; and so we see that, in Greece, the ancient religion is again blossoming, at least to some extent.

All this comes naturally if you explore reality through your own intuitions, not leaning on any text by Homer or Krishnamurti or whomever. What it requires is to have the guts to kick all traditions in the ass; to be loyal to something infinitely greater than the past, namely the present, the Now, and how it contains seeds of all the future, and many more levels beyond your human thought.

And this is, as said, requiring a willingness to be reverent about the universe, about Cosmos as a living whole, beyond the known, and--it follows--we must be creatively dissatisfied with the gurus, the shamans, the bodhisattvas, the lamas, the imams, the rabbis, all the priests and popes and similar characters. But also, we must be creatively dissatisfied with human society and its chatter about its own little concerns, its own petty little rankings and worries and machines. You cannot both love the littleness of thought and also love the vastness of cosmos. The littleness of thought must be seen for what it is; we must endeavour to have a cosmic intent pervading our daily lives, for a portion of every day.

Q: Suppose we do share in such an approach, or such an attitude to life, or belief somehow. What then can we say about what painting and dance must be?

A: Something that accords with this. In particular, that which Nature has produced as to the shape of the human being in her natural, young, rather new form, must be considered something beyond thought-processes, and something worthy of being a pointer to the wholeness that all human beings, no matter age, seek. So to find the essence of this form, the most beautifully athletically disciplined form in which the functions of this form can effortlessly express itself, whether we call it ballet or something else, must be part of the action of art on society--for someone who is thus inclined. To remind ourselves of these natural wholenesses--natural in the sense of being not at all the construct of mere human thought--and to point to these wholenesses, rather than seek to implant some new 'cool' idea instead of them, is a way in which art can be true.

Q: Will all humanity get to it?

A: Obviously. Of course. Certainly. I'm an optimist. It'll only take a million years or so.

A Beautiful Society? Your own exploration!

Q: Today it's a sunny day, beach temperature, all that, and in a cafe and around I talked with several people who both seemed to, and said, that they're just soooo happy. In the light of our foregoing conversation, it would seem that such a mood, such an emotion, genuine as perhaps it may be, sort of cover up what we called 'the human ego'?

A: I wouldn't say that. Ego or not, flashes of great, grand feelings, inspirations, genuine enthusiasms, also happiness, certainly can and does touch people, at least to some extent, some of the time.

Q: Would this be much the same as glimpses of enlightenment?

A: Enlightenment is a little bit more sophisticated concept--even if it's only a glimpse of it. But, of course, it may be that some such glimpse was there together with a flash of joy or happiness or love or whatever. Enlightenment has a depth of understanding in it; it's more than the happiness of the animal.

Q: But is there more joy in enlightenment? I mean, if happiness can come along touching people on a lovely day

like this, and it is sort of independent of enlightenment, then..

A: ..then what's the point of the quest of enlightenment?

Q: Yes, exactly. What's the point of it? Considering how, after all, enormously complicated it is.

A: There are several levels of answers to that. One, we do not really have any choice as to our highest goal-- somehow, in the human essence, it seems to me that it's pretty much imprinted in us to strive for understanding, and includes the understanding of the totality, in moments at least. We can deny this highest goal but only at the expense of becoming reduced in minds and/or feelings. Then, there are some more levels to the answer. For instance, radiant happiness without understanding can blow away as easily as it came, and leave not merely a kind of blank emptiness, but rather a tremendous sense of psychic suffering. It may be kept at bay for a week, but when there is no depth of insight of the kind enlightenment is about, strong happiness is easily leading to strong attachments and bonds which, when broken, as they will, create despair and suffering. Then add to all that, that when happiness comes about, we may not be capable of deciding whether it has a ground in understanding or whether it is a shallow thing, as the happiness of an animal. The energy of it, when present, does things to us: should we deny that? But that would seem silly; and so, moved by joy, we are also, in a way, moving in an area or

cloud of not-knowingness. At least for a little while. The day after or sooner or later it may be rather clear to us, what it was all about.

Q: Do you think that all are affected positively by beauty when the ego isn't fighting it, somehow?

A: Yes. The ego tries to render all perception subjective. But somehow, when beauty touches you, it is faster than that, faster than the ego. It's there, vibrantly, within you. Does it enliven you? Yes. Does it even enlighten? Yes. But an allergic ego may then step in and say, "No, this isn't a kind of thing I'm attracted to. I dislike this." In doing so, it may try and pump up a false self-image, which declares that one's own fat, aged forms are topping all scales of beauty. This is the kind of shoddy hidden arithmetic of the more-or-less subconscious part of the mind of most post-teens, especially if they are worried about their decay.

In the presence of such an ego, the mind gets considerably smaller,--a claustrophobic feeling may become dominant in the person. She or he may feel cured only by reckless travelling about, but there's no running away from the fact of the mortality and decay of body and face and one can easily become a travelling circus, or a rather unsuccessful tragic clown in it. When such a person declares that such and such isn't interesting, isn't attractive, isn't art, etc, it is merely a sort of "chess-move" by the ego to say so, and the statements carry little of the radiance of fact. Such a person may have an

easy time to laugh about many things, but not about these facts about the person, self-referentially. And so it has been said: the limits of your humour are the limits of your wisdom.

Q: But whole societies may be this way.

A: History is full of tragic societies. Let's rather explore beauty, why it is so taunting, why it hurts so much--and solves so much, when one gives oneself over to it; how it is that intelligence flourishes when one lets oneself be exposed to beauty, and reconditions one's sexuality to fit with the purest and most innocent of beauty-experiences--and all sorts of things like that--which are themes for plenty more than just one chapter, or just one book. It's part of the perennial exploration of worldview and enlightenment to work out these themes, and do it in various ways, and not stack these ways on top of each other as if they were systems. But rather to climb up the mountain of enlightenment in so many fresh ways, forgetting the earlier ways so as to give full attention to this way, now.

And that's a way to create a more beautiful society. Which should be an after-effect, rather than a goal, for these things are too vast to be ruled or regulated or even influenced more than a little by anyone mortal. But each can, just as when there is a voting process, make a little bit contribution, and that little bit, if it is the best you can do, is enormously valuable for you personally to sense that you're part. So you're not taking

responsibility for society as a whole, but you're sensing how your influence, however small it is, can work in the right direction--and mix that with infinite patience, the kind of patience that requires a faith in the persistence of lives and souls beyond deaths and births.

Q: Give me a hint of how to begin the explorations personally that I have to do, in order to make some headway about all this. To come to the point of making my own contribution.

A: Then I suggest you try and remember how you as a child tried to match your inner attractions and emotions with what you were very probably told by elders what your attractions and emotions ought to be. How you sometimes succeeded in suppressing something. How you nevertheless kept on having your own sense of things. And how you, when you came into your fuller set of hormones, found yourself again subject to many recommandation from without, and probably even more intense pressures from within. How did you resolve it? And what did you land on? And why? And was it really entirely right? Go back and open up the questions, with your intent of harmony and your adult logic and wish to be a responsible and legal citizen perhaps fully intact. Find out about the energy of beauty. Explore why something is beautiful, why something is erotic, and will yourself freer than that which the 20th century and before claimed to be natural to be attracted to--go beyond the conditioning that says what's normal and what's not normal, what's healthy and what's unhealthy.

Q: How do I do all that?

A: Go for a walk, meet your friends, watch the bikini bodies on the beach, look at art, look at photos of every kind, and sense how your mind and your body is activated about this or that and how people's voices and smells and gestures turns you on or turns you off. And how you yourself may change in what you are looking for, from one mode of the day to the next. See if you can find a pattern, a pattern of energy, a pattern of intelligence, in your attractions. And if you have close friends, polyamorous or monoamorous or something like that, do it quietly and politely, but with personal sincere strength. Don't declare revolutions, but see it as an artistic exploration to enliven your mind for the future.

Q: Alright. I'll give it a try!

Friendship, sex, etc

Q: To a young person who says something like this (as I overheard the other day): "The only things that makes sense to me is sex, much sex, perhaps good food a little--if it doesn't make me fat--and travel, beaches, all that--and to have much money--and the rest is all duty, boredom, routine, really nonsense." What would you say? That the person is gripped by illusions?

A: No, but I'm not sure that such a statement should be considered exhaustive or complete. I mean, there's typically a lot more depth to people than that which they easily put words to. And there's a degree of frankness in such a statement, and frankness is certainly a great starting-point for explorations.

Q: Well, but is sex the point of it all?

A: I think I want to say 'no' to that question, but while doing so, I wish to point out that sex is one of those themes to which there may be more than what it seems to be at the surface. In some sense, when you read a good book, and get absorbed in it,--a great fiction story--and you're touched by some passages, and it is so alive to you that it puts your own sense of living into an as it were sharper light, then there's a lot involved in that--rhythm

and interaction and feeling and thinking and a mental touching and a form of dance within, and it reaches a maximum, a peak--the absorption is almost a form of mental orgasm, is it not? And so there is a wholeness associated with such experiences that make them not sharply divided from the experiences we typically point to by the word "sex". Certainly one can also dream a sexual experience, and that may be wholly mental and it is still, in a sense, a form of sex. So sex isn't sharply cut off from the other themes of intense living.

Q: But I wish to go back to the type of statement that young girl came with, as I referred to--about sex being the most important and so on. She probably referred to real physical sex. And she being a good-looker, she gets it: and then one would like to ask, is the meaning of life tied up into something requiring a person to one of the luck winners in that which some people, rightly or not, call "the genetic lottery"? And for how many years can she keep it up before the bite of time forces her to be more reflective about what matters in life?

A: I quite see what you mean. Completely. Before we go on and answer it, let's be very clear that this sort of theme has led to considerable emotional upheavals, societal changes, the more popular the idea of the "single" person has become in the often rather overpopulated and rather ageing societies we have on this planet in the 21st century. Many ageing people, single or not, have become almost tyrannically against any cultivation of the idea

that youth = beauty = much good sex = meaningfulness. They have engaged into all sorts of intellectual activities, they have formed movements, they have tried to, and to a not small extent, overtaken dominant institutions steering cultural lives many places, all based on the idea of pumping up the value of old women and old men and rather on the expense of the youth. One might say that it is much the say intensity of emotionality connected to this as the so-called "hippies" directed against what they called "the establishment" in the 1960s and into the 1970s, so as to liberate their right to cultivate youth and sex.

Q: But it's almost the opposite movement now.

A: Yes. In some ways, yes. The 'sex' bit is still sort of cultivated and championed, but hippies easily talked of anyone above twenty-five or so as "too old" to understand anything of what they were doing or talking about or singing about; and then, of course, when the hippies themselves got old they tried, some of them tried, to argue differently; and what we see in the 21st century are typically aged children of post-hippies, trying to do away with the beauty concept, trying to do away with cultivation of youth, trying to keep the money and the jobs recirculated amongst their ageing cliques. They scorn at the "teenager"--which is to say, anyone much under 30, --who sneak her way into their circles.

These trends are not everywhere, not in every country. They may also change fairly fast; and trends always exist simultaneously with other movements, defying them. So, as

we have said earlier on in this book, let's rather work on more general questions, more enduring questions, than what society around us at present is, or isn't: and find, connected to these questions, more enduring answers. But it makes sense to be aware just how intense 'battles' are fought under the surface of apparently harmonious societies, and this can explain how some societies come to support just some forms of art and some forms of science and some forms of newspapers and some forms of technology. So, then, let's go back to your original question, about meaningfulness of life, sex, travel, youth, all that.

Q: Is friendship the meaning of life? --just to throw in another concept.

A: Ah, if it is, what meaning is there for a person who one day feels that he or she is alone and basically without a single friend? Certainly there is meaning also then; certainly we are not that deeply socially tied that an individual is pointless just because no other interesting individuals at present have signalled mutual bonds or friendship or something like that. The individual does have meaning. And, spiritually, we have to remind ourselves not to be too taken in by what we see by the senses,--there's more to life than what meets the eye.

Q: An immortal soul?

A: Yes. Meaning that there are infinitely many bodies for each mortal human in the future; that nothing is really

lost; that, with a wide enough perspective, it can even make sense to say that infinite beauty awaits in the future, for each. As I see it, this is the meaningful and also what I take to be intuitively totally true view: that reincarnation is real, that there is no hell, that, all in all, things don't occur by chance but that there's a guidance--even if it is very hard to see sometimes or even often. And this reincarnation isn't one-soul-pr-body but rather a more diverse approach. So we should explore all that, regularly, when we pursue the questions of meaning all the way to the bottom. At the surface, though, I would like to point out that a person with a meaningful purpose (or purposes) is action-oriented; and that action-orientation typically means that one far more easily forms friendships with other people whose purposes have some element in common, in one way or another, with oneself. Not that friendships always depend on practical plans: but haven't you noticed this tendency yourself?--as if friends connected to lots of potentials actions in ways that involve possible collaborations; that this is part of the flow of life, how things organize themselves.

Q: Yes. You are right. People who do things form more easily bond with people, even if they are not necessarily aware of how these bonds might relate to their plans.

A: Yes. Too much awareness might make a person seem too much a 'strategical' individual as it were. Friends are beyond the explicit purpose. But the purpose or purposes may create some resonance. And this may be the case even

for sex. When we then explore what purposes do to us, see how it may also provide healing and wholeness to a person to be positively interested in getting something done, also in the long run.

Q: Yes. It shapes coherence.

A: That's what it does! So life, and its meaningfulness, doesn't merely involve the attention to what is around us or inside us in this moment, but it also involves going ahead, maybe far ahead, or not so far ahead, and form intentionalities, and let these guide things. The good purpose creates a certain smoothness of skin, creates an interest in shelving worn-out clothes and shoes and get new ones, and to stay clean, do exercise, eat healthily, practise language and thought and logic skills, such as by G15 PMN FCM programming, and much more such. The purposes are as if magnetic for the body and the mind and the emotions, too. And, yes, they can even give some meaning to what that girl you quoted called 'boredom' or 'routine' --for things have gotta be done, and somebody's gotta do them,--and then the holidays and the sex and so on are more fascinating for they feel more deserved. Also across reincarnations, we should add.