

OCTOBER GATHERING 2016 ~ SATURDAY MORNING, SECOND SESSION

PARTICIPANT: [referring to the High Commission's reasons for the implantation of the organ Kundabuffer] ...every kind of apprehension and surprise was absolutely vanished and yet they went ahead to avoid any possible complication.

KEITH: Who is speaking there?

PARTICIPANT: Beelzebub is speaking:

“His Conformity then told me that although the movements of both former parts of the planet Earth were now already finally regulated with the general harmony of movement and that every kind of apprehension of some or other surprise in the near future had absolutely vanished, yet to avoid any possible complications in the distant future it had been explicitly decided by the Most High, Most Sacred Individuals to actualize the ‘corresponding’ on the planet for the formation of what is called the Sacred Askokin so that this sacred cosmic substance, required for the maintenance of that planet's former parts, might continuously issue from that planet.¹

KEITH: Those are the words of the angels, *not* Beelzebub. He is saying what the angels said to him. And it's just the damn angels all over again. The screw-up is in the angelic world.

PARTICIPANT: This is just a noticing. It seems Askokin first needs to be extracted so when I was reading that it seemed to imply that the debt of our existence towards the vivifying force, conscious or unconscious comes before our ability to use the other two sacred substances. It seems there is a material debt.

“... this sacred substance Askokin in order to become vivifying for such a maintenance must first be freed from the said sacred substance Abrustdonis and Helkdonis.”²

It seems there is an indication of a process that that had to happen first.

KEITH: Who is speaking there?

PARTICIPANT: Beelzebub is speaking.

KEITH: What is the context of what he is speaking about?

PARTICIPANT: He is saying His Conformity then told me.

KEITH: Ah! there is the damn angel again.

“To tell the truth, my boy, I did not at once clearly understand all that he then said, and it was only later that I came to understand it all clearly, when, during my studies of the fundamental cosmic laws, I learned that these sacred substances Abrustdonis and Helkdonis are just those substances by which the higher being-bodies of three-brained beings, namely, the body

1 Gurdjieff, *Beelzebub's Tales*, pp 1105-06

2 Ibid.

Kesdjan and the body of the Soul, are in general formed and perfected; and when I learned that the separation of the sacred Askokin from the said sacred substances proceeds in general when the beings on whatever planet it might be transubstantiate the sacred substances Abrustdonis and Helkdonis in themselves for the forming and perfecting of their higher bodies, by means of conscious labors and intentional sufferings.³

PARTICIPANT: He is implying that he came to see it for himself that this was the truth, that you had to get Askokin out before you could use Abrustdonis and Helkdonis.

KEITH: That's Looisos. That is the angel speaking.

PARTICIPANT: Yes, that is the angel speaking but then it says Beelzebub saw it for himself.

KEITH: No, then Beelzebub went to work on it as he goes to work on so many other things that the angelic forces have brought down. He has a lot to say about the criminal unforeseeingness of the implantation of Kundabuffer so I think this is another instance like that. The first statement (and this is second we have discussed) is Beelzebub speaking in the words of the angel; it is the angel we have to hold to the fire relative to what it implies.

From an angelic point of view, Looisos' point of view, it is perfectly reasonable to place Askokin at a higher level than the 'incidental' Abrustdonis and Helkdonis because that is the downward flow of involution.

PARTICIPANT: He needs it. If you don't get it the thing is going to go off and ...?

KEITH: Right, they might do something really weird, like become conscious and we don't want that. See there is delightful background play that Gurdjieff does so beautifully here of man vs. the angelic world. This is the *Conference of the Birds* and the whole bunch of things that he's got wrapped up in this tension between higher power looking down in an involuntional sense and what restraint that places on us when we make efforts to look up. What we see is the criminal unforeseeingness. We cannot understand. *How could you do this?* When he speaks that way, he is speaking for us. Beelzebub is speaking for us.

But when Looisos speaks out, it sounds perfectly logical. We see almost immediately that oh boy, we are going to get into trouble from the implantation of this organ but from the High Commission (remember it is not just Looisos) that this seems to be a perfectly logical, necessary step that has to be taken. This is the same. The way he looks at Askokin puts it at much, much higher level of importance than Abrustdonis and Helkdonis. But then, as he says, Beelzebub didn't understand this at first but later he came to understand it is quite the opposite that when they are extracted they become contributions to the building of Higher Being-bodies.

PARTICIPANT: I have the impression that Abrustdonis, Helkdonis and Askokin are bound together, a triad of something, a three in one and they have to separate. How would we understand what the container is that contains the three prior to separation.

KEITH: Take an ordinary life event. You wake up in the morning and you have to go to the bathroom and then you get some coffee and you start chatting with somebody and then other people begin to arrive and then you have breakfast. Now in all of that I haven't made

3 Gurdjieff, *Beelzebub's Tales*, P 1106

mention of anything notable other than a certain sequence of events when I got up. All of this is the flow of events; this is Askokin, this is experiencing. I did have the cup of coffee; I did sit down; I did walk from there; I went to the bathroom, etc., etc.. That is experiencing.

Now when you came over and sat down with me while I was drinking my coffee and you said, “I have a question.” Ah! The possibility in this interchange amongst the other events that have been taking place, the possibility in which there is some way we can be of help to each other appears—as a possibility. If I see that there is way of helping you understand something by telling you a story or giving you a picture or an explanation of one of the laws the Law of Three or whatever. Whatever I do, whatever my effort is, if my effort is toward helping you, now I am in the world Abrustdonis. I can possibly be a help into that world.

Now the event will continue. We finish our cup of coffee and we have breakfast and then the day goes on from there. So the stream is going to continue to flow and all kinds of events may come into them. You can't tell when the fish will come, whether it's going to be a truck or a little squiggly thing—whatever—you can't tell. That's up to your fishing of the event, the significance of the event. Does it contain something that has emotional significance in the world of self-other? Does it have something to do with recognizing a need? Is there something that can be done to be helpful? Or, is it a question of what it has to do with understanding the Law of Three or the Enneagram or whatever? It may be more in the arena of understanding. So, whatever degree we try to be helpful, in helping someone understand a particular transition from point 8 to point 5 on the enneagram, then, to the degree that we have made that effort to be helpful to another in understanding, we have a relationship to higher Reason or making an effort in that direction, from our understanding to help someone else along that pathway. That is Helkdonis.

There are an unlimited amount of possibilities in any given day. Many of them have ‘no fish’ in them. Many are just drinking a cup of coffee or going to the bathroom or carrying on a mindless conversation about the fact that my shoe doesn't fit well and it's hurting the outer part of my great toe.

PARTICIPANT: In those examples, there is no connection to Abrustdonis and Helkdonis unless there is awareness of that possibility that appears in some moment that we refer to “waking up.” So would that be corresponding to the sequence of extraction?

KEITH: Yes, exactly.

PARTICIPANT: You talked about the three-finger exercise and I've worked with that. It is kind of like a metaphor in terms of we've got Askokin, Abrustdonis and Helkdonis—these three parts which are together and they have to be separated. My experience of that is working with the three-finger exercise—where you have sensing, feeling and rhythmical counting—usually those three things (sensing, feeling and thought) are mixed together. Working on the exercise, I had the experience of them becoming separate and separated and then there was another part of me which was much more aware and it was kind of like there was some free attention when these three parts were then separated. And then it was like each part carried on the work it had to do. There was some taste of freedom. But that was an experience of three things that are normally together becoming separated.

But there was one other thing I want to thank you for. I've worked on this exercise a fair bit and one thing you said that was really clarifying for me was when I read the part you were quoting from the *Third Series* where Gurdjieff say about the purpose of this exercise is to observe in ourselves the three process of feeling, sensing and thought (with the counting).

It was a realization that my job in this exercise was not to try and produce this feeling or produce sensation or particularly to produce thought but to observe these things in myself. It made me realize that what I had been calling feeling—in your paper you wrote a lot about the mammalian, second brain which is happening all the time and it wasn't about a higher emotion or feeling and that this mammalian feeling brain is working all the time and that exercise it was a question of just me observing my motor center sensing, which is happening all the time—observing the feeling, which is happening all the time (as it is a part of the physical nature) and the rhythmical counting is like a formative kind of process and then realizing that all these things are part of my physical nature and just try to observe them objectively and just sit there and work with the exercise, it allowed part of me to be free and be in this other world, the Higher Emotional center where higher feelings come into it.

Basically, realizing these feelings which are mass-based, part of my mammalian, second-brain but then these higher feelings are totally separate then these, such as love or faith or hope. There is a difference between this mass-based world and this higher world which is our emotional world and that they are completely separate experiences. Before I had always kind of mixed what was happening in the second brain with higher qualities. To just be able to observe the second brain is what the exercise helped me to do. It was really great opportunity to work with it.

KEITH: Right. I hope everybody has that differentiation clearly, which is an important one. We have to get very familiar with our mechanical second brain, with our steady state of mechanical emotion. It is very, very different from Higher Emotion. It is worlds away. It is unfortunate, in the line of life, the words that we use to try to point to these states, at least in English, can be so misleading. They can get us confused and mixed up so the differentiation that you point to is a very, very essential one, one that we should always be alert to. Where am I here [pointing to the solar plexus]?

Mrs. Popoff used to so frequently, as a departing gift, she would say, “May your sun rise.” What she was talking about is that for us, now, we put our sun here [solar plexus]; this is the solar plexus in the belly. May it rise. May it rise over the diaphragm so that your sun is here [center of breast] in the Higher Emotion. She was referring always to this effort that we can make. So this is a great reminder.

PARTICIPANT: I'd like to bring up something that came earlier about our having this organ inside of us that is not like Kundabuffer but can be real I in ourselves. Diana and I were speaking this morning about marching bands and in just speaking about that, what came to me in listening to this discussion, was that all of our little 'Is' are there to become a singular I, to become that organ.

Now, what helped me with that is my own feeling as a separate I, an individual, a potential member of the marching band—all of those little 'Is' within me, everyone doesn't want to be left out. I always wanted to be in the choir; I always wanted to be a part of you, a part of everything existing, and not left out. So all these little 'Is' could they be that which is already in us if we do make conscious use of our attention and not discard them as little 'Is'—not leave Bonnie out of the choir because she wants so much to be a part of it but to direct Bonnie and the others in a way that we do amass and create this organ, this I within us that can unify, that can properly with the help of ENDLESSNESS enter World 48, enter Creation in a way that ENDLESSNESS can no longer do that, only three-brained beings who have the capacity to have Higher Emotion, Higher Intellect and Reason to administer and govern that

which has been created and to do it with Conscience and proper compassion and love for everything existing.

So all of our little 'Is' may be are the substrate of what that organ can become, that we get to become part of the marching band or that stack of blocks or the unity the I can become.

KEITH: This is Bonnie's hopefulness; she is always like this. Yes. A few of my 'Is' are quite able to become Hasnamussian. They are not going to change. They are not going to join the marching band. [laughter]

PARTICIPANT: Only a few, though.

KEITH: You didn't say only a few; you said you were going to get the whole of the marching band. [laughter] But I don't disagree! But I think it is important to qualify, that we are forever going to have to be on our guard.

PARTICIPANT: Or they will start their own marching band. [laughter]

PARTICIPANT: Well the reason that the marching band took this form, is that in speaking with Diana about raising funds for the Golden Rule Project and quite a while ago I became aware that through all the armed services that the Department of Defense gives lots of money to marching bands. I thought well maybe we can get some Golden Rule songs and marching band to be funded.

PARTICIPANT: When I processed overnight our conversations from yesterday, there were a couple questions that came up, one of which the question of the role of Hasein and the future substitute. One theme was that through the whole of *The Tales*, that occur in Beelzebub's experience of exile, eventual pardon and eventual return to the center, it is Beelzebub and Ahoon who are together. In the whole of the recounting of his wisdom and experience with his grandson, that is another time/event that is preceding that now there is a third part and that third part is Hasein. So that raised a question regarding what Beelzebub represents as something that was exiled and returned. It seemed to me that Hasein is obligated by law to return to be Beelzebub's substitute and to process and return because that brings back something that Beelzebub was unable to bring back because that part was not a participant in the whole of that experience.

And then there is another question (which is my on-going fanatic question) is when we say, relative to the independent individuality that in part Beelzebub says that he represents in his accepting of his opportunity offered to him, that he would take this on so he could become a particle, albeit, an independent one. When that was processed yesterday, you taking that and putting it into the DNA and speaking of the independent uniqueness of every individual.

So the question that comes up for me in that, from one perspective, I could look at any unique entity, such as a leaf, I can look at any part that is an independent part of a network whole and I could say that part is independent and that leaf is unique and I can ascribe that to the world of materiality and DNA, yet Beelzebub, as you said in the imagery, is not a physical entity. So whatever it is that Beelzebub represents in the context of that representation is also implanted this question of what is independent individuality in that realm? Is that clear?

KEITH: No. Try again.

PARTICIPANT: If Beelzebub is not a material entity, then for Beelzebub to assert part of his aim in his story is to become an independent part then how does that correspond to ascribing independent individuality to material reality and DNA as you described that yesterday?

KEITH: As far as the DNA is concerned, the independence is a very relative thing. We are talking about the physical form of human beings on the planet Earth and that there is something in each one of those beings that is unique, in spite of all the similarities that they all have tongues and toes and so forth. But with all of that they share, that they hold in common, each of them is, still and all, unique in some way. Not the whole of them—the whole of them is not unique. That is very clear. We would never have children if that were the case. So, no, the uniqueness are a very specific marker of the physical world. The DNA has to do with qualifying our physical attributes, the physical body.

So it almost like there has to be some level of representation of uniqueness in that physical world just as you point out, if you take a leaf off the oak tree, there may be billions and billions of leaves but if you were to extract the DNA you would find that it is all the same and it is quite unique to that tree. I don't know if that's why or not...do all oak trees have the same DNA? I don't know the answer to that. Do you know?

PARTICIPANT: It would be different according to species and then there would be certain tissues within it that are uncommitted to any kind of particular form.

KEITH: But given a specific species?

PARTICIPANT: It would be the same.

KEITH: So, in those terms, the uniqueness would be, like in the human being, we could say that we are special or unique in that sense, but that uniqueness is very singularly highly focused and really doesn't influence 99.9999% of what we do or can do. It simply marks us as being unique in that sense.

If you follow the mitochondrial DNA in the cytoplasm back far enough, theoretically, and several people have done this, you find a common female. There was a single female who is the common ancestor of all of us. Following the mitochondrial DNA in the cytoplasm you can do that kind of thing; you cannot do that following the DNA in the cell nucleus.

PARTICIPANT: So I am still not getting how that would apply to Beelzebub and what he represents as having because that is what he seems to represent in the various ways we have spoken of what he represents.

KEITH: Can we ask ourselves that question? Is there the possibility in Higher Being-body in the individuality that emerges wherein they could say, "I am an independent particle of everything that exists."

PARTICIPANT: Relative to the notion of independent, in DNA, in humans, there is a mathematical infinite combinations, but the independent part that I see is Conscience because it is the part that allows in the moment for our species members to stand up and say, apart from the social pressures, the familial pressures, biological pressures, the impulse to survive, to say this is not right, and in some times in the extremist things, it calls people together. As we say in World War II when people stood up against the rounding up of Jews or the

enslavement of individuals. This isn't right and they died for it. There is something in the freedom of Conscience to stand on the points against everything that we are subject. I wonder if that is not part of this individuality and freedom almost from the physicality of being.

KEITH: My personal opinion is that this is a manifestation that I think we are going to have to mature enough to see. What you just described is not Conscience. That's a concept that is all mixed up with good and evil, that this is evil behavior and I am against it and so on. That is not what Conscience is.

Conscience is that which swallows the *whole* of what is there — the *whole* of what is there. It accepts, impartially, everything. If that is part of the nidus of Conscience, it cannot possibly be this judgment that we come down on and I object to in terms of some awful, terrible behavior that individuals or groups participate in. No, I think we miss the mark. We fall into the concept of modern man. Modern man looks on Conscience just as you described. It is a good and evil thing and Gurdjieff spends a lot of time trying to dissuade us of good and evil—that it is not like that.

PARTICIPANT: Once we have had that experience of seeing all at once, it's really hard to then pick something to be, pick something to do that remains free after the choice to do it and be it. There is a conditioning that happens. And it's kind of nice to sit back in the world of Conscience and see all at once and not have to be any one individual thing but once I've seen and I pick, then I have to suffer the consequences of that choice which is what she was talking about.

KEITH: Yes, the clash. This is Makary when he points the good and to the other end of the stick and then he points to what is in between. And that's the most essential part of that that everybody forgets. That is history, they remember the good and the evil and they forget what he is really pointing to. The Reconciling force is the clash. That is where Conscience lies — there in the clash.

I feel this is an extraordinarily difficult arena to really try and stand in, in terms of my individuality. When I look at some of what is going on in the world today, I am overwhelmed. It buries me in its painfulness and the destructiveness. And what do I do with that? First of all I have to accept that it is real; that it is really happening so all of my agonizing over that or all of my feeling bad about all the things that are happening in Syria or in South America—all of that simply is. And part of the Conscience end of it is to bear that, impartially. I find that struggle is extraordinarily difficult. I fall out of it every day. Over and over I find that part of myself that goes into judgment that goes into feeling so offended that I want to get rid of the whole thing; that I want to object mightily and on and on and on. I keep falling into that, over and over.

And then, I remind myself or hopefully wake up enough so that I see that judgment doesn't take us anywhere. We don't understand any more. We don't feel and well wish for other. What does that mean? *Well-wishing for other is everybody out there*—not just one side of the Syrian war, it is all sides. What does that mean? How do I do that? How do I feel inside? What part of me—is it down here—when I have this self-emotion—this that comes out of my physical nature? Or it is up here where I get very confused because I have feelings that I want to be able to appreciate and really make the underpinning for the world of manifestation but I find I don't understand that manifestation. What am I to do? How am I to do it? For myself, that is just extraordinarily difficult.

So the question of Conscience is a very big one and I think it goes way beyond good and evil.

PARTICIPANT: The hope there are some moments when we can see that, and that stops it even momentarily and then something else has a possibility of emerging within ourselves—another particle can be created within ourselves. That is the hopeful thing in the midst of all this confusion. The minute I can step aside and separate myself, I see something different. And then I will fall into it again but I am not completely captured by it. Something's changed. That is that moment of grace I've transubstantiated something by stepping aside. And there is a moment of grace, really it is impartiality, a brief moment when you embrace, as you said, the whole picture and you are not caught.

I was looking for the discussion of impartiality in *The Tales*, which was in "Purgatory." That has always seemed so important an idea of what really is impartiality if I could really understand these Laws of Three and Seven that could mean that I would see everything; it would all be apparent and there wouldn't be a need for any kind of judgment at all about anything. I would see that lawfulness of all of it. Then I wouldn't be caught and I could transubstantiate Helkdonis and Abrustdonis. [laughs]

KEITH: It is that getting to that impartiality and the understanding of Law.

PARTICIPANT: I have that struggle myself, whether it is global warming or the world's problems and trying to bring Reason into it. Trying to be impartial is having different degrees of Reason but it certainly hurts—not to run away from it but to be aware of what's happening. That degree of impartiality is pretty far away; of being able to see what it is. There must be hope; there must be the possibility that there is someone or there is a group that could somehow be sincere and help to look at that. But as an individual, to hear that news, it is constant. Years ago, when we heard of a mass slaughter, we spoke about falling into this false suffering—that's been helpful. My experience now is to try to bring a deeper Reason.

PARTICIPANT: What has been a help for me in this is the question of looking at this as a representation of the way things are at different levels and there is nothing to do with agreeing or not agreeing. At one level, my solution of all these terrible things is to kill all the people who are doing the terrible things, which makes me one of them. As Keith says, this is just so awful and sad so for me to recognize that this is the way it is, not with everybody but with certain people at certain levels. Those sleeping people who get enough political power and make life miserable for all sorts of other people—that is how it is.

Regarding the groups that counteract these people; Gurdjieff talks about that in *Beelzebub's Tales*. They are good for a while and then they either fall apart because they fight with each other or it turns into its opposite. As long as there is this level of sleeping man engaged in protecting negativity, that is what it is going to be like there.

So then we have to recognize that that is how it is; there is nothing as an individual I can do about that. There is something I can do about that in me. And perhaps ease some of the burden for those who are in contact with me so I don't fall into World 96 in myself. Maybe that is my Work. This is painful for me to have see objectively like that, what must it be like for ENDLESSNESS to see into hearts and minds of all three-brained creatures?

So maybe if I take my small part of that on myself maybe that has something to do with lightening the burden of ENDLESSNESS.

PARTICIPANT: I don't even see it among people. People have taken whatever it is as it is. I see intelligence in the Universe from plants and one-brained beings and two-brained beings with their own intelligence and what we inflict on them. It is not part of their nature to inflict on each other.

PARTICIPANT: I don't mean to imply that people shouldn't get together and try and *ameliorate* that as best they can but that if it could be approached with an attempt to bring a reconciling understanding, it might produce different results that if it is just to go to war with what I don't agree with. But we here, we have got to do something; we might as well do something that feels appropriate to us. But I think reason tells, even when I am engaged in those attempts, I am doing what I can but I don't have great expectations it is going to change the world but maybe a little corner of it could be better for a while and, collectively, over many centuries, I think we have seen a change, certainly in the West, humanism and the rise of individuals and responsibility to the environment so it is not that nothing is happening. I might be a tiny little individual in that larger counter-movement to the lower level of sleep but even much of that is sleep also; it just has different motives.

It is heartbreaking. I think of the words attributed to Buddha on his awakening, "Behold the world is Nirvana; it is also monstrous suffering." We have to hold both of those. It will break the heart but it breaks the heart open. It releases compassion, "Forgive them, Father, they know not what they do." But they are still doing it.

PARTICIPANT: I sense that there is something that we can do. Part of the myth is to reconcile ourselves to that horrendousness. And yet, in my small world, for example, I could take Hurricane Katrina and, in the life of the Earth, we could see that as a horrendous experience but it really isn't anything horrendous about it; it really is quite normal, like a volcano, like St Helens, is a normal event in the life of the Earth. We make it something horrible—not to discount the fact that there is immense suffering, undeniable but that is part of what we enter into. There is nothing bad or good about that; it is just what it is.

But those emotions that get unleashed, it would seem that my reaction to that could be, at a certain level maybe the emotions are the same, and to the degree that I can change my response to that event, it almost seems like I have the potential to change everything in that world—not tomorrow but it significant in terms of what we can do. It may never be in my experience to experience the horror of war but, at a level of emotional energy; I can be in a point within myself where that same emotional energy could be transformed.

KEITH: Does this bear on the issue of personal and group? Is there something that Gurdjieff groups, as a point, but other groups as well? Is there something in common here? Is there something that can only be done by groups? Is there something that can only be done by individuals? Are they similar? Are they the same things? What is it that we, as individuals, bring in our own daily life as an individual, as an I? And what do we bring as a member of a group? What does that group bring relative to these gargantuan issues, these great problems? Do you see a distinct difference there—difference between the individual and the group? How do you see that in your own world, because we come from lots of different worlds? Some of us are quite solitary, quite separated from any other Gurdjieff group work; some of us are very intimately involved on a daily, weekly basis with Gurdjieff group work. Some of us live in or are closely associated with communities of work people and some of us are totally separate and on our own. How does this apply to all of that relative to

our responsibility? What is it that we are engaged in that we share with others as individuals, as groups?

PARTICIPANT: I have two examples that are dangerously close to real life. It has only been individuals that have made significant impacts on humanity; for example, the founders of the religions. In other arenas it would be people with vision in technology. These people have been galvanizing forces. We could point to other things that are happening today that have been galvanizing forces for at attempt at conscientious examination.

But on the other hand there are things that groups have done, such as building the cathedrals where it was not possible for one person to build a cathedral. So it seems like there are things that surely there were galvanizing forces that could get enough people to work for a long enough time to create some monument like that in some school like that, but perhaps there are different applications that are more suitable to groups and more suitable to individuals.

KEITH: Bennett put great emphasis on the communities.