

22 23 X XX

①

9 24a 27

If we had really good eyes ^{we} would be able to magnify & diminish what we see. We are very limited in space-scale but seldom realise how this narrows down our world-view.

Ideally, you should be able to see me as man, or as cells, or as molecules, or as in Man, as in life as in Earth, as in Sun, - at will.

Ideally, you should be able to see my insides also.

Ideally, you should be able to enlarge or diminish any part of the world at will, leaving the rest at 'normal' size. E.g. looking at semen. (over

Or seeing your enemy, dispassionately, as 3" high.
Smiling the size of what you owe to its importance
to you. This will probably come. Big snowcrystals

But unless you can, in imagination or in
fact, see things thus completely, in all their
spatial gamut, & internally as well as externally
in X ray fashion, & in time too, you do not
really see them.

Imagination, & the growth of science, & mysticism
overcome the limitations of the untrained senses
in their different ways. You see abstractly -
not truly. Amazing how we don't realise that we
don't see an object but only selections from it.

(2)

Telescopic-microscopic Sight When men are fitted with such eyes the Conquest of Space will have reached another stage. It will mean that man can adopt perspectives proper to his sub & super-selves to a greater extent than at present. And in the rapid change from ^{super-}sub- through human, to ^{super-}super-perspective we will be following the process of Real Experience.

At present we universalise space in Soc, thus affording the basis of Society's spaceliveness at do-own level. But the path of your evolution is level-exploration, the discovery of verticality.

Thus you must learn to adopt the private
sub-social perspective of shrinking space in
Soc. And you must learn to see the planets
more or less as Earth sees them, in correlated
perspective. That is, you must sink from
your level & rise from it, self-consciousness
& other-consciousness being correlative.

9 16 21 22 23 24 25 26
Objectification ① The world is God's objectification of himself.

② All God's richness is implicit at the centre, but it is not explicit because it is (metaphorically speaking) divided infinitely. Paradoxically, then, the centre, though potentially of infinite richness is actually empty, a void, or nothing. Only by bringing out its richness in what we call integration is the fulness of the God-head revealed - at the circumference. This is Objectification. Note that the Centre is, on this showing, logically (not temporally, of course) prior to the circumference.

③ We selves, aspects of the Self at the Centre, participate in this exfoliation, this expression of the Self. We objectify ourselves.

④ Yet there is much that we appear to have no control over, that is even contrary to what we would objectify. How is this? Much is contrary to your self; none to your Self. The world is a challenge to you to make it your own, to recognise in it your Creation. We must overcome the world by including it. Tell me how much of the world you call yourself & I will tell you how much of the Self you have realised. We realise the Self not at the Centre but by absorbing the Self's world.

Objectification ⑤ But, as the other side to the Objectification process, there is the opposite process, the "Dis-objectification." At the circumstance God is actually all that at the center he contemplates as Himself. At the circumstance God enjoys the fullness of Godhead, just as you enjoy what it is to be a man. But he, like you also are conscious of what you are. Now to become so conscious you must shed yourself. You must deny yourself to be yourself. You must pare away every layer of your being till you come to the bare Subject that is absolutely simple &

without any richness, any quality save nakedness.

This is the descent of God ↓

⑥ The degree of your self-consciousness is the degree to which you can hold yourself at arm's length. You get rid of yourself to experience re-union. The world is only alien that you may have the thrill of discovering that it is nothing of the kind.

⑦ We re-discover ourselves in what we take to be our world. And it is essential that we should at first feel the world to be alien. The more alien it is, the greater the thrill of reunion. Thus the feeling of the world's opposition is essential to God's purpose.

Objectification Thus it is not the man who always was at home in the world, always happily harmonious, always James' healthy-minded type, who becomes the profoundest mystic or seer. Your feeling of the world's otherness is part of the process in which God dissociates himself from his glory & comes down to nothingness.

⑧ Growth is the opposite process - of rebuilding yourself. You first project tentatively an aspect of yourself in the form of a plan of action $\uparrow$, which, by virtue of your again becoming as nothing $\downarrow$ you

natural ↑.

⑨ Note how the two processes of embracing the world ↓ & denying it ↓ are essential to all being. To find yourself ↑ you must deny yourself ↓. To have anything to deny you must first have found yourself.

X
 9 16 20 21
The Office: & Science's failure to learn from it. Men of
 Science try to find out how an amoeba, or a molecule,
 or an atom, works, how they are organised.
 Astonishing that, (since admittedly the problem is to
 unravel organisation, & organisation is universal &
 presumably subject to universal laws) they don't
 study organisation first of all where it is an open
 book. Organisation - the very notion of it - is obtained
 from human society, from social relationships, from
 our activity in society. We get the idea from society
 in a rough & vague way & try to apply it to

other fields. We should study organisation at what is for us its source, & when we can really experience it at first hand.

Take an Army. You can study Army organisation for it is laid bare to you. You can even serve in the Army & know what it is to organise what is before you, & what it is to participate in the bigger organisation to which you belong.

A biologist can't get a job in an amoeba, nor a physicist ^{get} into an atom's shoes. But there is no organisation from G H Q to the smallest company, no function from grand strategy to barrack square drill, that we cannot follow in every detail.

The Office It may be argued that it is wrong to assume that social organisation is like any other sort, & to argue from analogy. But the answer is that ^{the} organisation we seek in other fields is necessarily based on that analogy with ^{the} social field. Let us start from what we know, while being careful to look out for differences.

The inability to consciously use our experience in Society (we always do unconsciously but that isn't enough) is due to the quite unscientific beliefs that social affairs are "artificial", arbitrary, un-natural. Men don't yet realise that the world & its laws are

of a piece, indivisible, & that (while avoiding the
pitfalls of analogy) we are justified in accepting
the light that shines from the relatively known
on to the relatively unknown.

X
9 22 23

Your appreciation of Curly Alice's vision.

You see your dog. You don't say: here comes a community of cells, or here comes a member of the Species or Genus Canis. But the reason is not to be found in your dog, but in you, in your level of development. Your dog is a sun-organ, an earth-organ, a particle of life, a living of its species, a cell-community, a cloud of molecules, & so forth. But to us only the dog qua dog is real: the rest an vague ideas. It follows that you see the merest fragment of what 'your dog' really is. The world you see is

unreal because you cannot see with depth of focus.

The dog belongs at all levels of the aura. The material of the aura becomes Real only when it is seen as in all rings of the aura. Any object ~~thing~~ has an aspect in every ring of your aura: its reality is all its aspects, in every ring.

The Division & Reunion of the Self ① Our picture of the world in its essentials is very simple indeed: a picture of a stream that divides, & unites further on. There is but one Self, which has divided, yet is still One. It is One in three aspects:



(a) It is One when the stream divides (A) & (b) when the stream unites. It is also One at (C) because then each stream is utterly dependent for its content on the external aspects of the others. Though the streams seem to be separate, & in opposition to one another, they are still dependent on one another for their existence.

② Quoting Socrates' famous doctrine of the origin of the sexes from the Symposium. This doctrine is true of all selves. Every monad is your 'other half' from whom you have been parted & whom you will join again. All experience is a longing with this rejoining tendency.

③ For note that all relationship between monads, though apparently at C, though seemingly external & through windows, is really through A & B, through the one Self which is common to all monads.

④ The question remains: why was it necessary for the Self to divide, if the experience at C is really from A. Is the division merely an illusion, if all the pregnancy derived from it really belongs to the one?