

# Debriefing Gurdjieffianity

*Struggles  
Of the Black Magicians*

**John Landon**

© Copyright 2016

John C. Landon

Published by South Fork Books

Montauk, NY

Printed in the United States of America

Cover: Wikimedia Commons: Public domain, 19<sup>th</sup> century: *Anonym, deutsch, 19. Jh.: Angler an einem Wildbach. Öl auf Leinwand.*

# Table of Contents

Preface

In a Moscow Cafe

Introduction

1. Ouspensky and Gurdjieff

1.1 Meetings with a Remarkable Rogue

1.2 Revolution and Reaction

1.3 A Falling Out

1.4 A Great Work

1.5 Seekers and Suckers

2. Fascist Buddhas, Rogue Sufis

2.1 Sufistic Sagas

2.2 Blavatskian Times

2.3 The Lies of Esotericism

2.4 Great Chains of Non-being

2.5 A Fascist Gallery

3. Beyond Fourth Way Hype

3.1 Axial Ages, New Ages

3.2 What is Enlightenment?

3.3 Hermetic Flotsam

3.4 A New Age Begins

3.5 The Great Freedom Sutra

Conclusion

Appendix 1

Appendix 2

## Preface

This short work on the world of Gurdjieff and Ouspensky is an attempt to clarify some of the confusion created by a movement at the source of much so-called New Age activity, but with a very confused outcome on its own terms. This book is written under a reign of terror of the 'ghost', his gang, the larger sphere of gurus, and the authoritarian crypto-fascist world of these spiritual reactionaries. This book could have been better, and was created in a context of considerable occult flack. A disguised reign of terror is the case here, although the daring to defy this can teach you something. Be alert, without fear, to continue this debriefing. Do NOT surrender your will to such people. If you have, learn to exit this world. A century of these people has not produced anything of much value.

Too many New Age figures are invading modernity and attempting to undermine it, but the modern world springs from a far higher source than the archaic lore of these Sufis and gurus. The reality of the New Age movements is that they belong to a earlier age. There is to be sure a valid meta-epochal stream of perennial wisdom. But it is too often the source of retrograde cultism. The fascist strain in the modern New Age movement is strong but not often visible. It moves via one venue through the dictatorship of gurus, Sufis, and other authoritarian anti-modernists. Much 'New Age' guruism conspired to make the authority of gurus absolute, and this is a *de facto* political gesture. We need to sound the warning against the attack on human freedom and the subjection of man to occult spiritual powers. The end of the nineteenth century saw a mysterious occult operation, with figures like Gurdjieff, Blavatsky, Crowley, Heidegger, in suspicious concert with a phase of fascism. Our warnings are not idle. Gurdjieff wasn't even clear on the subject of slavery and is on record that surrender implies consent to being a willing slave. The whole game is an impostor in the modern world.

The secular is totally misunderstood by such figures and the current idiocy over a new 'New Age' of Aquarius is one token of the misunderstandings here. The secular is nature's ticking clock moving into a new era of world history. It is as sacred as religion and has its own weak protection. But the safe crackers are busy. The secular world is condemned to start over and learn the hard way, or else play to Faust to Mephistos like Gurdjieff. Man can find his true nature working alone, and that is the modern path by default. Look carefully at the initiative of Ouspensky and Gurdjieff: this is an attempt by reactionaries to attack modernity. Ouspensky actually wrote about promoting the ancient law of caste. This is preposterous. Such stupidities show that the ancient paths have become derelicts. Gullible students think this is some kind of esoteric wisdom. It is almost beyond belief. Gurdjieff exposed the problem, suggestibility, and then exploited it without mercy. He is as dangerous dead as alive. The real truth is that in a cycle of epochs, each of which must start over, an 'eternal wisdom', or 'santana dharma' must reappear to help man recover his legacy. But the true path appears beyond time, not so easily via the temporal stream of decaying traditions. India shows strong evidence of such a trans-epochal process, and we actually see the two counterpoints in Axial Age Buddhism, and the parallel stream of Hindu temporal remnants. This may go back to the Neolithic. India thus saw at least one, and probably three trans-epochal shifts. That's a warning the old and the new are not the same, and the New Age movement is mostly a travelling graveyard of the old. These gurus now are very frustrated because they can't graft anything onto modernity. The clutter of these layers is a drag on all the cultures into which these remains are deposited.

The legacy of religion has become so confused that secular culture has simply abandoned all of it. It is a healing process, but it has been replaced with scientism, hence the vulnerability to gnostic 'big shots'. There is no reason why secular man can't do it this way, bootstrapping via the secular: there are two issues: his consciousness and the cosmic question of god and/or nature. Beyond that the issue of soul, the legacy of man that is metaphysically unknowable, yet present in man. This obscurity leaves man vulnerable. But these can be pursued without the ministrations of gangster Sufis. Man's spectrum of states of consciousness appeared at the

dawn of the emergence of *homo sapiens*. The attempted monopoly by gurus, gnostics, and their variants has distorted what should be man's natural condition. We must be suspicious these shadowy figures have found a way to mine the rich energies of consciousness in that profitable creature called man. These issues are complex but the Sufi world of Gurdjieff has not clarified anything, and has flooded the whole new age scene with a complex of distortions and lies. Keeping man asleep by preaching his awakening is either a path or an invaluable racket. Man is asleep because his heritage has been confiscated by spiritual corporations.

Many seekers, especially the few trusties, and celebrity book writers, who interact with this legacy, are misinformed and those who find out exit too terrified to speak out. The 'dead' are not always dead, and don't like books debunking them, and take note of bad reviews at Amazon. A bit of self-awareness is the best defense, and the best introduction to the occult shadow world. Writing this book was closer to guerilla warfare, and not just against G, but the whole of the rogue Sufi mafia.

Debating mysticism is not the point: our purpose here is to be wary of spiritual intimidation, surrender and incorrect valuation of hypnotic figures. We can offer the disclaimer that this book could be 'wrong', that Gurdjieff had a great teaching, and that this might be of great importance. But Gurdjieff himself offered a warning, to call himself a devil by name. We must be wary of the evils that such men do. Essence plunder is the big payoff leading to elaborate gnostic cons.

The problem is that we cannot see what this secret teaching really is, that what we have is riddled with disinfo and outright stupidities, that it exploits suggestibility in the name of resolving it, that in the succession we can find no exemplars except those who realized using a different teaching and bluffed their way into Gurdjieffianity because ISOM attracts suckers in droves, and that the author himself of this stampede called the teacher a criminal, and warned his own students to stay away from him. Finally, a spiritual outfit of spiritual cannibals has a hidden scandal, diminishing body count. X enter, X minus exit.

The question of Sufism in the context of Gurdjieff, Indic and monotheistic religions provokes a crisis of correct understanding obscured by esoteric mystifications. The right understanding of Sufism is hard to come by. A book such as *People of the Secret* stumbles into some insights, but is larded with dubious information. The author connects Gurdjieff to a specific Sufi school, yet that figure never divulged the truth. Why on earth not? And the suspicion is he went into business for himself. Our discussions (in *Darwiniana* and *The Gurdjieff Con* blogs) of the 'Sufi soul process' are confirmed in *People of the Secret*. Gurdjieff either did not know or never divulged this knowledge to his followers. His entire teaching is a crippled shunt line to 'Sufism', itself a confusing medley of mystical Islam and the mysterious world of the Kwajagan, with strange echoes of Buddhism. Don't be tempted by Sufi con men.

Note: The Sufi Soul process: this reference is totally obscure for most readers. This document is perhaps the first in the English to speak of this in public. Consider the further discussions at *The Gurdjieff Con blog*. Even most Sufi groups are unaware of this hidden realm.

We must of course leave open the possibility of presentation of honest facts about Sufism, and its history. But the reign of disinfo makes that unlikely. In the same way Gurdjieff's claims about special exercises that can unlock various centers is not to be rejected out of hand. But no case of successful use of these exists in the literature. It is all come-on.

Sufism has a special secret about soul formation, but the Gurdjieff world remains oblivious to this, created a purely mechanical school going nowhere.

This book is also a warning to be wary of the commitment to an unknown that stalks allegiance in this venture of Gurdjieff, given all the appearances of what is called the left-hand path. The classic terminology is

'bait and switch'. And Gurdjieff is followed by highly ambiguous later claimants (mostly fast talkers) and there is E. J. Gold who has never presented any account of his training, contacts, and has offered no proof of any connection with Gurdjieff. His manner of mixing Crowley and Sufism/Gurdjieff is a warning to be wary. In that context, the current spread of Crowleyanity (sic) is corrupted the morals of seekers and the use of ritual sacrifice, black magic and other depravities is becoming a new norm. Crowley preaches 'do what thou wilt', so 'will' to be intelligent and don't trust these successors to Gurdjieff. Some of these figures are notorious for mindfuck, black magic, involution, and experimentation. Spiritual surrender is an ancient legacy of benign gurus, but is not appropriate in the modern marketplace culture where the standards of murder in spy films becomes the cachet of the esoteric. You can get into dreadful states with these peoples. They can also snare victims via short term 'school' workshops, leaving the real mischief to long after departure from the milieu. Methods of mind control are a critical danger and 'telepathic control' of the unconscious via 'spiritual surrender' is the most serious risk run by naive 'I will sign up now, absolute surrender? No problem' seekers. The world of Sufis in the Islamic countries is an unknown, but on the basis of the ISOM derivatives we can conclude little, and should trust less.

We should state the message of this book at the start: be wary of this realm of dangerous gnostics. The exploitation of Ouspensky to create a ready supply of trusting applicants to a 'school' environment is an abuse of right integrity. Ouspensky was suspicious from the start, but the late publication of his *In Search of the Miraculous* (ISOM) created a movement beyond his control and original criticisms. These gurus want you to surrender your freedom, your gift from modernity. Once you do, you may not get it back, waking up (or failing to) in a future life programmed as a zombie for that figure. It is a terrible hidden reality.

Gurdjieff uses the talk of 'esoteric Christianity' to transfer the authority of the Christological figure to his aberrant movement. You are under no spiritual obligation to submit to this cult in the name of the Christian legacy, which consistently banned gnostics plying occult methods. The exact understanding of Christianity is itself very difficult, but now the implied existence of fourth way esoteric Christianity is corrupting the whole tradition. It is true that Christianity lacked spiritual methods, but in retrospect its tactics were important in a field of what look like early versions of Gurdjieff. And the whole claim for esoteric Christianity is bogus. Was Jesus a crooked magician like Gurdjieff? The whole game is going to cause Christianity to crash.

This movement is unique in being highly promoted by the classic bestseller of a disciple who came into conflict with the guru. The resulting confusion has never been resolved. Ouspensky's decision to publish ISOM turned 'Gurdjieffianity' into an incoherent but global movement with all sorts of people trying to play successor, and using the goldmine of Ouspensky to create illusory versions of schools. The break with Gurdjieff by Ouspensky should demand some hard questions, but the result instead is the endless criticism of Ouspensky for not 'surrendering to the guru'. The reality is that he blew the whistle on something that had 'embraced the dark side' behind the cover of a spurious set of ancient doctrines. The use of ISOM and Gurdjieff as a front for Crowley black magic is a deadly deception. The only protection is to be wary of any and all Ouspensky/Gurdjieff derivatives: a rule of thumb: Gurdjieffianity was an occultist but not a spiritual teacher. All his derivatives are blanket suspicion until proven otherwise.

Whole books have been written on this idiocy: W. P. Patterson in *Struggle of The Magicians: Why Uspenskii left Gurdjieff* (Arete Communications, 1996) devotes a whole book to the question. Ouspensky thought Gurdjieff a criminal and said so, thus it is not surprising from an honest man. The question of searching for the 'miraculous' is Faustian, not spiritual, and we should wonder if this wasn't the right decision! But many issues enter here. Patterson is completely ignorant about Ouspensky who was discarded by Gurdjieff. It is futile to berate him here. His output, ISOM, was a priceless asset falling into the lap of the Gurdjieff sufis. But only if Ouspensky could be eliminated.

Shri Anirvan in *To Live Within* delivers a false comparison of Gurdjieff to the Indian guru phenomenon, and creates the usual false Nietzschean comparison to the Overman entitled to smash the uppity disciple. It is all dangerous nonsense, and has let borderline criminals come close to taking over Christianity.

The model of master and disciple has been undermined by the modern emergence of freedom, and this has even implicated Christianity since the Reformation. The abolitionists and Quakers joined the revolutionary movements of freedom while new age figures are counter-revolutionary anti-modernists with fascist innuendoes. J.G. Bennett discloses his suspicion that Gurdjieff supported the institution of slavery and his appearance in the wake of abolitionism is probably no accident.

Later students exploit the disciple's work without realizing a brilliant thinker was exploited to promote in whitewashed terms an ambiguous so-called spiritual path called the 'work'. The core teaching in *All and Everything* was so obscure that attention always reverted back to ISOM, a book self-declared as a set of fragments, from an unknown teaching. That has remained the status of the work from the start: confused seekers with incomplete remnants of a lost teaching. The term 'work' has never been clarified, although many have already been misled by it, Quijote-style. The strategy of exploiting an honest man as a front for shady activities has a long history, but Ouspensky soon smelled a rat.

Gurdjieff insisted that the ordinary seeker needs help. He certainly needs help in dealing with the debriefing of the 'teaching' of a figure as tricky as Gurdjieff. The idea that man needs help is like the claim he needs to pay \$100 an hour for psychoanalysis. The 'path' starts with careful study and extreme caution in the company of known occultists. Most major success stories, like Osho Rajneesh, avoided gurus entirely, the measure of success. Gaining correct information, and thus a starting point, is almost impossible. The effect of Ouspensky on many readers is so overwhelming they are ready to sell their souls for access to a 'school'. The results are psychologically destructive for many, because the whole concept of a 'school' is misleadingly presented: no historical examples are given that can be documented, and the whole tends to become muddled with Egyptian esoterica, Christian gnostic echoes, and modern occultism. The confusion is thus the same as those for all such streams of 'hidden knowledge' such as Rosicrucianism and Freemasonry, suspected of analog 'Sufi' lineages. A basic reality: the occult is almost always a kind of toxic sludge. Real spirituality is much simpler. Ordinary seekers in the West are not prepared for the 'Big Devils' associated with Sufism, modern occultism, and the gnostic legacy. The term refers to those who claim esoteric justification for the 'ethics light' that animates the Overman pretensions of amateur Nietzscheans. No true fourth way school of the type described by Gurdjieff has ever been documented. The few cases claimed, such as the circle around Jesus, don't fit that category. There is a mystery around Jesus, and his association in a triad of three prophets is an enigma, but it is not evidence of a fourth way school. The sense of this being a type of Sufi school, whatever the history of the latter, is common, but Gurdjieff at best provided a misleading version of such schools, themselves too often victims of the same syndrome of insufficient information.

There is a genuinely 'esoteric' or hidden teaching of 'soul development' associated with Sufism, but this 'soul path', as one of the remarkable mysteries of historical Sufism, seems to be absent in the Gurdjieff work, which is a pastiche of some very strange elements. As far as we can tell Gurdjieff had no knowledge of this tradition, despite speaking of the creation of souls. But this legacy remained a muddle by its assumptions about reincarnation. His students, in any case, never learned of the nature of classic Sufism. After all the fancy talk, the Gurdjieff work is a dud. Compare the standard *Dharmic*/buddhist methods and groups: they clarify what they are doing and do not indulge in distorted 'exoteric' lies.

Information on many subjects has been revolutionized by the onset of the Internet, which took many 'spiritual' teachers by surprise, since it made the expose of hidden behaviors public for the first time. Many interactions of students and teachers in this sphere were based on the assumption the 'disciple' could never

make known what had happened to him. There is a further dimension to this: the future fate of disciples in subsequent rebirths, if any. Few understood the dangers they confronted with rogue occultists.

This initiative thus began with the onset of the blog, *The Gurdjieff Con*, in 2008, close to the onset of the Internet itself (earlier material had appeared in the 1990's) along with a text at [eonic-effect.net/gmancon.htm](http://eonic-effect.net/gmancon.htm), a short online book, *Gurdjieffianity: Struggle of the Black Magicians*, in 2008, the source of this book, whose intent was to briefly introduce the blog and expose the shadowy side of that episode of 'faux Sufism' and to demand more generally some reckoning of the combination of occultism and authoritarian spirituality so strangely self-branded as demonic in Gurdjieff's legerdemain of biography, that of 'Beelzebub'. This short net-book is essentially reproduced in Chapters 1-3 here. This blog was the result of the author's long history of negative encounter with the various groups claiming to represent a profound esoteric teaching. This situation was complicated by the independent appropriation of the Gurdjieff legacy by the figure E.J. Gold whose background was never clear, and whose 'school' was simply an ad hoc cult of the new age type. These encounters were a warning that 'Sufis' and occultists are often not good people and must be suspected of shadow activities of the worst kind. Sufis rarely announce themselves in public and their private activity often includes low life activity from pornography to petty crime. Thousands of sincere seekers wander through Sufism while the big time operators dose Baraka to hoodlums and low-lives, a recent case being the founder of the San Francisco Ball. Do hoodlums and pornographers make better Sufis? The mere question should be shock treatment for the Sunday School seekers eager to sell themselves for esoteric knowledge.

This net-book, [eonic-effect.net/gmancom.htm](http://eonic-effect.net/gmancom.htm), as noted, is reproduced here with some notes, with a great deal of added material, along with a selection of posts from the blog in the Appendix.

The reality of the Gurdjieff legacy instead has been nefarious occult practices, and beyond that a teaching that has no real grounding in a practical method,, a great deal of distracting mythology about 'ancient teachings', and a failure to produce any exemplars.

The question of the Gurdjieff work is controversial and points to the dangers in the interaction of gurus and disciples and this is especially true of the world of Sufism and its 'sheiks'. One of the most confusing aspects of this legacy is the way it has undermined trust and confidence in the Christian tradition by those who think nothing of mixing occult issues into the 'congregation' of unsuspecting believers in a manner that has always been challenged by that religion. The evidence of the Gospels does indeed point to a figure who can perform miracles, and it would be unfair to see such figures in terms of a kind of Buddhist saintliness. The nature of the Christological mystery remains unknown, but the spurious addenda to tradition by rogue Sufism is something that bodes ill for the integrity of Christian doctrine. The miraculous is completely overhyped. Rank amateurs in sprees of pointed meditation offer generate the miraculous, and would do well to pass on and let the miraculous leave them suspicious of false coin.

We are justified in a critical stance. Figures like Gurdjieff tried to make traditional authority a modern implant, next to many new age gurus with similar ambitions. This would deprive us of our right to critique in the name of some unknown authority.

The legacy of figures like Gurdjieff bids fair to undermine the entire Christian legacy as a religious communion: the claims for an 'esoteric Christianity' in which a disciple is subject to authority to figures of suspect integrity in a milieu closer to a covert agency of spies than a church are a bogus and toxic brand of the Gnosticism that was always so controversial in the context of early Christianity. But the ambiguity was always there with Christianity with its symbolism of sheep.

But in the final analysis the judgment of Gurdjieff is simply that his thinking in public and book format is incomplete and almost unusable, next to a series of historical claims that are hard to verify. Overall the claims for the 'fourth way' school, despite their romantic charm, are inconsistent and under suspicion almost inevitably

of referring to unicorns. To imply that this putative category stands beyond the known categories such as the 'Sangha' of Buddhism is misleading, if not propagandistic. We cannot easily challenge what hasn't been defined, only pointed to, and the legacy here is filled with references to entities that somehow classified information that the seeker must accept on faith. A record of untruthful discourse in this context should be immediate grounds for suspicion.

Nonetheless, the Gurdjieff legacy does issue a warning that the history of religion is not entirely in the public domain, and that the mechanization of thought visible in many religious organizations suggests the decline from an original where the source materials were less codified. It might remind us of the *de facto* reality of Tibetan political esotericism and the difficult to study world of Sufism in the world of Islam. The generations since Gurdjieff (and Blavatsky) have shown almost no public clarification of the realm introduced by Ouspensky, while the legacy of Buddhism, by contrast, has grown and thrived for a community that knows what is dealing with, or so it seems. But Buddhists themselves are now accused of being esoteric fascists, so the whole game is threatened all around. This is almost inevitable in a new era dawning, modernity. The ancient ways disintegrated. Look at the religions of the Sumerian wake in the millennia before the Axial Age. Where are they now? They vanished in the wrath of the Old Testament prophets. A 'New Age' had dawned.

But in some sense we should acknowledge that the history of spiritual subjects is misleading at best and there is much that we don't know about the emergence of spiritual belief, method and association. The nature of Egyptian religion, for example, is difficult to assess, and has spawned a literature of very poor quality. And this in turn has made the history of Christianity difficult to get straight. The growing antagonism to gnostics resulted in the complete elimination of this realm from the Constantinian orthodoxy and we might well endorse any attempt to restore an accurate history here. But the result too often is the endless rehash of poor quality 'New Age' themes corrupted by the low standard of honesty created by the assumptions of esoteric legerdemain and the outright lying closer to the world of the Machiavellian politician or covert agent than that of a religious community.

The whole subject of Gurdjieff in any case has gestated long enough to demonstrate to most that they have no real connection with this gypsy circus and that they should be ready to move on. But the legacy as is has trapped many in a kind of indeterminate cultic fixation. The confusion of public knowledge and the expense and logistics of finding some closure with fragmented advertisements for the superior knowledge of a self-proclaimed 'devil' suggests the need for a time limit: time to move on. There are many such obscurantist derelicts of occult and esoteric littering the history of religion and culture, from the Count St. Germain, to Cagliostro, to the Freemasons, and, lest we forget, the *Illuminati*. The question of esotericism, we should grant, won't go away, and the place of the Rosicrucian tradition, for example, in the early modern remains a serious research subject. There is, beside the faux Sufism of Gurdjieff, the related incomplete corpus produced by the strange figure Aleister Crowley, and the proliferation of his incomplete and crypto-Faustian mess of pottage is becoming a serious challenge to simple exoteric sanity.

This book recommends the study of world history in *World History and the Eonic Effect* (Appendix 1): the majestic dynamism of world history is never manipulated by occultists, gurus, and the like. It has a mechanism that is completely different. All of the claims about the *Illuminati* are entirely misleading and overhyped.

Here we have a very considerable ally: the man who more than any other created the whole movement: Ouspensky, who very soon after contacting Gurdjieff both enthusiastically endorsed the core legacy and moved quickly to distance himself from a figure he called in private a criminal. This paradox has left the whole field a muddle. In the wake of the Gurdjieff generation a whole series of clarifications has emerged and the New Age movement has seen a considerable presentation of the tradition of Sufism, without much real clarification of the Gurdjieff legacy. The Tibetan angle and the supposed source of the notorious 'enneagram' in the discovery of

the many Sufi schools and traditions has left the Gurdjieff lore only marginally clarified. It was the warning of both Gautama Buddha and the philosopher Kant to be wary of metaphysical limits and the facile claims for esoteric wisdom have over and over again violated the standards of real knowledge in the name of some special lost wisdom.

We should try to reduce these forests of confusion to the simple point they were intended to make. We don't have to adopt total skepticism here: we cannot refute what we don't have in front of us beyond an obscure reference to something men long ago believed. But just here Gurdjieff is right in some sense: his claim that much knowledge has been lost as for example that the realm of 'pre-sand' Egypt had a lost early form of 'Christianity' actually seems plausible taken as heuristic: we fail to see that the Neolithic is the real source of much of what comes later and it might well be true that this era subject to clarification could relieve our ignorance of the sources of our beliefs. But the false claims of what these teachings really were is less than helpful. Simple skepticism will leave us as before with our ignorance wary of the supply and demand factor proposing to relieve our distress. The claim for ancient knowledge is in many ways trivial, and in the case of Gurdjieff most of his claims are wrong.

In the end an expose may succeed or fail, but there remains the need to issue the simplest of judgments: be wary of dishonest promotions of esoteric subjects, and do not be suffered to believe spiritual authoritarianism is a duty to demons in human form. The issues here, as depicted by Ouspensky, are not so off the mark: the forms of meditation in action are elegantly depicted by that reporter/journalist, and made a useful contribution to the New Age rediscovery of spiritual methods. But the context in which they emerge makes the whole result something far short of the standard of the classic sutras. Perhaps Gurdjieff and Blavatsky were inevitable as a classic phase of the globalization period encountering the complexity of world religion. We can let this stand with a wave of the historian's hand, if we can be clear to try and rescue the many victims of psychopathic occultists.

## In a Moscow Cafe

Ouspensky's *In Search of the Miraculous* is the standard, now classic, description of the author's encounter with the figure Gurdjieff. Let us note that in the final analysis Ouspensky is performing an act of journalism, not, as such, a description of a spiritual path. It is hardly inappropriate to challenge this point, but the general tenor of Ouspensky's account, concluding with an ambiguous suggestion of a parting of ways, is descriptive and historical, against the remarkable backdrop of the Russian revolution. Ouspensky promptly distances himself at the end of this work.

Ouspensky's ISOM is one of the most successful promotions of a spiritual subject in the literature of the modern New Age movement. It is therefore a near tragedy that its author was swiftly sidelined, accused of non-surrender even as he was excluded from the veiled aspect of Gurdjieff's activities. Gurdjieff had a habit of Svengali treatment of intellectuals able to promote his teachings and the restriction of these intellectuals to the exoteric advertising department was one of the key weaknesses, in the end, of the whole teaching.

The opening of ISOM raises the issue of the spiritual search, abroad, and at home. And it makes the point that Ouspensky's searches in India and Ceylon were somehow doomed and that what he sought was to be found close at hand, 'at home'. Since this is a frequent refrain of later Sufi writers like Idries Shah we should suspect this was somehow a ploy on the part of Gurdjieff to refocus attention on some broader than the 'generalized Buddhism' that focuses on India and the terrain of Buddhism.

But in retrospect this is misleading. Surveying the past generation of the accelerating New Age proliferations, we can see that the spiritualities of India and Buddhism have proven far more fertile in their success with students. If Ouspensky had stayed in India he might have been an enlightened sage by now, instead of the fruitless wild goose chase of the 'work' and troubled rebirth with nothing gained. And there are many examples even in Ouspensky's generation, such as the early students of Ramana Maharsi, who became realized men forthwith. So the emphasis of Gurdjieff on some rule of 'spirituality' at home is misleading. No doubt it is true that hidden sages lurk in many places, but esoteric obscurity is not a recommendation for confused seekers. The clarity of Buddhism, for example, is far more constructive. And it is not loaded with the misleading innuendoes of Faust receiving spiritual instructions and powers from Mephistopheles. This factor is very much a part of the world of Gurdjieff.

Ouspensky's 'search for the miraculous' was in many ways the flawed reasoning behind his failure to achieve spiritual realization. It is a good cover term for the kind of hidden Sufi brands of spirituality, but it is a very narrow vision, too close to mere occultism, that seeks out the miraculous. No doubt this is a preoccupation of Christians struggling with the New Testament and its focus on miracles. In the end, however, it is a good token of what Ouspensky came across, the rare 'paths of the will' that stand so obscurely behind outer Sufism, and which renounced in the 'paths of being' of the great paths of yoga and Buddhism. So perhaps Ouspensky's starting idea was not so far off: he was to enter the strangely ominous world of shadow Sufis with their demonic cast. But the miraculous is the wrong thing to aim at. It appears unexpectedly in seekers high and low on the way to another destination.

One of the puzzles of this encounter is its lead up, in terms of Ouspensky's autobiographical account of his long search, and its failure to result in anything. His masterwork *Tertium Organon* has been promptly cited as really Gurdjieff's, via some kind of magical wand influence, before the two had even met. We suspect at once a

set up here. It surpasses belief that Ouspensky could have navigated to India and Ceylon and not found a spiritual path. Tens of thousands of New Age seekers have found a cornucopia of ways, methods, ashrams, and so-called spiritual paths in their travels to India and the East. We are left to wonder if we are seeing the first stage of Gurdjieff's predatory targeting of celebrities to serve his own purposes. Nevertheless it is often the case that the search itself proves to be a problem and that possibly hidden teachers exist in one's country of origin. This is perhaps a notion related to the claims for the omnipresence of hidden Sufi guides in every culture.

The times of Ouspensky were dramatic, with the backdrop of the First World War and then the Russian revolution. It was indeed a moment for the 'war with the mechanical' envisioned by Gurdjieff. But the deep reactionary character of both Gurdjieff and his disciple were soon to show rather a clinging to the past. The truly obtuse Gurdjieff was oblivious to the political drama in motion and saw no problem in the plight of the Russian peasantry. All these sufis are disciples of Edmund Burke and excoriate liberalism, democracy, what to say of communism.

Ouspensky's preoccupation with 'schools' is another source of his later confusions and failure. But once again it seems to prefigure his coming encounter with Gurdjieff and his discourse on 'schools'. The open ashrams of the Indian sages of yoga are given short shrift for reasons that seem unclear. Ouspensky's funny way of setting himself up for Gurdjieff is one of the puzzles of his life, like premonitions of what was to come. The problem at once with Ouspensky's thinking on schools is his romanticism, with notions of the schools of Egypt, those around Pythagoras, or the creation of *Notre Dame*. It is very easy to be confused by the literature on this, and the endemic muddle over the Sphinx. The schools of Egypt are almost undecipherable at this point and make a dangerous starting point for seekers confused by the poor quality of the histories of all such.

Ouspensky was prey to the coming idea of the fourth way school. This idea would have been one thing if Gurdjieff had honestly declared it a new idea to be tested. But his way of presenting them as the key to the whole of spiritual esotericism is entirely misleading, especially in the claims for schools of the fourth way. To be fair, fourth way schools could well have existed, but the remarkable fact is that a century after Gurdjieff's coming we still don't have a single historical documentation of a fourth way school. Not one. The idea of a school that attempts to deal with the man as a whole, with a fourth unification factor beyond body/emotion/intellectual, is such an original sounding notion that we tend to take it on instant faith, but the reality has never been convincingly presented in the public domain.

Still, we should be careful here: as a huckster *par excellence* Gurdjieff may have distorted via advertising a very simple idea of the potential of man. That a hidden potential lurks behind the centers of the human frame if only they can act in unison is in many ways a revolutionary idea, but in all the time since we have seen very little evidence of this in practice, and once again we are confronted with the deceptive lure of 'esoteric' claims not matched in practice by anything specific. After the many seminars of the early years Ouspensky's breakthrough seems fairly elementary, on the level with the euphoria of a mindfulness workshop. Gurdjieff whispered in his ear from a distance. Big deal. We have to wonder at the failure of communication here, its hype factor and the lack of any convincing record of achievement. All blamed on Ouspensky for not following through. Over and over Gurdjieff promises but doesn't deliver.

Ouspensky's first query about the system brings the reference to 'work on self'. We can summarize a conclusion at the start by saying that 'work on self' turned out to be a deception, 'work on self is not the work' will be a coming retort, for those lucky enough to hear it. Unlike standard paths, the 'work' is trick play from start to finish: some other cosmic 'gobble gobble' is going to profit from the work, it seems, and the system depicted by Ouspensky even has charts of the 'cosmic stuff' in question.

Then we come to the question of money. This is one of the turning points in the New Age movement: Ouspensky's immediate assent as understanding the issue of payment, money, tokens the onset not only in Gurdjieffianity, but in a broader set of spiritual groups to come, of the commercial mode of the groups, seminars, and ashrams to come. The logic is impeccable, apparently, but the future of spiritual organizations cannot forever support the commercial framework. In the end, spiritual beggars finding their way to raise the money for spiritual instruction will end by becoming spiritual beggars all over again.

We cannot easily resolve the Gurdjieff mystery or fiasco, and the first meeting with 'G' shows the problem: the ballet, the 'struggle of the magicians', black and white: we are not in the realm of Buddhism or the ashrams of gurus. It is evidently in the spectrum of Sufistic schools, if such can be found, and this has an ominous note from the start, an occult gateway as a suggestion, where the reality is never realized. It is a different realm where the majority will always be frustrated in the end, and the frustrations would be at par for the successful Faustian cases, destined to be amateur devils. We should not belittle Ouspensky combination of enthusiasm and reserve: none knew at the start that Gurdjieff would confess to the designation of a devil, Beelzebub. Ouspensky we see suspected soon enough, and it is not foreordained in the canon of spiritual surrender to be a disciple to a devil. The endgame with Gurdjieff always whispers at the start.

Gurdjieff moves to his key theme: the mechanical nature of man. It is an original idea. Although it is hardly absent from the core of Buddhism. The latter attempts via meditation to transcend the mechanical in the task of arriving to 'consciousness'. Gurdjieff in a truly novel presentation points to a new way to understand the 'man machine' via the understanding of his centers, the complex psychology of these in terms of a host of engaging and original ideas, from the table of hydrogens, to the rest of the claimed esoteric canon. But experience shows that students of this new psychology are diverted from meditation to an attempt to self-analyze via a parts-list of Frankenstein and this never results in awareness. ISOM as a text creates obsession, easily relieved in five minutes of simple meditation. We see the funny bad habit of all students here: a moment of excited interest in new ideas, a sense of the intangible, an inability to do aught but thinking about the man machines, and a return to reading ISOM, in search of some understanding. But that never results in anything. It is a distraction from meditation, it seems, and the complexity of the man machine eludes simply understanding.

But we should be alert to the significance of this tale: it is a classic differentiation of the paths of will from the customary litany of 'dharmic' or 'Buddhist-style' yogas. It is a promise at the level, at first, of science fiction, of a new and heretofore unknown, or 'un-public' path to the transcendence of the man machine, not via consciousness, but will. It is a valid field of distinction. And this concludes the first Chapter. It is a brilliant pastiche by Ouspensky, if we recall that this material, although studied in page work by the many Ouspensky groups, was not to appear until decades later, at the end of that teacher's life, after a speculation he might not publish the work at all. It might be a futile worry, until we consider just how many have been left bemused by the path of will promised but never shown. With a cut from the 'devil', it seems, at each step on the way.

We will be critical of all this, which is arch-heresy in the obedient realm of the faithful, and we can equally point to the signs of a remarkable new presentation of a spiritual path, with a clear hint of Sufi disguises of an ancient, or once and future path. But we should also note the symmetry of Gurdjieff and Madame Blavatsky. Looking backwards we see we are in the realm of two parallel advertisements, and the new age movement is at a crossroads at the start, the realm of the disguises of Sufis, their ancestry, and the realm of the realm of Indic realm, which includes the Tibetan 'outcome' of the Buddhist experiments, and the history since the Axial period of that first-born of yoga, the Buddhist path, and its world-historical transformations and self-recreations. It shows a massive set of movements in a coherent play over many centuries, with methods, literature, and exemplars in an orderly progression. But the dark side of Buddhism was to be revealed later.

We find no such history in the realm of the Sufi, indeed, we are never sure we are in the realm of the Sufi at all: it may be some succession of phantoms in the minds of the peoples circling Sufisheikistan, with occult connections to Tibet, perhaps, and a path of paths not unlike that of Kipling's tale of the 'man who would be king'. The seeker in this realm is too often the victim of these phantoms, and the onset of Ouspensky's ISOM gives little indication of what the case will be for this scholarly flatlander meeting with the first or last of a list of remarkable men. In retrospect, it seems as if this works both ways. Gurdjieff is as curious about his future pupil as that pupil is of the 'master'. Later one New Age writer will pronounce Ouspensky an Arhant, a man with an ancient lineage behind him. We suspect that Gurdjieff is beset with an ambition: Ouspensky has found the remarkable Gurdjieff. But Gurdjieff has found a man from the ancients, less remarkable but with a hidden treasure this magician would like to cash in on for his 'work'. It is perhaps the suspicion about something like this that makes the coming break so bitter. He won't find anyone of the same potential as Ouspensky. But is this the case? What is the mystery of Ouspensky then? It is clear that Gurdjieff is trying to recruit mathematicians, and Ouspensky and J.G. Bennett, beside figures more in the literary realm like Orage, foot the bill. A lot will be wagered on the mathematics of dimension, and the obsessions of Ouspensky at the fringes of science. The conclusion will come with Bennett, but the overall result is still undecided. The theme and moral of Flatland will remain the persistent theme with an audacious attempting real physics, for which the jury is still out. Bennett's *The Dramatic Universe* is a lost masterwork corrupted by the tendency to pass Gurdjieff lies.

This account of Ouspensky meeting Gurdjieff is followed by a remarkable tale of the exposition of Gurdjieff's system.

We can skim through the chapters here.

The whole account is a *tour de force*, but rarely has such an elaborate introit led to so little. At one point Ouspensky makes the remarkable observation that Gurdjieff did not want to make it easy for people to become acquainted with his ideas: here, in many ways, we come to the basic flaw in the whole teaching. We can never quite make contact with its core, nor be sure we have a basic teaching with all of its pieces. Over time this can generate extraordinary confusion and frustration. The student becomes entangled in a system of considerable complexity, unsure if he must embark on an expedition to Central Asia for the key to the key. A basic question slowly emerges: is this system a serious attempt at communication or is it an obfuscation to maintain the esoteric character of a set of doctrines that are known only as public advertisements.

Later Gurdjieff will reveal another reason for this: the clear anti-democratic character of the whole 'work'; put in terms of the inability of the larger mass of humanity to receive the teaching and the need for a concentration of knowledge for it to have any effect. Gurdjieff reveals that he is treading on dangerous ground on the basis of metaphors of dubious derivation. Is the 'materiality' of knowledge a sound notion? If this is simply a version of the distinction of quantity and quality we might at least partially agree. But the reality is that the institutions emerging in the evolution of culture are premised on the assumption that knowledge as information is to proceed via its replication to become public. Any other view is an echo of a potentially malevolent gnostic antiquity that, like the legacy of Egypt, is forever a strip-tease revelation of fragments with no real key, indeed, 'fragments of an unknown teaching'. This manner of denouncing the crowd is a clear indication of the place of Gurdjieff in the larger context of his arrival in Russia and the backdrop of the great drama of revolution, democracy and communism. The suspicion that a deliberately reactionary package of ideas is being promoted by a Sufistic cabal of arch-conservatives has always accompanied the Gurdjieff 'work', and the very use of the term 'work' is under rising suspicion of being an echo of a rightist challenge to the working class. We seem to be getting a taste of Edmund Burke.

The discussion of the various bodies of man and of immortality are not the least of the potentially creative ideas on the way to renewal suggested, but never realized, in the echoes of the Theosophical tradition. The question of immortality is once again the crux of a set of ambiguities never resolved. In one account the man machine has no soul and disappears at death. In another man shows recurrence but not reincarnation and his place in the static dimension of eternity, frozen until the action of a greater spiritual power can release him from this temporal prison. This is indeed a remarkable novelty in the standard lore of spiritual legacies. But once again a set of ideas that implies millennia of error from both Buddhists and Christians is left undeveloped and ambiguous.

The later work of Bennett will attempt to rationalize all his in a construct of the Flatland concept nexus in a model of a six-dimensional universe, with three dimensions of time, including the fifth and sixth dimensions of eternity and hyperparaxia. This was to be a brave effort to connect the ideas, basically from Ouspensky, to general relativity. But the dilemma remains that almost no ancient tradition speaks in quite this way, with the idea of reincarnation being a framework not lightly discarded for this novel but inconsistent approach to the question of soul.

A more constructive notion would be the mainline monotheistic idea of the 'soul' as a species characteristic of man, and Bennett himself seems to rationalize this in his *The Dramatic Universe* with his 'story' of the emergence of homo sapiens as a new creature from homo erectus and for the first time a creature with a soul, a mind, and a spectrum of creative powers. As always with the Gurdjieff legacy it is simply unclear how to take the key concept, admittedly open to metaphysical challenge, of the soul of man.

Connected here is the discussion of the three ways leading to a fourth: the way of the fakir, the monk, and the yogi. This is too pat, quite obviously. The path of the fakir is a stylized abstraction, as is the way of the monk. The way of the yogi is almost always considered in terms of the path to Enlightenment and should not be so casually belittled in the context of a very obscure 'fourth way' that never at any point speaks of the state of enlightenment, nor gives any reason why this should be a sub-category in the fourth way, so-called. In fact, the idea of the fourth way is an engaging one, if only it had been developed to a practical specification. But in reality it is hard to find in history any example of the type of fourth way school indicated. None can be found in the history of Sufism, and there appear to be no examples of the category until, suspiciously, we find self-declared exemplars among those who have read the works of Ouspensky.

There is much to the Gurdjieff that is a remarkable gestation in potential of ideas that are useful in any reckoning of the tactics of meditation. The notions of the many I's, the lack of unity, the play of the various centers (of different designations and number at different stages of the teaching), and the development of a 'real I' are exciting and cogent renditions of what we frequently suspect is a counterpoint teaching to the 'Buddhist/dharmic' paths of the cessation of the will: the path of 'Will' itself. This path is obscurely the close cousin to the Buddhist, and its actuality is the obvious hidden thematic in much of the Christian doctrine of salvation, redemption, of sin and repentance. The path of the will is the great unknown and there are many indications, but no proof that the teaching of Gurdjieff is hinting at this reciprocal path, the mystery of mysteries at the core the great question mark called man. Is it not strange that the most successful teaching known to man should speak more to the despair of the will than to its realization, a process too obviously the orphan of such train wrecks as the teachings of Gurdjieff.

All of this impinges on the developing idea of 'evolution' which has suffered great confusion in new age circles. The history of any net equivalents to the idea of evolution in the modern sense is unclear, since the scale of deep time was unknown to the ancients, although the scale of cosmic epochs and their recurrent cycles is a mainstay of many teachings. The question of evolution is remarkable for being as much a mystery to the modern mind as the ancient. But it is the 'fact' of evolution, in the discovery of deep time that is so far the

characteristic achievement of modern science. This is of course controversial and the mainline theory called 'darwinism' is a mainstay of modern science. But the suspicion that as a theory it is flawed is more than a dissent from religious fundamentalists: many scientists have pointed to the difficulties with a theory of random evolution. And of course the Theosophical teachings of Blavatsky clearly dissent from the emerging positivistic theory of Darwin. The extravagance of the Theosophical claims is matched only by the unscientific character of the darwinian claims for natural selection.

It is no doubt in this context that the confusion has been confounded by the emergence in the New Age movement of the idea of 'spiritual evolution'. This has further compounded the confusions of all parties. Although in an age of the discovery of epigenetics we should be wary of speculative generalizations of any kind about 'self-evolution', the suggestion that in general man's 'evolution' is the self-creation via the element of consciousness of his mechanical substrate is a confusion of terms. The evolution of organisms in all cases that we see appears rather as a process of development in time, under a debate as to the directional character of this unfolding.

Here the later student of Gurdjieff Bennett produced a 'from thimble' model of a version of man's evolution under the guidance of his account of the 'demiurgic powers' in nature. These powers were present at the dawn of man (or, for that matter, the earlier phase of *homo erectus*) and it is in relation to this source agency that we arrive at the *homo sapiens* we know, or claim to know, with his remarkable spectrum of characters, language, the mind, ethical reasoning, creative powers, and finally most controversially the 'soul'. Ironically in this account which is not actually sourced in Gurdjieff the question of 'evolution' becomes problematical, if the agency of the result is a spiritual power. It is easy to dismiss this, but Bennett's account rescued the discussion from creationist mythology, and addressed (with an ad hoc brand of 'hi-tech' non-theistic creationism) the stark reality, which biologists committed to darwinism seem unable to face: the implausibility of random evolution in the emergence of the species transition to *homo sapiens*. To say that language emerged at random, and then to add to this the larger and still more complex issues of mind, soul, and creativity, is a species of mythology that is in no position to scotch confusions of new agers.

Here we confront the confusion over the term 'evolution'. Man as he emerged, as the contemporary to Darwin, Alfred Wallace, put it, was a creature with a larger potential than mere adaptation to an environment might suggest. Wallace was righter than he knew here, and from the perspective of Buddhism, we see the obvious point confirmed that man as he emerges at the dawn of speciation comes into existence arguably 'incomplete'. His powers of consciousness are like an instrument he must learn to play, and the path to enlightenment is by no means a given of birth, but a process requiring 'conscious' effort. It is this point that is the source of both Gurdjieff's standard version of this and the confusion over conscious evolution.

The idea of conscious or spiritual evolution is a misfire of terms, because evolution is the production of organismic forms and species, and this has a large mechanical component. We should be wary of turning around and speaking of 'conscious evolution'. What we mean is that an organism, with an already evolved potential, has the power of self-realization of this potential. It is this key difference that stands behind Gurdjieff's lament over the mechanical nature of man and his need for the remedy of conscious development. This is a key issue and it rescues the confusions of Gurdjieff for one important insight, but the instant confusion over 'evolution' and 'self-realization' detracts from the important discovery of the mechanical nature of man.

It is certainly possible that new agers could be right here in their talk of spiritual evolution. Is it possible, at the level of hypothesis, that a large subset of a species using meditative methods could 'evolve' that species to another level? It seems impossibly farfetched, but in an age of epigenetics one could lose one's nerve to pronounce dogmatically on the question. However, it seems more consistent to speak of the 'evolution' of a specific potential and its realization as a conscious instrument. It is certainly fair to suggest that darwinian

evolution cannot achieve this, and indeed even the cruder forms of the design argument are hard put to explain how this could be. The reason of course is that man is little known to himself and cannot produce the parts list for the construction of man. It is still elusive and not the least mystery is that of consciousness.

Once again our critique of Gurdjieff should concede the classic and fundamental issue of the 'meaning of consciousness', a point on which his teaching pivots, and compared to which conventional psychology seems flatfooted. The confusion has been discussed by many authors and sages, but in the world of Gurdjieff the fons and origo of the contemporary 'mindfulness' movement can be seen in the distinction of forms or levels of consciousness. In one classic rendering the distinction is that of consciousness and self-consciousness, the latter quite different from the ordinary slang usage of the word. All of this is by no means a Sufistic teaching but a version of the classic yogic canon of four states of consciousness, sleep, consciousness, self-consciousness, and 'turiya' a fourth state beyond the first three, often called 'enlightenment'. The tendency for the term 'consciousness' to slide into its near opposite is thus both frustrating, yet understandable. And we can see the frequent dialects of 'meditation' refer variously to consciousness as in fact what is meant by 'self-consciousness'. Gurdjieff frequently uses the term 'consciousness' in this other usage.

Gurdjieff, and millennia of yogis and Buddhists, have tended to this set of distinctions and the need for mediation, or the meditation in action of the Sufistic 'self-remembering'. The latter, like the exercise of mindfulness in contemporary descendants of new age meditation movements, is a tool to arrive or induce 'self-consciousness'. In Bennett's useful discussion in *The Dramatic Universe* the term referred to is reversed: evolutionary man is brought to a state of consciousness under the influence of the demiurgic powers, and his immaturity makes the intoxicating experience one requiring the 'avatar' descent into humanity of this realm of super advanced spiritual powers. The question is one that is not intuitive for man, despite his intuitive sense that the power of attention can 'wake him up' a bit and lead to a moment of 'real consciousness' from passive staring. This view from Bennett is not adequate, and open to confusion.

We should note, and here Bennett evokes a latent Gurdjieff distinction, that of the distinction of the powers of consciousness and those of will. We use an act of will to summon 'consciousness' via the power of attention: the hybrid of these two is not always properly distinguished. The treatment of Bennett avails of the larger framework of a cosmology derived from that of Gurdjieff pegs 'consciousness' as the first of the cosmic energies at the boundary of the autonomic (life) and hypernomic (stellar/galactic/cosmic). It is remarkable that one of the first texts of the new age movement was by an author who spoke of 'cosmic consciousness' for reasons no one quite understood until Bennett partially clarified the question.

The point here is that 'evolution' won't work here if a design argument is really at work, in the sense that man acquires the potential to experience the first of the cascade of 'cosmic energies' described by Bennett. It is evidently like the sudden influx of high octane fuel in a system able to handle that. And this isn't really evolution, but some kind of action by the larger powers of nature. This is shaky ground, but while we should be wary of speculative constructs here, the point made by Bennett adds a useful dimension of discussion to the confusion over 'spiritual evolution'.

A far better account would be that of the Indic Advaita which has a much deeper understanding of 'consciousness': man could evolve 'consciousness' without outside powers via a natural refolding of what is. In any case the interesting model of Bennett is hardly more than speculative, and leaves the issue open to those who will try to mediate 'demiurgic powers', big trouble. Bennett turns these demiurgic powers into Gurdjieff cannibals, feeding on man. We need to recall the abolition of sacrifice, human and animal, created by the Axial Age religions, and not let figures like Gurdjieff roll back this achievement. And that is the danger of the bogus esoteric Christianity. It is without authority and made up by Gurdjieff.

Gurdjieff makes many wise-sounding comments on human evolution, this in the context of man being food for the moon, a ludicrous notion. It is important to be wary of all of this material. We have seen problems with the evolutionism of science, but we cannot take the phony esoteric outbursts on evolution at face value. They come with no complete statement, source references and are barely coherent.

We can also try to sift something from Gurdjieff's 'spiel' here: to say that evolution is not mechanical and must be conscious is on to something, but the whole model of his discourse is askew, so we cannot take any of it at face value.

Gurdjieff's claim that evolution must be 'conscious' is a confusion of the terms 'evolution' and the term 'conscious'. Where is the proof? What does it mean? Gurdjieff has no real knowledge of evolution, a concept absent in pre-modern thought, despite anticipations of various kinds. Using the term 'evolution' for spiritual practices designed to 'evolve' man are a complete misunderstanding. Man 'evolved' the capacity for higher consciousness or enlightenment in the package of states that appeared at the dawn of *homo sapiens*. It is not necessary to evolve them. They are there already and require 'realization'.

We have exposed the misuse of the term 'evolution' and its muddled semantics among new agers. Keep in mind that the idea of 'evolution' was absent in ancient sutra discourse. Equivalentents in some form often seem to echo the modern discovery. But in the final analysis students and gurus of ancient legacies were forced to adopt the term 'evolution' on the fly and got it wrong from the start: man's self-evolution, so to speak, via spiritual practice is not likely the way to understanding speciation in general. If this is wrong then it requires careful proof, and some specific knowledge of how *homo sapiens* evolved. We have very little knowledge here.

The discourse on many i's continues intermittently through out ISOM, and it is the one saving grace of the book and the system: it is an eloquent restatement of the psychology of man's ordinary psychological state. It is not an insight that is new and goes back to Buddhist sutras and beyond. It can be seen at once from simple exercises of the 'will' in the sense of 'ego'. We can see the potency of this insight, which finally emerges from the ancient yogas, that man cannot exert his real 'will', whatever that may be. However, Gurdjieff overdoes it here. One of the oddities of the 'work' is the way that beginners can often exert their 'will' to some degree and better than advanced students who seem to get worse. This is in part the self-suggestion created by the dogmatic authority of Gurdjieff himself, "I can show will because the guru says I can't". Men in ordinary life often muddle through better than beginners in the 'work'. This is new territory, it seems, and yet the clarity of the ancient sutras is replaced with deceptive half-truths designed to snare the student. The failure to maintain the basic clarity of the 'path to enlightenment' is suspicious.

We are up to the vicinity of Chapter Four, and can skim over the rest, perhaps. But there are important insights mixed in the confusion: the idea of the line of knowledge and the line of being is strangely apt for the whole of the Gurdjieff system: all students here end up cluttered with a new form of knowledge which has not entered their being, to put it mildly. The concepts are exceptionally barren despite the way they induce seeming understanding. Sometimes the best way would seem to be to forget much of the material in ISOM and try to simply 'Be', in the sensing and attention exercise of mediation in action, dismissing the useless efforts to figure out the 'work'. One of the worst ideas here is the division into seven men. Assuming that the 'law of seven' has any validity at all, it is nonetheless very artificial to speak of seven types of men. And the discussion of the transition to 'man number four' is barely coherent, while the categories of man five, six, and seven correspond to nothing comprehensible in any of the traditions we have. Gurdjieff had a curious case of the mechanized thinking he complains of. This could be wrong: this canon could have a right explication. But we won't find it in the corpus given.

And this schematic of the 'law of seven' is then applied to many other categories, viz. the art of man number one, two, etc...But this is surely gabfest and makes little sense upon examination. We will later be told that the

Sphinx is an example of objective art, while Shakespeare is subjective art, pastiche of *bon ton*. We have Gurdjieff against the wall on many such points. We have so much nonsense on the subject of Egypt, the Sphinx and the Pyramids that we become suspicious Gurdjieff has simply dipped into the genre, the references to Atlantis being a prime example: we must suspect Gurdjieff is making up stuff as he goes along.

Gurdjieff starts in on the law of three. This is one of the most notorious of the confusions of the Gurdjieff work, but here we can cross-reference with the ancient *Samkhya* legacy: e cannot blame this on Gurdjieff, and the issue of three term systems, in Samkhya the 'gunas' is a real legacy and not made up by Gurdjieff. But the elaboration of this legacy and/or its presence in some other form than the Indic line is unknown. Anirvan in his commentary (*To Live Within*) notes that the Gurdjieff system is pure undiluted Samkhya. But the form it takes is not found in the Indic versions.

We can save triads for later discussion, but the sad fact remains no one has ever properly explicated this issue of triads. Between triads and Hegelian/Marxist dialectic, and the gunas of Samkhya there is a common echo, much blather about the esoteric, but little understanding. Clearly there is a hint this is a genuine esoteric remnant, but the reality is that no one understands it. We assume that Gurdjieff understands it but that is by no means clear. And the jargon in All and Everything doesn't count, too easy to bluff your way to profundity. There is nothing in plain language on the subject by Gurdjieff. The basic claims for a 'law of three' are bogus and misunderstood, but this legacy is so ancient we should be wary of dismissal, pending some historical clarification. It is a garbled legacy in Gurdjieff's thinking, and it is doubtful if Gurdjieff understood his own jargon. We should note that 'enlightened yogis' rarely speak in this terms, although the *Samkhya rajas, tamas, sattwas* claims to belong to this legacy. It is clearly a fragmented understanding that is all that remains in yogic discourses. The original idea is long lost, apparently.

But at least, between the non-dual (*Advaita*) traditions and some philosophic musings on the dialectic of dyads versus triads from Plato to Hegel we can get some inkling, to which skepticism must be applied.

Gurdjieff compounds the confusion by applying three forces to the tasks of 'work on self'. And he seems to speak from experience on this. All well and good. But in general this is another case where something that is plain in normal meditative traditions becomes a hocus-pocus of obscurities for the majority of students of the subject: the moral is to be wary of complex self-analysis of this type. It never arrives at answers.

From the law of three we enter in the next chapter (Five) to the discussion of the *Ray of Creation*. Here we confront a stubborn unknown: we are obviously in the realm of *Samkhya*, but altered by the addition of a different cast, i.e. the cascade of the *Ray of Creation*. Modern cosmology makes this a dubious application, and it is not so intelligible in the context of modern cosmology and multiverses. This usage of a seven term system is probably a nineteenth century invention. Is this really ancient knowledge or nineteenth century pastiche of the type we see so much of in Blavatsky? It is an engaging notion, actually, although in the age of string theory and multiverse physics, this hierarchy is starting to bite the dust, raising severe doubts about its real antiquity, esoteric valuation, etc...

It is good to adjourn here to a discussion of Bennett's later *The Dramatic Universe* to see if something can be made of this subject matter. Some of it has seminal value: the idea of the biosphere in Bennett's version as the matrix of evolutionary life is now echoed in the thesis of *Gaia*. But in general we have to suspect the claims here: don't be so suggestible as to think this material is beyond criticism because it is sacred esotericism.

Bennett's work borrows tacitly from Schopenhauer who suggests to Bennett that the 'gunas' are aspects of 'will', a brilliant idea, but divorced from that philosopher's distinction of noumenon and phenomenon.

We can see from this that some version of Samkhya has entered Christian theology: the confusion over the Trinity is clearly a fragment of *Samkhya* whereby the veil of divinity is the highest triad because the cascade into six, twelve, twenty-four, etc, laws... That makes sudden (historical) sense of the nonsense theology here. In general the term 'Will of the Absolute' sounds more like Schopenhauer pastiche than something ancient and wise. It is nonetheless in that light an idea of some interest to consider the concept of the Will in nature. The ancient *Samkhya* did not have the idea of will, which however resurfaces in the treatment of Bennett. Bennett slowly escaped the Gurdjieff system, but its remains are dishonestly mixed with his new perspective, making his corpus confused.

This is a grand fugue of *Samkhya*, but connected with the non-Indic idea of the Will, a remarkable echo of Schopenhauer. We are suspicious this is nineteenth century concoction branding with ancient Samkhya, but we can't be sure. The usage of the term 'will' might well suggest a version of *Samkhya* in some unknown proto-Sufistic brand.

Let us be clear that in an age of Science we have the right and the duty of scientific skepticism, and when we read about the concept of 'food for the moon', in a long list of other such suspected nonsense, we have the right to question what we are hearing. The author was once ejected from an email group at Yahoo on the issues of Bennett, thence the Gurdjieff system, for not taking the material as authoritarian dogma, true because of the endorsement of the master, as esoteric and beyond question. Such tripe. Already this material has become beyond questioning. That is entirely wrong. The more we read here the more we suspect a 'spiel' in motion, mindful of how schoolboys describe such things. The system of Bennett is thus already dogma. Best to be wary of it.

This chapter ends with more chestnuts, the Last Supper in its esoteric interpretation. Please, is there an end to this?

In Chapter six, Gurdjieff makes one of the most important statements about his initiative, one that should caution us to be wary: he won't state his real aim or aims. It is essential to remember this because behind the whole scaffolding of a teaching the fact remains that we don't know what is really going on or what is intended. The increasing suspicion the whole teaching is a front or deliberate 'farce' grows on us. We cannot surrender to such a teaching if we don't know what it is.

In the next chapter, we have more on the one issue that Gurdjieff seems good at the nature of real 'consciousness'. His remarks appear a variant of the classic line of all yogic traditions that speak of the distinctions of consciousness. There is a novel twist to the basic chord of mindfulness discourse: the double arrow of self-remembering. The awareness inward and outward of the process of attention. It seems we are listening to a graduate of mindfulness workshops from Central Asia.

From there we proceed to still another quagmire of pseudo-esotericism, the enneagram and the material on the law of octaves grafted onto this suspicious glyph with no known antecedents in the tradition, but a suspected source in Naqshbandi Sufism, or else the nineteenth century. Since this group ditched the enneagram for a new concoction, the enneagon of the Arica groups, we should suspect the overall con at work. There is no way that the enneagram discourse can be brought to a proper interpretation as ancient esoteric knowledge. The whole subject is incoherent although it is always possible the discourse is a reference to something else that can make sense of the muddle. If something is esoteric it could be that someone merely refers to something not present to discussion. Still, we have recorded our speculation that a lateral branch of non-Indic Samkhya may exist or have existed since ancient times, if we can be sure that it isn't simply an embroidered version of ancient *Samkhya*.

The next chapter leads to a classic version of the four basic states of consciousness, the yogic classic. But here again there is a twist: the third state of self-remembering (our 'self-consciousness') is followed not by Turiya, or 'enlightenment', but so-called 'objective consciousness'. It is a remarkable mystery, subject to suspicion, that

Gurdjieff never uses the term 'enlightenment' in the Buddhist sense, but instead refers to an hoc 'objective consciousness', but without the classic category being in evidence. This is the strategy of an unenlightened man to fix the terms of the game, to hide his failure. We suspect that Gurdjieff is the classic 'conscious' man of the Faust to Magus type, with dashes of occultism, and this veils his nervous ignorance of the real 'turiya'. It was one thing to present his teaching to naive westerners in the early twentieth century, but after several generations since of the new age movement this suspicious version seems to indicate a very limited teaching indeed. It is possible to freeze 'soul', however, into a new form of samsaric reincarnation, and this is surely a misfortune of men-turned-devils.

We have enough here to indict the 'work' with our suspicions. There is one last idea nexus, before adjourning to the last chapter: the distinction of essence and personality. Much better would be the distinction of noumenon and phenomenon. We often have a sense that Gurdjieff is onto something here, but only in the manner of those who have an established presence beyond the feckless inattention of the crowds we move in. But the issue has no grounding in any of the theory proposed and seems to spring from an idea variant to the distinctions of noumenal and phenomenal in a Kantian system. And here we see the dilemma of the noumenal aspect of man, and are left with the question as to how anything could interact with this deep core. We are suspicious even the work flunks this key test, and at the same time we leave with the suspicion that a method of penetration of the essence would put men at risk from the deprivations hinted at by Gurdjieff of dead souls, with the lingering borderline paranoia that we are in the presence of that dreaded monster, the Sufi cannibal. The table of beings in a hierarchy of creatures in a food chain is one of the more lurid sides to the generally preposterous concoctions of 'Beelzebub', and we have to consider that we have been conned into be the compliant meal of some unknown species of Sufi devil.

# Introduction

One of the most remarkable parallel developments accompanying the rise of modernity has been the emergence of the so-called New Age movement and its immense proliferation of groups and gurus, speaking from a variety of religious traditions. In that context one of the most confusing movements has been that associated with the figure of Gurdjieff and his expositor Ouspensky.

The immense influence of the writings of Ouspensky has served uniquely as a promotional literature for a figure whose enigmatic, controversial, and finally shadowy legacy has ended in a kind of limbo, leaving behind a long trail of 'read the book' converts, to say nothing of actual victims of that spurious Sufistic 'school', unable to extricate themselves from the combination of sales pitch and authoritarianism that characterizes the question of the so-called 'fourth way'. It is notable that, despite a considerable activity, this movement has proven singularly barren in its results, as if the intent behind the public literature had been something else, leaving those attempting to make use of the materials provided paralyzed, and suspicious a game of disinformation is at work. Followers of this movement demonstrate a frozen character, as if stuck in place, and unable to get beyond the obsessive rereading of the writings of Ouspensky by actually doing something productive. Such people urgently need something honest and open, like instructions to meditation. All this esoteric material is mostly 'hermetic flotsam'.

There is another side to this, the increasing realization of the dark side of Gurdjieffian activities, a factor suspected very early on by Ouspensky, who ended, we should recall, by renouncing the 'work'. Ouspensky in private on several occasions denounced Gurdjieff as a criminal, and the whole initiative has endured as an anomalous puzzle that never quite became a scandal. Few teachers have had the stroke of good fortune to snare a celebrity as good at (unwitting) propaganda for a cause as Ouspensky and the Gurdjieff movement has, strangely, been an overwhelming success at the startup phase and a complete failure in every other respect. Behind that the ominous, almost malevolent character of Gurdjieff himself has significantly poisoned the naive enthusiasm of many of its devoted converts, who cannot seem to snap out of the depiction of purportedly 'esoteric' knowledge made public by 'G', knowledge that upon examination shows far less substance than is apparent at first encounter. Hopefully this series can help those who begin something amiss to stand up to the pretense of the Gurdjieff work. Many who realize the trap into which they have fallen are too intimidated to deal with the situation.

The reader also has the resources of *The Gurdjieff Con* and the blog '/nemonemini.info', the latter for the confusion over the reincarnation of Ouspensky and the attempts to track him down for liquidation. The confusion with the author of this text is a warning to never trust these operators. They are using the rules of 'Crowleyanity' or worse behind the front of Ouspenskyianity. There he will find discussions of such figures as E. J. Gold and Osho Rajneesh, and others.

In fact, there is another dimension to the Gurdjieff escapade, one very difficult to unravel, but leaving those who come across it with a severe case of mixed feelings, even outrage, at the deception perpetrated by this cleverly publicized 'teaching'. It is important to assist those who become entangled in this already quite old spiritual quagmire so they can move on, and come into the presence of mind to stop saying 'yes' to their own exploitation. It can be difficult to penetrate the disguises of Gurdjieff, but in fact enough clues are readily available to do this, by looking at the chronicle of events as given in plain sight, without the confusing deferral to

the 'unknown' esoteric 'mumbo jumbo' said to justify the public action. Movements citing the legacy of ancient wisdom are not exempt from public judgment. And the same is true of the authority of those who proclaim themselves spiritual teachers with self-issued credentials beyond question. One has but to screw up the courage to indulge a healthy skepticism, to demand some answers, or else be finished with a pseudo-school left on automatic pilot to the great profit of those who wish to exploit the suggestibility of the spiritually bewildered. And that temporal remainder is destined to attract many claimants to its succession, shrewd enough to see the windfall in the formulation of spiritual authority concocted by Gurdjieff.

The purpose of this series of essays, and an associated blog, is to air public information of this subject, in the process setting an example of skepticism and free enquiry for those mesmerized by the formulation of the Gurdjieff 'teaching', perhaps enabling those caught in this legacy to 'snap out of it', and start reading the fine print. Experience shows that the stance, or necessity, of skepticism evokes fear and reluctance in many who wish to imagine they have stumbled on the path to esoteric wisdom by reading Ouspensky and embarking on the true wild goose chase of public 'schools' in this field.

The mystique of the absolute authority of gurus and sheiks, along with that of Gautama and 'Jesus' is a spurious phantom. You are under no such obligation.

Still others snap out of it right away once they sense they are in the presence of clear predestination. As such this communication is a warning, but runs against the grain of 'guru kowtow' that pervades the field of Indian religion spreading globally, a phenomenon that Gurdjieff exploited without ever explaining his place in any of the outstanding traditions. He laid claim to a new and different tradition, but if his public statements upon examination don't add up, then the claims for such plummet at once. Although we can touch on issues of what 'constitutes a spiritual path', it is not our aim to pursue that subject, or to add anything more to the hopeless confusion of such questions, as current in the proliferation of New Age movements. In fact, the realm of the 'work' tends to be a monopoly or cabal of insiders, and inside information, the various public groups and documents being cynically exploited 'fish bait' for the 'exoteric' support, financial or otherwise, of a select few. Exclusion from such information is fatal to any practical use of the spurious 'Ouspenskiana' which has come into existence as a kind of dog's bone of obsessive preoccupation.

One irony of the whole question is that Gurdjieff produced a distorted depiction of the so-called fourth way, and an effort to correct the record here might help bemused seekers to find all the elements of such a path embedded in ordinary culture, and especially in modern civilization, that entity against which we see a very reactionary 'G' posing an almost fascistic conservatism, spiritual or otherwise. Irony of ironies, then, that modern culture, almost by default, is the real 'fourth way', a statement of relatively little content, as if true by definition. In general no evidentiary instance of a 'fourth way school' has been documented for the times prior to the appearance of Gurdjieff, and the hype factor here is grossly misleading. After a while those pursuing all this should suspect it is all 'come on', with little content.

Gurdjieff had a knack for snaring intelligent intellectuals, three times at least, with Ouspensky, Orage, and Bennett, two of them, we should note, celebrities, and two, mathematicians, highly exploitable figures induced to serve a cause whose real aims and intentions were quite other than what appeared in public. The lonely and vulnerable followers who are turned on by this manufactured literature remain at risk in the vast success, undeserving, of this species of propaganda. Many questions remain here that it is not the job of these essays to answer, perhaps they have no answers. In the final analysis, modern culture has moved in a different direction from the spiritual legacies of antiquity, and any attempt to force modernity into that mould is going to backfire.

It was the guru Rajneesh who, puzzling over Gurdjieff, noted his total failure, and tried to get some of his followers to break camp and move on. I find a host of similar difficulties in the ashram world he created, but at least he stood in the great legacy of the bodhisattva tradition, that is, he granted the humanity of his followers and wished to point to the possibilities of realizing their potential. His methods are clear and belong to an attested legacy.

Please note that the Gurdjieffs and their gangs of nihilists, so reminiscent of Nietzschean loudmouth thuggery, grant no such potential to their mass of followers, and aim at nothing but to treat them as cattle, 'food' for some obscure ritual of their own. It belongs to an ancient world before the onset of democracy, and its much to be hoped for 'spiritual democracy', whose first requirement is acknowledgment of the humanity of seekers, with rights against exploitation as dead slot robots in the schemes of black magicians perpetrated over successive lives. The danger for a mass of followers is small, they are soon discarded to the public sphere, but for many the dangers of association with such people are immense, horrific, and we must rush into the fray with blunt instruments of exposure, and a hope to track down and liberate the victims of that dark world of spiritual slavery.

Wake up to the danger, and study the overall context, fine print, and the tactics of 'hypnosis' designed to achieve the release of any such sense of autonomy to the schemes of occult adventurers about their own obscure business, who have only contempt for the achievements of modern freedom.

# 1. Ouspensky and Gurdjieff

## 1.1 Meetings with a Remarkable Rogue

Gurdjieff's meeting with Ouspensky was a remarkable moment in the emergence of the 'New Age' movement, but in retrospect it seems like a staged entrapment of one of the most notable intellectuals of that period, and a very conservative Russian reactionary. The nature of Ouspensky's talents remain obscure, but he has been called a classic and developed Arhant by some. If so his interaction with a Sufistic or gnostic tradition might have triggered a negative response. The question of who people are, as reincarnations, is a trap in the realm of gnostics, if those in the know exploit those who 'can't remember'. Ouspensky produced a goldmine for Gurdjieff, one of the great pieces of sales pitch spirituality, yet we suspect that once written, the 'work gang' wanted to be rid of him. The endless diatribes against Ouspensky for breaking with Gurdjieff miss the point that he had served his dismal purpose and needed to be liquidated in his next life. The suspicions about his fate in his subsequent birth further undermine trust in what is going on. It is dangerous to submit to teachers if you are unsure of your future fate, which could be dreadful.

The great interest in Gurdjieff is as remarkable as is the sterility of the resulting movement. It is all based on ISOM which contains a lot of this advertising and little else. To be sure, *All and Everything* is supposed to contain the real goods, but that document is inexplicably turned into a text of great obscurity. The romanticism of his account and the valid transmission of some bits of hidden knowledge make his effort of archaeological value. But the mixture of bogus materials makes the whole untrustworthy. The text of *All and Everything* does count for anything: it is designed to induce repetitive obsession, so that unseen agencies can invultuate the reader over time. Hardly a single issue has been clarified in the text.

The enneagram is a red alert item that should make us sit up and demand a careful examination of 'esoteric' claims. The claims for universal knowledge based on this glyph make many snap out of the hypnotic lure of Gurdjieffiana. These people couldn't possibly know what they are talking about. And this lore has metastasized in the form of claims about personality types. Further, we see a huge literature taking off in the realm of Christian theology based on the enneagram. These novelties of theology threaten to turn Christianity into a gnostic cult controlled by rogue Sufis like Gurdjieff.

We sense and share Ouspensky's sudden reserve confronted with claims that emerge in the Gurdjieff corpus. But he was by and large induced to belief, as with the enneagram. The same is true of Bennett, whose *The Dramatic Universe* is corrupted with contradictory claims.

One of the puzzles of this encounter is its lead up, in terms of Ouspensky's autobiographical account of his long search, and its failure to result in anything. Gurdjieff's denigration of this is misleading. Gurdjieff castigates a search in India, but very few have found anything in the direction indicated by Gurdjieff, while thousands have achieved direct and classic results from Indic and Buddhist legacies. He is perhaps correct to suggest that Sufi figures exist in disguise in many cultures.

It remains true that the related 'Sufism' shows just how hard it is to locate significant practical resources in the sphere of Islamic culture. It is one of the most obscure, misleading and mis-advertised legacies. There even figures, like Idries Shah, were confused.

It is true that Sufi influences can appear in surprising places, but it is off the mark to downplay the 'path of the yogi' as Gurdjieff does. The legacy there is open, classic, and canonical. At no point does Gurdjieff present an equivalent from another tradition, save as few tantalizing details from unspecified legacies. There is no

classical indication of anything called a 'fourth way' and Gurdjieff after all his trumpeting of ancient traditions is a suspected wisecrack from the start. These points are worth dwelling on and they apply also to the work of the equally mysterious Madame Blavatsky whose known frauds are extravagant.

The path of the yogi is stylized by Gurdjieff as a work on intellectual center. That is simply untrue. The path of the yogi is that of the path to enlightenment, an important question ignored by Gurdjieff, who clearly is not 'enlightened'. The paths of the fakir and the monk, seem made up and are typical pastiche.

The fourth way is a fiction based on the idea of an integration of three centuries in a 'fourth', or else a figment posited beyond the 'way of the monk, the fakir and the yogi', one of the tritest pieces of analysis ever cited. That yogis have always constituted the core of the entire legacy of spiritual paths is lost in this statement which is typical of the odd cliché creation of Gurdjieff.

The course of a long exercise of multiple centers in some manner suggested by Gurdjieff could well lead to novel forms of consciousness. But the method is never stated and the results of his 'exercises' are left obscure, and seem to have led to no known results.

There is no known instance of a 'fourth way school'. Those that arise after the publication of Ouspensky's book are nothing of the kind, while no evidence of earlier cases are known.

It surpasses belief that Ouspensky could have navigated to India and Ceylon and not found a spiritual path. Tens of thousands of New Age seekers have found a cornucopia of ways, methods, ashrams, and so-called spiritual paths in their travels to India and the East. By comparison we have almost no cases of successful transformation in the Sufistic legacy. We should be careful on this point since the tip of the Sufi iceberg is misleading.

We are left to wonder if we are seeing the first stage of Gurdjieff's predatory targeting of celebrities to serve his own purposes. Nevertheless it is often the case that the search itself proves to be a problem and that possibly hidden teachers exist in one's country of origin. This is perhaps a notion related to the claims for the omnipresence of hidden Sufi guides in every culture.

Ouspensky's masterwork *Tertium Organon* has been cited as really Gurdjieff's, via some kind of magical wand influence, before the two had even met. It gets more outrageous the further we proceed. We suspect at once a set up here. It seems in many ways a pastiche written in response to the leftist dialectic and its mystique that must have been public knowledge at this period before the revolutionary era. But it does raise the question of triadic knowledge, one that goes back to the classical *Samkhya* and beyond. It also raises the question of 'evolution' and the way this term is abused by spiritual thinkers. It brings in the theme so often incorrectly stated of 'spiritual evolution' to a new man, one able to handle a higher logic. This raises the question of the meaning of evolution and its relation to spiritual ways.

To be fair the issue of triads is a riddle of great antiquity, and it has spawned a cousin in the confusions of dialectic found in the post-Hegelian left. The statement of a 'law of three' could have clarified the issues, but is the basic claim correct? Here the issue intersects with the classic *Samkhya* and basis of the 'gunas' is equally debatable. However, it is possible to create an intelligent model based on the attempt of Bennett to create a version of Gurdjieff's Ray of Creation. The latter shows Gurdjieff's method to be based on *Samkhya*, whether of the yogic brand or not.

At what point Ouspensky came on his radar is not clear, but to land the author of *Tertium Organon* was a considerable coup. It is not clear why. Gurdjieff had some kind of inside information which he didn't divulge about the mysterious Mr. Ouspensky. And Gurdjieff seemed to have realized he lacked the acumen for what he intended. He wanted a second opinion at sleeve, a 'pandit' of the type that 'talks to the guru' in India. Looking at

the whole corpus of Gurdjieff we see how many weak spots might have been worked out with good consultants. Instead we find both Ouspensky and later Bennett unable to question dubious Gurdjieffisms.

Lost in all the discourse on this history is this obvious fact: a series of prospects are suddenly snared for promotional purposes, and we are left to wonder if this is an interference in the natural spiritual biography that emerges in all individuals (hopefully!) to bend that individual to a transient exploitation. One must ask this question, since a host of commentators have remarked on what was said to have been Ouspensky's inability to complete some putative series of stages in his development. An as likely explanation is that having gotten a perfect public communicator, Gurdjieff terminated the relationship in order to veil the deeper purposes behind what was to become a very considerable public attraction point, the materials given in the series of lectures and activities beginning in Moscow in the period of the lead up to the Russian revolution. Gurdjieff didn't quite do a clean job here, since Ouspensky smelled a rat. We can't finally resolve this issue, but it has to be said that few claimants to the title of spiritual teacher have ended up with an advertisement as effective as Ouspensky's literary productions expounding Gurdjieff's so-called 'fourth way'. These tactics emerge repeatedly, with Orage, and then Bennett.

Let us note that Ouspensky began to harbor suspicions about Gurdjieff rather quickly, and, while it is not clear just what this was about, it seems clear that the charlatanesque flavor sometimes said to be acted out by Gurdjieff as deliberate put-on is the most obvious symptom of something amiss in the depiction of a hidden teaching. To be fair, we suspect a technique of 'living dangerously' by many such figures as a way to prompt consciousness against mechanical habit. But such tactics put the whole enterprise at risk of bad judgments, rash goofs, and the like.

If this teaching is so important, why do it that way? The point is not that Gurdjieff was a charlatan but that he was involved in a deception of some kind. From hindsight, the verdict is obvious. Much of the teaching was a series of 'brochure' materials, partly coming from Gurdjieff's own searches, but partly made up, or considerably embroidered. Ouspensky sensed that Gurdjieff wasn't on the level. It is not too hard for an outsider to see the problem! If you say the enneagram is the source of all knowledge you are either an idiot, or about the business of promoting gimmicks that can play on people's suggestibility. To be sure, the lore of this question of the enneagram deserves a respectful historical or anthropological account in a Sufi context, but then what are the facts? None are available. This example is significant because it is always difficult, if not impossible to challenge the ideas of Gurdjieff: his public statements refer to something that is not available 'at the moment'. But with the enneagram we have him nailed.

The enneagram is a reference to something else, the 'real thing', and as such is merely exoteric perhaps. Thus the material on the enneagram isn't really what the issue is about, because that is esoteric, and its meaning will come later. These loans on credibility are played over and over again by Gurdjieff. With hindsight we can see that balderdash went a long way here. We should play a straight card here: by their fruits ye shall know them. The material on the enneagram, and the associated material, is evidence of what is really a weak rehash of some kind of 'hermetic flotsam', material of no particularly deep character, but of the type that the contemporary New Movement has been flooded with, to no avail. We can reserve judgment up to a point here, but the issue is merely that gambling your fortunes is not called for in the context of such loans of credibility.

It is significant that Bennett, the second mathematician snared by this agenda, quietly saw through the enneagram figure and shifted his considerations to something else. Yet he never said so in public. Thus much of the material in Ouspensky is of this character. From the cosmic hydrogens to the doctrines of the cosmoses we suspect Gurdjieff was making it up as the game proceeded. This may be false, but at some point a resolution

must come in the form of development or clarification, and that never came. We should interject that in one case we can find the coordinates of Gurdjieff's pronouncements, the classical Samkhya. The resemblance to the Ray of Creation is obvious.

Hollywood Samkhya with a dash of theistic interpretation, or cooptation. And we can thus compare source and result, and we see an extraordinary pastiche of classical Samkhya disgorged with much added on in feverish mystical haste. Whatever the case, this example shows us the way Gurdjieff treated his materials. Such issues should be settled by proper scholarship, and telling of the truth, but we can see that has been made impossible and the same rehash of gibberish simply goes on and on. In all fairness an attempt to make classical Samkhya intuitive for modern man was a *'bon idee'*, one that somehow got scrambled in the mind of Gurdjieff into a concoction, wisecracking to use his own phrase.

We should be wary here. We can extract the original statements about the sequential logics and the number seven, and try to see the 'ray of creation' as a model of a *Samkhya* cosmology. In Bennett's hands it has a certain amount of cogency. But then students must be freed of the esoteric mystique to be able to study this construct skeptically. In an age of string theory the prospects of the Ray of Creation seem dim, yet the place of biosphere's in the larger logic of evolutionary life suggest an insight we have lost.

## 1.2 Revolution and Reaction

One of the most insidious aspects of the portrait given by Ouspensky is the unspoken strain of reactionary politics confronting the Russian revolution. An emerging 'spiritual path' is declared beyond politics, the 'history of crime', but with Gurdjieff we increasingly suspect it is to be anything but that. A great untold story of twentieth century history is of the shadowy occult activities of various esoteric fascists. Gurdjieff's place in that is hard to decipher, but his sympathies are clearly of the most reactionary sort. That said, Ouspensky is perhaps the worse, and Gurdjieff had no illusions about the injustice in Russia, and prompted Ouspensky on the point.

Ouspensky succumbed to the reactionary logic of the law of caste in his *Psychology of Man's Possible Evolution*. This absurd but dangerous piece was unwittingly part of the fascist anti-modernism of his generation. There is absolutely authoritative status in the caste nightmare of India. Castes were created by the Aryans after they entered India and had no status in the primordial 'santana dharma' of India.

To be fair, the onset of the phase of Bolshevism appeared to fulfill the dire prophecies of the conservatives. But his pertains to the status of capitalism which is never critiqued by reactionaries who denounce modern freedom. But the opposition of figures like Gurdjieff was as much a challenge to modern liberalism, democracy and freedom. It is the same old story, the legacy of Edmund Burke being but the most obvious outward case. Burke's fulminations against the French Revolution are the seminal grounding of much modern conservatism, and reactionary axioms, but Burke entirely missed the point of the French Revolution, which failed as an outward activist movement, but which was a success in the end. Within a generation the new order of democratic man was established, not least by the American Revolution. The history of revolution in modern times can't be dismissed by reactionaries who cannot see the reality: the bogus character of their 'new age' fantasies and the reality of the modernist tide. A study of WHEE is useful here. The attempts by spiritual reactionaries to attack modernity show they are 'cut flowers' abandoned by spiritual history.

The hidden anti-democratic strain of the gurus and sheiks of the modern new age movement is notorious. The theme of the 'masters' has a clear *double entendre* and to this we can add the ironic influence of Nietzsche on

new age operatives. The whole idea of a spiritual master is reactionary at its core. And the implications of occult control of unsuspecting individuals are part of the danger of this form of spiritual discipleship.

We need to understand the complete inability of various Eastern clusters of 'New Age' activity to grasp the nature of the modern world, with a resulting determination to foment the stages of a 'postmodern', anti-modern, cultural regression. The drama of revolution and counterrevolution begins with the French revolution, if not the Reformation, and the violent reactionaries of that period are still very much a clarion call for many in spiritual circles in the generations to come. Gurdjieff is found later to have mixed feelings about the great tide of abolition, is contemptuous, by indirect slur, at liberalism, and the emergence of modern freedom, and clearly exhibits an authoritarian strain in his relations with his 'disciples'.

The rise of modernity in the sixteenth century begins with the Reformation and this has a distorted history. The prophet Thomas Munzer shows the volcanic rebirth of a thread of the Jesus tradition in the brand of communist Christianity that was soon suppressed. Churches of the Reformation remorph many times as in the birth of modern democracy in the English Civil War, and work of Quakers in the abolitionism movement. It is a disgrace to find hints, as from Bennett, of Gurdjieff's sympathy with slavery. Gurdjieff's ignorance of this aspect of Christianity shows that he is an ignoramus and a fraud.

He was, to a high degree of suspicion, a Tsarist agent (who also two-timed in revolutionary groups, perhaps as an infiltrator), and evidently his personal ethics reflect some variety of the Machiavellian strain of the 'realist' in politics, what to say of his 'wheeler dealer' escapades and shadow activities with respect to issues of money. Ironically he is the type of the instinctive capitalist able to handle monies, business combinations and people with a definite panache. Add the occult strain to this, and the result is a concoction of the guru game that is a rank deception for the flock of liberal or modernist progressive persons drawn into the net of his activities. And a curious form of spiritual capitalism matched with occult powers to work the 'mob' picked up for a teaching.

In all fairness, Gurdjieff seems to have withdrawn from or balked at what he sensed was afoot in the emergence of later outright fascism and its Nazi horror, but the same can't be said of his later epigones, or of the milieu of Sufistic reactionaries that came of age in the era of the Holocaust. This could be too fair: he was on the fringe of the esoteric fascism that came into existence in the nineteenth century and which lost control as it morphed into Nazism. The guru Rajneesh has charged esoteric Buddhism with fascist and Nazi manipulations.

If it were a question of being a critic of the extremes of revolution or of the folly of Leninism, that would be one thing, but the contrary extreme, almost of de Maistrean proportions, bodes ill for the foundationalist hopes of a new tradition. Such a 'tradition' will start to founder and confront, ironically, what Gurdjieff called a 'denying force', the great tide of freedom that appears with as much 'spiritual' force as any initiative for the restoration of antiquity. What is puzzling is the poor understanding of history in so many of the gurus of this period, a clear indication that their posture of esotericism is a pretense. In general, Gurdjieff's assertions about the antiquity of real knowledge are mostly antiquarianism, and any plan of action based on denigrating modernity as less than spiritual is amateurish conservatism, more characteristic of religious traditionalists, and hardly to be expected from someone pontificating about the whole course of civilization.

A wished for spiritual tradition to be founded by a Russian pre-revolutionary intelligence agent is a species of wrong work, if ever there was such a thing, and we should be vigilant as to the result, a series of 'schools' exploiting those who are subject to endless deceptions and disinformation. Creating a spiritual tradition is not so simple, and, ironically, Gurdjieff's 'inability to do' is reflected in what to a close look shows an almost immediate failure.

### 1.3 A Falling Out

One of central incidents of the Gurdjieff movement, or the absence of one, was the sudden parting of ways initiated by the suspicious Ouspensky. There is a lot of confusion here, starting with the claim by Orage that an instance of rape by Gurdjieff triggered a final break.

Chapter 6 of James Webb's *The Harmonious Circle* (Putnam, 1980), "the inner and outer revolutions", discusses Ouspensky's departure from Gurdjieff, leaving the question ambiguous. No one seems to realize that Ouspensky is projecting his own future into that of the many who will become ensnared in the artifice of Gurdjieff. The 'search for the miraculous' will adjourn to the question of the 'inner revolution' mirroring the outer, the 'revolt against the masters. That Ouspensky left only to end momentarily in Bolshevik terrain is most ironic. The great drama of spiritual surrender is matched by the revolt against the masters that comes to a climax in the progression of modern revolution. And this is also connected, as we see, with the crisis of climate change and the destruction of the environment, with communist initiative to attempt before it was too late, a challenge to the rapidly expanding capitalist globalization. The emergence of communism was originally a prophetic vision of what we see now is the destruction of a planet by capitalism gone amok.

Here is an irony: an immense if disorganized movement has come into existence after the lifetimes of the principals, but at the crucial point of its emergence the chief 'discipline' balked and found the whole thing a problem. In the notes the reference to two essays by Ouspensky clarifies the issues to some degree. But we suspect that Ouspensky was unable to sort out the conflict in his mind between the completely overvalued idea of 'esotericism' and the instinctive realization something was wrong. For Ouspensky 'esotericism' excludes all possibility of criticism, a remarkable state of mind from an earlier age of authoritarian teachings, and a dangerous axiom by any reckoning. This period was to see the onset of the 'absolute obedience' syndrome that filtered down into the Nazi movement, and Ouspensky with a curious sense of ominous foreboding expresses the antidote. The canon of absolute submission to a spiritual teaching is to suffer a death in this era, and Ouspensky in despite of himself is one of the first to break out of the mystique of the authoritarian guru. In the second essay, he makes the obvious point that black magic and white magic are being confused and that any nonsense about the esoteric is being shown up as shoddy work, a shambles in the making.

At the end of his life he renounced the work, a smart move, and as documented in the blog *The Gurdjieff Con* the reincarnation of Ouspensky, by report, was found to be harried by obscure persons of occult power out to capture his later manifestation. That is the key danger of these games of surrender: unlimited and unconditional submission is the path to spiritual slavery over many lives and the sensible man would wake up from esoteric rules of procedure to be wary of slave masters and the profit in slaves, especially those usefully unconscious of their history in a previous life

And his posthumous publication has been the operating manual for a host of impostors claiming its authority. Is this situation not a bit absurd? Ouspensky makes a good role model here. Make sure you renounce the work before you die. One life wasted on all this is enough. In a second round you may not realize until too late your prior agreements. Guinea pigs! And be wary of what you put in print. Others will use your work in your name and if they can find out where you reincarnated they may track you down and destroy you to control your legacy.

The Gurdjieff people played at the debunking of reincarnation, near Ouspensky with his talk of recurrence. But Sufis appear to know all too well the Buddhist arts of finding reincarnates, and it is naive to think they might fulfill the prime task of a teacher, to acquaint the disciple of his past lives. Keeping him in the dark is more profitable.

A tremendous premium on spiritual authority and obedience has gotten currency from all this, again due to certain statements recorded by Ouspensky, and yet the whole drama seems to have been embroiled with the opposite. Trashing disciples seems to have been a Gurdjieff specialty. These are dispositions from an age now lost to us, as the tide of democratic logic overtakes the lore of gurus and disciples, and the similar world of sheiks.

There are several quite different questions here:

the need for a teacher

the requirement of obedience

the latter taken to an extreme

In the first case, the role of a teacher is canonical in all fields and requires no abject surrender. Courtesy and careful audition leave the problem solved.

Requirements of obedience are traditional in many legacies and spring from any number of sources/rationales. But the question arises, why is it necessary?

The final category of absolute obedience creates immediate suspicion, that of ambition in the one who asks this, as an unreasonable demand smacking of ambition.

It is important for those caught up by their own suggestibility in the proliferation of this mutating legacy to maintain their presence of mind and to see that the imputation of authority is spurious. Ironically, a degree of obedience might have left Gurdjieff to the supervision of his teachers, rather than his running off to go into business for himself.

And that the source of information in ISOM snapped out of the authoritarian game once he saw it in action. It is in fact a blessing in disguise that Ouspensky had the ability to think critically about what was afoot, even if it might be that he ended up not fully aware of the full picture subsequently drawn by Gurdjieff.

## 1.4 A Great Work

The term 'the great work' occurs in various occult traditions, and a variant 'the work', inherited in fact from the Sufi tradition, is used by Gurdjieff to refer to his activities and also to their purported place in a cosmological scheme resembling the lore of the 'great chain of being', with the cooptation of an 'evolutionary' idea whose exact basis is never given any kind of empirical or scientific foundation. It is all assertion on Gurdjieff's part, and, as presented in his writings, a very obscurely stated metaphysics. J. G. Bennett has attempted to present all of this in works such as 'Making of a New World'. But the slew of material has a false basis, and is based on the spiritual cannibalism racket of a great chain of being, with man some kind of 'food for god'. This is the ancient lore of the pagan religions abolished by the coming of Christianity. It is junk.

The 'work' is a pun on the work of the many and the justification of its exploitation.

The reactionary character of the movement is almost certainly connected to the general tide of the assault on labor on the right. In this context the term 'work' in its general tenor sounds like the union busting it is: part of the reaction against modernity and then against the revolt of labor against capital. As with so many spiritual conservatives the 'new age' will exempt the upper class capitalists against the proletarians. Everything in the formulation suggests a 'classy' spiritual membership. In fact the 'esoteric' has a long history among elites. And Gurdjieff like Nietzsche is a reluctant member of the age of Abolition, a point noted quietly by Bennett. The ironic references to the work are therefore under suspicion from the start.

Elites began licking their chops early here: a spiritual justification for an exploitative social ideology.

One of the most disturbing aspects of the 'Gurdjieff work' is the wild and likely false, claim that the spiritual action or effort of the individual is somehow required by greater nature in the transformation of energies. It is hard to see how Gurdjieff arrives at this, but a suspicion arises as we examine his activities with 'disciples', and already with certain of his most cunning 'successors', or interlopers, that this formulation is altogether convenient at the point where the financial needs of the 'work' approach the red ink level. We must suspect that the energies of the seeker are really to be appropriated in the ages old scheme of keeping the masses deprived of conscious energies. Bennett's promotion of all this vitiates his entire work.

Whatever the significance of Gurdjieff's metaphysics his references to the work show a curious bias indeed. A wheeler-dealer and accomplished capitalist who has a stumbling block on the issue of abolition, and a barely disguised distaste for liberal rights, proposes a psychological system with an unfortunate set of metaphors about factories, and the energies of 'personal' transformation, their extraction, and final destination.

Perhaps one of the reasons the 'work' never goes anywhere is that its 'workers' are suffering from the extraction of surplus value in a bad factory job! Maybe Marx was onto something. This is union busting on the grand scale. It seems Marx had a point. Be wary of the *haute bourgeoisie* and their 'make work' schemes. For all its vaunted resurrection of ancient and sacred teachings the 'work' shows a strange resemblance to an industrial metaphor.

The great danger of the 'work' is its occult/capitalist confusion of puns: the disciple ('worker') is to create and surrender 'conscious energies' in a larger enterprise, unspecified. We notice that almost no participants emerge with any consciousness. A strange hint was given by Reshad Field in the aside, 'work on self is not the work'.

## 1.5 Seekers and Suckers

A great many new age movements are based on the sucker principle, and the Gurdjieff work is under suspicion of belonging to that category. The sucker principle is the use of shoddy goods for an outer group who pay the bills and who always drift away sooner or later. A fruitless search arises over and over again with students of Ouspensky. A number of new age gurus have protested the illusions of spiritual search. The notorious guru Da Free John took this to extremes by denouncing the search, but he never explained the rationale. It is a point Ouspensky-ites might consider: ISOM induces an unquenchable thirst for the true teaching and a motive to seek out the sources of the Gurdjieff pronouncements. The search for the miraculous turns into the search for a school, and this search is almost completely hopeless from the start. The extravagant attempts to excavate Sufism in Islamic worlds and their failure should make that clear. The world of 'Sufisheikistan' is a remote fiction for most seekers who are cruelly set upon a search that can never succeed. The traditions of India are much clearer here and expose the search in the sense that man is already enlightened: the issue is realization. Such sentiments are lost on the Gurdjieff which puts the seeker into a long path that will never find any real outcome: 'enlightenment' is never even mentioned.

A work such as that by Paul Brunton on the long and short path, *The Short Path to Enlightenment: Instructions*

for *Immediate Awakening* Paperback, Larson, 2014, by Paul Brunton, can help to see the way the Gurdjieff system creates an endless 'path' with no outcome. Enlightenment in the Buddhist sense is never even mentioned. Further, it is helpful to 'self-debrief' with an understanding there is nothing to achieve save the realization that enlightenment is the case.

One of the notable effects of Ouspensky's ISOM is its creation of a strong motivation to complete the set of 'fragments of an unknown teaching' so that he can actually do something practical. But the world of Gurdjieff never measures up to a practical method. One's overall impression of the Gurdjieff legacy, for reasons we can now suspect, is one of exploitation, and more explicitly the exploitation of the 'search'. The very delineation into 'esoteric' and 'exoteric' lends itself to this, with the thought of a wild-goose chase coming to the fore. The spurious idea of a 'school', discovered only after endless search, generates an atmosphere of mystery for what in the final analysis is recycled 'hermetic flotsam' with a new twist.

Gurdjieff spoke of the phenomenon of 'suggestibility', evidently the exercise is to exploit, this being the cure for those who must learn the hard way the nature of their suggestibility. This is one of the danger points for the legacy because occult suggestion can enslave a disciple to permanent sleep in a treadmill of the 'work'.

It might be an important question to ask, what is the actual basis for the esoteric? There is an ominous parallel in the similar propaganda for covert agencies of government. Note that students of Gurdjieff confront early on the phenomenon of outward lying and are pressed into conformity to the borderline psychopathies of occult, covert agents, and politicians in general. Ouspensky transmits the idea of politics as the history of crime, but is the 'work' not stuck in this category?

But the reality of monotheism has always suggested the abuse of mechanical religion to hide the use of real spiritual methods by elites. And the tactics of 'disinfo', looking backward, seem frightfully in evidence in the legacy of Christianity. Christians are some of the most confused spiritual seekers. The effect of 'esoteric' Christianity is to condemn its converts to a treadmill of speculative frustrations as to the very basics of their history. The analog to covert agencies is apt. There are certainly secrets in religion as in politics and we must suspect the core of Machiavellianism in both. We have not stated the case for the 'esoteric', to be sure. But the case for a religion that is honest, clear and open, as with Buddhism, is a requirement that seems to fail in the Occident.

Perhaps the term 'esoteric' is a handy evasion of the ethical problematic that arises when a 'spiritual' authority sees fit to tell a pack of lies!

## Notes

---

### 1.1

Amazon Review of *The Enneagram: A Christian Perspective Paperback* by Richard Rohr

[http://www.amazon.com/review/RTMSNNCNWF33L/ref=cm\\_cr\\_rdp\\_perm?ie=UTF8&ASIN=0824519507](http://www.amazon.com/review/RTMSNNCNWF33L/ref=cm_cr_rdp_perm?ie=UTF8&ASIN=0824519507)

The material left behind on the enneagram remained relatively sidelined for decades until the key to hyping it appeared in the claims of its use for the study of personality types, a very peripheral species of junk science that created the illusion of making sense.

The enneagram is a completely unfounded form of new age symbology that has never received any clarification. It was expounded by Gurdjieff whose manner was to claim something was esoteric, presenting an outer teaching whose secret content is never revealed. This makes critics prone to pause, lest they confuse the outer wrapper with the content in question. The point is that everything said in public about the enneagram is falsely

claiming to explicate a subject too esoteric to reveal in public. There is a better explanation here: con men at work.

This issue has been further confused by the support given by two students Ouspensky and J. G. Bennett. The latter, who should have known better, gave the subject a pass, although he seemed to have been clearly wary of the symbolism.

No clarification of the nonsense of the enneagram has ever been put forth, its source claimed to be the *Nashqbandi* Sufis, who should have attempted clarification, but instead revealingly changed course with another version of this fraud, the enneagon of Oscar Ichazo, who denounced the enneagram as unscientific. This situation should alert scholars to the danger of using this junk thinking. But now we see an increasing flood of bad treatments of the subject, moving to the core of Christianity.

The attraction to Christians arises from the failed attempt to rejustify the question of the Trinity with something supposed to support its confusions.

I think what early Christians were about here was a possible influence of Indic *Samkhya* in the spread of Jain yogis into the Roman Empire. The Trinity looks like an attempt to recast the original triad of *Samkhya* as some kind of esoteric mystery in a veiling of the unmanifest. That's confusing enough once we know that *Samkhya* was the reference. But its transformation into Christian theology was clearly a distortion of the original meaning.

In any case the quite different enneagram is a confusion of seven term and nine term systems, with no explanation for the difference.

In the end the issue is a variant of claims about seven term sequences and the so-called 'law of three'. This was the original thinking, overhyped into an esoteric doctrine, and matched to the enneagram in an illogical confusion of terms. We have no references whatever to any source for these ideas, which are probably made up. Seven levels appear in the ancient *Samkhya*, we should note, but the source of this is unknown.

I think that theologians should be wary of this fake esoteric lore, and consider the opinion of many spiritual teachers as to the fraud in the whole game. Gurdjieff, the source here, put this question into the esoteric doctrine category, which means that doubters are at risk from some very dangerous occultists. This material should never have gone mainstream and is a front for some very unsavory Sufis who know perfectly well the whole subject is baloney.

I think the theological community should pull away from this false lead into the realm of the esoteric.

The law of three and the law of seven are interesting thought experiments, but they have no basis in objective knowledge. Only a devious klutz as retarded as Gurdjieff could have thought it possible to get away with such a piece of bad thinking.

Another Amazon Review:

This review is from: *The Holy Trinity and the Law of Three: Discovering the Radical Truth at the Heart of Christianity (Kindle Edition)* [http://www.amazon.com/review/RPH2PWJU1DCEX/ref=cm\\_cr\\_rdp\\_perm](http://www.amazon.com/review/RPH2PWJU1DCEX/ref=cm_cr_rdp_perm)

The whole discourse of the enneagram is flawed and is a part of the legacy of rubbish that Gurdjieff served up in the name of esotericism. The exact source of this glyph has never been revealed, a source of suspicion right at the start. It would be impossible in principle for a symbol of this type to be a source for all knowledge. The differentiation of the symbol itself is too thin for such a task (counting lines, points, intersections, etc..).

Therefore the symbol is either a fantasy or the 'Christmas wrapper' for the undelivered Christmas present. I cannot rule out the possibility that the enneagram refers to something withheld that can explicate its claims. But then why would those who revealed its 'wrapper' not be ready to explicate the real McCoy instead of letting tens of thousands, more, take false goods as the secret revealed? Such behavior shows the whole game to be nonsense.

And it is sad to see this stupidity passing first through psychology, in a mythology of types. And now in the realm of the Christian gospels, no less.

It is very confusing and unhelpful for this kind of occult shennanigan deception to penetrate the Gospels themselves. The issue of the Trinity shows a real example of a variant of this kind of confusion, so our complaint would be answered with 'this is nothing new'. In any case, the Trinity most probably is a version of the Indian *Samkhya* with its views on the nature of triads. Although the enneagram seems to do this it has confused the issue with an imaginary set of interpretations.

Whatever the status of Samkhya, it does offer a few insights into the scheme of things (in the end the same critique as with enneagram might apply) and we suspect the Trinity to be a garbled version of the top triad in the cascade 3, 6, 12, 24, 48...

In any case the enneagram is a mirage and it is unfortunate to also bring in the case of Boehme whose musings on a 'dialectical triad' was a genuine historical insight sui generis which does not deserve being annexed to the confusions of the enneagram. The law of three is almost universally garbled by all parties, so what is the reality. We cannot let some authority force belief on the grounds of esoteric omniscience. This is just idiocy. But the case of Boehme shows the way triadic thinking arises over and over again as a spontaneous archetype.

The enneagram shows a funny resemblance to the tale of Aladdin's Magic Lamp, as the source of manifold wishes fulfilled. The enneagram myth is like that and a clever ruse at the hands of hucksters like Gurdjieff

1.2

*The Occult Roots of Nazism: Secret Aryan Cults and Their Influence on Nazi Ideology* ~ Nicholas Goodrick-Clarke

Mark Sedgwick in *Against the Modern World: Traditionalism and the Secret Intellectual History of the Twentieth Century* (Oxford 2004), gives a biography of Rene Guenon, a student of Gurdjieff, and a discussion of Traditionalism (cf. Ch. 1), "According to Traditionalists the modern west is in crisis as a result of a loss of tradition..."

James Webb in *The Harmonious Circle*, 'The Great Game', Ch. 3, discusses the issue of Gurdjieff as a covert agent. Similar charges stalk Madam Blavatsky. In 1922, Gurdjieff was interviewed by a police or security agency and accused of being a Tsarist agent, p. 49.

This is a section from WHEE on the revolutions of modernity. They are an intrinsic part of the dynamic of modern history. The inability of spiritual gurus to understand this is a scandal haunting the whole new age movement.

The onset of the French Revolution deserves as much as any date in history, beside the more glorious flagship American onset from 1776, the importance that has risen around it, as the period that initiated a shockwave of modernizing change that was national, then continental, and then global in nature, and whose cornucopia of diffusing consequences is still with us. That it was directly influenced from the fringe by the American revolution in its virgin open spaces is itself significant, and it was therefore a subtle recursion, in the broadest sense, of the experience of the English Civil War, and its aftermath, the Glorious Revolution of 1688, against a backdrop of the rising liberalism and deeper underground radicalism generated from the philosophic, scientific, and revolutionary experiences of the English.

In the prismatic view of Dickens, it was the 'best of times, the worst of times.' When asked what he thought was the significance of the French revolution, the Chinese Premier Zhou Enlai is said to have answered, "It's too soon to tell". The era invokes a field of potential, against which relative free action passes between hypothetical eonic determination, and the realizations of new forms of society. Francois Furet, the historian of the French Revolution and its ideological history, has declared that the 'Revolution is over'. It is also true that the Revolution has been repeatedly been declared over, from almost its first phases, and continually spills over into future incidents, 1830, 1848, and finally the Russian Revolution.

The American Revolution seems like a kind of 'butterfly effect', a small-scale effect provoking larger and enduring consequences. Note that the endless debates over revolution are really about the intractable nature of simple changes, the French and especially the Russian being the obvious examples, compared to the American. It is all very well to denounce Rousseau and Robespierre but if such an immense convulsion echoing the American example failed to produce a republic these critics are really saying that freedom is impossible or utopian, and that we should, à la de Maistre, revert to primitive systems of barbarous ages past. Let us note at least that our system, upon full study, will be seen to adopt a shotgun approach and the total net effect of democratization springs as much from sources having nothing to do with the French Revolution. So therefore not everything, indeed not much at all, rides on the brief reign of Robespierre, whose failure seems to be grounds for every reactionary sermon delivered up to those who wouldn't dream of surrendering their own benefits. The classic example here is abolition, about which Enlightenment thinkers were a bit 'sluggish', the job done by the epigones of our to-be-secularized Protestant Reformation.

The myth of slow evolutionary change is not here concordant with the facts, and, Burke notwithstanding, our system explodes because change is thwarted even as the American system has set sail (albeit without dealing with abolition). It is a 'now or never point' relative to world history. Thus the conditions of the American version were obviously quite exceptional. And the American is the more remarkable for showing the 'what might have been' with respect to much modern confusion. If we consider the Decembrists in Russia, and the immense delay in the Russian case, we would do well to lay the violence of revolution as well at the feet of hopelessly muddled reactionaries.

In the final analysis these three revolutions, English, American, French (and what of the early German version in 1625?) are one and the same, and pass into 1848, the business too obviously still incomplete, as the tide climaxes and begins to recede, leaving the ghoulish Russian experiment stranded, with an historical expectation about 'revolution' that played them false. Just here we see the drama of 'permanent revolution' beginning, and a distinction is essential, between historical process claimed as revolution, and the free activity to create one based on memory, a fatal danger. Beside the late failure of the Russian Revolution, we see the issue of modernism computed against the incidents of its success or failure, and find that, relative to 1500-1800, history successfully reaches a new plateau, whatever the outcome of its particular incidents.

Our three centuries since Luther cover immense ground, but we can see the clear unity, as the 'real Revolution', by nature's method. Behind this unity we can as well see the deeper disunity, and catch the mechanism as what we suspect, small scale influences defeating the large, the sourcing of the American system at the fringes being a classic example. And the climax of our period of transition is spectacular, as the economic and democratic revolutions sweep the field in the last generation of the eighteenth century, and then cross a mysterious divide ca. 1800 into a period of relative stabilization. But these are, probably, already relatively contingent outcomes in a process that was complete at the time of the Thirty Years War.

After the experience of the Russian revolution the rejection of revolution as a process has become the dominant viewpoint. But the issue of 'revolution' is fundamental, whatever we think, because the slow evolution of society would never, by incremental change, given human nature and its obsession to dominate and enslave, to say nothing of the clear evidence that long term history keeps getting stuck, have produced the forms of modern freedom, democracy, or even economic development. Only a small fringe area at the boundary of Eurasia seems to have been able to break out of the system of antiquity. But we can grant the point of skepticism to see that revolutions aren't to be had for the asking, and don't just come about from audacity.

The point is simply that man as man simply will not, because the record of history shows that he will not grant freedom to his fellow man. And the great achievements of freedom show initial bursts of eonic determination. There is a mysterious 'something else' involved in the appearance of democracy.

The author's *Last and First Men* begins with a discussion of the mysterious hints in Bennett's *The Dramatic Universe* of interaction with the 'Demiurgic Powers', and their action in the period of 1848, the dawn of the 'new age' according to Bennett who also notes the birth of communism. The fascist conspiracies of occult and by suspicion Buddhist groups to foster reaction thus contribute to the failure of the communist initiative and the triumph of the capitalist forces of neo-liberalism. *Last and First Men* references the mind control tactics in question, and we can be sure Gurdjieff was aware of them. Which leaves the question of his involvements open.

From *The Gurdjieff Con: 02.21.15* Gurdjieff ignited the war against gurus...

Reading Patterson's book on Gurdjieff I am struck by the naïveté, and the failure to see the context. In later years students would discover that Gurdjieff thought the peasants better off under the Tsar, thought slavery should be the norm, and that his 'disciples' should also be slaves de facto to the master... And it is worse than that. There is the danger of slavery to a hidden master over many lives.

To arrive in Russia during a proletarian revolution with this mindset was not only unbecoming in a 'master' but a totally reckless throwing down the gauntlet, in a period that would see the fascist reaction to democratic governments.

I think Gurdjieff must have been stupid, as are many monarchs, and provoked his own discombolulation. It is part of the reactionary mindset that thinks modernity is a mistake and deserves to be taught a lesson. It is little wonder that Ouspensky balked. A teaching like this as he sensed wasn't checking out. And his instincts were right, even though he himself was a reactionary super-idiot with his book on establishing the Code of Manu.

C'mon guys: this wasn't the way to do it and I think that Ouspensky was right to refuse and move away. And he was right to think that the 'fourth way' (a phantom with some meaning) and the rest of it had to be independent of Gurdjieff: a student here could not be the passive slave of a 'master'.

These people got ass=kicked by reality, and the irony is that the 'teaching' was actually designed as we can see for men of the future, free men.

These people are dangerous for westerners stepped in the ideals of freedom: a war with the guru over 'total surrender' can break out and the 'disciple' is destroyed. This shows the dangers of the guru game in the West.

To be fair Gurdjieff in the 30's so frustrated he actually contacted the Russian embassy for a visa to return to Russia. He was turned down. What was that all about?

It can be useful to study the response of one Indian disciple who commented on Ouspensky's departure from Gurdjieff. This is *To Live Within*, by Shri Anirvan, who gives us an example of the logic of absolute surrender and the nonsense this creates. This confusing book discusses the author's contact with an unknown Indian guru, not with the completely different case of someone like Gurdjieff who is not a guru in any sense of the yogic or Buddhist traditions.

Gary Lachman considers the independent spirit of Ouspensky in *In Search of P. D. Ouspensky: The Genius in the Shadow of Gurdjieff*, Quest (2005). Ouspensky's interaction with Gurdjieff was in many ways a tragedy as he became subject to the influences of an authoritarian dictator promoting second rate belief systems, a Sufi pastiche. This was a waste of Ouspensky's talents.

From

*The Gurdjieff Con:*

07.28.08 Ouspensky and Gurdjieff the rapist

A lot of ink has been spilled on Ouspensky's break with Gurdjieff, in fact, whole books have been written, with a lot of backdated kibitzing about how Ouspensky was some kind of betrayer of the cause, or that he should have persisted in the great teaching to the end, etc, etc...

The reality would seem a bit different. Consider this from James Webb's *The Harmonious Circle*, p.384: Orage maintained that the split was caused by Gurdjieff's near rape of Mrs. Y in 1923-4. Ouspensky suffered a great disappointment, and saw that the whole game was going to suffer failure and collapse, and he was right, although the immense proliferation of Gurdjieffianity he did not foresee.

The 'work' was a failed enterprise by 1924, and it is no use blaming Ouspensky

*In Georgi Ivanovitch Gurdjieff: The Man, The Teaching, His Mission*, by W. P. Patterson, there are two Essays (Arete, 2014) by Ouspensky, *Why I Left Gurdjieff* (1926), and *Where I Diverge from Gurdjieff*

1.4

Gurdjieff was notorious for his castigation of religious democracy and thought it was pointless to deal with the multitude in his lurid metaphor of 'food for the moon'. The esoteric thus echoes the core idea of class warfare and is a veil to hide the potential of spiritual equality from the masses. This is a drastically anti-egalitarian stance and it is ironic that the flood of students to his teaching is just these 'low class' types, a dreadful thought.

1.5

### **07.31.13 The puzzle of the Illuminati**

I didn't mean to denigrate Rosicrucianism in the previous post. But the study of the eonic effect leaves the issues of gnostic history unsolved. It is all I suspect 'cultural trash' floating down the stream from some unknown first appearance in the late Neolithic. ???

The point is that things like the gnostic stream are not touched by the larger macro process of the eonic effect which operates on purely wholesome cultural entities.

But just here I can't pontificate. The history of Rosicrucianism (and or freemasonry) is a tough nut to crack, but, unless I am mistaken, it is not part of the macro effect in modernity. I think that Rosicrucianism predated the rise of modernity, and was never part of the real gist of modernity. It is a puzzle in part of German history, and that goes back to the obscurities of the Roman Empire encountering peoples at its fringes. Or else it is a seeded process of Islamic culture, like Romance poetry. The hidden influence of the Islamic tide is very hard to uncover, but it is there: consider Chaucer and his poetic themes. It is all mysterious. But the rise of modernity is something different, and doesn't operate via occult subjects. But there I can't be sure: look at the confusion created by the Illuminati, near the French Revolution. A probable mason or Rosicrucian concoction it was accused of seeding revolution. But all the students here were hopelessly confused. A close look suggests the

obvious fact that modernity springs from a different source and that this simply picked up the outstanding elements of the occult traditions momentarily the way a wave picks up a floating object and then leaves it behind. The revolutionary process and the emergence of democracy were something else then. The Illuminati are a complex hoax, in a stream that was highly reactionary, no doubt, but suddenly manifested a brief reign of radicals at the time of the French revolution. The amount of nonsense about this is beyond belief. But the later phase of some unknown German occultism that turned rancid and seeded a fascist milieu at the end of the nineteenth century produced much of the hysterical denunciation of the briefly appearing progressive Illuminati.

The attempt to blame the whole of modernity on the Illuminati via the revolutionary tradition is complete nonsense. Revolutions in modernity are part of the mysterious progression of epochs discussed in the previous post, and in WHEE.

So, this doesn't force us to reject Rosicrucianism, which once had an upscale rendition: it is simply that we wish to distinguish the mundane historical stream from the interaction with a spiritual process.

So verdict for Rosicrucianism remains murky. Don't expect such things to lead you to a spiritual knowledge or dimension. All this dead Gnosticism is part of the dead magic of long lost Pharaohs still lurking in samsaric realms to feed on later life in the damned cycle of vampires.

The ancient traditions of the earliest stage of civilization before even the rise of Sumer are lost to us (and not clarified by the ravings of hucksters like Gurdjieff).

So the tide of modernity is part of a larger process of civilizational evolution. And this doesn't contaminate culture with the refuse of long lost Egyptian occultism resurfacing ad infinitum long after its period of initial flourishing.

#### 12.06.12 Giving Christianity a foundation in modernity

Our post yesterday on the 'fate of Christianity' needs to be seen in the context of the eonic effect, and the progression of 'new ages' it suggests: the Axial Age religions are forced to either recreate themselves or pass away. One solution is to look at the outcome of the Protestant Reformation and create a new foundation in modernity. The world of the Enlightenment, of Kant, Hegel, and Marx, can suggest a new form of Christian relevance. The whole baggage of the religion now is an archaic package from the era of the Roman Empire.

The fate of Christianity

<http://darwiniana.com/index.php?s=communism+ultra+far+left+Christianity>

Two days ago we posted a 'Help Wanted' article, for a revolutionary Buddha, also a communist. We have, of course, had a lot of posts on an 'ultra far left Christian communism', but while the response was large, as curiosity, Christians have no real sense of the way in which their religion is 1. a revolutionary tradition, too often co-opted by reactionaries, and 2. something larger than its beliefs, as an historical movement connected to the Axial Age. The reality of Christianity is that the Reformation created something new, and capable of rapid evolution to a new religious format. Christianity in its current forms is dying on the vine, and the rightwing cooptation of the religion as some kind of adjunct to capitalist ideology is a gross distortion, and the death knell of American churches.

I think the comparative shallowness of the 'New Atheist' movement, a lost opportunity, creates a potential for Christians to actually do that job for the atheists, as strange as that might seem. The reason is that beliefs as to 'god' are, by and large, so decayed, chaotic, if not blasphemous, that a kind of 'semi-atheist negation' of those beliefs leads, not to actual atheism, but a sense of the implicit mystery of divinity, beyond words and concepts.

I think that embracing a radical left perspective by a 'remnant' and ditching the rest could revitalize the religion, and make it an adjunct to secularism, not an antithesis. Ironically, 'atheists' would find this appealing,

because their instincts are to create a religion, while denying, as an effort to escape the primitive confusions of theism.

07.29.12 *Illuminati*, and the occult paranoia of the right (and left)

Booknotes: *Illuminati* by Makow

The tide of modern revolution is a non-random occurrence in world history, and the careful analysis of the eonic effect shows what this means.

Anyone who didn't know that would tend to confuse the surging revolutionary tide with some kind of hidden conspiratorial action, missing the point completely.

The point here is that if you strip away ALL of the later idiocy about this 'cult', which is an extreme form of the reactionary literature denouncing the French Revolution, à la Edmund Burke, and/or the rise of liberal culture, what you have is an incident in the emergence of the democratic revolution, whose timing is, if you study the eonic effect, spookily non-random and clustered near the so-called Great Divide. Small wonder that reactionaries hallucinate a conspiracy. The timing of the climax to the modern transition is almost uncanny once you unravel the eonic effect. So the appearance of the Illuminati is simply an aspect of that tide of emergent modernist effects. All the later stuff is mostly paranoid accretion, and really sloppy thinking.

There is of course one other aspect here to the question: the association with the Rosicrucians, then the Freemasons: any association with these is the road to instant speculative excess, and the real history of the Freemasons is so muddled as to be nearly beyond factual clarification. And this rubs off on the question of the Illuminati.

Since radical masonry, if real, rapidly became rightist esotericism fascism in gestation, the paranoia is apparently deserved on both sides.

I cannot rule out anything about successors to the Illuminati, claiming their mantle, and it is from this later legacy that most of the crackpot stuff is associated. I could be wrong here, but I think the original movement has been the source of nearly fantastic distortions. A secretive group in non-democratic Germany inspired by the French Revolution deserves better than Burkean fulmination.

Check out the eonic effect, with its Great Divide, and the Discrete Freedom Sequence at [history-and-evolution.com](http://history-and-evolution.com) with links to each section/chapter online....

My principal point is that the macro effect in world history is far too broad and elusive for the kinds of esoteric groups peddled by these theorists to compete with. The two are often confused by conspiracy theorists, but they are completely different. Very little, close to none, of modernity was created by esoteric groups, nonetheless caught up in the tidal wave, the only real success being on the right, by reactionary anti-modernists, and the groups who seeded later fascism.

Setting the record straight is hard, perhaps hopeless, at this point. But a look at the eonic effect shows that all the really creative aspects of modernity spring from a different source.

## 2. Fascist Buddhas, Rogue Sufis

### 2.1 Sufistic Sagas

The questions of Buddhism and Sufism have become haunted with the mysteries of esoteric fascism and the charges against Buddhism in this context, up to and including the calamity of Nazism. Sufism is rarely seen in its true colors as pervaded by a rogue occult operation, a charge most will reject: at least be clear how concealed much of it is. What is striking is the scofflaw dishonesty of all these figures, a trait so reminiscent of the criminal class. The author has seen 'sufis' immersed in petty crime. Next to this the question of spiritual cannibalism and sacrifice has entered to haunt the reputation of Sufis, and the nature of the whole enterprise has foundered in paranoia. The basis of modern 'open society' is under check from movements that stew in their own confusions and public deceptions and threaten the well-being of free men with the 'duty' to be a sacrifice.

Ernst Scott's *The People of the Secret* gives some useful information on the history of Sufism, and its frustrating legacy of secrecy: Octagon 1983. The failure of Christianity to embrace even the basics of spiritual method left many spiritual guides in shock. But the solution is not to let loose the dog pack of every kind of gnostic con man.

The addition of methods has to be done right, and those methods made clear. Already the Gurdjieff world has produced all sorts of distortions of meditation. What is the matter with these people? The simple presentation of a basic techniques so carefully done by yogic and Buddhist traditions is beyond the capacity of these con men who can't discuss without making it a rip-off.

Scott brings home the fact that Sufi attempts to 'wake up the West' were based on a misunderstanding of modernity (which should be seen in the light of a work such as *World History and the Eonic Effect*). Nothing in Islam or Sufism could ever match the stupendous energies involved in the transformation of modernity, which has done more good to immense numbers than any brand of occult Sufism, such as the Freemason swindles. If we can decipher the record, the litter of Freemasonry movements shows a 'Sufi' signature, but these have in all cases turned into mechanical vestiges. Gurdjieff is thus visible as a variant, but this is out to be an enduring cult, one without any real keys to transformation. Hidden entities could lurk behind this, but no outsider should trust any of it. These operators have a rapacious appetite for suckers. Here, the materials bequeathed by Buddhism are far more open and transparent. Who needs this millennium of occult Sufi trash making an enigma out of alchemy?

We see Sufi misunderstanding of secularism in Gurdjieff's constant denigration of modernity (even as he played the machine tinkerer and capitalist), his choice of a reactionary spokesman, and his closet embrace of slavery, what to say of anti-democracy. Scott's book leaves the suggestion that concealed Sufi initiatives such as Freemasonry were thus early attempts to carry out a longstanding initiative in the West. Gurdjieff thus seems a later case related to this (but Gurdjieff was probably a lone ranger). Anyone who compares the cultural junk left behind by occult movements like freemasonry compared with the depth of the innovations of the early modern would have to wonder if Sufis hadn't missed the boat.

One obvious consideration with Gurdjieff is the relationship to Sufism, and its history, legacy, and relationship to Islam. At the time of Gurdjieff's appearance this connection was veiled, although many

discovered it soon enough. The question is highly complex and refers to many different forms of Sufism in the interior of Islam.

It is obvious in retrospect that Gurdjieff was raised in and explored the field of the Sufistic tradition, managing to find a number of its hidden corners. However, his 'teaching' is something quite different from what is conventionally seen as the 'Sufi path' (whatever that is). In general the question of Sufism is not easy to map out successfully and suffers from the totalitarian context it is forced to survive. It is difficult and finally counterproductive to attempt to embark on such a 'path' armed with nothing more than the public materials of that tradition.

The figure of Idries Shah has done a great deal to partially illuminate this tradition, and it is also an open question as to his connections with Gurdjieff. He has also produced a number of books, one with a pseudonym, attempting to throw some light on Gurdjieff's 'search'. Mostly his remarks are as untrustworthy as anything in Gurdjieff's own autobiography, so it is difficult to draw any conclusions.

J. G. Bennett pursues the distinction between the different Sufistic strains, as between the so-called Kwajagan and straight Sufistic/Arabian strains or schools, and we can, especially given our historical perspective (to be developed in next chapter) easily see that Sufism is being cast between the poles of monotheistic/gnostic mysticism and the Buddhist influences that had long before penetrated the field of Central Asia where Gurdjieff was at home. Don't let all this confusion distract from the basic simplicity of the situation as it revolves around a Buddhist and monotheistic dialectic. Scratch an accomplished Sufi and you'll find someone who has cribbed notes from Patanjali, no doubt. Since most Sufis 'in place' must bluff their way through a difficult totalitarian environment, the West has rapidly become a more useful milieu for the pursuit of Sufi issues. It is very difficult to find the truth about Sufism, and after one swindle, it is one time to learn. Sufis are not trustworthy.

No accurate or reliable accounts exist of either the history or legacy of Sufism, or of its more recondite manifestations, such as we see in Gurdjieff, who was, in any case, attempting to create a breakaway tradition of his own. In *People of the Secret*, Ernst Scott gives almost unwittingly gives a useful interpretation to the appearance of Sufism, and the attempt to bring a culture of consciousness to monotheism where that had aborted in Christianity. Influenced by J.G.Bennett Scott distinguishes the Hidden Directorate and the Demiurgic Powers. Along with this he mentions the nearly unknown lore of the 'soul' in the world of the Sufis. We can see that the question of who are the Sufis? equivocates the status of the 'Hidden Directorate', about whom there would be great confusion. The latter suffer all the limitations of the material plane and it is difficult to understand their place in terms of ordinary human history and evolution: it is just the kind of ambiguity we sense with Gurdjieff. Such beings are limited in their understanding, and have a legacy of creating spiritual/occult legacies left behind to confuse those who come later. And they cannot seem to grasp the dynamic of history, and the place of modernity in that context. We may be close to understanding how someone with 'consciousness' can be confused about issues such as the 'enneagram', and much else.

The question of the soul is discussed many times at *Darwiniana* and *The Gurdjieff Con* blogs. We can detect no discussion of this in Gurdjieff or his students.

## 2.2 Blavatskian Times

One of the key issues for understanding Gurdjieff is to see the backdrop of his times, and the legacy of Blavatsky, a figure whom Gurdjieff resembles, on the surface. Indeed, in both cases we see a slightly off-color or controversial figure claiming access to an esoteric circle promoting a form of spirituality for a 'New Age'. There

is an obvious strain of competition between the two, given Blavatsky's stance toward Christianity and the response of Gurdjieff with his claims for an 'esoteric Christianity'. We can see that monotheistic groups and traditions are rising in response to the clear Indic (Hindu/Buddhist) emphasis of Blavatsky's works. In both cases the element of deception, possible chicanery, and the promotion of the esoteric, colors the public presentation. In both cases we find more disinformation, guesswork, or outright deception than anything else, and it is finally difficult in both cases to do anything more than passively embrace the svengali of 'hidden masters' as an exoteric naif. The idea of 'esoteric Christianity' is a no-brainer. If the hidden esoteric Christians are this dishonest, you are out of luck and would do well to find another religion. Thieves in the night?

The tactics in both cases threaten in the end to discredit both the great streams of spirituality, in their traditionalist attacks on modernity disguised in the promulgation of a 'postmodern' New Age. In both cases, interested students are abducted into a labyrinth from which there is no escape on its own terms, short of simply abandoning the whole quest for something public, open, and on the level. People peddling the 'esoteric' seems to be looking for an excuse to lie to you. *Caveat emptor*.

The similarity of Crowley, Gurdjieff and Blavatsky and their appearance in concert at the end of the nineteenth century is probably no accident and is connected with the sudden onset of fascist politics.

And the wild card of 'esoteric fascism' emerging so notably in this generation suggests that something very 'occult' indeed is afoot, in which the two figures are obscure pawns.

*Madame Blavatsky's Baboon: A History of the Mystics, Mediums, and Misfits Who Brought Spiritualism to America*. By Peter Washington. Schocken, 1995.

## 2.3 The Lies of Esotericism

The world of esotericism resembles that of the intelligence agency, where the lie is the coin of discourse through and through. To bring this into the seeker's search for truth creates confusion in all cases, with destructive psychological results. The puzzle of figures like Gurdjieff includes the psychopathy of covert agencies and their '*real politik*'.

Beside this is the question of metaphysics and the equation of the esoteric with this, but with the claim that certain forms of consciousness can penetrate this barrier. The Kantian confusions here leave everything under suspicion.

It is interesting that the Gurdjieff initiative is associated via Ouspensky's *Tertium Organon* with the works of Kant. Ouspensky is of the type, beginning with Hegel, of those who wish to penetrate the 'noumenal', a task considered impossible by that critic of metaphysics. It is an open question, but the abuse of concepts is often exposed by Kantian critique. It is appropriate to be aware of the critique, and its associated materials, in approaching the two efforts of Ouspensky and Gurdjieff to 'break the bank', and make claims on what surpasses the capacity of the human perception. A great edifice of hidden wisdom content to declare the existence of all sorts of supernatural processes and beings is constructed by figures clearly nervous about what they can get away with in the context of the Kantian challenge to metaphysical speculation.

Here the deceptions of esotericism foot the bill, and convey the impression that 'men of higher consciousness' can penetrate the noumena. Maybe so, maybe not, but not likely to the degree of producing real knowledge thereto. A very dubious claim indeed. Gautama the Buddha was very wary to a fault of such claims.

Students of Ouspensky are so burdened with strange concoctions of ideas that they can hardly function. Travel light, this is not real knowledge.

It is essential for a student to try to assess skeptically such knowledge claims, so obviously based on the hope such students won't be so informed as to know anything of Kant. How foolish of Ouspensky to raise the issue!

It is worth noting the resemblance between Gautama Buddha and Kant. Gautama created a religious formulation that adopted the proper wariness as to the metaphysics of the noumenal, sufficing to adopt practical gestures of self-effort without commitment to grand cosmological schemes. Gurdjieff in some oblivion saw no difficulty in making pronouncements about the nature of reality and the universe by positing entities, energies, and domains beyond the realm of observation, and then legitimating that with appeals to esotericism for their proof and demonstration. The result is in the end a series of worthless metaphysical presumptions. Trying to break new ground would be one thing, but to declare such questionable thinking true in advance on the grounds of its esoteric character is simply a deception.

## 2.4 Great Chains of Non-being

We should note in passing the attempt to resurrect the 'great chain of being' in a novel form in the writings of Gurdjieff, and especially his student J. G. Bennett. We can call this bluff at once with our previous statements about Kantian skepticism. This system of despotism based on outright spiritual cannibalism threatens to remake antiquities degradation of man to the status of slave to spiritual powers, using him as food, like workers in a factory, or animals in a meat factory.

The Gurdjieffian 'great chain of being' is a giant food scale of who eats whom with the scale ending in amoebas....man, demiurgic powers, ...god? It is dangerous nonsense and it is important to see that the Axial Age led to the abolition of animal and human sacrifice. The occult stratagems of figures like Gurdjieff are an attempt by the Dark Powers to stage a comeback of the profitable rip-off of that hapless mini-buddha, *homo sapiens*, who is constantly cheated out of his birthright. Man is either a Buddha or a milking cow for conscious energies and we must suspect figures like Gurdjieff so obsessively computing the 'hydrogens' of 'conscious energy'. Man is already advanced in this field, or could be, but he is kept asleep to harvest his bio-machine's natural production of some potent spiritual energies. Most men never have a clue to what they are losing and figures like Gurdjieff have done nothing to restore man to his real nature. We must suspect states of self-consciousness and enlightenment were common in the earliest of men.

Especially is this necessary given the clear dishonest use of this archaic standby of the lore of the 'great chain of being' for the legitimation of social injustice, and worse, if we consider the synchronous emergence of fascist movements in the time-frame of the post-Blavatskian period.

It is very ill-advised to enter into esoteric front teachings: they are incomplete, untruthfully presented, layered with 'price hikes' at each stage of passage, and more generally watered down teachings that produce no result.

The creation of spiritual hierarchies is symptomatic of false authoritarianism aiming at the extraction of spiritual energies from groups of deceived disciples. It is the legacy of monotheistic surrender to God that makes the curious student vulnerable to this racket. It is highly suspicious that cosmic beings should need to feed over the energies of a planetary ape/hominid such as man. It would see more likely man must find his place as a creature of consciousness via the gifts of spirit from a larger spiritual domain.

Bennett transmits a core Gurdjieff confusion in his ambiguous discussions of 'Reciprocal Maintenance', a veiled reference to the process we see in the Gurdjieff world where spiritual energies are discussed ad infinitum and strangely absent in all cases. Taxes?

Gurdjieff seems unaware of the way he turned religion into something giving the appearance of a mafia in action.

*Gurdjieff: Making a New World*, J. G. Bennett (Bennett Books, 1992). This book promotes the whole racket with the naïve enthusiasm of a simpleton. Bennett hadn't a clue.

## 2.5 A Fascist Gallery

The great cold case of the modern world is the place of esoteric groups in the genesis of fascism, then Nazism, thence the Holocaust.

The figure Osho Rajneesh is the first to expose the reality of Buddhist fascism, albeit without sufficient detail.

Twentieth century esotericism has transmogrified into a crime scene, and there the question of the emergence of fascism leaves an ominous question mark. The obsession of Nazi figures with the occult is characteristic and no accident. Hitler shows many odd signs of hypnotic states. Mind control of such figures is not beyond the realm of possibility in the legacy of Buddhism.

The reactionary rejection of modernism, the wish to establish a kind of postmodern civilization once again dominated by the authoritarianism of an earlier age, is a built in theme of the whole spectrum of New Age movements, but this perspective slowly but surely is proving itself false, in the process leaving behind the sordid crypto-politics of fascism that lurks behind the spiritual fronts, beginning with Blavatsky, that rise to meet the wished for counterrevolution and restoration. Hitler wished to undermine the whole of modern civilization.

The whole game threatens to discredit the entire sweep of 'New Age' initiatives, and conspiracies, ironically provoking the real New Age movement latent in the transformation of modernity.

Gurdjieff's place in this is not clear, and it can be supposed that while his views resonated with this perspective he did not embrace what was to be the 'esoteric' version unknown to him of fascist anti-liberalism and counterrevolution against modernism that hides itself to do this day, despite the many hints and innuendos. Some of Gurdjieff's successors we should note have concealed outright neo-Nazi gestures, beyond the public view, and have issued ambiguous distortions of Gurdjieff's theme of reciprocal maintenance as the justification of genocide.

Clearly a student of esotericism needs to stop being an idiot and approach this field with extreme caution.

The buddhahood of Gautama is easier to understand if we (speculate) hypothesize that Gautama, unlike the teertankers who arrived in a series of 24, was pressed into maintaining his 'Sangha' over a whole age-period, whose nature and length was not understood by him, despite a record of some intimations of ages and future new era. The difficulty of maintaining a living legacy was finally settled with the path of the bodhisattvas and Mahayana, and this was strangely synchronous, no accident, with the onset of Christianity. But the whole game must have failed as Gautama melted away leaving the field to take-over by unknown demonic entities (men). The tremendous hostility of the neo-Brahmins to Buddhism resulted in their being driven out of India in a legacy of great bitterness. It is thus remarkable that the Sangha sought refuge in the Tibetan sphere. We have to wonder at what point Gautama passed away from his Sangha? Was it around the era of the Mahayana, or much

later? Or did he persist into the modern era. It would seem that the tremendous confusion of the later Buddhists who entered the modern period tells us Gautama was long gone. The determination to challenge and fight a 'New Age' was a tragic mistake. It is hard to believe the Gautama figure could have taken up the occult fascist malevolence of the later nineteenth century in Europe. But we suspect at least that some hidden groups, perhaps connected with Tibetan Sangha figures, plotted a monstrous revenge on history with a completely futile effort to destroy modernity. A close study of Hitler's thinking shows that this was his own objective. This dark irony will end by terminating Buddhism in world history and new re-starts are already underway.

If we study the period around Schopenhauer we see in reality the real 'New Age' movement and just how fast Buddhism spontaneously began to diffuse into the modern world. This real start came long before figures like Blavatsky, Gurdjieff and Crowley are smack of being plants for the Dark Op underway. If these Buddhists had simply waited they would have seen the seeds of the greater history of Gautama-buddhism sprout in the new era. But now the whole Sangha is cursed with the legacy of its last monster lamas and will end up dissipating into a memory. But the reality of meditation is spreading rapidly into the modern scene as a vigorous inheritance from the Indic legacy.

## Notes

---

### 2.1

*Masters of Wisdom of Central Asia: Teachings from the Sufi Path of Liberation* by Hasan Lutfi Shushud gives the context of the 'masters of wisdom' and their connexion with Buddhism. Bennett in *Masters of Wisdom* discusses the same legacy. This tradition is different from mainstream Sufism, and lurks in the zone of Gurdjieff's searches in Central Asia.

*People of the Secret*, Ernst Scott (Octagon, 1985)

A review of *People of the Secret*, at Amazon

[http://www.amazon.com/review/R11H769JQ1SV0H/ref=cm\\_cr\\_rdp\\_perm](http://www.amazon.com/review/R11H769JQ1SV0H/ref=cm_cr_rdp_perm)

This book has a number of problems, but it is worth pointing to the reference to J.G.Bennett without endorsing the whole book.

I think Bennett (connected to Sufis, and the book is an Octagon print, from Idries Shah zone) almost got it right. Readers should check out my *World History and the Eonic Effect*:

We must distinguish three different things, and they are all in Bennett, but not in the right analysis:

1. demiurgic powers
2. a hidden directorate
3. the cascade of cosmic laws as in Bennett with !\_biospheres in that sequence of levels.
4. Ordinary men, Buddhas, and perhaps men with 'permanent I', whatever that is.

Many students get evolution and demiurgic powers confused. The idea is from Bennett and a corruption of a good idea, because the idea of 'god' acting in history is not coherent. The Old Testament account is fiction. But the idea of 'demiurgic powers' is so speculative that we cannot be sure of anything. And it has been adapted to Gurdjieff crackpot 'cannibal gods'. The idea is ancient but too often spoiled by superstitious belief. It is a logical question: there could be spiritual powers within nature that intersect with history. However we have no real evidence or proof here. But the scale of the larger dynamic of history is probably something else. Demiurgic

powers probably don't have the energy resources to terraform planets or do operations on a global scale: this springs from the biosphere (GAIA!). The Old Testament era was part of the Axial Age which includes many contradictory things in parallel. The right explanation here is very difficult and can't be had with theosophical conceptions. The hidden directorate referred was taken by surprise by modernity, strong evidence they are deluded entities from greater antiquity. There has been so much nonsense written about a 'hidden directorate' that the idea is suspect. Such entities are mostly fantasies of pretenders to esoteric wisdom as peddlers of dishonest histories. There is probably an unknown strain of realized beings in history. But what is their status? If they are enlightened they exit history. If they are not their status is that of beings inside illusion. The bodhisattwa of the buddhists is suddenly under examination: who are these beings? In almost all cases the title is spurious and points to beings who remain within history while a small elite is enabled to a non-random rebirth. The vow of the bodhisattwas is a shot in the dark. The Sangha could not keep track of such figures. It is a confusing disservice to its faithful. But it is possible for men with special types of 'soul', we suspect, to recycle through history as 'completed' men. But if Gurdjieff is an example we must immediately point to the danger: a being who crystallizes in the civilizations of antiquity will suffer recurrences in worlds to which he is not adapted, one reason we might see so much antagonism to modernity. Better to let death strip away the past to recur fresh in a new world. The Buddhists were wiser: 'enlightenment' beyond rebirth seems the way of better sanity.

If we include sufis of some sort as the 'hidden directorate' their record is dismal. They missed the rise of modernity. The record of the eonic effect in *World History and the Eonic Effect* shows the scale of historical dynamics. It is too vast to be the result of any pack of fools such as a 'hidden directorate', and too mechanical to follow a conventional design argument. But we can't rule out the action of spiritual powers within nature and who interact with history. The reader might consult the author's *Enigma of the Axial Age*. But we have zero information about what 'Sufism' really is. The amount of disinfo is grotesque.

There is one possibility. Demiurgic powers can move inside this context like men in a factory but the larger system is different. Such entities could found religions with fronts and we have no other explanation for the mysterious starts of various religions, but the operation of the scale of the Axial Age is something different. This is why no one can figure out the evolution of religion, civilization and man, and the hopeless confusions of 'design arguments'. The Axial Age shows the emergence of religion in a larger context of civilization: this is perhaps biospheric with demiurgic co-participation. But the modern new age throws a curve ball. This biospheric level seems cyclic as Bennett noted and this suggests it is hypermechanical, while demiurgic beings have 'will' of some kind (although in Bennett biospheres have 'will' in a different sense, 24 laws?). And this leaves the founders like Buddha in an ambiguous context. The sequence of age periods is fixed: religions can arise in their transitions like Hinayana or Israelitism or they can arise in the middle periods like Mahayana, Christianity, Islam. It is important to study the difference because two sets of operations are different.

Religions, once founded, may be delegated to the hidden directorate, or figures like Gautama, who can initiate their starting points, while their actual construction sequence ends in the hands of men. This is why the Old Testament seems so smart and primitive at the same time. It clearly distinguishes 'god' and 'elohim' btw. Guatama tried to supervise what he had created. But we can see that Christianity became derelict very rapidly.

These three distinctions (or four) go a long way to explaining the confusion over religion, civilization, secularism, etc... We have biosphere, demiurgic powers, a hidden directorate, and Buddhas who clearly did not see anything beyond their enlightenment, a very tricky situation. And then ordinary men. The Israelites were very smart and saw a higher power or the biosphere where the buddha saw only a 'turning of the wheel', with a visit from the 'god realm' (???). The gestation of Christianity, Islam, Mahayana (outside of the Axial Age) are thus at best influenced by the hidden directorate, and then human agents, with the Jesus figure in between. Scott

is close on many points but this analysis is filled with traps...His take on Islam and Sufis is useful at a time when Islamophobes are rampant. The question of the hidden directorate is vexed. Just who are these beings and how do they relate to incarnation? The Buddhas move beyond incarnation. There is another category?? (the bodhisattva perhaps being an artificial imitation). The emergence of Christianity was a complete mess, yet succeeded in spite of itself. This model may help. Being a part of the 'hidden directorate' raises as many questions as it answers. They must support themselves over many lives on the surface of a planet, not an easy thing to do. We have not facts here, so we should be wary.

Note that, and Bennett realized this, modernity is a new age. This confounds all traditionalists. But it is important to see that the progression of epochs is beyond the 'sacred/secular' distinction. A closer look shows the Reformation and Buddhism reborn in spite of itself, just as Jainism was reborn in the Axial Age, but then giving way to Buddhism.

Is the 'soul' a spiritual technology of demiurgic powers in nature? May 23rd, 2015

- See more at: <http://darwiniana.com/2015/05/23/is-the-soul-a-spiritual-technology-of-demiurgic-powers-in-nature/#sthash.3NgFiu0D.dpuf>

<http://www.gurdjieff-con.net/index.php?s=soul+seed+plexus>

<http://darwiniana.com/2015/02/24/soul-and-Sufistic-legacies/>

One of the ironies of modernity and the religious legacies of antiquity is the way the hidden spiritual technology of the Sufis is leaking out into the public domain, or at least trying to.

It is ironic that modern materialism can suddenly seem primitive next to the elusive plexus/soul seed phenomenon which is very hard to get any information about.

I think this question impinges on the original emergence of *homo sapiens* and that this, pace J.G.Bennett discussed here many times, connects to the suspicion as to the realm of 'demiurgic powers', that is, beings superadvanced but within 'existence' or higher nature (same as lower nature, but still undiscovered by homo). The 'soul' technology of early man has spawned a descendant, but knowledge of this has been virtually unknown in most historical civilizations.

Perhaps in the new era of history we entered with modernity this situation can improve as knowledge becomes available.

There is an irony here: this is an issue of materialism (of the soul), but it is so elusive it appears (if it appears) as a 'spiritual' phenomenon...

We have suggested the communist left, reborn, as a future sponsor of this mysterious technology, the major religions having made a botch of the question.

If so, the left is in a lot of 'school boy' trouble. It is hardly competent for this as yet, next to the howls of protest from traditional religionists, really

Soul and Sufistic legacies February 24th, 2015

<http://darwiniana.com/2015/02/22/soul-questions-flubbed-by-neuroscience/comment-page-1/#comment-728121>

I have been running *The Gurdjieff Con* blog for many years, but didn't know of this critique. I will discuss it further over at that blog. But I have often pointed to the many confusions in Gurdjieff's corpus. Unfortunately it

didn't follow that he was some kind of charlatan. He as a dangerous occult figure for whom the teaching was mostly rubbish dished out to cover the less public part.

I know of absolutely no teaching, including the Buddhist, which has gotten spiritual psychology straight. People can reach enlightenment without figuring out how they work, fortunately.

I have a suspicion people grow 'souls' in this manner, none the wiser for the whole cascade of gibberish on these subjects, not least the Theosophical. The structure is almost impossible to figure out, but the Sufi world had a way to guide people with the injection of what I called the 'plexus seed' phenomenon which takes over the soul question. This method can be applied to congregations who are not experts in spiritual psychology. It suddenly happens to members of a group of students, who usually then disperse. There is no further instruction after that.

But he seems to be saying that early Egyptian religion was a source for Christianity. Implying, I think, that this process was present in early Christianity and died out. It is a highly dangerous situation if a dishonest mafia got hold of it and began to manipulate human forms at will. Terrifying.

The reality is stark:

We have no traditions that we can reliably point to as expositions of the truth about man. The only safe approach is some form of 'Buddhism 101', making it clear there is no monopoly here for 'Gautama Buddhists'. The whole tradition springs from primordial Shaivism and then passes into the forms of Jainism which pass into the brilliant recreation of Gautama.

This path does not create a soul, but shows the way beyond the samsaric manifestations. The theosophical whole nine yards can be filed away along with all your other mislaid notes.

Until someone can produce some real answers here I would be wary of the Sufi soul game, if you ever run across it. Keep in mind that a real path has to be workable for a shepherd at the ends of the earth who never attended school. The Sufis and early Christians were able to achieve this.

In any case, as noted, all humans of our species already have 'souls' of some kind. This is connected with the basic apparatus of man seen in the accounts like the Tibetan book of the dead where at death the personality is dropped but the basic human passes through the bardo world.

Sufis who enter this process (as I have explained, I intersected briefly with this, but aborted from the process) never see the source. It is not a function controlled by Sufi sheiks (as far as I know) but which suddenly appears when that figure seems to think his students ready. The process simply appears and I fear most abort without being able to figure what is happening. Thus the secret protects itself.

The die is cast now. In the next phase of civilization these ancient spiritual technologies will enter the public sphere. In the nonce, stay with the 'Buddhist' type path. Getting entangled with rogue Sufis isn't worth it.

I was a casualty here, I suspect, but have since recovered and moved toward a yogic type teaching.

Here another confusion arises: the emergence of Mahayana Buddhism in concert with the onset of Christianity.

- See more at: <http://darwiniana.com/2015/02/24/soul-and-Sufistic-legacies/#sthash.qhKWHv87.dpuf>

Beating Moslems over the head with the reality of rogue Sufism...if neo-liberals privatize prisons why can't dark side Sufis privatize hell? Good, I've scared you...

August 27th, 2015

<http://darwiniana.com/2015/08/24/losing-my-patience-with-Christianity-islam/>

I have tried in vain to clarify the dark side of Sufism, but the wall of silence is total, and the ignorance of Moslems as to their own religion is too embarrassing to discuss in public. The fact has to be faced that most of the relevant Sufi issues have landed in the hands of non-moslems westerners, while all sorts of creepy westerners have tried to leverage Sufi occultism for clever new forms of evil. Cf. the legacy of Gurdjieff and his near-doppelganger Gold.

For me the situation is beyond intolerable. It is just sick. SICK. I am the son of a Protestant minister, and approached the Sufi idea via Idries Shah's works with an expectation that the world of Rumi et al would actually be a spiritual subject.

But after thirty years of watching Sufi gangsters threatening life, using black magic, trying to experiment on the unconscious, trying to create experimental diseases, making a mockery of conventional Moslems and Sufis behind their backs, I no longer take a benign view of this ism. I think Idries Shah was embarrassed by his own books: he knew the reality was quite different.

In the climax to muddle we have the question of the seed plexus phenom of esoteric Sufis, the confusion over which is beyond belief, and as I am realizing very dangerous. I have tried for more than two decades to view a source of wise Sufi advice to ask one simple question in FAQ mode. Impossible. I must be such a peon they don't communicate with such as I. Worse, I suspect that this has degenerated into entrapment. I fear Sufi dark occultists in the know can imprison the unsuspecting pious in a form of spiritual soul slavery which can be a truly horrific in the hands of psychopaths. How did psychopaths ever get into this area? Go read Gurdjieff, you see the stages of madness in the explicit defense of being a demon with ambiguous remarks on being 'evil'.

I fear the worst: private hells created with Sufi ripped off techniques to enslave the unsuspecting pious for 'torture Baraka' and other forms of spiritual caviar for degenerates, and what degenerates...Sufi demons, I'd say. not on their driver's license.

In my case they show no interest. I had my portion ripped off in a 'thieves of Baraka' game of exceptional cruelty, but I think the phenom is like silly putty and a piece returns...But I think in my case the result is so damaged and so riddled with the vibes of PTSD no one would mess with it. Sigh of relief. It will automatically be stripped away in the bardo transit, or so I am told...

But that leaves the question of any number of unsuspecting 'Sufi' (idiots on the sidelines conned into pious association) fringe/exoteric dupes vulnerable to being preyed on. What a nightmare. Are there any spiritual police? Given the fact that 99% of Moslems are unaware of this aspect of their own religion I wouldn't exactly bet on it.

But there are people who could observe or at least sense something of this, enlightened men, perhaps... That's the danger of Sufism: people think they are getting spiritual but don't even meditate. They are in reality going nowhere at all and can't develop psychic self-defense...

This silent scandal is so grotesque I think it is time to move toward shutting down Islam. Time to move on....

I am sorry to sound Islamophobic, but it is not phobia. It is downright paranoia, and I think this is shared by many Moslems...

And I think someone in the American system decades ago encountered the dark side of Islam/Sufism and was the source of the 'hidden war' against Islam that we see repeatedly savaging Moslems cultures.

Good, I've scared you...but being scared here isn't good enough. This is REALLY SCARY...

- See more at: <http://darwiniana.com/2015/08/27/beating-moslems-over-the-head-with-the-reality-of-rogue-Sufism-if-neo-liberals-an-privatize-prisons-why-cant-dark-side-Sufis-privatize-hell-good-ive-scared-you/#sthash.hphz9BmB.dpuf>

2.2

The symmetry of Blavatsky and Gurdjieff is one of the puzzles of the end of the nineteenth century, to which we should add, the figure of Nietzsche, the rise of occult fascism, and the roots of Nazism. The connection of esoteric groups to this is an ongoing quest to understand and penetrate the covert operations of Buddhist and other groups.

Blavatsky creates a field of confusion in her habit of spiritual fiction. Her connection to the Russian secret police resembles that suspected of Gurdjieff, and sense of the 'secret chiefs' resembles that of Crowley.

The real new age movement began during the early modern, with the study of China, followed by the sudden flood of information about the Indian religious tradition. This is very visible in the philosopher Schopenhauer who produces his own interpretation of 'Upanishadic psychology'.

Our previous discussion of the 'Hidden Directorate' is relevant here, and we can locate, at least in theory, the kind of influences that seem to have animated the clearly parallel Blavatsky and Gurdjieff and in both cases left them laden with borderline 'esoteric' doctrines, in reality occult lore of dubious value and provenance.

We should perhaps instead look at the similarity of Blavatsky and Gurdjieff as non-coincidental: Blavatsky 'esoteric Buddhism' lead promptly to a parallel emissary from monotheistic sources. The whole game is highly confusing because the material is mostly disinfo.

<http://blavatskytheosophy.com/human-evolution-in-the-secret-doctrine/>

Blavatsky work, critical of darwinism, was bold for its time (although the Darwin paradigm was not yet so rigid), but introduced a slew of gross fictions as a substitute and this has tended to enforce the Darwin orthodoxy. The question of man's real (and spiritual) evolution is unknown to religious history and even to esoteric Buddhism. It is the kind of 'astral projection mental wreck that is omniscient and loony).

Gurdjieff was cleverer in his appearance of scientific rigor.

2.3

The most remarkable aspect of the Gurdjieff world is its lack of integrity, the failure to tell the truth. That makes everything suspect. We see the same thing in Blavatsky.

Consider the works of Blavatsky: what is the sum total that can constitute a legacy?

Why is it necessary to anything to be esoteric? The analog to covert agencies and the spy world suggests covers for dishonesty are the motive.

It is interesting that the Gurdjieff initiative is associated via Ouspensky's Tertium Organon with the works of Kant. Ouspensky is of the type, beginning with Hegel, of those who wish to penetrate the 'noumenal', a task considered impossible by that critic of metaphysics. It is appropriate to be aware of the critique, and its associated materials, in approaching the two efforts of Ouspensky and Gurdjieff to 'break the bank', and make claims on what surpasses the capacity of the human perception. A great edifice of hidden wisdom content to declare the existence of all sorts of supernatural processes and beings is constructed by figures clearly nervous about what they can get away with in the context of the Kantian challenge to metaphysical speculation.

Here the deceptions of esotericism foot the bill, and convey the impression that 'men of higher consciousness' can penetrate the noumena. Maybe so, maybe not, but not likely to the degree of producing real knowledge thereto. A very dubious claim indeed. Gautama the Buddha was very wary to a fault of such claims. Students of Ouspensky are so burdened with strange concoctions of ideas that they can hardly function. Travel light, this is not real knowledge.

It is essential for a student to try to assess skeptically such knowledge claims, so obviously based on the hope such students won't be so informed as to know anything of Kant. How foolish of Ouspensky to raise the issue!

It is worth noting the resemblance between Gautama Buddha and Kant. Gautama created a religious formulation that adopted the proper wariness as to the metaphysics of the noumenal, sufficing to adopt practical gestures of self-effort without commitment to grand cosmological schemes. Gurdjieff in some oblivion saw no difficulty in making pronouncements about the nature of reality and the universe by positing entities, energies, and domains beyond the realm of observation, and then legitimating that with appeals to esotericism for their proof and demonstration. The result is in the end a series of worthless metaphysical presumptions. Trying to break new ground would be one thing, but to declare such questionable thinking true in advance on the grounds of its esoteric character is simply a deception

2.4

The most dangerous aspect of the Gurdjieff work is the threat to reinvent human sacrifice and to caste this in the form of a critique of 'man's normal view of justice', a clear warning of the subtle attack on modern liberalism. The fight for human autonomy is stuck in the craw of reactionaries who have never accepted abolitionism let alone the validity of modern democracy. The views of Aleister Crowley are very dubious, but he put the point well: man owes no one anything in the way of sacrifice.

2.5

08.03.08 Rajneesh charge of fascism against the 'Buddhists'

<http://www.gurdjieff-con.net/2008/08/03/rajneesh-charge-of-fascism-against-the-Buddhists/>

These different perspectives are useful (although if Burton was another intelligence agent, I am getting restive. We seem to find nothing but the public hype of celebrities and intelligence agents passing for ancient wisdom. I am not going to take on Gurdjieff and exempt Sufis).

We, of course, don't know a thing of what Gurdjieff did in Tibet, and before we denigrate Gurdjieff let's keep in mind that Buddhism hides figures a lot worse than a mere fakir like 'G'.

Already with Blavatsky we suspect something strange going on, with many vague and indirect hints leading nowhere.

It was therefore a bombshell when the figure Rajneesh flat out charged 'Buddhists' with fomenting the Nazis. Since he didn't pursue the matter in detail, he left the question hanging.

But we can easily detect the gestation point in the late nineteenth century, with the lines of influence hopelessly obscure.

It is thus awfully strange that Gurdjieff should be roaming around here at the critical point (which is not an accusation) but I suspect he sensed something afoot, and he in general clearly poised toward a rightist/reactionary stance.

The emergence of clear fascist group(s), completely hidden, in the fuzzy milieu of the Gurdjieff succession viz. the Gold circle is another suspicious sign.

Since these deep sources always work through proxies it is impossible to know for sure, and it is equally important not to get into the spiritual surrender mode. Those dumb enough to surrender end up the proxies.

The whole sickening business.

We must of course be wary of the term 'Buddhism'. It covers an immense range of different things. And the hidden figures of Tibet, who never appear in the open line of the Lamaist tradition, but are there somewhere, are the suspects, not ordinary Buddhists.

There was of course the public nonsense of the Dalai Lama's youth and association with German agents, but at this level there is no contact with the deeper skullduggery. These people are oblivious to the game.

## 3. Beyond Fourth Way Hype

### 3.1 Axial Ages, New Ages

It might be helpful to connect our discussion with a larger view of history and evolution, and in particular the phenomenon of the Axial Age, and beyond that the eonic effect. While the material on the eonic effect can be useful in putting religious evolution in perspective it is not intended to be a tool to assess particular claims about 'spiritual paths' or traditions, that is, beyond a certain point. Nonetheless it is apparent that many claims made by spiritual personae of all types are speculative myth, at best.

One of most engaging terms of Indian religious history is the idea of '*santana dharma*', eternal dharma. Its usage has been to refer to Hinduism, but in reality it refers to the 'timeless core' that has survived many successive epochs. We see them overlaid, with the deepest layer still visible in the versions of 'yoga' dressed in the suits of Shiva with his trident. You see the difference by comparing the 'paths of Shiva' with the latter rationalization via Buddhism. The first rationalization must have been Jainism, then the Axial age Buddhism. What we call 'hinduism' is the parallel floating stream of temporal history, an immense reservoir of archaic material. Because this tradition uses open methods it has endured for millennia, while other traditions dressed in esoteric confusions have simply vanished.

Gurdjieff makes a host of statements and claims about ancient spiritual paths, but naive readers seldom think to ask for some kind of reference, documentation, or clarification of these claims. The result is a new series of myths about esotericism that can only be called shaky. Not a single utterance of Gurdjieff has panned out in this regard.

To say that much has been forgotten, lost, or suppressed may well be true, but to announce, for instance, that the fourth way first appears in pre-sand Egypt, while a provocative idea, is nowhere given even the slightest shred of evidentiary backup. This and many other statements by Gurdjieff end up by casting his whole enterprise under suspicion. The demand to take everything said on faith on the basis of an equally suspect authority is more than otherwise open-minded students of religion should accept. As with Blavatsky much of the material is under increasing suspicion of being simply made up.

Further, it is easy to document the woeful lack of historical understanding in many 'New Age' figures, especially as they begin to castigate modernity vis a vis the spiritual attainments of ancient civilizations.

We can put these statements to a test, up to a point, by considering the analysis given by the eonic effect, starting with its sub-component the Axial Age. It is significant that nowhere have any of the gurus of Eastern thought taken into account the discovery of this phenomenon. It is a reminder that their much vaunted claims to higher knowledge must in some way be either exaggerated, or non-existent. It is possible for an ignorant man to reach 'enlightenment'!

The Axial Age shows us the emergence of two world religions in a synchronous framework, and much, if by no means all, of what constitutes spiritual tradition revolves around these two developments. This applies at best, however, to religion on the large scale.

The eonic effect suggests a kind of 'sampling' effect as certain strains are amplified in the periods (e.g. Axial) of transition, and this mysterious process shows us at once one key to the complexity of Indic religion as one strain of its legacy suddenly crystallizes as an Axial Age phenomenon, leaving another legacy that is representative of that great, but almost unknown, tradition, one probably going back to the Neolithic. A great deal more can be said here. But it is important to note that no 'guru' can compete with the scale seen here. In fact 'enlightened' sages are still far from the knowledge required to assess the evolution of religion, whatever their claimed knowledge of the particulars of the various spiritual ways. It is hard to see this point, or to cut through the hype factor of those whose consciousness might be one thing, but whose knowledge is still very limited.

It is nonetheless true that much in the way of spiritual practice and knowledge might never register in the large-scale action on and through religion that we see in the eonic effect. There is every possibility of there being a host of lost traditions or constellations of religious activity that pass through the sieve of the large scale dynamic seen in the world historical process. This was the point that animated Gurdjieff's protests, but he was unable to get the history straight.

But unfortunately claims after this fashion are likely to be altogether suspect. When it comes down to basics, the eonic effect shows us only one great exemplar of Eastern religion, the Upanishadic to Buddhist (Jain) emergent interval. The outcome of this Axial transformation leaves in its wake an ambiguous legacy of Hinduism, but one truly global, 'cleaned up' spiritual path, set to proceed on the way toward globalization, Buddhism a very dangerous term, since its interior subsequent development is complex, and not validated by Axial association in its later manifestations. Gurus keep trying to match this, but never succeed, and they never understand why they can't proceed beyond the ashram to the world where Buddhism was tailor-made to do just that, speaking of its pre-modern history only.

The author of this statement is not a Buddhist, nor is this a recommendation one way or the other. Buddhism is one of the very few instances where history meets greater nature in the foundational moment of bestowing a pre-digested way for man, as he is. Such a statement must be taken carefully, since the Hindu matrix from which it springs might contain a larger field than the streamlined 'package' emerging in the Axial interval. And the term 'Buddhism' is hopelessly inadequate, its character changing greatly over time. We are referring to the proto-Buddhism emerging in the Axial interval, which is actually something of an unknown. Tibetan Buddhism is a much, much later development, and has no claim on standing in for early Buddhism at all, as such.

The point is simply that anything that passes through the eonic sequence will emerge at a higher level of quality, and will have a boost given by the eonic sequence to its emergence, but not necessarily to its larger/later manifestations, which may deviate from the source point or degenerate in medieval contexts. This is a big study, but the issue might help those confronted with the facts of the case with Gurdjieff, to see what might be possible for an accomplished Sufi of some type, but who is not a person in a position to lay the foundations of a spiritual tradition. These statements leave the issue of Jesus and Mohammed unresolved, but these cases we can at least

agree are not associated directly with the Axial interval, although they may echo its action. We must leave that issue to further study. But all at once we know one thing: these religious source points are different from the action of the Axial type of religious transformation. The reader will have to read between the lines.

The confusion that arose at once in Gurdjieff's activities is direct evidence of this. The whole effort is out of time and out of place, and simply chaotifies at once. For all of Gurdjieff's claims about objective knowledge, his sources are eclectic concoctions of medieval Sufism, Gnosticism, and what have you, and presume a knowledge that he did not have.

A concluding consideration of the eonic effect is with respect to the transition to modernity itself, a genuine Axial Age period in its own right, yet one constantly denigrated by the reactionary style of the flood of Eastern sages and gurus, Gurdjieff among them, attempting to roll back this period with a restoration of their ancient obsessions. The modern age doesn't show the formation of a new religion, for it has outsmarted the crystallized traditions by moving to the core issue, the freedom of the individual.

And this New Age is on a far larger scale than this and contains the potentiality for the resolution of the question of religion in a secular context.

And there we see a different significance to the labors of Gurdjieff. He is not a spiritual teacher, but an archaeologist. At many points he correctly points to what any student of the eonic effect suspects, gaps in our process, or religious zones of influence that the eonic sequence simply left behind in the stupendous motion of its greater action.

A good example is Gurdjieff's fussy obsession with Ashieta Shiemash, evidently a Zarathustra surrogate. Fine, but what real light has he thrown on all of this? It is all a mess of pottage.

We see in the eonic effect the great enigma of the emergence of the Occidental monotheistic series, beginning with the Israelite carrier, briefly mixed with Persian Zoroastrianism. The correct study of this possibly lost component to the sources of Judaism/Christianity/Islam finds very little that is clear or definite in Gurdjieff's obscure pronouncements, probably hiding some kind of mischief labeled 'esoteric'. There was another rascal here, Nietzsche. What's going on with all of this? Impossible to determine. And yet if one is going to found a new tradition it requires something more than dabbling in esotericism and speculations about the past, mixed with the allergy to ethics spouted by impostors like Nietzsche. The flood of gurus in his wake 'beyond good and evil' is a sordid joke played on those who claim spiritual powers but can't do better than the stylistic hypnosis in Nietzsche's pop philosophy. Therefore, while the efforts of archaeological enquiry should be respected as such, these are not likely to be the grounds for creating schools or religions of the future.

Without giving an overemphasis on Buddhism (we are not in the business of recommending spiritual paths), and evading the distraction for a moment, of its friction with its parent 'Hinduism', shows the job of religion creation done right, by honest men, who had the capacity to do what was needed, and succeeded in their endeavors because they had a larger force behind them, a higher power, ironic phrase, that operates across a larger history. They were unaware of this factor. The Israelites detected its action, but could not understand it.

The efforts of Gurdjieff cannot match this in any way, and much of his exhumation of antiquated material (none of it documented, possibly made up) misses the point.

There are really only two 'ways' or paths, that in time and that moving beyond time. Buddhism shows an instance of the latter, while the former is a purely logical deduction from the nature of the case, one that a Buddhist would find samsarically spurious. We see no exemplars. And yet, we do. The great monotheisms proceed by default to exclude the path in time by usurping its place, no doubt because it is beyond the capacity of man as he is, who is an instant screw up in need of redemption. Here Gurdjieff is a genuine Frankenstein of the will, a sort of 'higher spastic' attempting to realize the 'path of the will in time'. His refusal of enlightenment in a path of recurrent soul formation is a deviant monstrosity of the logically derivable possible 'path'. He deserves to be packed off a Zen monastery and 'historically terminated'.

Here we can see what Gurdjieff is driving at, but without understanding. The 'fourth way' was defined to be one immersed in ordinary life, without we presume the world renunciation seen in the mirror image way. It is no accident that Gurdjieff mentions thus the issue of the 'path of the will'. But this is caught up with much dross, and much occult nonsense, as to be virtually unusable. The successful occultist must be superman, and ought to pull rank on his inferior fellows to be top dog in a spiritual organization of the future. Rubbish. The whole thing is a hack.

The real fourth way is something much larger, and less exotic, the disposition of human evolution in time toward autonomy, freedom and self-realization. This path, which we would most certainly confuse by using the term 'fourth way', is omnipresent in the context of (modern) civilization, and yet rarely if ever realized, even as the great religions move to co-opt its potential in form of guardian churches. We can see the smoking gun evidence in figures such as Gurdjieff of people stumbling on its potential, but unable to successfully realize that as a social movement. It is hard to know what the future holds here, but the spastic disorganization of an association of occult cut-throats, Sufi predators, and esoteric pretenders is not going to foot the bill. Sufism we should note peaked before the sixteenth century. What is left is a kind of wasteland.

Greater nature has shown us the default form of the 'fourth way' in its staging of situations for the realization of freedom, and what this portends for the realization of future truly real and adequate religions, is at yet unknown. We can accept the archaeological suggestions of a figure such as Gurdjieff, but his obscure and exploitative activities are out of sync with the modern transformation and do a disservice to what we can deduce up to a point as the real 'fourth way', a term we should abandon at once as corrupted.

Ouspensky said it well, fragments of an unknown teaching. All in a day's work for the archaeologist. But it is not a spiritual path for the times.

### **3.2 What is Enlightenment?**

At the climax of the modern transition we see the appearance of Kant who performs an operation of major surgery on the inherited metaphysics of the great religions. In the process he produces on classic essay whose title is a question, what is Enlightenment? An ironic question given the legacy of, say, Buddhism. But his gesture

is a significant text in the period of the emergence of modern freedoms, and establishes, strangely, the real foundation for a religion of the future, human autonomy.

The Gurdjieff work is unclear and only speaks of the 'work', ominously.

For too long man has been subjected to spiritual authorities who have constricted his development. The right beginning point appears with Kant's question.

The Gurdjieff world forces the issue of 'enlightenment', beside the usage referring to the modern period by that name. The latter is an inspirational tag for a period of many innovations, under the aegis of reason (Gurdjieff has a related take on here), and it is not fruitful to compare/contrast this with a Buddhist or dharmic usage. The modern generic usage acts like a magnet and rapidly attracts a kind of Buddhist counterpoint injected into modernity.

The question is left as to the relationship of the Buddhist path to enlightenment to the ill-defined and somewhat treacherous terrain of the Sufi world where monotheism, the path of will, and practice of prayer compete in shadow terms with the classic legacy of *dharmic* paths.

We need a clarification of the larger world of 'Sufistic' paths and their relationship to Buddhism. The problem is the obscurity of the history compared to the openness of the Buddhist or dharmic tradition.

### 3.3 Hermetic Flotsam

Gurdjieff was correct in sensing the loss of a great deal of 'spiritual' knowledge from ancient times. But the flood of 'hermetic flotsam' is a kind of toxic sludge of useless fragments.

We can demonstrate no better example than that of the case of Egypt, which we suspect, looking at its visible history, conceals something prodigious in scope. And yet we are hard-pressed to delineate what that was. Many will be glad to fill in here, but little is known.

Let us cite our reference to the eonic effect and its sequence of 'new ages'. It is as if the window on the past closes during the periods of greater transition as human evolution passes on to something new, leaving the past in limbo. We see this dramatically in the case of Egypt (to take but one example) which is soon outstripped by the new productions of the Axial Age, leaving the traditionalists (of that time!) stranded, and perhaps trying to inject 'hermetic flotsam' into the historical record as they attempt mostly without success to preserve the knowledge of the past. It is important to consider that the greater process of history is what maintains the past even as it proceeds to discard it, to create a new future. This 'hermetica' effect is characteristic of each stage of our eonic sequence, as the system changes gear and leaves its past to the proliferation of 'religious junk' floating down the river.

This effect is clearly in evidence in modern times, and we see that in the wake of the modern transition a whole series of attempts emerge to restage the issues of the Axial period, with variable or no success. The jury is out. But the religion of the future, if any, has already leapfrogged these remnants of the Axial Age, the new Axial flotsam, with what potential for the future we do not know. The Indic tradition does tend to be a partial exception to this rule. Elements of this religious tradition have recurred ever since the Neolithic, we suspect, and there is a muddling through, despite the immense baggage of outlandish elements inherited in confusing layers from the past. Nonetheless, a great many pitfalls linger in that tradition (like the spurious law of caste) and we

see that the Axial Age shows the attempt to rationalize and streamline that tradition with a reform, one that ended up moving in parallel to its source.

Thus the denunciations of modern materialism, etc, by traditionalists has completely missed the point that a new religious dispensation (it won't be called that) has already planted the seeds for the future, and we can see, at least, that this pertains to the place of freedom in a secular context, this being a sacred as you can get. Modernity has an immense spiritual potential, but it won't dabble in spiritual jargon or repeat the past.

All these retrograde actions are thus likely to become the next 'flotsam' of the future, as the lost initial conditions of a passing age are lost to memory or practical action.

### **3.4 A New Age Begins**

This, and the next, sections are short and refer to selections from *World History and Eonic Effect* in Appendix 1. The real 'New Age' is the early modern, starting in the sixteenth century. All the nonsense about 'new ages' created by gurus is just that. Here the periodization of *World History and The Eonic Effect* can help. Almost every New Age Group has a false and misleading periodization, and a hatred of modernity.

Thus, we have it. With the rise of the modernity, a New Age begins, one whose realization is still underway, and seemingly antagonistic to the legacies of religion, but in reality only demanding a recasting of the past in essential terms, in a new form. The issue is thus not religion at all but the potential for self-consciousness in man, and his evolution as self-realization in the context of this potential...

As we have noted at the start, the rise of modernity is the real new age. The attempts to create a postmodern new age have all failed.

### **3.5 The Great Freedom Sutra**

We can conclude by noting that the question of human freedom has been lost to the consideration of the Axial religions, whatever their claims otherwise. The upsurge of the new age of modernity re-tables the potential toward freedom in man, and this constitutes the real living sutra for modernity, just as certainly as the ancient sutras of antiquity express the subtleties of human consciousness. The false dichotomy of sacred and secular blinds us to the higher potential for evolutionary advance latent in the transformation of the modern, and as such is the indication of a starting point as solid as that we find in the memory of the Axial Age and its antecedents. The idea of freedom courses through the parallel Axial Ager period of Greece, and has its own 'sutra'. Modern thinkers such as Kant take the idea to a new depth.

The confusion over sacred and secular has blinded many new agers to the disguised 'sutras of freedom' in the modern.

#### **Notes**

---

### 3.1 Axial Ages, New Ages.

The question of the Axial Age and the modern subsequent 'axial' age is discussed in World History and The Eonic Effect. Traditionalists in their rejection of modernity have failed to see the dynamic involved.

The resemblance of the modernist transformation to these early cousins completes the list of three 'new ages'. Is any of this important? Our eonic pattern moves through this territory, and it is good to be wary of merely recycling archetypes. Our approach is different, purely empirical. The New Age obsession is much ridiculed, but contains a valid impulse. An age of spiritual democracy is clearly coming into existence amidst considerable confusion. Further, the 'new age' idea is an outstanding challenge to the legacy of the great religions now challenged to a great renewal.

The issue of the New Age is simple. Everyone is observing fragments of the eonic effect, without seeing the whole pattern, which is 'evolutionary' in our sense. This has nothing to do with current New Age ideas of 'evolution' as personal transformation. The eonic effect grants no foundational status to the idea of a new age, but solves the problem at once on a de facto basis by suggesting the mistake of periodization in most efforts to periodize New Ages. The quest for the Age of Aquarius was silly, as is the postmodern attempt to undermine the rise of the modern with a 'New Age'. There is even a new myth of the 'Second Axial Age' appearing. The myths of the 'New Age' spring from the lore of the Great Year, a total red herring, whose astrological periodization of the precession of the equinoxes is too short and throws everything else out of whack, leaving the field in total confusion. The mystery of historical cycles has always haunted civilization, for reasons that we will see. It is time to lay the issue to rest. It is a hopeless question, but we can take a chance and use our eonic model to attempt some clarification.

The larger point here is the danger of entanglement in occult paths that, as Gurdjieff warns, are very dangerous. It is useful to look at the history of the macro effect: all the great periods of advance have a core of exoteric activities and innovations, and this springs from a higher level than the pretentious occult stream of Rosicrucian, Masonic and other ersatz cults. The desert of such cults needs a reminder of our distinction of the demiurgic action versus that of the gang that can't shoot straight, the hidden directorate.

### 3.2 What is Enlightenment?

The important reality that Gurdjieff was not 'enlightened' demands a careful look at the rival Sufi and Indic traditions. There is a pun with the Western Enlightenment which angers many antimodernists. There is also Osho's *Beyond Enlightenment*. The study of *Advaita* is helpful here.

### 3.3 Hermetic flotsam

History is littered with a vast number of confusing, distorted and occult traditions. Here the study of the eonic effect can help to see that none of the larger traditions of world have anything to do with these sideshows of mostly crackpot individuals. The modern transition completely ignores and bypasses all occult and esoteric traditions. As time goes by they lose the grace of their starting points, if there was any.

### 3.4 A New Age Begins

Thus, we have it. With the rise of the modernity, a New Age begins, one whose realization is still underway, and seemingly antagonistic to the legacies of religion, but in reality only demanding a recasting of the past in

essential terms, in a new form. The issue is thus not religion at all but the potential for self-consciousness in man, and his evolution as self-realization in the context of this potential.

J.G. Bennett in *Gurdjieff: Making a New World*, despite his understanding of the place of modernity in world history, became a promoter of Gurdjieff's complex system and transmits the ambitious sense of creating a new form of civilization. Gurdjieff's vision here is entirely suspect on the grounds we have presented here: the evolutionary progression of civilization follows a complex dynamic complete beyond the understanding of the spiritual figures of the legacies of antiquity. Much of the conception of a new spiritual era and a new form of civilization are based on a kind of cavil of modernity which is completely misplaced. The standard of comparison is not with the spiritual level of a Jesus Christ but of the overall tenor of civilization since the Neolithic, or before.

Spiritual figures in isolation are not able to create new eras in world history and the suggestive rhetoric of Bennett's book belies the absurdity of the Gurdjieff effort which is secretly antagonistic to modern freedoms and is a precursor of postmodern confusions.

"Making a new world' is a lot harder than people like Gurdjieff seem to think. Its complexity can be seen by looking at the modern transition from 1500 to 1800, in a distinction of the 'modern transition' and the onset of the modern period after 1800. In a strange clarity amidst confusion Bennett correctly exits his own model and finds this period arising around 1848.

We can see that modernity is in essence a far better foundation for a future spirituality and makes for a robust and fertile garden of possibilities. People often learn their real foundational stance in their youth before the sermonizers of tradition grab hold of them, as was the case with Gurdjieff, who was at his core a modernist *malgres lui*. His fascination with machines, his capitalist big-time-operator talents (but no socialism from this sinner), his attempt however confused to reckon a rationalist cosmology, his outrageous but telling theft of the classic Samkhya with its affinities to modern materialism, all these elements made Gurdjieff an unconscious modernist, his traditionalism a brand of archaeology, and his searches an echo of covert operational work. We cannot trust the facts we have but it would seem that he collided (a trip to Berlin!) at the key moment with the emerging Nazi movement and balked. We can't be sure of the connection but his movement froze up and came to a halt throughout the thirties of the last century, and nothing further happened until after the war.

Nonetheless we can't be naive about the ominous fascist sideshow to the onset of the new era, and this disastrous moment attempted to plant the seeds of a future anti-modernist restoration of antiquity. It can hardly manage as second coming after the disastrous manner of putting the issue to a test with the Nazi movement. Can't we conclude that the legacies of antiquity are spent? This issue has put the entire new age movement at risk and we can see that the phase of dissolution, already so visible in Christianity, even despite the Reformation, is destined to overtake the Aquarian gang, and this will happen via the clear concordance of the path of the masters and the echoes of the master/slave dialectic.

07.29.12 *Illuminati*, and the occult paranoia of the right (and left)

The tide of modern revolution is a non-random occurrence in world history, and the careful analysis of the eonic effect shows what this means.

Anyone who didn't know that would tend to confuse the surging revolutionary tide with some kind of hidden conspiratorial action, missing the point completely.

The point here is that if you strip away ALL of the later idiocy about this 'cult', which is an extreme form of the reactionary literature denouncing the French Revolution, a la Edmund Burke, and/or the rise of liberal culture,

what you have is an incident in the emergence of the democratic revolution, whose timing is, if you study the eonic effect, spookily non-random and clustered near the so-called Great Divide. Small wonder that reactionaries hallucinate a conspiracy. The timing of the climax to the modern transition is almost uncanny once you unravel the eonic effect. So the appearance of the Illuminati is simply an aspect of that tide of emergent modernist effects. All the later stuff is mostly paranoid accretion, and really sloppy thinking.

There is of course one other aspect here to the question: the association with the Rosicrucians, then the Freemasons: any association with these is the road to instant speculative excess, and the real history of the Freemasons is so muddled as to be nearly beyond factual clarification. And this rubs off on the question of the Illuminati.

Since radical masonry, if real, rapidly became rightist esotericism fascism in gestation, the paranoia is apparently deserved on both sides.

I cannot rule out anything about successors to the Illuminati, claiming their mantle, and it is from this later legacy that most of the crackpot stuff is associated. I could be wrong here, but I think the original movement has been the source of nearly fantastic distortions. A secretive group in non-democratic Germany inspired by the French Revolution deserves better than Burkean fulmination.

Check out the eonic effect, with its Great Divide, and the Discrete Freedom Sequence at [history-and-evolution.com](http://history-and-evolution.com) with links to each section/chapter online....

My principal point is that the macro effect in world history is far too broad and elusive for the kinds of esoteric groups peddled by these theorists to compete with. The two are often confused by conspiracy theorists, but they are completely different. Very little, close to none, of modernity was created by esoteric groups, nonetheless caught up in the tidal wave, the only real success being on the right, by reactionary anti-modernists, and the groups who seeded later fascism.

Setting the record straight is hard, perhaps hopeless, at this point. But a look at the eonic effect shows that all the really creative aspects of modernity spring from a different source.

#### 05.06.15 The myths of the *Illuminati*

<http://www.gurdjieff-con.net/2015/04/30/the-illuminatus-trilogy-wikipedia-the-free-encyclopedia/>

Wilson's book is fiction (novels), of course...

The issue of the *Illuminati* is one of the most notorious zones of wrong scholarship and right wing paranoia. This is a hard subject to deal with but, as we have noted before, most of the claims of conspiracy are made up or confused with something else.

If you try to deal with this subject you should sit down and study the analysis of *World History and the Eonic Effect* carefully. The idea that the French Revolution, leftist revolutionary projects, and for fanatic anti-modernists, modernity itself, were the result of occult action by the *Illuminati* and/or other Masonic-type organizations is exceedingly doubtful.

The strong correlation of these with the analysis of the macro effect in WHEE is far more convincing, although this doesn't complete our understanding fully.

Look at the public record of occultists. Its members are uniquely idiotic in their thinking on almost all questions. They cannot change history with their bad of tricks.

One way to see the wrongheaded nature of the accusations the French Revolution was an occult conspiracy is to see that the emergence of modern revolution and its themes of democracy and freedom have a far larger context than that of the action of those who started it (unwittingly in most cases: the spontaneity of the first phase of the FR is notable.) That context is the 'modern transition' as a whole and this clearly appears to include a host of events appearing in tandem. Look at the 'divide' so-called in WHEE: the period around 1800 includes a whole series of interlinked ultra-complex mega-events like the suspected correlation with German Classical philosophy. You can't ascribe this field to conspiratorial action, and yet its influence on the emergence of liberalism was crucial. The Illuminati were inside this phenomenon and could not have caused it. No one human is smart enough for any of this. Consider an amusing example: Kant's transcendental deduction, one of the most complicated innovations in modern philosophy. Do you seriously think that this distantly connected event could be induced by someone at the level of Masonic intelligence? We can't argue that some occultist would induce Kant's thinking on liberalism, but not the core issues, like the transcendental deduction, the interconnections of this type are endless). The point here is that historical induction does exist but it requires at a minimum a higher intelligence than the highest achievements of men in such a social context.

Thus the whole complex of events associated with the French Revolution is like this, and far vaster and sweeps up a whole cascade of unrelated events like Kant's famous deduction. A similar argument applies to the birth of modern science. One of the important influences on the French Revolution was the American, thence the English Civil War and beyond going backwards. Pretty soon the issue is the generation of modernity itself.

The emergence of occult organizations and individuals related to modern politics is entirely possible but we have very little evidence in public apart from the crackpot literature here.

I have addressed this question in the *Preface to Last and First Men*. There probably is an 'esoteric left' (there is certainly an esoteric right of muddle heads) but the nature of this is a complete mystery. Occult scholars often stumble on this point, but confused the explanation. We can see their claims of a 'conspiracy across world history' are a debased version of the clear perception that some directional process stands behind emergent civilization itself. WHEE clearly shows this to be the case, but no individual or occult group could accomplish this.

Ironically, we have an example of a real occultist at the level of the typical mason, but probably much better: Gurdjieff. He noted that fifty 'conscious' men could change the course of history. A vain boast if we consider the complete idiocy of most occultists on political questions: they have never been able to grasp modernity and denounce it as an aberration, a clear sign of their total ignorance of real macrohistorical change. His own intellect was very limited as he knew well and he had to try and capture smart intellectuals like Ouspensky to further his aims. You cannot change history with occult conspiracies, but, sadly, you can strengthen rightist confusion and resistance to the future.

And here we must consider that there have been rightwing conspiracies on the right. What about Hitler and the Holocaust? We can certainly suspect a set of rightwing conspiracies based on German occultism and their emergence as fascism in the context of nineteenth century Germany (and Europe). The connection of these to Hitler is not clear. But there is obvious evidence that what started as socialism (consider Mussolini) turned into fascism. Occult influence? We can hardly be sure of anything. Elsewhere we have documented the charges of Rajneesh against Buddhist 'nazis'.

Note that all these groups can only destroy modernity, they can't replace it with something better or with anything at all. Hitler was clear about his intention to destroy modernity (along with Jews and Christians). The only significant venue for occult malevolence given the hyper-complexity of the macro effect (which was latent

throughout here) is the mind-control of a 'zombie politician'. And we see the almost endless rumors of 'mind-control' actions and research, down to the era of the American CIA.

People who think covert agencies can act at the level of world history should study the American CIA. Since its creation in the era of Truman this cancer has almost destroyed American democracy and has set a whole civilization on a downward course.

The rise of modern liberalism and its ideas of freedom are studied at length in many modern texts and the Kantian expositions of the idea of freedom. Gurdjieff's antagonism to all of this is completely cockeyed and in sync with the fascist reaction of his generation. The whole mindset of the spiritual teachers of antiquity is off the mark.

## Conclusion

We have completed a short commentary on the Gurdjieff question, and the result is a set of ideas that can help to free oneself from the hypnotic lure of the Gurdjieff corpus. We see that the issue is that of autonomy and the dangers of its surrender to ambiguous agencies. Over and over we see the partial contents of a 'teaching' divulged, leaving one hooked and ready to sacrifice freedom for the full product. But to banish 'Gnosticism' from Christianity was its own danger. The naïve are easily exploited. But we must suspect a very dark situation around the Sufism concealed within the world of Islam.

Much of all this is really a game of 'insiders'. There really is a secret realm of very disreputable esoteric shadow figures, and these have one must fear entirely corrupted the realm of Islamic culture.

If you are a reader of Ouspensky you are an outsider at the sucker level, destined to stay there, and have no friends in that cabal and have no options beyond slavery, cannibal casualty, or zombie in the 'work'. Gurdjieff did however publicize much that has remained hidden among elites. The situation resembles the world of covert agencies, but these are at a lower level of crudity and psychopathy. Christianity became a religion with some protection from occult agents, but this is passing away. The only refuge left is secular culture which is, however, accumulating a large amount of occult, new age trash culture. The Indic brand is also relatively benign, no doubt with its own hidden shadow world. In a globalizing world new hybrids of Indic and Sufi entities may come into existence run by dishonest crooks. The hapless Anirvan exposed this shadow side of the guru world.

A new muddle is arising, in a hybrid with ideas of Nietzsche (cf. Ouspensky's interest), Overmen, and the esoteric. Nietzsche is very attractive mirage, and a trap for many self-styled gurus. See if you can master Kant here, first! Nine out of ten candidate supermen are rank amateurs, and make fools of themselves with that philosopher whose axioms were materialistic, we should note, in the era of Lange. His work is a trashing of Schopenhauer.

Gurdjieff, to be fair, gave the game away, unwittingly or not. No one will ever again take religion in any form at face value. He could have used Ouspensky to expose the real horror of religion. Instead, he went into business with materials that merely expose his mendacity and probably low intelligence beyond certain cunning. Again, the enneagram seems to be a fetish of long standing of the 'Naqsbandi' school of Sufism. They seem to have realized the jig was up with the enneagram and tried again with a new swindle in the enneagon of Oscar Ichazo.

But this partial expose of Gurdjieff does not imply he was a democratic or that he believed in a path of the bodhisattvas. He appears to have thought humanity worthless and not open to any compassion. Attempts to snare the 'proletariat' in an age of revolution seem an equally likely motive. The 'work' is a sick play on exploiting the 'work' and its 'workers'.

The modern reactionary world has spawned methods of psychological mind-control that have neutralized the resistance of the modern proletariats with psychological manipulations. The world of Gurdjieff must constitute but one of the sources for this kind of mass hypnosis. Indeed, the phrase itself springs from the works of Blavatsky, and the techniques have escaped into the realm of rightist anti-modernism. What place Gurdjieff had in this is not clear. But at the key moment, we find Gurdjieff visiting Germany, Ouspensky washing his hands of the whole business, and the dissolution by Gurdjieff of his school, left in limbo until after the war.

Many critics are too terrified of occult retaliation to critique a figure like Gurdjieff. The result is one of the most over-hyped figures in spiritual history. The 'work' has thousands of customers, but no product. Gurdjieff refers to very special methods of work on self, but what we are left with, including the so-called 'movements' don't amount to much and have left very little in the way of a permanent legacy.

Commentary is beset with the massive amount of disinfo that surrounds the whole movement. It is impossible to create a practical and specific spiritual path from the material given. Simple mindfulness workshops can do better than most so-called fourth way groups.

The example of the enneagram is typical.

A useful survey and critique can be found at:

<http://www.kheper.net/topics/Gurdjieff/Gurdjieff.PDF>

The absurdities of the enneagram can be seen very quickly from this statement by Ouspensky. A symbol of a countable number of distinct 'form subsets or lines', nine in number, plus a circle, could not map one to one to anything of any degree of complexity, contradicting the claim below in Ouspensky:

All knowledge can be included in the enneagram and with the help of the enneagram it can be interpreted. And in this connection only what a man is able to put into the enneagram does he actually know, that is, understand. What he cannot put into the enneagram makes books and libraries entirely unnecessary.

Everything can be included and read in the enneagram. --P.D. Ouspensky, *In Search of the Miraculous*

Again, the bait and switch principle warns that 'not what I meant' is at play. In the mathematical distinction of use and reference, the enneagram is not use but reference to something not made public in the communication. So the issue at best is up in the air, but almost certainly we see from the type of thinking that the whole game is simply nonsense.

A similar situation arises with the claims of objective art. Some of the world's great literature, such as Shakespeare is dismissed in contempt while we get still another plug for the esoteric nature of the Sphinx. This game begins to get tiresome.

The enneagram, we should note generates the repeating decimal  $1/7$ : 142857. One would think something a token of omniscience would not be innocent of the irrational numbers! What a laugh.

The enneagram issue has mutated into a larger religious and psychological literature, of human character types, and this complete fabrication of a whole fake science of out nothing (Oscar Ichazo seems to be one source here with the distinct enneagon) is rapidly expanding: google the term 'enneagram' at a site such as Amazon. This literature is starting to corrupt the Gospels, and no one can grasp the exploitation in progress.

This is an example of the way basic questions, such as self-remembering, really no more than meditation, have been confused by association with a huge addition of things clearly made up, a clear case of the wisecracking Gurdjieff complained off. Buddhism warns of the dangers of metaphysical speculation. The danger is courted here.

Compare this situation to that of Buddhism or (raja) yoga where an immense open literature exists to assist students of all types. By contrast the Gurdjieff world hides an unknown body of teachings given promotional come-on's by figures such as Ouspensky who did not understand what they were dealing with. This deception was deliberate. A book promoting your cause from someone of the caliber of Ouspensky is a coup in itself. Keeping such a person confused about the larger context would be top priority. In fact he became suspicious from the start.

Note that Ouspensky was only to learn much later that Gurdjieff would call himself Beelzebub, a term for a devil, and one used evidently to subtly justify himself to posterity, and to justify his shadowy side. Students forget the implications of such a self-description. Ouspensky suspected early on that he has dealing with a person of questionable ethics.

Figures such as Shri Anirvan in *To Live Within* have produced a justification and defense of Gurdjieff here, with another of the baseless attacks on Ouspensky. Ironically Anirvan made public a stance on gurus that is revealing and must have caused great embarrassment in many Indian teachers with its extreme disciple

masochism, and defense of a guru's right to murder unruly disciples. This writer completely confuses the question of Gurdjieff by taking him as a Hindu guru of some kind, and this is incorrect. But the issues of surrender to a guru do enter the thinking of the extreme authoritarian Gurdjieff, who appears to have marked Ouspensky for an extreme revenge sequence, into his next incarnation. Anirvan's revealing book spells the death knell of classic guruism and the basic foundation of the modern age will regurgitate this kind of guru fascism, keeping in mind here that Gurdjieff isn't a Hindu, but an obscure degeneration of some form of Sufi sheik.

**A warning about Shri Aniravan** This fool, a disciple of quite another guru in India whose identity is unclear, creates a form of masochistic homage to the super mystery Gurdjieff, complete with injunctions to the ultimate kowtow to the 'master' with a veiled warning to such rebels as Ouspensky that the supermen in question have a right to kill such rogues who disobey their masters. The spread of this doctrine in new age movement has created a new standard of submissive idiocy in westerners suffering hidden terror at the dangers of disobedience. However, this work most ironically has spelled the doom of the guru game: its standard of Nietzschean psychopaths enforcing a new law of caste over disciples who can be played with or killed at will is so extreme that it will turn the tide on its own absurdities. Gurdjieff in any case was not an Indian guru in the traditions of Buddhism or yoga.

James Webb in *The Harmonious Circle*, Chapter 10, also discusses the break, with the charge that Ouspensky was too intellectual. This sounds right, but clearly Gurdjieff was not intellectual enough. His promotion of a long list of 'new and unknown' superstitions, under suspicion of being cynically promoted by this occultist to entangle people suggests he needed a course in ethics, and adult supervision by an intellectual. But Ouspensky was unable to really see through the teachings Gurdjieff pulled out of a hat, despite his clear understanding that something was wrong. Gurdjieff is constantly given a 'master's' wave of the hand, but his indifferent promotion of junk esotericism is well on its way to corrupting the integrity of the New Testament with gnostic bait for the unwary.

Bennett, in *Making a New World*, outlines the obscure platform of the master, and we can discern the disguised reactionary agenda dressed up in a kind of faux environmentalism wishing some kind of prophetic mission. But in all the hoopla over this mysterious occultist we are still as much in the dark in the twenty-first century as we were at the start. Gurdjieff's thinking in the rendering of Bennett is another take on the strange dodecad of beings from simples to soil to man, angels, and all the way up to 'endlessness'. The appearance of the 'Trogoautoegocrat' at stage 11, "I eat autoegocrats" is a hint we are dealing with a bluff concealing 'spiritual cannibalism' (cf. Rudranandra's book by that name), and reciprocal maintenance is making a spiritual duty out of this. Any student of this subject needs to be very careful here, and wonder why so few students ever progress to any real consciousness. Like a factory for the 'work', the student appears to be the object of the extraction of 'surplus value' in the phrase of leftists. We are no so surprised that we have found aristocrats planning a new reaction at the dawn of the Russian Revolution.

The question of Gurdjieff remains one of the most confused in the whole arc of the New Age movement. The twin figures of Gurdjieff and Ouspensky remain a puzzle of interpretation and it is a curious irony that Gurdjieff was stopped in his tracks by the curiously obtuse yet insightful Ouspensky. The latter put in motion a negation of the Gurdjieff operation for which many innocent suckers will in the end be grateful. The work generates 'exhaust', dead, deadened and exhausted seekers, who take the works of Ouspensky at face value and end in the snares of something quite unexpected.

The question of Gurdjieff has obvious connections to the legacies of Sufism, and yet no clarification of this has been offered. There is a characteristic connection of Sufism with a nearly unknown spiritual technology

called the 'soul seed plexus', which we have discussed several times at the blogs *Darwiniana* and *The Gurdjieff Con.* Gurdjieff speaks of the soul and yet not once in his work did he reference this Sufi 'technology', a very obscure and dangerous aspect of esoteric Sufism. It would appear that this aspect of Sufism was completely denied to the students of Gurdjieff who never refers to it, certainly not in public, in writing, or in private, as far as we can tell. None of his students ever leaks anything, and nothing in the secondary literature of students betrays an awareness of this aspect of the Sufi path. Few Sufi groups ever contact the 'real' thing, and this is a tragic waste.

This opens the world of G to the charge of barren 'mule' Sufism, a path designed as fruitless from the start and allowing no release into real consciousness that we seem to overhear as working in the Islamic world. But it must be suspected that the majority of Sufi schools suffer this fate and move into history as doomed mechanizations from the start. The place of Gurdjieff in this world of deception is betrayed by his consistent deception, double talk, promotion of fake teachings, and repeated lying. We are thus paralyzed in any attempt to get to the bottom of the disaster.

Even as we critique Gurdjieff formations of ideas of 'esoteric Christianity' we confront '*deja vu* all over again' in doctrines of the Trinity that have so confused the theology of that religion. The ideas of the 'law of three' and 'seven' are later versions of what ultimately is the teaching of Indian *Samkhya* which speaks of 'gunas' of three elements or processes, *tamas*, *rajas*, *sattwas*, an early remnant of something Gurdjieff was perhaps trying to revive, but with no real knowledge of the original. Any discussion of three forces simply nosedives on first flight and it is not clear what the original ideas really were. The ray of creation is simply a pastiche of the *Samkhya* regime of seven levels of doubling gunas, (1), 3, 6, 12, 24, 48, 96. Now we suddenly see what must have happened to early Christianity in a fashion we can only suspect. But the presence of Jain monks in the Roman Empire world suggests that the Trinity is a garbled version of the *Samkhya* cascade. If so, it is no wonder it has produced so much confusion.

The work of Bennett in *The Dramatic Universe* creates a remarkable version of updated *Samkhya*, but this version owes as much to Schopenhauer as to the original: the connection to a theme of the 'will' in nature to the gunas was a cogent insight, but Bennett naturalizes the will under the influence of Whitehead to a phenomenal issue with no 'noumenal' aspect, defeating the whole purpose. It seems the Gurdjieff school was a bunch of bunglers who couldn't get anything right. But Bennett's contribution does give us an inkling of what the garbled Ray of Creation of Gurdjieff was about. He never once mentioned the source in *Samkhya*, unless there was a Sufi version of his approach.

The question of *Samkhya* shows one case, however garbled, where Gurdjieff's claims for ancient knowledge are born out, though it is hardly unknown, but the result required a considerable labor of interpretation by someone like Bennett, and the result is still dubious as foundational knowledge. The core idea of the triad is garbled in all accounts and it is hard to consider whether there ever was a really esoteric version. The 'razzledazzle' approach, so visible in the 'enneagram' of simply concocting elaborations, well described by school boys in language we won't quote, is under suspicion of being too far gone to be a reliable record. But the comparison of the gunas, *tamas*, *rajas*, *sattwas*, with the version in terms of the Ray of Creation shows how some original idea has mutated downfield. We should thus respect Bennett's brilliant partial solution to the riddle, mindful that the original breakthrough lies in Schopenhauer.

The result of all these labors is a remarkable study of the *Samkhya* brand applied to real cosmology, and a contemplative version in the correlation with selves and individualities in the layers of 'gunas' from 3 to 96.

The world of Gurdjieff began to give way to the entry of Sufis into the western new age movement. A work such as Muge Galin's *Between East and West: Sufism in the Novels of Doris Lessing*, shows the influence of the equally ambiguous Idries Shah starting in the fifties and beyond. The mysterious school of science fiction

writers, with Lessing at the fringe, and which includes figures such as L Ron Hubbard, many secondary and famous best-seller sci-fi novelists, and rogue Sufis like E.J. Gold whose father edited a classic pulp fiction magazine of the times, shows the way Sufis had moved on from the indigestible Gurdjieff jargon (which apparently was an attempt at science), but we can see precursors in the echoes of science fiction in A&E. This long text with the 'open secret' of contact with space aliens, still in the realm of Sufi sea yarns, is clearly an aspect of Gurdjieff's flatfooted 'teaching'.

But we must protest that everything is always a set of fragments we cannot assemble or use. Wait fifty years, and another piece appears, but we are still not ready to find a Sufi path or the Gurdjieff work.

Gurdjieff and Blavatsky appear roughly at the same time, next to Aleister Crowley, at the end of the nineteenth century where paranoid students of occultism began nervously searching for the roots of fascism and occultism. The confusions of the *Illuminati* on the lefts, after a series of baseless charges of revolutionary conspiracy were ironically countered with genuine conspiracies on the right, and it is into this slot that the reactionary Gurdjieff and his hoped for chess piece Ouspensky place themselves. The conspiracy against the Jews, the destruction of the left in the creation of occult medium fascists from socialists like Mussolini and Hitler spell the appearance of something dark and ominous, and here the guru Rajneesh finds the influence of rogue Buddhism.

The occult has had almost no constructive influence on history, but in this case of its extreme degeneration we see its destructive aspect through and through.

The figure of Aleister Crowley enters here with still another puzzle of new age muddle by example. His appearance in concert with Gurdjieff and Blavatsky is unnerving evidence that is no evidence of a connection. Crowley's work requires an independent judgment beyond the question of Gurdjieff, who often criticized openly occult methods.

Una Birch, in *Secret Societies: Illuminati, Freemasons, and the French Revolution*, re-spells much of the confused history of the *Illuminati* and the tide of modern revolution.

We cannot decisively scotch many claims of the esoteric since they aren't made public. We get instead obvious disinfo or the occult muddle of suggestible students who construct fantasy worlds of magical purport.

We have rescued modernity and revolution from conspiracy theories and the occult in our idea of the 'modern transition', with selections in Appendix 1 from *World history and the Eonic Effect*. It is useful to study that work to expose the false claims of the *Illuminati*, left or right, in the dynamic of history.

There is very little evidence that occult societies, left or right have exerted any major influence in either world history, modernity, or the French Revolution. We cannot ascribe independent causal explanations for the French Revolution in the context of the stream in which it flows: we would have to find the explanation of that stream, and this includes the whole of the early modern, not least the English Civil War, and the American Revolution. The immense confusion of Masonic and Rosicrucian secret societies has driven seekers to frenzies of speculation. We have already cited the text, *People of the Secret*, with its suggestions of the Sufi origins of freemasonry, etc... It is very hard to sort out the facts, but a larger study of history suggests the impotence of occult operatives by comparison with the larger dynamic of history.

This book appears connected with Idries Shah, speaks highly of J.G. Bennett, and transmits his distinction of demiurgic powers and a hidden directorate. The book then derails with just the kind of speculation about the occult that has confused everything. Clearly the hidden directorate consists of people on a relatively low level who can't really understand the complexity of history. Who can point to a typical member? Gurdjieff surely does not qualify in the sheer bungling of his operation. In too many accounts of the 'hidden directorate', or the

equivalents in many authors, we see a kind of postmodern wish to create a new spiritual future beyond modernity. It is already a degenerated version of the originals that were used to generate fascism.

People who promote political reaction and who find modernity a deviation of history and then presume they are part of a hidden directorate are members of the permanent boobhood that has persisted with immortal ego since the time of the Egyptian gnostics or before. This group has reached Hollywood and stars in grade B horror fare as *The Mummy* walks.

The larger dynamic of world history creates ordinary cultural forms that ordinary men can use and thrive on. The world of the occultists and their Sufi brands produce endless blind alleys from alchemy to free masonry and magic/witchcraft that cripple and main, leaving behind legions of confused beginners who corrupt their spirituality with Faustian idiocy.

#### Note on Bennett:

Bennett was a sad figure: he was a partial replacement for Ouspensky, but his work has not produced much of a result. His *The Dramatic Universe* was, however, a remarkable work, but it has already been turned into a cult fetish and is not open to serious critique. But it shows influences beyond those of Gurdjieff and can be a vehicle useful as an exit strategy for Gurdjieff cultists. Some very high source beyond Gurdjieff seems to have filtered through some Sufi somewhere who was a medium. But the evidence against this is the frequent muddle in the midst of some brilliant idea that shows a mystic amateur at work. And the whole thing is ripped off from *Samkhya*. The result is hard to evaluate, but its use is ruined by the predatory claims on Bennett's work by people who have no right to it. *Samkhya* is not the property of sufis or the Gurdjieff legacy. It is filled with wrong ideas, but also with a brilliant rendering of the ancient *Samkhya*. Bennett caught the disease of the conman from Gurdjieff and much of his thinking is borderline hype. But the DU has some truly brilliant fragments. Bennett marginalized himself by giving modernity its due in Volume 4 of that work. He managed to escape the Gurdjieff world, and his references to demiurgic powers suggest he had contact with some different influences. But his work is a confusing pastiche and he misleads his camp followers, one suspects, by passing the Gurdjieff materials into the new and different exploration he conducted. If you wish to do scholarship, you must stick with the standards of open society. In any case, DU is a treacherous minefield of stir-fry concoctions. We should discuss this figure elsewhere.

# Appendix 1

Some selections from

## ***World History and the Eonic Effect***

This work is also available online at [/history-and-evolution.com](http://history-and-evolution.com). The number references refer to WHEE.

*Note: World History and the Eonic Effect (WHEE)* turned out to be an unwitting commentary on the history so mangled in Bennett's *The Dramatic Universe*. That book was most strangely based on the remnants of astrology using the idea of the Great Year to clock his outline of world history. The reason was the clear perception inherited from antiquity of a cyclical pattern to history. But the 'New Year' myth simply won't work, and it is clear that Bennett saw this and interpolated a different scheme even as he keeps speaking in terms of the old. The problem was solved by the work on the eonic effect cited above.

Religious thought is pervaded with an obsessive attempt to negate modernity in the name of some spiritual legacy from the past. We need to put the problem in the right perspective to see the failure to understand the dynamic of history and its connection to issues of the rise of modernity. The material in *World History and the Eonic Effect* is tailored to this discussion and can also help to see the emergence of freedom ideas in the creation of the new man of modern times. His sense of freedom and autonomy is under assault by many of proponents of ancient legacies attempting their restoration. Some material from WHEE is helpful here. The reader is referred to the larger complete text to pursue the issue further.

### **1.2.3 Discovery of the Axial Age**

Our search for causes is confronted with the phenomenon of the so-called Axial Age, a term invented by the philosopher Karl Jaspers who collated a whole series of observations of this phenomenon, as it came to be discovered in the nineteenth century. The discovery of the Axial Age is one of the great episodes in the more general drama of the archaeological revolution, whose most notable incident is perhaps the discovery of the Rosetta stone by the army of Napoleon in its invasion of Egypt. The sudden opening to the mystery of ancient Egypt in the decipherment of its ancient hieroglyphics heralded the massive new findings of the nineteenth century. The at first less spectacular but in many ways as significant discovery of the Axial Age did not impinge on public consciousness until much later, and in fact has still not done so. From his *The Origin and Goal of History*, we have Karl Jaspers' observation:

The most extraordinary events are concentrated in this period. Confucius and Lao-tse were living in China, all the schools of Chinese philosophy came into being, including those of Mo-ti, Chuang-tse, Lieh-tsu and a host of others; India produced the Upanishads and Buddha and, like China, ran the whole gamut of philosophical possibilities down to skepticism, to materialism, sophism and nihilism; in Iran Zarathustra taught a challenging view of the world as a struggle between good and evil; in Palestine the prophets made their appearance, from Elijah, by way of Isaiah and Jeremiah to Deutero-Isaiah; Greece witnessed the appearance of Homer, of the Philosophers—Parmenides, Heraclitus and Plato—of the tragedians, Thucydides and Archimedes. Everything implied by these names developed during these few centuries almost simultaneously in China, India, and the West, without any one of these regions knowing of the others.

Our perception of the suddenness of the Greek transformation, and the parallel emergence of the prophetic age of the Israelites now finds its explanation, or rather a larger question in search of an explanation, in the realization that an entire spectrum of cultures across Eurasia in the period, as Jaspers depicts it, from -800 to -200.

Here simple periodization uncovers something spectacular, however we are to interpret the result. And yet this discovery has been almost orphaned by an inability to properly grasp what the evidence shows. Jaspers is not alone in his observations, which collate a whole series of such. Joseph Needham, in *Science and Civilization in China*, notes:

The close coincidence in date between the appearance of many of the great ethical and religious leaders has often been remarked upon: Confucius, c. -550; Gautama (Buddhism), c. -560; Zoroaster (if a historical personage), c. -600; Mahavira (Jainism), c. -560, and so on. But the Chhun Chhiu period was also contemporary with many important political events, such as the taking of Nineveh by the Medes in -612, the fall of Babylon to Cyrus in -538, and the invasion of the Punjab by Darius in -512, all examples of Iranian expansion. At the beginning of the Warring States period, the Greeks checked Iranian expansion westwards (-480), and the middle of the -5th century saw the erection of the Athenian Parthenon. The concluding stages of the Warring States time are contemporary with many outstanding events, such as the conquest of Alexander the Great (c. -327), the foundation of the Maurya dynasty in India and the beginning of the reign of Asoka (-300 and -274 respectively), and the Punic Wars in the Mediterranean (-250 to -150) which overlap with the first unification China under Chhin Shih Huang Ti. But the beginning of the Roman Empire (-31) does not take place until well into the Han dynasty.

These observations began earlier in the nineteenth century as global historiography began to force the issue of a multicultural perspective, and this entailing the need for synchronous study. The first philosopher of history to mention the Axial phenomenon would appear to be the little known Lasaulx (1856), who observes,

It cannot possibly be an accident that, six hundred years before Christ, Zarathustra in Persia, Gautama Buddha in India, Confucius in China, the prophets in Israel, King Numa in Rome and the first philosophers—Ionians, Dorians, Eleatics—in Hellas, all made their appearance pretty well simultaneously as reformers of the national religion.

A sense of something defying probability arises spontaneously as we notice this phenomenon. Victor Von Strauss (1870) notes,

During the centuries when Lao-tse and Confucius were living in China, a strange movement of the spirit passed through all civilized peoples. In Israel Jeremiaiah, Habakkuk, Daniel and Ezekiel were prophesying and in a renewed generation (521-516) the second temple was erected in Jerusalem. Among the Greeks Thales was still living, Anaximander, Pythagoras, Heraclitus and Xenophanes appeared and Parmenides was born. In Persia an important reformation of Zarathustra's ancient teaching seems to have been carried through, and India produced Sakyamuni, the founder of Buddhism.

We can now return to consider the Greeks, and note that many observations of the type collected by Jaspers exist for isolated instances of what we can see is connected to this 'Axial Age' phenomenon. Thus the philosopher Bertrand Russell opens his *A History of Western Philosophy* with an exclamation of wonder at this generative era:

In all history, nothing is so surprising or difficult to account for as the sudden rise of civilization in Greece. Much of what makes civilization had already existed in Egypt and Mesopotamia, and spread thence to neighboring countries. But certain elements had been lacking until the Greeks supplied them... What occurred was so astonishing that, until very recent times, men were content to gape and talk mystically about the Greek

genius. It is possible, however, to understand the development of Greece in scientific terms, and it is well worthwhile doing so.

We suddenly see the question of Greece in the larger context of the Axial Age, and to understand the question in scientific terms requires an objective look at a phenomenon that we had not suspected, where the occurrence of so many novelties in parallel seems at first inexplicable. In any case we are left with a question, is there a science of history?

The implications of the Axial Age have thus left its study stranded in a kind of limbo, as the phenomenon has tended to drift into misinterpretation. Karl Jaspers, in a curious blend of the religious and the secular, brought a carefully balanced sense of the philosophy of history to his depiction of the question, but many in his wake have tended to see a kind of generalized 'age of revelation' in which the issue of religion is given center stage. And this has tended to scare away serious students of the subject. But if we examine the data of the Axial Age more closely we discover to our surprise that it is more than just an historical garlanding of sages and prophets. If we zoom in more closely we discover to our astonishment that these sages and prophets are merely the tip of an iceberg, that the Axial phenomenon encompasses an entire social transformation in place of an entire stream of culture. And we soon see that the question of religion is only one aspect of the mystery. For as the remark of Bertrand Russell suggests the case of Greece comes to the fore in the synchronous emergence in parallel of multiple Axial exemplars, and leaves as its clearest case the spectacle of secularism at the point of its birth in world history.

As we examine the Axial Age in its breadth we are confronted with the difficult question of arriving at the history behind each of its exemplars. Thus the history of India behind and leading up to the remarkable era from the appearance of the Upanishads to the birth of Buddhism is difficult to reconstruct. And yet the basic outline of the Axial phenomenon is clear. And the question of what is historical in the Old Testament at first bedevils any simple account of the birth of that remarkable document. China, in turn, while it clearly echoes its parallel cousins, confronts us again with a confusing picture of the period in question. Ironically, then, despite the hopes of religionists for some secular version of the idea of an 'age of revelation', the clearest example given to us, the period of the Greek Archaic onward, shows us in detail something quite different, and in many ways far more remarkable: a kind of evolutionary leap or jump to a higher level of civilization, one very well balanced between all the categories of culture.

The notion of the era of Classical Greece as the birth of the secular would at first seem paradoxical. We need not press the point save to note that the birth of philosophy as a critical consciousness sows the seeds of rationalism for the first time. In fact, a balanced view is essential, for the essence of the Greek phenomenon could as well be argued as the last flowering of a strange form of political polytheism, and we should be wary of assigning a modernist label to what we see. But the gestation of philosophical tradition in Greece shows us the first birth of the Enlightenment, as it were, along with the first birth of science, the first Scientific Revolution millennia before the one that centers the transformation to the modern world in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The point here is that the Axial phenomenon is clearly connected to a larger set of categories than the merely religious, a point that is clearly indicated in Jaspers' original description, although he is struggling in the text of his work on the subject to remain without his theological boundaries, and yet to see that something larger is at work than the legacy of Christian historicism. Axial Age Greece was a multidimensional masterpiece whose legacy has ultimately transformed world civilization.

As we look beyond the pointillist sprinkling of great minds in the Axial interval and examine the question of what happened to the culture as a whole we begin to see that there is a kind of transition in a cultural totality leading to a new and more advanced stage of civilization. The Greek phenomenon thus crystallizes as new cultural substrate in its Dark Age, then begins a kind of take-off in the archaic period beginning in the eighth

and ninth centuries. We see a field of city-states emerge in a spectrum of political experiments, as dramas of class struggle and republicanism yield finally to the first great democracy in world history in the case of Athens. Pervading this general tide of sociological rebirth is the manifold of cultural achievements that we associate with the classical era, from the creation of the Homeric epics from an oral tradition, with a great flowering of poetic art climaxing in the birth of the Greek tragic genre. We see the birth of philosophy, and science, and, indeed, the birth of historiography in the works of Herodotus and Thucydides, and others. The entire account of the Greek achievement here is then something far larger than the individuals that make it up and constitutes a kind of eerie time-slice of creative upheaval, one as remarkable in swiftly coming to a close as in the suddenness of its arising.

In fact the dates suggested by Jaspers for his 'Axial Age', -800 to -200 seem overly generous, for we can see, if we take the example of Greece as a defining instance, that the interval of great innovations is essentially over by -400, and that the onset of the Hellenistic period is of a quite different character. This is clear from the way the great experiment in democracy yields to the resurgence of empire in the conquests of Alexander the Great whose legacy is to create a larger oikoumene into which the achievements of Greek civilization diffuse. We thus are confronted with an interval of the Greek Axial Age that almost suggests a kind of 'punctuated equilibrium', to use the phrase of the evolutionists, for we can almost clock the 'punctuation' in the brief period from the late ninth century to the generation of Plato and Aristotle, followed swiftly by the seeming 'equilibrium' period in its wake as history seems to resume its less spectacular course.

While many who have attempted to grapple with Jaspers' framework of an Axial Age have narrowed their focus to the issue of religion, we can begin to suspect, to the contrary, that the case of Greece suggests something broader. And if we take to heart the case of Archaic Greece, and look at the emergence of Israel, we begin to see an analogous period of social transformation that just so happened to produce the seeds of what was later to become a series of monotheistic religions. It is important to see that the history of Israel in the Axial period at least is that of a Canaanite culture and its passage through an age of empires, as it creates an epic literature of itself, and leaves this in its wake, as a set of seeds that will, as with the case of Greece, diffuse into a larger oikoumene. We can begin to see the structural similarity between the two histories, and to notice what is most surprising, the way in which whole literatures seem to come into existence in a strange timing, that of the Axial Age itself.

Later we can attempt to grapple with the parallel histories in India and China, but already we seem to have a basic clue: the general stream of historical emergence is punctuated with a set of innovations that pass into the larger field of history to influence a later oikoumene. The effect is obvious in both China and India, where a close look might also resolve the two harsh contrast between the religious and the secular. For the effect as a whole shows clearly the way in which categories are fluid, as philosophy becomes religion, and religion becomes politics, and politics becomes 'sacred'. From Confucius to the prophets of Israel, to the philosophers of Greece and India, we sense of continuous spectrum of realization that is in a most spectacular display of historical dynamics producing a new whole new epoch of civilization in its wake, as this takes the form of a series of reborn 'civilizations'.

#### **1.2.4 The Rise of the Modern: Another Axial Age?**

Almost as remarkable as the sudden onset of the Axial Age is its sudden waning and the return of what we should almost call 'history as usual'. There is something odd about it. The world against which the Axial phenomenon reacts was itself a kind of middle age. And the succession to the Axial period is another. We are

left to wonder what the significance of the Axial Age might be. And most of all we are confronted with a question of dynamics. And we are confronted with something unlikely: the uniqueness of this period. Jaspers' use of the term 'axial' is ambiguous in that respect. It seems to point to a unique period in history, a pivot point. But a larger look at world history suggests something quite different, a succession of 'axial' periods. We have but to zoom out to see that a very simple pattern is at work in the progression of civilizations since the Neolithic. Jaspers himself attempts to generalize his finding, but is obstructed by the issue of 'civilizations'. And his examination of modernity is on the threshold of discovering a 'second axial age', but is thrown off the scent by the confusions of secularism.

It is odd at first to consider the solution to be a frequency hypothesis, but, whatever the case, the basic facts speak for themselves: the Axial Age is part of a larger sequential structure. We should start moving in two directions, backward toward the Neolithic and forward toward the present. The 'axial' character of modernity is often noticed. Thus Bruce Mazlish observes, "The German philosopher Karl Jaspers has spoken of the periods when the great religions arose as 'axial periods'. At such times, there is a 'revolution' in the conditions of human existence and society turns on its axis."

Postmodern riddle explained? All at once, if we can trust the analogy, we see why the sense of a 'postmodern' age arises: it is not the decline of a civilization, but the waning of an impetus, clearly visible after the Axial interval, that mimics 'decline'. Our postmodern confusion is a similar reaction to the immense impetus of the rise of the modern.

We should begin to backtrack to find the 'axial' before the 'Axial'. Joseph Campbell finds an axial period at the dawn of Sumer. The Sumerian source is easy to underestimate. It looks primitive to us now, but its immediacy of creative surging gives birth to 'real civilization' in the odd 'early hybrid modern' where the village passes to the large city-complex. Its effect must have been as seminal as the later Greek transitional era to those who received its influences. It is as if everything was invented all at once, in embryo, to constitute the root-ideas of coming civilization. Thus,

In the epoch of the hieratic city-state (3500-2500 B.C.), the basic cultural traits of all the high civilizations that have flourished since (writing, the wheel, the calendar, mathematics, royalty, priest craft, a system of taxation, bookkeeping, etc.) suddenly appear, prehistory ends, and the literate era dawns. The whole city now, and not simply the temple compound, is conceived of as an imitation on earth of the cosmic order, while a highly differentiated, complexly organized society of specialist, comprising priestly, warrior, merchant, and peasant classes, is found governing all its secular as well as specifically religious affairs according to an astronomically inspired mathematical conception of a sort of magical consonance uniting in perfect harmony the universe.

We note the obvious similarity of this statement to Jaspers' observation of the later 'Axial' Age. Describing the swift transition from the era of earliest Egypt, Michael Hoffman, in Predynastic Egypt, is driven in some puzzlement to adopt the economic take-off idea of the economist W. W. Rostow as a metaphor to account for the sudden change that produces the unification of Upper and Lower Egypt under the Pharaoh Menes:

The immediate archaeological problem in explaining the cultural identity of Menes and his state is to account for the sudden embarrassment of riches that characterizes the material culture of Egypt between the Late Gerzean (ca. 3300 BC) and Archaic period (ca. 3100-2700 BC) in terms of a sophisticated, multifaceted explanation. Professor Renfrew borrows the term 'take-off point' from the economist Walter Rostow to characterize the rise of civilization and the proliferation of certain types of artifacts. Over the years a number of propensities develop within a social system, which predisposes it to a really major transformation. When that transformation does occur, it is so thorough as to convey the impression of crossing a critical threshold.

Remarkable, to say the least. What about Mesopotamia? In Prehistoric Europe, Philip Van Doren Stern wrestles explicitly with the evolution/revolution paradox and observes the sudden jump to the first level of

civilization in the first hydraulic world of Mesopotamia as it emerged from its mysterious roots of it in the era of the so-called Ubaid and before:

Something happened in Sumer during the fifth millennium B.C., when all the rest of the world was still so primitive that the Sumerians had to make their own way. The initial stages proceeded slowly for a thousand years or more, and then, during the five centuries between 3300 and 2800 B.C., culture accelerated so rapidly that in this brief time villages became cities and cities grew into city-states... Roux[Georges Roux, *Ancient Iraq*, London. 1964,] merely says of this extraordinarily rapid cultural development in Sumer that 'a close examination reveals no drastic changes in social organization, no real break in architectural or in religious traditions. We are confronted here, not with sudden revolution, but with the final term of an evolution which had started in Mesopotamia itself several centuries before.' Perhaps. But perhaps he is applying our modern time scale to an age when centuries were equivalent to our decades. For a village to become a city in a few hundred years when there had never been a city anywhere before, is, to put it mildly, something more than ordinary evolution.

Again, remarkable. And this statement suggests we can keep on going backward to find a still earlier case, but for the moment we have discovered something very simple, and a resolution, to some extent, of the riddle of the Axial Age, it is but one in a series. There is one last piece to our puzzle, the rise of the modern. Having moved backwards toward the beginning of civilization, we can move forward from the Axial period.

The sudden waning of the Axial effect, as we have noted, is dramatic. By -200 the Axial phenomenon is clearly over, and the onset of empire seems like a rush into a vacuum, to replace a brief period of republican experiments. The onset of the Hellenistic world of empire is almost a return to the world whence the Greek experiment hopes to escape. In the case of Greece the period of spectacular achievements is over as the Hellenistic, soon yielding to the Roman world ushers in the age of great empires. It is interesting to consider the cognate relation of the Greeks and the Romans, and to consider that the early appearance of Rome and its republic is really a part of the Greek phenomenon. As we study the Greeks we note the way in which their common culture was a function of language and custom, and that this was in turn a medium binding a set of city states and their colonies across the Mediterranean, including the southern part of Italy. Was not Rome, in a sense, a child of that nexus of all things Greek, as the diffusion of ideas and the vague sense of a new age animated those in the immediate field of Hellenic influence?

Thus, the emergence of Republican Rome is really still another branch of our far-flung Axial Age, and the appearance of the Roman Republic is the cousin to the surge of republican experiments in the age of Greek political innovations, and the uniquely prophetic creation of the world's first democracy in Greece. There is something significant in the brevity of the Athenian experiment, and the endurance of the Roman. The Athenians will leave a hope for the future, not to be realized until millennia later, in the rise of the modern world. The Romans will carry the issue in its sturdy republican form until the onset of its imperial phases precipitates finally the breakdown of its phase in Axial swaddling clothes and the age of the Caesars begins, enduring all the way into the medieval period.

There is something odd about our use of the term 'middle ages'. We spontaneously consider that the era after the fall of Rome is the middle of something. In fact, it is in the middle between the Axial Age, as a boundary point, with its associated Roman continuation, and the rise of the modern world millennia later. This 'medieval period' suffers a charge against its reputation in our minds, then, one frequently protested by various parties to its defense, in the way we see it as in some fashion not up to the standard of either its Axial beginning point or its modern recurrence. Whether this downplaying of the medieval interval is fair or not, the fact remains that our very terminology reflects a larger pattern of history, and on a scale that goes far toward explaining why a pattern of overall coherence is hard for us to detect. For until the rise of modern archaeology

the beginnings of our traditions seemed to be those visible in the Axial period. The intimations of unknown earlier acts of the play are seen in the unexplained appearance in Biblical history of the Egyptians, or Assyrians, lurking in the background as remnants of some unknown world thought to be passing away.

This effect of relative beginning in what we have dubbed the 'Axial Age' seems then to suggest a complete unit, of 'punctuation' and the 'equilibrium' that follows in its middle period, until what is apparently another punctuation occurs, and this we call the rise of the modern world. We are getting suspicious. If the Axial Age is a kind of new beginning inside a larger history, its uniqueness would seem to have been the result of our lack of knowledge of earlier civilizations. But this lack of knowledge about the earlier stages of civilization is no longer the case: the rise of archaeology has shown us the antecedents for the mysterious Assyrians and Egyptians who appear in the Biblical text. And as we proceed backwards we are left to wonder if some antecedent 'Axial' period is not visible in the historical image crystallizing in archaeological fixer. We already know the answer, if indeed we are aware of any of the findings of modern archaeology, which show us the so-called rise of civilization at the end of the fourth millennium in strangely synchronous emergence of Egyptian and Sumerian civilizations. Strange to say, we can even produce a rough interval between these moments, of just over two millennia.

The dynamism of the Axial period, its seminal creativity, seems to fret an entire an entire cycle of civilizations, and is unmatched by anything until the rise of the modern world. What is remarkable is the loss of so many of the innovations of the Axial period, a notable example being the birth of science, and its slow passing away with time, such that by time of the medieval period, in the Christian West, its birth among the Greeks is almost a forgotten memory. Its partial survival in the world of Islam is like an ember fire carried across time.

And then suddenly in the sixteenth century we see once again, almost like a timed renewal, what is in many ways a recursion of many of the innovations of the Axial period, with some important differences. The parallel transformations of the Protestant Reformation and the Scientific Revolution, Copernicus and Luther, stand at the threshold of the modern transformation leading to the rough point, around 1800, when a transition to a new era seems complete, and a new age begins, at the threshold of globalization. The phenomenon of the rise of modernity is the object of many theories and controversies, but the basic observations of the phenomenon resemble the exclamations we find with the Axial Age.

There is a mysterious seminal generation springing from the period ca. 1500, indicated by the onset of the Reformation. Over and over our sense of historical modernism draws us to this point of the so-called 'early modern', and into a controversy or equivocation over its significance as one of the great turning points of history. Relative to world history, progress explodes in the sixteenth century, despite the puzzle over the Renaissance. The abrupt start after 1500 is constantly suggested and then challenged or retracted because its proponents cannot account for it, or sort out the fact that a discontinuity might interrupt prior continuity.

This sudden change in direction is reflected in the puzzled observations of a host of historians. J. M. Roberts in his *History of the World* opens by noting, "After 1500 or so, there are many signs that a new age of world history is beginning...". William MacNeill, in his *The Rise of the West*, calls the career of Western civilization since 1500 a vast explosion. Geoffrey Barraclough, in *Turning Points in World History*, notes the remark of Paul Valery that Europe is a 'peninsula of Asia', a western appendix of the Eurasian land mass, and asks, "How was it that this western appendix came to be in a position to exercise this power, this domination over the greater part of the world?" He cites the factors of technological and scientific proficiency, the revolution in transport and communications, that 'caused' this brief hegemony, but in a manner typical of historians stumbling over the eonic effect is driven to note, "So much, I think, is obvious; but it tells us very little".

Marshall Hodgson, in *The Venture of Islam*, speaks of the Western Transmutation, 1600 to 1800, and sees the connection with the earlier period, generated from Sumer, but his analysis focuses on the history of technology, and fast-forwards to exclude the Reformation.

What happened can be compared with the first advent several thousand years BC of that combination, among the dominant elements of certain societies, of urban living, literacy, and generally complex social and cultural organization, which we call civilization.

Jacques Barzun in *From Dawn to Decadence* asks, "Granted for the sake of argument that 'our culture' may be ending, why the slice of 500 years [from 1500 to the present]? What makes it a unity? The starting date 1500 follows usage: textbooks from time immemorial have called it the beginning of the Modern Era." There is no implication of decline or decadence after the interval of transition, since a new era has come into being. The conclusion of the eonic sequence should be great new beginning.

This sudden take-off (relative to world history) has always been intractable for students of the question, and driven historical sociology into a frenzy of Renaissance resurrections, dialectical Big Bumps, Marxist social stages, Weberian econo-religious explanations, or the 'European Miracle of the historian E. L. Jones.

As noted, the periodization question of the 'rise of modern' has many casualties in the realm of theories. Three sets of failed theories deal with these eras in isolation, those of the rise of the modern, the birth of civilization, and, to the extent they exist at all, efforts to explain the Axial period, along with the whole spectrum of interpretations of the classical civilizations, to say nothing of explaining the history indicated in the Old Testament. Without exception these theories have all failed. Suddenly we realize they are really all asking a similar set of questions about an invariant puzzle. The question of the 'modern' remains baffling until we see it in its greater context. Then the remarkable resemblance of the rise of the modern to the Axial interval, and especially Greek Archaic appears.

We are closing in on a pattern of universal history, at once simple, and mysterious, and clearly showing us the principle of coherence we were seeking in our perception of world history. And we are close to the resolution of the riddle of modernity, and to a perspective on the way it might suddenly show chaotification. We seem to be, not in the stages of the postmodern, but in the early stages of a great new era of world history, after passing through the transitional period of its onset. And as we explore this larger framework we can attempt to redefine the modern in a fashion more conducive to the needs of our future, beyond the domination of economic fundamentalism, or the imposition of false views of evolution on the outcome of something larger than Social Darwinist paranoia and environmental degradation. We begin to see the clue to better resolution than the return to traditionalism.

**Democratic Revolutions** One of the most mysterious aspects of our new perspective is the double birth of democracy, in classical Greece and the modern transition. This exact correlation is one of the most remarkable discoveries of careful periodization, and leaves us to wonder what it means.

As we examine this 'ratchet effect', the pattern confuses us because it does not follow the course of a single civilization, but jumps between civilizations as it proceeds. The question of the rise of the modern world also shows the displacement of change beyond the frontiers of the old Roman Empire into those parts of Europe that were only marginally a part of the ancient Roman system. We observe the Reformation, and see a religious phenomenon, but we might look beyond religion to see the opening of a new field of culture free from and at the exterior to the system of antiquity. In fact, we begin to sense another instance of the frontier phenomenon that we noted in the Greek Axial Age. This is in many ways the signature of this age of renewal, as it expands beyond the framework of antiquity, first to Northern Europe, thence to the Americas, and beyond. We must begin to wonder if the phenomenon we are trying to understand is not a globalization process more than a phenomenon of civilizations.

Our sense of modernity has been confounded by a false Eurocentrism, but we can begin to see beyond that. The constant references to 'Western Civilization', or the 'West', or the Judaeo-Christian heritage, in a series of Eurocentric terms, blinds us to the reality, which is that the rise of the modern is not a European phenomenon,

as such, and finds its field of realization almost sooner in its exterior than in its homeland. The obvious picture left by history here is the temporal correlation of the spread of European, we should rather say, Eurasian, civilization to the Americas. It is hardly accidental that the North American colonies beginning in the seventeenth century already show the seeds sown by the English Civil War that will grow later in the classic harbinger of a new era dawning, the American Revolution.

There is obvious something larger than Europe then in the modern transformation and the result is the birth as much of a new global civilization as the passage of a cultural particularity called the European. The same interval of sudden change, followed by the creation of an oikoumene in the diffusion from a source, is visible in the modern world as it was in the Axial Age of Greeks. And a comparison of the two leaves us with a set of unanswered questions about the nature of historical change, and the more general issue of slow or fast evolution. We seem to see, or think we see, the slow evolution of modernity from a medieval world. But it resembles very closely the Greek Axial interval, and there we were left hanging with such explanations. There wasn't anything at all slow about the Greek Miracle. In a few centuries it emerged from nothing, flowered in spectacular fashion, and was done. The sense of a resemblance with the modern transformation begins to suggest a new and different kind of explanation for the rise of the world we have inherited from the early moderns.

## New Ages

The forms of historicism include the myths of eons and epochs. Our data leads us through this terrain, yet gives us a handle on the mythological confusions. We live in an age when the millennial calendar of eschatological Christianity, a very ancient cousin of the idea of a New Age, suggests an illusory finish to our affairs that might distract from the practical efforts demanded by problems that have no miraculous solutions. Behind the idea of the last age lies the idea of a 'new age', and the endless echoes of antique notions of epochs, ages of man, and great cycles of nature. Ideas of a 'new age' braided with that of an 'eschaton' and its strange futures are clearly evident in the thinking of the New Testament.

For the onset of the New Age, if this has any meaning, has already come and gone as far as historical Grand Dramatics is concerned. Beyond the issues of the greater future on a scale of millennia, our 'new age' crisis might be very real on a scale of mere centuries: a loss of momentum or postmodern chaotification in the unfolding of a new phase of 'civilization' from its roots in the period of the earliest modernity. Our moment, that one might wish to move 'toward a new enlightenment', instead moves quickly 'toward a new age movement'. A further confusion lies in the idea of decline, near ideas of the rise and fall of civilization, such as those advocated by Spengler and Toynbee. These views cleverly find the Enlightenment the onset of the fallen man's last hurrah, in some hellish finish of 'western' civilization. But secular thought lays the best claim to the 'new age'.

The confusions of eschatology, new ages, last ages, and cyclical views of history are chronic, and in the recent versions, come with an anti-modern ideological twist. The eonic effect produces a useful commentary on the issue. We should note that the term 'eonic' was made a synonym for 'intermittent', and invokes a systems analysis metaphor (e.g. digital samplers), but also obviously puns on the word 'eon', and this is both an afterthought, and a means of seeing why myths of 'New Ages' are endemic to history for a reason the eonic effect makes clear. Our 'eonic sequence', will elicit the confusion over myths of the Great Year, and hopefully displace that with something else.

The great shockwave of modernism is the onset of a great new period of history and joins the short list of two previous such transitions, the great force of the first civilizations, and the second great wave of change that gave birth to the classical world. One and the same pattern of geographical differentiation followed by 'globalizing' integration is clearly at work, with, however, a rising expansion of scale in each case. The resemblance of the modernist transformation to these early cousins completes the list of three 'new ages'. Is any of this important? Our eonic pattern moves through this territory, and it is good to be wary of merely recycling archetypes. Our approach is different, purely empirical. The New Age obsession is much ridiculed, but contains a valid impulse. An age of spiritual democracy is clearly coming into existence amidst considerable confusion. Further, the 'new age' idea is an outstanding challenge to the legacy of the great religions now challenged to a great renewal.

The issue of the New Age is simple. Everyone is observing fragments of the eonic effect, without seeing the whole pattern, which is 'evolutionary' in our sense. This has nothing to do with current New Age ideas of 'evolution' as personal transformation. The eonic effect grants no foundational status to the idea of a new age, but solves the problem at once on a de facto basis by suggesting the mistake of periodization in most efforts to periodize New Ages. The quest for the Age of Aquarius was silly, as is the postmodern attempt to undermine the rise of the modern with a 'New Age'. There is even a new myth of the 'Second Axial Age' appearing. The myths of the 'New Age' spring from the lore of the Great Year, a total red herring, whose astrological periodization of the precession of the equinoxes is too short and throws everything else out of whack, leaving the field in total confusion. The mystery of historical cycles has always haunted civilization, for reasons that we will see. It is time to lay the issue to rest. It is a hopeless question, but we can take a chance and use our eonic model to attempt some clarification.

One reason for the importance of the idea of a New Age is that the periodic renewal of religious formations, correctly anticipated by many New Agers and Eastern thinkers, is a force to be reckoned with and can have devastating impact on received religions. It is probably the case that the religions generated in the wake of the Axial period will slowly pass away, or be transformed into something else. The effect is very clear from the Axial period itself, which pressed against the remains of still earlier religions, and we can see the issue clearly in the modern world where all the old religions are clearly falling to pieces. The place of the better idea of evolution here is obvious, although Darwinism, due to its reductionist account of man has, if anything, miscast the tone of secularization which was proceeding in more intelligent fashion before the false metaphysics of selectionist theories gave religious reaction a fresh impetus. Consider that preeminent New Ager, Spinoza, giving birth promptly in the early modern to Biblical Criticism. Also, please note, the Protestant Reformation, in the mainline of our eonic sequence recycles a Christian stream. We should therefore be wary of any predictions.

The mysterious discontinuity of the sixteenth century, and the onset of the modern in the nineteenth are a de facto resolution of the Great Expectation predicted, but whose secular character was not wished for. That the early champions of revolution and change, during the French Revolution, saw fit to periodize a New Age in the 'revolution' of time by attempting to invent a new calendar of the Year Zero is altogether apt, and not quite as ridiculous as the swift reactions of conservatives were soon to make that seem.

Thus, the rise of the modern world has often been seen as the beginning of a New Age, *Novus Ordo Seclorum*. But this falls out of sync with the periodization of the Great Year. We can breathe a sigh of relief, determining the onset of the Aquarian age is superfluous. But a host of 'New Age' gurus, plying the 'standard postmodern strategy' pioneered by Spengler, find the rise of the modern to be an aberration, and the situation to require their ministrations, please forget the many achievements of human liberty attending the old New Age. The new New Age requires the sacrifice of human autonomy, in the name of spiritual guidance. We are presented with the Old Age movement, in a flood of cults promoting archaic confusions.

The condemnation in spiritual terms of the new age of the modern with its revolutionary struggle for freedom is currently being amplified by the postmodern strategies of forces of reaction. In a strange irony, the West was the last place on the planet not subject to the concealed domination of spiritual or 'esoteric' mystifications. It has produced in short order the groundwork for a new disposition of the true spiritual man, able to inherit his autonomy as the natural freedom of his own self-consciousness. We are still living in the future of this moment of this transition to a new era of world history, symbolically climaxing in the generation of the French Revolution, in the sense that our current culture came into existence very swiftly in the century from 1750 to 1850. This greater significance of the Revolutionary period was clearly in the mind of the philosopher Hegel who, ideas of the 'end of history' apart, was inspired both to the early enthusiasm for and the reactionary rejection of this event in its excesses, as one of its most notable observers.

As Hegel notes in his *Phenomenology of Spirit*, written on the eve of Napoleon's approach to Jena, as the supposed (hubristic) World Spirit on horseback:

Our epoch is a birth time, a period of transition. The spirit of man has broken with the old order of things, and with old ways of thinking. The spirit of the times, growing slowly and quietly ripe for the new form it is to assume, disintegrates one piece after another of the structure of the previous world. That it is tottering to its fall is now indicated only by symptoms here and there...but something else is approaching. This gradual crumbling to pieces will be interrupted by the sunrise, which in a flash and at a single stroke, brings to view the form and structure of the new world.

Hegel is useful in one way for he restates a classic mystical theme of the ancients, but slips in the idea of freedom. The guru game will never be the same, and the current New Age conspiracies against human autonomy using the postmodern strategy should soon play themselves out. Hegel, of course, is sometimes well challenged for his version of the Freedom idea. Indeed, is he not a sly version from the same game? His concealed occult roots should leave us wondering. But the point is clear. Failing Hegel, the pack of left Hegelians, New Agers in the vein of Feuerbach, rewrote the terms of the New Age rather well, although Marxist 'materialism' is too constricted to handle these issues. The terms are set, the 'class struggle' is very much present at the core of religion. The Enlightenment theme of autonomy creates quiet alarm in the spiritual authorities of antiquity. And why would that be so? The dark rumors of the occult fascism pass through the New Age underground.

In the end, there is no theoretical basis for the New Age concept as such in the eonic effect with its crude stages of self-organization, but the battle of the ancients and moderns takes its place, and now takes new forms so visible in the 'old and new' of the vigorous movements styled 'New Age'. But the new age of the modern is real enough, and connects to historical dynamics. The postmodern swindles of the gurus attempting to displace modernity with their own 'New Age' should hopefully prove transparent, and proof they have little grasp of history.

**New Age Movements** The generation of the sixties and seventies in the West with its plethora of New Age movements rising from the multicultural compression of the emerging world culture, in a proliferation of spiritual groups whose radical therapeutic fringe mixed with an easternizing, semi-Theosophical character, proceeds by such a swift and grim law from the language of spiritual renewal to the commercialization of astrology, pseudo-yoga and channeling that one must wonder what happened. The question of world religion is crucial to our subject, but it is hard for standard historiography to get to the bottom of it, impossible in an age of Darwinism, and the history of India is especially interesting and difficult in this respect. Our discovery of the Shiva seal puts the whole question to the fore, and we have fulfilled our task, to a first approximation, by placing these issues in some relation to real historical evolution.

Shiva Seal: Yoga and Tantra The Indic tradition, witness the Shiva seal, is an elusive play on what is really the twin legacy of yoga and tantra, one tradition, the latter no doubt the evolutionary source of the former, in a fashion lost to us. The degenerations of tantra veil the obvious path to the discovery of yoga.

It is not our business to pass judgment on these movements, which constitute part of our eonic history, and which show a thriving realization (attempted) of spiritual democracy, but the amount of sheer drivel produced is enough to completely paralyze the 'spiritual paths' of anyone who ventures here. It should be noted that the world historical significance of Indian religion is reflected in its entry into late modernism, just at our divide, as if to squeeze in on time, and its evaluation an important task of contemporary culture. Note that our eonic sequence never repeats itself, and the Indic stream bids fair to be cheated out of a future transition. But we see the reverse diffusion effect in the spread of modern technology and the Indic tradition starts to flood into modernity almost exactly at the modern divide. We can't play favorites with our term 'eonic determination', but we can see that these traditions from the Axial Age are not going to get renewed treatment from our eonic mainline, which has already completed its business by the time of the divide. Or so our model suggests.

This helps explain the strange dilemma of the New Age movements we see. In any case a last phase of the Reformation seems to be the case, as the modern pluralistic omnibus picks up all passengers. Note how the seemingly oddball Reformation does in fact show the factor of eonic determination and climaxes near the divide with the birth of such ideas as 'rational theology', as seen in Kant, or Hegel. Hegel was very clear on this point, that German philosophy was the end cap of the Reformation. And it is no accident that it tries to lift itself up by its bootstraps to 'beat the competition' by disgorging a sort of wild flower Upanishadic rabbit from the hat. But the result can't really compete with the Indic strain, at least at first sight. But if we study the Kantian Dialectic carefully we see that the religions of antiquity fall into place around the antinomies of self, soul, divinity, with the idea of freedom appearing in concert. We have the clue. A great new 'Freedom Sutra' is struggling to be born, to integrate all the religions crowding for space in modernity.

That early entry of Indic religion, before the stampede of gurus, began with the generation of the Romantics, and figures such as Schlegel. And the critique from this perspective of the monotheistic traditions is also a significant liberation for the mass hypnosis macro-cults that haunt the Western tradition. But its legacy should be its own self-liberation into an age of spiritual democracy. In fact, despite his disavowals, the figure Schopenhauer is proof these issues were built into modernism at its foundations, so we need not apologize for introducing them. The West has its own confused and concealed Hermetic traditions, but little profit to the public comes from them, it would seem.

Beyond that the New Age shows one irony, that none of the great religions of antiquity are likely to survive in their current form. And yet Hinduism probably gestates in the Neolithic, so we should not predict. A host of gurus have said as much, and the point is hardly controversial. Beside the great religions, the great yogas, and their Sufi variants, are not always benign vehicles. Nor is the classic ashram adapted to needs of modern man. The clear evidence of Christian totalitarianism in the legacy of Constantine suppressing Gnostic cults was not benign either. The endless efforts to repackage antiquity go on and on, to no avail.

The modern Enlightenment is suddenly undervalued now, but its final task will be to rewrite the archaic sutras in a critical vein, a task not easily accomplished, and barely to be hoped for. The Enlightenment chord of Reason in history is taken as some degenerate vice by some, but was already visible in the streamlining of the ancient tradition in the great Gautama. We should certainly be open to a postmodern or yogic critique of reason, but too many, who could use a good scientific education, have wrecked a great thematic of history in the name of mystical idiocy. It is a false quarrel. Reason is the common carrier of historical man. Study the theology Luther was forced to deal with before renouncing the theme of Reason in History. If it can outperform, in the

long run, the mystical confusions of self-styled prophets and sages, and it can, then it claims history, leaving the Buddhas to exit history, as wished.

The Enlightenment has been underrated by self-appointed wizards, but will sooner or later show a resurgent effort to evaluate this heritage of antiquity, whose decayed forms are proliferating at a rapid rate. Beside Hegel, a perfect example is the brilliant, if imperfect, formulation of Schopenhauer who automatically proceeds to resurrect these ancient questions (which are obviously latent in Kant). But these men were doing something quite different. Modernity has done its business by staging pluralism, and there these rival stains prosper as never before. What is the objection to modernity?

The problem is that horizontal history rarely produces a viable spiritual movement, and we notice the way the intersection of the ancient Indian stream with the Axial phase suddenly produces such a world religion. Let us note that the original Buddhism does not resemble anything by that name now, a good example being its rejection of vegetarianism.

The authority of gurus is bogus. Due to a false mystique of pre-democratic ages, they have become an obstacle to development. There is no cosmic involution of spiritual men. Instead we see the bottom up bootstrap of autonomous freethinking men realizing their mysterious and latent evolutionary psychology. The point is clearer from something like the early Jain, or early Buddhist, traditions.

In any case, we can also see that this ferment of New Age religion is a delayed aspect of modernism and global diffusion. Note from our later model the fact that it occurs late in this rise and has no special status overriding modernist foundations. This is not the new Axial Age, nor are we likely to see a replication of the period creating a world religion like Buddhism or Christianity. It is thus worth noting again that the only period of Indian religion intersecting with our eonic effect is that of the Axial period, and the result was the creative ferment that gave birth to traditions such as the Buddhist, traditions as rich as that seen in the world of the parallel Greeks.

The Battle of the Ancients and the Moderns recommences in a different form, and a global Reformation moves to interact with the full scope and antiquity of the religions of classical period. That New Age movements have had their opportunity to surpass modernity, yet are unable to do so, can be seen from the confusion created by Theosophy. And yet this movement contained a valid protest against the completely false view of man coming into existence in an age of positivism and Darwinism.

Madame Blavatsky's Baboon The modern secularist has only himself to blame for attempting to foist a 'soul-less' post-Cartesian positivism on the globalizing universal culture. The counterattack was swift, even as Huxley was debating Wilberforce, the Indian world starts launching a series of torpedoes to reset the balance. Darwinism was and is a standing joke in many minds.

But is Theosophy any better than Darwinism? The rapid appearance of a new metaphysics of 'spiritual evolution' in Blavatsky's wake has produced still another field of confusion. But behind the carnival of Blavatsky's 'rubbish heap' lay a serious effort to remind Westerners that the man in the Shiva seal existed before the rise of civilization, and that the deeper evolutionary psychology of man is hard pressed to survive into a scientific age. Such issues as reincarnation, condemned as crackpot by Scientific Committees investigating the occult, are certainly not the simple one scientific psychology pretends it to be, and the ancient legacy is soon resurgent. The real and deeper issue is human autonomy and the threat to this in the realms of spiritual domination so strangely embraced by the Theosophical obsession with Himalayan masters. Never let the phantoms of the 'Himalayan Masters' control your unconscious.

The New Age movement is thus likely to be the vehicle for conservative mystifications and restorations of the worst kind of false postmodernist traditionalism, including the regime of the imitation Hindu-style guru, to a receptive public eager for mysticism and unaware of the hegemonic nature of Brahmanism and the history of

the Indian religion between Buddha and Shankara. This world is beautiful in itself, in spite of its historical shadows, and it is unfair to denounce as 'gurus' the modern crop of hucksters trotting down the road with this label.

Nonetheless, this recent movement, frequently excoriated, is of historical interest in its own right, and one whose issues and history deserve their own telling, beginning, not in the seventies, not in the nineteenth century, but in the wake of the first phase of global interaction, and the fascination of the *philosophes* with the arriving data of other cultures, such as the traditions of China. The first achievement of modern culture is a pluralism that can yield a field of renewal to the manifold sources of antique spiritualities to find stowaway passage in modernity, near a technocratic Lord Jim.

The 'self' of man is a mystery not easily understood, and the recorded testimony of complex states of consciousness, however confused, makes Darwinism a dead letter, with its complete absence of any definition of what an organism such as man might be. There are no simple answers here and the Indian tradition promptly equivocates the nature of self/no-self.

A Challenge to Guruism the New Age movement is neglected by modern thought, and these remarks are not a rejection of the so-called New Age movement, as such. In fact, we have potentially built into our thesis the great issues of Indian religion. But if we do so we need to sound a warning that we are not in the endorsement business for the many deceptions that pass under the name of esoteric spirituality. It is important to remember that these movements have none of the factor of macro-action we see in the Axial Age. That's a fact of life, and a warning to false hopes the next guru will ever match, viz. the emergence of Buddhism.

A good starting point is Kant's classic essay, what is Enlightenment? The issue of autonomy is an apparent threat to the legacy of guruism, and the time has come to challenge the spiritual authority of these ancient traditions. No mention of the guru is made in the Buddhist Eightfold Way. The manufacture of proxy fascist agents in downfield reincarnation sequences with the unwitting trust of 'disciples' is the end of the line for the legacy of naïve guruism.

Wolves in sheep's clothing. The figure 'Jesus' gave a sound warning. The New Age collapse of Sufistic and Buddhist traditions (to say nothing of the Christian) is already showing the proliferation of freelancers and spiritual capitalists and degenerate cannibals armed with occult means of exploitation. Occult fascists put democratic politicians at risk. The modern transition with its emphasis on freedom and autonomy should, but won't, put these operators out of business. The modern liberal is a perfectly good exemplar of 'Santana dharma', with a Kantian angle on transcendental freedom, historically mindful of the spiritual slavery peddled as dharma by the reactionary Neo-Brahmins and their massacre of the Buddhists.

We should inject a caution against an emerging false, or misleading, view of evolution taken as 'spiritual self-evolution'. It is not evolution to do yoga exercises, unless you define it that way, in which case you should not confuse it with general evolution. No one, not even Gautama Buddha can operate on the level of the eonic evolution we see in history. These people are not evolutionary guides for mankind in the sense of macro-evolution. The propaganda of gurus is in a state of rapid diffusion, and many wild claims are made to buttress an authoritarianism inappropriate to the real development of human autonomy. The question is simple. If we examine the relation of religion to the eonic mainline we can see that evolution in our sense far outstrips any of the cultural initiatives of Buddha figures. Claims related to this of the 'Sufi guides' behind the evolution of man are false, and misleading. We can see the scale of the eonic sequence is so awesome in its effects as to sweep up the religions of entire continents in a greater pattern. The sad truth is that these authoritarian traditions show the same drift and deviation as every other, and could as well profit from the challenges of the Enlightenment to recast their foundations. It is hard to think of a better foundation for a truly informed modern 'spiritual path', based on the individual's autonomy, and receptive to the classic findings of ancient sutras (subjected to some

historical sandblasting). The eonic sequence shows us that evolution in our sense is on scale far greater than any initiative of religion.

Looking at the legacy of Buddhas and gurus we notice a highly embarrassing fact. They cannot resolve their own history, its ideologies, or even its data, let alone detect evolution. The many attempts to speak of 'spiritual evolution', sometimes with involutory myths, have muddled the issue of both the classic sutras, and modern empirical evolutionism.

The endless guru wars between the Buddhists and Neo-Brahmanism are forgotten. The latter was the enforcer of last resort of the spurious law of caste and has never repented of this even as it spreads globally. The realm of the guru has an immense propaganda, but it belongs to another age, and is a dangerous game that will turn the disciple into a Faust with a Mephisto problem. Be wary! The issue is that there is a critical point of danger in the release of the 'sovereignty of your own will', which you alone can fritter away. There is absolutely no spiritual law of spiritual guru authority.

The point should be stated then that there are absolutely no spiritual authorities anywhere to which anyone is required to submit. The gurus, Buddhas, Sufis, popes, Jesus Christ, Mohammed, are not spiritual authorities. Their conspiracy to undermine the legacy of the Enlightenment and generate propaganda against human autonomy stretches all the way to fascist anti-modernism. Enlightened men often perform poorly on cultural issues, and have a poor understanding of history. The long string of hopeless idiots with this label in the recent New Age movement suggests an essential caution: the term can only be verified by individuals after making their own efforts. There is no public standard definition of the term. Rarely does the field get lucky with someone like Gautama (and significantly this occurred in the Axial period). Acquire a stash of bootleg sutras and be off. You are alone here, completely. And that is unfortunate, but it so. That's the way it started, bootstrap from ground zero. Look at the ferment of philosophers and yogis in the period before Buddha, Axial India (about which we know too little). The shadowy gurus come later. And Buddhism is already quite late.

The always unstated problem is that of captive agency, or agency involution. One must always be suspicious of what happened with Wagner, Nietzsche coming to in puzzlement. Something terrible was afoot at the end of the nineteenth century. Rumors abound. Declare yourself a 'null occultist' to figure through the dangerous possibilities, and never be tempted. The most shining Buddha is no more than Mephistopheles to you. Behind too many spiritual fronts lies a predatory world of the esoteric mafias, 'Sufi' hyenas of the will. In the West as Christianity passes with its minimal protection a dangerous realm flows into the void. It is significant the Christ figure warned of it. It is a serious problem with no public resolution.

The world of modern science leaves the typical Westerner ill-equipped to confront or resist the devastating tactics applied without warning by the practitioners of exotic hypnosis known to agents in these traditions. Never trust or join an organization you suspect is a front in the cancerated traditions of the exoteric and esoteric division. The case of Sufism is especially devious in this respect. The legacy of Theosophy is revealing here, yet it is a promoter of the very problem of passive spirituality and cultic dependency that are the opposite of any true search for enlightenment. Dark rumors, or slanders, of fascist Buddhism begin to undermine the whole basis of trust in the spiritual fronts of these antiquated and corrupt religions. No one can exploit your sovereign will unless you yourself consent.

### **6.6.1 The (Eonic) Evolution Of Religion**

The clear but not exclusive association of religious evolution with the eonic effect should prompt us to coin a new phrase, the 'eonic evolution of religion'. Looking at the Axial Age we can see that religious emergence is

strongly correlated with the eonic pattern. It is important to consider that the association is not, couldn't be, exclusive.

In the wake of the modern transition, right on schedule, we find a resurgence of religious traditionalism, indeed, fundamentalism, endangering the fragile achievement of secularism, and giving us a sense of déjà vu as we note the fate of the Greek Axial and its birth of rationalism (next to the Indic). Quite apart from this consideration, we suddenly inherit a better sense of the nature of religious development over the course of world history, the eonic evolution of religion.

In a nutshell, the issue is simple. Anyone can found a religion at any time, but, as an empirical observation, those emerging in the Axial interval, or any part of the eonic sequence, show a coherence and amplification that gives them a momentum, and a seminal character overshadowing the rest. Thus, our method is simple: we have to separate the general course of religion in general from the result of its intersection with the eonic effect, or eonic sequence, as we will call it. Once we do that the puzzle evaporates. We have spoken of the 'eonic evolution of civilization', and can also extend this to the 'eonic evolution of religion (or science)'. These are formal terms, less profound than they look, cut from the mould of our periodization. The point is that the stream of religious history intersects with the eonic sequence, and a new potential for religion is created. In fact, all we can do is describe a phenomenon we don't understand. If an intermittent long sequence is overlaid on a series of continuous streams the result would be about what we see historically, in a limited range. The gist is simple; two great religions arise in the mainline of the eonic sequence. Note the distinction of macro-action and micro-action: the creation of a religion is a freely open possibility at any time. The results, however, that occur in the eonic sequence are deeper, or, at least, have greater momentum.

Our discussion of the evolution of freedom, despite its seeming political cast, connects to this at once if we look at religion, on the one hand, as the consideration of the freedom of the individual in the sense of ethical agency, and, on the other, the collective 'religion' or 're-ligion', rebinding, of that individual in terms of community. In modern terms, one would ask here, why bother with the second? Isn't the first the only religion? But we see, like it or not, the dilemma of our freedom and necessity discourse all over again as the historical induction of religion produces all the dilemmas of the state in a different form.

We should remember that 'Israel/Judah' was a state in the context of empires, and a 'religion' emerged from that, still bearing all the traces of its theocratic statist origins. Nor can we safely ascribe any teleological process to what we see, although the temptation is severe. For, clearly, as Christians realized, the match was peculiar: should they annex the Old Testament or simply start from scratch? And the progeny then proceeded to overtake the entire Roman Empire. So the connection is completely transparent, whether or not we find any of this the 'true essence of religion' or not. We should note that primitive Buddhism associated with our pattern was a revolt against society, and induced the individual to renounce the 'state of civilization' to seek his own salvation outside of the state. But within two centuries there was a Buddhist empire. And the appearance of Mahayana Buddhism is direct concert with Christianity is another reminder of the integrated complexity of our eonic sequence and its effects. Whatever the case, the mystery of religion is discovered in the permutations and combinations of our freedom consideration, and the evolution of man's self-consciousness. Religions end in the mechanization of social ideology, and rarely serve this purpose. We must also remember the absurdity of discussing 'religion' in the abstract as a category in itself. What religion is, changes drastically at each stage of history. The system of medieval Papacy was as surely a form of 'state/empire' as the Roman. Most discussions of religion now assume the gestures of Luther who created a 'revolution against this state'.

We focus on this, one of the subtlest points of our thesis, for a specific reason, among others, that it will help to define the 'secular' age in which we find ourselves. The secular philosophy of history is the object of much criticism for its supposed shallowness, and one might consider, for example, Karl Lowith's acute examination

and critique. But what was the objection, apart from the confusions of Darwinian scientism? The modern philosopher of history is indicted as a secularist. In fact, in our analysis the 'secular' shows eonic macro-action, which the great religions of Christianity do not.

And we may with some irony trace the Zoroastrian theme through the modern period, as the recycling of a myth. And then go back and trace it once again as recycled in a previous cycle of the eonic effect, the emergence of the Judeo-Christian tradition. That the term 'secular' should derive from the word 'saeculum' and merely suggest a new age is a reminder that the legacy of the Old Testament is a secular as the 'modern' in this dictionary sense. Our words fail us at this point. There is no ultimate distinction between sacred and secular history once we factor in the eonic effect. The ironic fact is that we are in the same position as the original observers of the modernist eonic transition, to use our developing term, armed with a superset of data calling for a new interpretation, as universal history. We should further note that the same conflict between old and new that we see in modern times is clearly present in the radical Judaic tradition creating its new tradition.

Witness the near simultaneity of parallel emergent culture in the world of Archaic and Classical Greece, or the China of the period of Confucius. What is going on? The secular enlightenment is born in this period in parallel, making a mockery of a series of Comptean age periods, sacred followed by secular. We could as well say an early form of modern thought emerges in the Greek Enlightenment. The clue is to see the spectrum stretching from philosophy to religion to science, and to see the unity of the diverse manifestations in disguise. Then the resemblance of all of them to the rise of the modern will stand out. We need to consider that the transformation indicated in the concept of the 'Axial' age seems independent of its content, and like a wave simply bobs the phenomena it finds already in place. But there can be so simple theistic explanation of the fact that this period produces two religions, one theistic, the other atheistic. There is no absolute category of 'religion'.

Thus it is obvious, although strange, that religions can and do arise potentially at all times, yet the ones that carry the day show the signature of the Axial period, as if they were being amplified or transformed as they cross a temporal boundary. The only explanation here is some idea of an intermittent sequence, calling up the elements already in place and producing something new from what was already there. That is what we will call the 'eonic evolution of religion', and we suspect that it earlier and later signatures in disguise in the model we will construct. We also suspect the birth of this sequence even before the rise of the state in the era of the Neolithic. Thus religions are evolving on two levels. The following will become clearer once our model is established. But the point lies in the question, e.g. what of Christianity (indeed, late Judaism), Islam or the Mahayana?

We are left to ask the nature of religion itself. Here we must see that while the eonic evolution seems to take it to new heights, the factor of mechanization is not religious. Our later discussion of the so-called 'fundamental unit of historical analysis' will help here, in part. The confusing entanglement of a strange frequency phenomenon with the essential meaning of religion creates a muddle from which we might hope to free ourselves. One of the confusions, as noted, of the Axial Age concept is that it mimics the idea of an age of revelation. But the problem here, as noted, is that we see the continuous appearance of religions before, during, and after the crucial era, yet we have an especial mystery attached to those that arise in a narrow band pointed to by Jaspers. Thus Buddhism seems to be a cousin to the Judaic exemplar, and appears in an entirely different context, yet proceeding from its 'Axial' source outward in the generation of an oikoumene. Christianity and Islam appear in a seemingly contingent fashion quite outside this seminal period. The issue will resolve itself as we go in search of the 'fundamental unit of historical analysis' and its transformations, state, empire, and religion.

The sudden reappearance of a strong 'secular' civilization, in what is almost a surprise attack on the European fringes of Eurasia dominated by religious formations, echoes the Ionian Enlightenment, so to speak, and reamplifies a lost strain of world history. The theme of Reason in history rises to challenge, and to fulfill, the trend, leaving the deeper question of the place of religion in the future. The significance of Spinoza, for example, and then of Kant, and others, is already forgotten in the ill-conceived effort to replace religion with a positivistic scientism, a gesture doomed to fail. As we will see these developments are as valid datasets in the 'eonic evolution of religion' as anything in antiquity, the concept of 'revelation' being shown up for what it is, an eonic myth, and returned to the domain of philosophical enquiry.

### 6.6.2 The 'Axial' New Age

Contemporary New Age movements, stretched between radicalism and conservatism, are an attempt to recover the sense of the 'new age' that appeared after -600 in China, India, and the Occident, when the great religions were born. We take for granted the attitude of denunciation expressed by the Hebrew prophets of the world of Babylon without quite asking ourselves why it is that they took this stance, unless as a committed religionist we accept this as a religious issue of pagan morals. The Judaic core-period shows a classic emergentist 'New Age movement', in another age. Our eonic outline of periodic architecture gives us no trick answers, or the ability to grind out explanations without close study of actual facts.

All we know is that a group of men gave direct expression to religious and cultural 'new aging' and yielded their discourse to immediate successors during 'downfield new aging'. This is evidently a religious issue, for the obvious 'superficial' point is that this was an era of rapid religious evolution, as the form and content of monotheism as we know it took shape and became the inner substance of a new field of culture, assembling itself from earlier elements. But the issue is a deeper one, for behind the religious factor stands what history was to confirm, the passing of an antique world, whose last representatives were the Assyrians, and the Egyptians of the New Kingdom, their creative energies spent. Thus, Jeremiaah expresses his furious anathema of Babylon, more than a symbol of the Mesopotamian world that preceded the classical:

And Babylon shall become a heap, a dwelling-place for dragons, an astonishment and a hissing, without an inhabitant.

What? Babylon wasn't all that bad, but the prophecy was confirmed. In a similar vein, Isaiah prophesies:

Every one that is found shall be thrust through; and every one that is joined unto them shall fall by the sword. Their children also shall be dashed to pieces before their eyes; their houses shall be spoiled, and their wives ravished. Their bows shall dash the young men to pieces; and they shall have no pity on the fruit of the womb; their eye shall not spare children.

And Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah...

What is remarkable is how prescient these predictions were, not as revelatory visions but in their sense of geopolitical becoming, and the sense of the dawning of a new era. Where the Greeks, nearby and simultaneous, experienced a fantastic flowering of culture without grasping what was happening to them, the Hebrew prophets began to perceive as the first 'futurologists' the changing shape of civilization itself. And in India there was a 'Great Awakening', in China a fascinating play on a combination of Indian mysticism and Greek rationalism.

The great world generated from Sumer had already been in a 'last phase' for centuries and the world of developed and developing culture and civilization was very much changing gears in this era. And a close look will certainly discover sooner or later the first primitive version of the still earlier 'new aging'. We know it is

there, from, for example, the automatic clocking of the Egyptian dynastic tradition from ca. –3000. Nothing could be more natural, once the reason is seen. The tactic of the prophets to ascribe this to the wrath of divinity throws us off the scent, although it give vivid testimony to those who were involved in the creation of the new, which they interpreted in terms of religious evolution, and the need to create a new conception of the divine. Religious issues apart, they were attuned to the phenomenon of rapid transition itself that was so clearly, to our hindsight and our reconstruction of the earlier period, in convulsive passage.

But the countermovement against modernism is already reminiscent of what happened in the ancient world in the period before the coming of Christianity, but after the centuries of the great flowering. In *The Greeks and the Irrational*, E.R. Dodds puzzled over the interruption in the Greek Enlightenment:

Looking at the picture as a whole, an intelligent observer in or about the year 200 B.C. might well have predicted that within a few generations the disintegration of the inherited structure [of the pagan religious world, the ‘Inherited Conglomerate’ of Gilbert Murray] would be complete, and that the perfect Age of Reason would follow. He would, however, have been quite wrong on both points. To understand the reasons for this long-drawn decline is one of the major problems of world history.

In a discussion of great importance, not only for understanding what happened in the ancient world but of what might happen in our own, Dodds describes, for example, the onset of astrology like a blight and the loss of the seeds of rationalism, and the weakening, and complete loss, of science. The experiments in political republicanism and democracy seem to vanish into thin air as the processes of empire gain the upper hand and remain in place to the modern world. Further, there is the same influx of mystical ideas and religious forms into the western oikoumene. This is the ‘failure of nerve’, a term invented by Bury who gave it to Gilbert Murray.

But unfortunately this explanation will not work, even as the defense of the Enlightenment turns into its very opposite, the yogi’s Enlightenment, indeed that of the well-documented ‘gymnosophist’ (naked Jain) of antiquity, for it is not a failure of nerve that is the difficulty. Nor is it correct to scapegoat ‘mysticism’, never defined. Heraclitus was a mystic. There were many men like Socrates in India in the age of Buddha, who wasted no time on ‘mysticism’.

Dodds’ important description of the problem is far from complete in the sense of ‘taking sides’ with one party that failed, and not grasping why. Many parallel fields failed together. It is futile to blame Oriental religions for the ‘failure of nerve’. These oriental sources, along with the clearly analogous Greek mysteries, all arose in parallel with the Greek Enlightenment in the era ca. –600 and interacted in a way that was quite natural. One tends to wring one’s hands and complain of superstition and cultic mysticism or the sudden onset of neo-reincarnationist beliefs, once again so characteristic of our own time, and it won’t do much good. For the effective historical force of all these factors was precisely their parallelism, and parallel decline. We see the original period through the lenses of traditions that come much later.

And beside the rationalist view there is the equally significant cultic side of the Greek flowering with the mysteries of Eleusis, near which arises the strange phenomenon of Greek Drama. We cannot subtract these from our consideration under the rubric of a master theme of rational advance. Nor can we play favorites with the simultaneous appearance in antiquity of Taoism, Buddhism, Judaism (and soon-to-come Christianity and Islam). It is a symphony of many melodies. And the beginnings of science were virtually unknown to most, and remained at best seminal. Finally, the false distinction of the Oriental and Occidental is little more than geographical. A case could be made that the Occidental shows a different ‘tuning’ in the spectrum of ‘Being and Becoming’ leading to its better disposition to progressive culture. This theme is a trifle tired. The idea of ‘progress’ is a modern one, whatever its intimations in earlier times.

It is fascinating to compare China and Greece, and then China and India, and then India and Israel, at the roots of the classical source. We see in Taoism a kind of transition between philosophy, and religion. In India it

is the Upanishadic movement that corresponds to the parallel transitions, analogous to the emergence of the prophets in Israel, as the great New Age movement. Behind the picture of religious innovation, we can find a context of small states, economic development, and political change not unlike that which we see in Greece. In fact this backdrop is the ballast for the whole phenomenon. In India it produced an age of great ferment reminiscent of the Greek, notwithstanding the different spectrum of perspective. In one description,

When Buddha grew to manhood he found the halls, the streets, the very woods of northern India ringing with philosophic disputation, mostly of an atheistic and materialistic trend. The later Upanishads and the oldest Buddhist books are full of references to these heretics. A large class of traveling Sophists—the Paribbajaka, or Wanderers—spent the better part of every year in passing from locality to locality, seeking pupils, or antagonists, in philosophy. Some of them taught logic as the art of proving anything, and earned for themselves the titles of ‘Hairsplitters’ and ‘Earwigglers’; others demonstrated the existence of God and the inexpediency of virtue...Large audiences gathered to hear...It was an age of amazingly free thought, and a thousand experiments in philosophy.

This ‘materialism’ is not what we make it out to be on the basis of modern thought, and is in danger of grafting a modern conception onto an ancient context. But the fact remains that the later world of Hinduism is almost further from this era than the modern. The world of Samkhya rings a distinctively modern note. The remarkable aspect of early Buddhism is its ‘rationalistic’ touch, and its gesture to bring the primordial confusions of consciousness into some kind of ‘tuning’. This is evident in the distinct blend of philosophic rationalism and meditative consciousness that casts its aroma in the world of Buddha, and those who came before the rise of the monotheisms, or the idealistic philosophical Vedanta. The men of this time were not so much materialists as ‘still not confused’ by the relentless coming state theocracy

As the world of the modern New Age movement shows, the authority of the ancient spiritual teacher is not an easy or safe playground and long precedes the emergence of contemporary freedoms. Be ye Lamps unto yourselves, the Buddha warned. As if they foresaw the world to come and the horrific and dangerous variants about to spread into the world as esoteric exploitations, we are left the sutras of the Samkhya Karika or the Yoga Sutras (as well a good treatise on vipassana from, however, the denominational Buddhist sources) which essentially states everything that one needs to know in non-denominational form, without esoteric trappings, although it is difficult to make practical use of this now. The world of Indian moves in parallel to the whole, as the Axial period makes obvious. World history almost needed such a laboratory in isolation. Now as that legacy is bequeathed to the global stream a new and critical perspective is needed to recast and preserve this underground stream.

### **6.6.3 The Great Freedom Sutra**

One of the more notable anti-modern occult conspiracies springs from the shadow Sufistic world, as documented by the reactionary mystic Ouspensky. The Islamic oikoumene generates the remarkable history of so-called Sufism, and this carries a confused legend of the ‘fourth way’ (beyond ways of the body, emotions, or mind) as something deeper than the already complex yogas of the world of Buddhism, whose adherents are world-renouncing, leading to ‘historical termination of its exemplars’, the premonition of realized Man manifesting his full Will as freedom in history. Mathematically, such a being ought to exist, but... The Islamic world hides a number of claimants to this category, rarely seen in public. This has nothing to do with Islam. Such a being would be limited from the start by the historical conditioning of his time and place. He would, for example, have no knowledge of modern physics, and live in mystic limbo (not that modern physics is much help

here). A real man of will would require independent soul formation, and some objective in time, since he would more likely pass beyond the realm of rebirths, Buddha style. And just this rumor does exist in the corners of Sufistic lore. So we don't know. Perhaps this man is a myth, his early exemplars poor imitations of themselves, too often 'rogue Buddhas' wreaking havoc on the eonic sequence with delusive visions. Almost nothing public is known of this, although its possibility is easily deduced in the abstract, nor is its reality visible in recorded history, and yet beginning with Sumer or before these still rare individuals might have begun to emerge, injecting an obscure factor of unseen action in history, as they mediate remarkable initiatives via proxies. We ought to be entirely suspicious of any and all New Age mythologies on this issue, and point out that such individuals are not the 'secret guides' of human evolution. The point is that the early era of Sumer might conceal an entire spiritual tradition invisible to us, symmetric to the Indian. This Sufi myth indicates as much. We must be wary of any and all claimants to such a 'path of will', mindful of Dante's systematic codification of devils.

In any case, we see that such beings would be limited to the local knowledge at the stage of civilization they found themselves in, and the Axial Age, given its stupendous scale, could not be the result of spiritual guides leading humanity with prophetic vision. Its scale is too immense, its action mechanized at a level of sophistication that eludes human intelligence. We can barely observe its manifestations, and have no idea what it is, save a 'force of nature'. Founding a religion via proxies is, however, within their range of such possible types. Note this point and the clear difference of the ersatz religions arising in the wake of the Axial Age, as human realizations. Compared to the Axial scale, Christianity and Islam are different, and show clear 'initialization' points. We must remain suspicious of such isolated source points, our 'floating fourth turning points', that don't fit into our sequence (and don't have to), a good example being precisely the onsets of Christianity and Islam themselves, with their unaccountable sudden success without eonic determination, albeit clearly in the wake of the Axial Age. We are missing the background! Our model doesn't overdetermine history and doesn't explain the mideonic worlds. The point is that we must stick to what the eonic sequence explains, and be wary of the obscurity of much that happens in between. Tracing diffusion is hard enough with tangible artifacts, in this case it is almost impossible. Thus we have no record of much that is crucial to history, save useless tidbits, such as the strange appearance of Three Magi out of nowhere in the gestation of Christianity. To suggest that Jesus and Muhammad were proxies in such action is unsettling and of course entirely beyond the possibility of current demonstration, and we can't pursue the issue, save to be wary of the standard histories of these two religions springing from their delimited sources. The odor of occult artifice haunts their traditions.

The idea of the 'fourth way' is worthless in its current apocryphal form but suggests its own original meaning, and that, for the future, the conflict of secularism and religion is completely false. If one thinks otherwise, consider Karl Marx. The function of religion, in one sense, to assist the helpless individual in the mechanizations of the state ideology, or civil domination, succumbs to the disease it wishes to cure, and this function is wrested from 'religion' by an agent of labor unrest! Quite the religious man! The only real candidate for the fourth way (whose keynote is the 'religion' as the ordinary life in civilization) is the rise of secular modernism, escaping the dead end of theocracy. Much in modern life shows the echoing signature of this long lost 'path of the will', like a vehicle stuck in first gear.

The Great Freedom Sutra The modern transition has already stolen a march on the classic yogas of antiquity with its seminal discourses of freedom and autonomy, bursting asunder the spurious authority of the gurus. The passage of free men across the abyss of their freedom might prove not so simple, yet the die is cast, and man is left to the existential reality of his own self-evolution.

None other than Kant protests the compromised autonomy of the self mesmerized by religion and demands a 'religion within the limits of reason', whose vehicle is the will of the individual. Nothing esoteric here, the simplest of direct pointings to the 'fourth way'. The right vehicle for this is secular society itself. The catch lies in

the deficit between the ideal and the clear reality of the social mechanized state. The 'fourth way', civilization itself, has expanded to include all society, and the individual is left to an abstract possibility, one that existed in all stages of civilization. And yet the formulation is surely the right one, granting the result is like paper money, and the need to produce an enzymatic vitamin factor to assist this ocean of floundering wills. The great religions can be of little help here if they degenerate into ideologies. They simply put their adherents in cold storage. The question is one for the future. The apocryphal 'fourth way' can be set aside, and graduate to the philosophies of freedom that emerge so clearly correlated with the modern transition, and whose status is something far more fundamental than anything legislated by the priesthoods of Christianity or the empire projects of prophets.

#### **6.6.4 Schopenhauer and the Caveman Buddhas**

In the evolution of humans the emergence of the Buddha phenomenon remains one of its most enigmatic aspects, as it appears fully blown in the Indic stream (and elsewhere, often in disguise). We see the sheer inadequacy of Darwinian scientism to even describe this phenomenon, let alone confront its evolutionary emergence. Our model should not presume to simplistic explanations, but a close look shows us a number of clues. Although clearly specialized as an exploration of the limits of philosophy the classical German phase of philosophy in the Enlightenment shows us in the works of Schopenhauer how the connection between the discourse of Reason and the sutras of self-consciousness, as these arise in the phases of Indian Upanishadism, can easily be made.

The resemblance of Kantian critical thinking to the classic vein of discourse on 'appearances' (Maya) is brought out clearly by that remarkable successor to Kant, this in parallel to the work of Hegel, despite its later publicity several generations downfield. What is remarkable is that Schopenhauer appears just at the point that reverse diffusion globally injects the stream of Indic religious thought into the dramatics of modernism. And yet, as he insists, his intuitions appear just before the onset of the flood of this diffusion. He even tells us the secret behind this, as he refers to the One Thought behind his opus. Although we cannot easily divine the mysteries of mind in such a Romantic genius, the type par excellence, we can roughly intuit what he is driving at, and we can also see that his realization appears almost at one stroke, virtually reinventing 'Buddhism' on the spot, and in isolation, and this in the most obvious connection to a general mainline of eonic emergence given powerful expression by a figures such as Rousseau and Kant.

This is a specialized philosophic endeavor, and may not reach quite the same result as the practical efforts of ancient yogis and their meditations and ascetic practices, but in the end it is all of a piece. It is this field of eonic emergence that gives us the clue then. And as we look backward toward the vistas of deep time and the period of man's earliest appearances, we can easily suspect, without the details, just how the Buddha phenomenon could arise suddenly in the deep Paleolithic and almost fully formed from the latent potential of human self-consciousness.

#### **7.5.1 Spengler, Toynbee, and Cyclical Theories**

As we look at our three turning points, we begin to realize, or suspect, that we are observing a cyclical phenomenon whose structure sticks out like a dinosaur bone from the backdrop of history. Although our core pattern is secure as an empirical map, it remains mysterious, but makes instant sense if we posit a cyclical phenomenon.

Ideas of cyclical theories, often blended with eschatological thinking, have, historically, been notorious and created near bedlam, the most notorious example being the lore of cycles of the Great Year, but our data and analysis shows the beautiful and elegant solution to the riddle. Spengler and Toynbee with their ideas of 'cycles of civilization' have further muddled the question. Our eonic data shows us that the right approach is to see that the cyclical phenomenon proceeds independently of the civilizations it touches. Instead of Toynbean civilizations we will think in terms of 'streams' of culture, as these intersect and the 'eonic sequence'.

Ideas of cyclicity in relation to the historical process have a long history, as the infamous confusions of the Great Year make clear. The cyclical views of the ancients are ritually denounced, although the nature of these views, and their exact history, is not understood, because of the 'linear view of history' in the early forms of monotheism, or more accurately in the codification of Augustine, in reality the coin of Zarathustra, changing hands in many transactions.

It is not quite true that the Hebraic gave birth to the 'linear concept of time', although it could well be claimed that the idea was first honed to some implicit sharpness in the first period of Judaism. The linear view of history was probably already present or emerging very early in Mesopotamia, if not earlier, but certainly appears decisively in a remarkably sophisticated form in the teachings of Zarathustra, that on inspection is a blended cycle-linear conception, as is that of Vico. But their real appearance on the world stage began with their diffusion into the world of emerging Judaism and the Persian Empire after -600. This is a very confusing subject indeed, for the impression of telescoped history is that a cycle of religion gives birth to an anti-cyclical view of time.

Cyclical theories are also the Eldorado of those who search for the motor of history. It is not as foolish an idea, at root, as one might think. Indeed we have a found the key, empirically. We should start over with fresh terms. We are confronted with the recent, and actually less sophisticated idea of the 'cycle of civilization'. Even the Augustinian idea is better, for it is in principle eonic. The idea of the 'cycle of civilization' was given new life in this century by the works of Spengler and Toynbee. In fact, cycles of time, as in the myths of the Great Year, are different from the 'dynastic cycles' of the many Ecclesiastes, and are inherently better than the 'cycle of civilization', which makes no sense, upon close examination.

Spengler and Toynbee are really ideologists of conservative postmodernism. In the closing period before the onset of the Great War, whose disillusioning scale of destruction had left an entire century of thought in a state of philosophic shell-shock, Spengler prophesied the 'decline of the West' and produced a theory of civilizations at the close of this war whose foundations were never successfully laid but whose cogent evocation of cycles drew attention to the large-scale structures of history. What then is World History? he asks at the beginning of his effort to understand the nature of civilization. The Nietzschean elements seem almost like a wished for cultural sabotage, and the idea of a Faustian civilization starting in the Year 1000 and entering decline in the Enlightenment must be a garbled version of this idea of Nietzschean decadence.

The point for our analysis is that we have a cyclical system that transcends the phenomenon of civilizations. Our eonic sequence proceeds independently of the individual civilizations that it touches. Our fundamental unit of analysis is not therefore the civilization. It is very doubtful if civilizations have the dynamic unity claimed by Spengler and Toynbee, as our eonic analysis makes clear.

Myths of the Great Year One value of our frequency hypothesis is to be done with the lore of speculations over the Great Year, based on a cyclical notion 2150 years in length. This phantom has haunted civilization long enough. We can see that intuitions of cyclical mythologists were onto something they could not have understood. Our frequency hypothesis, based on 2400 year intervals, explodes the hallucinations of the Great Year that have resurfaced in modern times in the various notions of the New Age.

Our cycles are more like simple tempo, a clocklike rhythm, and show us three periods of rapid advance, followed by medieval periods in the first two cases. Why do they stand out? They are not inherently different, their immense creativity apart, from any other periods, myths of revelation notwithstanding. Why does advance slow, create what we will call sequential dependency, even go in reverse, from Athens to Rome? They show a kind of sudden acceleration. It is a strange situation. A fragment of rich structure in a void, its suspected antecedents disappearing into preliterate fog.

As we pull away from the early modern, and archaeology discovers the sources of earliest civilization, we discover a pattern, and linear assumptions collapse. We feel a kind of 'Hey wait a minute' about random advance. As the dataset pulls across 5000 years, a different picture emerges. We have essentially all we need for a practical use of the eonic data, but it suggests something more that we can formulate as a frequency hypothesis, and a commentary on cyclical theories. An hypothesis is just that, and is open to falsification.

But the question then is, cycles of what? What is this frequency, barely above a whisper? How can whole cultures remorph themselves via relative transforms on a rough schedule? We don't know, but it makes sense, as we have seen in our reverse-engineered approach, to think that a system 'evolving freedom' in any sense would go into alternation. Alternation reconciles the information paradox of a deterministic system, and as the data shows, the net information or novelty of the system, rapidly increases at selected intervals. This system is so complex we will probably never know, and we can default to the idea of tempo. Observing tempo is the one thing we can analyze in a hyper-complex system. For what it is worth, the data corresponds perfectly to the idea of self-organization, transparently, but we cannot connect this with current theories along these lines. This isn't thermodynamics.

The basic series that we suspect, then, is a simple extension in 2400 year intervals backward to the onset of the Neolithic. This assumes a kind of monotone sequence. Since we have a two beat sequence that is nearly a three beat sequence, it must be admitted that all sorts of other frequency possibilities exist.

Another frequent division of human cultural evolution attempts to grapple with the immensity of man's past, and the acceleration of his more recent entry into civilization with a series of stages that map the entirety in a series of periods of unequal length. Thus, one frequent categorization is the division into 'stages' of cultural evolution, based on the idea of 'transformation', giving us

1. A Paleolithic transformation,
2. The Agricultural Revolution,
3. The Urban Revolution,
4. The Industrial Revolution.

These schemes are useful enough, but throw thinking off-track, and confuse 'pure stages' of unequal length with their labels, and quite understandably attempt to 'glove' a long rising curve punctuated by interrupts in its last three stages. The exponential and cyclical are blended, as is the technological, economic and cultural. They are mixing economics, technology, and cultural evolution in a spurious unity that wishes a bridge to the Paleolithic. Let us simply void the general rubric search and use our monotone sequence fragment empirically, as far as it goes. Then a great insight arises. Everything falls into place. But we must sacrifice absolute beginnings, and are left with an hypothesis of a monotone sequence.

???

1. the 'birth of civilization',
2. the (relative) rise of the classical civilizations,
3. and the onset of the modern world,

???

This, at first, less desirable scheme is far more revealing, but comes with the price tag of renouncing beginning and ending. It is difficult to restrain the temptation to complete this sequence, backwards or (armed with basic Zarathustra) forwards, although we can suggest a Neolithic, and New World extension. But the relation of the New World civilizations to TP1, 2, if any, needs to be sequestered due to the lack of evidence, although its place in relation to overall civilization is unlikely in the extreme to be an exception to the pattern, with apologies to the general case made for independent cultural evolution in the New World. This is quite heretical. It is tantamount to saying 'our current system' can't be derived from antecedent histories. It is really evolving!

Thus theorists fail to consider a periodic rhythm of unnamed stages visible in historic times, reluctant to sacrifice absolute origins. Marx was hot on the trail of a discrete-continuous model, but he still wished to find named stages. Generally the influence of 'historical economic materialism' is pervasive and all parties agree not to see the Axial Age. Here the technological and economic theoretical constructs are forced to confront controversial 'out of nowhere' global synchronous evolution, as in the emergence of many religions. We are left with a fragment sequence, about which we can however reconstruct a great deal, and see the vague outlines of its source in the Neolithic.

Let us restate again the basic question, reverse engineered on the basis of the data. Does world history show signs of general sequence? The question is ambiguous. The pure flow of time is a sequence, and world history shows a host of sequences, but the results tend to disorganization, as cultures proliferate. What we really seem to mean is, does world history show signs of a sequence within a sequence, as intermittency, that can advance the whole through the part? The answer is immediate, yes indeed, however strange that may be. But we never see anything but the outcomes, the surface. Let us mention once more what we have been cautious in mentioning, a strange resemblance to noumenal/phenomenal distinction. We should be wary of such a claim, but the symptoms are there, to suggest why we never see the core mechanism. There is an unseen component in what the data is showing us. It even drops a provocative hint of its relation to a basic antinomy. Let us insert again our basic clue. This is not a 'theory of freedom', but a basic clue.

Notes: Economic cycles: Economics is one of the few subjects that studies cycles in the large in our sense. Our situation resembles that of the economist, who discovers 'cycles' through periodization, and whose models, discovered looking backwards, must end in the present. Predictions may be possible up to a point, but free action can always in principle falsify them. Note thus that a cyclical economic dynamic changes its character in the present. This is the exact situation we find ourselves in with our eonic model. However, it is not an economic question.

Looking backwards... Economies are observed by a free agent looking backwards toward the past. The agent is embedded in and subject to the cycles, and able to use his observations to change them. Thus the mechanics of this dynamic becomes unstable in the present. Momentum may overwhelm free choice, but in principle choice is there. The past is a 'might have been', but now fact. This is the right exemplar of our distinction of eonic determination and free action, here, economic cyclical action and free agency.

### **7.5.2 Is There a Postmodern Age?**

The student of the eonic effect casts an ironic smile on the postmodern idea. Although the term has created considerable confusion and debate, its usage proves itself by the spontaneous sentiment with which it has come into existence. We note that it is a term of periodization, invokes an epoch or age, and indirectly asks us to define what it comes 'after', i.e. to define what we mean by the modern age. But the term 'postmodern' in many

ways is a fine term suffering a botched definition. Instead of indicating a reasonable suggestion to stand back and look on modernism as a whole, it tends to be taken as indicating a rejection of the modern, and the too facile hope one will simply rewrite the whole of modernism with a new beginning. The critique of 'metanarratives' is nonetheless a powerful one, for, as we see, a directional system might reflect a deeper teleology, but the two are not the same. The question for us is one of periodization, not the content of 'postmodern' philosophizing as such (which might show dialectical cousinship with the Enlightenment).

In many ways a 'postmodern' work in a true sense would be, say, *The Communist Manifesto*, this irregardless of one's ideology, or stance on the controversial issue of private property, in its critique of the modern transition and a subsequent aspiration to redirect that transition as an ideology or universal history of freedom. That's a good idea, or a very bad one, but, whatever the case, nothing in our model forbids it. The modern should be distinguished from the threshold or transition that created it. And the term 'postmodern' really should be 'post-transitional'. That perspective neither affirms nor rejects the 'metanarrative' of the modern, but considers the relation of historical transformation and the free realization of that potential. The postmodern is taken to mean we sense a problematic with that realization. But the result should not lead to the rejection of the historical source, for, as with the Industrial Revolution, its ratchet effect on history is fixed. Our aim should be the disposition and realization of the given, without succumbing to the idea that it is fixed.

These questions in the debate are difficult to answer unless terms are defined over the course of world history. A simplistic postmodern gesture reacting against modernism will induce a kind of jackknife of a system with itself, and in fact we see that in the disastrous effects of the Bolshevik experiment. Our 'eonic' definition resolves the paradox, if you accept the definition suggested (which we might call 'eonic modernism' or 'eonic period modern'), and adopt a perspective on world history as a whole, and take 'modernism' as a transformation relative to world history, starting in 1500, with a divide at around 1800. Then, if you adopt a view concerning a dynamic of history for this definition of the modern, and if this dynamic is discontinuous, the 'postmodern' automatically arises with increasing distance from the dynamic era. It is stunning to see actual philosophers arising in this timing and, although our 'by the book' chronology seems to affirm the basic modern, we might tiptoe over to these postmoderns to see what they are up to. More eonic data! They are eonic observers, of a sort. Thus a postmodern gesture is both natural and yet open to chaotification in the sense of rudderless 'going off on a tangent'. A full postmodern agenda would be to assess world history as a whole, and there the perception of a metanarrative might as well be the right approach! Postmodernists are really reacting to the ideological teleologies that invariably bungle the job without something like our distinction of two levels.

We can adopt a simplified definition here, one that distinguishes

1. the modern transition, 1500 to 1800
2. a divide near 1800
3. a plain vanilla period starting in the nineteenth century.

Note the postmodern is not defined here, but rises as you look backward toward the modern, i.e. transitional era, followed by the realization era of this modern transition. The 'modern' period is really two things.

In fact, no one owns the term 'postmodern', and Toynbee was one of the first to use it, so there is no ideology with a monopoly on the word. He is challenging the whole modern age, it seems, in a confusion of retrograde thinking. A rightist 'postmodernism' is surely fallacious, and is a warning the leftist ruminations on postmodernism will be cheated of their concept, à la the Toynbee declinist with his confusing mix that really still begrudges modernism its very existence. If you wish to decline, and erase the modern advance, no one is stopping you, except those who would rather not be on the other side of an impregnable boundary, e.g. the Thirty Years War, after which the secular as social pluralism became fixed. To do that right, you must renounce modern economy, no more rights of man, democracy. Check all the papal bulls between, say, 1524, and 1900.

Toynbee was very confused, yet he got one thing right: the system is moving toward a greater global integration, beyond the local stepping of 'European' civilization, which might decline in some sense. There is only one civilization, that of man as man, a point quite clearly made in the Communist Manifesto, quintessentially modern and postmodern at once.

This, and much else, spills from a thimble of eonic analysis, with its powerful integration of period concepts in one rubric. There we see the exact analog of the 'postmodern' in its previous incarnations, e.g. the Hellenistic period coming after the flowering of Classical Greece, a grim reminder. It is worth remembering the Hellenistic example (forget Spengler). Within a few centuries ancient man lost everything, it would almost seem. In fact, although this analog is correct, it can be misleading. The modern world has the potential to create permanent advance, where antiquity was still too diffuse to maintain the stupendous level reached in a few centuries by the Greeks.

## Appendix 2

From *The Gurdjieff Con*

There is an immense amount of additional material at /gurdjieff-con.net.

The posts without dates were second or subsequent entries for that day. The full blog is available as an XML file at dropbox.com (find the links at *The Gurdjieff Con*, using search)

This was the first post for the blog The Gurdjieff Con:

### **06.28.08 Ok, ready to go. Welcome, to the Orphans of Civilization**

The purpose of this blog is to assist those floundering in the so-called Gurdjieff work to recover their perspective on the confusion it has created, and to 'snap out of it' to the degree of recovering and hopefully moving on. However, this is done by a process of historical analysis, and I am not in a position for one on one interactions. But if you have a question, by all means. There is very little public help available here, and the 'deprogrammers' in the public sphere are ill-equipped to understand the position many find themselves in. And certainly the people in the movement are of no help. You need the presence of mind to walk away from it, and it can be a lonely moment to realize that you have no institutional resources that can be useful.

Welcome, to the Orphans of Civilization.

### **07.31.08 Illusions of the 'fourth way'**

In one way Gurdjieff was right: there is a possibility that 'ancient knowledge' of some kind has been lost to us. But one should recommend caution in thinking, therefore that a little scrounging in the Caucasus or the stomping grounds of Sufis, is going to tell us what that is. In any case, we can refer once again to the essay series eonic-effect.net/gmancon, and to the outlines of history in other essays at that domain puts the question in perspective.

Gurdjieff is filled with traditionalist spiritual illusions, despite his acumen in some respects, and this framework cannot resolve the question of the evolution of religion or the dynamics of civilizational emergence. That process is on a scale that is far greater than any spiritual tradition or school, and indeed transcends even the constructs of Christianity and Islam. If we examine the 'eonic effect' we see that there is every possibility of some ancient knowledge emerging at an early stage of civilization. The eonic framework shows us directly that the period of the onset of the Neolithic is the seminal era, however primitive still in many ways. Most of what later emerges in civilization has antecedents in that period. It seems likely in the case of India that its spiritual tradition goes back to the Neolithic, or rather the epoch just prior to the onset of Dynastic Egypt and Sumer. The equivalent in a Middle Eastern context is a compelling idea, but it takes more than Gurdjieff's fast and loose thinking to find out what that might be.

Thus the idea of the fourth way is already a very late derivative, probably suffering distortion. Gurdjieff's way of handling such ideas was all too flawed and for all his posturing about ancient knowledge his treatment of these archaeological 'artifacts' was poor stuff, site tampering.

In any case, the local and temporal stream of schools and supposed 'esoterics' is a limited one, whatever its promoters say. Clearly Gurdjieff, as with so many New Agers, miscalculated the nature of history, and modernity.

In broadest strokes a study of the eonic effect shows how what we think of as 'spiritual operations' (in reality something more general) over time are far far beyond our easy ken. Consider the phenomenon of the Axial Age, and its truly stupendous effects over a period centuries in separate isolated zones of Eurasia, remorphing whole civilizations in its wake. Compared with this the efforts of isolated gurus, occultists, and seekers is virtually a zero. Such people don't really understand the nature of religious emergentism, which doesn't operate via avatars, world saviors, or occult operators. It is way beyond such nonsense, really far beyond it, and doesn't operate through people in time at all.

There is more to be said about the 'fourth way', but the way in which it is portrayed, as some operation of people founding schools and nonesuch suggests something far too limited to be the kind of 'ultimate path' it is misleadingly made out to be.

### **07.28.08 Ouspensky and Gurdjieff the rapist**

A lot of ink has been spilled on Ouspensky's break with Gurdjieff, in fact, whole books have been written, with a lot of backdated kitbitzing about how Ouspensky was some kind of betrayer of the cause, or that he should have persisted in the great teaching to the end, etc, etc...

The reality would seem a bit different. Consider this from James Webb's *The Harmonious Circle*, p.384: Orage maintained that the split was caused by Gurdjieff's near rape of Mrs. Y in 1923-4. Ouspensky suffered a great disappointment, and saw that the whole game was going to suffer failure and collapse, and he was right, although the immense proliferation of Gurdjieffianity he did not foresee.

The 'work' was a failed enterprise by 1924, and it is no use blaming Ouspensky.

### **07.27.08 All and Everything: refighting the battle of Marathon**

There is already some discussion of Gurdjieff's mighty tome, a book that would seem overrated. And one that most readers would find offensive if they realized its meaning and intent. It is mostly a lot of rehashed 'new agism' of the early twentieth century, and its core set of values is not wholesome. Gurdjieff was clearly an enemy of democracy and the modern establishment of rights. His material on Ashieta Shiemash fails to really make its point because it is unhistorical and therefore in no sense a reliable judgment of history. It seems that the legacy of Zarathustra and the Persian world and empire that competed with the rise of Greece is still stuck in the craw of these people. It is a completely balderdash view of things. One would be more than happy to see a revisionist view of Zarathustra, if that can be backed up with some real data, but instead we have this pastiche of pseudo-esoteric mythology designed to distort Zarathustra, half reinvent him, and end up a disguised PR mockup of Gurdjieff himself. The true history of Zoroastrianism, I would grant, has not been told, but I long ago began to doubt that Gurdjieff knew what he was talking about here. Zarathustra was finally the template of the plain vanilla monotheist preacher that comes later. The great esoteric mystery behind him just might not be there at all. We don't need a lot of junk esotericism on this. We need some good historical research, and that has not yet fully gelled in this case, but I find it hard to place an Ashieta Shiemash anywhere in the vicinity, or anywhere else in antiquity. It is unlikely that anyone ever discoursed on the issues the way Gurdjieff does. To backdate that to somewhere between Sumer and the Persian satraps isn't very helpful. The only reason it is taken so seriously is because no one sees what the Beelzebub tome is about. The hidden fascism of a number of mystic types in the post-Blavatsky era has been well documented. Gurdjieff always cagey didn't quite show his hand here, but the indirect evidence is clear, and is certainly a part of his succession.

Thus the diatribe against the Greeks and Romans in his work is simply a misunderstanding, evidence that Gurdjieff was always way out of the mainstream. Do people still feel so strongly that the Greeks won the battle of Marathon and founded democracy as an historical first? What a bunch of useless reactionary diehards, really.

I am all for a careful critique of the Greeks, if that's your view, but in the final analysis their place in history is secure, and critically so. In general, the question of the Axial Age emerges here, to show the real evolutionary progression visible in history, something that Gurdjieff and his ilk simply could not grasp. Thus all their efforts to pull rank, so to speak, with esoteric claims, is mostly a pack of nonsense. And it has wasted a lot of time for a lot of people, as the whole postmodern game of anti-modernism starts to generate more and more chaos.

As for these teachings of Ashieta Shiemash, and the great trumpet for 'Objective Conscience', etc..., it is mostly hot air, a 'good idea' that never goes anywhere. The legacy of later Gurdjieffianity shows how little interest these people have in really doing any of that. Instead we see the behind the scenes operatives plying a reactionary anti-democratic propaganda

operation to serve some very ancient vested interests. They have little interest in the august profundities of this imaginary Ashieta Shiemash.

### **08.21.08 Sadists and masochists**

..There's another dimension to this at the next level, beyond the fools you have encountered: Sufi sharks who want to know if their 'marks' are masochists. In a teaching with so much dark stealth manipulation as the Beelzebub game exploitative versions of 'conscious labors and intentional sufferings' can be deftly twisted into torturing an unconsciously willing victim.

Make darn sure you aren't a masochist before you tackle Gurdjieffianity's devil's lair of these 'psychologists'. Actually, everyone probably has the whole shebang in their unconscious in different combinations, the question is to be able to exorcize this module and neutralize in your own self-consciousness (hopefully with better methods than the Freudian). Exploiting the masochist ('he really wants to be screwed') is a shadow Sufi game I have seen, sometimes with a decoy girl to stage a come on. The motive was 'thieving Baraka'. So, there are all stages to the 'evils' that Sufis do.

### **Review of Ouspensky's ISOM In search of the head on one's shoulders, August 29, 2000...and an old review of Future Evolution of Man**

As a classic account of Ouspensky's encounter with Gurdjieff, thence with a disguised version of the Sufi world, this book is remarkable and worth reading as reminder of the many spiritual disguises of one and the same potential self-consciousness of men of all eras, but as an indication of a spiritual path actually existing it deserves a severe caution, if not a skull and cross bones, as on a jar of poison. Beware of it, and the people who claim to exemplify it after so many years. Disappointing, but necessarily so. Try reading a similar work such as Idries Shah's *The Sufis*, and note the arbitrary nature of all the content (by and large) describing about the same type of predestination of method, always the same wiseacred method in the end described plainly in Buddhist sutras on vipassana. The question of the esoteric belongs to authoritarian worlds in a state of hiding, one that is unnecessary now. Bright-eyed candidates of liberal bent for this path created from thin air from a mess of theosophical pottage might consider the reactionary nature of this sage Gurdjieff, the book's account of the trail of the Whites heading south at the onset of revolution, and the plain fact that Gurdjieff, for all his fancy occultism, was a de Maistrean sort of guy, who disapproved of the abolition of slavery, and liked a submissive relationship in disciples. The grounds of spiritual authority subtly suggested to induce the impulse to surrender the will as one's freedom are spurious, the more so if Gurdjieff in Ouspensky's own view was not even an honest man. This work belongs to an ancient world, and is misleading because it seems too draped in the esoteric and a touch of the modern, when in fact the cosmology is a pastiche of ancient Indian *Samkhya* transformed in magician smoke. The verdict on a method of spirituality should be the number of its successes, and it was the Indian teacher Rajneesh who noted that this path has never produced a result, realized men. The reason is that the terms described, both as philosophy and method, are too arbitrarily exotic, and finally under suspicion of being made up and leave enthusiasts permanently frozen at the starting point. To concoct a mystery of the enneagram and call it esoteric wisdom takes a peculiar type of brazen hucksterism, since the whole notion is surely a complete fiction, not to say a put on. One of the warnings of Buddhism is, don't get fancy, and beware of speculation. These vices of metaphysical salesmanship are grimly pervasive in this work and leave desperate seekers tying their head in knots trying to compute self-remembering or produce an alchemy of higher hydrogens in an addlebrained brain.

Be ye Lamps unto yourselves, the Buddha warned. Before becoming the piece in another all too tricky play designed to stun the wary, and reveal nothing at cost, it is well to remember the warning. And it is worth remembering Ouspensky's starting point in *Tertium Organon* with its solid Kantian beginning and metaphysical austerity, all thrown away in this beguiling path that left its own expositor with nothing. Anyway, Gurdjieff is curiously unique, do not therefore grant this

to those who claim his teaching. As for the occult demos claimed, either they are fake, and we have fraud, or they are genuine, and we have a fallen yogi indulging in left-hand path skullduggery.

## **Review of Ouspensky's POMFE Laying to rest the great lie of the Code of Manu, September 5, 2000...An old review of Ouspensky's Psychology Of Man's Possible Evolution**

In this work Ouspensky perpetuates an historical confusion that vitiates his presentation of the so-called 'Work' and the 'Fourth Way' by injecting his obsessive concern with the antiquated law of caste and the Code of Manu. The claims for the esotericism of the Work, derivative from Sufism, whatever their merits, are needlessly and quite egregiously burdened with this aura of the archaic Russian reactionary. Ouspensky's almost de Maistrean viewpoint, so popular among oblivious liberal westerners lured into this esoteric quagmire by its beguiling innuendoes, contains the absurd suggestion that spiritual esotericism condones and sanctifies one of the most oppressive exploitations in history. Check the history here, unvarnished, and the place of this thinking in the destruction of the Indian Buddhist world. The Code of Manu is an impostor, and springs from the post-Buddhist consolidation of the Brahmins whose legacy was to make spiritual equality seem anomalous, when it was always fundamental. Such thinking emerging in the context of early twentieth century fascism was, and is, provocative in the extreme, and should be laid to rest.

What is surprising is the inability of many adherents of this so-called spiritual path to face the simple reality that the classic spiritual paths were and are more compatible with a basic democratic attitude than otherwise. The reason is desperately simple; these ways prosper better in an open society!

Never feel obligated to take this nonsense seriously.

Will Gurdjieff perish like a dirty dog?

### **Limits of enneagram and rational fractions**

I have always had a problem with the enneagram. A glyph of universal knowledge selects one rational fraction (1/7) as the basis (evidently implied) for indexing this. Another Pythagorean disregard of the real numbers.

Here's a review of one of the enneagram types books with a similar sentiment:

[http://www.kheper.net/topics/Gurdjieff/psychobabble\\_triumphant.html](http://www.kheper.net/topics/Gurdjieff/psychobabble_triumphant.html)

### **08.11.08 WHEE and modernity**

One of the objectives of this blog is to correct the false understanding of history visible in Gurdjieff's rants on the subject, and in the process to amplify on the treatment of the issues in *World History And The Eonic Effect*, a book recommended on this issue. The book has an approach to recasting the misleading issue of the 'fourth way', a path that is summoned up yet never really specified in the discourses post-Ouspensky.

In general the conceptions of the New Age in many 'spiritual' groups are misleading and denigrate the culture of modernity, one that is probably far more conducive to 'spiritual action' than anything in antiquity. We are beset with all these reactionary 'gurus' who claim a preposterous authority, when in reality they are ignorant.

I hope that WHEE can help in correcting the false historical perspective peddled by so many New Age 'prophets' who want to overturn the modern world in the name of some kind of absurd ashram politics.

### **08.10.08 In Search Of P.D. Ouspensky**

There is an online selection from Lachman's *In Search Of P.D. Ouspensky*, a not entirely adequate but still somewhat critical look at Ouspensky.

Don't suffer Ouspensky's fate! Don't get conned into donating your talents to the propaganda systems of occultists too corrupt and too ignorant to produce their own books. Examine the Gurdjieff legacy, it seems to be a series of predatory episodes in which he tried to induce some high-powered public intellectuals to write his books, the rest being mostly sawdust 'work' with people for whom he had no further use beyond being stage props in a 'school'.

### **08.09.08 Just what the blazes is the 'work'?**

I have to ask a really basic question at this point. What the blazes is the 'work'. The whole game is suspicious. Note that Buddhism makes very clear what it is up to: the path toward enlightenment. Any cavorting in archetypal space gets prompt feedback with reality: what are you doing....

Students of Gurdjieff suffer unconscious despair and create a life-cave in which their spiritual path is in actuality turned off, and they have nothing to do with themselves. Behind all the noise about the work there is nothing. In part because Gurdjieff being unenlightened had to make up a substitute.

The subtle trick of the Gurdjieff formulation is to keep you twiddling your thumbs with a non-aim, the 'work', by someone's else unspecified definition. If that means slave labor over ten reincarnations, then you asked for it and any criticism is a failure of spiritual obedience.

If is a false formulation.

And it has, as we saw yesterday, subtle political implications of a reactionary kind. These people are really a kind of capitalist class who think their disciples are 'shit', and can be exploited, the 'work'.

Gurdjieff's language speaks of the 'factory' of spiritual energies, and the game is to skim the sucker in the 'work' off the top, bleed off his meager supply of hydrogen 24, and he none the wiser. An honest Christian no less. Aha, esoteric Christianity.

Dunno, was Jesus another 'big devil' like Gurdjieff. I am amazed at old G's presumption to speak for the Nazarene.

So don't get jerked around by the 'work'. It is an undefined abstraction that will automatically set up in the direction of a phantom 'aim' as the idea revolves in the brain looking for a concept slot it was never given.

So these 'workers' are really scabs on the strike line.

### **The 'law of three' and disciple brain damage**

People in the Gurdjieff (I won't call it a ) movement are pressured by the logic of the ideas into a typical confusion, in this case over the so-called 'law of three'. The way this is presented shows a strong resemblance to typical 'non-dual' jargon confusions, rife in the New Age movement. This is an ancient confusion, and we can consider its real proof, but the versions given are mostly gibberish.

But in Gurdjieffianity we see this instant dogma of the 'law of three' as some kind of cosmic law. People who spend their lives puzzling over this should pause for a moment and withdraw the holy aura that surrounds it. It produces a confusion of thought that cripples most efforts in this so-called work.

Relax, take a deep breath, and consider that it is nonsense. It may point to a real version, somewhere, at some time.

This is not an uncommon confusion. Hegelians suffer it also. Consider this post from Darwiniana:

### **Slavoj Zizek and Hegelian brain damage**

At least we can consider it a small world and note the frequency of this type of confusion. As with everything in Gurdjieff's affair, something is pointed to, never really explained, made a dogma so it can't be questioned, and then the corruption of thought begins in those constrained by 'cult enclosure' to believe.

In all fairness, this kind of confusion goes back a long way. And Gurdjieff got what he was asking for (pun intended) when he pilfered the great Samkhya teaching.

One remedy, it might be noted in passing, is the philosophy of Schopenhauer who quarantined (in effect, he didn't intend anything in doing so) the non-dual from the phenomenal, and simply pointed to the issue with respect to the noumenal.

Be that as it may, I would say in my own thinking that the 'non-dual' (and its degenerate bastard progeny like the 'law of three') is not a philosophy, but an indication beyond thought of certain individuals who turned into jumping jelly beans of 'higher consciousness' and through an excess of mystic enthusiasm tried to explain it in words and concepts, with disastrous results that have become Traditions of muddle in their own right. So non-dual philosophies don't make any sense, be forewarned. The issue was not intended to be philosophical.

Actually, if you care to attempt the Hegelian mountain climb, his approach is relatively interesting as an exercise in philosophy, but frankly the confusion generated seems to have outweighed the benefits.

### **Anirvan's *To Live Within***

Amazon Review: *To Live Within*

This is a link to a review of a book called '*To Live Within*' written by a confused and fawning Indian disciple, not of Gurdjieff, but of some other guru.

It is the kind of propaganda for the guru system that gets people into trouble. In my tangential travels on the fringes of Sufi Disneyland I saw it used and exchange hands (in an old first edition) in the Gold world as a bludgeon to keep people subtly in line. For someone who never met Gurdjieff and understood nothing about him to produce this sly kind of guru pornography is both unfair and finally dangerous, since he drops the subtle hints about the 'murder' to be expected from those who don't submit to the absolute authority of the guru.

Gurdjieff a guru. That's a joke.

Rajneesh charge of fascism against the 'Buddhists'

Another interesting comment, this time bringing in Burton. These different perspectives are useful (although if Burton was another intelligence agent, I am getting restive. We seem to find nothing but the public hype of celebrities and intelligence agents passing for ancient wisdom. I am not going to take on Gurdjieff and exempt Sufis).

We, of course, don't know a thing of what Gurdjieff did in Tibet, and before we denigrate Gurdjieff let's keep in mind that Buddhism hides figures a lot worse than a mere fakir like 'G'.

Already with Blavatsky we suspect something strange going on, with many vague and indirect hints leading nowhere. It was therefore a bombshell when the figure Rajneesh flat out charged 'Buddhists' with fomenting the Nazis. Since he didn't pursue the matter in detail, he left the question hanging.

But we can easily detect the gestation point in the late nineteenth century, with the lines of influence hopelessly obscure. It is thus awfully strange that Gurdjieff should be roaming around here at the critical point (which is not an accusation) but I suspect he sensed something afoot, and he in general clearly poised toward a rightist/reactionary stance.

The emergence of clear fascist group(s), completely hidden, in the fuzzy milieu of the Gurdjieff succession viz. the Gold circle is another suspicious sign.

Since these deep sources always work through proxies it is impossible to know for sure, and it is equally important not to get into the spiritual surrender mode. Those dumb enough to surrender end up the proxies.

### **09.28.08 Bennett's *The Dramatic Universe***

The posts on *Samkhya* are also an indirect commentary on the writings of J.G. Bennett, and I have been looking over his *The Dramatic Universe* again, a book I read many years ago at the same time Star Wars appeared, and the effect of the book was a similar transient enthusiasm. On the one hand a critical examination of the claims of Gurdjieffianity are important, on the other a blanket rejection of the traditions cited in this 'religion' is not responsible history, just because one is critical of Gurdjieff.

Bennett's work, as noted, reflects the legacy of *Samkhya* and his rendition is open to a lot of questions. But there aren't many exemplars of that ancient genre, which could, potentially, become a lingua franca of religious questions (always a failed hope), and the attempt of 'the next lunatic who wants to try' has a morbid interest. Bennett was a man of very high intelligence in many areas, and the audacity of his project requires a kind of chase plane approach just to keep up with him. This man figured in the twenties or thirties the Kaluza-Klein wing of Einstein's general theory of relativity, and wanted to adapt it to his, or Ouspensky's, system. A foolish idea, or brilliant, it makes one sit up and take notice.

But his Systematics isn't rigorous enough for this kind of grafting. Things pop out of the woodwork with a kind of facile logic that can leave you paralyzed at what seem to be valid, often cogent, insights, but which conceal the outrageous premises of the whole operation. To do this at all requires an end run around a basic Kantian challenge to metaphysics, and, wouldn't ya know, the first pages of the first volume show Bennett, either with a guilty conscience or else at the stage of crossing the threshold of delusion, claiming he is going to replace Kant's categories with his own. That's a foolish beginning for such a smart endeavor, and I fear that if you are wondering about the details of the result, you may not succeed, because they are a labyrinth that began with shaky starting assumptions. "We aren't going to be stopped by Kant" seems to be the shadow motive here.

So you can pull the plug there if you want. The other alternative is to be strapped to the mast like Odysseus as you go past the land of the lotus eaters, and keep a list in your mind of the assumptions being bought on cheap credit as this remarkable Systematics starts to fill with hot air.

The basic assumption, which long predates Bennett, is that there is a basic cosmic triad of three impulses, a view that is as persistent as it is undemonstrable, or even explicable. Unless that question can be gotten straight the whole *Samkhya* enterprise remains a mysterious puzzle. Theological renditions are completely worthless, and litter the landscape of Hinduism and Christianity. Bennett's attempt to rationalize that legacy of hopeless confusion is not without value, but he changes gears and accepts stray dogs in the middle of his serious section, because he is too humbly prone to look the other way when the distortions of *Samkhya* in other religions are under examination. We have to suspect that the doctrine of the Trinity is a garbled version of a *Samkhya* idea, and, boy, what a garble.

Perhaps the whole mess of pottage is beyond rescue. Modernity made a good attempt to escape from the past here, but, with Hegel and his dialectic, the whole question resurfaced like the White Whale in the middle of that modernity, and has been in the Marxist version the source of some considerable chaos. So the subject won't stay buried. The reason for my continuing interest.

One reason the issue is important is that any use of the *Samkhya*, so clear on the surface in many ways, requires a strategy to deal with its basic framework which is that of the 'gunas' or basic triads, whose character between everything from the non-dual of Vedanta to Gurdjieff's law of three to the dialectic of Hegel/Marx. Getting that straight is perhaps impossible, and one has to ask, where did the original *Samkhya* come from. Gurdjieff, in fact, noted that the human mind can't handle this kind of logic. Period. So what to do with it, if you can't handle it? Bennett does a series of compromises and lays down what might be a flatland version that is at least consistent with itself, leaving a mysterious result hard to evaluate, the more so as it does produce suggestive solutions to some of the obscure puzzles of self, will, and mechanism. But always the result is not something you can finally bank on.

A further problem is the way Bennett got hijacked by some kind of Christian path of his own (it is visible in his autobiography) and his effort to adapt *Samkhya* to his Christian theology, at the seams, in many ways discredits the whole work. We discussed the issue of 'pandit-knapping', or the kidnapping of potential propagandists of high intelligence, at Darwinian blog, and maybe we should repost some of that here. I think Christians should stop this pilfering from the Samkhya cookie jar. Its legacy was not theistic.

There is a lot to consider here, maybe a series like the /gmancon series on Bennett's DU might be in order, but the labor required is considerable, and the logistics impossible (I don't even own copies of the books, obtained from a distant library to get the original first edition version of Vol I, and always due for return before I get any work done), so we shall see.

## **Gurdjieffianity and right-wing political tactics**

It is worth studying what has happened in the last generation in the American political sphere, where the onset of neo-liberalism was fueled with a set of tactics to co-opt ordinary, working voters. There is no other way for an elite to dominate majorities from a minority stance. The dynamics of this political finesse are worth careful study.

From there you can begin to study the analogous, if quite different, tactics behind the 'game owners' of Sufistic/Gurdjieff (and other, viz. certain Buddhist) legacies. How to create allegiance to elites from those who stand to gain nothing from such movements? The work is like that, and, indeed, the overtones of the term 'work' itself are ironically a play on the idea of those who are the workers and those who are the bosses.

Study Ouspensky's book (and Gurdjieff's) and try to find the way in which the 'sale' is made with clever come-ons and insistence on traditionalist obedience. And the whole nine yards. As years go by and the revolving door spins around the functioning of this swindle slowly become clear.

You would do well to consider if you are really 'in' this game, or just an Ouspensky bibliomane/idiot with zero prospects in a rigged game that has no intention of helping you out, quite the contrary. This game is especially vicious, with its hidden fascist anti-modernism. The game has given itself away, but such is the momentum of propaganda and the magnitude of the background tradition of spiritual authority wrested from thin air no one seems to put two and two together. And it takes a considerable experience and occult savvy to come upon the completely concealed conspiracies of reaction being played out even as we speak.

It would take five minutes to produce a thriving democratic spirituality for a new age of freedom, but there is no one with the nerve to take on the ancient establishments whose self-perpetuation is accomplished anywhere but in public movements.

## **Gurdjieff's guinea pigs, the dark hints**

The point of the theme about rights is the concealed exploitation on that basis of various individuals for experiments. Gurdjieff, unbelievably, hinted as much and gave the game away, almost.

This issue requires tremendously knowledgeable people to detect and police, and, there is no such police!

This question should be one of the first foundations of an indictment of the grotesque 'Gurdjieff work', but since we can do nothing, it is important to at least sound the warning through whatever media we have available.

Don't let this legacy become a tradition! There is absolutely no special privilege granted gurus in such matters. Get someone to beat you over the head until you realize the ethical issues here.

We can beat this cancerated Sufism, all it takes is some public exposure. The lilly wilts pretty fast as people come to and snap out of the propaganda.

### **Early nineteenth century 'New Age' movement sources**

Rawlinson's essay starts with some interesting points: he notes how the flood of gurus has reached a point that the West now has more activity in this field than the East (a distinction I dislike). Note how the real source of this energy is that of 'modernity', in the context of globalization. It is not inherently spiritual. Note the irony. The New Age is filled with so much nonsense along anti-modernist lines, but these impulses are really cut flowers with no generative power for the future. We need to take stock of this phenomenon beyond the say-so of the gurus themselves who are elements in a larger field.

This phenomenon Rawlinson describes is actually sourcing around the time of the Romantic movement, and as so often the first to note it had an objectivity that was later lost.

I recommend studying this early history before Blavatsky because this moment when, e.g. Indian texts, began to reach the West animated figures like Schopenhauer who produced what is most certainly the best rendition of 'sutric psychology' in existence. That's the irony. The 'great work' of translation was done instantly, and all the rubbish that comes later has served mostly to confuse people. The whole thing is latent in Kant, whose key or clef was transposed by Schopenhauer, who detected the latent strain of 'Upanishadism' in the Kantian critical system.

It is interesting that Schopenhauer read the 'Upanishads' in an English translation of a Persian translation!

Look carefully at Ouspensky (Tertium Organon gives the game away), and then Gurdjieff, and then finally Bennett. They are trying, without saying so, to bypass the 'Kantian revolution' in metaphysics, because they have an agenda that wishes to revive a pre-Kantian world of thought.

### **Lentrohamsanin and Gurdjieff's attack on democracy**

One of the most devious, essentially fascist, strains in Gurdjieff can be seen in his spurious tale of Lentrohamsanin. The account in Beelzebub's tales is completely opaque, but at several points he gives his game away when he tries to make a villain out of a proponent of Equal Rights!

The portrait of this figure is a complete setup of paste up.

Anyone thinking of the 'fourth way' as a path should note this point. You are essentially declared unequal in this game, and therefore the question of your receiving anything of the teaching beyond rote obedience to the outer form of its doctrine is taken away at the beginning.

In general, Beelzebub's Tales is the most grossly overrated piece of deceptive junk in the New Age movement, generating its poisonous doctrines behind a veil of obscurity.

It is all the same 'New Age' propaganda against modernity and its democratic innovations, an issue that sticks in the craw of guru after guru, among them, beside Gurdjieff, Rajneesh, who also concealed his fascist tendencies behind a lot of fine words.

In general the semi-mythical figures invented by Gurdjieff completely distort the history of religion when what is needed is the simple history of known historical individuals and their movements.

Ichazo, in the seventies

I remember the period of the emergence of Ichazo, and I saw the premiere of Jadarowsky's film, or at least one of them, that associated with Ichazo. It seems a long time ago.

In a funny story, I was once a considerable traveler, and passed through Arica or near there, on my way home from living overseas, quite by accident during the period of the first Arica emergence. Strange! I had never heard of any of that at the time.

I have less knowledge of Ichazo and his activities but can't forget the day I opened the New York Times and saw the enneagram on its august pages.

Even as I am critical of all that I take seriously the claims, however garbled, of Ichazo's Sufi association. Clearly the gang in Ultra-Afghan wanted to throw some holy water on the already crystallized G movement, with not very successful results.

They just try these experiments to see what happens, and never take any responsibility for the result.

It's a commentary on the original Gurdjieff movement which, despite the obvious surface differences, is almost identically the same type of 'experiment'.

The whole question of the enneagram, as its transposition into the enneagon, is a hack, and a clever mystification, whatever its history in earlier

## **2009 01.20.09 Spies too far gone to be spiritual teachers**

The measure of the man, a spy

That Gurdjieff might have been presenting an ancient teaching is entirely possible, but a century later the question is as unclear as ever, the reason we suspect being that everything Gurdjieff said was at best half-truth, if not an outright deception.

Thus what he describes as 'ancient teachings' is mostly a pastiche of bits and pieces of we know not what finally.

That is the problem with 'esotericism': you refer to something you never describe and then demand submission from seekers (or suckers) to approach the future day when the nature of the teaching will be revealed to you.

As with Gurdjieff and so many others, the magic day never arrives because the esoteric teaching isn't there.

In general Gurdjieff is so unclear and secretive that we can't verify any of his claims, none in fact.

It looks as everything is set up to keep people attentive for as long as they are useful to those promoting the deception.

And a lot of dangerous imitators, like E.J. Gold, are coming down the pike. so we should be clear: ancient teachings may well exist, that we don't know about, but Gurdjieff told us nothing about any of them.

And no, reading *All and Everything* twenty times won't help.

I guess you can never trust a spy. His sense of ethics is so far gone that any teaching he might have found, as in an act intelligence gathering, is going to be the object of still more bait and switch operations.

Compare all this with a genuine set of ancient teachings, the Buddhist, with clear indications of what it is, where it came from, and what to do about it.

This openness is transparent, so why did Gurdjieff, and Sufis generally, spend so much time lying, if the reason is not that their motives and intentions are dishonest or malevolent?

## **02.07.09 Gurdjieff the crypto-nihilist?**

I am often surprised at the passive acceptance of the Gurdjieff proposition from those who should be skeptical from the start.

After all, as Shirley announces without batting an eyelash in his book on Gurdjieff, referenced last week, Gurdjieff did not even believe in the possibility that many were able to adopt a spiritual path.

I won't cite the passage in full, but remind those dreaming about a fourth way that no such thing really exists in the sense Gurdjieff spoke of it.

Gurdjieff is way out of line there, and it is important to demand some credentials at that point (if only to expose the lack of such): that is, Gurdjieff speaks without the slightest basis in authority of any kind.

So many are simply mesmerized by a fast talker, but it is important to see how little basis there is for his assertions on all levels. And he lies and lies and embroiders/wisecracks and makes things up.

On what grounds should anyone take this exploitation seriously? Please note the nihilism disguised behind the 'spiritual path' baloney: he has rejected the possibility of religion, redemption and salvation.

Thus he is way out of the mainstream, and a crypto-Nietzschean bent on genocidal destructions.

It is a brand of 'spirituality' that arises in the degeneracy of Islam and so-called Sufism. There are endless numbers of complete idiots in the geographical range of Sufism, and Gurdjieff was entangled in a specious concoction of 'traditions' under dry rot in the various 'paths' inherited from earlier times.

The problem with the Gurdjieffian cynicism about human potential, is that that potential is universal, and waiting on its realization.

To indulge in right-wing fascism because the ordinary Joe isn't yet awake is a total miscalculation of history. In that sense the rise of modernity, that entity so hated by New Age gurus, is the real 'fourth way', in the sense of realizing the human potential for freedom, and much else.

Gurdjieff and his ilk are unable to reconcile themselves to the possibility that history moves on, has left the world of antiquity and its authoritarianism behind, and brought into existence the first civilization that devotes itself to the realization of potential by large numbers of people.

### **Gurdjieff/Ouspensky confusion on evolution**

One of the strains of the Gurdjieff corpus is the play of isolated remarks on evolution. Here we confront a tricky question. The issue of Darwinism is one thing, check out Darwiniana, the blog, for a series of critical views of Neo-Darwinism. A critique of Gurdjieff/Ouspensky on evolution is not intended as a plus for standard Neo-Darwinian views.

The views of Gurdjieff here reflect the revolt against Darwinism of Blavatsky and the Theosophists, et al.

But Gurdjieff embroiders this with his own questionable interpretation in terms of the seven stages of man. That rubric sounds convincing on one level, at least to some, but surely 'evolution' can't work that way. The idea of man evolving from man number 1,2,3 to man number 4,5, 6, ... is a stilted and clichéd formulation that confuses evolution with self-development.

The fault is one inherited from nineteenth century New Agers such as we see in the legacy of Theosophy.

To clarify, the various New Age interpretations of 'evolution' have co-opted the word for a different meaning, usually some kind of spiritual development process. But is that 'evolution'?

The question can't be answered since the neologism 'evolution' appeared in the nineteenth century as a near semantic orphan, one not even used by Darwin in the first edition of his Origin. An earlier usage was 'transformation', or 'transmutation'.

Here confusion arises because of the Darwinian theory of natural selection, and the legacy of scientism that it embraces with an overly narrow reductionist view of man. Darwinists correctly point to the fact of evolution in deep time, but their emphasis on natural selection is open to severe challenge.

The various groups in reaction to scientism, and Gurdjieff, and especially Ouspensky, fall into place here, correctly pointed to the failure of scientific reductionism to account for the complexity of human consciousness. But then these groups produced their own confusion, and began to concoct all sorts of myths about the descent of man, almost as unhelpful in reverse as Darwinism.

The nature of the confusion can be seen from the fact, as noted, that 'evolution' is a neologism, and that none of the ancient and canonical sutras of yore used the term. It is important to consider this point, since the modern usage of the term 'evolution' for spiritual development is a piece of speculative wisecracking, one that can lead to wrong work. It would have been better to have chosen a different and clearer terminology, e.g. 'self-realization', which is a closer match to the usage of antiquity.

To say that people doing yoga are somehow doing 'evolution' is a botch of terminology, one that we can't actually protest very easily, since you can use words as you please.

But the idea arises that New Age style paths are provoking a future evolution of man. We simply cannot be sure of that and it is in fact a doubtful assertion, one that might vitiate the real significance of the classic methods of the development of consciousness.

To be fair, the point is simply unclear, since we don't know how man evolved, and how he evolved to be able to show the complex potential realizable as indicated by ancient sutric discourses.

Men of developed consciousness are nonetheless not in a position to pontificate on the descent of man, a thoroughly complex mystery as yet unresolved by any party to the debate.

Much more could be said here, but the bad usage that we see in Gurdjieff (as reported by Ouspensky) is highly misleading, and suggests incorrectly that a development of self-awareness is a form of evolution, and that, pace Nietzsche, that ominous figure in the background, self-aware men are to become a sort of ubermensch circuit. It all goes to show that these figures are not all they are cracked up to be.

Men's self-realization is roughly the same, we suspect, at all stages of his history since the Paleolithic transition (??), and while it is entirely possible that this potential tends to remain hidden or latent, it is doubtful if its realization is a form of evolution. One suspects, given the striking image of the meditating yogis on cylinder seals from before 2000 BCE, that spiritual practices and tantras are very ancient with man. They are a given for man as he is now, not a result of his evolution which is probably static in this set of age periods (the last ten thousand years).

Man's real evolution in the past is a mystery, and, remarkably, even a figure such as Buddha couldn't resolve it.

More on this later.

But anyone entangled in the Gurdjieff confusion should realize the abuse of the evolutionary idea here, and its Nietzschean wisecracking at work: an isolated individual who thinks some occult knowledge makes him 'more evolved' and somehow a 'higher being' then proceeds to wreck the potential of others who have not found that set of states, in the process wreaking havoc with such people.

It is mostly fantasy, and a failure to realize the immense complexity of real evolution, which is not understood by man as yet, and not reducible to the provincial notions of Indic-style yoga practitioners, however significant such aspects of historical culture might be.

Again, it should be noted that the term evolution was not used in antiquity, even if we noted that various forms of Samkhya, for example, come close.

The question of 'evolution' is very deep, and the wrong interpretation promoted by Ouspensky, and Gurdjieff, can create endless confusion, and much unfairness and wrong work.

Evolution is better thought of as a species level action in greater nature. The self-realization of individuals in that context is a realization of the potential emerging from that greater evolution.

Gurdjieff does make a significant point, using the wrong language, that 'evolution' of consciousness can't be mechanical, that unconscious evolution can't be conscious. That sounds plausible, but the language is wrong.

Much of man's evolution obviously was mechanical, or a complex hybrid of the mechanical and something else.

The point is that while evolution in general might be mechanical the process of self-realization requires self-consciousness, or self-awareness, not just passive awareness, and nature, so far, only brings man to the threshold. The rest is up to him.

But to realize this potential is not 'evolution'. We could certainly hope that some future 'evolution' might facilitate the realization of that potential. We have no grounds for saying what that might be like, or what process of nature could perform that. In fact, it is likely that the New Age thinking is a garbled version of the right idea, that man's future 'evolution' must be his own creation. But so far the antics of a figure such as Gurdjieff really don't foot the bill, and his obvious mistakes throw severe doubt on the authority he proposes for himself.

It is worth checking out both darwiniana.com and the site on the eonic effect, with its considerations of just these questions of macroevolution and self-development.

## **The hundred year war between Gurdjieff and Ouspensky**

<http://www.gurdjieff-con.net/2013/03/11/the-exploitative-legacy/>

The Gurdjieff legacy is dangerous for many who become known to the sources of the work, including the disembodied G entity or related Sufi sharks/devils.

We linked a while back to the movie *The Bourne Identity*: an agent suffers amnesia (a Hollywood cliché, but...) and tries to 'self-remember' how he was programmed, if he was, and by whom, and how he can escape it. The movie is so-so, but the symbolism is apt. It comes as a shock to realize you might have been enslaved hypnotically by a devil like Gurdjieff. It is not a bit funny.

If you are part of the Gurdjieff legacy, if you have come to the attention of the G-process or related Sufis (thousands pass anonymously by), you have probably lost your spiritual freedom to a deep set of post-hypnotic suggestions that can persist between lives. Gurdjieff bragged of his power there, not being specific and he wasn't kidding. It is a dangerous process, because such people do not allow awakening or enlightenment, using them in life after life as 'energy drones' milked for their small amounts of conscious energy. The trogoautoegocrat ('I eat ego-crats': ensnaring the will of another for spiritual food in the destruction of that will). Such are the perils of spiritual surrender. Ouspensky became infuriated that his life work was to be propaganda for such devils, and an implacable enmity arose between the two.

The figure Ouspensky reincarnated in the USA and passed through the work again (blunder!), briefly, gravitated toward Rajneesh (who even as an enlightened man was briefly fooled by Gurdjieff), but was never a part of his movement, as such. He was made to realize his 'deep programming by the work entity, and has been in a kind of continuous warfare with Gurdjieff through two lives. The obsessive clinging of Gurdjieff to Ouspensky in the determination toward revenge is an unnerving, and a warning to naive readers of the corpus, from Ouspensky to the rest.

The only solution to such deep programming is to enter a higher path, the path to enlightenment (not the path of bodhisattvas), which sooner or later must uncover such unconscious hypnosis. Be afraid, if you have ever passed through the Gurdjieff work.

Ouspensky has, in any case, long since denounced/renounced Gurdjieff. The whole episode is unfortunate and has distracted spiritual history for a century with a difficult enigma.

You should be suspicious of the Gurdjieff canon, as was Ouspensky, who realized Gurdjieff was a criminal. No exemplars have emerged in the entire period since the era of Ouspensky. Nothing. Look carefully: enlightenment is never mentioned, because Gurdjieff was so graced, being an occult, a 'Faustian' case of unknown provenance.

### **07.31.13 Gurdjieff foundation on Secret Talks**

All That Glitters...

Crazy Wisdom and Entrepreneurialism in the Spiritual Schools of E. J. Gold: <http://www.gurdjieff-legacy.org/40articles/glitters.htm>: this is the info on 'Secret Talks' that I was looking for.

This is a reasonable discussion of Gold, but to bring in the 'crazy wisdom' excuse in the wake of the shoddy and pretentious procession of New Age instant junk peddled by Gold doesn't wash. What of Crazy Wisdom after the students go crazy and have no further help from the Sufi cocaine/spiritual cannibalism of these predestigators. Where do the victims go to complain? The New Age better be over at this point, as we help the human refuse left behind by figures such as Gold.

The fetish of 'crazy wisdom' teaching is beyond me at this point. I have been forced to live through and don't find scholars like Feuerstein helpful in the least. I think the point has been missed, not that I really understand this (each phase seen by the participants is but a small part of the larger mystification): this was an upgrade of things like Scientology, an earlier and completely stupid 'dosing Sufi cocaine' in a psychopath to create an experiment, with a large 'karmic' residue: a permanent movement of idiots trying to create a religion. I think with Gold an attempt was made by the same hidden Sufis to study this problem, and try their luck with Jewish smarts (but Gold was a complete idiot, afraid of smart Gentiles), to achieve something better, with a series of rapidly appearing/disappearing pseudo-schools, all of them so stupid or undocumented no one would pick them up for permanent movements. But what was the point. Everything Gold did was a farce. And there was one strain few have seen: a strange Nazi/fascist genocidal theme: the path of mass death to feed the planet. That subsection never appeared on the charts of such as the Gurdjieff Foundation's analysis. I found that aspect a strange puzzle, especially since it was carried out on the sidelines by his hidden groups of Jewish favorites, who ended up with Nazi armbands. What was that?

I thought once (I had a brief contact with Gold's shenanigans from 1975 to about 1977). The result was so confusing that I feel out of the economy for three years, and was helped by a study of Marxism: the left will settle this in the end, because it is a set of experiments in mind control, soon to be crowd control, soon to be another massacre staged with Sufi Baraka, etc., etc... It is clear now that Gurdjieff was a super-reactionary, appearing at the moment of the Russian revolution to study the chances of counterrevolution in the Big sense: a rightwing takeover of modernity. Maybe Gold's fascist phase echoed that. It wasn't in character, so who knows.

Let me say that if this is unfair Gold has had decades to set the record straight, five minutes of honesty would do it, but the reality is that there is no mindfuck like Nazi occult mind fuck, and it is an experiment crazy wisdom addicts fall into finally. And it goes all the way into the mystery of degenerate 'Buddhism' in the medieval period.

In any case, we must wrest the myth of gurus and spiritual sheiks from the clutches of Baraka addicts. The result here has been a big zero, and Idries Shah warned of this: what's the final tally? In Gold's case, I see no benefit. Zero. It is a waste of breath to call this unfair. What of the victims? Gold will get away with a legacy of spiritual Sufi. While the victims struggle to find a real path. It is ultimately a Nietzschean parody: mindfuck the 'last men', fuck their brains out for good Baraka. The disciples are animals and riffraff and deserve nothing.

This theme was attractive behind the scenes from Gurdjieff onward in the creation of neo-liberal counterrevolution (Gurdjieff was a minor player here): we see the strain emerging in the renewed contempt on economic class issues of conservatives newly emboldened to class warfare of the most open and ugly type. The 'work' was always a crypto-capitalist con with the many new age groups clearly based on free disciple labor. We barely see the seeding of this process by figures such as Gurdjieff, who was a peasant taken up by hidden elites to do their dirty business, in the 'spiritual' sideline: we are maybe a little unfair: he was a fellow traveler who couldn't quite keep the secret. And his disciple Ouspensky went into near panic near, a reactionary himself. It didn't add up to him. The hidden figures we have never seen we can at best reconstruct from the misleading case of Gurdjieff. Being an enslaved pseudo-master operating on a Faustian bargain with Sufi cocaine/Baraka, he must have been tempted to break ranks, give the game away, and the evidence shows he did just

this, sort of. It is interesting the J.G. Bennett, always close-lipped and obedient let slip a modernist, even hidden communist, mindset. He concealed it well, and wasn't 'discovered'.

In any case most of the New Age work is incapable, as we suggested in the previous posts, of any real spiritual depth. It is all 'feeding the vampire' of dead movements, like Sufism, Hinduism, and even almost, Buddhism, which however seems destined for 'death and rebirth' in a new age of modernity. All the spiritual trash, as with Sufism, is just flotsam of Egyptian (et al.) Gnosticism and its dead vampires of false spirituality.

My Marxist friend had much of the narrowness of dogmatic Marxism, but he sized up the process of people like Gurdjieff almost immediately. The idea of the 'work' has never recovered from that moment of insight, and it is obvious the 'work' is a phony cover from class warfare.

## **WHEE and the distance of the real spiritual plane.**

You might study the 'eonic effect' in my book WHEE online at [history-and-evolution.com](http://history-and-evolution.com). It is interesting to see what we suspect is the real 'spiritual' plane acting on history. It never interacts with occultists, rarely with spiritual types, and seems to seed the elements of group/social action in the rise of civilization itself. Thus the history of the Rosicrucians, say, is misleading: it has no connection to spiritual depth.

This process in history acts very remotely over intervals of many millennia and then never intervenes. It is neither spiritual nor material, and creates sacred and secular culture equally. It is beyond 'god' and 'beyond' enlightenment, since it creates in both realms with contradictory signatures, a hint these are our own categories. This is what started the confusion over the Age of Revelation, which was a botched explanation. This process is not, I suspect, 'god' at all. That is something different. But we can see that both atheist and theistic religions had a deep support from this mystery, which seems to reawake at the dawn of modernity. It goes into overdrive and is hypercomplex, perhaps driving man to evolve out of his current muddles.

Enlightenment is therefore not yet quite a spiritual domain, but a realization of man's evolutionary potential. A step into man, then a glimpse beyond man. We should feel some confidence that this mystery process was directly focused on re-amping the 'paths to enlightenment'. Man has a hard time being man, and hardly as yet takes a first step toward the spiritual. Enlightenment is the state man should have all along. It is part of the mental equipment of savage human apes and (savage) modern monkeys. It is a species characteristic of *homo sapiens*. The whole thing gets lost over and over again. However, the process has clearly seeded monotheistic AND semi-atheistic religions like Buddhism. Buddhism in the Axial Age is a 'soufflé' effect dished up from early Indian/Jain elements, to create a global religion. Magnificent. So this process both invoked a past legacy and recreated it en passant. The Occidental monotheism coming out of Israel was less successful, and became muddled over the 'god' question. Hidden Israelites seem to have adopted a Middle Eastern legacy of not uttering the divine name, IHVH, yet the outer religion rapidly crystallized as a god cult. I am hard-pressed to resolve these questions, but the framework of the eonic effect can give a sense of what real spirituality, from a distance. The term spirituality is wrong, because it has nothing to do with the religions we know.

In any case, figures like Aleister Crowley, Gurdjieff and Gold aren't even on the radar of this process, which works only with simple elements that can help ordinary culture.

WHEE is a hard book, many say. Maybe it is better like that. Note then that occultism is part of the legacy of mundane history. It has no real spiritual significance.

The place of middle era prophets like Jesus and Mohammed is not explained by any of this, although we can see the seeds of what they created appearing in the Axial period. These two are different mysteries, but they obviously 'play with the local toys' to communicate, Jesus in the Axial Age wake, and Mohammed the same, but with a Persian ( Zoroastrian) twist. So these foundational moments involve genuine spiritual beings, of a different melody. The practical cyclical grind of the 'eonic effect' is the different process of macro-evolving civilization. We should note how Christianity became too localized.

The suspicion remains that the Israelites were hardly monotheists until in the Exile they mixed their emerging religion with Zoroastrianism. But this connection was forgotten, and then rediscovered in Islam (???).

### **08.07.13 The fourth way a bogus teaching...the fate of Ouspensky**

The problem here is the reason for this blog: Gurdjieffianity is not sustainable as a 'spiritual path'. People like Gold, by peddling the lie that his IDHNB is a fourth way school, cement a system of exploitation based on false spiritual authority. So the whole thing needs to be dismissed, and the figures of false authority deprived of their fake credentials enabling endless harm done to the unsuspecting.

And Gold has never given any explicit account of his life, his contact with spiritual teachings, his meetings with Sufis, nothing, zero, beyond the usual pack of lies he spins in response to questions.

We have listed some of the anomalies of the Gurdjieff path, but here Gold cleverly drops most of the Ouspensky/Gurdjieff legacy (substituting it appears the even more toxic Crowley).

1. the enneagram is bunk...
2. the law of three doesn't make sense, and merely echoes other teachings in order to look original (e.g. dialectic, or non-dual Vedanta)
3. the idea of the work is a toxic ambiguity used for various deceptions, among them a rightwing philosophy of 'extraction of surplus value', and an excuse to not pursue a path of enlightenment
4. Gold has spread the falsity that he is the successor to Gurdjieff...

We will continue this list in further posts...

The point here is that Gurdjieff never produced a viable teaching. Gold is even worse. Further, part of the current battle with Gold lies in something hinted at: the way Ouspensky in his next life was persecuted without mercy to keep him from stopping people like Gold taking control of the Gurdjieff legacy...Ouspensky II became mad as hell that his ISOM became a tool for others to exploit people. While he himself was anathematized behind the scenes for spiritual disobedience.

Outrageous: he saw through the Gurdjieff deception....

### **The commune, a critique?**

<http://www.gurdjieff-con.net/2013/11/05/3814/>

This post, and the one before on departing from the Osho fringe might be subject to misunderstanding. Actually, I have been here before: I walked away from the Osho affair in 1991, not really having been a part of it. Since 2008 I have been considering it again, and now again moving away. I have often felt that Osho found his own movement mediocre and wanted to recruit fringe people as a failsafe or as future guides. But his hidden authoritarian manner tends to alienate such people. Such is the dilemma of ashrams. Gurus will entrap people they need for their work. You must escape if you wish to find realization. Moral: gurus don't liberate. They take you half way...(maybe) But sticking with a spiritual commune may be the best option that you have. But be forewarned that thousands and thousands of Buddhist followed that route, straight into the path of the bodhisattvas (which means you never get out), only to be dumped in the new age cycle of modernity, as the old religion begins to dissolve.

Osho's work was a bit weak in certain ways. Sannyasins with some initiative might take up what I couldn't qualify to do: a sane critique, and some wish to contribute help. It won't produce any gratitude, so beware.

Let me express some of the problems (out of fifty) I see in the Commune, that I would be forced to try and remedy:

1. The Commune used 'tantra' to attract followers, and succeeded beyond its wildest dreams, but the result is useless.

2. The Commune was a free gift to feminists, and the sannyasin mass control the ashram totally. Now a reversal has taken place: the men need liberation from female domination. They can't reach enlightenment in this context, for many other reasons the above.
3. The Commune is too commercial, and too expensive, and this erodes trust...
4. The Commune is authoritarian, and can't allow criticisms from such as I, so goodbye, and mutual good riddance. Easy to fix, but not by me.

There's more, but that's my take. I think the whole Commune is so chaotic that these flaws will drop easily, in more chaos. The basic thrust of the Commune has a great future. But maybe tear it to pieces and start over, often.

Note: a movement as rich in potential as Osho's deserves such consideration.

### **01.28.14 Losing all one's new age trails...fortunately...**

As to the previous post...I forgot to mention that I am better off having lost all the New Age groups I passed through. The possibility of a real path opens for the first time. Goodbye to all the junk spirituality now current from TM to Qaballah to yoga to guru ashram bus tops, to Sufism to Tibetan Buddhism to Zen puke regurgitated, to born-again Christianity, to... the list goes on, and includes a new and toxic innovation, Aleister Crowley style occultism. If at all possible one should bypass this new occultism, but black magicians like Gurdjieff, E.J. Gold and far too many Tibetan honchos, are starting to force people who should stay away from occultism to take it up in self-defense, failing disastrously because they are nice guys without the psychopathic facility to harm other creatures for spiritual profit. The long view of world history shows that the successful ways were the proto-Jain (or what we now see as Buddhism). The world of Mahavir is nonetheless obscure to us, and the comparison to Buddhism, first born of the ancient Jain line, is only roughly useful. Monotheism was an Axial Age manifestation, or innovation, and its status is not clear. Since pop theism is almost a form of idolatry the emergence of 'garbage disposal' groups like the New Atheists is, eh, a sign of the times.

For some reason it is very hard for non-Indians to move into the path of enlightenment, but that may change. Americans should consider the fate of 'yoga' in the realm of capitalism and ask if there is anything they won't destroy that they touch on. I would strike yoga off the list at this point, its value for those seeking better dieting methods getting a wave of the hand. Christians and monotheists should consider the Kantian critiques of reason, and metaphysics. Naive theism is a problem. The issue of 'god' becomes the doorway to a world of 'antinomies', the first of Kant's list being the 'god' question, the thesis/anti: there is a beginning in time, there is not beginning in time. We cannot resolve these antinomies using our human reason, but wait, can physics do the job? You can take the antinomial reality as the next stage beyond theism/atheism, or you can take the Kantian reinvention of 'faith' as way to persist in belief. But I think the Christian exploitation of 'faith' can't survive the Kantian version. But I don't know. The more productive paths of meditation are under assault after the fashion of yoga, so the future then (save in India) is not clear. It may be necessary to break the question down into components and start over: the meditative path examines the phenomenon of 'attention' which is a complex hybrid of the 'act of will' and the 'being levels' of consciousness/self-consciousness. That's two paths in one, and the 'Buddhist' goal of the cessation of the 'will' in the finale of pure being is theoretically only half the answer. A race of intelligent devils using their 'wills' in an eternal warfare of spirit cannibals seems to suggest the First Noble Truth all over again.

The question of the future of Buddhism will determine the whole game, and it is hard to see how Buddhism will survive in American culture. So we might look elsewhere for the future of the 'new age' exploration. It would help to have better histories, and Indian spiritual history is especially confusing.

### **01.21.14 The Sufi 'plexus-seed' mystery...take a rain check and consider the 'path to enlightenment' /./99% of all 'Sufis' are fakes...**

John Shirley doesn't sound at all as if he had any connection with the Gurdjieff game (I won't say 'work'). Actually the connection to Sufis, if that was real in the period when Ouspensky et al. were alive, is related to a form of so-called 'soul

creation' (but we all have souls already, so the lingo is ambiguous) and a related phenomenon its puzzled recipients refer to as a 'solar plexus' zone 'baby', or belly seed. My brief experience of this resulted in getting ripped off, good luck, I am free of the whole game which is really about something else, perhaps. If you have been connected to the work so-called for more than a year and don't know what I am talking about, be gone: you are being manipulated as an outsider. This Sufi signature shows no signs I can detect in the Ouspensky/Gurdjieff groups, but I can't tell: moral, despite all his impressive circus acts Gurdjieff is ambiguously a Sufi fake or perhaps not. ?

It is best to forget this phenomenon, and be glad you are an outsider. Seek a more transparent path.

John Shirley: quit while you are ahead. I doubt if you have any connection to the work gang, and be glad that is the case. There, you got the Sufi secret from an outsider. A warning to never trust Sufis. (and my account her may be confused. But people who find out anything about Sufis is so rare I will briefly spill the beans)

later comments:

This is strong stuff (cf the post from two days ago quoted below): you can implode people's view of Sufism in an eye blink. I hope that's the case. I think it is important and worth it to expose the confusion here. That's hard: the 'real' Sufis have a spiritual technology beyond anyone's ken. But I wonder if they understand their own resource. 90% of 'Sufis' are involved in a fake, and no one gives them a warning: don't be a casualty of Sufi/esoteric disinformation. The post above (several times discussed in my blogs, here and at darwiniana.com) is the real McCoy, as far as it goes. But I steered clear of the whole question, because it is a trap. I passed briefly through this zone of Sufis, but my conclusions are cautionary.

The 'Sufi' plexus 'soul seed' is a strange mystery, with no public information or resources. It is beyond the realm of manipulation. It simply happens to Sufis in proximity to various sources, usually ambiguously disguised. Despite all this I refused to enter this path: it is suspiciously manipulated by demonic people. You are given a gift with a hidden price. And that's the end of your spiritual path. A crucial question arises: why be a Faust to a Sufi Mephistopheles if you can do better, move beyond 'soul' on the path to enlightenment.

But this is nowhere a public phenomenon. The odds are that you will never find the 'real' Sufis. I was cured of Sufi interests, in fact. Who wants to be potted plant is some obscure Sufi culture of medieval sheiks?

It is not funny. In fact you may fall into a real hell and stay there for a long spell of many many lives. The path of enlightenment moves beyond 'soul', while 'paths of will' (I am guessing here) can adopt a samsaric strategy of action. The latter seems the way to go, but in reality it will teach you the first noble truth, as your 'will' is made the object of capture. You will repent of being a Sufi hotshot, really repent.

But the phenomenon is genuinely remarkable: a mysterious plexus 'object' evidently in a higher dimension interacting with the human body. Don't waste your time trying to find this. And in any case, realize it is never worth getting anything free from the Sufi mafia. So I must have been lucky I encountered the unique experience of 'stolen Baraka (actually the plexus 'baby' phenomenon).

There are a lot of mysteries to man's 'evolutionary psychology'. But they have fallen into confusion. Another example is the kundalini nexus, now almost impossible to figure out.

Sufis are total shits. They have misled thousands upon thousands of people with disinfo, wrecking their spiritual potential. Never have anything to do with them. I refuse to keep their secrets, and am persona non grata anywhere near them. Let me repeat, total shits. Exceptions: those who sweetly call themselves 'Sufis' are usually naive and innocent people. Leave them alone.

The question of human soul is obscure, but it seems clear that 'homo sapiens' individuals all have a soul factor as a species character. This other mystery of the Sufis is something else. The problem with the species level 'soul' is that it is not really permanent at all: you get a healthy run of human existences in order to accomplish 'human completion'. That's why, no doubt, the religious preacher rant, now so decayed, makes sense: be about your business of life and don't be tempted by demonic sideshows. I have a bad feeling that conventional Christianity no longer works anymore, so, with all due respect, you might do well to question what it offers. It is a complete mess at this point. Small wonder the new atheists refuse to put up with it anymore.

Still, it is a pity that science can't study this phenomenon. The existence of a hyperdimensional object near the plexus, and 'sensed' partially by the physical nerve system is a puzzle of puzzles, especially in what is considered a backward cultural context! I can't resolve this because my experience of this was very brief (fortunately, in retrospect). Embittered 'Sufis' who sense they have missed the real thing converge on bewildered beginners to 'steal' the energy there, or so I suspect from my own case. (but it is also true that the energy involved is infinite, so why the egoic muddle?) Goodbye to all that. They did me a favor, because I wish to move in a different world. But the whole thing is beguiling and strange. I suspect there are many such phenomena connected with the human evolutionary psychology, e.g. the mostly lost art of kundalini. What ancient knowledge is lost to us?

If you are an aggressive scientist looking for proofs and evidence this is a cliffhanger: the evidence is there, but....!! In any case, I suspect the 'soul' is material in some sense. The spiritual/material division is misleading. Anyway this was intended to warn John Shirley he has no connection whatsoever to Gurdjieff, unless it be the unconscious manipulation of a writer useful for propaganda. Get the fuck away from these devils, even as 'soul' peddlers.

#### **02.19.14 Hinidutva. AIT/OIT, and the confusions of Hinduism**

[www.gurdjieff-con.net/2014/02/17/hindutva-notes-from-weit-blog/](http://www.gurdjieff-con.net/2014/02/17/hindutva-notes-from-weit-blog/)

This is a good depiction of the conflict over Doniger's book on Hinduism. I reviewed this book at Amazon, not very perceptively, but with a reminder that the issue of the Axial Age is important for studying Hinduism, and Indian religion in general. One Indian contributor suggested I critique Hindutva here, but I am not very familiar with the details here, having never been to India.

The question of Indian religion is hopelessly confusing until you find the key: the scholar Danielou, learning from various Indian sources, produced that key, which is that the Indian tradition is very ancient, going back very far, probably to the Neolithic. But this not exactly revolutionary finding is now heresy in the world of the current debate over the OIT/AIT (out of India/Aryan invasion theory). We have dwelled on this debate at length, and, while I would not like to be dogmatic, the attempts to dismiss the AIT have not succeeded, and this intersects with the Hindutva question. But it is not the same debate, exactly. So two pieces of information help to clarify the legacy of Indian religion: 1. the source tradition is very ancient, but 2. the Aryan 'entry phase' (invasion or not) modified that tradition to make it look like the tradition was more recent, generated by Indo-European influences, quite late, in the second millennium BCE. The Vedic literary tradition is then grafted onto the masthead as the source period, leading into the Upanishadic era, followed by Buddhism, and, here the confusion is downright obscure, an emerging recrystallization of the tradition, now called Hinduism, a much later term. The OIT theory just doesn't work, one of the reasons being the anomaly of Jainism, in the context of Hinduism. In fact, Jainism is no anomaly at all, but a remnant of the very ancient tradition behind pre-Aryan 'santana dharma', and matched with what Danielou calls 'primordial Shaivism'. The cult of Shiva is confusing because its later influence is immense, in its divergence into different 'Shaivite cults' or religions, and this obscures its more ancient forms. In any case, the traditions of yoga (not including yoga asanas), tantra, meditation, and we know not what, stand as sourcing from this earlier tradition, which suddenly appears in Sanskrit in the Upanishads. Then there is a final phase of Jainism, with Mahavir, who concludes a stunning line of 24 teertankers (Buddhas), followed by an exoteric religion we now call Jainism (and still with a tradition of monks), in parallel with a new tradition emerging from the Jain-type earlier tradition, also moving into Hinduism as yoga, namely Buddhism, a mighty successor to Jainism, that becomes a world religion for the first time. Sadly, for some reason the Buddhist religion died out in India, as it became an East Asian presence of great depth. The situation resembles the division of Judaism, and Christianity, in the Occident. We have put up a scanned version of Prem Nath Bazaz' book on the history of the Gita here on this blog, with its tale of the revolutionary Buddhism emerging in the Axial period, and moving as a revolutionary movement against Hinduism, but failing here, and finally driven out of India. The obscure nature of Hinduism, a misnomer, falsely called 'santana dharma' now, requires care to see the many religions that go under that much later rubric. The vitality of the religions in India, non-Buddhist, complicates everything, because the introduction, spurious, of Aryan caste thinking into 'Hinduism' as a set of religious principles of class corrupted the whole tradition, and now we are confronted by the confusing and hopelessly wrecked outcome, of Brahmins (including Khrishnamurti) dominating the field of spiritual teachers and making caste the foundation of the

‘stages of spiritual rebirth’, a completely queer and false outcome. In fairness, this lore is being rapidly rejected by the field of new age gurus, and in Osho/Rajneesh, a Jain, we see clearly that the mainline of the tradition will now start to move outside of the spurious phantom of Aryanized Hinduism. These are the issues that terrify traditionalists, facing the prospect of being totally wrong about key issues for centuries, millennia. That Vedism is an interpolation into the larger tradition is hard to take. There is a possibility all this can be straightened and Osho/Rajneesh went a long way toward doing just that. None of these gurus take the caste issue seriously, in their interaction with Westerners. So the confusion should start of fade.

The OIT/AIT debate (use that hybrid term in the search box here for a long list of posts) is very tricky, and I try to proceed with a minimal version. There are many secondary inferences that might be false and complicate the discussion, but the general line of research makes it hard to proceed with the OIT version. One simple anomaly discussed here many times, is the direct parallel of Vedic and pre-Homeric Greek languages: it is almost impossible to derive the Greek case, with its direct resemblance to Vedic pre-Sanskrit, as a derivative springing from India. Two languages so similar must almost inevitably be parallel descendants of a common extra-Indic source. It must seem to some, naively, that since Homeric Greek and Vedic Sanskrit are so similar the first could have emerged from the second as the proto-Greeks, in the OIT version, were part of some exodus from India. That won’t work. It was obvious to the nineteenth century scholars, Indian and Western, that the Aryan entry into India must have been real, in some sense.

But there is nothing in the Indo-European tradition to suggest yoga. The core is directly visible in the Greek and Vedic cases, polytheistic pantheons, with similar names for the divinities. There is not a hint of yoga. Then suddenly in the Axial period we get the Upanishads in an Indo-European language, next to Buddhism, in a later dialect, with Sanskrit as a curiously invented language. It is not surprising this situation is confusing. We simply don’t know the way that the Aryan tribes entered and influence the indigenous cultures. Was the cult of Khrishna Aryan, or pre-Aryan?

Whatever the case, the suspicion is strong that the true Indic tradition, visible in some forms of Hinduism, like yoga, in Jainism, in Buddhism, is a very ancient phenomenon, seen now through the lenses of a kind Shiva cult, with yoga/tantra under that umbrella, and Jainism one of its realizations. And the presence of the ‘Mother’ cults suggests all this goes back to the Neolithic. Or before. This leaves the mystery to an earlier era: what is the source of the inner core of ‘yoga/tantra’ that emerges in Jainism and Buddhism? Does it go back to the Paleolithic? Danielou tries to contextualize the question in terms of the sacred cults of other areas and peoples, such as the Dionysus cult in the Occident, with Neolithic roots also. Here Danielou may be too speculative. But the question remains: where did the profound spirituality we emerging later into Buddhism, etc, come from? (to be continued)

Note this is not the same as the issue of Hindutva, which is a further distortion in this field of issues.

## **Sufi cannibals**

<http://www.gurdjieff-con.net/2014/02/19/stephen-seagal-the-tulku/>

This ‘Jewish’ effect in New Age groups, where the source people give preference to Jews has been discussed here many times re: the case of E.J. Gold, where the problem of ‘Jewish middlemen’ and ‘monopoly’ essentially blocks passage for a Gentile. I was surprised to learn long ago that Gold’s attempt to create a cult of ‘Jewish Sufism’ would subtly discriminate against Gentiles. Gold is too clever to get caught, and routinely gives the appearance of favoring Gentiles. But a closer look shows that the ‘lineage’ is being covertly passed into Jewish hands as Gentiles are given a superficial good time and then sent packing, none the wiser. And the problem here is that Gold seems to use those covert disciples to do strange things, one of his disciples was an open (Jewish) fascist. Let me say this game was too clever for me, and I can’t make charges easily here. But the issues become dangerous in the Gurdjieff world (and NOTE that this depravity of ‘evil paths’ was invented by Gurdjieff and ancient Sufis, not Gold), so there is no ground for anti-Semitism here. But I think that Gold should withdraw from this field. The reputation of Sufis has taken a hit from which it can’t really recover, save that this info doesn’t become public in any meaningful way. And there are hundreds of alternate Sufi groups that are I am sure

quite honest. The intersection of Sufism, Gurdjieff and Jewish operators trying to muscle in on the Sufi/Gurdjieff mafia is a bit chilling, I would put Gold/Sufism, probably Sufism in general, and Tibetan Buddhism on the growing list of 'new age' wastes of time.

This is no laughing matter. To make the confusion worse, Gold is using Crowley black magic under the cover of Sufism. It gets too complicated and I give up. But give up you can't because the rituals of Crowleyan soul murder (and/or so-called spiritual cannibalism, first figured out by the Jewish guru of Da Free John, apparently a prime offender) hinted at in his disgusting texts, is a profitable undertaking, it seems. Anything this far gone is a sign all the formations of an earlier era are degenerating and about to disappear, after 'casting a seed into the ground'. Jewish smarts applied to new forms of evil along the lines of the Gurdjieff criminality is downright scary, especially since the fascist underground intersected here in the nineteenth century. The New Testament gives a very weak warning here of gnostic degenerates, so we must presume this game is ancient. Gold, leave him alone, and just avoid him, unless you have strong grounds for anything more. Do not surrender your will to such people, and if you have in the name of guruism, take it back. That can be hard. If you cede control of your unconscious to a 'higher teaching that isn't higher, you will be unable to stay aware of your own actions. A true nightmare. Best to say goodbye to all guru games, and proceed via Kantian autonomy toward a future spirituality for an age of democracy.

### **Osho and the expose of Buddhist fascism**

Paul, before calling me paranoid, let me remind you that it was Osho, not me, who first laid the charge of fascism against Buddhists. That stunning revelation has left me completely wary of Buddhism as an historical movement, Tibetan Buddhists especially.

It would be nice to know if there is anything left of the Buddhist path. And for that matter restarts like Oshoism.

We are at the point of trying to see how occultism interacted with the corruption of the left into fascism in the era of Mussolini up to the entry of figures like Hitler and his early milieu of brown shirts. The called themselves 'socialists'! Etc...

### **04.27.14 New Age movement going bust**

After reading The Three Magi book on Osho, Crowley and Gurdjieff I have repented of my plug of Osho for leftists. Forget I mentioned it. The book did help me realize something that was true for many years, seventies to eighties: the three paths were scrambled from the start and cancelled out.

I really can't recommend Osho at this point for leftists on a revolutionary path. You will be rapidly penetrated by all sorts of demonic confusions. And I fear the same could be said of Christianity at this point. Christianity has strength in numbers: on the average the Christian community has a kind of spiritual protection circle, however often individuals fuck it up. But Christianity, as we all knew in the sixties, is almost worthless as a vehicle of development. If you are content to be a robot for Christ, you will more than likely be able to function without demonic confusion in ordinary life. No more than that. Virtually all development is blocked in Christianity. We always knew that and embarked on the ways of development in Eastern paths/cults.

But after thirty five years I can see that every possibility there has been destroyed.

Sufism is, forget it. I have actually penetrated to its esoteric mystery, the solar plexus seed process. But can't use it, and will ignore the implant until after death when it will detach from the astral body. Women have a word for it. Abortion. Done. No more Sufi buggers.

Sufis are the most devious and confusing devils. It is impossible to trust such a mafia. Everything I have explored there, all of Idries Shah, has been useless. Deliberate deception. People like E.J. Gold make any Sufi path in the US dangerous. If he finds out you are on some path he will try to undermine it. The Gurdjieff gangster devils want to know your weaknesses, to exploit them and cause your downfall. These people started as gurus and ended up devils because it is a good business.

These people are dangerous if they are able to seize control of your unconscious. Buddhism? The factor of Tibetan Buddhism has made Buddhism a waste of time. The Tibetans monopolize a huge zone of techniques, but these are by definition useless on a real path: these are bodhisattvas out to save you before the end of time. Great/ But in this life they may kill you if you are really serious on the path to enlightenment. In any case Tibetan Buddhism is a closed monopoly of a very few disembodied spirits. Forget it for yourself.

The other paths in Buddhism (we have had visitors here from various Thai/Hinayana paths), I don't know. I can't afford to travel to these places. They have left hundreds of comments on this blog, but never once introduced themselves or invited me to their situations. I got the message.

Yoga, I simply stop doing, given the way it has become a business. The local Buddhism in the US is being taken over by the New Atheist type of secularist: they wish to neutralize the whole game, and reduce everything to mindfulness, a complete crock.

The question is what can be done here? So long sucker. Not much. I think working toward a revolutionary future with a kind of default spirituality of nothing at all is one way to go. The early communists became atheists, materialists, and implacable enemies of all religion. I can see their point! But that itself is a vulnerable 'path'. But a slightly more elaborated 'null path' could be a good disguise, and even the materialist disguise is useful.

In fact a very simple path is open here; simple meditation. Don't take a single method from any source. Wikipedia can probably describe enough to start. Sitting can help to explore the way to a real path of your own. Another tactic is to schedule your days: how much will do you have? Have you been invultuated by an unseen power? The ability to follow a path of autonomy can sometimes expose those hidden devils. See what is obstructing your path, your life. You might notice that beginners are better off here. Long term practitioners come to the attention of hidden powers who will look for an entry into your sphere.

If a new communism could ever succeed in the creation of a new society, a clearing of the slate could rid the field of all these vultures and start over.

The left should simply study the issues of religion and be ready if they can ever help. Everyone in the spiritual sphere is so confused, leftist might actually be able to help.

Another source of help is Krishnamurti: his loathing and contempt for the whole sphere of New Agism was so total that he simply stands outside of it. You cannot bother such a spirit with you individuality. But as a refuge of sorts, it might help. That used to be the point of Buddhism. But expecting any refuge in that nightmare is unrealistic.

#### **04.26.14 Booknotes: Three Dangerous Magi**

[http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/184694435X/ref=oh\\_details\\_o01\\_s00\\_i00?ie=UTF8&psc=1:](http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/184694435X/ref=oh_details_o01_s00_i00?ie=UTF8&psc=1)

*Three Dangerous Magi, The: Osho, Gurdjieff, Crowley* Paperback by P. T. Mistlberger

I just came across this book and am in the process of reading it. I think we have stumbled on the problem Sannyasins are going to have in the future with Osho's teaching. This book cavalierly created a triad of three very different things, and persons. I can't see any problem with someone who wants to provide information often lacking in New Age circles, but here we see the emerging problem with many New Age groups: people are starting to create impossible combinations of things that don't add up to anything.

Here the author's enthusiasm misses the point that Osho, Crowley and Gurdjieff are completely different 'paths' or perspectives. Combining them won't work.

Osho was an enlightened 'Buddha' who passed beyond the cycle of births. He proposes a clear path to Enlightenment in the context of the Indian tradition.

Crowley is in the end obscure: his practices I strongly suspect (based on rumors of his rebirth as a 'Sufi' somehow) led nowhere and he was promptly subject to rebirth and amnesia as to his previous works.

Gurdjieff was a self-described 'devil' who was not enlightened but a party to the obscure Sufi 'awakening of consciousness', or something analogous, in the context of the obscurities of the 'will' paths, very different from the paths of enlightenment. Gurdjieff seems to have a way of 'soul rebirth, yet with something on /permanent aim/', the logic of his tale of the trips of Beelzebub to the planet earth (rebirths).

Gurdjieff whoever he was a dangerous black magician, not to be trusted, and likely to enslave his students and to use some cannibal-style as food. I see absolutely no progress in consciousness in any of his students, and suspect that some are destined to be 'food for the cannibals of the work'. But then how would I know, I haven't met all that many. His students if they are lucky may stumble into some real Sufi zone, but most will have to start over with something they can use. They can also end up as 'forever drones' of the magus, destined to spiritual slavery as robots of the master. A terrible fate. When you enter a spiritual path, read the fine print.

How are you going to create a hybrid of these three things? In fairness to the author he has researched a set of issues and provided some facts, and has stumbled on what is going to be the situation suffered by Osho's Sannyasins, hybrid of messes of pottage. Osho warned of this chaos. This writer's 'authorial sympathy' is not necessarily the stance to take with these thinkers. Crowley is a REALLY BAD person to imitate. His 'path' or 'paths' are obscure in their provenance and depend on the still misunderstood legacies of 'Rosicrucian/Freemason' gosh knows what. These 'paths' have NEVER received any clear and reliable historical documentation. And the drivel of the psychopaths in these fields resembles that of the secret agencies of political spy worlds.

The author seems to see the influence of Gurdjieff on Osho. We have discussed this here many times. An Indian on the lineage of Buddha with all its riches influenced by Gurdjieff's superficial methods of 'meditation in action'? I doubt it. I think that Osho saw through Gurdjieff in the end, and moved away from him. But, whatever the case, the path in Gurdjieff is not clear and many reread Ouspensky dozens of times, without a single hour of meditation. It is a pitiful situation.

In any case, the path of the 'Magi' is not that of Osho, and these Magi are historically obscure, and aren't really the same as the 'magus' in Crowley's cult/occult cult.

Trying to these three things at once is going to produce chaos.

### **A new review of Doniger book**

I wrote a review of this book when it came out, but withdrew it to reconsider the issues in light of the recent controversy. That controversy has been somewhat confused on both sides. This is an account of some depth of Hinduism, but something has gone awry, notwithstanding the conservative strains of Hinduism to Hindutva that have tended to discredit the critics. But one reviewer hit the nail on the head, with what is essentially my view, by suggesting that the book tries to take the high ground via the stance of secularist debriefing from one who can explore an immense amount of detail but miss the simple issue of the live core of Hinduism as it is, a living tradition older than anything the West knows. The question of Hinduism is very confusing because it is at once what remains of the original source of the greatest religious phenomenon of world history: the yogic/Buddhist/Jain legacies of the path of enlightenment. But at the same time something has gone wrong somewhere. Any critic who wishes to subject this tradition to stealth debunking via the details will miss the point. I am myself very critical of much that calls itself Hinduism, for example, the caste laws and the attempted spiritualization of this in a set of views that are really a later addition to the original tradition. What is the real problem here? In fact the problem is not hard to find, but this ends up in another controversy over the so-called 'Out of

India' versus the 'Aryan Invasion Theory'. The last generation has seen the debate enter a stage of acrimony that is often hurting the case of many defenders of Hinduism. Let us recall here that the debate of the AIT is something recent and confused. Many original scholars of Indian background were themselves proponents of some variant of the AIT theory. So it is not really an issue here of Western bias. The 'Out of India' thesis won't stand and defenders of Hinduism would do well to reconsider this recent confusion. There is no reasonable way to propose that the Indo-European languages source in India. Some of the claims here are simply bizarre in their logic and this has confused traditionalists all around.

Let me suggest a resolution of some of the issues by returning to the AIT and then suggesting that many of statements of this view are rightly considered chauvinist by Westerners. We don't know quite how to state the AIT. But one should consider the views of the older scholar Danielou, adopting the views of Indian students of history. Here we see that the term 'Hinduism' is misleading. The tradition of Indic religion goes back very far into the past, into the Neolithic finally. But this earlier tradition predated the Aryan entry phase on the second millennium BCE. Thus the entry of the Indo-Europeans created a misleading hybrid of primordial and invader religions resulting in the false view that the Indo-Europeans were the source of Indian spiritual elements, as in Buddhism. But this hybrid has confused everyone. The original 'santana dharma' predated the Aryan invasion and shows clear elements of an almost primordial version of Shaivism, ultimately the source of the yogic paths to liberation.

If we stick to this simple resolution, most of the problems go away, at the expense of exposing the Vedic tradition as something altogether different in the way it tries to make Vedism the predecessor to the Upanishadic view of yogic sadhanas. The ancient legacies were translated into 'Sanskrit' and/or related Aryan languages such as Prakrit (in Buddhism) and this left the impression

The originals were of Aryan origin. We can see at once the source of the hopeless confusion created by the forgotten stages of the assimilation era. A lot of sophistry has emerged here obscuring the simplicity and clarity of the resulting restored view that looks for the source of Indian tradition in the very ancient eras before the Aryan entry, the third and fourth, or earlier epochs, BCE. As Danielou suggested, some of the Sanskrit materials look like they were translated from some other language, whether Dravidian or other linguistic foundation. But this view has been rejected by most scholars, too many, unaware of the shoddy foundations of their interpretations. The classic Shiva seal ought to be a reminder that yogis were on the path to liberation from very early times. So western scholars and critics of the AIT are both confusing the issue. There is a lot more to say here, but the basics of a solution is simple: Indic religions originates far back, perhaps even in the Neolithic, and goes through two grand cycles prior to the Aryan era, viz. the two millennia of the high Neolithic after about 5000 BCE onward, and then a second phase after around 3000BCE. It may be here that the primordial Shaivism began to split off its cousin religions, starting with Jainism, and then with Buddhism in the next era, called by many scholars the Axial Age, which is the source of Buddhism. The Axial Age is the key to much of the confusion arising between Hinduism and Buddhism because the latter shows an immense innovation, while source called 'Hinduism' is more static because it is the source! Nonetheless the Upanishads offer the hint of the vitality of the older tradition. In fact the outstanding legacies of ancient Indic religion will soon spawn a series of religions in the various descendants of non-dual Vedanta, creating an immensely complex set of religious worlds, quite apart from the case of Buddhism.

We can leave this alternative history incomplete but with the key to the issues clearly indicated in a brief summary. We can see now why the new version of Hinduism is muddling the real history, while the work of secular scholars such as Doniger apparently deny/negate the spiritual basis of Indian religion. We have seen books written in the West trying to take 'enlightenment' out of Buddhism, in the same of some kind of secular imperative. This kind of extreme reductionism is unable to do justice to the depth of Indic religious tradition, which should include the Jain and Buddhist traditions under the common umbrella, santana dharma. So the attempts by Western scholars, apparently including Doniger, to induce a kind of Weberian rationalization of a religious tradition not in the Iron Cage have all backfired, in the realization that the core of the Indian tradition contains something very profound and not clarified by the perversity of much Western sociology of religion

Readers can find a lot more on this subject at the blog [The Gurdjieff Con](#) and this includes attempts to study the history of Buddhism in India and its conflict with 'neo-Brahminism'.

#### **04.17.14 Anirvan defects**

The sidebar has a link to an Anirvan review: [http://www.amazon.com/review/R3QA0WVTY9KDKN/ref=cm\\_cr\\_rdp\\_perm](http://www.amazon.com/review/R3QA0WVTY9KDKN/ref=cm_cr_rdp_perm)

I am getting a lot of noise/messaging to the effect that Anirvan the self-styled supergroupie of Gurdjieff is repenting of his disciple's awe, if not fawning, and wishes to move away from the Gurdjieff zone. That can be a perilous passage, but determination will do it. We need a clear expose of Anirvan's book, *To Live Within*, and its excessive kowtow to the memory of Gurdjieff, and his confused equation of the realm of the Indian guru and his ashram with the quite different world of Gurdjieff who is not an Indian guru, although people repeatedly confuse this point. Many of the statements by Anirvan apply only to his experience with an Indian guru, and not to the quite different semi-Sufistic world of Gurdjieff.

So one more of the authors induced to Gurdjieff propaganda is beginning to slip. Perhaps soon John Shirley will get the point, and maybe soon even that hopeless case Patterson, the author of still another Gurdjieff paean, now out at Amazon. I will review it at some point.

#### **Approaching a last birth...**

I am sorry for the ambivalent judgments of Osho, but I risk a very dangerous situation here, one that most will not suffer. I still recommend the field of Osho as a Buddha field for the left, but my personal situation here is strangely toxic. I have been getting warnings that his treatment of me is predatory: he wants to freeze people in place to make them find rebirth in a way he can exploit. I dunno, is that true. Meanwhile the whole Osho zone is a victim of disinformation that goes on and on. A pity. In a way the future of his work is in jeopardy due to this routine of savage attacks. Destroying ego can be a front for destroying the will to independent Buddhas turning the dupe into the illusion he has transcended ego, when in reality he is a groupie still in the guru's sphere. That deserves a hearty 'fuck you, goodbye'.

I think that Osho should create an open space into which future realizations of this broad avenue of paths can be independently accomplished. Christians and Buddhists have suffered for being reduced to flunkie status in these two religions. There is, to be sure, ample evidence of realized Buddhas in the Buddhist tradition, with virtually nothing in the Christian, a barren field. But I think the deadzone of Tibetan Buddhism is going to destroy the future of Buddhism. It may be time to create something new altogether.

It is strange that Osho had himself killed in his last incarnation. One can reach a stalemate at the end of a life and be unable to close the deal.

#### **05.26.14 I am not a spiritual teacher...**

We have moved through some dangerous terrain here, and I think we need to proceed with caution, in some new direction.

I need to at least point out that I am not a spiritual teacher, and need to warn some readers of the confusions here. You can see a lot deeper than most, even spiritual teachers, and still not be at a point of playing that role. One I never intended, but which has been recently thrust upon me as a successor project to my work on world history.

As a non-teacher I have lost twenty years of 'meditation time' for work involving other issues of intellectual study, and am way behind in that field. I am not really even in the amateur zone here. But such things are not measured in units of Zendo time, and the study of history has its own 'path to enlightenment', with a small 'e', but still nothing to be rejected out of hand. Ten years of homeless wandering in the West and living like a hobo counts as 'living death time' in bardo terms,

meditation or not, a method beloved by Sufi teachers 'die before you die', etc, previously referred to here as the 'biggest bums in history'. I meant that, and the 'living death time' as meditation is dubious in retrospect, if attempted murder was the intent, but who knows, the Sufis aren't bad blokes, however little they think of me. Decent chaps on the whole.

Modern society needs help on the issue of evolution, and it seems I was delegated to that task, along with many others. The result sank like a stone in the resulting cultural sphere, but the real result is achieved, however fuzzy the result.

And just at the point of trying to reenter the new age field of meditation I have been 'recommended' to attempt a successor task to my historical studies: an attempt to cast the legacy of the 'communist idea' (and marxism itself, perhaps) into a new key, with the new tool of historical analysis, and its take on revolution and modernity, pace the economics of capitalism.

Whatever the case, I am not a spiritual teacher, and am not indulging in some form of 'crazy wisdom teaching'. In fact, I think that my indirect job as a 'teacher', spiritual or not, was to remind the 'new age movement' not to be an old age movement, and to challenge the postmodern attempts to destroy modernity. In the process the signs of a new gestation of religion, or post-religion in secular society are becoming increasingly obvious.

One issue here is to expose the perceived problems with the Gurdjieff legacy, and we can return to that in a conclusion to this blog's first mission statement.

#### **05.19.14 The passing of authoritarian spiritual teacher traditions // How Hitler killed spiritual surrender...**

As the New Age movement spreads globally the core institutions inherited from antiquity are beginning to degenerate or shift into malevolent forms. It should never happen that a 'spiritual teacher' uses 'disciples' for magical experiments, or as guinea pigs. At that point we must sound the alarm and move to expose the guru phenomenon as antiquated, corrupted and superfluous. And it is all unnecessary. If there is one thing that can stop development it is dependency on someone else's will. There is another side to this argument. And the meaning of the original institution should be clarified. But it never is, and the whole game is a form of guesswork. The question has many aspects, and many would disagree with this. But in a global context people are combining completely different traditions, from Sufism, to Indian guruism, to the more ambiguous issue of authority figures long deceased, like Mohammed or Jesus.

It should be noted that guruism in India is more circumspect and effective. But the recent manifestations in the West have included a lot of dangerous new forms. I have to leave that world aside. I can't generalize there because I have never seen the real original tradition.

First, surrender is an ancient concept, relevant to clear circumstances. But these have fallen away now. Let the history be told. But the generalized format crossing Indian to Sufistic realms is an abuse by generalization, and has produced distortions.

The real of Sufism is especially open to abuse, because it has no clear defining texts or traditions. People can declare themselves Sufi sheiks with no open source credentials or histories. This is already clear with Gurdjieff, and his imitators. We have no trustworthy account of his life or study. Compare this every almost every Indian teacher. The legacy is almost always open.

The rule now is simple: trust no one. Surrender to no one. Don't do it. The worst offenders in the Sufi tradition have spoiled the whole game. The exceptions know themselves and arise in the context of personal relationships with trusted teachers in publicly documented contexts.

The extreme forms of super authoritarianism, died with fascism and Nazism. The similar context in Gurdjieff should be a warning call. The danger is to become dependent over lives to an entity that will exploit in a second life. A terrible danger. The solution is to preserve one's autonomy, dispense with spiritual surrender and stick to the classic formats of the path, like the Buddhist Eight-fold Way, which has not connection with gurus. With a few defining safeguards the institution could flourish once again, but the confusion now is almost incredible.

A figure like E.J. Gold calls himself a Sufi sheik without a single documentation of any kind of who where and when. The suspicion is strong that he simply made it all up.

You should avoid at all costs occultists in disguise who can establish a hypnotic bond, fake a guru game, and then initiate exploitation after you leave his immediate circle. That calamity should be enough to condemn the whole set of traditions. The exceptions here happen very naturally, as in the assembly of realized Buddhas, a transient situation that seems to define itself by its immediate efficacy. But the confusion arises later in the working out of the original moment of transparency. It appears that something malevolent to the distant descendant disciples here, after Gautama finally passed away forever.

Incidentally, the reverse has come to be: now people wish to use figures like Aleister Crowley as the model of autonomous spiritual work. It is complete nonsense. But the impulse is not incorrect: to realize one's own true will. Don't imagine the degenerate Rosicrucian nonsense concocted by the occult traditions is effective here.

Stay away from it.

Almost a better study point to see the issue is a study of Schopenhauer. His views of the 'will' are complex and open to misunderstanding. But the nature of the 'will' is entirely mysterious and complex and is almost never even approximated by the idiocy of the texts left by Crowley.

The idea that the rite of Abramelin the Mage could be used to realize one's 'true will', to me, is nut job thinking at its worst. We must consider that all these things are junk from an earlier age that may have known the real meaning. The thinking of Schopenhauer and Kant here suggests that the latent noumenal aspect of the 'will' (whose core meaning is not what we think) is protection against the abuse we see in guru games.

In any case the mixtures of Gurdjieff, Sufism, Crowley, Buddhism, yoga, the list goes on, can only produce hopeless confusion.

The abuse of spiritual surrender that produced the fascist automaton and deviated into hidden political fascism was actually the death of the guru phenomenon. The abuse of surrender of the will to stage a revolt against modernity via reactionary hidden gurus with their zombies is over and gone.

It has hardly as yet died in the visible new age movement, but it has no future at this point. The suspicions of occult traditions manipulating Nazism has poisoned any possibility of trust here.

So if you proceed alone you must transcend your own ego. Not a promising activity. But if it is going to happen nature will lead you to it, and then it will be obvious that you don't really destroy ego, but simply move beyond it.

### **Laying waste to Ouspensky**

Gurdjieff shows the dangers of 'soul creation' in this Sufi sense: you crystallize around the issues of an ancient civilization and then rebound into modernity and are disoriented by the way the future wasn't according to expectation. Modern

civilization is not a decline, democracy isn't a sin against god, and the whole aura of the ancient spiritual teacher is grossly inappropriate.

And the issue of Ouspensky is a failure on the standards of antiquity: Gurdjieff was privileged to deal with an ancient Buddhist: Ouspensky seems to have been a venerable old Arhant and was not in the Sufi mould at all. Gurdjieff had no right to trash this person just because he wouldn't submit. Bullshit. Ouspensky should have been a realized Buddha in a totally different context and never fallen victim to this Sufi gangster peddling a hopeless muddle.

And the problem here is the way Gurdjieff has no standard of truth and simply spins the tale: the fourth way school refers to nothing we can point to in history.

Ouspensky deserved better than to be destroyed by Gurdjieff.

The Buddhist and Sufi way are different: if you crowd a soul you block enlightenment, and like Gurdjieff are able to reincarnate, here as a kind of demon. It seems like the way to go, but reality seems bizarre.

### **The macro model and the schema (such as it is) of the Neolithic phase // hard to figure a fourth way school in 5500 BCE Egypt**

I added a note here: I almost got sucked into Gurdjieff's speculations about pre-sand Egypt.

<http://www.gurdjieff-con.net/2015/02/16/not-getting-taken-for-a-ride-on-pre-sand-egypt/>

<http://history-and-evolution.com/appendix/appendix.htm> The appendix to WHEE contains an outline of the model of the eonic or macro effect and may help to see the place of early Egypt in the larger scheme of civilizations. All this is an example of the way speculations can confuse the issue. It is also true that the model is incomplete and the matrix of civilizations is almost empty around 5500 BCE. This prelude is an extension of the core model, and could be wrong. It is at least a reminder that the study of these periods requires some arduous reading in a library with research books on the Neolithic.

Gurdjieff's material is like much of the older speculations of the type rampant in Blavatsky, and we are still in the realm of the Atlantis faithful.

Note: The idea of an early form of Christianity and/or the fourth way in pre-sand Egypt momentarily stopped me from seeing the obvious. The correlation with the significant period ca. 5500 BCE momentarily caught my interest.

But the general model of the macro effect exposes immediately the dubious character of the claim. The stream and sequence analog shows that in the cases we have there is never a transitional effect twice in succession in the same stream. The point should be obvious on other grounds: the period around 5500BCE shows Egypt in a very primitive state. Civilizations were barely into the mastery of pottery (an earlier Neolithic innovation). It would seem that Egypt in the stream and sequence aspect of our model is a completely typical case of a 'stream' history developing in a diffusion field (i.e. Mesopotamia, Sumer itself being before its major period after 3000BCE) then suddenly entering a major transitional interval as it becomes an exemplar of the master sequence, in parallel with the also transitional Sumer. A miniature Axial Age. This in the centuries leading up to 3000 BCE. A double transition in succession in Egypt would be a squandering of energy in a system trying to minimax a global integration with two tricks: intermittent sequences generating a mainline and starting at the navel of the Eurasian system, i.e. the Middle East, and parallel sidewinders suddenly appearing after a period of early growth in a diffusion field. The state of Egyptian religion prior to 3000 BCE is unclear. This does not prove there wasn't some early religious phenomenon somewhere early on here. But I don't see any evidence. However the question of religion in the Neolithic is under suspicion of hiding something that leads to later developments. In the case of India, I claimed that primordial Shaivism, with its side aspects of yogis, begins in the Neolithic. But once again India around 5500 BCE becomes an object of curiosity. But again this zone is still in a stream aspect and will exhibit a transition only millennia later in the Axial Age. So the sources of Shaivism and the form they took, and whether yogis understood what Buddhists and later yogis understood are unclear. The attempt to squeeze everything into an Indo-European mould

in the period after 2000BCE doesn't work. WE can easily get a hint or a glimpse if we examine the later cults of Shiva and/or Krishna (probably much later, but who knows?): we see how the practices of yoga can be carried by a very exotic and colorful general religious cult such as we see to this day in India.

I am getting nervous here: I don't have enough evidence to discuss India and Egypt around 5500 BCE. But something was happening we don't see. Danielou, whose speculations require caution, points to this general period or later suggesting that the cult of Shiva and Dionysus were the same originally and spring from a general oikoumene of the period. It would be nice to be able to prove it.

But even if the details are wrong the suggestion that there was a ferment in the mid-Neolithic is highly suggestive. It is interesting to study the Greek case to get oriented on the often confusing Indian case: in historical times we see the same overlay with the pre-Hellenic cults of Dionysus mixing with the Indo-European brands. The overlay in India is extremely confusing and has led to a great confusion of Vedism and Santana Dharma.

### **02.16.15 Gurdjieff and other monsters**

I can't think of anything crueller than the Gurdjieff legacy of issuing disinfo on the question of soul formation. The latter is real, but should have had a more compassionate presentation that didn't throw the greater public into panicked confusion of being left out. I went through this issue years ago and learned later that it simply wasn't worth it. Who cares about enduring a million years of deluded and demonic existence as an old soul in the ages of the solar system. Buddhism speaks clearly of looking for a way out. With enough torture you will agree with the Buddhas. You will discover to your horror early on the truth of Buddha's First Noble Truth. But we can't forbid the universe from what it is in its totality. Clearly soul formation is an aspect of hominizations and began at the dawn of man. So it is misleading to confront 'soul peddlers'. But whatever the case, the truth here is impossible to find in the mass of lies. It would seem clear that man as man has a 'temporary soul' and a certain amount of time and lives to reach 'salvation' or liberation. The latter are real, distinct, and not well handled by the monotheistic religions.

I would skip the Gurdjieff/Sufi brand here and move along a Buddhist line. Still, correct information is not available, not to me or Gurdjieff, so we have to consider the future of man that can find some form of science in this madness. Just don't go making pacts with devils for soul formation. What you have now is a Volkswagen, and is enough to start. Don't get greedy for a Rolls Royce.

Judged carefully the issues of human completion suggest a vehicle of the will where the Buddhist/Indic religions speak only of liberation. I don't know, but it appears all the representatives of the former are demonic. That's a slap in the face, to be sure. The reality is unknown. But I think that the disinfo here has wrecked the lives of almost all the later students of Gurdjieff. As noted, we find people writing books on chakras and Gurdjieff's higher bodies. No one will even bother to correct you. A hidden cabal of rogue Sufis play on interest and fear and carrot dangle foolish suckers until they are ready to drop dead.

The larger realm of cosmic beings is something else and we begin to suspect a realm of demiurgic powers is at work in the larger system of higher material existence toward which man aspires but is so far too primitive to understand. But we suspect therefore that spiritual anomalies like Gurdjieff might represent distorted perversions of this unknown realm. Christians got a distorted mythology here unwitting pointing to this with the nonsense about angels and angelic powers. The lore of the Apocrypha suggest the need to a more careful look at the earlier 'religious' lore from Sumer onward. But the crackpot literature here is almost too overwhelming to sort out (at least for me). Much of the exotic near-myth history of early civilization in the crackpot zone might conceivably be point to something, despite looking like the ravings of people in straightjackets.

But the study of WHEE starts to close in on these archaeological myths. We can see that a global phenomenon of stupendous innovation, the Axial period, starts to look downright automated. A larger spiritual influence is not doubt there but they are invisible and the real change we can see is the result of some kind of macro transformation.

Bennett's discussion mixes modes and suggests that we are in a food chain with higher beings. That's a calamity for esoteric religion, and has turned the whole game into the paranoia of figures like Gurdjieff, forced into the vampire game of preying on disciples as food. The cosmic loony bin is very large.

If higher cosmic beings depended on man for 'food' the universe would be a madhouse of supernatural predators. So, is that the case?

But beyond that Bennett's introduction to the idea of demiurgic powers can at least be useful as the lesser of crackpot notions taken as hypothesis, compared to what you find if you google 'nephilism', etc...

The issue won't go away because the 'soul' question I suspect is really about advanced technological forms of 'spiritual materialism'. Without understanding and in the hands of 'secondary sources' from rogue Sufis like Gurdjieff you are better off in the realm of the Buddhas.

### **Not getting taken for a ride on 'pre-sand' Egypt**

Note: The idea of an early form of Christianity and/or the fourth way in pre-sand Egypt momentarily stopped me from seeing the obvious. The correlation with the significant period ca. 5500 BCE momentarily caught my interest. But the general model of the macro effect exposes immediately the dubious character of the claim. The stream and sequence analog shows that in the cases we have there is never a transitional effect twice in succession in the same stream. The point should be obvious on other grounds: the period around 5500BCE shows Egypt in a very primitive state. Civilizations were barely into the mastery of pottery (an earlier Neolithic innovation). It would seem that Egypt in a the stream and sequence aspect of our model is a completely typical case of a 'stream' history developing in a diffusion field (i.e. Mesopotamia, Sumer itself being before its major period after 3000BCE) then suddenly entering a major transitional interval as it becomes an exemplar of the master sequence, in parallel with the also transitional Sumer. A miniature Axial Age. This in the centuries leading up to 3000 BCE. A double transition in succession in Egypt would be a squandering of energy in a system trying to minimax a global integration with two tricks: intermittent sequences generating a mainline and starting at the navel of the Eurasian system, i.e. the Middle East, and parallel sidewinders suddenly appearing after a period of early growth in a diffusion field. The state of Egyptian religion prior to 3000 BCE is unclear. This does not prove there wasn't some early religious phenomenon somewhere early on here. But I don't see any evidence. However the question of religion in the Neolithic is under suspicion of hiding something that leads to later developments. In the case of India, I claimed that primordial Shaivism, with its side aspects of yogis, begins in the Neolithic. But once again India around 5500 BCE becomes an object of curiosity. But again this zone is still in a stream aspect and will exhibit a transition only millennia later in the Axial Age. So the sources of Shaivism and the form they took, and whether yogis understood what Buddhists and later yogis understood are unclear. The attempt to squeeze everything into an Indo-European mould in the period after 2000BCE doesn't work. WE can easily get a hint or a glimpse if we examine the later cults of Shiva and/or Krishna: we see how the practices of yoga can be carried by a very exotic and colorful general religious cult such as we see to this day in India.

---

<http://www.gurdjieff-con.net/2015/02/14/review-of-patterson-book-on-gurdjieff/>

I added a note to the review of the Patterson book. One should be wary of anything Gurdjieff says whatsoever. I am not sure of the status of claims for the greater antiquity of the pyramids, but unless I am mistaken this is falling by the wayside these days.

Students of world history might look at my WHEE and its periodization of world history. This is controversial itself, but used with care we suspect a progression of epochs of some kind and our increasing knowledge is in any case pushing back

the origins of Egypt/Sumer. We are confused by the sudden transition just before 3000 BCE which ushered in a spectacular era of advancing civilization in Sumer and Egypt. But the real origins of Sumer lie in the periods of the Neolithic, and the period around 5500 BCE is the projected onset of a new prior era. Whatever the case the history of Egypt lags behind that of Sumer but then it takes off in the later period around 3000 BCE. It is not necessary to use this model or its periodization, but it reflects the data fairly well. Can we really see advanced religious schools in the era before 3000 BCE in Egypt?

In any case to move historical discussions back to before the Neolithic (8000 BCE onwards) and its immediately prior epoch (10000 to 8000 BCE) is always dubious and can never be taken as true without evidence, for which there is none that I know.

It is not clear to what extent the Sumerian world influenced Egypt before 3000 BCE. We suspect that the era after 6000 BCE or later up to 3000 BCE was seminal for later Sumer as we know it now, and it is entirely possible that Egypt began to develop in concert or with a somewhat delayed parallel.

Note in the link below that 'pre-sand Egypt' is pegged at around 5500 BCE. I suspect but can't prove that this period was a seminal one all the way to India and beyond. What may be the case is not the nonsense from West et al. about the antiquity of the Sphinx but a distorted echo of something seminal at the dawn of Egyptian prehistory moving toward history.

[http://www.gurdjiefflegacy.org/60gine/pre\\_sand.htm](http://www.gurdjiefflegacy.org/60gine/pre_sand.htm)

The model in WHEE must be used with extreme care and shouldn't be employed for projections without evidence. The periodization is purely conjectural prior to 3000 BCE. But it often scores correctly even in this earlier periods. Before the invention of writing around the 3000 BCE era documentation is almost non-existent, although archaeology is rapidly finding better data for these periods.

Again the roots of later Egyptian religion in the centuries before 3000 BCE require serious evidence. The roots of the Osirian religion(s) await some future clarification, and would seem indeed to have a very distant resemblance to some of the much later Christian themes. The Egyptian gnostics fall into place here possibly as holding some early form of teaching about human consciousness, mixed with a confusing mythology. We simply don't know much here.

I think the claims of Gurdjieff here can be destructive. Christianity and Judaism spring from an Axial Age transformation starting in the period after 900 BCE to 600 BCE and we can see how the roots of a set of religions can spring rapidly from remorphed legacies (indeed, the very Egyptian tradition discussed) very rapidly in a transitional period. To reduce Christianity to an echo of Egyptian religion misses the point that the religion shows its backing in a tremendous transformation of the Axial period. We can't just sling around speculations about it being taken without change from an earlier period.

In one way it is a dead ringer to claim an influence of Egyptian religion on Axial Age monotheism. Even when we take into account the severe mythologization of the Old Testament it is obvious that it is a tale of Egypt's influence on the onset of monotheism in the tale of Moses, factual or not. The history of Atenism is of course very significant.

Googling pre-sand Egypt:

<https://www.google.com/search?q=presand+egypt&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8>

### **02.15.15 Confusions of soul questions**

The questions of soul are confused by all parties. The references to soul formation in Gurdjieff are apparently a variant of a Sufi tradition, but it is not clear if Gurdjieff was or was not connected to that.

Consider Schopenhauer's view: similar to the Indic: at death a man as yogis note shows (since he may lose consciousness) the way he was never born never died: there is an aspect of self that is already beyond space and time. The question of 'soul' therefore is either something else, or a fuzzy term that means several things. This basic situation is all Buddhists need to enter the path of enlightenment.

Our discussion of two forms of consciousness might apply here: at death a man tends to 'lose consciousness' stripped of psychological ego as the vision of the 'clear light' as substrate emerges.

The catering to an elite with a secret doctrine doesn't find favor with the spiritual beings behind religions of spiritual equality. The confusion of soul and immortality is thus built in.

Sit down and watch Black Hawk Down, about Somalia. (My argument can't work for a movie, but a photograph of Somalian somewhere would do). Locate the Sufis in this movie (or the photograph).

My point, religions like the monotheisms, and the Buddhist types are different but similar, of Christianity and Islam, spread invisibly across the globe and have a dimension in relation to soul that is not visible on the outside. These religions carry the same species of man with his basic spiritual/psychological 'soul'. The dimension pointed to by Gurdjieff is something else, as far as I know. Somalia could well have more realized Sufis than the US. Note that Buddhists on the path of enlightenment do fine with the basic apparatus thus described, without the 'fancy soul' add-ons mysteriously rumored of in the few leaks like those of Gurdjieff. The question of Christianity is thus simply unclear. It seems to have lost what it pioneered, a Sufistic-type core. Too many rogue gnostics, like today, maybe like Gurdjieff, or not.

If a halfway intelligent form of 'communist' civilization replaced that the hidden guides would surely infiltrate benignly to include all men. And no one would even know they were there. It wouldn't require the god fanaticism of an earlier but it would need to be a halfway intelligent and broad perspective. Our accounts of modernity are misleading: the secular outcome revolves better around the last phase of the Reformation, the figures of Kant, Hegel, and Schopenhauer creating a universe that can include almost everything. They are fallible philosophers, not spiritual prophets. The materialism of the era of positivism is a sudden break in the continuity of the early modern. But materialism is OK too, after all the whole of Indic religion can be seen in terms of a form of Samkhya materialism. But materialism was a phase trying to deal with religious hypnosis. At this point the left should loosen up a bit. The real issue perhaps was that there is no going back. We can't recreate an earlier era of religion. The slate is being wiped clean to reset.

It is not clear if Gurdjieff even knew of the larger question. The confusion is almost endless. Consider this book (which I haven't read):

[http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/0615982867/ref=ox\\_sc\\_act\\_title\\_2?ie=UTF8&psc=1&smid=A1IK43E02MC6SV](http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/0615982867/ref=ox_sc_act_title_2?ie=UTF8&psc=1&smid=A1IK43E02MC6SV): Higher Being Bodies: A Non-Dualistic Approach to the Fourth Way, With Hope

Does the author understand the subject? A commenter protests that he has mixed in the issues of the chakras. Thus apparently the book gets it wrong. Note this. Most of the followers of Gurdjieff did not really receive a real form of the teaching, which is what? Sufism? Pre-sand Egyptian Christianity? It is impossible to know.

This blog has described some aspects of this question. For myself it seems the Buddhist approach is more productive, but that may just show my ignorance.

In any case the issue of soul as immortality is misleading. And the aura of Gurdjieff is dreadful. This Mephisto dealing with Faust, not sweet Jesus with his flock.

I am not really in a position to pass judgment here. Clearly the 'soul' question is in limbo still as man creates a science foundation (at this point totally misleading) that might help. But figures like Kant and Schopenhauer are cogent reminders that the metaphysical boundary of the noumenal or, for Schopenhauer, the thing in itself is a very real barrier to perception and knowledge.

### **03.25.15 Tracking down the reincarnation of Ouspensky to eliminate him and take over a monopoly of the so-called 'work'**

As per previous post: the suspicion is that Gold et al. want to track down the reincarnation of Ouspensky and destroy him in order to create his (Jewish) monopoly of the 'work' franchise, a very lucrative, as it were, form of once Sufistic spiritual activity. The spiritual cannibalism factor makes the Ouspensky corpus, one of the greatest success of spiritual advertising ever, a gross temptation. But Ouspensky made it through and is trying to debrief the 'Gurdjieff Con'. Didn't I make it clear already? The Sufis are all con artists.

#### **The reincarnation racket/trap/disinfo regime**

<http://www.gurdjieff-con.net/2015/03/25/bbc-hosts-debate-on-whether-and-where-the-dalai-lama-will-reincarnate/>

I am suspicious of this Tibetan system re: reincarnation. If the lamas have the powers stated why won't they help people in need to find out their reincarnations. We have discussed here the way I have been confused with the reincarnation of Ouspensky and subjected to black magic attacks as if that were true. That is a revealing suggestion of the total lack of ethical behavior in the Sufi world.

In general, a worse situation is frequent, I am sure: people reincarnate, some spiritual people find out, and, failing to inform the victim, exploit them without their knowledge.

It would be of great help if the reincarnation of Ouspensky could be found, to stop these monsters from attacking me to take control of the Ouspensky legacy.

#### **Exposing the enneagram fraud**

A review of one the flood of enneagram books now turning mainstream. Given the fraud behind this new age junk It is important for new agers with some math training to help expose this barren nonsense from someone too dishonest to care about corrupting public knowledge. Gurdjieff's brazen invocation of esoteric Christianity makes it easy to exploit gullible Christian believers.

The baseless confusion of the enneagram myth/hype, March 24, 2015

[http://www.amazon.com/review/RTMSNNCNWF33L/ref=cm\\_cr\\_rdp\\_perm](http://www.amazon.com/review/RTMSNNCNWF33L/ref=cm_cr_rdp_perm)

This review is of: The Enneagram: A Christian Perspective (Paperback)

The material left behind on the enneagram remained relatively sidelined for decades until the key to hyping it appeared in the claims of its use for the study of personality types, a very peripheral species of junk science that created the illusion of making sense.

The enneagram is a completely unfounded form of new age symbology that has never received any clarification. It was expounded by Gurdjieff whose manner was to claim something was esoteric, presenting an outer teaching whose secret content is never revealed. This makes critics prone to pause, lest they confuse the outer wrapper with the content in question. The point is that everything said in public about the enneagram is falsely claiming to explicate a subject too esoteric to reveal in public. There is a better explanation here: con men at work.

This issue has been further confused by the support given by two students Ouspensky and J.G.Bennett. The latter, who should have known better, gave the subject a pass, although he seemed to have been clearly wary of the symbolism.

No clarification of the nonsense of the enneagram has ever been put forth, and the Nashqbandi Sufis, who should have attempted clarification, but instead revealingly changed course with another version of this fraud, the enneagon of Oscar Ichazo, who denounced the enneagram as unscientific. This situation should alert scholars of the danger of using this junk thinking. But now we see an increasing flood of bad treatments of the subject, moving to the core of Christianity.

The attraction to Christians arises from the failed attempt to rejustify the question of the Trinity with something supposed to support its confusions.

I think what early Christians were about here was a possible influence of Indic Samkhya in the spread of Jain yogis into the Roman Empire. The Trinity looks like an attempt to recast the original triad of Samkhya as some kind of esoteric mystery in a veiling of the unmanifest. That's confusing enough once we know that Samkhya was the reference. But its transformation into Christian theology was clearly a distortion of the original meaning.

In any case the quite different enneagram is confusion of seven term and nine term systems, with no explanation for the difference.

In the end the issue is a variant of claims about seven term sequences and the so-called 'law of three'. This was the original thinking, overhyped into an esoteric doctrine, and matched to the enneagram in an illogical confusion of terms.

I think that theologians should be wary of this fake esoteric lore, and consider the opinion of many spiritual teachers as to the fraud in the whole game. Gurdjieff, the source here, put this question into the esoteric doctrine category, which means that doubters are at risk from some very dangerous occultists. This material should never have gone mainstream and is a front for some very unsavory Sufis who know perfectly well the whole subject is baloney.

I think the theological community should pull away from this false lead into the realm of the esoteric.

The law of three and the law of seven are interesting thought experiments, but they have no basis in objective knowledge. Only a devious klutz as retarded as Gurdjieff would have thought it possible to get away with such a piece of bad thinking.

### **03.20.15 The seed plexus phenomenon and the man with a million pound note...**

The issue of the soul plexus seed phenomenon is hard to assess. But this blog is forcing some answers. I am hearing that the statements about the Gold school are false: that the whole Sufi soul game has retreated from the Gold zone and his followers. Great, I will believe anything when I see it. Trying to give Jews special advantages here is something Sufis would not do, so we are talking about something else. The Gold school had no control over any of this as such, as per all Sufis schools.

A fascist Jewish Sufi isn't a promising venue, so I see the logic of 'confiscation'. But then people who have something to hide will cover their tracks. There is a good chance I have got this question scrambled. But I made a determination to expose the question.

Whatever the case we have done the one thing esoteric gangsters dislike: public revelations.

But I can see that once again the Jewish/Christian boundary is the source of hopeless confusion and mutual suspicion and hatred. Clearly the Islamic/Sufi universal category had to be the last refuge of the monotheistic riddle. And I don't think it has anything to do with monotheism. Someone in this mystery is suggesting taking the 'secret' to a communist left: if they can create a serious civilization, Sufism will move into it.

Further I am told that my experience of the 'thieves of Baraka' episode was irrelevant: there is no shortage of the requisite 'stuff'. In fact my account here has been inconsistent, I have often thought the Sufi connection had been restored, despite efforts to dump any further plexus entries. The seed phenomenon pops in and out but I ignore it totally. It is odd: if you seek it, it flees. If you flee from it seeks you.

The question arises: how become a transmitter.

This is a strange situation that might help to show Buddhists and Sufis their collision in a phase of globalization. I am at the boundary of two great religious streams, with a question for the future: how will this double heritage find a resolution. Meanwhile students of Gurdjieff would do better to simply walk away from the Gurdjieff work. It has no connection with the path it is describing and promoting. That takes the cake for cruelty. A reminder once again that spiritual mediated by devils is going to be 'not as expected'.

I suggest a way to deal with people as ruthless as this: the old story of the man with a million pound note. You can do a lot without actually having the money. if you suspect the reality sooner or later it will have to be revealed to you.

Here the knowledge of what you don't have is almost as good as what you do have. And you can assist 'Sufis', 99% of whom have been deceived, to not waste their time... Ditto for the conned Gurdjieff flock.

In general I must suspect that this issue is mediated by demonic entities and is therefore a dangerous game. And the prospect of 'immortality' if that means a million years as a devil who never knows his master is not a pleasing prospect. Buddhism and Indic religion proceed beyond time. Endless existence in time is not really more desirable: there, that word, desire. These things are not commodities for desire.

#### **04.30.14 Time to dismantle Tibetan Buddhism// PTSD and the fascist surrender syndrome// compassionate Buddha?? Bullshit**

The deep core of Tibetan Buddhism is under suspicion of some really upsetting facts in the dark rumors of the last generation. Osho gave the game away, but the message didn't quite sink in. After a while it creates a kind of sickness in people, a species of PTSD in the contradictions created by traditionalist authoritarian spirituality and modern notions of freedom and autonomy. The whole question of gurus and disciples is a pile of shit at this point, and I think the whole game is shot. This issue wrecked the Sufi milieu of EJ Gold who was unable or unwilling to discuss the issue, and seems to deliberately have left it hanging in a void of induced paranoia. In Jews this was a super puzzle. But I guess their Sufi brownshirts must have persuaded them to 'surrender'. They managed the miracle of 'surrender', Jews who would do the Heil Hitler and call themselves Sufis. One for Ripley's 'Believe it or not'.

The legacy of Tibetan Buddhism is under suspicion, and the failure of its leadership, the Dalai Lama, to address the issues is going to spell the doom of the movement. The lesson of Chogyam Trungpa is that the whole of Lamaism is sick with no viable future. You can't operate a fascist spiritual movement of ghost/bodhisattvas using a set of Tibetan peasants as fronts, trained parrots mouthing Buddhist slogans on cue in the involution of the spiritual hierarchy. Conceivably the whole sick routine was a comedy routine. But I think that we have lost the thread of the original tradition and the result now is a stillborn Tibetan Buddhism trying to eek out a future as a dead vampire. We don't need this corrupt remainder to take up the next centuries of a new era, displacing the chance of a really creative real 'new age' movement. Buddhism is dead, and Tibetan Buddhism is worse than dead.

This movement is dangerous because it demands submission to spiritual authority but allows no release via the liberation of consciousness into the field of enlightenment. The result is an army of dead orcs who have to fight the battles over the 'really dead dead' preying on the politics of vulnerable Western cultures. It could never have endured very long, and I think the short success of the Lamaist movement in the West is more of a death than a rebirth of dharma.

These are strong words and the traditional response of Tibetan operators is black magic (if not torture and death in the old kingdom of medievaly), but they dare not expend their in any case spent firepower in this area, although a few select victims could be vulnerable. We should be vigilant and out front in public, lest their old habits persist unbroken. I think we can at least put the game on defensive as it looks for an exit strategy into a real new age, a real future. But it can't do that in its current state without confessing to its real history, and on that score we can sit back and wait while the beast dies away.

In the meantime the real effect of Buddhism is a sickness, a form of PTSD that requires a resolution and an easy if slow cure in the refusal of all Buddhist, or other gurus, and some awareness of the plunder of autonomy involved in the creation of spiritual fascists, often across lives so the victim can make no connection.

The whole sick game is over, and the fight for the postmodern fascist coup to restore the lordship of antiquity is dismissed with a Bronx cheer, to start, and a countdown to a real spiritual war if the dead men waling in the Buddhist line can't get the message.

#### **04.29.14 Beyond Buddhism**

As per the previous post, it is true that most people can't imagine what is being talked about or how Buddhism could connect with Buddhism in some form. Perhaps it is almost better not to know! But the issues are not so complex, but they are not likely to ever enter public consciousness. We must be prepared to help people evade being set up by reactionary fascists using 'new age' fronts. You can see the whole confusion arising in Blavatsky's deceptive talk about spiritual powers, etc... Not much more is needed to fit the task of explanation to some...nonexistent facts. I think some skepticism is useful, but I think we should realize that something is needed for the future. People are giving us a warning without going into detail.

India has to restore something of their legacy from the root stock, and bypass standard Hinduism with its complications. That root stock is evidently what Osho was pointing to or trying to carry forward. Society is likely to abolish 'real Buddhism' as the path to enlightenment, and this will frustrate the issues further.

#### **New age movements and reactionary fascist Buddhism**

Don't misunderstand me: the new age movement is not the same as the 'path to enlightenment'. The latter is trying to give birth to itself in a new incarnation of Buddhism that is free of its past legacies. Osho claimed to be doing that, but we can't be sure of the result.

The 'new age' movement is a modernist sphere of study that began in the modern transition at around the time of Herder and Schopenhauer (or we could say in the period of the Reformation). It was unable to produce a path to enlightenment, although Schopenhauer stumbled into that, almost. It was then hijacked by the various seminal figures such as Blavatsky and Gurdjieff, both dishonest operators destined to cast false or confusing seeds, as Krishnamurti protested in a moment of bitterness.

Krishnamurti and Osho, however, seem to grasp the need for a new spirituality of the future.

The so-called 'new age' movement is thus a phase in transition. It seemed as if the whole game should be according to the ancient traditions of spiritual movements. The problem is that we don't really know what those were! Something was awry there from the start. The attacks on modernity were misconceived and doomed the 'new age' movements to being old age movements trying to fight modernity and restore ancient traditions. It seems logical on the surface, but it has produced confusion. Modernity is not the Kali Yuga or a degeneration. It is a complex advance in the progression of civilizations. One that was so isolated from Eurasia's larger context that it failed to properly reexpress a 'new age' in areas such as the Buddhism rapidly flooding into the West. But that immense movement belongs to an older era. As Buddhists themselves suspected protesting that modernity was false and should be destroyed with an occult anti-modernist movement. I think the 'old age' movements died with that fascist underground initiative that rapidly deviated into the calamities of the era of Nazism. I think Buddhism died with it, but no one realizes it yet. Time in its wisdom is using this Buddhist fad to rescue something from disaster in a move toward the future. The forms of the older Buddhism are destined to pass away. This is not even newsworthy. Look at the Jainism of Mahavir, the last of his lineage passing the baton to the first of a new, Gautama. Buddhism is destined probably to an institutional continuity (as was the post-Mahavir Jainism) but without its old fire.

It is hard to predict, but we can create our own 'prediction' by creating a new future beyond the old. I often feel that this was what animated Osho, but I am not able to speak for him. He is the one who accused Buddhist of fascism, outright Nazism. It is hard to proceed here with incomplete information.

One thing is clear: the false Buddhists who forced the issue of absolute obedience to the authority of spiritual hierarchy and then cashed in on this to stage fascism and genocide destroyed Buddhism as Gautama-ism and the rubble is all that is left. It may be that that was a way to destroy the movement, by its founder. He stated clearly his sense the future would

produce a new teacher. So much hype has arisen from that that we fail to see how directly insightful the Maitreya myth was, but one that has always foundered in nonsense as claimants attempt to take the title.

That is the way this series of epochs works, apparently. But it is hard to see how the future can generate a continuance of Buddhism. Perhaps the Osho path can do that. Or take a first step toward that. I don't feel automatic confidence in that.

#### **04.28.14 The end of the 'guru' legacy?! So how did the 'compassionate' Gautama create so many genocidal fascists? Answer, Gautama was long gone, no longer 'existed' as individuality**

The discussions of Gurdjieff strongly indicate the need to abolish the 'guru' legacy. If we can't create a form of the spiritual path leading to enlightenment without gurus then the whole tradition is likely to die of its own successes turning into failure. The question is relative. Getting help from a source is one thing, like going to a library, or seeking counsel from a wise person but the demands of absolute surrender, too often with an invisible political subtext, are a puzzle that isn't a puzzle at all. They are a corrupt and decadent brand of the guru legacy itself. This stance of surrender achieves no purpose: it doesn't lead to spiritual realization, in reality destroying the whole possibility.

The issue with Gurdjieff is a misfortune. This interloper outside the main tradition uses exotica to mesmerize a following. But that is never connected to anything definite and we suspect is a way to create drones in service of the operator, Gurdjieff, in life and beyond.

The situation in the Indian guru tradition is more complex and has repeatedly produced realized men. But I think the successes are due to something beyond the format of the guru. Many gurus indulge in spiritual energy games that produce the illusion of realization. All of that is beside the point.

The 'path' requires autonomous individuals, whatever the need to transcend autonomy. If it can't be done with autonomous individuals it is not doable at all. But here we have to face the complex history of Buddhism where a suspicious tradition of esoteric fascism emerged, or so it is charged. The situation is most probably nothing to do with Gautama who seems to have delayed the final nirvana until the medieval era, dumping the whole game on the Tibetans, and dissolved into nothing. We had better hope it is so.

Let's look at the paths of Osho and of Gautama himself: Osho had no guru, and Gautama had some very superficial contacts with peers, not 'gurus', as far as we know. In fact full story no doubt stretches over several lives, and we know little of any of that, the various biographies being mostly worthless.

The issue of Gurdjieff is frustrating. Over and over mesmerized outsiders plug his path, people kept well away from finding out the truth. Ouspensky is blamed for lack of surrender when in fact he surrendered far more than anyone should have done. His rejection of Gurdjieff has to be taken seriously. He could see that the guru game was going to be a problem.

The whole situation is an outrage against Ouspensky. It is Ouspensky's book that created the Gurdjieff movement, as Gurdjieff well knew (his own writings without Ouspensky would never have been able to survive, such is there obscurity). And one suspects the exile of Ouspensky was deliberate: Gurdjieff knew that he would have a rival here. Twice Gurdjieff played this trick: ensnaring highly intelligent outsiders (Ouspensky and Bennett, both with mathematical aptitude) and using them to create an attractor gravitating newcomers to his 'teacher' or 'guru sphere of hypnosis'. Ouspensky began to sense the way he was being used, but in the end fell into the trap completely with the publication of ISOM after his death. The book he wrote has created an almost unlimited power source for the dead spirit of G, for generations to come, the damage created rarely seen by the dupes who almost always got where they are from Ouspensky.

It is time the whole thing passed away into history. The movement has not created a single case of higher consciousness, although fakes like EJ.Gold arrived at an imitation via other Sufistic sources.

Bennett is another sad case: his brilliant book *The Dramatic Universe* was muddled by the addition of Gurdjieff elements. Bennett experienced a mysterious spiritual contact in the wake of his work with Ouspensky, before the second world war, and this led to a confusingly double project, on the one hand a brilliant set of ideas based on his Systematics, and then some Gurdjieff elements grafted on, corrupting the result. An example is the enneagram, which is most probably complete nonsense. Bennett convinced himself all these contradictions didn't matter, but his work as a result is confusing. Once you get a sense of the original project which comes from a different source his work makes better sense. Gurdjieff wrecked two individuals in this fashion of his exploitative method, and as many Sufis quietly realized the whole project was a failure.

You cannot mix scholarship with guru surrender games. You see the way this wrecked the *Dramatic Universe*. Many ideas of unsound basis enter the book as esoteric truths, no less, eroding the skeptical enquiry needed to bring off such a project. Much can be rescued from the *Dramatic Universe*, with the simple method of scholarly critique and analysis. What's left is a lot of Bennett, a mysterious brand of the ancient Samkhya, which should have nothing to do with Gurdjieff's purloined version, and a set of general philosophic and scientific ideas blended into an intriguing world history.

To see that Bennett unwitting stepped outside of the game plan read the fourth volume of *DU* and you will see something that contradicts the strategy of reactionary antimodernism that animates so much new age guruism and Gurdjieff in particular. The modern world is anathema and the rejection of modernity is basic to that. Bennett had no clue to that and actually entered a plug for communism in his depiction of the onset of a new age period in 1848. This blunder of Bennett has doomed his book in traditional groups, while the modernist crowd remains rightly suspicious.

So we see two brilliant individuals damaged by the guru context. Worse (read the Preface to *DU*) we suspect Gurdjieff didn't give a shit and thought the placement of some of his material in Bennett's book would be good for him. And so it has happened. The works of Bennett are all 'higher powered' by submission to the Gurdjieff sphere, which laughed all the way to the spirit bank at the easy attraction of many new students via the appeal of Bennett. The whole legacy is trash, and needs to be scrapped.

We need to be done with guru surrender games, which threatened the spiritual core of its victims, Sufi con artists and the abuse of magical elements to induce dangerous forms of hypnosis...in a short list.

And I am more than sure that Ouspensky in his next life realized to his horror how he had been cheated: he produced a book that was dynamite propaganda for Gurdjieff, while he himself in his next life was completely banned from any further contact with the 'work'. This strategy is horrendous, and so far is a brand of the perfect crime. Five hundred years from now the same racket will allow these spiritual criminals to feed off innocent suckers attracted by Ouspensky.

#### **04.27.14 New Age movement going bust**

After reading *The Three Magi* book on Osho, Crowley and Gurdjieff I have repented of my plug of Osho for leftists. Forget I mentioned it. The book did help me realize something that was true for many years, seventies to eighties: the three paths were scrambled from the start and cancelled out.

I really can't recommend Osho at this point for leftists on a revolutionary path. You will be rapidly penetrated by all sorts of demonic confusions. And I fear the same could be said of Christianity at this point. Christianity has strength in numbers: on the average the Christian community has a kind of spiritual protection circle, however often individuals fuck it up. But Christianity, as we all knew in the sixties, is almost worthless as a vehicle of development. If you are content to

be a robot for Christ, you will more than likely be able to function without demonic confusion in ordinary life. No more than that. Virtually all development is blocked in Christianity. We always knew that and embarked on the ways of development in Eastern paths/cults.

But after thirty five years I can see that every possibility there has been destroyed.

Sufism is, forget it. I have actually penetrated to its esoteric mystery, the solar plexus seed process. But can't use it, and will ignore the implant until after death when it will detach from the astral body. Women have a word for it. Abortion. Done. No more Sufi buggers.

Sufis are the most devious and confusing devils. It is impossible to trust such a mafia. Everything I have explored there, all of Idries Shah, has been useless. Deliberate deception. People like E.J. Gold make any Sufi path in the US dangerous. If he finds out you are on some path he will try to undermine it. The Gurdjieff gangster devils want to know your weaknesses, to exploit them and cause your downfall. These people started as gurus and ended up devils because it is a good business. These people are dangerous if they are able to seize control of your unconscious. Buddhism? The factor of Tibetan Buddhism has made Buddhism a waste of time. The Tibetans monopolize a huge zone of techniques, but these are by definition useless on a real path: these are bodhisattvas out to save you before the end of time. Great/ But in this life they may kill you if you are really serious on the path to enlightenment. In any case Tibetan Buddhism is a closed monopoly of a very few disembodied spirits. Forget it for yourself.

The other paths in Buddhism (we have had visitors here from various Thai/Hinayana paths), I don't know. I can't afford to travel to these places. They have left hundreds of comments on this blog, but never once introduced themselves or invited me to their situations. I got the message.

Yoga, I simply stop doing, given the way it has become a business. The local Buddhism in the US is being taken over by the New Atheist type of secularist: they wish to neutralize the whole game, and reduce everything to mindfulness, a complete crock.

The question is what can be done here? So long sucker. Not much. I think working toward a revolutionary future with a kind of default spirituality of nothing at all is one way to go. The early communists became atheists, materialists, and implacable enemies of all religion. I can see their point! But that itself is a vulnerable 'path'. But a slightly more elaborated 'null path' could be a good disguise, and even the materialist disguise is useful.

In fact a very simple path is open here; simple meditation. Don't take a single method from any source. Wikipedia can probably describe enough to start. Sitting can help to explore the way to a real path of your own. Another tactic is to schedule your days: how much will do you have? Have you been invultuated by an unseen power? The ability to follow a path of autonomy can sometimes expose those hidden devils. See what is obstructing your path, your life. You might notice that beginners are better off here. Long term practitioners come to the attention of hidden powers who will look for an entry into your sphere.

If a new communism could ever succeed in the creation of a new society, a clearing of the slate could rid the field of all these vultures and start over.

The left should simply study the issues of religion and be ready if they can ever help. Everyone in the spiritual sphere is so confused, leftist might actually be able to help.

Another source of help is Krishnamurti: his loathing and contempt for the whole sphere of New Agism was so total that he simply stands outside of it. You cannot bother such a spirit with your individuality. But as a refuge of sorts, it might help. That used to be the point of Buddhism. But expecting any refuge in that nightmare is unrealistic.

#### **04.29.14 Beyond Buddhism**

As per the previous post, it is true that most people can't imagine what is being talked about or how Buddhism could connect with Buddhism in some form. Perhaps it is almost better not to know! But the issues are not so complex, but they

are not likely to ever enter public consciousness. We must be prepared to help people evade being set up by reactionary fascists using 'new age' fronts. You can see the whole confusion arising in Blavatsky's deceptive talk about spiritual powers, etc... Not much more is needed to fit the task of explanation to some...nonexistent facts. I think some skepticism is useful, but I think we should realize that something is needed for the future. People are giving us a warning without going into detail.

India has to restore something of their legacy from the root stock, and bypass standard Hinduism with its complications. That root stock is evidently what Osho was pointing to or trying to carry forward. Society is likely to abolish 'real Buddhism' as the path to enlightenment, and this will frustrate the issues further.

New age movements and reactionary fascist Buddhism. Don't misunderstand me: the new age movement is not the same as the 'path to enlightenment'. The latter is trying to give birth to itself in a new incarnation of Buddhism that is free of its past legacies. Osho claimed to be doing that, but we can't be sure of the result.

The 'new age' movement is a modernist sphere of study that began in the modern transition at around the time of Herder and Schopenhauer (or we could say in the period of the Reformation). It was unable to produce a path to enlightenment, although Schopenhauer stumbled into that, almost. It was then hijacked by the various seminal figures such as Blavatsky and Gurdjieff, both dishonest operators destined to cast false or confusing seeds, as Krishnamurti protested in a moment of bitterness.

### **Krishnamurti and Osho, however, seem to grasp the need for a new spirituality of the future.**

The so-called 'new age' movement is thus a phase in transition. It seemed as if the whole game should be according to the ancient traditions of spiritual movements. The problem is that we don't really know what those were! Something was awry there from the start. The attacks on modernity were misconceived and doomed the 'new age' movements to being old age movements trying to fight modernity and restore ancient traditions. It seems logical on the surface, but it has produced confusion. Modernity is not the Kali Yuga or a degeneration. It is a complex advance in the progression of civilizations. One that was so isolated from Eurasia's larger context that it failed to properly reexpress a 'new age' in areas such as the Buddhism rapidly flooding into the West. But that immense movement belongs to an older era. As Buddhists themselves suspected protesting that modernity was false and should be destroyed with an occult anti-modernist movement. I think the 'old age' movements died with that fascist underground initiative that rapidly deviated into the calamities of the era of Nazism. I think Buddhism died with it, but no one realizes it yet. Time in its wisdom is using this Buddhist fad to rescue something from disaster in a move toward the future. The forms of the older Buddhism are destined to pass away. This is not even newsworthy. Look at the Jainism of Mahavir, the last of his lineage passing the baton to the first of a new, Gautama. Buddhism is destined probably to an institutional continuity (as was the post-Mahavir Jainism) but without its old fire.

It is hard to predict, but we can create our own 'prediction' by creating a new future beyond the old. I often feel that this was what animated Osho, but I am not able to speak for hi. He is the one who accused Buddhist of fascism, outright Nazism. It is hard to proceed here with incomplete information.

One thing is clear: the false Buddhists who forced the issue of absolute obedience to the authority of spiritual hierarchy and then cashed in on this to stage fascism and genocide destroyed Buddhism as Guatama-ism and the rubble is all that is left. It may be that that was a way to destroy the movement, by its founder. He stated clearly his sense the future would produce a new teacher. So much hype has arisen from that that we fail to see how directly insightful the Maitreya myth was, but one that has always foundered in nonsense as claimants attempt to take the title.

That is the way this series of epochs works, apparently. But it is hard to see how the future can generate a continuance of Buddhism. Perhaps the Osho path can do that. Or take a first step toward that. I don't feel automatic confidence in that.

#### **04.28.14 The end of the 'guru' legacy?! So how did the 'compassionate' Gautama create so many genocidal fascists? Answer, Gautama was long gone, no longer 'existed' as individuality**

The discussions of Gurdjieff strongly indicate the need to abolish the 'guru' legacy. If we can't create a form of the spiritual path leading to enlightenment without gurus then the whole tradition is likely to die of its own successes turning into failure. The question is relative. Getting help from a source is one thing, like going to a library, or seeking counsel from a wise person but the demands of absolute surrender, too often with an invisible political subtext, are a puzzle that isn't a puzzle at all. They are a corrupt and decadent brand of the guru legacy itself. This stance of surrender achieves no purpose: it doesn't lead to spiritual realization, in reality destroying the whole possibility.

The issue with Gurdjieff is a misfortune. This interloper outside the main tradition uses exotica to mesmerize a following. But that is never connected to anything definite and we suspect is a way to create drones in service of the operator, Gurdjieff, in life and beyond.

The situation in the Indian guru tradition is more complex and has repeatedly produced realized men. But I think the successes are due to something beyond the format of the guru. Many gurus indulge in spiritual energy games that produce the illusion of realization. All of that is beside the point.

The 'path' requires autonomous individuals, whatever the need to transcend autonomy. If it can't be done with autonomous individuals it is not doable at all. But here we have to face the complex history of Buddhism where a suspicious tradition of esoteric fascism emerged, or so it is charged. The situation is most probably nothing to do with Gautama who seems to have delayed the final nirvana until the medieval era, dumping the whole game on the Tibetans, and dissolved into nothing. We had better hope it is so.

Let's look at the paths of Osho and of Gautama himself: Osho had no guru, and Gautama had some very superficial contacts with peers, not 'gurus', as far as we know. In fact full story no doubt stretches over several lives, and we know little of any of that, the various biographies being mostly worthless.

The issue of Gurdjieff is frustrating. Over and over mesmerized outsiders plug his path, people kept well away from finding out the truth. Ouspensky is blamed for lack of surrender when in fact he surrendered far more than anyone should have done. His rejection of Gurdjieff has to be taken seriously. He could see that the guru game was going to be a problem. The whole situation is an outrage against Ouspensky. It is Ouspensky's book that created the Gurdjieff movement, as Gurdjieff well knew (his own writings without Ouspensky would never have been able to survive, such is there obscurity). And one suspects the exile of Ouspensky was deliberate: Gurdjieff knew that he would have a rival here.

Twice Gurdjieff played this trick: ensnaring highly intelligent outsiders (Ouspensky and Bennett, both with mathematical aptitude) and using them to create an attractor gravitating newcomers to his 'teacher' or 'guru sphere of hypnosis'. Ouspensky began to sense the way he was being used, but in the end fell into the trap completely with the publication of ISOM after his death. The book he wrote has created an almost unlimited power source for the dead spirit of G, for generations to come, the damage created rarely seen by the dupes who almost always got where they are from Ouspensky. It is time the whole thing passed away into history. The movement has not created a single case of higher consciousness, although fakes like EJ.Gold arrived at an imitation via other Sufistic sources.

Bennett is another sad case: his brilliant book *The Dramatic Universe* was muddled by the addition of Gurdjieff elements. Bennett experienced a mysterious spiritual contact in the wake of his work with Ouspensky, before the second world war, and this led to a confusingly double project, on the one hand a brilliant set of ideas based on his Systematics, and then some Gurdjieff elements grafted on, corrupting the result. An example is the enneagram, which is most probably complete nonsense. Bennett convinced himself all these contradictions didn't matter, but his work as a result is confusing. Once you get a sense of the original project which comes from a different source his work makes better sense.

## **07.25.14 The solution is simple: NEVER submit to the spiritual authority of SUFIS, or more especially the false construct of authority created in the Gurdjieff 'work'**

The previous post on Ouspensky reinforces what we have said here many times. The solution is simple: NEVER submit to the spiritual authority of SUFIS, or more especially the false construct of authority created in the Gurdjieff 'work'. All the basic concepts are misleading, mystifications, and worse. They are all bogus. What is the work? and what grounds are there for 'ends justifies the means' criminality in the people who do the work? None whatever. The whole game is a series of non-standard redefinitions by Gurdjieff. The work, the fourth way school, are bogus constructs designed to displace definition behind the mystique of artificial propaganda.

The idea of a fourth way school generates tremendous stress in its victims who are cautioned about the extreme rarity of such schools, and the reasons for total submission lest such a unique opportunity be lost....

That crap surrounds Gold's totally hyped idiocy about what he calls his 'school'.

The discussions of fourth way schools in Ouspensky are so overhyped that one should be suspicious at once. No actual 'school' could match the near sci-fi requirements.

NEVER fall for the 'fourth way school' deception.

**<http://darwiniana.com/2015/02/26/reply-to-nk-the-Sufi-soul-question/>**

<http://darwiniana.com/2015/02/25/nk-comments-the-strangeness-of-the-soul-question/>

Why would I get the left to take up the Sufi soul question...?

The issue of the Sufi 'soul' question was active in my life decades ago when I briefly encountered the world of E.J. Gold and his circle of ambiguous people, i.e. fascist Jews. This didn't have anything to do with Gold, as far as I know.

My alarm at this situation was made worse when I realized the Sufi handlers in the background seemed to be trying to create some fascist Jews to use this 'soul seed' phenomenon. A very scary situation. As it happened, the Jewish leader here seems to have seen insanity in action and retreated from it.

\So there it is: a reactionary right experiment trying to fix some 'smart' Jews in a fascist stance to operate the 'soul' technology. To the extent that I get this situation rightly.

There is a funny law to life: such an abomination will undergo karmic/dialectical reversal and end up in the lap of the left, to the hysterical hatred from the right.

You know I think? I think this ancient spiritual technique is lost to civilization. And I think the demiurgic powers behind this must have moved in to put a stop to all this.

This was about the time I myself intersected with this soul question, in the context of a buttoned down pious western Sufi, Reshad Field. I think he sensed what was going on, but I am not sure.

Just about this time I was conned into a kind one on one training situation that suddenly animated this 'seed' process as it flushed into the conscious awareness field as a brief higher consciousness experience, a form of spiritual candy, like dope except better. Out of the blue a mysterious Arab appeared for a visit with the girl providing the coaching and to the classic story of Mulla Nasrudin and the theft of his fruit which I had mentioned, he smiled and soon left, and the 'energy' of the conscious experience was gone. That was the end of that. The soul seed phenomenon could be flushed out into a state of higher consciousness, highly vulnerable to dissipation, and, with a rogue Sufi, ripped off.

It was after this that I began wandering through the streets of Los Angeles muttering to myself so I guess it was important.

But in a way I was lucky: I had seen something remarkable and had learned a strange lesson, and, also, I was freed at once from any obligation to Sufis. The Sufi experience was over almost as soon as it started, and I was free of it, although such momentary experience of 'enlightenment' was vulnerable to mundane manipulations and was only a form of conscious energy and not the real thing.

I don't think this was the point of the phenomenon, which should be a background to a lifetime of development. So I remain unclear of what is going on. But I suspect the whole game is shot to hell.

But I am suspicious now of the way that esoteric gangsters have manufactured fascists. So I think the question should be flushed out in the open.

If I am right about demiurgic powers, we should realize they exist in the time-frame of the solar system, and their intersection with man is not on the level of cocktail party gossip: it may be more like looking at man through a microscope between tens of millennia and ordinary human time. It could take a long time to discover one of their experiments had gone awry.

I can't fill out this picture or be sure of its outlines, but the point here is the left has by a kind of karmic rebound stepped into this quagmire as a result of doing nothing, and it is a question as to how a leftist challenge to rancid reactionary fascist spirituality at the highest level could ever be handled by 'historical materialists' oblivious to reality. Better hope the tooth fairy will rush in to give guidance as the xth/umpteenth Internationale sends in its Sufi rat patrol.

It may be time to lock historical materialists in a Zen monastery until they can contact reality, and be ready to challenge the fascist core remnant in a number of spiritual constellations.

But the question of spiritual fascism, which I suspect was rampant in response to the Russian revolution through the twenties to thirties, requires careful study by the left, itself not choir of saints.

A new left has to be pretty sophisticated for the future that is coming, and my diatribes against historical materialism are mostly away to make a point. And let us grant that rightists were as afraid of leftists as leftists were of fascists. In a funny way the materialist bent of Marxists has protected them, but at some point a broader perspective is needed.

We may be out of time to repair historical materialism. Order a rubberstamp marked 'Refile under Classical Samkhya' and the job is done. But actually this is a pretty good example of the gist of histomat and its exposure of ideology and religion.

## **02.25.15 From Darwiniana // soul and Sufistic legacies**

Soul and Sufistic legacies

February 24th, 2015

<http://darwiniana.com/2015/02/22/soul-questions-flubbed-by-neuroscience/comment-page-1/#comment-728121>

I have been running the Gurdjieff Con blog for many years, but didn't know of this critique. I will discuss it further over at that blog. But I have often pointed to the many confusions in Gurdjieff's corpus. Unfortunately it didn't follow that he was some kind of charlatan. He as a dangerous occult figure for whom the teaching was mostly rubbish dished out to cover the less public part.

I know of absolutely no teaching, including the Buddhist, which has gotten spiritual psychology straight. People can reach enlightenment without figuring out how they work, fortunately.

I must interject here my discussion of the 'soul' issue in Sufism, with a suspicion that this was what Gurdjieff was talking about. If not, it is what the Sufis aren't talking about but which transmits through their schools unspoken, and not often even there.

I have a suspicion people grow 'souls' in this manner, none the wiser for the whole cascade of gibberish on these subjects, not least the Theosophical. The structure is almost impossible to figure out, but the Sufi world had a way to guide people with the injection of what I called the 'plexus seed' phenomenon which takes over the soul question. This method can be applied to congregations who are not experts in spiritual psychology. It suddenly happens to members of a group of students, who usually then disperse. There is no further instruction after that. It is this I suspect Gurdjieff was talking about, indirectly. I am not sure. His disciples don't seem to know what was meant. Did Gurdjieff?

But he seems to be saying that early Egyptian religion was a source for this. Implying, I think, that this process was present in early Christianity.

The reality is stark:

We have no traditions that we can reliably point to as expositions of the truth about man. The only safe approach is some form of 'Buddhism 101', making it clear there is not monopoly here for 'Gautama Buddhists'. The whole tradition springs from primordial Shaivism and then passes into the forms of Jainism which pass into the brilliant recreation of Gautama. This path does not create a soul, but shows the way beyond the samsaric manifestations. The theosophical whole nine yards can be filed away along with all your other mislaid notes.

Until someone can produce some real answers here I would be wary of the Sufi soul game, if you ever run across it. Keep in mind that a real path has to be workable for a shepherd at the ends of the earth who never attended school. The Sufis and early Christians were able to achieve this.

In any case, as noted, all humans of our species already have 'souls' of some kind. This is connected with the basic apparatus of man seen in the accounts like the Tibetan book of the dead where at death the personality is dropped but the basic human passes through the bardo world.

Sufis who enter this process (as I have explained, I intersected briefly with this, but aborted from the process) never see the source. It is not a function controlled by Sufi sheiks (as far as I know) but which suddenly appears when that figure seems to think his students ready. The process simply appears and I fear most abort without being able to figure what is happening. Thus the secret protects itself.

The die is cast now. In the next phase of civilization these ancient spiritual technologies will enter the public sphere. In the nonce, stay with the 'Buddhist' type path. Getting entangled with rogue Sufis isn't worth it.

I was a casualty here, I suspect, but have since recovered and moved toward a yogic type teaching.

Here another confusion arises: the emergence of Mahayana Buddhism in concert with the onset of Christianity.

– See more at: <http://darwiniana.com/2015/02/24/soul-and-Sufistic-legacies/#sthash.491x5T1W.dpuf>

### **02.24.15 The soul question**

<http://darwiniana.com/2015/02/24/soul-and-Sufistic-legacies/>

### **02.22.15 Soul: the Sufi wild goose chase // and the reality of 'soul stuff'**

<http://darwiniana.com/2015/02/22/neuroscience-and-the-soul/>

<http://darwiniana.com/2015/02/22/soul-questions-flubbed-by-neuroscience/>

The question of soul is very confused because it is surrounded by disinfo and sharks like Gurdjieff who never quite speak the truth. But he did elect to reveal certain questions in public. We should grant him his nerve to try and communicate hidden traditions, getting them baloxed in the process.

I am unsure if Gurdjieff understood the Sufi question of soul, or, if he did, whether this was theoretical without a direct contact with the practice of the plexus seed phenomenon. Idries Shah warned that two identical spiritual groups can exist together under a similar name, one real, the other fake. This dreadful possibility warns us to be wary of Gurdjieff. I see no conclusive evidence he was connected to a real 'soul creation' process. Or rather that he didn't share that with his students, merely issuing public info. None of his students seem to be connected, and surely one of them would have leaked some hints (as I am doing now).

I don't know. But I find it quite interesting to consider if this in fact was what was first appearing in early Egypt, or Mesopotamia as a whole. This apparently would have been seen in terms of the exotic soul beliefs we see in so many Egyptian artifacts, with no understanding.

What about Greece: they are multiple signs of spiritual schools and Egypt was but a boat ride away.

It is possible this obscure tradition emerged in early Christianity, dying out later, and then reappeared in Islam. It is possible to apply this teaching to a flock of disciples without their understanding of what is going on.

But in his confusion, as we have discussed it here, about proto-Christianity in pre-sand Egypt, and this confused with fourth way schools, a dubious concept, may point to an obvious issue: we have tried to suggest the spiritual ferment of the high Neolithic after 5500 BCE and pointed to primordial Shaivism in India (with Dionysus in Greece). In this context it is possible there was a similar phenomenon in Egypt (with another question mark about Sumer) and that this was a primordial type of spiritual tradition that later stages a reentry in a new disguise in early Christianity.

The traditions of yoga and Buddhism are open, with clear manuals and practical advice and have produced thousands of enlightened beings. The traditions here of 'soul' in the Occident, are nothing but a pain of the neck with almost endless bum steers and mostly the silence of the ages to the 'exoteric multitude'.

In the 'Sufi' version, the 'soul' question comes with a definite 'plexus seed process' sensed as a presence in the lower abdomen and while it can be sensed (a significant fact) it is somehow beyond the manipulations of the will. This is a process that apparently takes over the body apparatus of the individual and from there the soul in some new sense emerges. But the process just happens and comes with no FAQ or instructions, and is never the grant of any explicit individual. Most of the time the process aborts, but there seem to be second chances here.

As with my case, people who speak are often those who know least, so the reality of this in the Sufi world is unknown. I have made clear why I chose to abort this process, and I got some 'advice' for other sources that during the bardo transition the seed core will be stripped from the body.

There is a great danger in this process given its hidden core of becoming a potted plant in some demonic Sufi realm. It is a dark puzzle, and hard to fathom but it is pretty clear evidence that the 'soul' issue is mostly chatter, the reality something dramatically specific.

I think however that this line in the greater traditions of antiquity has been a botch. Look at the fulsome glory of general Buddhist (i.e. more than Gautama's Buddhism) traditions. They help people on the way and speak clearly of enlightenment.

This other world is very difficult to understand.

We have said here many times that man as homo sapiens already has a soul, and this is sturdy, but not ultimately immortal 'forever', but a basic construct that can serve his search in the space of history and evolution.

It is strange scandal that none of this is open knowledge. But the die is cast now. The reality is being leaked, and the next epoch will likely see some resolution of the physics of these issues.

I suspect, but don't know, that this process gets confused with kundalini, but they are not the same, and in general all those distinct legacies are in a muddle.

I don't feel bad about discussing this: the crooks who run this game are not trustworthy and until the reality is made clear without bullshitters like Gurdjieff and most other Sufis, it is not worth the aggravation of getting into a 'me too' frame of mind. Do something real, to start: meditation in the style of Buddhism. I doubt if very many Sufis have any contact with this now. The reason my first experience ended in being cleverly sought out by a gang of rogue occultists who were able to coax this process to bleed out in a clever 'theft of Baraka'.

Much later the process tried to return for a second chance, but I refuse to cooperate and will abort the process as soon as possible. If I have not done so already.

This is closer to Mephisto than Buddha, so be glad you are not a part of the process.

But future science will have to deal reckon this in any future evolution of man. The time is not ripe, but surely ripening.

It is time for some foolhardy science jocks to enter this process and try to produce something for the moderns of the future. But you don't call them, they call you.

I have already given my view of Sufis, the biggest bums in spiritual history. Gurdjieff wasn't the only bloodthirsty devil here.

### **Laying waste to Ouspensky**

Gurdjieff shows the dangers of 'soul creation' in this Sufi sense: you crystallize around the issues of an ancient civilization and then rebound into modernity and are disoriented by the way the future wasn't according to expectation. Modern civilization is not a decline, democracy isn't a sin against god, and the whole aura of the ancient spiritual teacher is grossly inappropriate.

And the issue of Ouspensky is a failure on the standards of antiquity: Gurdjieff was privileged to deal with an ancient Buddhist: Ouspensky seems to have been a venerable old Arhant and was not in the Sufi mould at all. Gurdjieff had no right to trash this person just because he wouldn't submit. Bullshit. Ouspensky should have been a realized Buddha in a totally different context and never fallen victim to this Sufi gangster peddling a hopeless muddle.

And the problem here is the way Gurdjieff has no standard of truth and simply spins the tale: the fourth way school refers to nothing we can point to in history.

Ouspensky deserved better than to be destroyed by Gurdjieff.

The Buddhist and Sufi way are different: if you crowd a soul you block enlightenment, and like Gurdjieff are able to reincarnate, here as a kind of demon. It seems like the way to go, but reality seems bizarre.

### **02.21.15 Gurdjieff ignited the war against gurus...**

Reading Patterson's book on Gurdjieff I am struck by the naïveté, and the failure to see the context. In later years students would discover that Gurdjieff thought the peasants better off under the Tsar, thought slavery should be the norm, and that his 'disciples' should also be slaves de facto to the master...And it is worse than that.

To arrive in Russia during a proletarian revolution with this mindset was not only unbecoming in a 'master' but a totally reckless throwing down the gauntlet, in a period that would see the fascist reaction to democratic governments.

I think Gurdjieff must have been stupid, as are many monarchs, and provoked his own discombolulation. It is part of the reactionary mindset that thinks modernity is a mistake and deserves to be taught a lesson. It is little wonder that Ouspensky balked. A teaching like this as he sensed wasn't checking out. And his instincts were right, even though he himself was a reactionary super idiot with his book on establishing the Code of Manu.

C'mon guys: this wasn't the way to do it and I think that Ouspensky was right to refuse and move away. And he was right to think that the 'fourth way' (a phantom with some meaning) and the rest of it had to be independent of Gurdjieff: a student here could not be the passive slave of a 'master'.

These people got asskicked by reality, and the irony is that the 'teaching' was actually designed as we can see for men of the future, free men.

Here Osho made one mistake: he said a few good things about Gurdjieff (besides his criticisms). The result is that the G entity is all over the place in the Commune. Unsafe against the onslaughts of attempted take over.

These people are dangerous for westerners steeped in the ideals of freedom: a war with the guru over 'total surrender' can break out and the 'disciple' is destroyed. This shows the dangers of the guru game in the West.

To be fair Gurdjieff in the 30's so frustrated he actually contacted the Russian embassy for a visa to return to Russia. He was turned down.

## **02.18.15 All the soul peddlers I have met are 'Sufi' crooks. Take a rain check**

I will try to re-summarize what I know about the 'higher being body' question in the book by Patterson. But this is not an easy or safe subject. I have a lot of enemies who attack over and over to try and debilitate me, and it is almost impossible to even work along a meditation path. But at this point ironically it can't get much worse and is beginning to damp off. I know very little here but I think the Gurdjieff brand here has failed. As far as I know all the people in the Patterson circuit have been used for decades to reproduce public information, none of them with any real contact with the 'soul' question.

The factors of soul in some sense are the birth right of all individuals *homo sapiens*, but it is not the same as what Sufis are doing here. The confusion of the whole subject with demonic individuals undermines confidence in the whole thing, which is entirely masked by disinfo. You don't want to develop 'soul' under the aegis of Sufi gangsters. Best to forget it. The questions of soul for ordinary religions, usually monotheistic, are more or less clear, and yet cluttered with useless beliefs. Clarification there can help. The situation is changing: the 'secular' age is trying to translate the core religious content of the monotheisms into a more contemporary format. But no one knows how to do that. The soul has to be the case, it would seem, for a creature as complex as man: his 'equipment' partly stands outside of space-time, so the question is, well...elementary, maybe even to Sherlock Homes, Watson who knows...

Gurdjieff's talk of pre-sand Egypt fourth way schools simply doesn't compute. If what he meant was a Neolithic Egypt cult after the style of parallels like the Shiva cult, etc, all I can say is maybe.

The term fourth way school is a bungled concept and doesn't work. No one can point to one anywhere in history. But the concept was carefully laid out by Ouspensky: it is based on a larger concept of meditation in action that works on body, emotions, intellect, and a 'fourth' integrating factor. The definition sounds legit but garbled in transmission.

The Indian example of primordial Shaivism (not the same as the much later 'Shaivism' as branch of Hinduism, if you look at the robust images of the ancient 'still present but' Shiva 'religion' with its profusion images, practices, and hybrid yoga/worship with proto-yogis still embedded in the larger cult it is possible to at least conceive of how Neolithic humans could approach a sophisticated version of 'consciousness transformation' (i.e. meditation) in long ago eras, and perhaps this even goes back into the Paleolithic. The point is that anyone *homo sapiens* can reach 'enlightenment' even if a

technological primitive. And what is indicated by a 'four term' meditation is something complicated to figure, but probably easy if the right 'energy' is there, even for a person in the Neolithic. It appears to be along the lines of a mindfulness technique except somewhat larger in scope. But Gurdjieff keeps making things up, and holding back in all cases the practical keys to its use. So the idea of an Egyptian religious cult before the later era of the Pyramids is perfectly possible. But we have no evidence there. In fact the evidence may be so totally abundant as to be obvious, if we knew how to decode the clear outward signs.

## 02.16.15 Gurdjieff and other monsters

I can't think of anything crueller than the Gurdjieff legacy of issuing disinfo on the question of soul formation. The latter is real, but should have had a more compassionate presentation that didn't throw the greater public into panicked confusion of being left out. I went through this issue years ago and learned later that it simply wasn't worth it. Who cares about enduring a millions years of deluded and demonic existence as an old soul in the ages of the solar system. Buddhism speaks clearly of looking for a way out. With enough torture you will agree with the Buddhas. You will discover to your horror early on the truth of Buddha's First Noble Truth. But we can't forbid the universe from what it is in its totality. Clearly soul formation is an aspect of hominizations and began at the dawn of man. So it is misleading to confront 'soul peddlers'. But whatever the case, the truth here is impossible to find in the mass of lies. It would seem clear that man as man has a 'temporary soul' and a certain amount of time and lives to reach 'salvation' or liberation. The latter are real, distinct, and not well handled by the monotheistic religions.

I would skip the Gurdjieff/Sufi brand here and move along a Buddhist line. Still, correct information is not available, not to me or Gurdjieff, so we have to consider the future of man that can find some form of science in this madness. Just don't go making pacts with devils for soul formation. What you have now is a Volkswagen, and is enough to start. Don't get greedy for a Rolls Royce.

Judged carefully the issues of human completion suggest a vehicle of the will where the Buddhist/Indic religions speak only of liberation. I don't know, but it appears all the representatives of the former are demonic. That's a slap in the face, to be sure. The reality is unknown. But I think that the disinfo here has wrecked the lives of almost all the later students of Gurdjieff. As noted, we find people writing books on chakras and Gurdjieff's higher bodies. No one will even bother to correct you. A hidden cabal of rogue Sufis play on interest and fear and carrot dangle foolish suckers until they are ready to drop dead.

The larger realm of cosmic beings is something else and we begin to suspect a realm of demiurgic powers is at work in the larger system of higher material existence toward which man aspires but is so far too primitive to understand. But we suspect therefore that spiritual anomalies like Gurdjieff might represent distorted perversions of this unknown realm. Christians got a distorted mythology here unwitting pointing to this with the nonsense about angels and angelic powers. The lore of the Apocrypha suggest the need to a more careful look at the earlier 'religious' lore from Sumer onward. But the crackpot literature here is almost too overwhelming to sort out (at least for me). Much of the exotic near-myth history of early civilization in the crackpot zone might conceivably be point to something, despite looking like the ravings of people in straightjackets.

But the study of WHEE starts to close in on these archaeological myths. We can see that a global phenomenon of stupendous innovation, the Axial period, starts to look downright automated. A larger spiritual influence is not doubt there but they are invisible and the real change we can see is the result of some kind of macro transformation.

Bennett's discussion mixes modes and suggests that we are in a food chain with higher beings. That's a calamity for esoteric religion, and has turned the whole game into the paranoia of figures like Gurdjieff, forced into the vampire game of preying on disciples as food. The cosmic loony bin is very large.

If higher cosmic beings depended on man for 'food' the universe would be a madhouse of supernatural predators. So, is that the case?

But beyond that Bennett's introduction to the idea of demiurgic powers can at least be useful as the lesser of crackpot notions taken as hypothesis, compared to what you find if you google 'nephilism', etc...

The issue won't go away because the 'soul' question I suspect is really about advanced technological forms of 'spiritual materialism'. Without understanding and in the hands of 'secondary sources' from rogue Sufis like Gurdjieff you are better off in the realm of the Buddhas.

### **Not getting taken for a ride on 'pre-sand' Egypt**

Note: The idea of an early form of Christianity and/or the fourth way in pre-sand Egypt momentarily stopped me from seeing the obvious. The correlation with the significant period ca. 5500 BCE momentarily caught my interest.

But the general model of the macro effect exposes immediately the dubious character of the claim. The stream and sequence analog shows that in the cases we have there is never a transitional effect twice in succession in the same stream. The point should be obvious on other grounds: the period around 5500BCE shows Egypt in a very primitive state. Civilizations were barely into the mastery of pottery (an earlier Neolithic innovation). It would seem that Egypt in the stream and sequence aspect of our model is a completely typical case of a 'stream' history developing in a diffusion field (i.e. Mesopotamia, Sumer itself being before its major period after 3000BCE) then suddenly entering a major transitional interval as it becomes an exemplar of the master sequence, in parallel with the also transitional Sumer. A miniature Axial Age. This in the centuries leading up to 3000 BCE. A double transition in succession in Egypt would be a squandering of energy in a system trying to minimax a global integration with two tricks: intermittent sequences generating a mainline and starting at the navel of the Eurasian system, i.e. the Middle East, and parallel sidewinders suddenly appearing after a period of early growth in a diffusion field. The state of Egyptian religion prior to 3000 BCE is unclear. This does not prove there wasn't some early religious phenomenon somewhere early on here. But I don't see any evidence. However the question of religion in the Neolithic is under suspicion of hiding something that leads to later developments. In the case of India, I claimed that primordial Shaivism, with its side aspects of yogis, begins in the Neolithic. But once again India around 5500 BCE becomes an object of curiosity. But again this zone is still in a stream aspect and will exhibit a transition only millennia later in the Axial Age. So the sources of Shaivism and the form they took, and whether yogis understood what Buddhists and later yogis understood are unclear. The attempt to squeeze everything into an Indo-European mould in the period after 2000BCE doesn't work. WE can easily get a hint or a glimpse if we examine the later cults of Shiva and/or Krishna: we see how the practices of yoga can be carried by a very exotic and colorful general religious cult such as we see to this day in India.

---

<http://www.gurdjieff-con.net/2015/02/14/review-of-patterson-book-on-gurdjieff/>

I added a note to the review of the Patterson book. One should be wary of anything Gurdjieff says whatsoever. I am not sure of the status of claims for the greater antiquity of the pyramids, but unless I am mistaken this is falling by the wayside these days.

Students of world history might look at my WHEE and its periodization of world history. This is controversial itself, but used with care we suspect a progression of epochs of some kind and our increasing knowledge is in any case pushing back the origins of Egypt/Sumer. We are confused by the sudden transition just before 3000 BCE which ushered in a spectacular era of advancing civilization in Sumer and Egypt. But the real origins of Sumer lie in the periods of the Neolithic, and the period around 5500 BCE is the projected onset of a new prior era. Whatever the case the history of Egypt lags behind that of Sumer but then it takes off in the later period around 3000 BCE. It is not necessary to use this

model or its periodization, but it reflects the data fairly well. Can we really see advanced religious schools in the era before 3000 BCE in Egypt?

In any case to move historical discussions back to before the Neolithic (8000 BCE onwards) and its immediately prior epoch (10000 to 8000 BCE) is always dubious and can never be taken as true without evidence, for which there is none that I know.

It is not clear to what extent the Sumerian world influenced Egypt before 3000 BCE. We suspect that the era after 6000 BCE or later up to 3000 BCE was seminal for later Sumer as we know it now, and it is entirely possible that Egypt began to develop in concert or with a somewhat delayed parallel.

Note in the link below that 'pre-sand Egypt' is pegged at around 5500 BCE. I suspect but can't prove that this period was a seminal one all the way to India and beyond. What may be the case is not the nonsense from West et al. about the antiquity of the Sphinx but a distorted echo of something seminal at the dawn of Egyptian prehistory moving toward history.

[http://www.gurdjiefflegacy.org/60gine/pre\\_sand.htm](http://www.gurdjiefflegacy.org/60gine/pre_sand.htm)

The model in WHEE must be used with extreme care and shouldn't be employed for projections without evidence. The periodization is purely conjectural prior to 3000 BCE. But it often scores correctly even in this earlier periods. Before the invention of writing around the 3000 BCE era documentation is almost non-existent, although archaeology is rapidly finding better data for these periods.

Again the roots of later Egyptian religion in the centuries before 3000 BCE require serious evidence. The roots of the Osirian religion(s) await some future clarification, and would seem indeed to have a very distant resemblance to some of the much later Christian themes. The Egyptian gnostics fall into place here possibly as holding some early form of teaching about human consciousness, mixed with a confusing mythology. We simply don't know much here.

I think the claims of Gurdjieff here can be destructive. Christianity and Judaism spring from an Axial Age transformation starting in the period after 900 BCE to 600 BCE and we can see how the roots of a set of religions can spring rapidly from remorphed legacies (indeed, the very Egyptian tradition discussed) very rapidly in a transitional period. To reduce Christianity to an echo of Egyptian religion misses the point that the religion shows its backing in a tremendous transformation of the Axial period. We can't just sling around speculations about it being taken without change from an earlier period.

In one way it is a dead ringer to claim an influence of Egyptian religion on Axial Age monotheism. Even when we take into account the severe mythologization of the Old Testament it is obvious that it is a tale of Egypt's influence on the onset of monotheism in the tale of Moses, factual or not. The history of Atenism is of course very significant.

Googling pre-sand Egypt:

<https://www.google.com/search?q=presand+egypt&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8>

### **02.15.15 Confusions of soul questions**

The questions of soul are confused by all parties. The references to soul formation in Gurdjieff are apparently a variant of a Sufi tradition, but it is not clear if Gurdjieff was or was not connected to that.

Consider Schopenhauer's view: similar to the Indic: at death a man as yogis note shows (since he may lose consciousness) the way he was never born never died: there is an aspect of self that is already beyond space and time. The question of 'soul' therefore is either something else, or a fuzzy term that means several things. This basic situation is all Buddhists need to enter the path of enlightenment.

Our discussion of two forms of consciousness might apply here: at death a man tends to 'lose consciousness' stripped of psychological ego as the vision of the 'clear light' as substrate emerges.

The catering to an elite with a secret doctrine doesn't find favor with the spiritual beings behind religions of spiritual equality. The confusion of soul and immortality is thus built in.

Sit down and watch Black Hawk Down, about Somalia. (My argument can't work for a movie, but a photograph of Somalian somewhere would do). Locate the Sufis in this movie (or the photograph).

My point, religions like the monotheisms, and the Buddhist types are different but similar, of Christianity and Islam, spread invisibly across the globe and have a dimension in relation to soul that is not visible on the outside. These religions carry the same species of man with his basic spiritual/psychological 'soul'. The dimension pointed to by Gurdjieff is something else, as far as I know. Somalia could well have more realized Sufis than the US. Note that Buddhists on the path of enlightenment do fine with the basic apparatus thus described, without the 'fancy soul' add-ons mysteriously rumored of in the few leaks like those of Gurdjieff. The question of Christianity is thus simply unclear. It seems to have lost what it pioneered, a Sufistic-type core. Too many rogue gnostics, like today, maybe like Gurdjieff, or not.

If a halfway intelligent form of 'communist' civilization replaced that the hidden guides would surely infiltrate benignly to include all men. And no one would even know they were there. It wouldn't require the god fanaticism of an earlier but it would need to be a halfway intelligent and broad perspective. Our accounts of modernity are misleading: the secular outcome revolves better around the last phase of the Reformation, the figures of Kant, Hegel, and Schopenhauer creating a universe that can include almost everything. They are fallible philosophers, not spiritual prophets. The materialism of the era of positivism is a sudden break in the continuity of the early modern. But materialism is OK too, after all the whole of Indic religion can be seen in terms of a form of Samkhya materialism. But materialism was a phase trying to deal with religious hypnosis. At this point the left should loosen up a bit. The real issue perhaps was that there is no going back. We can't recreate an earlier era of religion. The slate is being wiped clean to reset.

It is not clear if Gurdjieff even knew of the larger question. The confusion is almost endless. Consider this book (which I haven't read):

[http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/0615982867/ref=ox\\_sc\\_act\\_title\\_2?ie=UTF8&psc=1&smid=A1IK43E02MC6SV](http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/0615982867/ref=ox_sc_act_title_2?ie=UTF8&psc=1&smid=A1IK43E02MC6SV):

Higher Being Bodies: A Non-Dualistic Approach to the Fourth Way, With Hope

Does the author understand the subject? A commenter protests that he has mixed in the issues of the chakras. Thus apparently the book gets it wrong. Note this. Most of the followers of Gurdjieff did not really receive a real form of the teaching, which is what? Sufism? Pre-sand Egyptian Christianity? It is impossible to know.

This blog has described some aspects of this question. For myself it seems the Buddhist approach is more productive, but that may just show my ignorance.

In any case the issue of soul as immortality is misleading. And the aura of Gurdjieff is dreadful. This Mephisto dealing with Faust, not sweet Jesus with his flock.

I am not really in a position to pass judgment here. Clearly the 'soul' question is in limbo still as man creates a science foundation (at this point totally misleading) that might help. But figures like Kant and Schopenhauer are cogent reminders that the metaphysical boundary of the noumenal or, for Schopenhauer, the thing in itself is a very real barrier to perception and knowledge.

## **Exposing the enneagram fraud**

A review of one the flood of enneagram books now turning mainstream. Given the fraud behind this new age junk it is important for new agers with some math training to help expose this barren nonsense from someone too dishonest to care about corrupting public knowledge. Gurdjieff's brazen invocation of esoteric Christianity makes it easy to exploit gullible Christian believers.

The baseless confusion of the enneagram myth/hype, March 24, 2015

[http://www.amazon.com/review/RTMSNNCNWF33L/ref=cm\\_cr\\_rdp\\_perm](http://www.amazon.com/review/RTMSNNCNWF33L/ref=cm_cr_rdp_perm)

This review is of: *The Enneagram: A Christian Perspective* (Paperback)

The material left behind on the enneagram remained relatively sidelined for decades until the key to hyping it appeared in the claims of its use for the study of personality types, a very peripheral species of junk science that created the illusion of making sense.

The enneagram is a completely unfounded form of new age symbology that has never received any clarification. It was expounded by Gurdjieff whose manner was to claim something was esoteric, presenting an outer teaching whose secret content is never revealed. This makes critics prone to pause, lest they confuse the outer wrapper with the content in question. The point is that everything said in public about the enneagram is falsely claiming to explicate a subject too esoteric to reveal in public. There is a better explanation here: *con men at work*.

This issue has been further confused by the support given by two students Ouspensky and J.G.Bennett. The latter, who should have known better, gave the subject a pass, although he seemed to have been clearly wary of the symbolism.

No clarification of the nonsense of the enneagram has ever been put forth, and the Nashqbandi Sufis, who should have attempted clarification, but instead revealingly changed course with another version of this fraud, the enneagon of Oscar Ichazo, who denounced the enneagram as unscientific. This situation should alert scholars of the danger of using this junk thinking. But now we see an increasing flood of bad treatments of the subject, moving to the core of Christianity.

The attraction to Christians arises from the failed attempt to rejustify the question of the Trinity with something supposed to support its confusions.

I think what early Christians were about here was a possible influence of Indic Samkhya in the spread of Jain yogis into the Roman Empire. The Trinity looks like an attempt to recast the original triad of Samkhya as some kind of esoteric mystery in a veiling of the unmanifest. That's confusing enough once we know that Samkhya was the reference. But its transformation into Christian theology was clearly a distortion of the original meaning.

In any case the quite different enneagram is confusion of seven term and nine term systems, with no explanation for the difference.

In the end the issue is a variant of claims about seven term sequences and the so-called 'law of three'. This was the original thinking, overhyped into an esoteric doctrine, and matched to the enneagram in an illogical confusion of terms.

I think that theologians should be wary of this fake esoteric lore, and consider the opinion of many spiritual teachers as to the fraud in the whole game. Gurdjieff, the source here, put this question into the esoteric doctrine category, which means that doubters are at risk from some very dangerous occultists. This material should never have gone mainstream and is a front for some very unsavory Sufis who know perfectly well the whole subject is baloney.

I think the theological community should pull away from this false lead into the realm of the esoteric.

The law of three and the law of seven are interesting thought experiments, but they have no basis in objective knowledge. Only a devious klutz as retarded as Gurdjieff would have thought it possible to get away with such a piece of bad thinking.

### **03.20.15 The seed plexus phenomenon and the man with a million pound note...**

The issue of the soul plexus seed phenomenon is hard to assess. But this blog is forcing some answers. I am hearing that the statements about the Gold school are false: that the whole Sufi soul game has retreated from the Gold zone and his followers. Great, I will believe anything when I see it. Trying to give Jews special advantages here is something Sufis would not do, so we are talking about something else. The Gold school had no control over any of this as such, as per all Sufis schools.

A fascist Jewish Sufi isn't a promising venue, so I see the logic of 'confiscation'. But then people who have something to hide will cover their tracks. There is a good chance I have got this question scrambled. But I made a determination to expose the question.

Whatever the case we have done the one thing esoteric gangsters dislike: public revelations.

But I can see that once again the Jewish/Christian boundary is the source of hopeless confusion and mutual suspicion and hatred. Clearly the Islamic/Sufi universal category had to be the last refuge of the monotheistic riddle. And I don't think it has anything to do with monotheism. Someone in this mystery is suggesting taking the 'secret' to a communist left: if they can create a serious civilization, Sufism will move into it.

Further I am told that my experience of the 'thieves of Baraka' episode was irrelevant: there is no shortage of the requisite 'stuff'. In fact my account here has been inconsistent, I have often thought the Sufi connection had been restored, despite efforts to dump any further plexus entries. The seed phenomenon pops in and out but I ignore it totally. It is odd: if you seek it, it flees. If you flee from it seeks you.

The question arises: how become a transmitter.

This is a strange situation that might help to show Buddhists and Sufis their collision in a phase of globalization. I am at the boundary of two great religious streams, with a question for the future: how will this double heritage find a resolution. Meanwhile students of Gurdjieff would do better to simply walk away from the Gurdjieff work. It has no connection with the path it is describing and promoting. That takes the cake for cruelty. A reminder once again that spiritual mediated by devils is going to be 'not as expected'.

I suggest a way to deal with people as ruthless as this: the old story of the man with a million pound note. You can do a lot without actually having the money. If you suspect the reality sooner or later it will have to be revealed to you.

Here the knowledge of what you don't have is almost as good as what you do have. And you can assist 'Sufis', 99% of whom have been deceived, to not waste their time... Ditto for the conned Gurdjieff flock.

In general I must suspect that this issue is mediated by demonic entities and is therefore a dangerous game. And the prospect of 'immortality' if that means a million years as a devil who never knows his master is not a pleasing prospect. Buddhism and Indic religion proceed beyond time. Endless existence in time is not really more desirable: there, that word, desire. These things are not commodities for desire.

#### **04.22.15 Gurdjieff and slavery....**

<https://debriefingthenemocon.wordpress.com/2012/09/21/gurdjieff-and-slavery/>

I accept the challenge to the statement that Gurdjieff approved of slavery. I will try to find the Bennett book on that. If Gurdjieff had any liberal sentiments let's hear them.

But I think that what I am saying is true in the same way it is true of Nietzsche, sort of. Anyone proceeding down the exile path of the Whites to escape the revolution is a dead ringer. Gurdjieff was among the reactionaries. In general these people use the thematic of the 'masters' without the slaves after it. Disciples are far more comforting. The overall verdict is not doubt murky, but it is clear that he was content for the Russian peasant to be as he was. C'mon. That's just grotesque. But you are right: he could do a dialectic and was actually critical of Ouspensky's support of Indian cast law. The latter is one of the gross evils of the G movement. How could Ouspensky have fallen for such putrid horrors.

All these new age gurus are having a hard time with modernity, but it is a strategic error that will bring down the new age movement.

Students of Gurdjieff should be exceedingly wary they don't become slaves of the master, to use the correct ugly phrase. One you have agreed to surrender he will find you in your next life, and attempt control without your awareness. A dreadful plight. Never surrender to such people.

Enlightened Buddhas are different: they must finally help you to reach enlightenment (maybe). Figures like Gurdjieff can wish to control a whole flock of slaves over many lifetimes. They have no enlightenment to offer, and must hoard\e the energy of 'consciousness' they extract from their 'slaves in the work'.

Osho was very cagy here: he saw that spiritual movements had to drop the past and he tried to cast his gaze on modernity at many points.

## **Ouspensky/Gurdjieff the death knell of Christianity**

<https://debriefingthenemocon.wordpress.com/2012/12/02/ouspensky-gurdjieff-well-ahead-of-nemo-in-amazons-bestsellers-list/>

I think that World History and the Eonic Effect has had a lot more readers than you might think: people forget the world of books is passing: free books online accumulate a huge readership, surpassing swiftly that of printed books. The net total for WHEE probably surpasses already that of Ouspensky/G. WHEE has had vastly more readers than most scholarly books, the right comparison.

You forget that critics of darwinism are supercensored in the current intellectual environment.

Gurdjieff was one of the first new age gurus to keep his mouth shut on the evolution question.

Ouspensky was clearly a critic of darwinism, but said little.

These are peripheral issues. Obsessing over this shows you are worried. A shrug is right. The key issues no one deals with.

The success of Ouspensky's book is misleading. Ouspensky and Gurdjieff are undermining Christianity more even than secularists. Who wants to replace Jesus with Sufi devils? Don't fall for it. Beelzebub walks straight through the church and Sweet Jesus wasn't there to help.

Why would anyone point this out?

WHEE is not about new age subjects. It is a study of world history and it makes a strong defense of modernity. Figures like Gurdjieff are caught up in the anti-modern reaction and it has vitiated all their efforts.

## **New Age(s)**

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New\\_Age](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_Age)

The real New Age was the rise of modernity, and it even produced a strange thimble-sized 'Buddhism' in the works of Schopenhauer.

And then vultures began arriving. Blavatsky and Gurdjieff both gave away unwittingly or not that someone was running them: the Secret Chiefs for Blavatsky, and Gurdjieff's less public version. Gurdjieff appeared at the dawn of fascism, thence to Nazis, and we can't be sure of his place there. Perhaps he realized he was part of a larger unseen gang at work, as Blavatsky did with her secret chiefs.

We can't do spiritual life based on esoteric non-present occult powers. The whole New Age movement is stuck in that rut. And a new postmodern era even has a name and bogus astrological bullshit foundation: the Aquarian Age. This new aging is deliberate because it puts those spiritual powers out of the range of democracy, for starters. And it is simply baffling until you see why that these powers could send someone like Gurdjieff who believed in slavery. Something that goofy has to be deliberate.

And we have to suspect that Nietzsche was partly influenced by this also.

The real New Age will simply restart without any connection with the Axial Age succession. All of it is going to go down the tubes.

That filthy fart the Dalai Lama as the front man for post-Holocaust Buddhism

### 05.06.15 The myths of the Illuminati

<http://www.gurdjieff-con.net/2015/04/30/the-illuminatus-trilogy-wikipedia-the-free-encyclopedia/>

Wilson's books are fiction (novels), of course...

The issue of the Illuminati is one of the most notorious zones of wrong scholarship and right wing paranoia. This is a hard subject to deal with but, as we have noted before, most of the claims of conspiracy are made up or confused with something else.

If you try to deal with this subject you should sit down and study the analysis of World History and the Eonic Effect carefully. The idea that the French Revolution, leftist revolutionary projects, and for fanatic antimodernists, modernity itself, were the result of occult action by the Illuminati and/or other Masonic-type organizations is exceedingly doubtful. The strong correlation of these with the analysis of the macro effect in WHEE is far more convincing, although this doesn't complete our understanding fully.

Look at the public record of occultists. Its members are uniquely idiotic in their thinking on almost all questions. One way to see the wrongheaded nature of the accusations the French Revolution was an occult conspiracy is to see that the emergence of modern revolution and its themes of democracy and freedom have a far larger context than that of the action of those who started it (unwittingly in most cases: the spontaneity of the first phase of the FR is notable.) That context is the 'modern transition' as a whole and this clearly appears to include a host of events appearing in tandem. Look at the 'divide' so-called in WHEE: the period around 1800 includes a whole series of interlinked ultra-complex mega-events like the suspected correlation with German Classical philosophy. You can't ascribe this field to conspiratorial action, and yet its influence on the emergence of liberalism was crucial. The Illuminati were inside this phenomenon and could not have caused it. No one human is smart enough for any of this. Consider an amusing example: Kant's transcendental deduction, one of the most complicated innovations in modern philosophy. Do you seriously think that this distantly connected event could be induced by someone at the level of Masonic intelligence? We can't argue that some occultist would induce Kant's thinking on liberalism, but not the core issues, like the transcendental deduction, the interconnections of this type are endless). The point here is that historical induction does exist but it requires at a minimum a higher intelligence than the highest achievements of men in such a social context.

Sit down and figure out the transcendental deduction and ask how you would use mental telepathy to induce another to make this discovery. Absurdly put, on reflection, but a step to a larger question' what can induce larger transformations in history (beyond the direct 'semi-causal' flow of successive events)? There are many jokers in the deck here that make Masonic individuals look like clowns.

Thus the whole complex of events associated with the French Revolution is like this, and far vaster and sweeps up a whole cascade of unrelated events like Kant's famous deduction. A similar argument applies to the birth of modern science. One of the important influences on the French Revolution was the American, thence the English Civil War and beyond going backwards. Pretty soon the issue is the generation of modernity itself.

The emergence of occult organizations and individuals related to modern politics is entirely possible but we have very little evidence in public apart from the crackpot literature here.

I have addressed this question in the Preface to Last and First Men. There probably is an 'esoteric left' (there is certainly an esoteric right of muddle heads) but the nature of this is a complete mystery. Occult scholars often stumble on this point, but confused the explanation. We can see their claims of a 'conspiracy across world history' is a debased version of the clear perception that some directional process stands behind emergent civilization itself. WHEE clearly shows this to be the case, but no individual or occult group could accomplish this.

Ironically, we have an example of real occultist at the level of the typical mason, but probably much better: Gurdjieff. He noted that fifty 'conscious' men could change the course of history. A vain boast if we consider the complete idiocy of most occultists on political questions: they have never been able to grasp modernity and denounce it as an aberration, a clear sign of their total ignorance of real macrohistorical change. His own intellect was very limited as he knew well and he had to try and capture smart intellectuals like Ouspensky to further his aims.

And here we must consider that there have been rightwing conspiracies on the right. What about Hitler and the Holocaust? We can certainly suspect a set of rightwing conspiracies based on German occultism and their emergence as fascism in the context of nineteenth century Germany (and Europe). The connection of these to Hitler is not clear. But there is obvious evidence that what started as socialism (consider Mussolini) turned into fascism. Occult influence? we can hardly be sure of anything.

(We have discussed this before here with reference to occult fascist Buddhism, but we can't resolve that issue) Note that all these groups can only destroy modernity, they can't replace it with something better or with anything at all. Hitler was clear about his intention to destroy modernity (along with Jews and Christians). The only significant venue for occult malevolence given the hypercomplexity of the macro effect (which was latent throughout here) is the mind control of a 'zombie politician'. And we see the almost endless rumors of 'mind control' actions and research, down to the era of the American CIA.

People who think covert agencies can act at the level of world history should study the American CIA. Since its creation in the era of Truman this cancer has almost destroyed American democracy and has set a whole civilization on a downward course.

### **07.19.15 Brunton classic, The Short Path....Gurdjieff dupes need a fast exit from rogue Sufi terrain**

The Short Path to Enlightenment: Instructions for Immediate Awakening Paperback – September 7, 2014 by Paul Brunton

Here is an interesting book from long ago, now, by Paul Brunton on The Short Path. This angle has been developed over the last generation by many in the new age circuit. (It also seems to be rapidly entering the pop spirituality market in a rising tide of commercializations.

If ever there was a long path with no short path it is the madhouse of Gurdjieff and Sufi devils. Slip away stat and you can use this to become aware of the simplicity of the issues. There is going to be a problem somewhere here and I don't know if the people who have pursued this (I have been obliviously on the side lines for that last thirty years) have found it. But there is a short version of the Short Path which is not a path but a simple clarification on the level of simple information of the paradox 'There is nothing to achieve', ....

Ouspensky/RB is wrathful at the way he was used to create false advertising for a bunch of Sufi crooks. Those caught in the net need an exit strategy. Best find it soon.

### **Rogue Sufism and control of plexus/x ...best to give it a wide berth...**

The issue of the seed-plexus phenomenon has been left in frustrating ambiguity.

Best to just know about it and pass on for the nonce. There is no chance of getting anything correct in such a morass of disinfo. But the knowledge of the existence of such mysterious spiritual 'technologies' can be a guide to the future. In the

current context this 'technology' sets you up for the Sufi slave markets and is to be avoided. In the process I would bypass Sufism and Gurdjieffianity. These are cabals of devils and don't intend to help you with your spiritual path (guffaw)...

By making these issues public I hope that it will force the issue on public accountability. But this could backfire and allow rogue Sufis to carrot dangle all this to exploit. Consider the irony: making it public scrambles the method. The original must have required great trust among a cloistered group of virtuous people  
But this tech can't fall into the hands of mafias or covert spy agencies who could create drone beings condemned to endless suffering. We have already noted the connection to 'Jewish Nazis'! People will do anything to gain control of this. I don't think they can succeed.

The whole question is completely useless at this point. I am not promoting anything. Making such info public will I hope shut down a Sufi exploitation racket and demand this spiritual method be done right.

Man as he is has a sufficient strong 'soul' structure to persist through many lives and can achieve completion of his being without Mephistophelean help from Sufi psychopaths.

Note my motivation here: I am no friend of Sufis. A spiritual technology such as this made public will 'discombobulate' the centipedes...make its use come to a stop because everyone will know what they don't know, and Sufi lies and involution will be harder.

The whole question of Sufism to a relative outsider like myself has always been confused with the issue of 'demiurgic powers', to use Bennett's phrase (to which he gives a false definition) and/or alien questions. There are many hints of such connections from various Sufi sources. Which means nothing among such liars.

The point here is that soul technologies must source in such cosmic powers, and perhaps such are the only ones that can deal with this situation.

Let me note the hint in Last and First Men that among such powers are those who represent an 'esoteric left'. Don't let reactionaries like Gurdjieff bamboozle you.

### **08.31.15 Even dead Buddhas are deadly**

<http://www.gurdjieff-con.net/2015/08/30/oshogurdjieff-jesuschrist-gautama-the-nazi-and-that-fart-the-dalai-lama-gold-his-nazi-pals-and-the-Sufis-straight-and-gangsters-would-go-fuck-themselves/>

This is strong stuff, but the realm of authoritarian gurus has a problem, and dead ones a worse problem.

You might consider that the criticism of Osho merely reflects the chaotic war of dead gurus and the attempts to destroy each other.

I think Osho is the only survivor, of sorts, in the sense that he is a rebel himself against gurus, and brings some ancient across the finish line. But a church with a dead Buddha isn't going to do it for the future: we can simply move into that space and reconstruct a new future from the wreckage of the old...every needed is there in the Osho corpus...

But we have a new reality. No one, not even enlightened men, is smart enough for the task... We can only take the approximation and try to enlarge our perspective...

But the deep unconscious control of the 'self' as 'surrender' won't work on a global stage. The human wreckage is increasing: we must create a path of individuals dispersed globally who can't be advised to surrender to a figure they barely know five thousand miles away. The dead zombies are lying in wait for this new opportunity.

Those who encounter gurus via a book on a distant continent need a whole new form of spiritual path...

### **09.29.15 The Axial interval in the Indic case**

[http://www.amazon.com/Back-Truth-Advaita-Paperback-](http://www.amazon.com/Back-Truth-Advaita-Paperback-Author/dp/B00E8H6F82/ref=sr_1_26?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1443548881&sr=1-26&keywords=dennis+waite)

[Author/dp/B00E8H6F82/ref=sr\\_1\\_26?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1443548881&sr=1-26&keywords=dennis+waite](http://www.amazon.com/Back-Truth-Advaita-Paperback-Author/dp/B00E8H6F82/ref=sr_1_26?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1443548881&sr=1-26&keywords=dennis+waite)

I am asked to comment on the current Advaita movement.

I am not able to do that, it is too much to take in as yet...

But I read Dennis Waite's tome to get my bearings here.

Instead of commenting let me put the question in context, that of my WHEE.

The Indian Axial Age, 900 BCE to 600 BCE is the interval in my model, not exactly the same as the Axial Age, is a tour de force of three things (or more). The transition moves through the classic legacy corrupted with Vedism and extracts the Upanishads and from there the Vedanta appears. This mysterious process then acts on the Jain legacy which is very ancient and the result is the world of Mahavir. And this leads to the third phase, the Buddhist. Look first at the emergence of Israelitism: between 900 BCE and 600 BCE a whole new religious constellation emerges: the Old Testament starts to crystallize, the Prophets appear, then just around 600 BCE it is ready, almost. Then out of the blue Judah is destroyed and the 'Israelites/Judahites' are in Babylon and the Judaic corpus blends with the Zoroastrian. Then within a century they are back in 'Israel' and the religion emerges... Note how the period after 600 BCE is a realization phase.

The same is true in India: just after 600 BCE the Buddhist legacy begins to undergo its realization and it is on its way. But there is a lot more there that leads up to this, and the conventional legacy is about to produce Vedanta's larger realization and is also gestating further. The Indian tradition is thus confusing but the analysis of the macro model in WHEE is completely logical and makes sense of the data. The result goes in different directions, that of Vedanta into the realm of Advaita and much else...

The model produces this analysis without knowing anything about the content!

The Advaita world from Vedanta/Upanishads is almost primordial but it is corrupted by the Vedic legacy which is actually foreign to it. That's the significance of Buddhism: this mysterious process seems to wish to extract the core legacy from the confusing mixture by deleting the Vedic hybridization.

### **Danielou and the mystery of Indian religious history**

Shiva and the Primordial Tradition: From the Tantras to the Science of Dreams This may be a dubious scholarly book as the old NK charged, but the accusers still can't get straight on the Aryan Invasion issue...

Checking out Advaita is beyond my capacity, so far, so be wary of what I have to say, but I have twenty books on the subject tabled for study, and questions are arising already. What is enlightenment, given this alternate literature and to which of the writers in this field does the term apply. It is late in the day to discover this realm. I must have been in an

alternate universe (many Buddhists and near Buddhists no doubt avoid all contact with 'Hinduism', and are oblivious), so my judgment is not reliable.

But my trusty 'eonic effect' model is of some help.

As I approach Advaita I suddenly feel the Hindu hatred of Buddhists and am already (temporarily) infected. Did this generate my recent attacks on Buddhism?

Item: The Book of Undoing by Fred Davis, Direct Pointing to Non-Dual Awareness...Advaita is now a form of therapy with a sideline for the Twelve Step Recovery world. Question mark. Someone else will have to provide the answer.

I often reread Danielou's books to remind myself of the mystery of Indian religious history. He had local unnamed Indian contacts, and his account is unusual. That author's books may be as dubious as the mainstream ones he tends to indirectly critique.

You may reach enlightenment and still be confused, it seems.

But Danielou is worth reading in case you think you understand the history of Hinduism/Buddhism. It is a VAST universe of so many different strains that no one understands it all. And a lot of commentary even from so-called experts is pervaded with basic errors. My point today is that I often get disoriented by Indian spiritual history. It is almost impossible to get any of it straight. Danielou speaks of a Shiite revival from the third century BCE onward, something not even mentioned in most books. A whole series of things like that. Maybe nonsense, maybe not.

My point is that basic errors pervade the whole subject. You are then subject to them. If, like me, you step outside you can correct those errors, but it is not a good prospect. So each point of the traditions liable to wrong thinking. (A good example is the real history of Mahayana)...I am ostracized by all the various traditions, plus the Sufistic. Why? uppity westerner, won't say Heil Hitler on demand.

Clearly I am better off outside the whole game of new age garbage dumps.

Here's my general perspective, with some help from Danielou (caveat lector, here, his books however have a key, I think). The eonic effect shows the significance of three epochs in world history, or four including the onset of modernity.

5400 to 3000, 3000 to 600, 600 to 1800, 1800 onward with three century lead ups, over exact dates, perhaps. We don't know what these epochs are, but they obviously represent in my model phases in a dynamic cycle model. This has NOTHING to do with astrology or the cycles of the Great Year which has totally confused everyone.

The question is, where does Indian spirituality come from and when does it start, or show relative restarts...? What, if any correlations does it show with the epoch starts indicated?

Note that Buddhism, a clear offshoot of the general line, shows the system in a clear relative restart after ca. 600 BCE (with a parallel Jain post-Mahavir outcome). Hindus were baffled by Buddhism but in the eonic model it is an obvious sideshoot giving birth to an Indian contribution to general globalization, like Israelite monotheism. Note that the year 600 BCE more or less is crucial in both cases: a religious stream initiates and proceeds outwards. Note also the utterly remarkable fact that around 0 BCE both streams start to generate a new more general form. Christianity and Mahayana, the latter being connected to the idea of 'savior' religions. We suspect a global connection of both cases.

The model distinguishes 'stream' and 'sequence' and we can see that the stream of Hinduism (?? meaning) can intersect with the larger macro effect as in the Axial Age and generate an entity, Buddhism, that is shorn from its roots to become an entity in global civilization.

But we have to ask if there were earlier such interactions, e.g. 3000, 5500 BCE. In fact, the eonic process never touches the same area twice, but that applies to the mainline. We can't be sure there weren't 'Axial Ages' or intervals in these two phase starting points. It seems unlikely, but we have to remain suspicious, and here Danielou himself notes the connection of Krishna, a pre-Aryan figure (?) to 3000 BCE, along with a long Jain sequence (?), and then the resemblance of Shiva and

Dionysus: was there a kind of Axial Age in the middle Neolithic? Gurdjieff speaks of a pre-sand Egypt and its generation of proto-Christianity (a dubious claim, but he may have hit on something).

But a close look at the eonic effect makes a proliferation of 'Axial Ages' dubious: they follow a very exact pattern. The issue is important because it is rare to see highly advanced entities like Indian religion arising absent a boost from the eonic effect. But those boosts are strictly related to a larger pattern. It could be that a kind of Axial Age synchrony like the later seeded east/west culture/religion in multiple zones, Egypt, proto-sumer, India, china... We can't conclude that but the issue of the source of Indian religion remains.

Answer, we don't know, but the middle Neolithic is the obvious source of the phenomenon of religion as we know it in later civilization (e.g. the temple religions connected with agriculture we see in the North of Sumer, after 5500 BCE, etc...)

Indian religion shows many signs of a Neolithic signature. We must look at the beautiful legacy of the Shiva religion with its embedded yoga. So, was the 'primordial Shaivism' considered by Danielou as the source of the whole of Indian spirituality (proto-Shaivism, yoga/tantra, Samkhya, Jainism), present in the middle Neolithic, with figures like Shiva emerging in parallel with related figures like Dionysus, or the proto-Isis/Osiris cult in Egypt.

We can't answer the question, but we suspect that primordial Shaivism generated the early Jainism which is so reminiscent of later Buddhism. When? The tradition speaks of 24 teertankers! And the source of the Krishna cult remains obscure.

This is part of the reason for relative restarts like Buddhism: the system simply starts over with a related strain. But the vigorous 'Hindu' milieu carried a huge number of alternates which seem likely to out-survive the now fading Buddhism in the epoch after 1800. None of these proliferations will have any system status the way Buddhism did (and probably some earlier version of the Shiva cult/yoga). It is a pity but we can't locate the real starting point of what the remnants of the Shiva cult obviously suggest: it was the source, as Danielou notes, of almost everything that came later.

NK when he was still here suggested the text whose name I forget discussing the diffusions from Sumer. It would resolve many issues if we could locate a single source of later religions in the era of Sumer, or the epoch leading up to it. But it doesn't seem to work. There is nothing in the Sumerian corpus to suggest either proto-religion of Egypt or that of India.

In any case, the history of Indian religion is misunderstood by everyone. No wonder.

We have already discussed the lineage of Advaita in terms of the axial age and its interval: a remarkable mystery: from 900 BCE to 600 BCE we see the eonic system 'touch' the stream and spawn the Upanishadic corpus with a related confusing Vedanta (with a lot of ambiguities). The problem is that this larger system correctly sees the red herring of the Vedas (Aryan legacy stuff) and tries to bypass it as it moves via the 'Upanishadic' Hinduism through the Jain ending in Mahavir and then Buddhism. Advaita then has an apparently clear lineage in this system, but....

It is possible that the source of the Indian tradition lies in the Paleolithic and a continuous stream until it encounters the eonic system, but that is just the point, when and where, before Buddhism?

There is another possibility: reaching enlightenment was the 'natural state' of early homo sapiens, whose diaspora from Africa (one or many) would have reached South India very early and produced early Indic tribes of homo sapiens still able to reach enlightenment naturally. Who knows?

This streamlined account using the eonic effect works remarkably well considering that it has no connection to actual content, but it is still too fuzzy. The full account of India in the Axial Age is almost impossible to figure out. In part because it 'stepping stones' between three legacies, the proto-Hindu, the Jain, and the to-become Buddhism. But this system does not create a world religion from Hinduism directly. It feeds an 'Upanishadic' milieu which leads to the field of yogis that produces Buddhism in the end.

So it is important to see that the Hindu stream is simply a vast disorganization of 'this and that', remnants of antiquity, with hard to understand subreligions, that are all localized Indian traditions. In this sprawl we find the legacy of Advaita, which suddenly looks to be shorn of its credentials, leaving a question. It is probably close to the core of the real legacy, to be sure, but the overall clarity of the subject is lost here (to say the least). As the lingo goes, jalopy. Advaita is a classic car, but does it really run? Its actual exemplars appear to validate its reality, but Schwartz is already accusing Poonja of creating false exemplars destined to crash and burn (Andrew Cohen for example), and that is very cruel: we are presented with an Indian export given to westerners as a baby pacifier, apparently...

Trust meter goes negative, we should attempt a ruthless examination of Advaita...But it gets a pass via its indirect 'eonic' status, but with a reminder that our deft 'macro system' which detects a problem with the Vedas, trying to sift out a real core, leaves Advaita with its Vedic trappings, which most yogis ignore anyway.

I will list the books I am looking at:

starting with

Brunton: *The Direct Path, The Secret Path, Discover Yourself*

the Ramana Maharsi corpus, *Who am I?*

Dennis Waite, *Back to the Truth*

James Schwartz, 2 books, *How to Attain Enlightenment,*

*Vedanta, Vajraprana...* various books on Vedanta...

Brunton, *The Gift of Grace*

*Advaita, the Truth of Non-duality, Iyer*

*Advaita Vedanta, Deutsch*

*Enllightenment, the Path thru the Jungle, Waite*

*Conversaions on Non-duality, edited, Gilbert*

*The Direct Path, Harvey*

*Awakening to the Dream Hartog*

*Wake up and Roar Poomja*

plus others...

**-Beyond the master game...Osho included...**

I think the guru question is going to wreck the whole new age movement. I feel it in the Osho situation I am going through. I cannot submit to the kind of domination created by invasive and somehow demonic dead gurus, such as the Osho entity. Quite apart from anything else, it is impossible to escape the delusive confusion of 'nobody there' still there and somewhere between a ghost, a demon, and an inspirational guru abstraction. I think the whole game becomes hopeless because rogue elements assume the identity of dead gurus and turn ashrams into feeding troughs. But beyond that the whole stance of the guru and disciple is false. The only path is for the disciple to rebel to find his own autonomy. Persistence in disciple mode is spiritual death. At best, robotic zombie existence with or without the remaining potential to become realized. Something is wrong with the guru model. A look at the record shows how inefficient it is, because it deprives the disciple of the possibility of realization. The ashrams, and I must include Osho's, are controlled environments where no one can really be himself. The methods given in the legacy literature only marginally speak of the necessity of the guru. They speak of the need for a teacher to explain something, to be a guide, to transmit a legacy. But nothing in that tradition demands the gross invultuation by a pretended superman of groveling disciples, the 'last' men of samsara. That's bullshit. The point I made in my review of Osho on Nietzsche was that German classical philosophy unwitting lays a trap for the amateur supermen of yogic enlightenment. Can you deal with the hypercomplexity that movement pointed to? Can you deal with Kantian deductions, the elusive derivations of that moment of philosophic enlightenment? You can't just bypass that by reading Nietzsche. He's too easy. A plant to trap suckers. My point is not that philosophic enlightenment is real or superior to yogic/Buddhist enlightenment, but that the complexity of the overall realm of

nature/spirit cannot be mastered by simple enlightenment, and the latter is not grounds for playing god or master with ordinary men, men who now rightly demand democratic cultures. The rise of Buddhist fascism is easy to understand all of sudden: the Buddhas became corrupted by their power, and when modernity took it away some plotted to overthrow it, a fruitless and failed endeavor that dooms Axial Age Buddhism to oblivion. Let's hope Osho rescued something (Advaita can cast its seeds to the winds also, along with dilapidated yoga for weight loss and, gosh, its raja yoga wrapper) from disaster, but he is still stuck in the same 'master' rut, beset by monsters like Gurdjieff and the Sufi mafia. A new way needs to be found.

I am not sure if I am deluding myself (one symptom of the overall confusion) but if it is true that Osho is trying to create a succession lineage then it must be of autonomous Buddhas. But all I see from the last two years is dead Buddhas trying to assume total master control of still living seekers.

I resist it because it will destroy me: it is like abolishing passwords on the Internet. If you allow total access who is to say you will not be simply whooshed away, even by Buddhas? It is a silly method, and the modern world is moving beyond it.

So that is why I am in such a fight with Osho. Surrender, even here, is nonsense. This entity is more like a tiger let loose consuming all his disciples. A living person, enlightened or not, needs to assume the mantle of authority, and an independent spirits must move to create a sequence of Buddhas, like the Jain teertankers. That legacy is a mystery. Was such a progression really of true individuals, or a staged play of zombie figures controlled by an invisible founder?

In any case I have to fight back at the Osho control game: access to the zone of 'real I' is possible to enlightened masters, and that is not benign. So much for that... And the next case is the Christian with his 'Lord Jesus'...we can discuss that some other day...

We are at the moment in the movie Animal House when the head Master say's 'Out with it'... You asked for it...

A few posts back we talked about 'pulling rank on the Buddhas'. We're getting there, laugh all you like...

### **11.19.15 Answer re: Advaita question**

I have finished as per request my quick take on Advaita: despite a shellacking from the boundaries, the core legacy is part of the ancient tradition of Indic religion, predating its appropriation and hybridization by the Aryan entry factor. Hindu commentary will refuse to accept this, but the problem should therefore be solved outside of the Hindu historical nexus. I use the term Hindu for the form of Indian religion that arose in the wake of the Aryan entry phase. This is distinguished from 'santana dharma' pointing to the long history of 'dharmic' religion that goes back very far, perhaps millennia. That tradition is not properly summarized in either Hindu tradition or Advaita, and has components found in Jainism and thence Buddhism, and much else.

I will stop short on this since I don't feel confident in such a complicated discussion, but wish to exit the discussion for the moment: however, the Advaita material is a great way to clarify the issues of the path of enlightenment, if not to enlightenment, but it can induce a sense of being enlightened on the basis of intellectual understanding, not 'enlightenment' realization.

I will pursue this further, but my basic answer is clear, for the moment...

**Pulling away...again...**

I am not an Osho follower or spokesman, so I need to pull away once again, but I suggest the Osho Commune open up a venue for the study of Advaita, and try to see this in the context of a larger history of Indian religion.

### **11.18.15 Destruction of Osho paths**

I am too kind to Osho: his chance seems to be slipping away as he roves in search of help or rescue, thus my repeated invultuations and exhausted ambivalence, in what must a long list. All that will have to help itself...

A lot of entities have gone to a lot of trouble to destroy the Osho initiative. I think they succeeded. Advaita isn't going to work any better than any other path...But its gurus will spread a fake to promote their Hindu stream...Be wary...

There is no general Indic global path, if Osho's initiative is shot. Not Hinduism. But it will proliferate as a global spiritual garbage dump...

### **The Advaita idiots think Shankara's chauvinism doesn't matter...**

<http://www.gurdjieff-con.net/2015/11/17/just-as-i-thought-advaita-in-its-current-form-is-doomed-shankara-as-a-hindu-chauvinist/>

Advaita mixed with junk Hinduism is going to be the undoing of the movement. That was the reason the spiritual domain split off into Buddhism. Now the whole racket is going global, from yoga to Advaita...

The Osho movement was India's real gift to the world in the form of a neo-Buddhism like Gautama's to proceed outside the black hole of hinduism...I don't mean to be too caustic here, but the Advaita movement will not work as a spiritual path connected to hinduism. And these western liberals think they can just extract this and use it for free.

In fact, you can: take a book like Brunton's The Short Path: reduce it to bytes and bits, export it, change terminology, and declare it public domain. Done...But it probably won't work.

Hinduism has hidden 'masters' who control who gets enlightened. They must be licking their chops over the Advaita fad, a feeding frenzy...

Here's the lowdown, very logical:

Shankara was a Hindu guru. Hindu gurus demand absolute obedience. Shankara thought only Brahman yogis were allowed to study Advaita. None of the modern Advaita students from the west were Brahman. Therefore the whole gang is in disobedience mode....those in disobedience can read Anirvan on the fate of the rabble who don't kowtow...

There is no such fate. Flip the bird to the august gurus in Nietzschean Overman mode.

I note in passing that I caught Osho making a small blunder in his Nietzsche commentary: weak point, to pull rank on gurus everywhere....

We will see if this is a joke...

I think that this is the reason people like Poonja cast the method to the winds and in general Advaita is a floating fragment in de facto global public domain....

The Advaita group should make a point of not letting their efforts feed the new Hindu global sprawl. The spread of diet yoga has already turned raja yoga into a farce (ditto for mindfulness and Hinayana Buddhism)...

## **Time to abandon Tibetan Buddhism...Heil Gautama...ditto for that fool the Dalai Lama. Tell Bob Thurman to put his 'Heil Hitler' in public, more honest for a Jewish front**

Almost all new age Buddhists are good liberal people. The slow but steady effort to remorph such people into an unconscious antimodern fascism is the final last gasp of Buddhism as historically known, in its modern Gotterdammerung...I think the moral is that Buddhism was very nice until the medieval period, and its modern degeneration means Gautama dissolved into final nothing, and his Sangha become possessed literally by demonic entities. Demons to me are fictions of dead monotheism, but, BUT... but point to some reality we don't understand (Gurdjieff dead is a good example, very concrete).

The idea that a medieval Tibetan kingdom could steer the future spiritual life of humanity was always unrealistic, but the actual facts are x100 worse...

### **11.14.15 I think Buddhism/Gautama brand is dead, or deserted...move on**

I think Gautama was one of the greatest teachers, and he had a tidal wave of history behind him, but something went awry. I can only try to guess what it is: but we see the problem right away in this: we don't know what Buddhism is really like, and how it 'happened'. Its Mahayana phase shows Gautama's dilemma, enlightenment, ditching a movement as the 'Buddha' disappears. Or trying to make the Axial Age moment last throughout an epoch: the resolution emerges in the obscure idea of the bodhisattva, and a way to carry the movement through an age is found, and yet....

A bodhisattva? Is the idea really serious? Such a being must acquire a soul, so what happened, and who was this being.

I think it is an illusion, or if not, an idea that will pass with the old epoch. To renounce enlightenment is an invitation to open the commune to demons of the worst kind and as Gautama passed away the Sangha could no longer remain aware of itself. There were immortal bodhisattvas. They seem to lurk behind Tibetan Buddhist fronts, like dead vampires that must consume from each generation of Buddhist initiates. What do they do? Enlighten? They cannot. So what is the purpose, the rationale?

IN this enigma the fascist confusion seems to have entered as a hidden calamity.

The verdict must be to dismiss the phantom of antiquity, and let the present be the present. It is not required to sacrifice modernity to keep an older band of dead men going...

I think Buddhism has forgotten its secret, and its current generations are turning in circles. And dissolving into modern society.

This must have happened with Jainism after Mahavir. The real movement sprang up elsewhere as the remaining movement became a religion for householders with token paths we still see today. The energy moved into Buddhism. And now the same is happening with Buddhism itself.

What really happened with Buddhism? We have lost the pieces to the puzzle. We can't imitate the past, and Buddhism now is a layer cake with three layers. It can no longer develop because its development is complete. Becoming a bodhisattva is a dangerous practice in a global environment: it presumes a refuge for such brave souls. But now, such sacrifices are pointless and eject the candidate into a dangerous environment with a vow to never wake up. It is a cruel hoax now.

Gautama seems to have used this to extend his movement to the end of an age period, but was he still there at the end? His movement fell prey to something monstrous, his worst fears realized...

Best to move on here and find some vital way that speaks to a new era...

achieved, as it were; a sense of the natural state of man...

### **11.05.15 A review: The Fourth Way and Esoteric Christianity**

[http://www.amazon.com/review/R3MF5EU12JNGNV/ref=cm\\_cr\\_rdp\\_perm](http://www.amazon.com/review/R3MF5EU12JNGNV/ref=cm_cr_rdp_perm)

This review is from: *The Fourth Way and Esoteric Christianity* (Paperback)

Don't be fooled by this book and its related titles. The idea that Christianity hides an esoteric version in the form of the 'fourth way' is a complete fabrication by Gurdjieff, whose thinking confused the issue of what Christian religion really is. The idea of the fourth way has no basis whatsoever in historical fact, not a single instance can be pointed to before the term began to be used in the twentieth century. Christianity, whatever else it is, was a religion that was completely open and simple. To say that there was a hidden version like the fourth way depicted by Ouspensky is both implausible and completely confusing. It implies that demonic figures, and Gurdjieff calls himself a devil, were really behind the religion, and this truth was never divulged to its members. If it were true then such Christians should abandon such a religion at once, because they are open to dangerous occultist like Gurdjieff, whose lies make any spiritual path confused and unusable.

The point Gurdjieff was trying to make, perhaps, in the complete muddle he made of spiritual esotericism, is that some parts of Christianity echo very ancient teachings, perhaps from Egypt. Perhaps so, let the proof be given with evidence with the bait and switch act of gnostics like Gurdjieff whose hidden agenda is malevolent. The whole literature of the New Testament is confused enough, adding the completely confused and bogus issue of the 'fourth way' is a kind of power grab intending to transfer authority to an occultism, such as Gurdjieff.

The whole of Christian theology is being rewritten with this stealth promotion of Gurdjieff's ideas, witness also the complete idiocy of the 'enneagram' myth being similarly used to wisecrack Christian theology.

Gurdjieff clearly gave the warning, cleverly presenting himself as above the wolf's real intent with the sheep, in speaking of the magician after the skins of the unsuspecting seekers.

Christians have to answer for their religion as it is in tradition. They don't have to surrender to the wolf in esoteric trapping trying to plant a clever theological trap for the unsuspecting.

Again, let anyone give evidence of a fourth way school in history.

### **Review of Osho on Buddha...Buddhism turned fascist disintegrates...Osho too second rate to replace Gautama...**

[http://www.amazon.com/review/R2M91FHCKJ0QGC/ref=cm\\_cr\\_rdp\\_perm](http://www.amazon.com/review/R2M91FHCKJ0QGC/ref=cm_cr_rdp_perm)

This review is from: *Buddha: His Life and Teachings and Impact on Humanity (Pillars of Consciousness)* (Paperback)

Did Osho finish off Buddhism? Osho, then Rajneesh's, declaration that Buddhism was involved in the occult fascism of the Nazi era probably sealed the death warrant of Buddhism, which was a creature of the Axial Age destined to pass away in the new era ignited by modernity. And we have to wonder if the neo-Buddhism of Osho can survive the charge made against gurus and their powers of mind control used for purposes other than leading toward enlightenment.

I think that the New Age movement has failed to see the implications of its own modern history and the calamity created by exposing a world religion as involved in fascism.

I think that the religions of the Axial era are doomed to pass away, and that Osho's concoction, while strictly speaking modernist (santana dharma in all age periods), is going to fail to if it can't detach from the Buddhist nightmare. People are

flooding out of the realm of the Buddhas into the diminished but freer realm of mindfulness workshops. The path to enlightenment must be rescued from (neo-)Buddhists and placed in a universal context. Osho is second rate behind Gautama. But if the latter's dharma is cancerated, we are left with nothing.

### **The Maharsi sphere (= Brunton entity?) denouncing their own reactionary background...**

This method is actually proving effective, maybe: being denounced forces entities with the psychic clout to figure things out to check things out, but they won't go public.

My citation of Brunton at the start seems right, with support in the background

I am chided for not including discussion/reference to 1. Hindu power zones, the gurus behind the gurus...not the same as Hindutva, but reactionary... dead beings processed as zombie entities, Bollywood Faust cases.2. EJ Gold and Jewish supremacists??/Gurdjieff in league with reactionary entities 3. Sufis in the majority incapable of occult action 4. impotent Christians with no clue to anything...5. The only group with the power to stage a fascist movement was the 'Buddhist' with a swastika from the hapless Jains?

A larger social project that fulfills the critique of the new age movement is a response the 2/6 way system of murder taking the form of a 2/6 system of counter attack consisting of

<http://www.gurdjieff-con.net/2015/10/14/a-forty-year-waste-of-time-deprogramming-new-age-stupidities-a-larger-social-detachment-project/>

1. an exit from the Osho sphere
2. a critique of Buddhism and an indication of its proximate demise, and this includes an examination of Advaita/Hinduism/Vedism...
3. a call to dismantle Tibetan Buddhism
4. a double critique of Islam/Sufism,
5. a expose of Sufi gangsterism
6. an expose of Islam's hidden and corrupt 'soul' process
7. a call to dismantle Islam
8. an expose of Christianity and its incoherent theology (long exposed by Islam) and a reminder of its suppressed Munzerian communist gospel
7. declaration of 'war' against the Gurdjieff Con and a debriefing call to scrap its pretension to being a spiritual movement...  
with a related expose of the Gold pseudo-Sufism...
8. a request to not subject the exiles of these movements to the inadequate new atheist movement, or secular humanism as current.
9. a further debriefing of Jewish covenantal mythology, Jewish supremacist occultism, the Israeli pretense to a Jewish homeland, a call to dismantle Jewish Israel, and a boycott of Jewish new age gurus: the principle duty of Jews is assimilation if they course is spiritual teaching...

A new study of modernity is required to see the existing strategies open here, and a new brand of secular humanism is urgently needed....

### **01.07.16 Abandoning all spiritual paths?...a first step to sanity... Stealth Neo-Advaita as an exit strategy**

Reviewing the posts here one might/should conclude that a kind of emergency step to some kind of sanity is to renounce all spiritual paths, of the new age type, with Christianity leading up the rear, a slightly different case, Islam being analogous

but not as such relevant save that the issue of Sufis as 'moslems' remains up in the air (throw in Islam!). You must find your own way beyond the mechanized methods too often used as 'treadmill paths'.

My case is special. After decades of black magic/spiritual cannibalism from Gold/Sufi/G sources, and the concealed harassment of the 'Osho entity' (invultuation, will destruction/cannibalism), topped off with outright attempted 'murder' (spiritual) in the wake of this blog (g entities don't like dissent), the first point above is obvious, or should have been long ago.

Others will have a larger scope of possibilities, but I recommend the same: at least try as an exercise the abandonment of all spiritual paths. The idea is contradictory, but is more or less 'doable' in very obvious ways.

The result very often is to suddenly find a path. There is no reason not to study history here, or to examine 'paths' as virtual abstractions. But 'paths' are the object of manipulation by figures such as Gurdjieff: extractive pseudo-paths that generate energies in the 'factory' are a severe danger.

Buddhism: suspected fascist esotericism, generalized manipulation into a conservative reactionary force

Sufism: hopeless case mafia??? (have never met any exemplars, might have missed the 'nice guys'), you never met the real gangsters as super occultists: cannibal rackets, slave markets, treadmill paths, 'denying force' rackets (treadmill paths),...

Sufism's classic nearly unknown 'soul development' strain has no public info, under suspicious as a master invultuation method taken over from the pious by gangster Sufis... Usable as a trap without victim's consent beyond 'I am a Sufi' implying consent... means to create personal 'devils'?? Truly scary form of evil.

Find a concealed exit strategy (abandon all paths, but not your birthright: self-consciousness, and 'enlightenment').

Advaita?? under scrutiny... useful perhaps as an exit strategy... but it is a bright legacy with a dark side (Shankara was a caste fanatic, etc...)

But what then is the result? a kind of generalized secularism, and then from there a stealth reinvention, if you wish, of a path of your own creation using sound and guru-free methods as classics, in all cases recast entirely from scratch. This is a perilous strategy because you can invent something even worse.

But the basic point is clear: disentangle your will from all the agencies on the hustle to control it via 'spiritual surrender' and fake paths created for outsiders, etc...

Let's leave this incomplete, as is, for the moment...

In my own case I made an immediate discovery: my energies were suddenly my own, and I was stunned to discover how much personal energy was being 'taxed' by all these gurus and spiritual vampires. Sufis like 'Gold' are the worst, but the Osho entity seems to have discovered and transformed after passing away, or else is replaced by something using that as a front....

Be wary here: 'secularism' is undefined, and misdefined by many sources. It is potentially a far superior resource than the now bedraggled spiritual legacies... Secularism is not anti-religious and has already sifted the best of many classic legacies and spread them globally.

But broadly speaking the 'secular' tradition, which climaxes with a figure like Kant, posits autonomy, a 'will' to action/ethics, etc..., rights as an individual, etc... the idea of freedom is key... The whole Advaita tradition can be reissued at a stroke via Schopenhauer (but be wary of the effort to try this, please... study long and hard). The realizations via Advaita stand behind almost other traditions, even we suspect Zen and Sufism. This goes back before the coming of the Aryans to whom it doesn't belong. There is nothing achieve so that is a form of self-defense. Check out a stealth neo-Advaita without gurus as exit strategy mindful of its limits. Reflect on those limits and complete this 'end of paths' with a stealth rediscovery of the classic Advaita as your own path.

The future of modernity will come to transcend these legacies and leave the gangsters behind.

