Ontology Series
Talk given by Yogeshwar Muni
Sanatana Dharma Foundation
(Foundation for Natural Meditation)
Berkeley CA 1975
USA

AB Series: Beingness and the Laws of Form

I'm going to talk to you off and on for a few mornings about some of the more rigorous aspects of philosophy and Sahaja Yoga. But be patient with me. Things are difficult to talk about not because they are embarrassing but because they are hard to make clear. The closer you approach the Truth which is absolute the harder it is to describe it in relativistic words. Nevertheless, I think it can be done. There are two ways to approach such a subject.

 One is to start with apparency and gradually try to construct a pathway to the absolute. The other way is to start with the absolute that seems theoretical from the beginning and gradually show the connection with what most people would call the real world.

In this case, I'm going to take the second choice because with you people I am not going to try to convince you of the reasonableness and usefulness of these propositions. I'm taking it as given that you think that there is an absolute or there isn't and try then to gradually reduce it to the useful.

There are three prime elements in understanding the entirety of what seems to be. The first one is you. You are an absolute. The Indian way of explaining absolute is to say that which is without a second. It's not a bad definition.

A Westerner explains absoluteness as opposed to relativeness. It is in a way the same statement, 'without a second'. But 'without a second' is a little better because absolute can be related but it cannot have a second. Or I mean it can not be second. Nor can there be anything less than that. Now if I start to lose you in philosophical terminology, you can already begin to appreciate what I first said about using words to describe absolute.

It means there is nothing greater than or nothing less than. It doesn't mean that there can't be anything else than an absolute.

Paul Tillich was a great theologian from the University of NY, from the theological seminary. In my estimation, he was the greatest Western theologian. He said that if you are going to talk about absolute, it is the same thing as talking about God. You can't draw a circle around it. You can't exclude anything. You cannot define it. I think in the most rigorous sense it is a draw.

Theologians are not known in the mathematical circles as being particularly rigorous. They are quite intuitive and very often are really saying the right thing, but the wrong way. I know that you people are not particular mathematicians nor are you necessarily that careful about your theology. But you do ask pointed questions. Some of you ask very excellent questions. And I am attempting to build a framework for questions. And gradually as time goes on you are able to sort out what I am talking about.

What Tillich was talking about was the non-exclusive principle. For anything that is in set A, or I should say anything in A, is in B. But there's still A and B. A is an absolute. And B can exist if every element that is in A is also in B. But there is still A and B. What Tillich was confusing was that, he said, "Well, you've excluded B out of A. You are saying there is a B and not saying that it is also A or included in A."

Although a casual person would say, "Well, if indeed there is every element that is in A, then what's the difference?" Well, in a way he would be right. Except that you still have A; and you still have B. Now, I think a mathematician understands this, now, even in elementary school.

So the point is that you can have absolutes that are not singular as along as in A and B and C contain every element that is in every other. You are an absolute. You are A. But then there is B. And in B is every element that is in A. So if you are A, then guy sitting next to you is B. And he contains every element that you do. He is also absolute.

So now we have the two basic elements. But there is a third element. This is the relationship between A and B. Now in normal sectors, you draw circle and put a letter in it called A. And you draw another circle and you have another one which you call B. But this has an implied difference of location.

So there is a great modern genius, his name is [Spencer Brown], who worked out a new way of handling the situation, actively and rigorously, a calculus, called The Laws of Form. Calculus means a way of handling, means a way of calculating.

It in itself accomplishes nothing except handling which means to establish the rules for the inner relationship between elements. Now you're one element. That which is other than you is another element. So the Laws of Form establish the nature of the relationship between you and otherness.

I am satisfied in investigating these Laws of Form that Brown worked out that there are principles accurately and rigorously to/in relationship or whatever that means--'relationship'. And I think that third element requires a little discussion in order to make head or tail out of it.

We all have an intuitive sense of what relating is. You and I are doing that right now. We are relating. So we have an experiential sense of it. This relationship may be rather strained at the moment due to the nature of the subject and the terminology which is difficult.

Nevertheless even that is a relationship, a strained relationship. But if we operate only off of our intuitive interpretation of our experience, we leave the realms of rigor. And we are back into theology again.

What is relationship? Somebody asked me that today. What is love? It is the same question. There is no difference between them.

There are two ways to get a relationship. One is to take a unity and split it in two. Then you have an inherent relationship between those two halves because you can say that they came from the unity. Or you can take something that is inherently separate and draw a line between the two. That is to say, that there is a relationship.

There have been arguments about which is the correct approach since the beginning of witch doctors sitting around camp fires. And that argument has never been resolved. As far as I can see, it's irresolvable. Because once you think you are a given unity, you are in trouble. Once you are given a duality, you are in trouble. Thinking in terms of unity and duality is where we get into trouble.

Recently in India, I had a very nice interview with [Sathya Sai Baba](#). Some people were bored with it because what he said seemed to leave them pretty cold. Other people, of course, were fascinated with his presence. Well, even the same people were fascinated with his presence and therefore were impressed by that.

But what he had to say, I found, was rather significant. I have always found that Sai Baba's teaching, his verbal teaching, was superior to his circus act that he's got going--materializing things, people sitting around by the hour, and gingerbread buildings. Things like that I was never impressed by. But I have been unusually impressed by his philosophical statements.

And even in that meeting he said that there was a thing that he thought was very important which was "The thing called One." I don't know if you guys caught that. Just a few of you who are here were there. And he was talking about this idea called One. You have to understand what One is. When you can't understand, he was giving this analogy of the fan. They had a lot of three bladed fans that pushed the air around.

And he was explaining how you must have these three in order to make the wind blow properly and cool the people off. But to do that you had to have one blade.

Also we had an interview with [Sakya Trizin](#) who is the chief spiritual leader of the [Sankhya](#) Tibetan sect. He was talking about a bird that must have two wings. But you can't have two wings without one wing. But you must understand what One is!

I was sitting in my college library when I was a freshman working with a calculus that was developed by students. And I finally came to the most startling revelation! I didn't know what One was.   What is One? In order to count, you have to go one, two… Well, two is really two ones. If you don't know what one is, how do you know what a thousand is, or anything else?

When you are dealing in metaphysics, you always come down to a thing called an object. An object. But this implies a unity. It's an object; it's one object. Then you try to figure out, what is this? But we have slipped into a state which is normally taken as given which is an object, the endness of it. It is an object.

This is where we get into trouble. First of all, we don't know what that (object) is. And second of all, is it really necessary (to know)? You don't have to apply it to an object. You can apply it to you. Am I one thing? Is there unity in the universe? Is there oneness? Is it all one or is it multiple? We are talking about multiple. He has accepted one already. Oh my!

Try to put up with these words in a way of approaching things because somewhere along the line, I think you are going to find something that is valuable to you, something that is useful. But I'm trying to invite some of you who normally don't fly yourselves into this place. I'm trying to establish some

of the nomenclature for you, some of the ways of thinking. So be thinking about it. Don't just dismiss it and let it slip through. Yogeshwar has to do this, so go ahead and do it.

Hang on and don't abandon the task because there is nothing complex about any of this.   In fact, it is simplicity itself to think about what One means--that is, unity. What is One?   It is a very simple process. It is hard to do. It is much easier to watch "To Tell the Truth" on television which is a rather complex process than it is to contemplate what is it that makes one one? Try as you will, you can never come up with an answer. Because there is no answer because there is no One! It is an illusion. How about that!

When I was a freshman in college I was 18. It wasn't until I was 30 that I got the answer about this thing about one. I knew one was important. But it made me ill. It made me want to vomit. To try to penetrate what this thing of 'One' is.

If you think of yourself as 'One' as opposed to the state of which there is you and another, you will never come up with the proper conceptualizing of what is. This is the same thing as saying that there is A and there is B and drawing circles around it. By putting circles around One, you are putting a boundary.