Conference 16 from Phase A.

CONF. 16

OBSERVATION OF ONESELF THE SELF-OBSERVATION

The intimate Self-Observation of oneself is a practical means of achieving a radical transformation.

To know and to observe are different. Many confuse observation of oneself with knowing. We know that we are seated on a chair in a room, but this does not mean that we are observing the chair.

We know that at a given instant we find ourselves in a negative state, perhaps with some problem or worried about this or that matter, or in a state of restlessness or uncertainty, etc., but this does not mean that we are observing it.

Do you feel antipathy toward someone? Do you dislike a certain person? Why? You will say that you know that person... Please, observe that person; to know is never to observe; do not confuse knowing with observing...

Observation of oneself, which is one hundred percent active, is a means of changing oneself, whereas knowing, which is passive, is not.

Certainly, knowing is not an act of attention. Attention directed inward toward oneself, toward what is happening in our interior, is indeed something positive, active...

In the case of a person toward whom one feels antipathy just because, because we feel like it, and many times without any reason at all, one notices the multitude of thoughts that accumulate in the mind, the group of voices that speak and shout chaotically within oneself, what they are saying, the unpleasant emotions that arise in our interior, the unpleasant taste that all this leaves in our psyche, etc., etc., etc.

Obviously, in such a state we also realize that inwardly we are treating very badly the person toward whom we feel antipathy.

But to see all this one unquestionably needs attention intentionally directed inward toward oneself; not passive attention.

Dynamic attention truly comes from the observing side, whereas thoughts and emotions belong to the observed side.

All this makes us understand that knowing is something completely passive and mechanical, in evident contrast with observation of oneself, which is a conscious act.

We do not mean by this that mechanical observation of oneself does not exist, but that type of observation has nothing to do with the psychological self-observation to which we are referring.

To think and to observe are also very different. Any subject can afford the luxury of thinking about himself all he wants, but this does not mean that he is truly observing himself.

We need to see the different “Egos” in action, to discover them in our psyche, to understand that within each one of them there exists a percentage of our own consciousness, to repent of having created them, etc.

Then we will exclaim: “But what is this Ego doing?” “What is it saying?” “What is it that it wants?” “Why does it torment me with its lust?”, “with its anger?”, etc., etc., etc.

Then we will see within ourselves all that train of thoughts, emotions, desires, passions, private comedies, personal dramas, elaborate lies, speeches, excuses, morbid fancies, beds of pleasure, scenes of lasciviousness, etc., etc., etc.

Many times before falling asleep, at the precise instant of transition between vigil and sleep, we feel within our own mind different voices that speak among themselves; they are the different Egos, which at such moments must break all connection with the different centers of our organic machine in order then to submerge themselves in the molecular world, in the “Fifth Dimension”.

THE TWO WORLDS.

To observe and to observe oneself are two completely different things; however, both demand attention.

In observation, attention is oriented outward, toward the exterior world, through the windows of the senses.

In the self-observation of oneself, attention is oriented inward, and for this the senses of external perception are of no use, a reason more than sufficient for the observation of his intimate psychological processes to be difficult for the neophyte.

The point of departure of official science, on its practical side, is the observable. The point of departure of the Work on oneself is self-observation, the self-observable.

Unquestionably these two points of departure cited in the lines above lead us in completely different directions.

Someone could grow old absorbed in the intransigent dogmas of official science, studying external phenomena, observing cells, atoms, molecules, suns, stars, comets, etc., without experiencing within himself any radical change.

The kind of knowledge that transforms someone inwardly could never be achieved through external observation.

The true knowledge that can really originate in us a fundamental inner change has as its basis the direct self-observation of oneself.

It is urgent to tell our Gnostic students to observe themselves, and in what sense they must self-observe, and the reasons for it.

Observation is a means of modifying the mechanical conditions of the world. Inner self-observation is a means of changing intimately.

As a sequence or corollary of all this, we can and must affirm emphatically that there exist two kinds of knowledge: the external and the internal, and that unless we have in ourselves the magnetic center that can differentiate the qualities of knowledge, this mixture of the two planes or orders of ideas could lead us to confusion.

Sublime pseudo-esoteric Doctrines with a marked scientism in the background belong to the terrain of the observable; however, they are accepted by many aspirants as internal knowledge.

We find ourselves, then, before two worlds, the exterior and the interior. The first of these is perceived by the senses of external perception; the second can only be perceived through the Sense of internal self-observation.

Thoughts, ideas, emotions, yearnings, hopes, disappointments, etc., are interior, invisible to the ordinary senses, and yet they are more real to us than the dining room table or the armchairs of the living room.

Certainly we live more in our interior world than in the exterior one; this is irrefutable, incontrovertible.

In our Inner Worlds, in our secret world,
we love, we desire, we suspect, we bless,
we curse, we yearn, we suffer, we enjoy,
we are defrauded, rewarded, etc., etc., etc.

Unquestionably the two worlds, internal and external, are experimentally verifiable. The exterior world is the observable. The interior world is the self-observable in oneself and within oneself, here and now.

Whoever truly wishes to know the “Inner Worlds” of the planet Earth, or of the Solar System, or of the Galaxy in which we live, must first know his intimate world, his particular inner life, his own “Inner Worlds”. “Man, know thyself and thou shalt know the Universe and the Gods”.

The more this “Interior World” called “Oneself” is explored, the more one will understand that one lives simultaneously in two worlds, in two realities, in two spheres, the exterior and the interior.

In the same way that it is indispensable for one to learn to walk in the “exterior world”, so as not to fall over a precipice, not to get lost in the streets of the city, to select one′s friends, not to associate with the perverse, not to eat poison, etc., so also, through the Psychological Work on oneself, we learn to walk in the “Interior World”, which is explorable through self-observation of oneself.

Truly, the Sense of self-observation of oneself is atrophied in the decadent human race of this dark epoch in which we live.

As we persevere in the self-observation of ourselves, the Sense of intimate self-observation will develop progressively.



End of Conference 16.