

about abstract convictions. If a man has been fleeced by a cult, he may react negatively to you if you use the same tactics or seem to use the same tactics as they do.....even though the motives of the cult or pseudo-knower be realized by such dialectics while the other person is sincere. For instance I corresponded with a man who introduced me to a cult "Brotherhood" that put out papers of clever dialectics. They made statements which they defended with this system of dialectics, and reduced the aspirant to wordlessness by attacking everything he said. Now if such a process were to "Clear" or "Open" then it is little wonder that some aspirants who had went thru army training, or "brotherhood" dialectics, might turn and charge your fortress with all the mental vanity of a Don Quixote.

That I am yet clothed in vanity is quite possible. I must continue to use each faculty until I can learn to get along without it.

When you say that you "know" God I conclude you to be either ~~either~~ a great well-nigh incomprehensible man or else a liar since you do not appear deranged. If you are the great incomprehensible man then I can really see that it will some doing to find a medium of communication. If it is true that the finite mind cannot perceive (conceive) the Infinite, then my relative bicameral approach is in for some effort.

Let me ask you a question. Concerning the post-mortem chances for the more fortunate who manage to attain immortality....

1. Are there any in your opinion who become immortal.
2. Do you believe or know whether such immortality involves the death of the body or "translation" of same.

When you ask for sentiments, you ask for things sentimental, which smacks of the emotional which according to Ouspensky is even lower than the pseudo-intellectual. If man (undeveloped man) has many facets or "doers" or egos, then we here run the risk of creating new ego-faces. Yes and now I hide behind Ouspensky.

What do you prescribe?

Sincerely,

Richard Rose