

SCIENCE and MAGIC

HYPNOSIS and ZEN

by

R. M. Reynolds, Ph.D.  
Chief Psychologist  
Ontario Correctional Institute  
Brampton, Ontario, L6V 2P1

Paper presented to the University Women's Club,  
Niagara Falls, Ontario, 22 March 1988

A long time ago, in a land far away, human nature was divided into two parts, an executive part called a God and a follower part called a man. Neither part was conscious. The man simply lived his life without thinking about it, and the God-part spoke to him from time to time, as one person to another, to tell him what to do. You may wonder how that could be.

In the dawn of history, mankind did not have a mental language. The pictogram language which we associate with Cro-Magnon man had consisted of pictures of visual events familiar to the artists, in contrast to our own writing which is primarily designed to give the reader information about something which he does not already know. Midway between these two kinds of writing were the hieroglyphs, the term meaning "the writing of the Gods", and the more widely used cuneiform writing with its wedge-shaped characters.

Most of the cuneiform literature is in the form of receipts or inventories, i.e., the subject matter was quite down-to-earth. But then a dramatic change occurred. About 1200 B.C., the king of Assyria had a stone altar made that was dramatically different from anything that had preceded it since the beginning of time. In the days of Hammurabi, for example, the king was often pictured as standing and listening intently to a very present God. Suddenly, in the carving on the face of this stone altar erected by the king of Assyria, the king is shown twice, first as he approaches the throne of his God, and then as he kneels before it, and the throne before which he kneels is empty. No king before in history is ever shown as kneeling; no scene before in history indicates an absent God.

In fact, it wasn't until about this time in history that language had evolved to the point where man could consciously have a conversation with himself, and the Gods began to withdraw from his company and to make their home in heaven; and winged beings, angels (or genies, as the Assyrians called them) began to appear as intermediaries or messengers between the absent Gods and their forlorn followers. In addition, demons began to appear and needed to be defended against, and a priestly caste arose. In Persia, they were known as the Magi, or Magicians.

Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea in the days of Herod the King, behold, there came wise men from the east to Jerusalem, saying, "Where is he that is born King of the Jews? For we

have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him.” From these few sentences in St. Matthew, a whole legend developed during the Middle Ages. The wise men became three in number, were promoted to kings, and finally, during the sixth century acquired the names of Melchior, Gaspar, and Balthazar which, in Syriac tradition, are Persian and associated with Persian religious history.

The term “magic” is derived from the Greek “mageia,” meaning the occult learning and practices of the Persian Magi. This magic was not merely an irrational substitute for a not-yet-developed science; it was an active attempt at mastery of a none-too-friendly world; and as long as the Persian empire lasted, i.e., well into the middle ages, the wisdom of the Magi was held in high esteem. Their magic was even given official recognition by the developing Christian church. After all, wasn't it the Magi who, through their astrology, had been among the first to discover Christ.

It has been said that the history of hypnosis runs back to antiquity (Coppolino, 1965) when it was used as a treatment for possession by evil spirits (e.g., by the Persian Magi) and as a form of anesthesia (e.g., by the fakirs of India). “The Druids, at the beginning of the Christian Era, were versatile in their use of hypnosis, and music was one of their chief ways of inducing this so-called ‘magical sleep.’ ” (Williams, p.6) and some of the “fairy” lullabies of Scotland and Ireland can be traced to these sources. In Biblical times, we read about the laying on of hands for the healing of the sick, a practice which was carried on by kings and emperors during the middle ages, and called the Royal Touch. In the sixteenth century, Paracelsus wrote in part, “Man possesses a hidden power which may be, in a way, compared to a magnet, for by his power, man attracts the surrounding chaos, and this magnetism comes down from the stars.” (quoted in Coppolino, p.4). He also believed that magnetic iron could cure ailments. It wasn't until some two hundred years later, however, that Frederich Anton Mesmer introduced us to the term “animal magnetism” as an explanation for the powerful effects which he was able to produce through what is now known as hypnosis. Shortly after being graduated with a medical degree from the University of Vienna, in 1766, Mesmer wrote: “I believe that health is based on a fluidum (and) that this fluid comes from magnets and astral bodies.” At the time, a contemporary of Mesmer's, one Father Gasner, was achieving considerable success as an exorcist, literally scaring the devil out of his patients; Mesmer wrote “What this clerical

gentleman is doing is superstition; what I am doing is science. I'm talking about magnetism, and magnetism is something every scientist can know something about." In fact, he spent a great deal of his time conducting scientific experiments in an attempt to demonstrate the validity of his theories; and when he did get around to putting his theories into practice, Mesmerism soon became a household word, and patients literally flocked to his door begging to be cured.

Nevertheless, within the scientific community, a few dissenting voices continued to be heard; and finally, the French Academy of Medicine attempted to come to grips with the problem. At their request, King Louis XVI appointed a commission to investigate Mesmer's claims. The committee was composed of four doctors and five laymen, including Benjamin Franklin, and one Joseph Guillotin, later famous as the inventor of that ingenious device which so many of the aristocracy were soon to lose their heads over. In due time, they passed a resolution branding mesmerism as sheer imagination; and, at least within the scientific community, mesmerism fell into disrepute.

Still, there had been some who had been impressed by the power of the procedures that Mesmer had used, if not by the prepsychological theories with which he had attempted to explain them; and in the mid-eighteen hundreds, the English physician, James Braid, suggested that the hypnotic effects *which Mesmer had produced* with such regularity could be explained solely on the basis of concentrated attention. That is, he proposed that hypnotic phenomena and both genuine and important, but that they are essentially psychological in nature. The same conclusion was arrived at independently in France by an unassuming country doctor from the small town of Nancy, Ambroise Liebeault, and the professor of medicine from Strasbourg who championed his viewpoint, Hippolyte Bernheim; and Bernheim soon succeeded in drawing world wide attention to the importance of mental therapeutics based on verbal suggestion.

Hypnotic therapy in the Nancy tradition, however, consisted essentially of induction of a state of heightened suggestibility followed by verbal suggestions of general well-being and direct symptom disappearance, in a tone of authority and confidence. This mechanistic approach left little room for concern about the etiology of the symptoms, although Bernheim and others, including Pierre Janet, Morton Prince, and Sigmund Freud, soon began to think in terms of *multiple systems of*

*consciousness* and to direct their attention to the underlying dynamics of the symptoms which they were treating. Freud, for example, wrote about his visit to Nancy as follows: "I witnessed the moving spectacle of old Liebeault working among the women and children of the labouring classes. I was a spectator of Bernheim's astonishing experiments upon his hospital patients; and I received the profoundest impression of the possibility that there could be powerful mental processes that nevertheless remained hidden from the consciousness of men." (Quoted by Shor, p.31, in Fromm and Shor, Hypnosis, 1972.)

An older colleague of Freud's, Josef Breuer, in the meantime, had discovered that the root causes of hysterical symptoms were painful memories and pent-up emotions, buried below consciousness. Pursuing this discovery, Freud and Breuer found that the hysterical symptoms could be eliminated by encouraging spontaneous verbalizations by patients under hypnosis, to evoke a catharsis of the bottled-up energies causing the symptoms. Unfortunately, Freud soon abandoned hypnosis in favour of the free associative technique which was to become the cornerstone of psychoanalytic treatment; and with the prominence of that method of treatment during the first half of this century, hypnosis again fell into disrepute.

During the eighteenth century, hypnosis had been used as an anaesthetic in several major operations. In 1842, for example, an English surgeon by the name of Ward successfully removed a leg at the thigh under hypnosis, and between 1845 and 1851 a Dr. James Esdaile performed approximately 300 major operations in India, using hypnosis as the only anaesthetic. However, it was in 1846 that ether was discovered, closely followed by chloroform; and from then until the Second World War, chemoanaesthesia was used almost exclusively. Then, in 1938, an article appeared in the Connecticut Medical Journal, again extolling the value of hypnosis as an anaesthetic, and this cry was soon taken up by others. Soon, the Society for Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis was founded, and by the 1960's hypnosis had been accepted by both the British and American Medical Associations both for the treatment of psychoneuroses and in hypnoanaesthesia; and once again, the seemingly magical properties of hypnosis began to be widely recognized and accepted, not only among practitioners but by the scientific community as well.

In 1933, Adolph Hitler was appointed Chancellor, and Germany withdrew from the League of Nations. Freud, who was seventy-seven at the time, suffered a heart attack. And a displaced Polish scholar by the name of Alfred Korzybski published the first edition of his magnum opus, Science and Sanity, which introduced the general public to the term "General Semantics" and the nonAristotelian system of logic underlying it. As you may know, newborn infants appear to be in what might be called an objectless state, in which they make no distinction between themselves and the rest of the world. In fact, it is only through the mother's interactions with her infant, in her "mothering" of it, that there is established in the infant an awareness, first of all, of its own body as a reality separate and distinct from the rest of the world. This differentiation of self from the rest of the world occurs mainly between the second and eight months of life, a stage of development which is known as normal symbiosis. The term symbiosis in this context, of course, is a metaphor. Unlike the biological concept of symbiosis, it does not describe what actually happens in a mutually beneficial relationship between two separate individuals of different species. Rather, it describes a stage in which the infant is becoming increasingly aware of the existence of his mother, but has not yet had enough experience with the world to be able to differentiate himself from her, and the infant behaves and functions as though he and his mother were a dual-unity with one common boundary. Within this symbiotic context, the child is developing memories of "good" or pleasurable experiences, first of all with the mother's breast (and later with an ever widening world of experience), and memories of "bad" or unpleasant experiences such as being hungry or cold or wet. And by establishing memories of his interactions with his mother, he is taking into himself those good and bad experiences which form the basis of his perception of the world.

Eventually, the growing child learns not only to classify some of his experiences as "good" and some as "bad," but also to think of one of the adults in his environment as "mother" and another one as "father," to drink "milk" or "water," to eat "breakfast" or "lunch" or "supper;" he lies on a "bed" and sits on a "chair;" and in this way he is able to make at least a limited amount of sense of the "blooming, buzzing confusion" into which he was born. The child's ability to form these concepts -- Korzybski calls "time binding" -- gives him an advantage over the rest of Nature in that it facilitates his adaptation to changes in his environment, giving first intellectual and then physical control over the things that go on around him. In effect, it enables him to break Newton's second law of physics,

the progression of the universe towards greater entropy.

This inborn tendency of mankind to try to bring organization out of chaos is a very powerful one. However, the particular way in which we in Western society organize our experiences is based on the Aristotelian system of logic which characterizes most of the thinking of the English-speaking nations. In classical Aristotelian logic, it is taken for granted that all judgements about what goes on in the world can be broken up into simple statements in which something (a predicate) is asserted about something else (a subject) -- Examples are "water is wet," "grass is orange," and so on. It is assumed that such statements are either "true" or "false:" water is wet is a true proposition; grass is orange is usually a false one. In this system of viewing the world, things are either black or white, good or bad, psychologists or not psychologists, people or not people, and soon.

Our classification system seems to require a division of the world. As soon as there is a class, there has to be what is inside of it and what is outside it. The separation between what is inside a class and what is outside of it seems to be as clear cut as that between a solid and a space, a figure and its background. And the separation, the difference, is what we notice, at least partly because it fits into our language system. We tend to ignore, on the other hand, and therefore to be ignorant about, aspects of our world which do not fit nicely into the way in which we ordinarily think and talk. Our language encourages us to think in terms of subject and predicate, actor and action, objects and their attributes; and it encourages us to read into nature fictional acting entities, simply because our verbs have to have some object in front of them. We have to say, for example, "it flashed," or "a light flashed," setting up an actor, a light, to perform what we call an action to flash, because that is the way our language is constructed. But this way of thinking about things has many disadvantages. Modern physics, chemistry and biology, for example, have had to discard our language in favour of the language of mathematics in order to continue to develop their ideas about the world and we cannot even understand the world as they see it because we do not even speak the same language. This is not true of all world languages. The Hopi Indian for example, is a better physicist than we are when he says "flash" -- one word for the whole performance, no subject, no predicate, no time element- than we are when we say "the light flashed." And the same is true of other languages such as Apache, Mayan, and Chinese. Perhaps an even greater disadvantage, however, is that we literally come to be at the mercy of the language which is the medium of expression in our particular society

(Whorf, 1956). For example, around the storage of what are called "gasoline drums," behaviour will tend to be of a certain type. That is, great care will be exercised. While around the storage of what are called "empty gasoline drums," it will tend to be different: careless, with little repression of smoking or of tossing cigarette butts about. Yet the "empty drums" are actually more dangerous since they contain explosive gasoline vapour. Physically, the situation is hazardous, but the descriptions which we use must employ the word "empty" which inevitably suggests lack of hazard.

During the last hundred years, however, there has been such a profound revolution in the way in which both science and philosophy have come to view the world that we can no longer afford to remain ignorant of the meaning which these recent changes may have for our understanding and experience of reality. The essence of these recent discoveries is that whether it is describing chemical changes or biological forms, nuclear structures or human behaviour, the language system employed is more productive if it is concerned with changing patterns of relationship rather than separate acting entities. It may seem, at first, that it is an affront to common sense to describe the world as patterns of relationship without needing to ask what "stuff" these patterns are "made of." But modern science affirms that the sensation of stuff arises only when we are confronted with patterns so confused or so closely knit that we cannot make them out. Take an orange, for example. It appears solid enough, but if you were to expand that orange to the size of the whole Earth, the atoms in that orange would still be only the size of grapes. And if you were then to expand those grape-sized atoms to the size of Toronto's new Skydome, the nucleus would still be no larger than a grain of salt. And all the rest of that space would be filled with nothing more than the probability of occurrence of an electrical charge, from time to time.

Now, modern psychiatry has not been totally oblivious to the field of general semantics and has begun to take advantage of some of this recent knowledge in its treatment of psychiatric patients. Psychiatrists, for example, have begun to think of the patient as the representative or emissary sent out by a family for treatment. Man can no longer realistically be thought of as a detached ego which merely acts upon the world. Rather, emphasis is beginning to be placed upon man as "being in the world", with emphasis on the dynamic, process character of being and on the fact that our being is necessarily in relation to the world. In this pattern, every push from within is at the same time a pull



from without, arising mutually and simultaneously, so that it is always impossible to say which side of a boundary any movement begins on.

That is, the individual no more acts upon the world than the world acts upon the individual; and when an individual acts in a particular way, it is never demonstrable that he or she could have acted differently. Only by ignoring the full context of an action can it be said either that I did it freely or that I couldn't help it. I can try the same action again, and if it comes out differently, I can say that I could have done otherwise, but if the same, that I could not. But in the meantime, the context has, of course, changed. Thus, in a family, one starts out by blaming some identified individual for his behaviour, but then discovers that these symptoms are a response to, or an effect of, the relations between the members of the family, and that these relationships are a function of an infinite regression of causes stretching back to the beginning of time. With this realization, we will no longer blame either the parents or children for their 'bad behaviour' but will instead think in terms of how family or other social relationships can be changed, in order to change the behaviour of the individuals involved, which should go along way towards alleviating many of our social ills. In terms of the potential offered by this new conception of the rule of language, however, even such a radical change as this is but a first faltering step. The next big step is what I would call the Second Gift of the Magi, for it is indeed magical, because following our previous line of thought to its logical conclusion, we realize that any classification system provides us only with units of description, perhaps useful to us in organizing our experience but not natural entities and not necessarily the best way in which to conceptualize events, and that all of the ideas that we have of the world and of ourselves are really social conventions which have no universal validity and which should not be confused with reality.

In one of his early books, Gordon Sinclair told the story of Baboo Dass, a 300 pound Hindu of average height who used to frequent the sidewalks in front of the Imperial Bank of India on Clive Street in Calcutta. As soon as he was seated, he would start a spiel in sing-song English telling everyone who would listen that anything can be done by people who believe in themselves. To prove what he meant, he would call the birds from the air and they would gather around him. Doves, buzzards, and now and again a parrot. These birds were called to attract attention and to help to draw a crowd; and when sufficient people had gathered, Baboo Dass would begin his magic tricks.

He might hand you a copper coin and tell you that if you wish hard enough it will turn into silver, or maybe even into gold; and Sinclair said that many people claimed the money had done just that, although it never worked for him. But the Baboo's real secret was his ability to give people extra strength, and for this demonstration you had to pay a quarter or more. Then Baboo Dass would repeat his sing-song chant about being able to do anything in the world if you'd only/believe in yourself. Next he would pick on some little fellow in the audience and say "Here my friend. Lift me up. My weight is 314 pounds but you can lift me if you only believe;" and some would actually try; and much to their amazement that great hulk of a man would come up with the ease of a baby. Sinclair, himself, tried it several times, and I'll tell you about his experience in his own words.

"I thought at first that I must be hypnotized / to the point where I thought I was lifting the man but in truth I was not. This wasn't the case at all. Several different visits spread over several different weeks proved beyond doubt that I, who certainly can't lift a 200-pound man, had easily hoisted this man of more than 300 pounds. What's more, I could hold him with ease. Even more amazing is the fact that when you are holding the old chap up he may suddenly tell you that he is about to withdraw his power from your muscles. Instantly your arms go limp and the Baboo's body slumps to the pavement. Sometimes in fact it goes down with a bruising thump. Many a scientific body has investigated Baboo Dass, indeed he is one of the prime sights of Calcutta, but none has been able to identify the hidden power he holds over the bodies of other people (Bright Paths to Adventure, pp.166-169).

There are, of course, many other stories about people performing miraculous physical feats. There is the story of the truck driver who literally tore a car door off its hinges to free a man who was trapped in a burning car, and the mother who lifted a car off of her child which had been trapped beneath it. I tell you these stories to illustrate the fact that there are many limitations on what we can do in the world which we have constructed to live in; but those same limitations may only exist for us within our normal state of consciousness. And in other states of consciousness, those same limitations may no longer apply. In any altered state of consciousness one's normal kinesthetic experiences may be temporarily suspended (in hypnosis, we call this dissociation), uncommon muscular rigidity may occur (catalepsy), memory may be affected (hypermnnesia or amnesia), past events may be relived or

revivified (age regression), a person may experience sensory input from objects which aren't there or may fail to see objects which are (positive and negative hallucinations, respectively), unusual amounts of strength may be available, and so on. And of course, what I have been describing for you are the standard hypnotic phenomena.

"That does not sound very scientific!" you say? On the contrary, it is more scientific than you have yet been able to imagine; and "Imagination", as Einstein reminds us, "is more important than knowledge." Einstein's theories of relativity describe a reality which is far removed from our ordinary experience. In relativity theory, space and time are neither absolute nor independent, as Newton had originally thought; both time and distance vary with the strength of the gravitational field; space is curved; and time can even run backwards if the proper conditions are met. Quantum mechanics stretches the limits of our credulity even further. The most careful experiments have shown that it is not possible for the scientist to be simply a passive observer of events, since the very act of observing, itself, change the observed. The universe is, in fact, in some strange way, brought into being by our participation in it and may exist as it does only because of the way in which we are conscious of it. Furthermore, all things in the universe are interconnected; that is, each part of 3-dimensional space is connected to every other part, with the result that whatever happens in any place in the universe affects what happens everywhere else. Modern theoretical physics provides a very mystical view of the world, indeed.

According to Capra (*The Tao of Physics*, 1975, P.27), throughout history, it has been recognized that the human mind is capable of two kinds of knowledge, or two modes of consciousness, which have often been termed the rational and the intuitive, and have traditionally been associated with science and religion, respectively. In the West, the intuitive, mystical type of knowledge is often devalued in favour of rational, scientific knowledge, whereas the traditional Eastern attitude is, in general, just the opposite. The Upanishads (one of the Vedas or Hindu scriptures), for example, speaks of a higher and a lower knowledge and associates the lower knowledge with the various sciences, the higher with religious experience. Chinese philosophy, on the other hand, has always emphasized the complimentary nature of the intuitive and the rational. Accordingly, two complimentary philosophical traditions -- Taoism and Confucianism -- have developed in ancient China to deal with

the two kinds of knowledge.

Confucianism is a philosophy of social responsibility, the ethical basis for the traditional Chinese inter-generational family system with its ritual of social etiquette and obligation. Taoism, on the other hand, is concerned with teaching spontaneity and the wisdom of trusting in intuitive knowledge. In a book of profound Western Taoist wisdom, we read:

“When you wake up in the morning, Pooh,” said Piglet at last, “what's the first thing you say to yourself?”

“What's for breakfast?” said Pooh. “What do you say, Piglet?”

“I say, I wonder what's going to happen exciting today?” said Piglet.

Pooh nodded thoughtfully. “It's the same thing,” he said.

“What's that?” the Unbeliever asked. “Wisdom from a Western Taoist,” I said. “It sounds like something from Winnie-the-Pooh,” he said. “It is,” I said. “That's not about Taoism,” he said. “Oh, yes it is,” I said. “No, it's not,” he said. “What do you think it's about?” I said. “It's about this dumpy little bear that wanders around asking silly questions, making up songs, going through all kinds of adventures, without ever accumulating any amount of intellectual knowledge or losing his simple minded sort of happiness. That's what it's about,” he said. “Same thing,” I said.

“When the Chinese mind came in contact with Indian thought in the form of Buddhism around the first century A.D., ... the pragmatic side of the Chinese mentality responded to the impact of Indian Buddhism by concentrating on its practical aspects and developing them into a special kind of spiritual discipline which was given the name Ch'an, a word usually translated as meditation. This Ch'an philosophy was eventually adopted by Japan, around A.D. 1200, and has been cultivated there, under the name of Zen, as a living tradition up to the present day.” Capra, 1975, p.124). Zen is concerned with the cultivation of intuitive awareness of reality (called Enlightenment or Satori) unmediated by the concepts of our abstract thought, the experience of reality as it really is rather than as we have constructed it to be.

Zen, like its predecessor Taoism, is convinced that such ultimate knowledge can never be apprehended by the intellect and can certainly never be put into words. Nevertheless, Zen masters have devised ways of helping their students to attain enlightenment, usually by pointing directly to the reality of immediate experience or by posing problems which cannot be answered in any rational way. For example, Buddha told the following parable:

“A man traveling across a field encountered a tiger. He fled, the tiger after him. Coming to a precipice, he caught hold of a root of a wild vine and swung himself down over the edge. The tiger sniffed at him from above. Trembling, the man looked down to where, far below, another tiger was waiting to eat him. Only the vine sustained him.

Two mice, one white and one black, little by little started to gnaw away at the vine. The man saw a luscious strawberry near him. Grasping the vine with one hand, he plucked the strawberry with the other. How sweet it tasted:" (Zen Flash, Zen Bones, p.22, 23). p.22, 23).

Much of the Zen literature is in the form of just such little stories, pointing towards enlightenment. My favorite story is the one of Nansen and the cat: “Nansen was the abbot in charge of a Zen monastery. One day he came upon the students of the two dormitories arguing about which dormitory owned the cat. Nansen seized the cat in one hand and his knife in the other and cried, ‘If any of you can say a true word, you can save the cat.’ No one answered, so Nansen cut the cat in two and gave half to each of the dormitories. That evening, Nansen's favorite student, Joshu returned from a trip, and Nansen told him about the incident concerning the cat. Hearing this, Joshu removed his sandals and, placing them on his head, walked out. Nansen said, ‘If you had only been there, the cat would have been saved.’ ”

Joshu grew up to be a Zen master with students of his own. One day a monk approached him and said, “I have just entered the monastery. Please teach me about Zen.” Joshu answered, “Did you get here in time for lunch?” The monk replied, “Yes, thank you, I have just eaten.” “Then,” said Joshu,

“you had better wash your bowl.” At that moment, the monk experienced his first taste of enlightenment.

“An older student came to Otis and said, ‘I have been to see a great number of teachers and I have given up a great number of pleasures. I have fasted, been celibate and stayed awake nights seeking enlightenment. I have given up everything I was asked to give up and I have suffered, but I have not been enlightened. What should I do?’ Otis replied, ‘Give up suffering.’ “ (Benares, 1977).

So what is Zen, and what is enlightenment? “Zen is a leap from thinking to knowing, from second hand to direct experience.” (Humphries, 1961), and enlightenment is “the realization that the universe is not external to you.” (Kapleau, 1965, 1980). As the sixth Zen patriarch said: “The flag doesn't move, the wind doesn't move, only your mind moves.” Whatever is in your mind is the reflection of your mind, therefore it is you. “The big clock chimes -- not the clock but mind chimes. The universe itself chimes. There is neither mind nor universe. Dong, dong, dong.”

Zen is exceedingly simple:

“Sitting quietly, doing nothing,  
Spring comes, and the grass grows by itself.”

It is also very profound. Perhaps I can give you just a flavor of it if I describe one Canadian housewife's enlightenment in her own words:

(1) The world as apprehended by the senses is the least true (in the sense of complete), the least dynamic (in the sense of eternal movement), and the least important in a vast “geometry of existence” of unspeakable profundity, whose rate of vibration, whose intensity and subtlety are beyond verbal description.

(2) Words are cumbersome and primitive -- almost useless in trying to suggest the true multidimensional workings of an indescribably vast complex of dynamic forces, to contact which one must abandon one's normal level of consciousness.

(3) The least act, such as eating or scratching an arm, is not at all simple. It is merely a visible moment in a network of causes and effects reaching forward into unknowingness and back into an infinity of silence, where individual consciousness cannot even enter. There is truly nothing to know, nothing that can be known.

(4) The physical world is an infinity of movement, of time-existence. But simultaneously it is an infinity of silence and voidness. Every object is thus transparent. Everything has its own special inner character, its own karma or "life in time" but at the same time there is no place where there is emptiness, where one object does not flow into another.

(5) The least expression of weather variation, soft rain or a gentle breeze, touches me as a - what can I say? - miracle of unmatched wonder, beauty, and goodness. There is nothing to do: just to be is a supremely total act.

(6) Looking into faces, I see something of the long chain of their past existence, and sometimes something of their future. The past ones recede behind the outer face like ever-finer tissues yet are the same time impregnated in it.

(7) When I am in solitude I can hear a "song" coming forth from everything. Each and everything has its own song: even moods, thoughts, and feelings have their finer songs. Yet beneath this variety they intermingle in one inexpressably vast unity.

(8) I feel a love which, without object, is best called lovingness. But my old emotional reactions still coarsely interfere with the expressions of this supremely gentle and effortless lovingness.

(9) I feel that consciousness which is neither myself nor not myself, which is protecting or leading me into directions. helpful to my proper growth and maturity,

and propelling me away from that which is against that growth. It is like a stream into which I have flowed and, joyously, is carrying me beyond myself. (Kapleau, pp. 279,280)

Science used to be concerned only with empirical events; and for psychology, thought did not even exist because it could not be seen and measured. All that has changed as a result of thinkers such as Einstein, Wittgenstein, Heisenberg, and Neils Bohr, to mention just a few. The world of modern science is now the world of magic, of hypnosis and Zen, a world of joyous participation, of freedom and responsibility, the second gift of the Magi.