

*The Practical Necessity of Wisdom*

Experience and knowledge are forms of our conventional or ordinary self-fulfillment. They are not, in general, to be avoided since they belong to the appropriate stages of our developmental growth. However, we must likewise grow in the more primary sense – in wisdom, love, or spiritual maturity. Experience and knowledge, in themselves, contribute to our sense of independence, and they effectively separate us from the processes, relations, beings, or objects by which they are generated. But wisdom, love, or spiritual awakening establishes us again in sublime continuity with all beings, things, processes, and their single mystery.

-Franklin Jones

"He only is wise who devotes himself to realizing, not reading only, the ancient revelations.

Solve all your problems through meditation, exchange unprofitable speculations for actual "God-communion."

-Lahiri Mahasaya

The broad sympathies and discerning insight needed for healing of earthly woes cannot flow from a mere intellectual consideration of human diversities, but from knowledge of men's deepest unity – kinship with God. Toward realization of the world's highest ideal – place through brotherhood – may the science of personal communion with the divine (meditation) spread in time to all men in all lands.

-Yogananda

Most individuals look outwardly for what is right and wrong, thus arguments are established among intellectuals and differences in ideology are increasing and incessantly produced. Although they "perceive" a distinction between right and wrong in their thoughts, there is truly no end to the expedition or the relative sphere. Unless one works to understand the function of the conceptual mind, through self cultivation, mediation, and a choice less awareness which develops insights, mankind will fail to know that all differences and opposites share the same origin, and all voices come from the same silent source. This is how the ancient spiritually developed beings set the direction of self cultivation in attaining spiritual development and evolution.

-Hua Ching Ni

An excellent or perfect memory is not true intelligence. How to *use* that memory for the benefit of mankind is true intelligence, or wisdom.

He who regards his knowledge as ignorance has deep insight. He who regards his ignorance as definite truth is deeply sick. Only when one is sick of this sickness can one cease to be sick. One who returns his mind to simplicity is not sick because he knows his conceptual knowledge is not "truth."

-Lau Tzu

God-self-realization is the highest I.Q.

Memory comes from the physical brain. Intuition comes from the spiritual mind.

Knowledge that knows that it does not know, is the highest form of knowledge. -Chuang Tzu

The knowledge of objects does not set you free, since it is the knower (rather than the known) that knows itself to be bound. Freedom can only be realized by transcending the subject (or knower) of knowledge, not by increasing the objects of knowledge. Therefore, freedom is not realized even in the attainment of an ultimate object of mere (or conditional) knowledge.

-Franklin Jones

All knowledge is meditation on the knower, who bestows the names "true" and "false," "auspicious" and "evil" on experience. Only in natural relationship, before we "know" a thing, do we also value it. Knowledge is naming and differentiating. When it becomes the fundamental form of our connection to everything, then our participation in Reality has ceased.

The seeker bestows the name "awesome mystery" on all the unknown. "To know" is the motive of all knowledge. And once a thing is known, mere knowledge loses its charm. Therefore, things known fall back into unknown.

Nor is the "unknown" the Truth, even though all men seek to know it. The "unknown," like knowledge, describes and points to the knower. Except it bestows the name "ignorant" upon its devotee.

The true Unknown is not that which is not yet known. It is the Eternally Unknowable. If there is such Unknown, then Ignorance is not our misfortune. It is our Nature! And, indeed, we cannot ever know what a single thing *is*. We may only know *about* any thing. But what a single thing is is not grasped in any perception, experience, or conception. Therefore, Ignorance is truth. The Unknown is Reality. Our Condition is obvious.

-Franklin Jones

### DID CREATION ORIGINATE FROM THE "BIG BANG"?

Franklin Jones States:

To speak about the "Big Bang" is to SPEAK FROM THE CONDITIONAL POINT OF VIEW. "Consideration" of the "Big Bang" is not a consideration about ultimate matters. It is a "consideration" about an appearance, essentially of a gross kind. So you cannot account for Totality merely by referring to that presumed event.

In Reality, the presumed "Big Bang" is a paradox. However, the phrase "Big Bang" has become such a common reference that people presume they know what they are talking about when they use this reference. To take another example, you commonly use the word "atom." But merely to be able to use that word "correctly" does not mean you have comprehended what an atom is. Similarly, you use the word "light", or you use the word "matter"—you use all kinds of words. And merely because words are usable, and have some sort of conventional associations that people find communicative when they are talking with one another, the general presumption is that everyone knows what they are talking about when they use words. But in fact, they do not.

Such is especially the case relative to certain unique notions, such as the "Big Bang" theory (or presumption). The "Big Bang" is not merely an event in time and space, nor is it merely the "starting point" for all otherwise ordinary events. The "Big Bang" is a paradox. The presumption about it is that, "before" (so called) the "Big Bang," There was neither space nor time. Thus, the "Big Bang" is not rightly conceived as an explosion in the *midst* of space. Rather, the "Big Bang" is the very incident in which space itself appeared. Therefore, to speak about the "Big Bang" as if it is a "something" that occurred "in" space and time (or space-time) is an expression of a rather conventional point of view. Merely the *phrasing* of the question is already beside the point of Ultimate Truth. How can there be a "before," in the sense of time, relative to something before which there was no time?

In any case, the space-time generated by the presumed "Big Bang" is essentially of a gross nature. What about all the rest of conditional existence? What about Totality Itself? What about Existence Itself, in all planes, and Absolute, Beyond Totality? These are not matters that can be fruitfully spoken about using the conventional mind as the means. The conventional mind is already fitted to location, space-time, and so forth. Such a conceptual framework is not the basis for comprehending what is beyond location and space-time.

Essentially, then, your question, as stated, is total nonsense! It is conventional space-time-bound mind struggling to have a thought in order to comprehend what is beyond itself. That effort is nonsense.

It cannot be done. The only True Answer to such questions is Divine Self-Realization Itself, not some collection of verbal descriptions.

You do not comprehend the "Big Bang." You are speaking about it abstractly, objectively, and also from a position in space-time, and based on concepts that are space-time-bound. Therefore, you are not, in Reality, talking about the "Big Bang" at all.

Reality Itself *Is*, Always Already.

Reality Itself is not limited or bound.

Reality Itself cannot itself be fractured.

Space-time is an apparent fracturing.

The "Big Bang" is a kind of metaphor, if you like, for the first cell division that was the basis for the appearance of your own body now. Before that cell division, what was there that has anything to do with you? Mother and father in bed sexing does not have anything to do with you yet, because that event is before the sperm and egg joined and started dividing cells.

Thus, in some sense, this notion of the "Big Bang" is like the notion of your own physical beginning, with the first cell division in the womb. Questions about what came before the first cell division have nothing to do with you (as a gross physical being). Such questions relate to what is prior to you. So it is, also, with questions that relate to what is prior to space-time.

It has even been "concluded" recently, by several groups of scientists, working independently, that there is not enough mass in the gross physical universe to cause it to "fall back in" on itself and collapse—such a collapse to be followed, thereafter, by another "Big Bang." These scientists (in contrast to other scientists, who "conclude" the exact opposite, based on their own theories and observations) suggest that everything will simply continue to expand for however many more billions of years. They hypothesize that there will be no "end-event" of the physical universe, but that, eventually, the physical universe will cease to be a living process (with new stars being formed, and so on), and that all matter will become virtually dead, standing in space without event.

Such hypothesizing is, again, a kind of extension of thinking about your own bodily condition. The "Big Bang" is like the first cell division that produced your body, and the eventual everything-merely-dead-moving- endlessly is like the notion of your own bodily death. Thus, the concepts about the nature of the physical universe which are current in scientific thinking at the present time are very much like the notions current about human physical existence. And, just as the notion that you are merely a gross physical body (beginning with a first cell division, and ending in death, or disintegration) does not account for the whole of you, is not the "end of the story," is not the totality understood—just so, to speak of the universe in terms of the "Big Bang" and eventual ever-expanding deadness is not the "answer," or the finality, or the total picture, either. Both of these are space-time-bound conceptions of reality—the one individual, personal, and bodily, and the other Cosmic. But these conceptions have very similar features as descriptions—one of the human reality and the other of Cosmic reality altogether.

Neither of these conceptions comprises (or leads to) a total comprehension of Reality Itself—not even a total comprehension of conditional existence altogether, in all of its planes. Only a fraction of conditional existence is taken into account by these (now commonly presumed-to-be-true) conceptions—namely, that fraction of conditional existence which is comprehended by the gross perceiver who located in space-time.

∞ ; 3. Knowledge (Big Bang of Creation) ∞

That is the basis of these descriptions, or these modes of comprehension. Ultimately, they are modes of non-comprehension, or only partial knowledge. These descriptions are not about Truth—neither the Truth of the human being nor the Truth of the universe. They may contain something true, relative to some details, but it is not the "whole story". They are both mortal metaphors—one a mortal metaphor of the human being, and the other a mortal metaphor of the absence of the full comprehension of conditional reality in all its dimensions.

. . . You cannot enclose Totality in thought. It is beyond you. *You* are subject to *It*—It is not subject to you. The complexity of All and all is immense beyond calculation, beyond measure. *You* do not measure *It*—It measures you. All your efforts of comprehension wind up being merely reflections of your own limited self.

—End of statement, F. Jones

Boundless compassion, and the profound understanding of nature are not the result of intellectual study, but the direct perception of the living reality.

"All I know now, is that I know nothing." -Socrates, i.e., now that I have attained the superior state of spiritual understanding, I know now that my intellectual knowing is nothing but a collection of concepts (conceptual knowledge).