May 27, 1970

I think it's the pressure of this Consciousness, but lots of people are quarreling in the Services, and particularly at the Press. So I wrote something:

(Mother holds out a note)

“You seem to forget that, by the very fact that you live in the Ashram, you work neither for yourselves nor for an employer, but for the Divine. Your life must be a consecration to the divine Work and cannot be governed by petty human considerations.”

Would you like to publish it, or have it posted up?

Maybe it's a bit too public....
What we could do ... It's especially at the Press that things are like that, so it would be amusing to give it to them (laughing) and tell them to print it on a little card!

(silence)

Apart from that I have nothing.... Some ‘dreams’ — not dreams: the night activities have become very clear, very interesting, but sometimes it's a symbolic dream. And it's so concrete and real.... I've never had such dreams before. Very instructive.

But then, there's a phenomenon. It's a world (this symbolic world) without distinction between the living and the dead. I mean there's not even any perceptible distinction: last night, for instance, I had an activity; well, Amrita was there and several other people, who are alive, and Amrita was like the others ... except that he was a bit ... (tired or apathetic gesture), but that must have been in his nature: no inclination to intervene.

It was a symbolic translation of an activity concerning money, but then, instead of money it was food, but it was clearly an activity about money: people's various attitudes and the reception, utilization and so on, with quite interesting details (but interesting from the standpoint of action, you understand, of what is done, how it is done).

Is it in the subtle physical, that place where the living and the dead are together?

Yes.

But are things to go in the direction of a materialisation of the subtle physical?

No. That can't be materialized, it would be impossible!... I think it's a means of action, that is to say, it responds more clearly and strongly to the will. It seems more receptive. It's more supple, more expressive too. But materialized, it would appear like pure chaos.

It seems to me to be the symbolic place of physical life. For example, within a small space, you can have a very wide action, which reaches very far.... In that way there were, as
though in adjacent rooms, people who live very far, in North India or in another country or ... They were just in different rooms, but I was able to move from one room to another; so it looks like ... (Mother gestures showing a concentration or a restricted field). It doesn't have the same concrete reality, it's symbolic.

For instance, money was symbolized as a certain food (asparagus, in fact! But not asparagus as we have here: it was big like this (gesture about a foot and a half), and one could organize it, receive and arrange it, as you would arrange food, but it wasn't put into the mouth (that's symbolic).

But then, what would materialise isn't this world but the consciousness specific to this world, the state of consciousness?

Maybe, yes.... What's trying to take place is a stronger and more direct influence on purely material circumstances.... Yes, this is it: action on this subtle physical has an effect according to the laws of the material world in the material world.

You see, amidst many other things (it lasted a long time and was a very complex thing), but as one example amidst other things, it had to do with the consequences, even current ones, of certain things Amrita did when he was here and handled money. But I spoke to him and arranged things with him as if he were present, not as if he had left.

(long silence)

Do you have anything to ask?

I was wondering about something. The other day, I asked you how to gain access to this subtle physical. But from what you've now said, do we gain access to this world through work activities, as it were?... Is it a world for work, as it were?¹

THIS ONE, yes.... I'd have to see several different things to make a rule, and I don't know. Last night, that's how it was, that's all I can say.

I may be able to tell after some time, but I'll have to be able to make connections between different things.

(silence)

You understand, those are very small things, but they're amusing as a symbolism. For instance, this food that looked like asparagus, but without being asparagus, it came in large quantity, and I distributed it, but I never ate anything; I never ate, I gave to others. They ate: those who spent, who used the money and regarded it as belonging to them, ate.... And then, some things weren't too pleasant, but others were ... looked delicious! (Mother laughs)

(long silence)

Nothing? What do you have?

¹ Satprem meant that this world seems to be a world of work and not of contemplation or speculation.
There's a practical point. In an Agenda some time ago [January 3], you spoke of the Overmind and the Supermind, and once or twice I feel you used one word for the other. But I'd like to be sure.... (Satprem takes out the text). At first, you speak of a new kind of perception that combines all organs together: a sort of total perception that combines hearing, sight, and so on. Then you say:

“All that is certainly the consciousness of what Sri Aurobindo called ... [here you say ‘the Overmind’, but I think it's the Supermind] the supramental: the being to come after man....”

Yes, its “supramental”.

“... How will he be? I haven't yet seen.... I haven't yet seen that. I did see, I did have perceptions of the superman, the intermediary being, but you clearly feel it's only an intermediary being. What will that being be like who will come after the superman? I don't know....”

Since then, I've had a vision in which I saw my own body.2

Your own body, but was it your supramental or superhuman body?

Ah, no, it wasn't superhuman.

It was supramental?

Yes, it wasn't superhuman at all.... And I don't see in what way this (Mother pinches the skin of her hands) can change into That. There has to be something between the two. I mean that materially, I don't see how this (Mother points to her body) can become what I saw. But I saw two things that same night, didn't I?

Yes, you killed someone.

Oh, yes ... who didn't die, by the way! (Mother laughs)

It was to show the Falsehood of the illusion of death. And it was also beyond all questions of sex.

Yes.

Then you go on (Satprem takes up the text again), and there's another ambiguity:

“What will that being be like who will come after the superman? I don't know.... Because we are still much too human; when we visualize the Supreme Consciousness

in a form, the Supreme Being and so on — the Supreme — we tend to give it a form similar to the human one, but that's our old habit.... I saw that being ...

So here, are you referring to the supramental being, or to the being intermediary between man and the supramental? You say:

“I saw that being (I saw it many years ago): it was clearly a far more harmonious and expressive form than the human one....”

Ah, that I don't know what it was, because it was earlier: before I knew Sri Aurobindo. I saw it ... I think it was at Tlemcen that I saw it. Then I had no notion of the superman, the supramental and all that, I didn't use those words. So I don't know.... Better use something vague.

The intermediary being?

I don't know.

The next or future being?

Yes: “the future being”.

“I saw that future being (I saw it many years ago): it was clearly a far more harmonious and expressive form than the human one, but there was a likeness, it was still a human form, that is to say, with a head and arms and legs and ... Will it be that? I don't know. There will necessarily be that as an intermediary — necessarily. There were all those kinds of apes which acted as intermediaries between the animal and man.... But lightness, invulnerability, moving about at will, luminosity at will — all that goes without saying,...”

You mean that it's part of the supramental?

Yes, yes.

“Also clothing at will: its not something foreign added on, it's the substance that takes on certain forms.”

Ah, yes, that's very important, because I POSITIVELY saw that. It's the substance itself that takes on now the form of a cloth, now ... (wavy gesture)

(silence)

Probably the difference between man and superman will be more a difference of consciousness than a material difference?
From the standpoint of form, it seems to be like that, but is it because of our powerlessness? That remains to be known.

There is obviously the precedent of the ape and man, but if there is the same difference between that being and man as between man and the ape …

*It would be something already!*

It's a lot! It's a lot.

*But one may conceive that a higher consciousness would ‘aestheticize’, harmonize this material substance….*

Yes.

*But the step beyond that is what's more incomprehensible.*

Yes.

You understand, it's the functioning of the organs and the need for organs, that's what would make a big difference. A being that wouldn't need lungs, wouldn't need a heart … that would make a tremendous difference!

*Yes, that seems possible only through a materialization rather than an evolution.*

(Mother nods her head)

I don't know anything at all.

*The only thing conceivable almost immediately is for a human being to feed on pure air, just as there are beings that feed on water (they live in water and feed on it). Its conceivable that human beings could feed on pure air. Some yogis used to do it.*

Are there beings that feed on water alone?

*I mean creatures that live in water.*

Yes, they live in water, but they eat.

*Simply plankton: tiny particles that live in water. …It is said that there are yogis who can feed on pure air. Ancient texts refer to that.*
That would be really convenient! But their appearance cannot be the same.

*At any rate, that would eliminate a lot of problems to start with.... And it's quite conceivable.*

Then what would form this (*Mother points to the body's substance*), the first formation?... We can picture the elimination of wear and tear and an indefinite prolongation with a renewal of vitality, that's quite conceivable, but the first formation?

*Yes, matter, substance.*

Well, yes!

(*long silence*)

From a purely scientific point of view, I don't know how the child is formed in the mother's womb.... In our system, food is almost dematerialized in order to be used, so for the child's formation, is it the same thing?

*Yes, it's the same food that's used for the child.*

Yes, but in the same dematerialized form?

*In the same form.*

Is it the blood that transmits it?

*It's through the blood, the child is nourished through the mother's blood. In fact, the umbilical cord is the link of transfusion for food.*

Oh, yes, certainly!... So this process of ‘becoming material’ and of ‘ceasing to be material’ is unnecessary.... If one could directly receive what nourishes ...?

*Yes, yes.*

But what is it? From a purely scientific point of view, a chemical point of view?

*It's molecules and atoms. Various arrangements of molecules and atoms.*

But they don't seem material to us, do they?

*They're material in the sense that they're observable.*

---

3 Needless to say, Satprem is perfectly ignorant of scientific matters.
They're observable.

Yes, they've been counted up.

(after a silence)

Which means that for the time being, the production of those atoms must go through a process of materialization, then of dematerialization, and then ... [of materialization again]. You understand, dense matter is an appearance. So? That's what I don't understand, there's something I don't understand from a purely scientific point of view.

Yes, if you absorb, say, a carrot or a potato, there's a large part of useless waste, and there's the essence of the thing.

Yes, and therefore if we could directly absorb the essence, there would be no more waste and no need to dematerialize and rematerialize.... I mean, even now they've found vitamins, which are an almost... (what can I call it?) ... A concentrated form?

Concentrated — but what we call ‘concentrated’ is something more and more material, whereas that's not material.... You see, we are told: You have to eat solid food because of the way you're built. Now turn the problem around: If you don't eat solid food, this construction would be unnecessary! (laughter) There would be no need anymore of a stomach, of this and that.... What could replace that?

We would have to be able to absorb vital energies directly.

Yes, exactly.

Not material energies, vital ones.

But that's something they're beginning to find, because you can feed on vitamins and things like that.

Yes, but vitamins are still a material process, Mother. It's quite limited, but it still rests on something material.

Yes, but it could be the intermediary.

True, it could be the intermediary. But the other thing would really mean a different degree of energy — the absorption of a different degree of energy. As you used to do
in the past when you breathed the smell of flowers, for instance, or as Madame Theon used to do when she put a fruit (I forget which) on her chest.

A grapefruit!... Oh, I saw that, it was extraordinary! She would put the fruit on her chest and ... it would dry out! She would simply put it there and ... she would keep it for a few hours, and when she removed it, it was all flabby, there was nothing left!

**But I often thought it should be possible for you to feed on air.**

Ah no, the air is disgusting! It's full of everybody's breathing. That's the problem, it's disgusting. Something else is needed.

Because I experienced the fact that if I go in the mountains, I hardly need to eat at all. I feel air nourishes me — but THERE, not here. Here, it's disgusting.

So that complicates matters.

We might conceive having ‘balloons of food’! *(laughter)*

**Bowlfuls of fresh air!**

Or else, as an intermediary, a system to purify air: instead of lungs, something that purifies air, as you purify food.

Ah, what time is it?