

A freely downloadable audio-file of the following transcribed talk is available by accessing the 'Archive' page(s) at the website of the 'Eugene Halliday Institute for the Study of Hierological Values'.

*NOTE: Transcribers comments are between square brackets [ ]*

## PHENOMENOLOGY

A talk given by Eugene Halliday at Parklands May 23rd 1976. Ishval tape no 27

[noted as *The Deficiencies of Phenomenology* by some recorders present]

### Précis

Eugene begins the talk light-heartedly and reminds the audience of the use of the hand as a mnemonic device. Then from a definition from the audience of phenomenology as 'having a think' he mentions that there is suggestion that Husserl the originator of phenomenology had had influence from Oriental philosophy, then states that phenom. is about getting to the essential datum of consciousness. He stress that all things, relations, everything is internal to consciousness. 'Phenomenon' means appearance and all things appear in consciousness in some form. Every human is a centre of a field or zone of consc.. A field being where an influence can be detected or a form may appear and in this way a circle can adequately represent the circumscription of a zone or a being, but that this circle or circumscription is always drawn within consc.. Before the circle the consc. had no edges. The consc. before the circle is drawn is 'transcendent' conc. in phenomenology. The skin can represent the circle drawn in consc. And the mind can then defined as the zone of evaluation. Adequate representation allows for mind to evaluate, and formulate, maths and physics equations can represent adequately the processes of the world.  $E=MC^2$  is such a representation. Such representations existed for millions of years before being represented on paper by men. So that these forms transcend time, are hence eternal, this relates directly to Platonism.

Eugene then says the pure datum of consc. is reached in Phenom. in **4 stages**. **Stage 1** is to deny the out-there-ness of objects and to recognise all as inside of consc.. They may or they may not exist independently of the observer. They are appearances within consc..

**Stage 2** is the 'eidetic' reduction - Greek word for form, from which we get 'idea' - the essential that characterises an appearance, purely, not given with any complicating personal, individuated, psychological additives. He states the essence, as pure being, always means formal, structural, functional power or energy. **Stage 3** is how these eidetics are

put together in consc.. He outlines how the baby's mind is structured to locate itself inside its skin shape by internal stress-strain within the organism itself, and also from without by the external stress-strains of other beings acting on it from outside. Hence if a structure is faulty we can take it to pieces and return to a stage of innocence (re-enter Kingdom of Heaven) which may be necessary as we have not all been structured essentially but rather by the needs of others. **Stage 4** is the transcendental reduction - suspend belief in yourself as a finite individual - all essential eidetic structures will still exist in their own right. Eugene explains this level of 'transcendent subjectivity' as infinite consc. - all circles erased.

These 'Phenom. reductions' or stages are then related to the mnemonic of the hand and the affective- ring finger level is missing. The value of 'Feeling' is then discussed and clearly described and distinguished from emotion. Eugene states mental disorders are fundamentally, affective disorders - hence it was ignored by philosophies eg. Stoics. Feeling is disruptive, it dynamises or charges the universe. In Islamic, Buddhist and early Christian thought the heart and sensitive feeling was an essential aspect of intellect. He then gives examples of hard-heartedness. The male mind tends towards the eidetics, ignores feeling, the female tends to feel, disinterested in structure.

The perfect human being is as sensitive in feeling as they are clear in idea, and our aim is 'prodigal-wise, to find out exactly what thinking is in itself, and what feeling is, in itself.

## Transcription

E.H. - I was going to give a talk tonight but I was nipped in the bud because when I came in, 'What are you going to talk about?'. 'I don't know, what do you think I ought to talk about?'. 'Well you'll have to talk about something.' 'Oh I know I'll talk about that perennial The True the Good and the Beautiful'. Cries of dismay, 'You can't do that, you made a tape about that. We've got you talking about that on tape, so you can't possibly do that'.

Now apparently the tape must be very good because it completely dispatched all problems pertaining to the True

the Good and the Beautiful. For which I'm very pleased - I didn't listen to the tape myself because, like Harold Wilson, I haven't much time because of land deals and things like that.

So I decided that as we have an expert in phenomenology in the audience it was either that I should request her to talk or David to talk or Zero to talk. I asked David he was quite prepared to talk without knowing what about. Zero was not prepared to talk without knowing about. The other person was quite prepared to talk but I didn't ask her to. Of course you all know who that was don't you. I'll give it to Gerhardt to voice the name. Who is it Gerhardt? Guess? No no no, you only have one guess each. Now who else . . . Who would it be. Hanukah do you think?

Well I thought she knows all about things like existentialism and phenomenology and Kierkegaard - three very abstruse problems - so I thought I might ask her to do it. Then somebody suggested to me that, it might not be fair because 'she's only a girl'. I immediately said that remark was illegal. And that we have to allow - we're not allowed to say 'she' actually . . . Do you know that now officially that there is no such subject as gynaecology? It doesn't exist, it's been outlawed. There never was a subject called *andrology*, but there should have been.

Anyhow I am going to talk about phenomenology. I am not going to talk about phenomenology as usually talked about because that would immediately make me a fit target for Hanukah's super wisdom in the subject matter, I am going to talk about the deficiencies of it which are not usually

mentioned, and one in particular,

Now, we use the human hand as a mnemonic device, don't we? We put things on our fingers to help us to remember them. It's a useful device. Any device that helps you to categorise, to place, to put into relation concepts ideas and so on, is useful, and we've got one that fits everything that we care to think about quite adequately, so we will do the same thing tonight.

Every now and then I will stop and ask Hanukah for a definition, or ask her if the definition that I give is actually permissible within the frame of orthodoxy. So, first of all I am going to ask her if she will define, in one sentence no more than three inches of tape, phenomenology, Hanukah, three inch definition of phenomenology. What is it?

Answer - Having a think

E.H. - Having a think, That is quite good, phenomenology is having a think. But it is a peculiar kind of having a think. It is having a think about the essence of thinking as divorced from external objective things of an assumed external world. It is a science of sciences. Now, I am informed by some very well-informed people who were informed by other people very well-informed, that Husserl, at some point in his career had some contact with a man who had studied oriental philosophy and that some of this leaked into his phenomenology.

So I am going to say that phenomenology is concerned to get at the essential datum of Consciousness. You say datum, I say dah-tum, you say dah-tum. I say datum. The

essential datum of Consciousness, I want to define why we need it, why it is worth having.

The whole, universe that we know and every part of it that we know, our near ones, our dear ones, our far ones, our hated ones, whatever they are, the things, the persons, the animals, the relations, the figments of the imagination, all of these are internal to consciousness. That is tremendously important. Internal to consciousness there are contents. Now, a content of consciousness appears to us in some form, in some manner; and the word for appearance is phenomenon. It is from a basic word meaning simply to appear. PHA, *pha* as in Pharaoh and *pharos*; a lighthouse, is the basis. If you write a Greek letter phi, that is a circle with a vertical through it. That letter symbolises this primary fact of appearance. Now it is a very good letter to use because the very form of the letter suggests the process whereby we do it.

We draw a circle. Shall I draw a circle or will you imagine one? It is quieter if you imagine it. I am already hot, through travel. Now if I put on this light it will get hot, it will also make a noise, so can I ask your indulgence, will you please, mentally draw a circle, like that and let that circle be the only content of your consciousness; And you are a field of consciousness. I say 'field' of consciousness using the word field to mean any zone in which something may appear or in which some influence may be detected. So when we use the word field we are meaning a zone in which an influence may be detected or in which something may appear.

So we can say, without any further debate every individual

human being is, for himself, the centre of a zone of consciousness, a field of awareness. Now I want you to mentally draw a circle in that zone of consciousness and then I want you do a little piece of mental acrobatics. I want you to say, "This circle represents my 'own skin.'" I could have drawn it along my skin and then tightened up the irregularities and produced a circle. Now I want us to observe this fact. If I look at my friend, Dr Arthur Berwitz out there, I can quickly run round him like that, circumscribe him with an irregular shape. But if I tie the ends together, so that I have surrounded him and then I put my fingers inside this piece of mental string and do this with it, I can spread it out and arrange it till it forms a circle. And I can call the circle then, the pure type, the pure form of circumscription. I've eliminated the irregularities and I have arrived at a conceptual line encapsulating an area in consciousness.

Now this area of consciousness is possessed by each observer. Each one of us is an observer precisely because he has conceptualised himself already as encapsulated. Now one of the basic Husserl-ian doctrines is that a blind man, congenitally blind man, who has never seen, can never get to the essence of seeing. He can't even see, never mind get to the essence of seeing. So the first thing is to remember, that unless you have an experience you cannot get to the essential of experience. First we experience, then by looking hard at our experience, we can arrive at what is essential to that experience. And by essential we mean that which is the guarantee of this particular presence and the absence of which would guarantee its absence. Essence is that which guarantees presence and the absence of which guarantees absence.

When we have this circle, each one of us can, actually draw the circle round our own being and then consider inside the circle and outside the circle. But it is essential for us to realise that when we do draw the circle, we have drawn the circle inside a consciousness, which before we drew the circle had no edges.

Consciousness without the circle drawn in is edgeless, it is infinite. We will come later on to discover that this infinite consciousness is what we call transcendental subjectivity. It goes beyond all limitations whatever and yet, mysteriously, it is consciousness. It is consciousness of zones of influence, zones in which appearances present themselves.

So, here we are, each one of us drawing a circle and saying, "Let this circle represent the encapsulating integument, the skin surface of this observing self".

Now I want to clearly note that we are doing a peculiar kind of operation when we draw this circle and when we say, "Let it represent something which it is not, for instance, my skin surface is my skin surface, it is not the circle that I have drawn to represent it. So that when I say; let this circle, represent my skin surface," I am doing an operation in my mind. Now the word 'mind' simply means 'counting process' within the determined zone selected as observer. Mind, that is *men*, base M N, the base to count, to evaluate, with the D at the end symbolises the dividing circle, the mind. A mind is the zone in which counting, evaluation is going on. It is encapsulated, a process of self-valuation, self-numeration is going on and because this is evaluatory process is going on inside a relatively finite

closed system we call it a min-d, the D being the determinant of the finiting closure.

So when I say to you, "Imagine this circle. Let the circle represent to you your own integument," this does not mean that this circle is your actual integument. It means that it is a symbol, a symbol that you agree, with yourself, shall represent that integument. But then emerges. a very peculiar thing. If it adequately represents your integument, your binding skin surface, if it adequately represents it then any operation you may do with that circle, you could, in principle, do with your integument. Thus, if I can draw the circle like this and say it now represents my integument and then I can mentally push my finger into the edge of the circle and bend it so that the circle now goes like this, see where the bend is, where the finger has gone in, I can do the same thing with my own integument. Now this is very important for science and for philosophy, because any operation that I can actually do with that which represents being, I can, in principle, do with being. Conditional on that fact it must be adequately representative of the being for the operation to be possible.

So, in the case of the famous equations of physics and mathematics, if the mathematical equation adequately represents a situation in the material world, then that mathematical operation can be conducted in the material world. So  $E=MC^2$  manipulated in a certain way in the human mind made a bomb on Hiroshima. The real physical bomb was merely the precipitation of a mathematical possibility. Now this mathematical possibility existed millions of years before the human beings

discovered how to represent it on paper, how to consider it and then how to manipulate the world in accord with that group of symbols constituting the equation.

Think that the Pi ratio, rapid 3.1416, known to the Egyptian priesthood, that pi ratio was known by them thousands of years before it was known to the populace and it existed in nature millions and millions of years before priest-craft ever discovered it.

So we are saying that the mathematical essences, the geometrical essences, the logical essences of the universe are eternal, that they may appear in time in the minds of men, but they are in themselves, not temporal. They transcend, absolutely the temporal process. Let us try to remember this, and don't let anybody say, "Oh, that is only Platonism." Say, Plato got the basic idea from initiatory processes from the temple mysteries and so on. And these truths are eternal, that a triangle has three sides, that a sphere has an inside and an outside, that a flat coin has two sides and an edge, and so on. These things are, in their pure essential form, the pure eidetic of them, these things are eternal. They are not temporals, nor are they derived from time. The play of time is derived from the inter-relating functions of eternal eidetic structures.

Now, we are looking for the pure datum, that is to say, that which appears in consciousness, irrefutably - irrefutably. It comes into consciousness and can be looked at, can be examined, and there are four steps given to get at this pure datum. Four steps are given by the phenomenologists. Shortly these four steps are, first phenomenological reduction.

Now the first step, phenomenological reduction, is done in a very simple way. When we drew the circle to represent our integument we had already made a first step downwards from the infinite field of consciousness. First step down from the infinite field of consciousness was to draw this circle and this circle allowed us to look inside and out. If then, the consciousness, deliberately, by intention locates itself inside the circle - this is an intentional act - it gives rise to the concept of a localised finite observer.

Now, imagine here is your circle, representing you, each one of you is a circle, you are sitting inside your skin, and everything beyond the circle that you have decided to pretend that you are confined to, I say pretended to be confined to because your consciousness is not so confined, because I am aware of all you other people. And therefore you must be in consciousness, but you are not inside this physical body over here. So if I identify with this circle and say I, sitting inside this finite sphere, looking out at you other circles I have posited you outside *this* closed system.

Now, when you believe that there are objects outside you, we call this the naive natural view and the view of materialistic empirical science. Science, like the common man in the street, believes that there are external objects. For many thousands of years he did not notice that the outside objects were only outside because he had identified with a particular physical body from which he made his observation. You observe it is a fact if you identify with your own physical body, you sit inside your skin, but in fact, you are aware of all the other bodies. So those bodies transcend, they go beyond, they pass across

your skin surface, they are transcendent objects to you for only one reason. They are transcendent objects because you have identified with your finitude, with your physical body circle self-encapsulation, which is merely an intention of your will to consider yourself as separate.

Now the phenomenological reduction is to say, I do not accept that there are any objects out there in space. I am going to remove the out-there-ness by considering them as appearances and nothing but appearances in consciousness. Consider that is obviously true. I am an appearance to you, you are an appearance to me, we both are in a field of consciousness; which is infinite, but for practical purposes we pretend that there are processes going on inside each head that are insulated from processes in other heads. There is failure of communication from head to head, there is concealment of content from head to head, and so on. And, by this device of deliberate self-finiting of consciousness, the identifying of consciousness within the closed zone we maintain an illusion of separativity. Now the phenomenological reduction simply denies the outside-ness of things and says do not posit that that being is over there, out there in space, but instead, think it is an appearance within consciousness, and when you do this process of saying it is only an appearance, why should I say, "Out there?"

There is my young friend, Andrew Berwitz, is he out there? What does 'out there' mean? It only means out there in relation to this body.

If I, here, finite my consciousness deliberately and then pretend that my information about him has come through my eye, which is a finite object, through light, reflecting

onto the surface of his body, coming across space into my eye and then being interpreted. Now, instead of saying that highly complex scientific explanation, all I need to say is, there is an appearance in consciousness. The appearance is called Andrew Berwitz. The appearance here, you know my name. These appearances are both internal to consciousness

So my first job is to get rid of the out there-ness so that we merely deal with appearances. That is the first step. The phenomenological reduction says stop thinking about physical bodies as located in space, existing independently of the observer. They may or they may not exist independent of the observer. That is irrelevant to the problem. The fact is, they are appearances within consciousness. So that is the first step. Reduce them to appearances in consciousness, deliberately ignore or suspend your belief that they are physical objects existing outside your own being in space, and existing whether or not you exist. Suspend that one. That is called the phenomenological reduction.

We then go on to the next reduction called the eidetic reduction. In this eidetic reduction we are looking for the essential form. This eidetic word is simply a Greek word for form, from which we get the word idea, an idea is Greek for form and form is Latin for the Greek idea. And shape is Anglo-Saxon for either form or idea. What we are looking for is the essential in the eidetic reduction, the essential that characterises this appearance and we want the appearance in a pure way so that this appearance is not given with any complicating personal, individuated, psychological additives. We want the pureness of a

process of hearing a process of seeing. We are looking, in the eidetic reduction for pure essence. Remember that essence word is simply a word which means to be, we are looking for pure being, and the essence, as pure being always means formal, structural, functional power or energy. Ultimately we are looking for forms of energy within consciousness and we are going to discover that all these forms of energy are intentional structures, That is, they are intended by the field of consciousness itself in order to structure itself as a universe, as a cosmos, as a world.

So the second step is the eidetic reduction, the location of the pure, essential form of it. Now, that requires a lot of very careful examination of a form in your mind. You listen to a sound, you look at a colour so if you see the colour blue in your mind, and you look at what is essential about the blueness of blue, the yellowness of yellow and so on. Gradually it grows in your mind it is a gradual process of self-sensitisation, gradually you become aware of what it means to be essentially a colour, essentially a sound, essentially a smell, essentially a taste and so on. You are looking for pure essences. When you have found these essences, later on, you will be able to put them back together and build a universe, which is essential. The universe, it is what it is, eternally so and therefore unalterably so; and therefore ultimately truthfully so and therefore absolutely, scientifically so but not in the ordinary, external: empirical scientific sense but in the sense of a pure absolute science of sciences, the pursuit of essence.

Now the third step is the determination of how these

eidetics are put together in consciousness. How do these forms in our consciousness become structured? What kind of operation is it that goes on inside the field of consciousness to structure a world that we know and that we agree with? Now the anthropological research of the last forty years has shown a remarkable similarity in the beliefs of ancient peoples, extant primitive peoples, and so on. Whether we are going from depth psychology, shamanism, witch-doctor practices, the psychologies of the most primitive peoples - they all concur in one fact and that is, that we build the universe in which we live - we structure thought.

When a baby is born, you have seen a relatively new-born baby with eyes not properly convergent, and that baby is a sensorium, we talk about the innocence of childhood, it is a sensorium, it is sensitive and it can undergo experiences and it can record inside itself all processes of energy that come within its vicinity and act upon its localised zone of sentience. But it has no determinants of what we would call structured civilised response. So that baby will burp at you - it do other things at you to. It will do things that later on it will not do in public.

The baby is a sensorium living, rather like an animal or a plant, completely spontaneously. Unless the baby has been very badly damaged *in utero*, before birth, the baby is a spontaneous sensorium with no external rides of how to express itself. It is nothing but pure responsiveness to processes in the field of consciousness. And we cannot say merely to processes outside the baby because you know very well, any good child nurse will tell you, that if the baby smiles, it does not necessarily mean the baby has

had an amusing thought. It might be being tickled by an air bubble running through its food tube. There are internal processes inside the child which show that the child on the inside is a little world stimulating itself within its skin surface and living within itself. And yet, the child is also aware of the emotional state of its mother most obviously, and of other beings round about it. So, for the child, although it has got a skin around it, its consciousness is not yet confined to processes going on inside the body, but the consciousness extends beyond the body.

Then the parents begin to act upon it. They get hold of it, might give it an external stimulus and they go all over it, more or less like this. In effect they are saying to the child this is the extent of your territory and later on, when you get a bit bigger, you will confine your rotten behaviour to inside this part, which I am de-marking for you; so that your behaviour system does not impinge upon my behaviour system in a manner that I do not wish it to.

So the baby, by external stimulation, is being conditioned by its parents and educators and it is being structured. And while it is being tapped and washed and turned over and powered and annoyed and fed with undesirable materials that it would not touch anyway if it could avoid them; while all these things are going on, words are going into the ears of that child, lights are going into the eyes, sounds in the ears, slappings haptically and so on. And that child is being stimulated in a five-fold manner, obviously, and in a sixth manner through the field force, the bio-field of the persons that act upon it, pleasantly and unpleasantly.

So we can say that that child is a hexonic, structuralising

process being acted upon by other structuralising processes in which the structuralising has gone on to a much greater degree So that we can say that the grown up adult is well and truly structured within the social framework in which it has been nurtured. It is structured.

Now, in that third process we are trying to determine how our world is structured. How the eidetics, the pure essential forms are actually put together. We know that they are put together from within by internal stress-strain within the organism itself and from without by the external stress-strains of other beings acting upon its integument from outside. But the essential internal structuring of all the responses of this localised zone of sensitivity, this child, the essential mode of structuring is this third step. When we have got at this essential mode of structuring, we are on the way to being able to disassemble the structure.

So that if a structure is faulty we can take it to pieces, we can return to a level called the stage of innocence that we were at. 'Except that ye become as a little child again - oh grown up - ye shall not enter the Kingdom of heaven.'

That means to say, unless you learn to de-structure yourself intelligently, you can never regain the lost innocence of the child, and then re-structure yourself according to your own will. You have been structured by your parents, by your educators, in accord with their desires, with their purposes. They have not always structured us correctly. Not always structured us, in the highest sense, desirably. They have structured us, They have structured us not essentially but psychologically, that is to say, they have structured us by their affective

needs rather than by the essence of the formal requirements of our cosmic situation. So that is our third step.

Now the fourth step is transcendental reduction. In this fourth step, we take the idea that there is a self that there are pluralities of selves, and like we did in the first instance in the phenomenological reduction, we said suspend belief in the out-there-ness of objects, suspend the belief that they exist independently of the observer, and just look at the appearance of them, and don't interpret that appearance, just see it as it is and describe its eidetic, its formal structure and the way it is constituted. Now the fourth step is to suspend belief in the observer as a finite being.

Now this is to suspend belief in your own egoic consciousness of the finite. You suspend belief in yourself as a finite individual and when you suspend this belief and the belief in all subjective finited observers, you arrive at a state called transcendental subjectivity, That is to say, the observing conscious field is now infinite.

We come back to the beginning. We started with an infinite field, we drew a circle within it, we could draw a jot of circles, each one of you draws a circle and says, 'This is my circle.' You sit inside it and say, 'Now, I am an egoic consciousness, sitting inside my sphere of awareness'. And then I will look out from this towards other beings out there in space, which exist even if I shut my eyes, or don't, but it does not matter either way, but certainly, in the naive sense, they are out there. We suspend this belief, we get to the pure form, the appearance of all these beings

by essential observation of our own processes of conscious observation, so that we become conscious of the consciousness processes themselves, and then, in our fourth step, we eliminate the belief in these circles which we have drawn. We rub them out.

Now what happens if you rub out all the circles? Do all the beings vanish or are they still there? They are there, but they are appearances, but the circles that we, intentionally drew round them are no longer necessary because they are essential eidetic structures in their own right.

So, if I suspend my belief in you as egotistic beings sitting inside encapsulated spheres of skin and I see you only as appearances, it is funny, the room looks lighter when I do it. All I have got is an infinite field of consciousness, structured just as it was structured before I did the operation, except now there are no limiting factors upon it that are not essential. There are no added limitations.

If your mother, annoyed with you says 'You don't do that, you don't talk like that to me!' Now that is not an essential part of your relation with your mother, it is an imposed, finite, private, psychological limitation. It is not an essential, and 'Don't you dare speak to me in that tone,' is really a kind of exhortation. I mean you have the tone within you, you can use it, whether you dare or not is your business. But when somebody says to you, "I impose a limitation on you, you shall not cross that line". Now if you are a bit like the chicken with the chalk line from the nose - and you stay there, you don't go across the line - that does not mean that the line has power to stop you going over it. It means that you imposed on yourself, by your own

interpretation, the idea that you could not go across the line. So that was not essential, that was psychological.

Now, in this reductive process, putting it on our hand, the phenomenological reduction we put on our little finger; the eidetic one on the middle finger; the constitution of the eidetics on your index finger and the transcendental reduction, that is a reduction of the belief that there are these separate observers, on the thumb. And, we observe that we missed one out, the ring finger, because, in the Husserlian analysis it is not mentioned. It could have been mentioned but it wasn't and it is called the affective reduction.

Now, affect in psychology means the charge of feeling, liking or disliking. We could have made an affective reduction, we could have said the whole universe is nothing but likes and dislikes, actual felt experiences, of pleasantness, unpleasantness of some degree. So we will put that one back in and say there is an affective aspect of the whole field of consciousness and that that affective aspect was not adequately dealt within that analysis we have just given. So we are going to put it back in and we are returning to it because, in this sense, for us, as human beings, the affective is the most determinant of our lives.

That is to say our pleasures, our pains, our likes, our dislikes have actually more influence upon us than: our pure eidetics; than the essences of forms; more influence than the patterns and the methods, the manner of constitution of patterns of form; more influence upon us than the concept of transcendental subjectivity; more influence upon us than the actual physical presence of our

body. The thing that most influences us is the affect, and we can see why it was left out because feeling, as such, is edgeless; feeling as such, is not concerned primarily, with formal definition. It is simply concerned with an evaluation of the degree of like/dislike or of pleasure or pain within the sensorium, within the field of consciousness.

Now when *we* feel, I am not saying, when we emote, when we feel, we simply evaluate degrees of pleasure/unpleasure. We don't do anything about it, we simply evaluate them. But, if we allow intensification beyond a certain level of feeling, feeling will tend to pile energy up towards liking or disliking and then, at a certain physical point it will overflow from its centre of evaluation, and at the point of overflow it stalled emotion.

Now, all the pathological states that we know of in so called mental disorders are really, fundamentally, affective disorders. They are to do with pleasures and pains, with likes and dislikes, with conditions of evaluating energy that have become attached either to physical body situations or to temporal eidetic situations or to complex structural situations or to volitional intentions of the subject. They have become attached to them and because of this attachment these eidetics have become themselves, dynamised. Think of this life field, Sentient Power, as the possibility of dynamising the whole eidetic structure.

Now there was a Greek philosopher, you know, Parmenedes, and the Greeks tended towards, apart from Heraclitus, they tended towards a static view of the universe. They did so because they were, or believed they were, logical. Now, making their analysis logically, they

said 'The perfect form is the sphere, the universe is a sphere, that is an *a priori* statement, a sphere is perfect it is a perfect expression of pi ratio, to alter it would be to spoil its perfection'. And then they made the most peculiar piece of inference 'Therefore, it does not alter, therefore, motion is an illusion'.

So they had a sphere of perfect form, and in this perfect form, everything was perfect and if you felt not-perfect, there was something the matter with you, and you had to adjust yourself accordingly. Now the men that particularly aimed at this kind of adjustment were the Stoics.

The object of the Stoic mentality was to get hold of the formal structure of the universe, the cosmos, the Logos, see its essential structural perfection and then train themselves to absolute indifference to what was happening in the world. So that, a Stoic philosopher, possibly the most popular figure would be Marcus Aurelius there, would be imperturbable in the middle of the baffle field whilst everybody else was being slaughtered. He could make his logical analysis, and say, "All of this is, as it were, nothing," because all this dynamism, all this rushing about, all this feeling evaluation, all this emotion, viewed from the point of view of structure, is strictly nothing.

Now they did a peculiar thing with the true, the good and the beautiful. They then said 'The structure is the truth and beauty is the truth'. We had a poet that said it, 'Truth is beauty ...beauty, truth, that is all you need to know.' That was to make truth and beauty identical. The reality is that beauty is the felt condition of truth. Truth is form, truth is structure, beauty is the feeling of that structure and good

is the will that posited that structure.

Let us consider what this means to us. In the realm of the affect, put it on your ring finger, your like and dislike, if you examine what is happening inside your mind, you will find that: when we have reduced the physical world to mere appearances; and when we have found the essential form of those appearances; and when we have determined how these forms are constituted within consciousness and how they are intentions of ultimately a transcendental subject, the Infinite Consciousness itself; when we have done all those, we by-pass the thing that moves human beings, like and dislike. We have really cut the heart out of the whole matter by looking at it in this eidetic structural way. True we can make a science, but it will be a de-humanised science. It will be a science in which you don't need to go to the ballet any more and nobody needs to train for the ballet any more because everybody has a screen at home and you have at the bottom, with slide controls, a computer, and you can just slide along and there will appear on the screen, figures dancing.

You may have seen some of the early experimental work of this kind. You will see the perfect ballet as produced by a programmed computer. There are no human beings there, the movement is perfect, that is to say it is logically, geometrically, mathematically determined. There are no human beings somewhere training to do these motions, there is just a screen.

And we take this one step further and we bring in the holograph. Now, in the holograph you don't have a flat picture on the screen, you have a three-dimensional

picture in the middle of your room. Imagine a situation in which you have perfect structure, everybody's striving for structure. We have a pianist in Canada, I think, who thinks he can make definitive versions of the great classics and by playing on tape, perhaps forty, fifty times, particular passages, he will give us the perfect performance. Well, he is trying to give them.

Well a pure mathematician would say, "We don't need you. We can actually read the instructions on a piece of Bach music and we can feed those instructions into a computer and we can link this computer with the necessary instrument, piano, orchestra, or whatever, and we can then give you definitive Bach - but put through the computer". And, because it has been perfectly analysed logically, because the pure geometry of form is known, because the mathematics of it is known, you will be required to accept that this is the perfect performance and that anything you do other than this is psychologically a falsification. Every element of humanity will be removed.

This little ring finger of yours, your weakest finger in the hand is the finger that contains the essence of feeling, quite apart from structural conditioning, the subtlety, the sensitivity, that evaluates processes without leaning on their eidetic structures.

If then, we were to take the science of sciences, leave out the affective level, make the phenomenological reduction, the eidetic reduction, determine the manner of constitution of these eidetic structures, make the transcendental reduction until all we have is the pure field, structured, we will then have an infinitely accurate science of form, but

there would be no feeling.

Can you imagine a universe where everything is going on perfectly and there is no feeling. Every human being has had every deficiency eliminated by super science, there is no such thing as disease, there is only perfect function in all the organisms that exist because they have all been structured correctly, they are all related perfectly, they all form queues where queues are to be formed, correctly, where queues are not to be formed they don't form them, and they move about in their individual processes but always from their inner structures We would have a universe of 'Spocks' and we would *be* traveling Star Trek-wise through infinity, taking our perfection with us. How does it feel?

Well, if we say, "How does it feel?" we have stepped out of the eidetic, out of the structural into the affective and we have totally falsified our structural analysis. But, tell me, what really moves us? Is it our ideas or our feelings? Has the word 'sympathy', the word 'compassion' got any meaning if we remove feeling from it? If we say the word 'compassion' means suffering together, and suffering means - sub-ferring, under-bearing. Look at it structurally, it means there are certain structural loads placed upon other structures but don't mention feeling; and we reduce the word compassion to pure eidetics. Have we improved the world by our clarity, our distinctness of ideas or have we dehumanised it?

Nowhere we have a point of choice it is rather funny, that in the Islamic world they place the centre of the intellect not in the head but in the heart. Now the European

scientific mind likes the intellect in the head. If you keep the intellect in the head, then you can do the most extraordinary things to your fellow man without worrying about it. You can perform all kinds of eidetically *correct* structural alterations in the human skull, in the brain and so on. You can investigate it with knives; you can investigate it with drugs; you can investigate it with electricity; you can do all sorts of marvellous things with it providing you keep your intellect in your head.

Now, it is rather funny that the West was supposed to have embraced Christianity, and yet Christ said to a question relating to the law of the old Testament, 'This law was given to you for the hardness of your hearts, but it was not so from the beginning'. So the fundamental of Christianity was also in the heart.

Now the word 'intellect' does not mean, in its essence, void of feeling. The true intellect takes cognisance of feelings and it deals with feeling as a real determinant of Cosmos, of Cosmic evolution, of racial evolution, of individual evolution. So that the word, which is translated into intellect in the Indian Philosophy, *Buddhi*, is a word that means a state in which the clarity of your idea and the sensitivity of your feeling are exactly congruent, there is no division, there is no divorce between the thinking process and the feeling process in the true intellectual operation.

Whatever the German situation under Hitler was, however much it may have been exaggerated, we do know that things were done that could not be done by one human being to another, if that human being had not first made this dissociation between thinking and feeling, and then

disallowed the validity of the feeling. Compassion, as a feeling, was disallowed and disallowed deliberately, because if you did not disallow it you could not eliminate rivals, you could not eliminate other beings who might actually, for you, place you in a difficult situation

Here then, we have this highly important thing, by leaving out the affective reduction, see the universe as a playing field of like/dislike sentient energy. By leaving that one out we can attain a 'science of sciences' in the structural sense and we could make a universe like the Age of Aquarius will try to make, a universe of perfect machinery, perfectly controlled by perfectly programmed computers. But when we have it, it will, if it is not stopped, inhibit the feeling capacity of the human race.

Now, last week, I met two men and one of them was a computer programmer who had gone to a very difficult state in which he had become aware that he and the other fellows in that very large organisation had become progressively de-humanised. And he saw that many of his friends have now got relationships in marriage degenerating so rapidly, through application of computerised thinking, inertia at home, that they had begun to think that they had to conduct their relationships with their wives and children, on the two-count base, yes/no, on the computer. And this fellow had become suddenly aware that he had become quite definitely, neurotic.

And he had pulled himself together, by a sort of super effort, and started reminding himself that he could feel and that the feeling was not determinable in this simple two-

count way because of its infinity of gradations, and to make a measurable grade, you must stop, you must finite the unit, and you must do that arbitrarily. So he had managed to control himself and had withdrawn from the process of more and more computerisation of his own mind and his own relations.

So here we have a simple situation in which, an occasion of choice has to be made. The male mind tends towards the eidetics, the female tends to feel. And in the feeling she often tends towards vagueness so that as far as the structuralised idea is concerned she is *not* tremendously interested. But if the dominant male success in the field of scientific endeavour is allowed to become so dominant that it begins to dictate and say that this is the only real mode of evaluation then the human race will become structuralised in exactly the same way that the bee-hive is structuralised or the ant colony is structuralised.

And it's significant, that most of the experts in the field of bee study and ant study say, as far as the ant is concerned, there is not an individual ant there, there is a body there under the dominion of a collective mind. Now, this collective mind of the ant colony is exactly like the transcendental subjectivity that we were talking about. You go up to a field of consciousness: you suspend belief in the individual, and then the field of consciousness determines the behaviour of all the bodies within it. And in the case of the ant colony, it means the perfect mechanisation. It has gone on, as Kaiserling once pointed out, in America this process of 'insectivisation', more than in any other country in the world - the progressive development of the pragmatic intention to gain mechanical efficiency. Which,

carried to its ultimate term means the reduction of a human being to a creature dominated by a collective mind, we see the symbol of that collective mind in the Russian Soviets. We saw it in the Nazi state in Germany, in the Fascist state in Italy, where the individual has no significance as individual, but the individual body is simply one of the instruments of a mind that is transcendently, subjectively controlling all those bodies for some ultimate purpose of the transcendental subject; which, totally ignores the behaviour of the individuals within that system.

So we have to choose. Are we going to continue to feel? Are we going to abandon feeling and structuralise ourselves, perfectly, into the perfect structural relationships?

If we feel, there will always be an element that we cannot measure. If we structuralise, we can measure perfectly but at the expense of the loss of life-flexibility. So therefore, it is not a question of us choosing either *to feel* or to structuralise, it is an imperative; that we become aware that when we structuralise, when we indulge ourself in this eidetic pursuit of a super science, we are also to develop our sensitivity to the results of this eidetic process in feeling terms.

When we develop the structure we are talking about the so-called male aspect. When we develop the female aspect of feeling, if we do both, we produce ultimately, the perfect hermaphrodite; a human being who is as sensitive in feeling as he is clear in idea; a human being as clear in idea as sensitive in feeling. Now, ultimately, the division of the sexes into intellectual males and emotional females do

vanish. Both sides of the equation must balance and they can do this only by both sides containing both aspects.

The woman must work to understand the eidetic structure; the man must work equally hard to sensitise himself to the emotive significance and the feeling evaluation of his eidetic structures. And this is a work that is to be done conjointly by discussion of the structure and by discussion of the feeling and emotional charges on those structures and these discussions are to take place between men and women.

We have had a society divided by militarism, which from Ancient Persia has said, men shall know how to fight and shall inhibit their feelings in order to fight efficiently and the women shall not fight and they shall be emotional when the warrior comes home from the war and they shall show their affection for his protection. This double view, persisting over a few thousand years actually suppressed the feeling capacity in the male and suppressed the eidetic appreciation in the female.

Now it is interesting because you might think to yourself superficially, what a pity that that ever happened. But if it had not happened, we could not, intelligently, put back together these two polarised halves. Originally, Adam, before Eve was taken out of him, was an eidetic, thinking being, feeling all his thinkings. But he had not split, he had not polarised out consciously, he had not separated his thinking from his feeling and he had not compared thinking as such with feeling, as such, because they were fused together in him.

So he did not know what it was that he was doing.

Therefore the Creator said, 'It is not good for Man to be alone - equals, all one. I will split him and I will separate from him the feeling side and he can have the intellectual side and his consort shall have the feeling side'.

And these two sides, the one thinking ever more and more clearly and the other feeling ever more and more sensitively and distressively made it perfectly clear what thinking, as such, is like and what feeling, as such, is like. And then, when we have become aware what it is like and that brings us up to today, because we know what it is like today, in a computerising society, we know what it is like, pure, formal structures are pure mechanics of motion, patterns of behaviours and pure feelings have no relationship to those as long as they are in two separate beings.

So we could make two totally different kinds of beings. We could continue to breed men who are men and women who are women; thinkers who are thinkers, feelers who are feelers and there would be no relationship whatever between them. So we could breed two disparate races of human beings, which would each be deficient to half its being. The problem for us, is having made this separation, having carried it on, prodigal-wise, to find out exactly what thinking is in itself, and what feeling is in itself it is now the express duty of every individual human being to come to terms in him/herself with the thinking-feeling aspects of being so that the individual can actually become whole in the same way the original Adamic human being was whole, plus a reflexive awareness of the implications of the polarisation.

So, there is the imperative for it and we have the choice. Will we work to become more and more conscious of the other side of our own being and to collaborate with the other beings in their other sides to produce a human being that will be bi-polar. Which has nothing to do with pathological homosexuality, it has to do with a progressive evolutionary sensitisation of both sides, thought and feeling, to produce the perfect hermaphroditic human being who will be able to do both sides of the equation, simultaneously to the total enrichment of human inter-relationship.

[end of tape ]