

Tape 402

Definitions - a transcript of a talk by Eugene Halliday.

[All commentary supplied by the transcriber are in square brackets [] and in smaller font italics. There are some small indecipherable phrases - as yet. The tape is also incomplete and starts in the middle of a question from the audience. Alan Roberts August 2006]

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 []

DEFINITIONS

A talk given by Eugene Halliday in Liverpool or Manchester during the late 1950's/early 60's

(Lecture 402)

Précis

The tape begins halfway through a question which Eugene directs into a consideration of words and the importance of them being correctly defined. He states that the fundamental problems of religious differences and the effects of propaganda stem from incorrect use of terms. Well used words such as 'spirit' and 'soul' are rarely defined. Someone asks him to define 'definition' and he responds saying that we define not the things themselves but the limit of how we can apply the word, we limit by circumscribing how we can use a word. Thus words are how we order the content of our minds.

He proceeds to describe the idea of the largest conceivable circle - macro cosmos - that includes all other smaller ones and creates a unity; where the paper is representing a plane for receiving marks and marks are representing definitions. Outside such a conceived largest circle is not defined, it is the 'abyss' and linked to God the father. A smaller circle is used to represent all humanity and the relation between them explained.

'Spirit' is defined as the free outside the largest circle, inside is unified 'soul'. A soul is rotating spirit, and further rotations create plurality. Spirit is identical in all of us but activated differently. Actual (spiritual or willed) differences

create all separations and quarrels and these in individuals and nations are outlined.

Then the word 'act' is defined referring to its letters both graphically and sonically and directly related to 'karma'. There are three kinds of acts, physical (knee jerk type), emotional and reasoned, these are related to the 'parts below the diaphragm', chest and head. Then the form of the accreted physical body is described as the action of the 'subtle' or 'form' body; 'shape', 'form' and 'idea' are described as synonymous.

Eugene goes on then to explain how these three functions can become disconnected - 'cut to pieces' . Material impulses direct man as a 'beast', man has other spirit forces in the higher centres, these can analyse and then consciously integrate the being. Eugene then recapitulates and refers to a Greek idea that we must not just think and do right but should do it to intend a benefit. He then describes: gross material sensibility; mental sensibility and its 'food for thought' ; and accepting and rejecting of feelings as in letting 'yea be yea and nay be nay'.

Feeling sensitivity has to be increased to be aware of emotions in others - feeling mediates between idea and act 'so here we have to train ourselves'.

The link centres between the head and heart, and heart and below diaphragm, are described and then the top and bottom giving seven centres. The fall is a fall of consciousness level to below diaphragm- forwards and down to pleasure/pains; the higher levels respond to truth and universal compassion. The higher mind is concerned with universal truths, primarily geography. Polarity in man and woman is described.

Again feeling is advocated as the direction for development, as it will lead us by what we really like to analyse situations. Black magicians are talked of as rejecting compassion. Then from a question Eugene talks about animals in contact with humans and humans deprived of human contact. Then from a further question he describes how words are not made by mankind, they predate us. Sound production in humans are universal sonic facts and that apparent changes in meaning over time are changes of application only. If we can understand universal reference then our vocabulary formulates and integrates itself.

Eugene goes on to use Lewis Carrolls 'Humpty Dumpty' to illustrate how all word meanings are related and mutually defining.

Then to a question on his drawings and on 'you are what you are' he responds by saying how our mutual interference overlays our true selves with re-active mechanisms. Then of the drawings that we are eternal actualities appearing in the material world and that the evil look of the characters in the drawings represents their prodigality and strength in revolting against established order. He then uses the clock face as a symbol of the fall

and redemption and that descent is important to develop individuality and describes energy expenditure and the value of gaining 'character'.

Eugene is then thanked for his talk and invited again.

Transcript

Question - . . . mentioned in one of your earlier lectures . . .

E.H. - . . . about the meaning of life, as determining our destiny, and that would require a definition of 'meaning', 'life', 'destiny', and 'consideration'. The important thing to begin with is to realise that we use terms - words - in order to signify things and events and relations between things and events, and if we do not get our terms correctly defined, then we are bound to come to grief. We know very well, that in the world there are many different religious systems, and that the adherents of these systems have, periodically, considered it to be an act of worship to murder each other. And that we know, fundamentally, these religions teach exactly the same things.

They all talk about descent from common ancestry, from God, from spirit, from universal power, and yet in fact they seem to be prepared to fight and destroy each other in the name of universal compassion. We know that there were five crusades historically¹, where in the name of Jesus Christ a lot of people in Europe rushed off to regain the city connected with his historic appearance. And that in the process of fulfilling the commands of a man who said 'love one another'² thousands of people, including children were killed. And we know that this arises, primarily from an abuse of terms. This might seem an oversimplification until we remember the power of propaganda - that a nation is determined largely by

¹ The Crusades were a series of military expeditions by Christian Kings and sanctioned by the Pope, to recover the Holy Sepulchre and the Holy Lands from Mohammedan control, from the 11th to the 13th century.

² John 13 v34.

catch phrases. We know that during the war, at one period, Russia was called 'our glorious ally'. We know that since then she has been called other things. We know also that promises were made such as 'Germany shall not rise again' and we know that Germany is being *re-armed* (unclear) against a hypothetical enemy.

We also know that half the world is flying an atheistic banner, the Marxist banner, and that the other half is flying a theist³ banner. And yet, fundamentally the Marxist position is a declared intention to improve the conditions upon Earth⁴, and the Christian religion says 'there will be a new heaven and a new Earth'⁵.

Now if we take the ethics of any great religion, we will find they are precisely the same ethics that the Marxist would declare to be his own basis of action. So we know that there is something fundamentally wrong in the way we think about these problems. When we go to study religious ideas, as children, usually to Sunday school, we find that none of the terms that are employed are defined. We talk about 'soul' and 'spirit' and yet they don't define either soul or spirit. An argument arises - 'Has man got a soul?' Now the argument could not arise if we say - 'Man is a soul'. In the book of Genesis it says that 'the spirit of God breathed into man and man became a living soul'⁶. It does not say - 'man was given a soul' but - 'man became a living soul.' Which implies that the soul is the very man himself.

³ Theism - a belief in a personal God, capable of making himself known by supernatural revelation.

⁴ Principles of Communism - Article 14.

What will this new social order have to be like?

Above all it will have to take the control of industry and of all branches of production out of the hands of mutually competing individuals, and instead institute a system in which all these branches of production are operated by society as a whole - that is, for the common account, according to a common plan, and with the participation of all members of society. It will, in other words, abolish competition and replace it with association.

The principles of Communism Engels. F. (1867 pub. Hamburg 1914).

⁵ II Peter 3 v13, and Revelation 21 v1.

⁶ Genesis 2 v7.

If we were to go into the Zen Japanese Buddhist view we would find that man is equated with unified will; that the will, the unified will is the real man.⁷

⁷ Statements about the nature of the self are rare in Zen literature, self is meant to be experienced, rather than thought out, but one quote from D.T.Suzuki (*Essays in Zen Buddhism* London 1949. p30) does describe it similarly; "What does this 'making one think' explain? From this it is apparent that Zen is one thing and logic another. When we fail to make this distinction and expect of Zen to give us something logically consistent and intellectually illuminating, we altogether misinterpret the significance of Zen. Did I not state in the beginning that Zen deals with facts and not with generalisations? And this is the very point where Zen goes straight down to the foundations of personality. The intellect ordinarily does not lead us there, for we do not live in the intellect, but in the will.'

So I want to begin by defining a few terms, so that we at least will know what we are talking about.

Question - May I ask what you mean by definition?

E. H. - I'm just going to begin with definition. First of all we say that, things do not need defining, they are adequately defined already. This room is defined by the walls that enclose it. So that, when we are defining, we are not defining things, they are already defined. We are defining the use of terms. We say we define the limits of application of terms. We only define the application of the word.⁸

Now 'to define', is a word derived from a Latin meaning simply to state the end or limits. The 'fin' in de-fin-ition means - end. If I was to define, I must circumscribe, so definition is the same thing as circumscription⁹. I draw a line and inside it I say I will write all the words to do with a certain idea. So if I write inside here the word 'DOG' and say that all about dogs has to be included in this circle. And what is not about dogs, must be put outside the circle, so that the circle is our limit. That is the 'FIN' in definition. To define is to

⁸ Eugene is saying that the need for definitions is a language thing only, it's purely about how we can use language, literally when we can use a word and when we can't. The objects, the 'things themselves' are defined constantly by their multiple relations with other things in the world, and which inquiry, science, art etc. constantly struggles to discover and language tries to capture in refined symbols and word patterns.

⁹ Circumscription simply means 'to draw a line around', and Eugene is saying that to define is the same process as drawing a line around an area of paper; both separate a zone, a space or a 'thing' from its surroundings. The line, and the definition, both work to mark out what is 'inside' and what is 'outside' the limit.

indicate the limits of application of terms.



'Word' itself, we will examine later, We will say shortly - it is the instrument by which we order our minds. You'll notice 'O' 'R' 'D' in the word 'word', this is from the root of ORDER. A word is an instrument whereby we 'order' the content of our minds.

So by definition, we mean – circumscription, limitation – not of things, they are already defined, but of the application of our terms. So beginning with the definition of definition, we can then proceed.

I draw another circle, and I'm going to say, let us assert that this circle represents the largest conceivable circle whatever. We would equate this with the word 'macro-cosmos', the great cosmos, the great universe. One of the theologians of the middle ages said that, 'God can be conceived by conceiving a sphere than which there is no larger'. This sphere is the sphere that includes all smaller ones. So we take this to represent 'the circle than which we can conceive no larger'. And simply because that circle encloses, we say that it has created the concept of unity. If we imagine the paper to extend itself infinitely in all directions, and to have no marks on it at all, we would say that the paper is a potential of definitional possibility. In other words we would say, the paper represents simply a possible plane for receiving marks. And every mark we put upon it will be a definition. Thus to draw at all is to define.

So let this represent the largest circle that we can conceive, and all subsidiary circles within it will be called sub-circles of the whole. Outside this circle, is usually called by the mystics 'the abyssal content'. If we write abyss here, we normally tend to think it means a large hole. Somewhere you could fall into without any bottom.

So that when we look at this circle here – this is the largest circle that we can conceive – what ever is outside it is necessarily not circumscribed, because we have defined this one as the largest circle there is. So beyond 'the largest circle there is' we say is the 'abyss'. You'll notice that this 'AB' is the root of the word 'abbot', 'abbey', 'abba' the Hebrew for father. The Abyss is the father affirmer, who affirms this first circle. It is said in Christian theology, there is God and Godhead, now this is the Godhead. And this is God. God by definition exclude his worshiper, because there is a

relation - God is the object of worship. So when we say this is God we have to postulate a worshiper. And without the worshiper there would be no God. If there were no intelligent beings to consider the supreme consciousness of the universe then that God would have no point of reflection, and no one could define it.

We will now put a small circle inside, and say that circle represents the whole of humanity. And then we can see the meaning of the statement 'in him' - that is the big circle - 'we live and move and have our being'. So the big circle is representing God and the little circle representing humanity, then, are in relation. We'll draw a radius to represent the relating factor. Along this line of the relation is the path along which man has to tread to go from an ordinary human being, conscious of the Earth. . . I'll put another little circle inside for the Earth, we'll put a cross in it, which is the sign of the Earth, - you know the circle with a cross in it. The man can either turn towards the Earth, precipitate himself into materiality and concentrate on the accumulation of matter, or he can orientate himself towards the largest circle there is which he calls God.

Now depending on the mode of his orientation he will get certain results. Everyone get the result of their own actions. Those people who collect matter - collect it. As a Jewish friend of mine said 'To make money, you just need one idea, just the idea - to make money'. If you have another idea as well that contradicts that, you will split your will. So the question of orientation raised is a question of the direction of the will of man, along this radial line.

Now I'm going to say of this circle here, that it is not correct to use the term spirit for it. We use the term 'Spirit' of this, outside the circle. Whereas the substantial being, symbolised by this circle, is called 'Soul'. The word soul is made up of the same root as the word 'solo' it means to be on ones own - to be alone. To be 'alone' is to be 'all - one' , so the idea of a soul is the idea of a unity of sentiency. Sentiency, means feeling consciousness. If we then

imagine a force going about in this manner, that is free, not binding itself – it never puts its tail in its mouth – that would we call the Absolute Spirit. But if that same spirit at some point turns on itself and rotates, at the moment of its rotation, at the moment it brings into being a sphere it then changes the name from ‘Spirit’ to ‘Soul’. Soul, means the solo power, the power made unific.

So that when we come to consider the statement in Genesis that – ‘God breathed his spirit into man and man became a living soul’ it is simply an illustration of the fact that the absolute power of the pre-universe is itself able to turn in and to rotate. And, in the act of rotating, to produce unific beings, which we call souls.

So let us now agree that when we write the word ‘soul’ we shall think of a solo spirit. We put the letter ‘U’ in there, which is an old form meaning to go, to travel. We see it in the third person singular of the French, *va* – to go. And you see it in the Sanscrit, *vayu* the name of the air, to go, the ‘go-er’. So the ‘U’ in it means ‘a unific goer’ or a power unified and mobilising itself.

Now we can see that if we do not circumscribe we cannot have a plurality. If this spirit wanders about and never at any time crosses itself, and seizes its own tail, then it never makes a unity, it never makes a one. And consequently the concept of plurality can never arise. But if that same thing proceeds to rotate and then go out and rotate again, then everywhere that a circle occurs it receives the name Soul. And although the spirit in all souls is identical, yet the fact of the rotation of each soul – separating it from the others – gives rise to the plurality that we recognise in beings.

That means to say the power in our bodies which ordinary materialistic science knows to be continuously coming out of bodies, and going into bodies, and therefore belonging to no-body, is nevertheless the sole cause of the bodies. Bodies are simply rotations of power. As long as there is a rotation of power there, and another there, it is permissible to talk about the plurality of

souls. And yet we know that there is only one ultimate power. Viewed from the psychological point of view, this power is 'Spirit'. Viewed from the scientific point of view it is an absolute force. Whichever frame of reference we use we cannot consider the existence of many beings unless we think that there are rotations of force going on.

You know that Sir Humphrey Davy on one occasion was lecturing to some students, and he accidentally inhaled some nitrous oxide gas, and it altered the state of his consciousness. And quite suddenly instead of seeing human beings sitting there, he saw in each seat a little whirling of power - a little force vortex. And from that moment he could never again believe in the gross material world as real. He saw every human being as simply a rotation of primary power. And the only difference between one person and another is the way they actually rotate. This word actual is tremendously important because in effect the absolute spirit in us is identical, but in spite of its absolute identity in bodies there is a different mode of actuality; a different mode of activating itself.

And it is the way that this spirit - or the will of the person, you can equate the will with the spirit - activates itself that enables you to know that this person is not that person. It is the content of actuality that determines the difference between people.

We know that the actuality of a dog and the actuality of a cat are different. A dog actually waves his tail at you when it's pleased; a cat actually does so when angry. So, although there is tail waving or wagging in both cases, yet there is a different motivation behind the two, and they signify differently. And if you look very, very carefully you'll find that the quality of the two motions is different, because it springs out of a different motive. There is a certain graceful movement in the cat's tail with a little angular flick on it every now and then; whereas in the case of the dog there is a more rhythmical happy look about it. In the cat you can see something of

the serpent and that little flick in the tail signifies the anger in it; whereas, the steady rhythm of the dogs tail signifies its happiness.

So there is an actual difference in the way a dog and a cat move their tails. Now this actuality is tremendously important. Theologically, of God, it is said - he is pure act - there is nothing in him that is not actual. It means that the spirit, power, cannot be conceived as static, it's always on the move infinitely and eternally, and therefore we say it is pure actuality. Whereas in the case of finite human beings, we know that quite a large number of their possibilities are not actualised. We say of a given fellow, 'Oh yes Bill, he can or could if he would do so-and-so but he doesn't do it because he's got no confidence'. If he had the confidence he could do it. It means that if he had something that he has not, he could actualise something that he is not actualising. And the actual differences between people, between nations, and so on, are the important differences on Earth, because it is in actual fact that the quarrels between human groups break out. In general they say that the big nations are actually afraid of the use of large explosives. Because they are actually afraid of that, they actually take steps to protect themselves. And all the steps of self-protection are potential aggression, and are viewed as such by other nations.

So the actual presence of fear in somebody precipitates acts of defence, which are acts of aggression.

Now let's look at the word 'acts' for a moment. This letter 'C' here can be written like that [*here Eugene will have drawn a line and a chevron, like l and <, forming a letter 'K' making the letter from the two elements, a line and a force vectored towards it, as l< = K*]. And used to be so written. If we leave off the straight stroke, we use it as a 'C', with the straight stroke we would call it a 'K'. The idea of it is the application of a force. In act we apply a force, this is the force [A], this is the application [C or <] and the 'T' represents the fixation arising from it. So if we say the is the intersection point - here T' [*or crossing of two lines as a 'T' simply is in it's lower case form*] - is the

point on which we apply a force, here is the 'K' and there is the 'T' and the energy by which it is applied is the 'A'.

So an act is really an application of energy in a closed situation. If I put my finger in this form - so [*crooking his index finger to present a knuckle*] - and then tap it on here, on the board, if you listen very, very carefully you will find it is giving forth the same sound that the tongue on the back of the palate does.

There it is, there is your palate . . . [*here Eugene would be drawing a line as the palate, with a force of air striking it with impact*] And there is the tongue turned to the back and it makes the letter 'K', that is its origin. That gives a kick , or a blow [*the blow of stressed air*] . If we look at the word kick we find it has got one of these [*'K s'*] at both ends to symbolise the application of this force.

So every act is an application of force that puts you on the cross. It means that when you act, you are doing something, putting yourself in a situation, from which necessarily something will act back on you. This is the idea that 'to every action there is an equal and opposite reaction'. In the East, of course, it's called karma. Karma actually means allowing your desires to run away with you.

When the desire runs into a situation, you then find that you have acted, and if you act in a certain way, then, immediately you have pinned your physical body in a situation. And you can actually be defined, by some other people, as having done that act, and be required to pay the penalty.

I'll do three kinds of acts now. I'll cut the human being into three parts. First the head . this is the spinal column. There is the chest, and there's the parts below the diaphragm.

Now there are three kinds of acting. There is the kind of acting with the physical body . . . we'll put that down here. Which springs out of an unconscious impulse. You know if you tap your knee suspended, you'll get a knee jerk. A nervous impulse runs up there, into the spine, and back again to the muscles and makes the leg

react. That impulse has not gone up to the brain and been thought about. It's come out straight away. We call that a simple reflex.

This is the kind of simple gross material reaction. The kind of reaction that that board *gives [Here Eugene taps on the board and produces a knocking sound]* when I tap it with this chalk.

Next we have here . . . *[pointing at the chest level of his diagram]* emotional reactions where, you know if somebody comes in a terrible state of agitation and sits next to you , biting their nails, that you begin to feel on edge too. This is emotional action. They're actually applying fields of force, feelings of enmity or fear and so on and beating them inside their emotional body.

And then there is the act of reasoning.

So we have three kinds of actuality here to consider: the act of your physical body, the act of your emotion and the act of your thought.

[These would be represented by belly, heart and head sections on the diagram respectively]

Now simply because we know that our physical body has become big although it was once very, very small - a tiny little egg. It has become big by absorbing food. So this material body which I can see and walk about, and move about, is sometimes called the food body, the body of food. And simply because I know that I put it into my mouth and then digest it, because of that I know that it is not the essential in myself. It is something accreted to me.

And it always accretes to me in the peculiar form in which I am. And to other people it accretes in another form. So that every person we know manages to retain their own shape, even though they may eat roughly the same kind of food. So we say they have another body, a body of form - the form body. The Yogis would call that the 'subtle body'. We have a body of ideas - *idea* is the Greek word for form. The Saxon word *shape* is the same thing. It implies circumscription. If you can draw a line round something, that line has a character we call the shape or form of the object. And there is

a form body a body of form, which packs the food that we eat into the form that we recognise.

And we also have this emotional body, the body of feeling flux. Mediums use this feeling body a lot. And this body is free from ideas, and free from the gross material body. So that although people might do right, and think logically, they may have a very peculiar motive in their feeling for doing so. It is possible to have a totally wrong feeling. One can have a feeling of enmity for a person, say at work, and have a good reason for being polite to that person, and get on with the job and do it properly, and be inwardly, emotionally, fuming about it. And we find very often if a person is doing something correctly, thinking correctly in order to do it, but feeling against it, that a division occurs in the will of the person. And if it is prolonged over a long period, then the person actually begins to sever certain connections between the emotional, the rational and the physical bodies. This is the kind of thing that happens in neurosis.

We can see how very important it is to have clear ideas and to express these ideas, in words, which enable us to carve the human being up into compartments, and then to tie the parts together again on the body.

You know in the Bible in one place it says of Simeon and Levi, two of the twelve tribes, that 'they killed a man to their own hurt' **[Gen 49:5/6]**. Now they symbolise the emotional and rational parts of a human being. And by his emotional and rational disintegration a man is cut to pieces. But it says of Joseph 'he threw a vine over the wall' **[Gen 49:22]**. Now throwing this vine over the wall is the same thing as connecting together the separate pieces. Simeon and Levi are the emotions and the ideas that you have which tend to cut you to pieces, and Joseph is the man that's trying to integrate them together.

So here we have a diagram of the human being, and power comes into his body in a number of different ways. This spinal axis

is the way that spirit enters into the body. And through the mouth here - matter enters into the body. When the matter in the body falls down into the stomach here: it's digested and the results of the process of digestion are put into the blood; it is raised up, meets the oxygen in the air, breathed in, certain actions take place between the two; and there arises in the body, nervous impulsations which climb up, and in the brain become the energies of thought. But all the food that goes down there and climbs up here has come from the material side of our nature, and is conditioned by its chemistry so that all its tendencies - its actual tendencies - are forcing the body to move in a way determined materially.

Which means to say that the man who is merely determined from down below is equivalent to a beast. In all the great religions it says, 'there is a spirit that goes down into the ground' - the animal's head points to the ground, it feeds on the ground, and so on, 'but the spirit of man comes from above'. Man is man: not because he eats, because animals eat, and vegetables eat, and in a certain sense even matter absorbs energy and therefore matter eats; but man is man because he receives something other than the energies from food. He receives an energy that comes from this free spirit and as it enters his body it is turned round and becomes the soul. And the man himself, the spiritual man, is that soul which is simply the spirit turning into a man. So there is no difference between the higher parts of the man and the spirit of God other than in the actual enclosure in man's consciousness.

So that if a man thinks he is a finite being, limited, as he thinks so he will become. If he thinks that he's a material being, he will start collecting matter. He'll put the matter into his stomach, and the more that stretches the more he'll think he's conquered the world. And maybe he is conquering that part of the world, so there's a kind of reward in doing that.

If the man opens himself to relations of compassion with other beings, then he receives a different kind of reward from devoting himself to eating up the Earth. If he devotes himself to truth, which means he prefers to be logical in his thought, then he will receive another kind of reward. So we have three kinds of actions and three kinds of rewards. And if we learn to think in this threefold way, we can begin to analyse our whole being, so that later we can consciously integrate all the various parts

Now let's just recapitulate here, that when we define we do not define things, they are already defined - an elephant is already not a butterfly. And when we come to apply the term elephant and the term butterfly, we must apply it to particular forms; and all the forms are actual. That is, they are ways in which spirit - which is 'the absolute' power from which all comes - behaves in act. So that there is no difference whatever between all the beings in the universe other than their actual behaviour. And their actual behaviour is of three kinds: actual physical behaviour, actual emotional behaviour, and actual rational behaviour.

Now we are very fond in these days, particularly since the Christian dispensation, of talking about the importance of motive. Once upon a time it was considered, that it was enough for a man to 'do right' that is his material actions should correspond with the socially permissible, and he was then called a good man. And after a time there was a revolt against that, and it said, 'it isn't enough for a man to do that which is socially permissible, he must also think in such a manner that his thinking coincides with his physical action.

Because at that time - we'll talk about the Greeks here - the rational, logical men - they thought that reason itself was a good thing in its own right. So they said 'we must learn to think truly' and they threw the stress on thinking truly. And then after a time there arose a reaction which said 'it isn't enough to do right physically, or to think right, one must also feel right'. That is, it is no good doing a socially acceptable act and thinking clearly about the doing of it,

unless you are doing it for the right reason. And the right reason you are doing it is because you intend a benefit, to the beings to whom you do it.

So we have the human being as a threefold being. We now apply this to the concept of the Trinity theologically - God the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost and we find that the three correspond. The Father is the primary energy the drive force. The Son is the *logos*, you know in the Gospel of John it starts off 'In the beginning was the word' - the original Greek document has *logos* where we put 'word'. He is the very spirit of truth. And the issuant feeling, which moves later into action - expression, is called the Holy Ghost or Spirit - the issuant. It is called 'spirit' when it issues out. It is called 'spirit' before it comes in. But when you consider it as in, and actualised as a unific being, it is called 'soul'.

Now let us consider the three kinds of sensibility we have here. We have sensibility of our physical body. If somebody kicks me on the shin, I know about it because I can feel an impact originating from outside myself. That is part of the sensorium of the gross material world. So I am sensitive at the physical level. If I tap with my knuckle I feel something on my knuckle [*E.H. makes a tapping sound*] and I know that what I am feeling is outside my physical body - because if I tap in mid-air here nothing happens. And if I go on tapping [*he taps again*] until eventually I hit the board, then I know that something is there, that was not here. That is an external thing. So my five external senses give me information about things external to my gross physical body.

When I come to think about the process, I can see that exactly the same thing happens in ideas in my mind. My mind has ideas, if I think of 'dog' I think of 'cat'. If I think of dog and cat I think of quarrel. There's an association of ideas in my mind such that if one idea is brought out, it stimulates the appearance of others. Just as my finger tapping on that board releases a noise, so the stimulus of the word-idea in my mind 'dog' produces another

idea 'cat' . So I know there is a kind of sensitivity in there. And in the same way exactly that this department, the 'belly', demands food for itself, so the head demands food, and we call the food this demands - 'food for thought'. The fact that we are here tonight is simply evidence that we don't want only one kind of food - 'man does not live by earth bread alone' [Matthew 4:4, Luke 4:4] - but also because we are looking for 'idea food'.

We must have ideas to feed the idea beings that we have in our minds. They are just like physical human beings, they have to be fed or they starve. And they also have to eliminate - falsities, erroneous views - they have to be thrown out. Just like when you eat material food, you throw out a large amount of waste, and retain the essential energies. So when you are receiving the idea stimulus, you take it in and you digest - that means 'cut the earth' - you digest it, analyse it, see what fits you, and the rest you reject. So there is a process of accepting and rejecting ideas, exactly as the material [*process ? inaudible word someone coughs over it*].

There is also a process of accepting and rejecting feelings from people. Now there are fundamentally only two feelings, feelings of liking and the feelings of disliking. To liking we say 'yes' and to disliking we say 'no'. Actually the name of Jesus in the Hebrew means - yes/no. He is the man who says 'Let your yea be yea and your nay, nay. All else comes of the Devil.' [Matthew 5:37]. He means that disintegration springs up in a person who cannot analyse the situation properly, and say 'yes' or 'no' to each of its constituent parts. Now saying 'yes' to it is the same thing as saying 'I like it', and saying 'no' is the same as 'I don't like it'.

So we have two feeling: I like it, and I don't like it. And all the feelings you have of 'liking', are fond of eating feelings of liking. So if you happen to be fond of a particular person, then you try to assimilate from that person his character. And sometimes, even if it's a bad character, you will assimilate it and you will make excuses, because you like him or her. If you dislike a person very

strongly it doesn't much matter to you whether he is very good at higher mathematics, or anything. If you dislike him you don't wish to assimilate anything whatever from him, so it doesn't matter if he's got universal compassion and good Aristotelian logic, if you don't like him you refuse to assimilate him.

So we have here a very simple way of consideration. In the feelings we can always say 'yes' or 'no' to any properly formulated question. If we analyse a situation we can find something in it to which we say 'yes' and something else in it, to which we will say 'no'. I'm in this room at the moment, I am talking, therefore I am probably breathing more than you are. In the process of breathing I am getting warmer. In getting warmer I am becoming progressively, physically more uncomfortable. To this I say 'no, I don't want it'. So that the moment I consider very, very carefully myself, I wouldn't like my temperature to go on rising higher and higher and higher, until I boiled away. So I say 'no' at a certain level. But to the fact that we are here to discuss certain ideas, I gives an unqualified 'yes'. I'm not wishy washy about it. About the excess temperature I say 'no', about the subject matter I say 'yes'.

And I am not indifferent. Now this indifference is the most unreal - actually - function that you can believe in. There is no absolute indifference. Indifference is simply failure to analyse a situation. You can be disinterested - yes - but to fail to see the difference is simply to ignore the essential differences, which exist. In the New Testament you will notice it says of the Laodiceans 'Because they will not blow hot or cold, I will spew them out of the mouth, saith the Lord'. . [Rev 3:15-16] That means to say that, if a man will not give an unqualified 'yes' to a proposition, and put his energy into it, or an unqualified 'no' and have nothing to do with it, then he's no good. Because if he says 'Ohh yes I'll come and work for you in-a-way', and you say to him, 'Well I think I'll pay your wages in-a-way'. So he works for you in-a-way and at the end of the week you've paid him in-a-way, and then you are both dissatisfied.

But if you say, 'Alright, I like the job, do you like to pay me those wages?' and he says 'Yes' and you say, 'Yes.' And you both mean it, at the end of the week you are both satisfied, you've given yes and yes. And if you don't want the job, and he doesn't want to pay you that much money, well then you say 'No' and then you are clean. You can go away without any hanging on, without any dragging upon you.

So that really the worst crime that anyone can commit, against himself, is this kind of indifference, which pretends that it's doing a thing 'in-a-way'. And it goes very vague on it, and will not clarify itself.

Now we have said that we've got three kinds of sensitivity.

A sensitivity in our physical body whereby which we know these external material objects exist:-

A sensitivity to ideas, whereby we test an idea for truth. Thus if a man says, 'I think a dog is a cat,' then we have to say of that man, 'he's using one or both of those words in a peculiar way. Because by our original statement, to define is to limit the application of terms, and we are not allowed to take the term dog and apply it to another animal which is not a dog. So that this sensitivity to truth in him, is recognised by his preparedness to seize hold of the truth presented, or to abandon an untruth once exposed.

And a sensitivity to feeling, here, is simply that awareness that somebody is annoyed with you or pleased with you. Now this sensitivity in general is more feminine than masculine. Men tend to be pitched on the head and think, and women tend to feel. Very often a woman can feel that somebody is annoyed when the man is so busy with his own thought process, that he is too concentrated up here to know that the fellow to whom he is proving his point is not even listening.

Now this kind of sensitivity, here, feeling sensitivity, the sensitivity that has to be developed if a person wishes to increase sensitivity in the mediumistic sense. You know that the physical

body is simply a precipitate of force, inside a form. You have taken matter, food, digested it and packed it into a form. This form is vibrating in a certain way, and the mode of its vibration can be felt. You can actually feel anger vibrating in somebody. You can feel indifference in somebody, that's a state of refusal to be clear. And you can feel an affirmation.

And it is along the feeling line that things have to be developed. Christ is talking about feeling. Buddha, himself talks quite a lot about 'right action', 'right knowledge' and so on - he gives an eightfold path to do with 'right actions'. Christ is concerned, primarily, with the feeling. We'd had right action, you could actually drive a man into the ground with an axe if you want, if your basis is - the act only is the important thing.

Potentially you're running about doing good deeds or bad deeds. Inside your head you have a pattern of behaviour, and your physical body can activate any one of those patterns in material behaviour, but between the two comes feeling. This feeling is that which causes a pattern of ideas, a behaviour pattern, to appear in the physical body, because if you don't feel like doing a thing, even though you have the pattern, you don't do it. So that it is in feeling that we find the mediation between idea and the act. So it is along the feeling that we have to train ourselves to take the acts that we believe to be 'right' acts and then to incline ourselves in feeling to do them.

When we incline in feeling to do it, then we do it. And if we don't incline, even though we have perfect pattern of action, we will not do the act.

Now along here we have the spinal column, and the spinal column has centres - we can see one two three, and the link factor here and another here that's five. And there is a special one down there and another one up here - that's seven. We've got seven centres along here already, simply by taking the three and the links between, and the top and the bottom.

Now if I say let us now draw the man again here, and put the spine slightly towards the back, where we find it, we can begin to understand the meaning of the fall in religious parlance; 'The fall of Adam', or 'the fall of the angels'. A fall. It is actually a fall of the level of consciousness. You know that in your body here you have a diaphragm, and you know that that diaphragm really cuts off the region that digests things from the parts above it. That diaphragm is like the firmament between two worlds: a world in which terrible chemical processes go on, to abstract energy from food; and another world in which you feel. And above there is a world in which you think. The spine is slightly towards the back.

If you carry your thoughts habitually forwards and down, well the energy of the body flows forwards and down. Now it is said that in this period of the evolution of the human race, most people carry their minds merely below the diaphragm. That is their level of consciousness is largely down here. Now this is what we call the fallen man. The fallen man is simply the man whose consciousness is low down, and the spinal nerves come forwards into the body, here, and they stimulate the lower parts of the organism.

So the sexual nature and the appetite nature and the lower emotional nature, here, are all turbulating in an average reaction. The cause of that fall is simply the contact [*E.H. knocks on a wooden surface at this point*] at the material body level, with sources of stimulation. Other bodies come, stimulate the physical body, the physical body reacts and consciousness is dragged down and forwards into the physical reaction. If we can drag that consciousness up again, we are raising the fallen man. We know that 'Adam' simply is the Hebrew for man. So if we like to translate Adam as 'man', and not think about it as a particular man but simply as humanity in general, the 'fall of humanity' is the lowering of consciousness by the stimulation of the lower parts of the body - the appetite centres and the lower emotional centres.

Now the lower emotional centres are the ones that seek pleasure-pains in the physical world. The higher emotional ones are those that respond to truths, that say 'yes' to every truth they hear and 'no' to every falsity.

So again we can begin to sub-divide a lower emotion and a higher one. The higher one is universal compassion, it tests every idea by whether that idea says that all the beings in the universe are to be treated with compassion. It is the idea of charity in ordinary biblical parlance. 'Charity', which some people translate 'love'; and some other people don't, because of the associations of the word.

'Compassion' is feeling with the being, sympathetically to be in his position.

So if you are feeling for the whole universe, we call that higher emotion. And if you are simply feeling for the sense pleasures and pains - pursuing the pleasures and avoiding the pains - of the material world, that is the lower emotion. And we also divide the mind part into higher and lower. The lower part of the mind is the part that receives the stimulation from the five senses. And in the lower part of the mind are all the ideas you have derived from outside. Logically we would call this the *a posteriori* mode of thinking - thinking after experience. And believing that a thing is so because you have experienced it. That is the lower activity of the mind.

But the higher activity of the mind starts *a priori* from primary definitions. The definition we started with, of definition, as 'circumscription'. The higher mind is concerned with universal truths, which you have not experienced outside but you experienced inside. They're here primarily as geometrical facts. The fact that a sphere cut in half will give you a flat surface and so on. But if you take the two halves of the sphere and turn them back to back they won't fit, they'll rock on each other. You can do tricks with a magnet. If we get a bar of iron and bend it round into a circle,

magnetise it, and then cut it in half, the two halves will stick together again. But if we turn one of them over they will immediately reject each other and fall apart.

In the relation between a man and a woman it is exactly the same relation as between the two halves of the magnet. They are originally a cut of one circle, and then one is turned over and forced to repel the other. And they are continuously trying to find out which way up they are at any given moment, because polarity - that is the attraction to the north of the south - is the law of their relation.

It is along this feeling level that this relation is studied. The feeling of liking will be called the positive pole, and the feeling of disliking the negative pole. So that in effect, if you expose yourself to the feeling of another person, instead of to his idea or physical action. If you keep yourself physically very, very quiet, and quieten your rational processes and expose yourself to the feeling of that person's inflection, then the feeling will tell you what he, or she, really likes, or dislikes.

You can hear in the intonation in a conversation whether a person really means what they're saying. If they don't mean it you can hear the negation in the voice.

So all our development is to take place, primarily, along the feeling. We have to watch that to which we can say 'Yes', and that to which we can say 'No'. Now in every situation that we find in existence there is never a simple yes or no, because the situation has not only got one element. It has many elements in it; and therefore the necessity for analysis. So when you've determined that you will get your feeling right, it then causes you to go into your thinking department in order to analyse the situation and see to what you will say 'Yes', and to what you will say 'No'.

We said that the fallen man was going down here. . . Down the spine, through reacting to the external physical stimulus. The other man is determined to love the truth, and he has got his simple

measure - I like and I dislike. And I refuse to be indifferent, because that is deception. I am going to find out, in my self, what I really like, what I really dislike fundamentally. And in order to make sure that I don't make a mistake I shall analyse every situation. So then my consciousness travels up, from the higher feeling into the higher thinking. And it begins to analyse the situation - cut it into little bits - and decide exactly how many parts you will nod your head at, and how many parts you will shake your head to.

So here we have the mode of the 'Fall', it is by response to an external physical stimulus. And the mode of the reclamation of the consciousness from the Fall, by taking the universal emotion of compassion and using that as a yardstick, and question yourself by saying, 'What do I really like?'

Now we postulate that all human beings would really like, in theory, the good, if they could see it. There are some beings who when they have seen it reject it for peculiar reasons of their own. These people we call 'Black Magicians'; they do exist. They are very, very rare, because in order to be one you have to be, first of all, tremendously strong in the will, and then tremendously misguided, and wonderfully adept at applying yourself in exercises of egoic integration. And it is not often that we find a person who combines these various disadvantages, of a faulty education, a tremendously strong will and the introduction to ideas that help egoic integration. If we do find those three things together, we will find a black magician. That is a person who, having heard about universal compassion, and knowing that it is true, says consciously, 'Nevertheless I will against it.'

Such men exist, but they are very rare. You might class some of the world conquerors with them. They know that the universe is one whole power. They know that that power is trying to nourish all beings. And they also know that the fact of isolation as 'soul' makes it impossible for the 'spirit' out here to interfere. Because the peculiar thing about God as spirit is this, he has, in

creating the world, made a logical structure, which in producing individual souls has produced free beings. And those free beings can do what they want, and he only wants free responses, and therefore he will not stop the person going on his own course. Because if he did that would be to deprive him of his freedom, and reduce him to the level of a puppet. And then the whole of the human scale of values would be removed.

Either we are puppets or not. If we are puppets we are of no value because then the creator simply observes that we dangle on the end of strings. We are not puppets, and therefore we are free, and being free we can choose. Being able to choose we can do either good or evil, but always the response is along the line of feeling.

Question - How is an [.unclear words. .] surely a domestic animal becomes different from a wild animal. I mean, in that, how could you have a dog, and it is almost like a human being, it has some things some human beings don't possess such as feeling and understanding? Is there a difference between a wild animal and the domestic one? I mean in its make up because they act differently?

E. H. - Well . . Did everybody hear the question? Is there a difference between an animal and a human, because animals in contact with humans actually behave differently. The answer is there is a difference because they have assimilated something of the truth of human activity. Er, a dog for instance, in contact with human beings is on the way to human reactions.

And the same thing happens to human beings. If you deprive a human being of all human intercourse, it does not reach the actual level of a human being. You may know that several cases exist of children being brought up by animals and they have been practically sub-human. So there is a real influence. And this is the meaning of the salvation of the whole of creation by humanity. It is

for human beings to reach the ideal and then turn back and save the rest of creation.

Question – Speaking of correct definitions. Meaning aren't you the words. And no matter how far you go back words are man made, and words are man defined. Now all words and all human [decisions? *indistinct word*] are subject to change, so is there any permanence in a philosophy based on these fundamentals?

E.H. – This question is about the origin of terms, the origin of words, and it's a very, very frequent one. The statement that human beings make language. We have to realise that they do not make language at all. Every human being is born with a vocal apparatus, which he himself did not make. And the way he uses it, also he did not make. Language originates in primary sound, which predates the appearance of human beings. And the sounds which human beings utter are significant because of the actual use of the organs which man cannot avoid. The fact that historically significances change is a proof of this because the organism of man is changing. And in the process his mode of articulation changes. If we take Arabic with their very strong gutturals, they are people with a strong guttural consciousness. They talk right out of the depths of the bowels - you know the word vowel is the same as bowel - it's a sound shift from 'B' to 'V'. The sounds that spring out of the bowels without interruption are the vowels. They're the free elements of language.

Now human beings did not invent language, and a philosophy that says that words are prior to human beings and that the universe itself is a gigantic word are called logistic philosophies. And Pan-logism is a philosophy that the universe is really a word structure. And by word we mean sounds - which are significant.

Here's a very simple experiment, if you try to whisper the vowels - the E A I O U, [*E.H. whispers the five vowels*] you will find

that the pitch of those vowels is fixed, that you can do nothing whatever about it, you cannot alter it. If you try to alter artificially a vowel [*he does so*] and then [*he whispers another*] and listen to the difference in pitch you, cannot alter it. If a dog pants, he pants, usually with the tongue flat in the mouth, and makes the pitch [*E.H. imitates the sound of a dog panting*]. The human being does the same thing, , a baby and a grown up, the vowel pitches are mechanically fixed. We can make a device with clay and model the shapes of the vowels.

We can introduce mechanical tappers to produce the consonants, they are all significant and all pre-date humanity. All that human beings have done is listen to the sounds of nature, the onomatopoeic values. Then they have taken the sound and constructed their references about them, and therefore at one time there was a nature language, which is called in the Bible terms 'pre-Babel language. In Genesis you notice it says, 'at that time all peoples were of one language, but because of their evil intent, God came and confused their speech'[[Genesis 11:7](#)]. In the case of the building of the tower of Babel, Babel means confusion, it means a house against a house divided. So that the real answer to this is that the significances of letters which compose words is entirely fixed, and the apparent changes are not changes in the significance of letters, they're changes in their necessary application as society evolves. There's no word for 'jet plane' say in the 11th century. But there was a word for 'jet' and a word for 'plane', all that's new is the conjunction.

So we have to remember that when we're analysing words we are not analysing man made entities but universal sonic facts. And if we understand their universal references and always use them in their correct significances, our vocabulary begins to formulate itself, and integrate into a whole. which tends to coincide with the original whole from which we started.

Questioner - Thank you very much.

New Questioner - We know, because [*indistinct - Mackitt ?*] said that 'act' should mean 'act' and not mean [*indistinct word*] ? How do you account for that?

E.H. - [*Mackitt?*] said what?

Questioner continues - I mean, if that could mean, make 'act' mean something else', put in another word there, is that not like this?

E.H. - Lewis Carroll was a theologian, a Hebrew scholar, a mathematician and a philologist of good repute and he wrote a little thing in one part of which 'Humpty Dumpty' is mentioned as sitting on a wall . Now it's meant to symbolise the wall of definition, and Humpty Dumpty symbolises outside and inside the circle - this is Humpty and that's Dumpty. He's sitting on this wall and the thing that Carroll makes him say is this, 'I will make words mean what I want them to mean, but they don't behave very well, and they will misbehave'. Because some of them, like the verbs and so on are so obvious in their meanings, that if I try to change the meanings and move a word out . . . Supposing I make the word active mean passive, active means passive, so I have disqualified the word passive. I must now find another word for passive. So if I alter one word in my vocabulary I will have to move all the words one up, because I've made a gap. It's very important to realise that. That the significances that man has are not made by man - he receives them from tradition.

If we today, in modern science we're stuck for a term we don't sit down and invent one. We get a Greek lexicon and find one. Latin terminology is borrowed by the medical profession, botanists and so on; the physicists tend to borrow Greek, because 'the Greeks had a word for it'. We do not introduce any new elements,

there is no new thing under the sun [[Ecc 1:9](#)]. All we do is borrow existing usages, if the borrowing is a good one we're alright. If it isn't then there arises a situation, as very often in science, when the scientist says, 'We have a wrong term and must now re-define'.

Question - the prophet. Is he a guide of yours? On those pictures over there.

Answer [not E.H.[]] Lao Tse.

E.H. - Yes . He's the author of the *Tao Te King*, the famous Chinese classic. A classic actually to do with the nature of definitions. And it is largely in communication with him that the true definitional functions have been discussed.

Question - You've done all that - you know - and explained all, the explanation - it means you are what you are.

E.H. - Everyone is what he is. Yes well. And this is tremendously important, 'we are what we are'. And one of the oldest sayings we have, in Egyptian manuscripts, actually, is that 'the light is in you let it shine', or 'become what you are'. We are essentially certain characters, but we are continuously being interfered with from outside ourselves. If we can cut off the outside interferences , what we really are will show - 'Let your light so shine'. You are already perfect on the inside. If people would only stop annoying you then your natural perfection would show, but it's this mutual interference, that causes, instead of our true selves, our untrue, re-active, mechanical, irritable behaviour coming instead.

Question - Gene, I'm not quite sure on one point you mentioned before because [*indistinct word*] mental that word tends to lower, and higher parts , all receive or caught off somebody, and that

would come in the lower parts would it. And in calling them higher, parts it's inspirational. . . .

E.H. - Yes.

Question - Could I ask a question?

E.H. - Yes.

Questioner continues - *[indistinct]* . . if you portray facial characteristics do you portray what you feel of the things you have past?

E.H. - Do you mean is my feeling reaction involved in the drawing?

Questioner continues - Yes, as you feel into the past, do you touch the characteristics of the personality, or spirituality, of the persons you have portrayed in expressing facial expression?

E.H. - This is really a question that requires a little bit of thought. We do not contact anything whatever in the past. Everything which is, is simultaneously present absolutely. We have to think a very peculiar thing about time and energy. You notice the word time is the word EMIT backwards, it is emission of energies that causes time.

Every being that has ever existed always exists. The appearance in the time process - the birth of that person - through an egg and its development is simply a process of actualisation in the gross material world of an eternal actuality; which is the essence of that person. This is the meaning 'Become what you are'.

So in the case of these drawings there is here a representation of the essential eternality of that being, manifesting itself through a feeling, and then precipitating through action derived from the feeling.

Every person is eternal. If we can realise this it isn't a question of a being coming to exist, and then ceasing to exist, but an eternal being appearing in the material world, and disappearing from the material world going back into eternality. And in eternality there is no time process whatever. Time is a product of rotation and the passing of energies over each other, so that we are not going into the past, we are going into the eternal present. And that what we call serial time is merely the expression in impulses of eternal actuality.

I had a good question put to me, 'Why are the men in these drawings so evil looking?'. *[laughter]* It's a very good question because it enables us to dig down a little into what we mean by good. You know what Christ said about a certain black sheep that got lost, and a prodigal son that lived with the pigs. When the prodigal son came back and he'd really been the pace, his father was greatly rejoiced to see him. But his brother, who'd never been out was very jealous, and objected to the killing of the fatted calf. Now Christ said there is more rejoicing over the one sinner that returns than over the ninety nine who never leave home. And strength of character always begins by revolting against the established order.

These men look evil precisely because they were strong men first. And you can never find out your strength unless you disobey. William Blake the greatest medium and mystic of the 18th century was fully aware of this when he said, 'Opposition is true friendship'. If God is really omnipotent I can afford to test him. I needn't worry about him being knocked over. I can afford to hit as hard as I like and if he is truly God, he'll still be standing up and I will know the limits of my power. The prodigal son - prodigal means

driving forth – he’s gone out of the security of the absolute will, into individual activity. He’s committed himself to a very lonely road of self-will. And in the process he’s taken some very hard knocks. And every knock that he has received has imparted something to his character which he wouldn’t have had if he hadn’t previously have sinned.

We know that the fellow who didn’t go out at all, wasn’t a very nice fellow because he complained about the good treatment given to the returning prodigal. So we know that the stay at home namby pamby boys, who’ve never really been tempted and they can afford, they believe, to make moral judgements about people who had considerably more energy and committed terrible crimes.

The important thing is if you have been wicked enough, out of strength of will, and then turned round, you will become exactly as useful to the divinity, in propagating his word as you were against it for him. This is a question of energy action and re-action. If you had the strength of mind to push against universal law, you will discover how much of it is universal and how much is a façade, set up by human beings. Many human beings have declared that there was a law in existence, that certain things were not possible, and they were saying it for their own ends.

We know that this is so in the case of the great prophets. All the great prophets have attacked the social structure of their day. Christ was put to death for attacking the structure of society and of its rulers in the synagogue. They said ‘He has a devil’, devil means – a dividing energy, a disintegrating force. In that sense he was a devil to them, he played the devil with the synagogue, he tore it to bits. He himself was a prodigal. He is the ‘Lamb slain from the foundation’ [[Rev 13:8](#)]. He is the bull with the yoke on its neck. He is everything that knows all about error. He goes down to hell and he comes up again.

So if we take a clock face, we put twelve o’clock up there. You know that the symbology of twelve means

'governmental perfection'. Down here is six, six means - sexuality. A man starts from governmental perfection, that's the universal, and he appears, born and that's his first period. He's then a unity being, circumscribed. He is then analysed, he then proceeds to try to integrate himself, and then he tries to establish himself on Earth. Then his five senses begin to act upon him. And when they have acted upon him he becomes a sexual being. And the sexual relation itself and the energy expenditure, is the primary motive that drives people to selfishness, to feathering their own nests. It's in the name of 'mother love' and 'father protective spirit' that all the wars of the world have occurred, that all defence of home, television sets and other things is invoked to justify whatever is done. So that is the bottom point.

All this is the process of the fall. And when a man begins to try to balance his energies;, seven means - equilibration and balance.; becomes aware of eternal forces - eight signifies infinity and eternity; learns to negate them, that's nine; can put them in order, that's ten. Ten means - ordinal perfection. He comes to the eleventh hour. At the eleventh hour he has to decide whether he wants to be a black or a white magician. He can at that point turn round and fall back like the 'great beast' Aleister Crowley did, he climbed so far and then willed backwards here. Other people have done the same. Or he can assert the rulership of God, the governmental perfection of the universe, and go into the centre to subserve it.

So we see here that if a person does not descend, we can't expect a child to be self controlled, kind hearted and universally compassionate, and considerate. He first has to be selfish. That's one. He must say I am one. It has to find there are two, and take a knocking from another child. It has to find three, the possibility of relating the two with a linking idea. It has to find four, the possibility of establishing itself on Earth. It has to realise five senses are its means of deriving information. And by which time it has

reached the age when sexuality wakes in it and it will proceed from there to climb. You notice it's immediately after the appearance of sexuality that idealism comes in for a short time. Quite suddenly there is an attempt, on the part of this selfish being, to consider another being, ideally. A boy, or a girl fall in love and quite suddenly the world looks different and they feel kind to everything. And they are approaching this seventh process, this equilibration.

Then comes the vow of eternal fidelity, and then comes, in practice, and there is no necessity about this, the negation of their ambitions. Their eternal fidelity vows fall to bits, and the negation that happens to them forces them to put themselves in order. And the order, once established, places them on the point of choosing whether they will subserve the universal spirit or egotism. If they subserve the universal they go inside and join the elect. If they will backwards into the material world, they can have a fine time, up to the point of death.

But the whole of prodigality is down here, and the reclamation is here. But if a person has a very, very low energy level, such that they haven't got enough energy to respond to an external stimulus, they cannot be tempted. Temptation means - temporal stimulation. If they cannot be tempted they cannot re-act, they cannot sin, and consequently they cannot get the big knock that will put into them the character they need to make it worthwhile recounting their funny stories when they get back to where they came from.

So we see that the peculiar expressions on these faces requires us to give a new definition to spirituality. Spirit is initiative, it is free form. That initiative is the 'light that lights every man who comes into the world' [[John 1:9](#)]. You cannot know whether you've got that light unless you go against something. If you always go for the existing, you are a tram on rails. And trams are being removed, although we were in Glasgow recently and they haven't taken them away from there. And there are some other places where they still

survive. Where trams survive it's like people in the groove surviving. If you get off the rails danger appears, but that does not mean that we should abolish private cars and the hermaphrodite trolley buses, which are safe above and unsafe below.

The whole problem to think about is the real value of energy expenditure as a mode of gaining character. It produced a line of strength of character, which eventually produced the messiah. So the question of sin, and so on, is bound up with the question of the amount of energy you have, and no person of low energy should feel ethically superior because there is no problem of controlling where there is low energy. People with tremendous tendencies to bad temper have real chemical irritants in them, and to control that is a victory. Whereas to remain calm in the absence of such irritations, is no victory at all.

Closing Address - *[indistinct -Thanks?]* . . . to Mr Halliday for an enlightening and very, very interesting evening, and we look forward to the day when he will shortly give us another evening..
Thanks.

End of recording.