

Engrams

E.H. [*reading a presented question*]

“I have evolved a theory of something resembling the encapsulating process which the body uses against T.B., happens in the mind. The attention tends to approach and then build a wall around areas containing uncomfortable Engrams. Why dwell in it we say. An exercise based on extreme contraction and release will break these walls and release energy. Right will issues, and ideas, which have been isolated, will suddenly associate into a clear pattern.

But the energy released appears to have a content of anger, resentment, etc., and will seek a target. Many myths seem to suggest that there is a catch in it. For example – king Midas, and we don’t get what we expect. How can we learn to use this gold, and prevent it doing damage internally or externally ? Or shouldn’t we care?”

[*laughter*]

This idea of encapsulation of unpleasant experiences, of course, is not a new one. It is precisely what has always been meant by psychologists, when they talk about repressed elements, and inhibition, and it is what Gurdjieff means by buffers.

The encapsulating process is simply setting up energy round any engrams, any ideas or feelings engrammed in our tissues, which might express themselves in unpleasant, anti-social actions. It is quite obvious that if we get a good idea, a kind, humane idea, socially acceptable, that we have no need to inhibit it, and automatically that, which is socially acceptable would tend to be released. And so we are not very likely to inhibit, to bury socially useful instincts, and their expressions.

So the things that we tend to inhibit will naturally be those that are anti-social destructive as anger, and resentment. So we shouldn’t be surprised when we find an encapsulated,

uncomfortable Engram being released, expressing itself in anger, considering what was inhibited in the first place was anger. If we imagine that is a man's mind, nice shaped mind that one, and we place in that mind some idea, with its attendant feeling, which is destructive of some external being or situation, and we realise that as finite beings we haven't the power to strike out against society successfully, because society would hit back, and restrict us. Then naturally we will inhibit it through fear.

If we were omnipotent we couldn't get angry in any case, because anger, if we remember, is a state in which we get blocked. Out energy, motion, blocks and then breaks out, in disintegrating forces. You know this root, the ANG in anxiety, and the German Angst, or fear, tells you that energy is moving and becoming blocked. That is becoming encapsulated-Inhibited.

Now, obviously, we don't wish to inhibit through fear something that is socially acceptable. So when we do inhibit, it is probable that the inhibition will be caused by our fear of consequences. We can fill the mind with little encapsulated unpleasant ideas about a variety of subjects. And many subjects as there are you will have some attitudes towards, half of which will leave be unpleasant ones, because we've said before, to affirm a pleasant thing, is to affirm the unpleasant simultaneous thing. Because the two horns of the dilemma belong together - you can't get rid of the other end of the stick.

If we imagine the simplest kind of relationship between two beings, then if this one likes the other being's presence, then it must try to rope the other being into a relation. But he can only like that other being for certain reasons, he couldn't like that being to such a point as wishing to absolve the being until the being disappeared completely, but If he did so then there would be no possibility of a relation.

Hence, 'thus far, no farther', in every relation. You like somebody to a certain extent for certain reasons, and you bring them to you for those reasons, and if they come closer than you

want them to come, then the antipathy the anti-feeling is generated.

Now this polarity of feeling is a necessity, an essential, an unavoidable. It is because of this polarity of feeling and the fact that pleasure/pain are simultaneous, one expressed and the other repressed, that Adam was told not to eat of that fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil/ And to try to separate good from evil, and to try to get one without the other. They are actually inseparable. If that is a young man, and that is a girl, if he goes towards the girl it is for some reason. And the girl also has her reasons, which he is not interested in, and when she begins to express her reasons there arises an antipathy.

If his desire is strong enough for the time being it will obscure in her both elements, which he does not want to see. And then later on by the law of the tiring of the organism it must follow that the things that have been expressed will lapse, and the things not expressed will appear. So in proportion as she has been pleasant, she must become unpleasant. That is the law.

Some say Jesus tried to escape this law by saying stay with her while she is pleasant, and run away when the unpleasant periods start and wait for the pleasant period to start again and then return. Most people have too many economic pressures on them to behave in this manner, and so they have to face it, even when the unpleasant reaction is coming. The important thing to realise is that you cannot separate out this pleasure/pain into two separate substances and throw one away. Therefore you must have both. Now if you have here a finite being with finite power, there are some thing he cannot do, and yet when he moves into relation with other beings, because he is not omnipotent he cannot make the relation go one hundred percent the way he wants it to go.

Therefore there must be something in the relation he doesn't like. And because, in general, that thing which he doesn't like is unpleasant to look at, he doesn't want to look at it during the period of a relation. Therefore he puts a wall of energy round it.

That energy wall effectively stops the appearance in consciousness of that element. That energy wall is this capsule in the theory- Mr Wilson's theory of the encapsulation of unpleasant experiences.

Now, when, by concentration upon it – hitting it, penetrating through it by force of will – energy is piled into it until it breaks out again, and then we have to face the fact that as Mr Wilson has pointed out here. The thing that bounces out is resentment. Hence the last bit of this – 'or shouldn't we care?' When this resentment comes out we should be very glad, because it is that resentment that is creating disease in the organism. As long as it is bottled up and not faced.

Lets do another diagram of this brain which we will deliberately cut a segment out, and we will put one of these encapsulated zones there, and we'll put repressive forces round it so that it cannot express itself into the waking consciousness. Nevertheless it exists, and it is continuously turbulating, and is being driven into a centre. Now, you know the rule about energy driven into a centre – if you keep driving it in, it becomes tumescent and shoots out.

Now, if you don't allow it to shoot into the waking consciousness and it is being driven in because it is not non-existent – it is a real force – it drives into the centre, and then shoots down into the tissue. It is now energy literally destroying tissue, because you have not allowed it out into expression. Now you can see why we shouldn't care. Caring, chiefly for opinion of other people, has caused us to repress to encapsulate these unpleasant but essential emotions that appear in any relation. Caring – remember that care is the same as the CRA root, to control, to relate, to inhibit, controlling, implies inhibition – caring for the opinion of other people has caused you to repress half of your emotive reaction.

If you never allow it to express itself, either to the other people or to you, then it must drive itself into the centre and eventually shoot into the tissue and proceed to disrupt it. Because there is no

way whereby the tissue can absorb that energy other than that way devised by nature for the absorption of it, through the special channels, through the digestive organs, through the blood, and so on. If the energy gets directed into the tissue from the repressed element, then it must act in a disintegrating manner.

Now, you probably remember Gurdjieff's statement about the man that had to blow the buzzer in the morning, and get everybody out of bed and how he felt very, very ill for a long time, until it suddenly occurred to him that people didn't like him. Remember the occasion, the stimulus that gave him that. He was out in the street and he saw a dog catcher, just about to catch a dog, and suddenly a stimulus came, and the dog escaped the net, and he then cursed the stimulus. And immediately this man, the buzzer-blower man, realised that when he blew that buzzer in the morning, people disturbed from sleep cursed him. And he said 'That is the cause of my feeling so ill - so I will beat them to it.' So every morning before he blew the buzzer, he first roundly cursed everybody who was about to be disturbed and thus released all the energy. Now, Gurdjieff had a sense of humour and there is no necessity to curse everybody in that way. But, there is a very real necessity for you, to become conscious of the tendency, the necessary tendency, of you to curse everybody, simply because you are in relation with them.

You know there is a peculiar thing called egotism, and we know that peculiar thing called egotism has a very, very deep root. It is rooted in spirit - it is not an invention of man. It is rooted in spirit, because spirit is free initiative. When the spirit is not enclosed it is not egotistic. But when that same spirit, comes in and goes round, the moment it has closed that circle, because here it was free initiative, now it is initiative bound.

It is the same quality as before, free initiative, but now it has bound itself, and its initiative goes inside itself, and works to organise its being. And when its organisation is complete, then tries to relate itself to other beings who have done the same thing

from the same source. Consequently it follows that every finite being has a centre of free initiative, and must, from its origin, its spiritual origin, will freely to do what it wants. It must decide what it is going to do. And any suggestion that a stimulus from another being could determine its condition must be resisted.

We often find in a relation, you know the rabbis said that you can't go to heaven unless you get married. And the reason was Kierkegaard agreed with them, only the married man, he said, is complete because only the married man is under test, sufficiently. When the stimulus of the wife comes to the husband, it comes at unpredictable and irregular times, and disturbs his inner process of conceptualising a situation. Therefore he tends to hit back at it, and, if he doesn't understand it, he actually hopes that someday she will stop this interruption.

Now if there are no other beings external to that man at all, we have said before, he could not ever become a full person, because you can only become a full person if you can find a reciprocal point. A point that will return your energies back to you, so that you can see what they are. A woman cannot understand what it is to be a woman, except in relation to a man. A man cannot understand what it is to be a man except in relation to a woman. There must be something to return, to mirror, his activities. Just in the same way that the sun, without the moon to shine on, cannot understand itself as a sun.

So, the conflict, the confrontation, as the philosophers might call it, of two beings is an essential part of the development of each. And yet, both derive from free spirit, and free initiative, and evolve into limitation, circumscription, by the free initiative will, and therefore they have self-determination in them from their very root. Self-determination – not super, added to the finite, it is from its original infinite source. And therefore you can never kill the will to self-determination. You can convince it in a finite situation that it cannot yet get its own way, that you cannot convince it that it could never get its own way. Even if you put a man in jail, with thick

walls, and convince him that he is in jail with thick walls, the centre of free initiative in himself, if you don't watch him, will start biting the walls with his teeth - if he has got nothing else - to get out. Because he has from the spirit this initiative.

Now, when people don't understand the nature of this conflict, because they have repressed the anti-social, or the anti-other, impulse. Which must necessarily exist, because of the nature of spirit - that is free initiative . When those elements have been repressed, then there arises the pseudo, humane, social relation, the conceptual relation which says that people ought to be nice to each other, that comical Kingdom of God, that some church people mention where everybody would be - if they were very nice to each other. Now that can never arise until people admit the essential polarity - thus far and no farther. That in every relation there is not only a value gained but there is also a restriction in the relation.

And the free spirit must resent the restriction of the relation, whilst pursuing the value of the relation. Now you have to make yourself conscious of this fact. Then you will understand why anger springs out of every encapsulated, inhibited concept that you ever had. It springs out because it was that which was inhibited, and the original character of a memory trace is still in the memory as its quality. If it is anger you repress, or resentment, or fear, then those are the qualities which must emerge when it finds expression.

So we have to understand that we must accept plus and minus, positive and negative, in every relation as absolutely inseparable, and know therefore that in your relation with other beings, there is something you don't like. It is exactly as strong as the thing you do like, not less strong, but exactly as strong, and if you can move towards the thing you like, with the thing you don't like in full consciousness, you are acting freely.

Whereas, if you move towards a thing you do like, having repressed the part you don't like, then later on, as you tire, which is necessary, because the organs have intoxicated themselves with the by-products of its own activities. As you tire, then the energy

repressed will manifest, and the loved object will be the hated object. This is a fact that every psychologist and every mystic knows. That love and hate are equal and opposite and applied to the same object. So necessarily the thing that you love is the thing that you hate to the same degree.

If the social taboo requires you not to hate, that is pseudo religion, pseudo Christianity, then you will inhibit it, and later on it will hate you, and you will think you were mistaken in that person, instead of mistaken in your analysis of life. So you have to affirm that these are aspects of one functional fact – love and hate are exactly, equal and opposite for the same object, at the same moment. In the most intimate of all relationships, if you are conscious of your feeling, you will always find exactly the same amount of repulsion as you find of attraction. And, if you just accept that fact, you will stop repressing, stop inhibiting, stop encapsulating these things, and then, not being inhibited, they cannot later shock you by the violence with which they appear.

Now, when we encapsulate a force which was this big. Actually it was infinite, but you bring it in. As you become aware of your violence towards a loved object, you drive it in to make it unconscious and eventually you drive it as far as you can do, and put your inhibiting forces around it to stop it bouncing out. Now, the energy locked in there is exactly like the energy compacted in a bomb. That energy is field energy which will spread out, and which when it was originally spread out, you could assimilate, and if you are conscious of it before it has time to compress it can never compress.

And if it can't compress, it cannot explode and give you a shock. This is the important thing about inhibition. Inhibition compresses a thing in order to cause it not to be. But it can never cause a thing absolutely not to be, so all it does is drag in the field energies to a very, very small compass, and hold them in as long as you have sufficient energy outside to hold them. But the time always comes, that either a shock from outside disturbing the

equilibrium, or simply the advance of years robs you of the energy needed to keep in this inhibited centre.

This is why you find very, very old people manifesting these peculiar attitudes towards people, which are really things repressed 40, 50, 60 years ago, which now bounce out. If they had been conscious of them in the first place and accepted them as essential polar opposites of the good qualities then they could never have been compressed, and they would still be spread in the field, and they could never explode. There can be no explosion without previous implosion.

So we see that really this question is a very, very valuable one, because it allows us to reconsider more fully the kind of work we have to do. When you hammer into, any unpleasant idea in yourself, when you find anything you don't want to look at, and you deliberately concentrate on it and force yourself to look at it, because it was a thing you didn't want to look at.

Therefore you know that it was an inhibited thing, therefore you know that fundamentally it is a thing not acceptable outside. It is anti-social – it is breaking the taboo. Therefore, when you penetrate into it, it must explode, and you must feel surging out of yourself this anger, this aggression, and you must say 'or shouldn't we care?' This you must say. Now the important thing to realise is this; you can never gain equilibrium unless you allow these repressed elements to express themselves. But, you mustn't allow them to come outside and damage people if you have been deliberately avoiding damaging for so long. So what you have to do is expect that it will be anger, fear, rage, resentment, treason, and all sorts of horrible things that you discover when you take the tension off.

Don't be surprised, and recognise that is what was in the pot when you put the lid on. Don't identify it, let it bob out and say so and so. If you had a very close friend you might actually say to that first friend 'would you mind if I tell you what I've been inhibiting about you for the last 25 years [*laughter*]. And if he's a very good

friend, he won't mind. When I did this to a friend of mine about 4 years ago, when he was in a very tight way, and I said to him 'you go and write down exactly what you think about me, and I won't mind.' And he said 'I have nothing against you.' I said, 'nevertheless, go and write down what ever comes, and on no account interfere with it. Well he wrote down for four hours a lot of words about me, most of them were four letters, and he was amazed (He was a Methodist, this boy) and he was amazed that there were so many rude words in his vocabulary. I was amazed that there were so few, so often repeated. If he had not been a Methodist, he'd have had more of them.

The point was that they were released, and he felt better afterwards. You can only become whole if you spread out your energies to where they came from. They came from equilibrated absolute spirit, they must be returned to that spirit. This is the meaning of throwing your sins onto the shoulders of Christ (Evilbound) You can throw all your sins back to where they came from because that's where they belong, because they are inherent, in the fact of spirit created. The spirit is free and absolutely guiltless, and the spirit creates, and the moment the spirit goes like that there is GU up to the hilt, as they say. That's guilt. When this gulletal will is crucified on the fact of existence that is called guilt. But there is no guilt, other than spirit creating, and in the act of creating, creating guilt, because to be finite, when one is freely initiative, when one can, from one's own source of absolute spirit, be self determined.

To be finite under such conditions is necessarily to be guilty, because immediately one wills from ones finitive, from ones creativeness one must, in relation to other beings, be a nuisance. And that must be accepted; you are a nuisance to every other being in the universe, and they are nuisances to you. Nothing can be done about that fact except to accept the fact. Just like all the men in all the cars all over the country, try to accept the fact that

there are other cars on the road, by going round instead of through them.

A sick person is a person who is aware in general that they are about to go through people instead of round them, and at that moment they usually go as voluntary patients to try to get rid of this regression to aggression. If previously they had been aware that this must arise and accepted it then it could never have arisen, because the pre-condition of it is that we must take field energy from spirit, drive it in, and try to compress it, until it becomes invisible. And in the act of the compression we are driving it in and down into our tissue, and it must find its way out when the inhibiting forces round it tire, weaken, as they must do as either when you are slightly off colour, or when you grow older, naturally.

Now, is that fairly clear? Are there any immediate questions about that?

Question:

Yes, I have one – Does the confessional and sacrament in the RC church, is that why it has so much value because all the things we inhibit are released?

EH

Yes, yes because was expressly designed for that. The very early church knew that they were dealing with primitive levels of energies repressed, and if they wanted to make a church, an enclosure, they would enclose a commune of people, and assembly. The mere fact that they were causing beings of free initiative to gather together in one place would either produce violent blows, as it must do in a closed situation like a church, which is an assembly, hopefully.

Then they said well now to get rid of these repressed energies we must institute a method of release. Therefore they must go to the *episcopos* - the bishop, the father, the leader, and say 'I am Albert, I felt like hitting Sammy very hard today. And he says - 'Yes, my son, you sure did, and I also felt like hitting Sammy. But, you see, you will always going to feel like hitting Sammy. Sammy is

the kind of fellow that causes people to feel like hitting them.’ And then, so I am not alone.

The energy was played out and that was the purpose of the confessional. It is exactly the same function that modern psychology has. Modern psychology is just a secular confessional. Where it succeeds it has actually persuaded the patient to speak forth these deep resentments. Where it fails is that it has actually failed to penetrate to certain resentments in them.

A rather amusing case recently was where a patient I know was sued by a psychiatrist for causing a breach of the peace, in the surgery and has recently appealed against this decision, and is conducting the defence of their own case. She had a very strange statement to make. She said she was at war with all psychiatrists because they were always trying to pry into the depths of her mind. *[laughter]* That’s the important thing about it. She resented them. She had lots of feelings, anti-psychiatric feelings, and nevertheless she was driven into relation with them because of the polarised fact, and these resentments she was determined never to voice, and they can’t cure her until she admits those things.

She has invoked the name of justice, that people shouldn’t pry into other people’s minds. So she is suffering from a concept that she is an isolated individual, and that a psychiatrist is another person also isolated, and that there is no right in that person to penetrate that person. Which means that spiritual education is deficient. If she knew that one spirit went like that, and that the right is of this spirit to penetrate that and that. And if the psychiatrist knew, that spirit is what he was dealing with, free initiative, and said - ‘Inside me there is a natural resentment for me, and I resent you too for being ill, and wasting my time. Nevertheless, the amount of recompense I get from you for wasting time makes it worth my while.’

Now, open statements of that order produce a release of this inhibited anger. So the confessional, as the name tells you, has to remain central to let us all confess that we are all as finites, equally

criminal, we are all as rooted in spirit, free initiative, we are all as creatures, limited, and must resent our limitations. And simply: because the absolute spirit has produced many such centres; and these centres are all centres of free initiative; and any one of them can do what it likes - because it is the spirit and if anyone can do what it likes, they all can - and if they all can, there is no reason why a lot of them should not gang up to stop one of them doing what it wants.

That is the relation we have to face, This is the eternal dialectics of spirit, Heraclitus himself was the first of the Greeks to formulate that. The spirit is essentially that which can form and un-form, and will form for some purpose for some time, and then will go on, and leave it, and it will disintegrate. And it won't bother with it, and will make another form. And therefore he said - 'Really the only rule worth knowing is this dialectical rule that there are no rules.' If anything can happen, the free initiative spirit will to happen, that must be accepted. And if it wills a finite, it immediately constrains itself. And if it doesn't like the constraint, it will have to undo itself, but if it wills the constraint, which is the Christian analysis, it does so in spite of the horribleness in the polar dialectics, and the love hate antithesis in every being.

Nevertheless it is worth my while to will it, because the alternative is wandering eternally in a maze of never makes anything. Of the two processes the Christian psychology prefers that analysis-the affirmation of being- as opposed to the non-affirmation of being, the crazy eternal wandering of Ahasverus-the wandering Jew.

We have to choose between being and not being. The Christian analysis says you must choose Being. Very, very, very, lazy people, and very tired people, and very, very sick people, get fed up with being and are prepared to lapse into non-being. When they do so, it is their choice. They will it. When they will to lapse into non-being, they are doing a foolish thing, whether they know it or not, because once they have become mazey again, any one of

these beings becoming conscious, can actually go through certain processes and capture that lazy energy, and bring it into itself.

That is what actually we do when we are eating things. The earth has captured mazy energies, the plants have captured them, the animals have captured them, man has captured them, so all this hazy-mazy business can be captured by beings who are conscious. So if a man is unbecoming in a real sense he is becoming manure, to a man who is willing to become.

Question:

One of the things I would like to ask now is, when you release this energy from these buffers if you don't handle it correctly you can actually have the same thing happen to you all over again. Is that so ?

E.H.

Oh yes.

Question

And that is the real danger of this business if you don't handle it in the correct manner you have just reverted in a way.

E.H.

But you will revert every time you do not accept that every inhibited element must have the qualities deserving inhibition, so they won't be nice qualities.

Question

But the only way you can handle these qualities is to observe...

E.H.

Is to observe them, and not identify with them, and to see that they are necessary as a result of the fact of inhibition. If you know, if you started today, and said 'all the people I know, I hate them as much as I love them, and I love them as much as I hate them! equal and opposite, they are no indifference.

So all your friends are your enemies, and all your enemies are your friends, actually, simultaneously, and you affirm this so you can never feel let down by a so called friend because he is your enemy. And you can never be fully annoyed with your enemy because he will do you a good turn.

Question.

But we still have to live in a society, don't we ?

E.H.

The society is full of your friends/enemies, its other people, who are in exactly the same boat as yourself. If someone bounces at you and becomes angry, you should say immediately they have inhibited part of their real attitude towards me, and now it has come out because they are a bit tired.

Question.

This is the complete understanding of [unclear word] of course.

E.H.

Yes of course.

Question.

You can prevent the manufacture of buffers by the use of the Magic circle and by constant observation of whats coming in and whats going out, you are preventing that happening...

E.H.

And making sure that you do not try to split good and evil, and throw the evil away. A man said to me last night, a Methodist, that the Bible said that God is love and that is all he stood on. I said it says in the Bible - 'Am I not he who gives good and gives evil, says the Lord? And the man said ' Well I would like to know what the references for that, because I don't accept it'. Now its quite easy to find that statement, when I said, 'I will give you the references' - 'Perhaps the word shouldn't be transferred evil there, it should be translated punishment. The other word should be translated as a reward.'

Anyhow I said 'I'll bring you the reference, and the original Hebrew word, and you can evaluate it yourself.' And he said 'Well,

err, I couldn't accept it, because I am sure that it can't mean evil.' I then told him the myth of the Garden of Eden, and how Adam and Eve were thrown out for dividing the good and the evil, and trying to throw the evil away. And he said he never understood it before, but he felt terrible about attributing evil to God.

Now, God is absolute, so if there is anything whatever, it hangs upon him, and therefore, at least by allowing it to hang on him, he is responsible for it. He is spirit, He is free initiative. When he breathed spirit into man, man became a freely initiative being, then at that moment, God had brought into being a responsible being that could commit evil.

Now, who is responsible - the man who invents the bomb or the bomb ? If there is any responsibility in a man, it belongs to the spirit. Although man, as a finite, has to pay a finite price, there is also an infinite price. That is to say, there is a reverberation to the absolute, as well as within the finite.

Eckhart, the great mystic, knew this when he said that 'If I didn't exist, God wouldn't exist either'. Because he knew very well that if that didn't exist, and that is the worshiper of this, this couldn't exist. Because to state that that is transcendent, depends on saying this is imminent. If we destroy imminence, we destroy that, and only that which can say there is a transcendence. So if we destroy all the worshippers, there will be no god, because God is the object of a worshipper.

So there would only be an absolute with no other name. Therefore, that spirit, in bringing to be, is responsible for the being it brings to be. It is because of this in Christianity it is said that that absolute being which makes all these little beings takes upon his shoulders all the guilt of all the little ones. Every error they make belongs to the macrocosmic being because it made first itself, and then all the parts internal to it. If I get a knife, and stick it in my arm, I am more responsible than the arm for the knife sticking in it. So I should apologise to the cells, I shouldn't tell myself to look where they were going. The fact that they are finite, and more

limited than I am, places them in passive relationship to me. If I could educate a little cell into reflexive self-consciousness, and then threaten it with a knife, it will dodge.

There is a slight tendency in tissue to try to move away. If I deliberately put a knife near it and threatened to stick it in, you feel a little cringe in that place. There is that much initiative in a cell that it can at least fear, and draw back from it, contract. If you put an acid on the cell it will start to shrink, it has that much initiative.

Question.

It is quite marked in shark flesh.

E.H.

You can see it in many animals, if you take a piece of tissue out, and isolate it you can treat that, It shows it's marked responsibility.

Question.

When you are releasing these buffers then you are actually working in the causal in relation to your physical health.

E.H.

Yes, of course you are. Remember, your field is infinite. The field of every finite being is infinite, and there are not two infinities, which means an absolute identity of us as spirit. Hence Christ saying 'as he is one with the Father, so we should be one with each other. Out finite, created, rotating force bodies are the things that cause the problems to arise. And as long as we believe that they are absolutely finite, we create problems which are insoluble. If we understand that all these finite bodies are merely modalities of the infinite spirit, then there is no problem of ultimate enmity, because all is non to all free initiative, in which there is no energy, enmity appears where there is identification with the finite. So, to get rid of it, all you have to do is remember your absolute origin. See that it is so. Believe it is so. To believe is an act of will.

Question.

There was a statement about 'judge not, lest ye be judged'.

E.H.

Yes, because, if you judge another being , if you judge that being there as being bad, you have an image inside your mind of that being as a bad being, and you don't like bad so you inhibit it. So you actually say 'I don't want to think about that man'. So every adverse judgement you make against another being actually means that you have encapsulated that man's image in yourself, in other words you have created the conditions of disease simply by being against that person outside.

When Paul was talking about 'strong-meat', he was talking about free initiative. He said 'here is some milk and water.' There is strong-meat, and you cannot yet bear it. So he didn't tell them. In the same way, Christ said something to Thomas, and Thomas wouldn't tell the others. In every language there is a key to that statement. Some 'strong-meat'. Every meat is ME AT, that is, it is the objective aspect, the M is the substantial of the spirit. That is HE - that's spirit and ME -that's body, the objectified spirit. So that's HE and that's ME and that's the cross, the A T the location. Now the strong-meat that Paul wouldn't tell, because if he had have done, he could never have made a church, was this. Every being in the universe, including sub-atomic particles, if it can do it, is entitled to do it. If it can do it. Only the true function determines the right. Therefore, if any free initiative being brings itself into be, it becomes MEAT, the substance on which that spirit will feed. Feed in the sense it will derive experience from. And wherever it drives that ME, that objectified HE, into whatever situation, some experience will be derived whereby that HE will derive joy from the experience. But it will have to drive that ME, that finited substance,into situations involving other ME's.

Now, the world is full of ME's, and there are all at different levels of understanding and they were in Paul's day. And if he had tried to make all those ME's understand at the same rate the same ultimate truth, he would have failed, and he would have introduced anarchy, because anarchy is the same thing as absolute self determination. So you cannot make a hierarchy, a church, a

pyramid or a state if you teach anarchy to the unprepared. Because they will not freely co-operate in the building of that pyramid, because they will have other purposes, namely their own evolution. Because they too must drive themselves into situations, and only in the painful situations can you derive the greatest value.

Now, in an established state, the situation gets less and less painful. It becomes a welfare state if you don't stop it, which means, in effect, that every person will get fed, get his television, or whatever it is, and he will become comfortable. He will become satisfied, and then he will die in his sins - as it says in the bible. That is, his comfort mechanism will get him, and he cannot improve. He cannot rise to the heights of reflexive self-conscious if he is told in the beginning that he is a free being, with the right to do what he wants. He will always do originally the pleasant thing, and dodge the painful. Therefore, that strong-meat, that everybody is entitled to make up his own mind from his inner spirit, could not be taught, because it would produce anarchy.

When Augustine, with the collapsing Roman Empire there, saw it, he saw that if a new unity wasn't made quickly, the thing would completely disintegrate, and the Goths would take over. The only possibility of unity was with the church. So he put his energies in the church, and the church then stood as a nucleus around which that state could reorganise itself. But the reorganisation cost the initiative of the individuals. And the dogmatic hierarchy was set up determining exactly what should be thought below the pontifical chair. Now, the fact that they succeeded is their justification. If anybody down below could revolt, and bounce up there, that would also be justified. And that is strong-meat.

That is revolutionary talk, and we don't want revolutionary talk. We certainly don't want the waste of energy that is involved in a social revolution where people rush about in the streets, breaking windows, stealing cans and bananas and something from each other, instead of going into unpleasant situations to develop their understanding.

The kind of social revolution conducted in France and Russia has not elevated the understanding and the spiritual level of the people involved in that revolution. It simply offered them something that they hadn't got, in a mass movement. And yet spirit can only be developed by individuals, and by individual effort. Seventy million Frenchmen can be wrong. One individual Frenchman might be right, and certainly, only one, and one, and one, can succeed in becoming spiritual, precisely because spirit is free initiative. And when it makes an individual, that individual, in order to be spiritual, must retain its initiative. And a social revolution, of the order of the French revolution or the Russian revolution, does not produce individual free initiative – it produces regression back to an animal level, to the herd.

So there's no justification for telling that secret, or giving out that strong-meat that every individual is really centred with spirit and initiative, and therefore Paul said you cannot yet bear it. 'If I tell you this now,' he said, 'you won't form a church; you'll rush about doing what you think you want. This will be to your detriment, because you should be moving towards integration'.

So because a man would not make a pyramid in himself. Set up his ideas in an order of importance, in himself, as an individual. Therefore a social hierarchy had to be set up to constrain him into behaviour, so that society represents, as a whole, one man, who has attained some order. And the individuals who accept that social thing, because they know of no better, are simply little bricks in that social pyramid. And they have abandoned their free initiative, and conformed to social pattern.

Most of the theologians who think about morality and ethics are always talking about this kingdom of God, in which everybody will have his position in the hierarchy of spiritual values. But there is no hierarchy of spiritual values other than the degree to which you have attained free initiative.

Now, quite obviously, you cannot talk to people in large numbers and tell them the fundamental fact of the riddle of Samson

that 'out of the eater came forth meat'. That you are a product of your own initiative, that you are yourself in character, in capacities, in talents, the product of the spirit which is involved into you and even now characterises you with further purposes, and that nobody else can be blamed. You have the idea of blaming anything whatever, including spirit, it's a waste of an idea, because the spirit is eternal and absolute and can never cease to exist, and is faced with the problem either to be or not to be. And it resolves it by being in the circle, and not being out of it.

The man who identifies only with the being and not with the non-being goes under the law of being. The man who identifies with the non being as well, is aware that his physical body is a machine, and he doesn't mind being a machine any more than a man with a motor car minds his motor car being a machine. Your body is such a vehicle. The man who identifies with the body frequently does mind this mechanical limitations, and when he minds it, he resents the limitations. When he resents it, he contracts; when he contracts he decreases his efficiency. The cure is always to remember your spiritual origin, your transcendence.

Some philosophers actually think that transcendence is a meaningless term. They insult it. Materialists in general do so. Not only those there are others that think that all that is is being, and that the non-being is a matter of no importance. Therefore don't think about it. Now, in fact, all that is is being, and the non-being is a matter of no importance. Therefore you ought to export yourself into it -not import yourself. Export yourself out of that which has been imported already. Remember your original source.

Question.

It's only your feeling of self importance that gives you importance in the first place.

E.H.

Of course self defence of the finite, and when you realise to defend the finite is futile because it ultimately must fail through lack of evidence. And therefore, if you will place yourself in the

infinite, you cannot fail. So the *Tao Te King* says 'he who does not declare his aim can not be said to fail'. So if you will not say what you aim is in the gross material world, nobody can say you've failed. You might say you're a loafer, but they can't say you have failed. If you know what it is you're looking for namely reflexive self consciousness, you can use your finite body as a piece of irritable protoplasm, responding to stimuli of various orders, and giving you occasion to meditate upon your own significance as a being of initiative.

As you become progressively more and more aware of your spiritual source, your free source, you will understand more and more that you can do anything whatever that you will. And don't say 'anything you want', because 'want' implies deficiency. Anything that you will, then you can understand Paul's statement that love is the law, and the statements love and do what you will.

That funny Magician Alistair Crowley borrowed it, and said 'Love is the Law. Love under will, is the law'. The thing is that if you become a free being, a being of initiative, there is no reason whatever why you should do one thing rather than another. But, nevertheless, you WILL do certain things rather than some other things simply because you WILL do those things to your ultimate benefit rather than to a temporal finite, lower benefit. You will choose between values, and you will always choose those things that enhance your initiative and freedom.

Question.

The implications are quite severe.

E.H.

Well, it's 'strong-meat'. We know one or two novelists have handled the idea of a man suddenly become aware, after thirty years in a bank or something, that he didn't have to be there at all, he never did need to go there. He was conceptualised into going there, and because of the inherent insecurity in him he accepted the concept. And then after many years he discovers that he didn't need to accept that concept. And then he breaks out of it, and

everybody else in the environment immediately panics. They tried to keep him in, although the world would go on without him, they tried to keep him in his conceptual position, for the simple reason he is a finger pointing at them, saying 'What are you doing here?'

If they can't replace him behind the counter, put him back and sit him on his chair, and make him accept, their inner initiative will tend to spring out. And to be free is the same thing as to be exposed to danger - because if you're free, you can do anything. Most people, people as such, to use the word technically, are terrified of being free, because when free they can do anything, and when then can do anything how do they now that they'll be alright when they've done it? So they prefer security. And security is the same thing as jail. Therefore, one thinker said, 'He who wants security, let him go and break a window, in public. He will immediately get security, in jail.'

I met a man once in Piccadilly, he came up to me and said 'Excuse me sir. Do you mind giving me in charge to that policeman, and tell him that I have bothered you and tried to get money out of you?' And I said 'What for?', and he said 'Well, it's only a fortnight to Christmas, and when you're in jail at Christmas, you get very well treated.'

[Tape cut]

. . . . well you have to cast away all moral, ethical considerations about this, and consider you own level. Just how much initiative you feel you've got, and how much you are prepared to face the implications of freedom. That a free act is an exposed act, anything can happen. Therefore you have to decide how much you are prepared to expose yourself, and how much you are prepared to pay the price of the results of your own actions. And there is no other law. Therefore, it is said 'The law is abrogated by Grace.' Grace is feeling.

There is a very subtle, dialectical trick in Christianity. It is the trick of making the thing you hate the thing you love. That actually can be done. If you understand the essential polarity of love and hate, you can actually do a very, very funny thing – you can actually love the hateful. You often find in the great artists a preoccupation with painting, or modelling sculpture ugly things – little distorted dwarves and things.

The thing is that people will say ‘those are not beautiful.’ And we can tell the level of the person, by the way he reacts to that kind of art. If he says ‘good gracious I can’t stand that’ you know that he is at a low level of freedom. He hasn’t understood the meaning of ugliness. He hasn’t understood the jester, the idiot in the court. He hasn’t understood the dwarf, the little distorted creature, being allowed to run about the court, in the presence of the most noble fellow, with the best physical proportions. He knew that the other man by his ugliness was going to be taken care of, as surely as the other man was being taken care of by his beauty. And therefore, to affirm the evil, the ugly, the wicked, and so on, is exactly valid as the good, the beautiful, the efficient.

To see that way changes your feeling, until in the end you can do what the absolute spirit does; it loves deficiency as much as it loves sufficiency.

And not with the feeling of pity, that is a great mystery, but actually to love it for what it is, at its own level, as an essential action among other activity. We get a certain amount of tissue. You get more water than usual, and you make a head with it. And you get a hydro-cephalic. Now, a person with no water on the brain would think ‘that’s terrible’, but the person with that water on the brain hasn’t got that same attitude to it. It can’t have. He is aware that other people are picking on him, but he doesn’t know why. He is vaguely aware that it has something to do with the size of his head, but he doesn’t know why. People impose a concept on him that he’s got a big head, and it’s full of water, and it shouldn’t be that way. That is a statement of the average, it’s a generality, and

they are trying to impose a concept on him to make him feel awful. Whereas, if they accepted him fully for what he was, he would feel alright.

Question.

The only thing I can understand as regards this love hate business is the detachment of [unclear word].

E.H.

Now, you can do a great mistake, if you are to become merely detached from it. That could place you in a position where you would never use your initiative, and all the great mystics have been aware of this trap. You see, when you disassociate from a thing, when you practice non-identification, you don't practise that in order to release yourself from unpleasantness, you should practise that for the sake of the truth. That all those modalities are not you, and then you can affirm the whole thing, not hide yourself from it, as unpleasant, but to will the whole, such as it is.

Question.

As I see, a thing, the only way you can see it really, is this group detachment because then there is no flux within yourself.

E.H.

Well, this is a transition stage, in order to release yourself from the fear provocation of a distortion of form, an ugliness and lack of beauty or disease and so on, is to practise non-identification. When you have gained it, you must not allow that to paralyse your initiative. There are men that have done that - we call them quietists- they get out of the situation, and they vegetate. They become sub-human. You must still use your initiative when you have detached yourself.

Question.

When you say that ugliness is necessary, because without it we wouldn't have beauty, we have to have [unclear word] to show us the way.

E.H.

t's the two ends of the stick again. You know, some very, very refined thinkers, men of aesthetic sensibilities, have deliberately preferred ugliness, in the ordinary sense of the term and revered it as beauty, as an act of will. Lord Byron did it. When he was in Italy, and he found the daughter of the washer-woman. You see, because he wanted to appreciate fully the refinement, that was his own, in his sensibilities. So he got a couple of shaggy bears and a rough girl in the house, and contemplated them for what they were, not with disgust – that would be a terrible error. He contemplated them as modes of life, as shaggy bears and a washer-woman's daughter. And their nature allowed him to be himself, because they were other. And he wasn't ashamed of them, he wasn't sorry for them, he didn't pity them, he just saw them as they were. And thereby saw himself as he was, with a shaggy bear buried in him.

Question.

But surely the only way he can do this, is through detachment

E.H.

But he mustn't allow that detachment, to stop his free initiative. You mustn't do a Pilate and wash his hands of the job. If he does he will come unstuck. You see, supposing you attain complete vairagya - complete detachment and you are a Yogi, attained. You are going down the lane, and you come to a little stream, and you discover an old man has fallen over, and at the moment is lying in the stream. Are you so detached that you don't pull him out of the stream? You see. There will always be an occasion presented to you whereby you will use your initiative, and quite detached, you will take him out.

In the story of the round table, Galahad is a detached man from this world, because he is attached to the Holy Grail. One of the things that annoys the knights about him is this. Another knight gets into trouble, and Galahad comes up and rescues him. And as soon as the man is safe Galahad walks off, and he doesn't stay for

thanks. He doesn't say 'Lucky I came along, old boy'. He just goes away, and the other knights were very annoyed, and said 'He's a stuffed shirt, because he's just rescued me and didn't say anything'. And an apology is made for him by Merlin, who said 'well after all, he's not human'. [*laughter*] You see ?

He is concentrated on the Grail. He wants free spirit, and he hasn't time to accept thanks.

Now there is a peculiar kind of bondage that could tie people up very, very subtle. Everybody knows the bondage that people have when they have borrowed money from somebody, and are indebted, where the debtor is indebted, and feels indebted to the creditor, but much worse than that is when the creditor feels indebted to the debtor, because he's done him a good turn.

Supposing a man brings up his son and educates him, and gives him every opportunity. Now, when he has given him every opportunity, he tends, if he is not careful, to keep an eye on him, so that he doesn't do something that daddy doesn't want. Daddy has identified with his success, and because he's spent so much time on him, he wants to keep hold of him. He is the benefactor. And yet he wants to keep hold of the one he's benefited. That's very bad. If you do somebody a good turn, you will find in you a tendency to want to keep on good terms with the person you've done a good turn to. So that he can appreciate that you've done a good turn for him. So that you feel terrible if he turned away and left you. You intend to follow him, because you have done a good turn to him, and that's a terrible bondage, much more so than the other one.

If you can let go of somebody to whom you have done a good turn, and don't care if you never see them again. You are much more free than the person to whom you are indebted is from you, when he can let go of you although you have helped him. And the psychological reason is that if you do somebody a good turn, you tend to think about him as somehow flying your flag. So you tend

to keep an eye on him, to see that he doesn't do something to disgrace you, considering that you did him a good turn.

Question.

With all the time in these things the best chances of detachment . .

E.H.

Yes but your detachment, when it is perfected, must never be allowed to paralyse your initiative.

Question.

An example I was thinking of; a person seeing someone knocked down and badly hurt, they're shocked, paralysed. The other person can see someone hurt and because they are not effected by it, they can get along.

E.H.

Well, then, their attachment has been the occasion whereby their initiative can operate.

Question.

In one case it has been the detachment that has made it possible for him to operate.

E.H.

Yes, but the danger exists that when you are detached you may do nothing. You may, in perfect detachment, you might see someone knocked down in the street, and just contemplate them, and say that it is a world in which people get knocked down,(*Laughter*). That can happen, and has happened to some people. Some people actually have glorified it. They have contemplated the battlefield, and not bothered to give somebody a drink of water. That is the danger.

Non-identification has got to be practised, because it is the only way that you can get free initiative. But you have to know, that when you've got it, you must use your initiative, and remember there is nothing to constrain you, because if you're free, you're free therefore you don't have to use your initiative. If you

had a faulty concept that you were practising non-identification in order to stop all initiative, you will just contemplate the world.

There is a certain branch of yoga that made that error very strongly, and there are certain Greek philosophers who did the same thing. They said the highest conceivable activity for a human being is to contemplate, without interfering, and then have a school of contemplators, And while they were contemplating, the city fell down on their ears and the soldiers of the enemy came in, and saw them contemplating, and carried them away, and their contemplating was interrupted. Then they said -'Now what were you doing when we caught you?'. 'We were contemplating'. 'Oh, well will you please teach our children to contemplate too?'.

So they became teachers. Either that or their heads were cut off. So their contemplation was interrupted. Now, one or two of them were very clever, and said we accept the job, and they taught the children to contemplate. The result was that that society also degenerated. And then some more enemies came in and captured them.

And this 'Quietism', this statement that contemplation is enough, without initiative, has caused many societies to crumble. Intellectualism has grown, and the contemplation of abstract truth has grown. Meanwhile the world was corrupting with rotting. When Nietzsche saw the state of the world. He saw it corrupting through this kind of activity. When Kierkegaard looked at the world, he saw it corrupting through that activity. There was a detachment of the intellectuals. Meanwhile, the place was rotting underneath.

He saw revolutions and wars ahead necessarily, because of this corruption, and he shouted out a warning - 'The place is corrupting through this detachment, we must use our initiative.' Single-handed. He attacked the church. It cost him his life. Today, he is THE existentialist philosopher that all the church leaders are studying like mad, to try to find out how it is the church became emptied; why they've got no power. And the answer was because

they hadn't detached themselves from reality, and contemplated the situation comfortably from the Bishops Chair.

The man who detaches himself and doesn't use his initiative will find that other beings will use their initiative and they will interfere with him.

Remember if everybody was asleep, it will be all-right, and if one man wakes up, all the other sleepers are in danger, and it is no good the dozy ones complaining. In order to formulate a complaint they have to become educated, and that depends on the educators' WILL to educate them.

You should work like mad to detach yourself, because the attached, the identified mode, gets you into trouble, into foolishnesses and wastes of time, but if you detach yourself you should remember that you are now a free being, and you must do something with your freedom. If you don't, someone else will do it to you.

Question.

This is when you select your real task.

E.H.

Of course. There is something in you if you find it, that the world needs, and that you need to express. Remember, you can never find that thing by thinking from empirical data. That's impossible. That thing springs out of your centre of free initiative. When Christ chose his disciples, he deliberately chose fisherman, and fellows who were not over intellectualised, because only in such people was it easy to bring out of their centres, their particular contributions. But to the over intellectualised the over-educated of his day, he had nothing to say except you're a lot of old bottles.

What you have to do is this. When you are born you were innocent. After a time you became educated, and therefore ignorant. You have to regain that innocence, because that innocence is exactly the same as free initiative. The educated ignorant person is a bundle of conditioned reflexes and can only operate mechanically, but the person who wills innocence, like a

child does, who wills it, is a free being; a being of spirit. And between those two innocences, the spontaneous innocence of the child and the willed innocence of the attained man there is only a bundle of conditioned reflexes, banging against another bundle, and responding mechanically to it.

Question.

Nevertheless that's the story of the stony road again, because all the time because you are not every day given the opportunity.

E.H.

That is exactly what Christ said. He said it's a straight and narrow, it's a hard road because the masses are not going that way and they ought to be going that way really. So if you start going that way and they see it, they're going to do their level best to pull you down. Because otherwise you're a finger pointing at them, and you have to decide whether you're being mud with them, or whether you are modelling yourself into a piece of sculpture and stand up, to be thrown at.

Now, if you prefer to be mud, all right. Well, it is a decision you have to make, and as you become more conscious of it, you become loaded more and more and more with guilt, if you do not choose to be free. Once you become aware that freedom is possible for you, if you reject it, you will feel awful. And the more refined and sensitive you become, the worse you will feel, unless you will to be free. And when you will to be free, then you will feel allright. But if you try to dodge the results of freedom you will feel bad. Which would you rather feel bad for ? Because you are mud, or because you are sculpted ?

Question.

This is the [moulding] into the still centre is it, and out to the perimeter. You say we must be free by non identification . That is the still centre and then we must retain initiative .We can only find that at the perimeter can't we ?

E.H.

You insert into the material world, into the temporal world that which you have attained in the eternal world. Remember, Time is inside eternity. When you go into your centre, you are going in. I'll draw a perspective of it, This is you in this diagram. When you go into your centre. What you find is, instead of an action band here. Which is the product of the five sensed activities. You find a hole, and you go through that hole into spirit, and that is free initiative. And then you bring out of that spirit into the time process, that change of action. That nobody can tell in the action band in their mind what you're going to do. Therefore Christ said 'The spirit bloweth where it listeth'. You hear it, you don't know where it came from, or goes to. You just hear it, whistling through.

That free initiative can do things, can change situations. Also, you could stand still with it, if you wanted, and do nothing. But, you should do something with it, because it is an absolute power, and not to do something with it, is not to use that which could be used. But the mode in which you use it is so subtle that nobody on the outside could possibly tell what you were doing. And never the less, you would be acting as a cause all the time, because the spirit is the cause, and this is the effect. So a being here, preoccupied with the five sense data, and the action band there, would be unaware of that centre of free initiative in itself. And therefore it will require you to conform to the mechanical pattern of its action band. And if you didn't it'd be upset and say your unreliable. It must always say that.

A purely routine being, must always consider that the spiritually free man is unreliable and this is not to confuse the spiritually free man with the unreliable man who is in the action band. And action band is in a mess. You can be unreliable in two ways, one through simple mechanical inefficiency, and one because you are free. And this man cannot tell. The man involved in the action band of the five senses cannot tell whether you are in efficiency, or non-action, or your interference, or your changes, are dictated by mechanical inefficiency or free spirit.

Question.

Well this one to appreciate what he would previously defined as the unreliability and the free one, is an indication that he is already moving towards that particular state himself.

E.H.

Oh, yes, he must have felt . .

Question.

. . . even though he doesn't necessarily understand that unreliability, to say there is a value in that unreliability.

E.H.

. . .he must have become aware of that spirit in himself before he could allow even the remotest possibility of that

Question.

Mmm...but it's an indication, isn't it, that someone can actually make that statement, though they don' . . .

E.H.

He has already loosed himself from this mechanical band before he can make that statement

Question.

This would mean that Christ was unreliable, yet he's the only one we can rely on ?

E.H.

That's right, well that's dialectics again. That is exactly the thing. The Angels who set fire to the city of London, and thus destroyed the plague, were unreliable, from the point of view of fellows interested in maintaining a city full of disease. You know that if you read the history of that you find that the dear powers that existed then, the monarchy and its administrative, actually went about interfering with the attempts to put the fire out. You see.

That fire killed a plague situation. There were some angels – angel means messenger, never worry for the moment whether there's a gross material body or not – because spirit operates through gross material bodies. They were angels, they were

messengers, the spirit that said that the place wants clearing out. There were Angels who went to Sodom and set fire to it, and who told Lot to get out before they set fire to it. Angel means messenger, and it doesn't matter if it's in a gross material body or not, he may be. As long as he brings the message of free initiative, he is an Angel. That's why Thomas Aquinas is called the 'Angelic Doctor' – because he gave them a message.

Question.

When you say that Christ has still not escaped that law of opposites...he has done as much evil as he had done good.

E.H.

Oh, obviously, one thing that is levelled against Christ is that he caused 2000 years of terrible conflict, with millions of people killed in his name. You know that one dialectician said 'He died for every man, and since then every man has died for him'.

It is a fact, a dialectical fact, and it isn't finished yet. We still got to fight a colossal war in his name, and the churches are still trying to gather themselves together to get the unity to do it. When they get it they will do it. That's dialectics.

[tape cut]

. . . and that is an unavoidable, absolute essential necessity. To try to wriggle out of it is just a waste of time. To accept it, to affirm it and to penetrate to the meaning of it, is just right."

END 90.21 min