

L063 – ‘Honouring Thy father and Thy Mother + Response-ible and Response-able’

A TALK GIVEN BY EUGENE HALLIDAY IN LIVERPOOL, UK, AT THE HOME OF KEN RATCLIFFE SOMETIME DURING THE MID 1960’S TO THE EARLY 1970’S

NOTES:

- *The particular titles used for this series of ‘Liverpool’ talks given by Eugene Halliday, were conceived by Richard Milligan (Ken Ratcliffe’s son-in-law). And it was Richard who was solely response-able for salvaging and restoring the original quarter-inch reel-to-reel audio-tapes at Tan-Y-Garth in North Wales, a task that took him a considerable number of years. These restored recordings eventually became the library of cassette tapes that were for sale to members of the IHS.*
- *I have taken the liberty of modifying the original title of this particular recording (‘Honouring Thy father and thy Mother’) by adding the words ‘+ Response-ible’ and Response-able’ - as Eugene Halliday spends much of the second half of this particular talk explaining his use of these two terms.*
- *As an aid to understanding the flow of his ideas, Eugene Halliday would invariably make use of an easel that was always situated next to the seat on which he was sitting. He would sketch drawings on this, often labelling them with important words, or phrases. And in various sections of this particular talk Eugene is almost continually referring to them.*
- *There are also a number of interactions between Eugene Halliday and various members of this Liverpool group. To distinguish between them, I have preceded any questions, or comments etc. that were raised by these members with the words, ‘Group Member:’*

TRANSCRIBED BY BOB HARDY.

OCTOBER 2023

1. Question here, what is the meaning of, "Honour thy father than thy mother." Does this imply the material parents or the spiritual? Because in the New Testament when Jesus was told that his mother and brothers wish to speak to him, he says as much as to say, "So what?" I like that free term (..?..). "These are my mothers and brothers," indicating to his disciples - the people to whom he is talking.

2. Well, it appears that Jesus there repudiates his parents. And he does, in a very special sense. And the Old Testament statement, 'Honour thy father and thy mother', must also have a special sense.

3. It's obvious that to honour anybody at all is not to demote them, is not to reduce their stature. It can only be to lift them up to a proper level.

4. So let's take the primary egg and call this egg prior to the split, 'The Edamic egg' - this is the human egg. And this egg has deposited inside it the spirit of God. That is to say the power, the intelligence, which is going to develop and raise this being to a proper functioning level.

5. And to Honour this being is to lift it up to its proper level.

6. Later on, the being polarizes, divides, and produces children - Cain and Able.

7. Now, the honouring of this human is simply the raising up of this human to its proper level.

8. So if the child is to honour the parents, he must discover what in the parents is good and worthy of repeating in the next generation, and furthering - pushing into the future.

9. To honour somebody, is to take their best qualities and stabilize them, and help them to develop, to perpetuate the good of them.

10. Now, when the Old Testament command, 'Honour thy father and thy mother' was given, after the subsequent degeneration of the human race through their peculiar behavior, the old statement 'Honour thy father and my mother' was taken by fathers and mothers, and used illegitimately to try to force the behavior of the children in particular directions.

11. Fathers and mothers made funny statements like, "I have devoted my life to you. I have worked my fingers to the bone for you. I have paid for your education. I have made your life for you. Therefore you owe me obedience in this thing."

12. And 'this thing' frequently consisted in something quite stupid.

13. So eventually, through many generations, it became apparent that the parents were interpreting 'Honour thy father and thy mother' in the wrong way. Somehow, they were saying, "To honour me is to obey me," without qualification.

14. Now if the command is stupid, it is no honour to obey it. It doesn't honour a mentally deficient person if you do what he says. It doesn't honour the insane, if you do what he

recommends. It dishonours him. Because the honoring of a person is to lift them up to their proper level.

15. So that once this thing has been misinterpreted by the parents and used for gaining obedience, or trying to gain obedience for all their commands, it follows that a revolt must occur at some time against the stupidity of the parents.

16. The parents are acquiring certain things from the children and quoting the law 'Honour thy father and thy mother' to justify it.

17. But in fact, the commands they are giving are stupid commands, and it is no honour to the mother and father for the child to obey them. So at this point Christ says, "Call no man your father on earth, because one is your father," namely 'the absolute source of all beings'.

18. And when the terrestrial mother comes knocking at the door, saying, "Come home, it's time for din-din," when he's talking about eternal spiritual truths. He just turns around and says, "These are my father and mother and my brothers and sisters - who do the will of this father - The Absolute - from which we all derived."

19. To honour your father and mother terrestrially in the real sense is to take the better side of their nature, seeing in what direction it points and trying to carry it a step further to improve it. If you actually improve on the purposes of your mother and father, and concrete certain of their potentials in actuality in the world, then you are honouring them.

20. But if you take any of their bad side, their weak side, their egotistic side, and allow this to dictate a series of erroneous actions, then you are not honoring them, you are dishonouring them. And therefore it is the duty of every child to decide whether the commands of the parents are good commands or not.

21. If they are, and he decides so, then he can obey them, and in so doing honour his father and mother. But if the commands are stupid commands, then in order to honour his father and mother he must disobey them.

22. Now I think that's fairly clear on that point.

23. We just restated the human race is derived from a human being. This human being is a being created by The Absolute, and that Absolute Spirit is entered into the human being, and is pressing out to develop a human being in certain directions.

24. All the potentialities of that being have to be developed. And to honour the human race is to develop those potentialities into act.

25. So that to take your terrestrial parents and obey them in a stupid thing is to dishonour them. But to obey them in the sensible thing is to honour them. Is that clear enough?

26. Group Member: Yes, that is. Who decides on the stupid and sensible thing?

27. Who decides? Quite obviously the decision will always be made by an individual. If you allow another individual to make your decision for you - such as your parents - then automatically you are dishonouring them. Because the essential part of the human being, that which constitutes its humanity, is the in-breathed spirit of God. And every child has got it. And it is that in him which is to decide.

28. Now it's perfectly obvious that if the original parent was sensible, the first thing he would tell the child, as soon as he's old enough, is you have inside you an inner center of decision. This center is intelligent and it can evaluate things properly. And I, as your parent, telling you about the origin - intelligent, sentient power - tell you that inside yourself you have this responsibility. And therefore you must decide what you are doing. And the parent who says to the child, "You must decide," places the child in such a position that the child cannot do other than make a decision.

29. His powers of decision are then encouraged by the parent. Now if the child then makes a decision, he's honouring the parents. And he can't not make a decision. If he says, "I refuse to make a decision," he has made a decision. And the parent then says, "Well, you're making a decision now. This refusal is a decision, and you're responsible for that."

30. And so he teaches responsibility and refers to the child always back to center for a decision. So when the child goes to the parent outside and says, "I want to know what makes the moon tick," the father says, "Well the present state of astronomical knowledge of the moon is roughly so and so. And if you want more information, there's an encyclopedia over there, go and read it."

31. Now the child is forced to make his own decisions in this way. By the continuous restatement of 'decision' as a power inside everybody, he's becoming self-reliant and self-reflexive, and is therefore honoring his parents.

32. But the child that continuously is brought back by the parents to ask perpetual permission for every act, and to finally have got no center of decision in consciousness, and has become a mechanical thing determined by the whimsies of the parents – this is dishonouring the parents.

33. And we see quite enough of this in mental hospitals all the time when you see this kind of breakdown. They are people with no power of decision. And when we examine them we find the cause is generally that their power of the decision was taken away from them when they were very little. Because the parents wished to retain the control of the situation. And they couldn't stand anybody making the decision in the situation other than themselves.

34. And thus they're dishonoured their children. And the children then dishonour them.

35. And this is the point. If the parents honour the child, they honour the sense of decision in the child. But if they dishonour the child, they obscure that sense of decision. The child then depends on the parents, and cannot decide. But that dishonours the parents.

36. You often find in discussions about juvenile delinquency, some very naive men who are saying, "It isn't the children who should be whipped, it's the parents." Because obviously you have to account for it.

37. During the war from '39 to '45, a lot of children were evacuated and running about out there, and deprived of proper orientation. Now, they have provided the great numbers of juvenile delinquents and teddy boys and so on. Who is responsible? Those children? No. Who is responsible? The parents? Were they responsible? If we remember our use of responsibility, we spell it. with the 'response - the answer, and with an 'l' in it, response-ibility, where there should be an 'A' in it, response-ability.

38. Response-ability is the ability to respond, to reply, adequately to a stimulus in a situation. Response-ibility is that which is defined of somebody from above. Thus if you go into a court, and you've been brought to court because of some misdemeanor, and the man on the bench says, "I hold you response-ible." He is holding you response-ible. He's not holding you response-able. As soon as that vowel 'A' - which means that expansive energy - has been contracted, down to response-ibility, it is a statement. Responsibility is defined from above, by one man, about another man, who has no 'a-bility' to respond.

39. Take the classic case of the Hunchback of Notre-Dame. He can hardly talk, and he's deaf, and the judge is deaf, and the judge defines him as response-ible. And he says, "Yes, it's a wart your honour," and then he gets beaten. He's responsible, not response-able.

40. So this question of legal responsibility is about a quality that people are supposed to have, which they have only by virtue of somebody above them defining them to possess this quality. They haven't got it.

41. For instance, how can you possibly avoid breaking the law if you don't know the law? St. Paul says, "Before the law there was no sin," because whatever you were doing, before the definition was made, you couldn't say whether it was right or wrong. But when the definition came to be, somebody had made the definition.

42. Now the man who made the definition had an army behind him. And all the other fellows who hadn't read the definition yet, were just fooling about, rolling in the clover and so on. And along came this man with his herald, unrolled his definition, and read out, "You are response-ible."

43. Now, this isn't what he meant. But suddenly, they got hit with a club, and the word "responsible" was engrammed with a blow from the club. And immediately they felt 'responsibility' means a bang on the head. This is how responsibility became into dispute.

44. Meanwhile, the man who made the definitions has a response-ability which he never confers on anybody else at all.

45. Now the parents hold the children response-ible. But if the parents themselves are not response-able, their definition has been passed from their parents and their parents, from someone who is known as the 'definers of the law'.

46. None of those has a right to fool about with the full permission of that great Yiddisher director. What's his name? Rolling about enjoying themselves like they used to do.

47. Group Members: (Inaudible).

48. And while they're rolling about thinking that it's permissible, Moses is upstairs, hammering away on these blocks of stone, and he comes and writes down, "You can't do that – any of you." And shouts at them, and points to the clouds and says, "There's a big fella up there, and he doesn't like it."

49. And he imposes on them fear, by restimulating their experiences of the past, of pain and misery and deprivation. And he says, "It's because you behave like this that you have to go in the desert." It isn't strictly true, but it will do.

50. And so gradually they get a sense of guilt. Guilt means they're interested to do anything about it, and they are now responsible. He was response-able.

51. But he was busy up there thinking out how to curb their behavior and hammering these bits of plaster of Paris.

52. Here we have the simple fact that the derivative egg from the parent egg can only honour the parent egg by developing the powers of that egg.

53. Three levels – thinking; feeling sensitivity; and will - drive. If you're increasing your understanding; increasing your sensitivity; increasing your will power, you are honouring your parents. But if you are not doing those things, you are dishonouring them, because that's what you ought to be doing. And if your increase of understanding annoys your parents, or your will power annoys your parents, and they try to curb it, and they curb it unintelligently, well then you break out. They have been trying to dishonour you, and you are honoring them by disobeying them.

54. While we're on this question of responsibility, we have another question- a terrible question - about the responsibility of one person for allowing things to come out of his mouth that might rattle somebody else's ear-drums and then determine their behavior.

55. We've said before that if you get certain sounds coming out of the mouth and impinging on an ear drum, (*Sounds of Eugene drawing*) the vibrations from this voice going in that ear, going inside the mind, circulate and settle down into a conceptual pattern.

56. Now, the question is raised, 'Is this man responsible for what he says?' And are these people legitimate if they complain that what he said precipitated them into some form of behavior later? We actually know that people frequently have trouble from listening to truth. Let's see why.

57. There is any being, and there is his imminent center, his pure initiative self. A stimulus comes from outside. It maybe from the voice of his dear mama, saying, "Albert," or some other such thing. Now, when the force from inside meets the force from outside, the two together

produce a rotation. All forces in opposition produce a zone of rotation. That rotating force is then an idea, and if it's a compressed one, made of many such stimulus and reaction situations, it's a concept.

58. Now, who is responsible for the creation of this idea? The man who speaks, or the man who attends to it? Because the particular conceptual structure inside that, is a product of the action of the stimulating voice and the reaction of the centre to it.

59. If you remove this force from inside to oppose it - so there's no opposition whatever - then the entering force goes straight through the being and out again, leaving no trace. Only in the presence of opposition can you generate this rotation. So when a concept is struck up inside somebody's mind and somebody has spoken, it isn't only what has been said, but what has been done with what has been said, that constitutes the complex structure of forms we call a concept.

60. Now the most often repeated form that any human being has as a child is his own name. It starts very, very early. "Little Sammy is very pretty." "Little Sammy wants his dinner." "Little Sammy wants potty." "Little Sammy wants chocolate," and so on. Whatever it is, it's 'Little Sammy'.

61. This is quite natural. You want to make Little Sammy's organism respond, so that when you shout, "Sammy come home for tea," he will come. So you keep reciting "Little Sammy, Little Sammy." Now, he comes out to meet this, and the result is 'Little Sammy' is set up as a concept. And because it is the most often repeated one, it becomes central to the individuated egoic structure.

62. Now all subsequent things like falling on the knee - "Little Sammy has fallen on his knee." - 'Falling on the knee', accretes to Little Sammy. "Little Sammy has stolen the mince meat," that accretes to Sammy. 'Little Sammy had a secret affair with a five-year-old girl around the corner', and so on.

63. This builds up gradually round Sammy, this concept - group of ideas - based on repetition of the name 'Sammy', and the experiences that he has. Now this group of ideas is the one we call the 'egoic group'. And you'll observe that it's been set up between the imminent self - center; and the external limit - the perimeter. It is not the true center.

64. The true center isn't called 'Little Sammy' at all. But this center - this egoic center - is a false center, set up in the axial band between the true center and the perimeter.

65. Now, as soon as this thing had been well set up, no matter from what angle a stimulus comes, the energy is always tracked across into the individual concept group. And the individual concept group then mechanically interprets this incoming stimulus, and itself reacts so that whatever stimulus comes in, it reacts to it and sets up another little rotation round it. This way it builds up for itself its individuality.

66. Gradually then it's established a line of least resistance from the sense organs into this egoic group of ideas. Now this is the group that is going to be defended most violently when the person is attacked. He's not going to defend his immanent self, because the whole accent of being has been shifted from true center into this conceptual being.

67. Now as long as he's eccentric - that is, 'off his true center' - his action is bound to be impaired. It cannot be what it ought to be, namely free, because it is a mechanical structure created by incoming energy and outgoing energy, producing a little machine - a concept group.

68. So, whenever that reacts, it reacts mechanically. And because it is built up in a certain environment, it necessarily is confined mechanically to the kind of environment in which it is built. It cannot respond adequately outside that environment.

69. So if you bring up a child in the Bantu tribes in Africa, and then suddenly whip him out at twenty-one into London and let him loose, he will not have adequate reactions to deal with the London ladies of Leicester Square. He just won't have the equipment to place it. The result will be he will get into trouble.

70. And it therefore becomes necessary periodically and at specific times in the history of civilizations for some other forces to come along that talk about this center - the immanent center - and teach people not to identify with the egoic complex of ideas, simply because it is too mechanical and too determined by specific environments.

71. And this voice speaking here about the center, is requiring a re-accenting of the being. It's requiring a shift of stress from the action band into the immanent center.

72. Now as soon as that force of the stimulus comes, it sets up another concept. It doesn't go immediately and make the person self-conscious in the proper sense, but it goes in and says, "That is a possibility." And the energy coming out to meet it - the two together make a new concept. It's still a concept, but it's now a concept that is an immanent center, the center of freedom.

73. And these two concepts - the new one, and the old egoic one - are going to fight. Every time a new stimulus comes and reinforces the concept of the immanent self over against the egoic self, there's a trembling of fear in the egoic centers. And because they have been inbuilt to protect themselves, anything whatever that refutes their existence causes them to tremble, and the reverberations of the assembling person of the being, is anxiety. They are under threat. They don't want to know about it, but they feel something is coming in that doesn't allow them to exist. They're going to be rubbed out.

74. The new truth then acts, in fact, as a disintegrating force on the old one of the egoic self.

75. Now we call this egoic structure here being built inside the action band, 'The Old Adam'. And the 'New Adam' is the awareness of that inner self - the immanent spirit. And the 'New Adam' is going to fight the 'Old Adam' inside. And these are two conceptual groups, and they're fighting for the incoming stimulus energy.

76. The next time you're stimulated, the energy starts to track over towards the ego, and is suddenly bent round and whipped into the concept that reminds you of the Immanent Center. As it is carried in, the egoic center feels deprived of that energy, and immediately a depression settles down in it.

77. That depression then starts spreading through the being. Now if the being hasn't thoroughly learned that 'the observer is not the observed', he becomes identified with the depression. And in that state he may move towards concepts of dying, even towards concepts of suicide. Now the thing that wants to commit suicide in him is this egoic center.

78. Very often in dealing with mental patients, we find them saying, "I want to die," and if we get them to repeat this statement "I want to die," and say to them, "who is saying it," and listen to the voice, they discover it's not themselves saying it, it's somebody else.

79. There's a mechanical tendency in here, whenever failure is presented, to want to get out. Explain one's failure away, and if one fails, then get out and die. Because as the Bardo said, "Good name (Little Sammy) good name in man and woman is the immediate jewel of their souls." 'Immediate jewel' - the first jewel they've got. It's only a jewel, but it is the first one. Their own precious name. And if they can't make their name in the world, they want to die. And yet if you ask them very carefully what it is in them that wants to die, suddenly you see a smile flitting over their faces. The thing that wants to die is the egoic self. Why? Because it's no good. All right. Let it die. Let it die. There is another self, other than that one, inside. When this one has died, then you live to that one.

80. Now dying is the same thing as corruption, disintegration. It is a very unpleasant sensation. But if you know that it is a necessary process - that the old egoic complex shall disrupt, shall corrupt, shall disintegrate, shall die - if you know that and affirm it, then you are affirming the death of the Old Adam, and the rebirth of the New Adam.

81. Now, whose is the responsibility? Let's have a look. Here is a man with a very strongly stressed egoic concept, getting him into trouble. Here is another man whose action-band has been equilibrated so that he can perceive the whole thing without a false accent on it. And he knows about his imminent center. And because he knows about it, he knows that you're better off without this false stress on the egoic complex. And he knows that he can speak, he can let this immanent center pick up transcendence with its message, which goes through, comes out here, and speaks to this other person. He knows exactly what's going to happen, that when he speaks and reminds this other being that there is an immanent center, non-egoic. In so far as it promises power - increase of willpower, increase of idea power, increase of feeling power - this egoic thing will try to absorb it and grow on this new power. It knows it must do that.

82. So that as soon as the technique of yoga or anything else is taught - drawn in from the and transcendent into the immanent and spoken out - that the egoic center of another person is going to try to assimilate this in so far as it confers power. But if it does manage to assimilate it in terms of power, it is going to refute itself. Because as it goes in power, it is going to characterize itself completely inside here as a will to dominate.

83. Now that will to dominate is going to hurl this being against other beings. He's going to try to impose on other beings - and there are an infinite number of them.

84. So that as soon as the ego center absorbs the concepts of power from the new teaching, it always interprets in terms of forcing another person into subjection.

85. Now there are too many persons about the place to be forced into subjection. It's a full-time occupation. It's really a full-time occupation forcing one into subjection because it too has an immanent center which responds to every stimulus coming in - every command - by making a new concept.

86. So, the strange fact is that when the truth about the immanent center is stated, it is accepted - absorbed by the ego center because it promises power. And therefore the ego center opens up for it. But as soon as it discovers the implications - that it cannot use this power for its finite egoic ends - then it doesn't want anything to do with the teaching. But it's too late, the thing is in.

87. And the teaching has set up, inside, the new concept - there is an immanent center there. There is spirit within, and that spirit is the same in every other being. And it's the same as the transcendent spirit.

88. So then the fight begins. And the more the egoic center struggles against it - because two forces in opposition always cause a rotation - the more it struggles against it, the more concepts are generated between them, and the hotter the fight becomes. And the victory must go to one or the other.

89. Now if we insert ideas very quickly into an unprepared person, and make them firmly aware that they can never get away with this power game. Because they're fully stressed on the egoic center, and they haven't learned to detach themselves from it, the proof that you can never get away with the individual power game, is the same thing as the denial of that individual's life.

90. He wants to get out, he wants to commit suicide, because you've said he can't win. And because of this, it is not usual to go to an unprepared person and give him a full metaphysical proof that he can't get away with it.

91. If you do it prematurely, all you will do is throw him into profound despair. But if you insert the idea that 'The observer is not the observed' first, and then teach him that he doesn't depend on any function whatever in the action-band, you give him the possibility of a new kind of security in the centre.

92. And if this is done gradually enough, he can shift his action day by day, bit by bit, off the egoic center into the immanent spirit.

93. It can only be done safely if it's done in degrees. If it is done too fast, the fight between the new concept and the old concept - the New Adam and the Old - is experienced as very, very uncomfortable. And it may result in temporary breakdown.

94. Now, a temporary breakdown - if someone is there knows what it means to take care of them - is not so bad because they can be sheltered and brought back gradually to understand the true position. But in today's highly technical civilization, if you get that kind of breakdown and there's nobody there to look after you, you are whipped very quickly into a hospital and the electrodes are placed on your poor old 'crumb pit' and your exercises are blown away. And you then have to start again.

95. So that because of this, in general the thing is done in a series of steps. You are given an awareness of the center as intelligent, as power, and as having your welfare at heart, long before you are required to disrupt your egoic centre completely. You have to be given another limb to stand on before one is cut away. Now who is responsible?

96. We had a debate in Manchester the other day, and this was the sentence that was put up. 'Who is the observer?' This is the same thing as who is responsible, because there is no response-ability other than in conscious power. This is put out as a question, "Who is the observer?" I said it wasn't a question and could not be considered to be a question because 'who' is nominative and refers to a conscious person. So it is not a question. If we reformulate it, it says, 'conscious person is conscious person'. It isn't a question. And the Jungian psychologists who were debating this point wanted to know who it is behind the symbols. And they thought it was a question. Who is the observer? But it cannot be a question because the first word means the same as the last word. So it's really quite a simple straightforward statement. 'Who - that is the conscious being - because 'who' means 'conscious being' - is the 'observer' - means

'conscious being'. Who is who? Observer is observer; conscious being is conscious being. It isn't a question.

97. The absolute sentient power is who. He is the who. If you put an 'M' on the end of it, it becomes accusative, or dative – 'whom', because 'M' means substance. It is now objectified. So the 'whom' is the 'who' substantiated - now standing as an object. So if you said, "'Who' is 'whom'", you would say, "Subject is object." And the absolute identity of the subject and the object is the ground of all true metaphysics.

98. If the subject and the object were not absolutely non-different, then the object could never be known by the subject. The object is really - as we've seen before by the meaning of the word 'ob' - is a modal operation of the force of the subject.

99. The subject's own force, own power, modifies or modulates, or produces motions within itself, and these motions are its object. So the object is the motion of the subject.

100. Now who is responsible? 'Responsible' is the same thing as able to respond. Who is response-able is not the question, it is a statement. That only is responsible which is a whom, and is a conscious being of power. A conscious being is responsible, and no other kind of being can be responsible.

101. Now it has been put to me several times in the last few weeks, that if a man becomes schizophrenic through reacting to a truth sent to him from outside. (*Eugene starts drawing*) There's a man, with a strong egoic center, no awareness of his immanent self, and the truth is fired at him, and then his egoic center disintegrates. And in this process of disintegration, he is turned schizophrenic, meaning he is disintegrating. If that has arisen from the stimulus, and the stimulus came from a who - that is from a being - then the who is responsible for giving the stimulus.

102. But if there hadn't been a force inside to meet it in the first place - and in all initial stimulus situations, to build up that egoic false center, then there could have been no reaction of the order called 'disintegrating'.

103. So if you imagine the men of Troy with their walled city, and somebody brings a nice little horse outside, who is responsible for Troy being overthrown? The men who made the wooden horse and stocked it well with soldiers, or the Trojans who came out to tow it in. Who is

responsible? 'Who is responsible' means 'conscious power is responsible'. If anybody was responsible there, it was the outlying Greeks. They devised the horse. They understood more about Trojan nature than the Trojans did. And therefore their horse got in and exploded the Trojan situation.

104. So they were more responsible, more response-able. They could have defined the Trojans as responsible, and no doubt did so illegally afterwards when they tried them. But the Trojans were not response-able in the situation. They were only responsible.

105. So you see, it's a very, very subtle question. When somebody is suffering from a truth. Christ came along and he shot a truth into the Pharisaic structure of the minds of the synagogue attenders in his day. And that began to blow them to bits. And when they felt themselves falling to bits, they reacted against the man who spoke by fixing him. Who is responsible for that? Well, he was response-able and they were responsible.

106. Their responsibility did not extend to response-ability because he says when he's pinned up, "I know what I did and they don't know what they're doing." His response-ability is greater than their response because he determined from the beginning what he was going to do, and knew what they would have to do, and therefore was an efficient cause of them doing so.

107. Now is responsibility a moral or ethical question? We've said before that 'the moral' is 'that which is convenient for ruling the situation'. And the ethical is 'that which rational men think ought to be done by rational men to rational men'.

108. Now, is response-ability an ethical or a moral concept or is it something totally different? Response-ability is really a statement: 'response ability' is a statement about power to respond. It has nothing whatever to do with moral or ethical concepts.

109. So when you are talking about the responsibility of a 'who', "Who is responsible?" You're not really talking in the moral field at all. The archbishops and the great military leaders will say to their congregations and to their common soldiers, "I define you as respons-ible," meaning, "I require a certain reaction from you when I give you a certain stimulus." And that's not response-ability. And response-ability itself knows - because it is able to respond - what it is doing.

110. But it also knows that it's a very serious world we're living in. There are some crassly egotistic beings here, injuring themselves and their derivative children, and so on, every day over a wider field.

111. The truth has to be said somewhere, And yet it is known perfectly well that when the truth is said, somebody is going to object to it. Somebody is not going to like it. Someone is going to fight it, and someone is going to be disintegrated by it. And he accepts the responsibility, because he can't not do, because he is able to respond.

112. And he's not interested if somebody comes along and says, "On moral ground you didn't ought to have said that truth because it upset our little Willy." When Christ said, "Sorrow must come, and woe to him by a who," he was saying, "The world being so constituted as it is, in such a way that the incoming stimulus and the outgoing stimulus produce between them a concept, and these build up and up and up into false centers. The world being so constituted, it must arise at some time that the truth is going to disintegrate that structure. And when it's disintegrated then there is sorrow and suffering for the person who had that false action placed in him. But that suffering properly understood is for the benefit of this whole being.

113. Let's consider the aspects in fairly recent teaching by different thinkers, take that arch-humorist Gurdjieff. The child begins as an innocent self spontaneously wanting what it wants when it wants it. And quickly the educators begin to work on it, and the child reacts to the educators, and there is built up inside it a structure of ideas which gradually become the focus of attention.

114. Now, if you get overheated or devoted very intensely to any of these ideas, the heat of them fuses them together. And this fusion of the elements is what we call 'the integration of the personality'. When it occurs, if it's been fused on a great heat, that is, under great emotional excitement, it is extremely difficult to disintegrate it. If the thing has been integrated loosely, coldly, by simple intellectual consideration, without emotional heat, it's not difficult to break it.

115. But if the thing has had a lot of emotion involved in it, it's very difficult to break. Now this growing individuality (these complex structures here) is gradually filling up the being with form, and the form is all reactive form.

116. The older you get, the more full of this stuff you become. Until, in the end, if you are not careful, you become a complete mechanism, a system of reactions inbuilt in an environment. And only in that environment, in similar environments, can you respond mechanically, adequately. As soon as the environment changes, you're stuck with your reaction pattern. And because of this, all this stuff in here - which the theosophists and Gurdjieff know is called personality. Although we've said before that's the invert usage of it, philosophically - all these complex patterns of ideas, which are really mechanical reaction patterns, are going to be the vehicle of this being when the being reaches the point of death.

117. So if it is a finite, mechanically reactive structure born in a certain environment, and unfit for another environments, it isn't adaptable, and it is not free enough for an evolving soul to utilize in all different environments.

118. Consequently arises the necessity for re-evaluating all this data from this idea, and to re-evaluate it requires a lot of energy. A person who thinks he's solved his problem integrated himself, being presented with the truth of the immanent spirit - being identical with the transcendent, and this being the same with every being; and being told that all his structure of wonderful self-defense, self-aggrandizement and mission and so on - the machinery of success in him - does not justify him attacking another being and flooding it with his whimsies, and overthrowing its own inner determination.

119. All of his life has been built up to make it a mechanism to dominate the situation and force other beings to his will. And at some point in the future he must come to realize that this he cannot do. and at that point he's going to be very miserable.

120. So, consequently, when he's got sufficient of this furniture to make it worthwhile examining it, if he gets the right stimulus reminding him of the process; and he's taught 'The observer is not the observed'; and then the dialectical process of analysis in polarized pairs. He then proceeds to subdivide all his experience, categorize it, understand it, and reorganize it, so that to him it's just a library book of experience which cannot respond mechanically, but is useful to him if he wants to read it on given occasions.

121. But it cannot respond mechanically once he's thoroughly understood it and categorized it. But in order to categorize it, he has to cut into it, sort it out. And wherever there's been a

very strong emotion, that part of it is going to be resistant, because strong emotion integrates the thing just like heat on two pieces of iron enables them to be welded together. They weld better hot than they do cold. In the same way, ideas weld together better under emotion than they do cold.

122. So at some time, in the future of any being, no matter how carefully he's laid his plans and built his character and projected himself to dominate the world's situation. No matter how big he is, whether he's a Napoleon or a Genghis Khan, whatever he is, he's going to fail. And at that point, if he's identified with the processes in the action-band, when they disintegrate, he's going to go to a terrible death process.

123. Now because it is possible to fuse - with strong drive and emotion - a pattern, to such a degree that it cannot be undone without the most extreme suffering. It is better that one should not be allowed to go to the term of full integration of a false pattern. If the pattern is false it won't work in many different environments. And if you have actually managed to integrate such a false pattern with great emotional drive, it's going to be extremely painful to undo it. And therefore it is better for you - before you reach that level - if you are subjected to stimuli that disrupt the small parts of your false centers, and disintegrate them and allow you to reassess them with the little bit of suffering you can stand for the time being.

124. Because if you do wait for the total thing to fuse, and it is wrong, the suffering and pain of disintegrating it in order to reassess it, is far greater than can be endured by most individuals. And it's for this reason that the teaching is given.

125. And again who is responsible? The person who gives the stimulus is responsible, he is able to respond. And he can see that the end result of a false integration in terms of suffering is so great, that it is justified in giving a stimulus of truth now that will break up a temporary little egoic concept with a little suffering attached to it, scatter it elements, and produce a temporary disorder, and then a reassessment and the reintegration.

126. Any man who has the ability to do that is response-able. And he decides whether he will take it upon his shoulders to give that stimulus or not.

127. If the situation is not so bad, he won't give it because he's a busy man. If the situation is very bad or moving towards a worse situation, and he can remain in the situation long enough to help reorientate it, then he will do it.

128. Now it is very important to see that because the 'who' and the 'observer' are the same, because the 'who' and the 'responsible' are the same, and that only a conscious being with power to do what his consciousness requires, only such a being is responsible. It follows that all beings who are not able in that sense, are not qualified to judge the response-ability of such a being.

129. So beings at a lower level cannot define the response-ability of the judge sitting up there. Here are the people; and there are the twelve good men and true. The judge decides, and he is response-able, how he should direct the jury. The jury haven't undergone the special training that he has, nor have they had the continuous experience that he has, and therefore they are in that position - because they have been sent a little notice requiring their presence - and they have been defined as response-ible. But their response-ibility is simply the fact that they've been put there by this other person above them. And the criminal in the dark and the men who collect the evidence are all only response-ible. Whereas the response-able man is the man who, at the top level, has studied himself and knows himself so well that he knows the correct evidence of the evidence-givers; he knows the human nature of the criminal; he knows the fallibility of 'The twelve good men and the true'; he knows the horrible, stupid, gazing mentalities of the people in the body of the court. And out of all of these, he has to equilibrate such a judgment to be executed on that criminal that will help the whole of them to balance and lift up to a higher level.

130. Group Member (Ken Ratcliffe): That 'who' will always remain a question to a people who've have not become conscious of themselves.

131. Yes, and yet it refers quite simply to consciousness itself.

132. Group Member (Ken Ratcliffe): They will see it as a question though until such times.

133. Until they see it's a statement and not a question.

134. Group Member (Ken Ratcliffe): Whether they ask who is the observer, or who is the demon or who is... Who are you? All those who remain questions until such time as they can see otherwise. They're all the statements in the end result.

135. They all think a statement is a question. But when you turn your consciousness back on itself, then you know the meaning of who; and you know the meaning of observer; and you know the meaning of response-able, and these are interchangeable terms.

136. The who; the responsible; the observer; consciousness, are synonyms.

137. Group Member: in the case of encouraging children to make their own decisions. (*Inaudible*) are the parents to stand back and let the child out from that decision, even though the parents might consider the decision is. (*Inaudible*)

138. Well, this is an existential problem, isn't it? What parents are you talking about?

139. Group Member: Well I'm talking about myself for instance.

140. Well, if you talk about yourself, you know what you have to do when you think about it.

141. See, the important thing is, we've said this often, that at a certain point we must stop generalizing and come down to this. What do I know? And what am I going to do about what I know? Not what do people in general know? What do parents in general have as a duty to their child? And so on.

142. In a concrete situation, your little boy will come up to you and say so and so. With your then knowledge level, you will respond. The more conscious you are, the more accurate will be your directive to him.

143. If you're unconscious you will react mechanically. And you're not response-able at such a moment. If you want to be response-able you have to become more conscious of yourself; your motives; the facts of the situation; the motives of the little boy in the case, and so on. And that's always an existential problem right from the moment.

144. And we have to stop the tendency to talk about things in general, problems in general. When in fact we never get such problems. We get problems in particular. Each one of us,

145. Group Member: Each parent of that child will make a decision which may be quite different.

146. Very probably, because the understanding level of the two parents will be different. And it becomes a simple question. Is one or both of the parents response-able? Or is one of them responsible and going to define the other one as response-able in order to try to provoke a better level of reaction?

147. If you say to somebody you are response-ible, what you are really doing is exhorting them to better behavior. You are not doing anything else. Because if they are response-able they will be able to respond and you've had it. And if they're not able to respond, you can define them as response-ible and thus conjure into them a sense called 'sense of responsibility' which may result in better action. But if you're not careful it will result in the opposite.

148. But if you define somebody as response-ible and say, "That means you do as I say," then their willfulness will define themselves as response-able to resist. And only in the existential test situation can you know.

149. Very often the father and the mother give contrary orders to the child, the child looks at both and sees who has got the biggest muscles, who has got the largest voice, and watches. And his mum is six foot nine and pounds five foot three; the mum has red hair and shouts; and daddy wilts, then the little child goes over to mum and holds her hand and decides she is his ally.

150. But he also sides with the victim. Because he's a good politician.

151. Group Member: Then you (*Inaudible*) upset.

152. Everybody is getting upset. The thing is. can you bring yourself as an individual into higher levels of consciousness so that you increase your response-ability. The ability to respond adequately in the situation is response-ability. And lacking the ability to respond adequately is the same thing as deficiency.

153. Group Member: Would this be a sign of initiation rather than response-ability?

154. Yes. All initiative is response-ability. Whereas reaction defined from above as responsibility. Response-ibility - as when the judge says to a drunk man, "You are responsible for murdering your wife because although you murdered her drunk, the day beforehand, you spoke to Willie Badger and said that tomorrow night you are going to get dead drunk and kill her. So you premeditated it, therefore you are responsible."

155. Actually he wasn't response-able in the situation at all, because he got caught. He wouldn't be response-able who kept his mouth shut, got nice and drunk, chopped wifie's head off, wept terribly in the box, and apologized, and volunteered to go for psychiatric treatment. Having carefully laid a plan with the doctor earlier, that the treatment should be private and consist entirely of hashish. That would be response-able. There aren't many of those.

+++++ End of Tape +++++