

L462 – ‘Inclination and Choice’

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:

- *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 referring to these.*
- *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:’ If these consist of a single word or short comment however I have included them in the body of the text between italicized brackets.*

TRANSCRIBED BY BOB HARDY.

OCTOBER 2023

1. *The recording starts as Eugene is speaking: You can go up from doh to doh – that’s ‘God immanent’ and God transcended. (Yes). The thing is you can go up from top to bottom actually because the top notes are faster – higher frequency. And therefore more original aren’t they?*
2. Group Member: I’m saying yes.
3. Let me justRemember, if we take a surface of water. When the wind first blows on water, it ripples it. So the first motion on the water is the high frequency - short wave. (Yes). On those undulations, primary ripples are still present. (Eugene is drawing) And then it continues to go down like this. On the wave of the third order, you have this wave in the second order. And of the high frequency of the first super-imposed on that one. So you can build your scale like that. Now each one, beginning at the top, which is 'doh', and then the next frequency is G, or C below it, and the next one is an Rah and the next one is a Soh and you go down continuously so that really the scale - this energy - is contained within the motion of one substance. This you can

see very easily if you watch a body of water moving, a highly complex nature of the most symphonic.

4. Now, if we talk 'reasonably', we're talking about formal relation - the ratio of one to the other, how many beats per second on the first, how many in the second, and so on. And you're talking reasonably.

5. But that may or may not have an application. Actually this diagram has an application, the one you mentioned may or may not. You might be able to extend it to make it have one. But just because a system is self-defining does not mean that it has application. *(No)*.

6. Because if that were so, then every self-consistent philosophy would be true. And what we know about philosophy is that you can construct them on the basis of our thought, 'As if'. 'As if' - whatever was said. You could make a rational philosophy 'as if' everybody had a triangular head. And you could then work out how many people would lie in a bed, and in what positions to leave the least exposed space. That doesn't mean you can find those people with triangular heads.

7. So that when you make a closed system, like, say, Leibniz's philosophy of substance, It doesn't follow that that thing actually corresponds with being absolutely. So although self-consistency is essential for unity, it doesn't follow that if you've got self-consistency you have correspondence with reality.

8. Group Member: What I was thinking about the time that I started looking at the scales was the idea that different levels, say, from the mineral world right up to the human being, must be kept in being by resonance factors. I started to study music as something you could equate with resonance. That's what I was getting at. *(Yes)*. That's how I started to... *(There are now a few seconds of incidental unrelated chat between a couple of the group members)*.

9. It's a good exercise of course to try to work out the relationship between things in that way.

10. Group member: Well, I was trying to see a 'link factor'.

11. If you see in a diagram like this, when we've drawn the first ripple, we have to bend this first line that was entered in the circle. So, really we should rub the first one out... Here's the first one. We'll rub that one out and draw this.

12. Now the wind continues to blow, and over time builds up another wave, so we rub that one out, and we do this. That's got three elements (Yes) already. Now we're going to take a structure which we're going to wrap another one around this. And then like this. Like this. And then like that.

13. Group member: Are you going to describe each one of those as a different order of energy in that case? I'm sure that they're all different frequencies, therefore different orders of energy.

14. And yet there is only one substance there vibrating in this highly complex way. (Yes) So the different orders of energy, do not in fact introduce a concept of plurality of discrete beings. These beings are not separated out. They are really highly complex motions of a non-differentiated substance. That non-differentiated - which we represent initially by a straight line - is the seamless garment of Christ. (Yes) And that guarantees that we can't really break out of relation. Because whatever you do, you're only bending that seamless garment. (Yes) It is the continuity principle of the universe.

15. So when you think you're furthest from it - that's in this diagram - you're really not. All you have to do is ignore the differentiating vibrations, and you can contemplate its seamlessness immediately. Which means that heaven isn't far away.

16. Group Member: This isn't the worst problem.

17. The kingdom of heaven is at hand. Yes, at the moment this light is hurting my eyes. It should have a nice shade on it.

18. Group Member (Ken Ratcliffe) I couldn't get one.

19. I'm aware of that, whilst at the same time I'm talking to you. (Yes). The sound of your voice, to me, when you speak, is a different frequency from the light that's hitting in the eye. The voice is pleasant and the light is unpleasant. They both occur simultaneously. My continuous substance is responding to two different frequencies simultaneously.

20. But I can ignore the intensity of that light deliberately. I can deliberately give it a new significance. I can say it represents the absolute brilliance which could penetrate all possible darknesses, and deliberately give it an emotional tone that it's really very nice. It's a delightful hurt that it gives me. In fact the way it hurts may give me evidence that I will always be free

because that light exists, it shines in my darkness and the little bit of pain it gives me reminds me that I'm not alone, I'm in relation.

21. So I can interpret the stimulus in any way I like. And yet, in the act of interpreting it, I'm not separating the fact from another fact. The light and the sound of your voice coexist. And there's a funny noise going from the machine over there. And there's certain elements from the carpet, that are softer – in the echo – than there is from the wall. These coexist and simultaneously impinge on my sensorium, without breaking the sensorium into separate bits.

22. If I concentrate on one of them exclusively, the others tend to lapse in intensity, and then I can believe that they're separate. Now to believe that they're actually separable, 'severable', is to make a mistake, they are not. (*I see*) And as soon as I believe that they are severable, I believe in isolation. And if I believe in that, I can believe that I am isolated, and therefore out of relations.

23. And as soon as I go out of relation, I go into hell. (*Yes*) Because hell is a state of unrelatedness.

24. I believe you were discussing this question of 'choice' recently. (*Yes*).

25. Group Member: (*Sound of Eugene moving paper on easel*) I found it very (*inaudible*) difficulty about choice. What I found difficult was to separate choice from inclination. (*Yes*). I mean, after all, have you inclined towards, or away from, something. And what is the real difference between inclination and choice. Because I may be choosing something by past condition, or conditioning.

26. Well let's see whether physically you can see the difference. Will you stand in the middle of the floor now? Straighten your legs so that your knees are braced. Now lean forward without bending your knees until your waist is on the balls of your feet. Keep leaning until you think your heels are coming up. Now I want you to choose, while you are doing that, not to fall whilst physically you are inclining. What's the difference?

27. Group member: I can't choose not to fall. When I lean forward hard enough.

28. What do you actually do? You continue to lean forward without choosing not to.

29. Group Member: Well, you start to fall.

30. You start to fall. Now, when you think about choosing, what do you actually do inside?

31. Group Member: I inhibit the action.

32. How do you do it?

33. Group Member: By act of will.

34. And to what do you refer in order to make that act of will?

35. Group Member: The decision not to fall, I take it.

36. Your decision not to fall. Right. Supposing we then have 'inclination'. We represent that simply as a line out of the vertical. (Yes). As soon as you take the line out of the vertical, it starts to fall. When we're talking about a physical body... (Yes). ...your own physical body, inside that physical body is something responding to the suggestion that you should choose not to fall. And as soon as you chose not to fall, you've released energy that alter the distribution in the body of muscular stresses, and intended to inhibit the inclination by feeding energies into muscles in certain places to pull you back. So you had an idea of 'non-fall' (Yes). and a fact of physical inclination.

37. Now the idea of 'non-fall' up there was sufficient to release energy into your body to readjust the balance of forces in you. To bring you back towards the vertical.

38. Group Member: Could it be the idea of the fact that in the past when I've fallen I've hurt myself that's pulling me back?

39. It may be, but it doesn't have to be. That's an empirical statement.

40. Group Member: That was the thing I was getting at. I mean to say, I was given the choice of two coins, and I said that I may choose to pick the brighter coin, because as a child I'd been told that bright coins were good things to have.

41. You hadn't remembered the casket scene, have you?

42. Group Member: Not yet? Yes.

43. The important thing here is that when your physical body is inclined, you come under the law. (Yes). When you refer to an idea in your mind, you are able to redistribute energies, so that you escape that law, and yet all you've done is release energy from an idea.

44. Now the idea is a faster frequency than the body, but as we've seen in this diagram, the idea is really a super-imposition on your primary substance, and your body is another one of a later order.

45. So you say the body is this way.
46. Group Member: A later order, so that the body is later than me?
47. Yes. There's a bit of a body. Here's your being. Here is your ideas. And they're all on the same thing, superimposed one on the other. (Yes).
48. Group Member: So if you can't see it...
49. The fact is that when we choose, we introduce energy. from one world into another - a lower one. We have to get energy of a higher level and introduce it as energy of a lower level in order to choose.
50. Now it's quite obvious if a person hasn't got the idea of a 'non-fall' he can't apply it to the falling situation. This is the meaning of 'Know the truth and the truth shall make you free'. Free from what? Free from the law.
51. So the more clear we become in idea, the more we release ourselves progressively from the law.
52. Let's take a simple case. If we show to a child two apples, they're supposed to be identical, exactly the same size, the same rosiness and so on, and say, "Choose one of these," the child cannot choose, because they're identical. Now if we say, "You can't have both, you must have one only," then it cannot choose one rather than the other, but it will choose one rather than none. We determine its choice by saying if you don't take one now, you won't get one at all, because you're only allowed one, not two. And that determines the choice.
53. So it's always an idea, that is, a higher order energy that determines a physical behaviour. And this determination of a physical behaviour by an idea energy is what we call choice.
54. Group Member: So the choice is always at the next highest level of stages of being.
55. That's right. So if we take the carpet, we say the carpet cannot choose to get up and go out because it hasn't got an energy of a higher order than itself.
56. Remember what we've said about the fall into gross matter. In gross matter all the energy is locked up in being, just being. Whereas in a man the energy is not locked up in being. Some of it is feeling, and some of it is thinking.(Yes).

57. In the case of the billion ball, an ivory billion ball, all the energies there are 'being' ivory. They're not being thought, they're being emotion, they're just being ivory. So if the total amount of energy in a being is involved in being, it has no energy left for something else.

58. So if we find a man totally identified with the material situation, the pure materialness, we find a man who is entirely under the law because he is being material. He believes in nothing else. If he believes that he is a material entity and nothing else, then he is entirely under the law of matter.

59. A very pathetic example, I think I mentioned to you before. A man with sufficient money to retire quietly at over 60, preferred to go for shock treatment rather than turn over his business to his two sons, because he was a materialist. And to him, to hold the business in his grasp, to dictate his policy, was existence. To turn that over to his two sons, who were 30-ish and 40, meant to him to cease to exist. And when the question was put to him, "Either will give up your firm to your sons, or have shock treatment," he had to have said, "I will have shock treatment." When it was said, "How will the shock treatment alter the position?" it will merely place you in the position where your sons actually run the business and you haven't given it up, but you can't run it." Now to him that was preferable to giving it up. You see, his life was material. He had conceived it.

60. So if you concentrate on the gross material of your body and believe that nothing else exists, you must necessarily obey the law of matter. So the being totally concentrating on its material existence has no choice whatever. There are no alternatives for it. It is simply being. If we want to introduce choice into it, somehow, we need to get it. Grind it down. This is what's happened to the rocks on the Earth. The rocks have been ground down by glaciers and rivers and volcanic eruptions and earthquakes. And in so doing they have been pluralized and thus a relation must appear between them.

61. And you know that from the fact that when particles of matter cohere that there must be a field of energy holding them together. So we have now introduced feeling into them by separating them. So if we take the rock, say a piece of basalt, which is simply being itself, it has no choice - we free it up, we throw it about. If we grind it down very, very fine, then our control of it becomes more difficult. It tends to slip. If we liquefy it again, it becomes more difficult to

hold. If we turn it into a gas, it becomes more difficult to hold. So that the more we are moving it away from the compaction, the more difficult it is to control from outside, and the more alternative motions are, on the inside.

62. Group Member: Does that mean you're actually raising the being of the thing?.

63. Raising the being, you see. When the first precipitation of matter occurred - the fall - from the original energy of the universe, rotating and producing finite beings. Each finite being, being spirit, was free. And some of them compacted themselves. When they compacted to a certain level, they covered themselves up, put their own light out, and became stones.

64. Now, in so becoming, they had abandoned choice. Just as if we are in the room now, we can walk around, and we can choose where we will go, because we can see. Supposing we switch the light off, and on a signal, "Right," we all get up and rush about. With no light, we'll bang into each other. We can't choose to avoid each other if we're running about in the dark. And so the fortuitous concourse of atoms, of old Huxley, is a blind thing where the atoms collide with each other because they can't do other. They're just rushing about, and they're totally enclosed in themselves and out of relation with the others. And therefore, all their contacts are continued and external, and there is no choice in them.

65. If we don't take those rocks and it just happens on the earth and we grind them down through volcanic eruptions and great glacier periods, and floods and so on, we reduce the mass of it to such fine proportions that it can be organized into plant form. And the plant can already choose, you see, it can choose to go towards the light and away from the darkness. So that when we break down a solid compaction, a unity principle - the 'Einpassen' of Boehme, the grip or fastening to make one only - if we break that down we introduce plurality, a space between, field of consciousness, and a relating factor.

66. Now, once we've broken the thing down, we have introduced a field. Those are primary beings (..?..) and we now have two. Because they are primary energies originally, they are still related together. But now there's a space between them, a field. And the whole being now has an awareness of it as a body, a duality, and a field of relation. Now, when it feels this relation it can adjust the distance between the two physical parts. The feeling is higher than the physical fact.

67. But if we let it break down further still we get a lot of little parts of hearing as the unity, the diverse element, and the field between. And highly complex formal stimuli within the being are ideas. And by reference to these ideas and this feeling, these particles can be adjusted. They're always adjusted from above - that is, from the feeling and the idea level.

68. So to increase the power of choice, you have to increase sensitivity of feeling. And this itself generates plurality of ideas.

69. These ideas are forms which are not gross material, but have the power to release energy in a gross material body.

70. Now if we take this again, and we take it right back to the idea of The Absolute, then we have the idea of the free. (Yes) People that are not taught that freedom exists, don't understand what it means, and cannot as a consequence have it.

71. I don't know whether you read Edith Bone's "Seven Years Solitary". There's an example of herself in a Hungarian jail where she was supposed to be incarcerated because she was a spy, and she wasn't a spy, and she knew she wasn't. When she told her jailers that in England she was allowed to move about freely, and she was given a passport to go out without having to say what it was for, and so on, they couldn't believe it. Because they were not allowed to move in that way. So they hadn't got an idea of a state that could allow free movement to the individual within it, and consequently they could not move freely. They could only move with reference to the authorities to whom they had to report. Because that was their idea level.

72. So if we take... I know some materialists, who actually believe that choice doesn't exist at all, they believe that the quality of the material stimulus determines your action, absolutely. And therefore 'choice' isn't a word, it's just a sound having no meaning. And really it shouldn't be in the dictionary.

73. Now for those people, funnily enough, it is true. They are actually determined by the idea level at which they function. (Yes). Because they don't believe choice is possible, and that everything is determined by material stimulus, they concentrate on the material stimulus all the time. And consequently they are determined by their mental horizon.

74. Group Member: This is the idea of being governed by what you believe in. (*Mm-hmm*). Well, as I understand it now, every higher level has a choice in relation to the lower level, all the way up to the scale.

75. Say, "Every higher level can determine what happens on a lower level." And this power to determine is what you mean by 'choice'. But it's the higher, looking down on the lower and introducing energy into it, by referring to the higher.

76. If we have an idea of a universal meaning, the idea that there is, say, one God, one God, and this one God is the Father of all of us. If we have this idea, we will have a problem of why some people don't accept it, why some people behave very badly.

77. Now, Christ doesn't do it in this way because he said that there are other fathers, some beings are fathered by the devil. There is one father of certain beings, and another father of some other beings. Because he says, "You are like your father who was a liar from the beginning." to a certain group of people.

78. If we take non-dualistic philosophy as our basis we don't have to tie ourselves down with a monistic view that there is one God of all beings.

79. The Absolute - which is not circumscribed – generates - wherever it is, beings. And the energy generating those beings is the Father of those beings.

80. So if, in this place, beings are generated of triangle nature, and here as square, then the father of triangular beings is here, the Father of square beings is here.

81. When Christ says, "There are sheep of other flocks," he's saying a similar thing. Because fundamentally every being traced back to its source is self-generated.

82. So that the father of the people in this room is not the same father unless we are contemplating identical forms in the beings in this room.

83. The fact that we are bipeds, roughly, means that we have something in common, and therefore as to our biped nature we have a common father. But if we have different ideas - as 'father' means 'generative power' - we have as many fathers as we have different ideas.

84. And therefore we will say that we are not different from The Absolute if we push ourselves back absolutely. Rather than to say that we come from the same source.

85. Because you can't say that entirely diverse actions come out of the same source. But you can say that entirely diverse actions come out of a non-different source.

86. The differentiating factor is energy itself. If we say that energy is one, we have circumscribed it. But if we say it's 'not two' or 'not closed', we haven't circumscribed it, but we are still contemplating energy.

87. If I want to be free, I must have an idea of what 'free' means. I must say free is the opposite of bound. The left binding is a circle. And if I close the circle. (*Eugene is drawing*) See, that's free. Draw a circle and rub it out. Let that circle represent any concept whatever, any binding idea that circumscribes people's activity - say the idea of the synagogue; the idea of the church; the idea of the Labour party; the Communist party. Insofar as you can apply a term, it is finited. Insofar as it is finited, it is a restriction, and therefore no longer free.

88. When we talk about perfect freedom, 'free-dome' means that the free energy 'dome' itself. So it's equivalent to autonomy, to self-control. So ultimately there is no freedom other than self-control. 'Free' is non-finited, 'dome' is finite. 'Free-dome' is the non-finited with the finited precipitated within it by itself.

89. So if I want to be free I must 'understand' - I must have an idea - of what 'to be free' means. And if I want 'free-dome', I must get self-control.

90. Group Member: This self-control that you speak about, what was the .. was there any relation to this self-control when Christ was talking about being bound by the law? Can you go too far in? Or what...

91. Too far in self-control?

92. Group Member: Yes, can you get to a stage where you're doing practically nothing?

93. If you were in control of it, obviously you could stop it at will.

94. Take the Jains in India. Now they specialized in harmlessness. Therefore they immobilized themselves. They actually stood still rather than tread on an insect. But in the process of trying to stand still they became colossal giants of will power. They couldn't take it too far.

95. Group Member: But what about the people for instance that... Not the fakirs, the fellow that says, "Cut one (..?..) and they believe it their whole lives," and then they can't move at all?

96. Then they haven't got control.

97. Group Member: Obviously they have...

98. If you hold your arm up until your joints set, you've no control over it. You've lost control.

99. Group Member: And yet it's .. *(You've lost control)* It's taken an act of will to do it in the first place.

100. Has it? You have to be very careful to define what will is first. You see, in most of those cases, the man has been determined - certainly in the street fakers, who are beggars - has been determined by a method of earning his living.

101. There used to be in Manchester, a gentleman with one box of matches and, apparently, one leg. He used to stand outside Woolworths. Actually he had two legs, one of which was strapped up at the back. And on one occasion when he got drunk he took it out and was severely told off by a landlord who had believed he had only one.

102. But he wasn't acting freely. He was acting determined by an easy way of earning his living. The fakir who puts his arm up like this, and by so doing cultivates a reputation and some reverence in passers-by who think he's a yogi, which he isn't. All he's done is lose control. **3309**

103. Group Member: *(Inaudible short comment)*

104. You can do certain acts.. If you like to sit down with your legs crossed for four hours. When you come to stand up you'll find they creak a bit and they're quite painful, and you're losing control. So at a precise part where you push (..?..) to the stage where you can no longer determine the formal activities, you are not gaining control, you are losing it.

105. To be intelligent about it, if you wanted to sit down for four hours, you should start with four seconds. And gradually extend the realm of your control, so that when you did stand up after a six-hour session you wouldn't creak. You then have control. The other way you lose it to unintelligent action. And this again depends on the control idea that you have, to which you refer in order to determine your bodily behaviour.

106. Group Member: *(Inaudible short comment)*

107. I'll have to wind that (..?..) up from the chair. Bert's illustration of this is useful. Your physical body - the whole of your physical nature - is in a continuous state of inclination. It takes

energy to make it sit up, energy to make it stand up, energy to make it walk, because it is made of food. And that body - which is made of food - is simply the earth picked up by energies of another order. If you refer to the physical body, it will always drag you to the ground.

108. If you refer to something other than the physical body, you can pick the physical body up. And the choice consists in becoming clearer and clearer about the idea in your mind, and the application of that idea in the material world.

109. You cannot choose between two identical things, but only between two different things. And one must be above and the other below. And you choose to modify the lower by reference to the higher. And as our ultimate aim is to become free, self-determinate, then there must be a clear concept of what it means to be free.

110. Free from what? Obviously, free from the lowest end. Free from the billiard ball, isolated, egoic consciousness. Which means you must have an idea that to be out of relation is false. To be totally out of relation is to be dead. When St. Paul says there is no death, he means that the person who is believing himself totally out of relation is suffering from a misapprehension. There is no total out-of-relatedness.

111. Eighty percent of the people that go to a psychiatrist for treatment believe that they're unrelated. But their belief is false. They are related. And they act as if they were not.

112. Once they accept the truth that they really are related, then they can begin to determine the behavior of the body and the lower levels of the emotional and ideal life, by reference to higher concepts.

113. But if ever you got the idea in your head that choice is impossible, it would become impossible for you. (Yes) Because you would have determined - with the concept of the impossibility of choice - your own action.

114. This is the concept of claiming the promise. It is stated, "We are free spirits." If you accept that fact and somebody comes along and says you must do as I say, whether he's in uniform or not, you refer to your inner spirit and say, "I don't have to do anything any external being says, because the kingdom of heaven - and my God is in heaven - is within." So I refer to my depths to see whether I need to do anything at all.

115. If I am to be free, I am to be free from something, and it must be free from something other than myself. So I must have a very clear concept of what myself is - that I am a free spiritual energy. And this spiritual energy is essentially inner. And the contingent stimulus from outside has no power over me unless I confer it upon it, by accepting it as valid at the level at which it comes.

116. Not to believe in free choice is to be self-hypnotized. And auto-hypnosis is what the Marxist practice.

117. Group Member: I was having difficulty deciding which was an actual choice, because I felt that whichever way you went, it could be from, say, past conditioning or memory or ..

118. Already you conceptualize yourself as a materialist. (Yes.) If you do that, you will respond as if you were. And people who don't accept that will be superior.

119. The Marxist believes that a man has no thought that isn't determined by material economy: and therefore his thoughts are determined by material economy.

120. There's no such thing as generosity, spontaneous up-springing of spirit in such a man, because for him that's a nonsensical concept. He says, "What material situation are you talking about?" And we say, "No material situation." He thinks you're lying. (*.. I see what you mean*) He says. "it's metaphysical wickedness." So that a so-called 'good Marxist' - if you talked about actually human love or something like that, doing something for nothing, he would immediately accuse you of being metaphysical, which to him means 'non-existential'. You can't do something, except for a material reason, because there is nothing other than matter for him.

121. Group Member: When you mention accepting situations a the short while ago, does this mean seeing them as they are, and then deciding afterwards whether to act or not to act?

122. Yes. You have to see the situation - the lowest level of it, and then all the subsequent levels above it that you are sensed to be left to see. And then from the highest one you determine the behaviour at the lowest one.

123. Group Member: And what determines the height to which you go, the benefit you might possibly get from it, or the opportunity that there is presenting itself for development?

124. Well, if you say 'opportunity', immediately you are down on the material, external, contingent stimulus again. The thing is in your will. You don't need an opportunity. Opportunity means that you've got an eye on the door that's opening. You see? It's your will.

125. Group Member: You will a benefit from it.

126. Yes. (Yes) It is sufficient for you to will a benefit.

127. Your will is an energy. That energy opens doors. The 'port' in 'opportunity' is a door. If you open your eye, you can see the door, and you can will through the door. But if you say there is no such door, you cannot go through it. Yet another man can go through it where you say there is no door. Because he doesn't accept the conceptual limitation.

128. History is full of occasions when large numbers of men have said there is no door there. And another man has gone through. Columbus fell into the (..?..) you see. Just reached on the table.

129. It's an act of will to push through a situation when everything says there is no possibility there. But if another person says to you there is no possibility and you accept it, you have been conditioned by him. And if he's been conditioned by somebody else, which is usual, you're not even being conditioned first-hand.

130. Group Member: Is it possible that people who believe they are good materialists are not?

131. Well I have talked for many years with confirmed Marxists, Marxist educators, Marxist paper runners, and I have never found one who wasn't a liar. That is to say, who wasn't inconsistent and pushed to the point, admitted things as a Marxist, he should not have admitted.

132. For instance, one man who's quite a figure in Germany at the moment, he admitted to being fond of his wife without a material ground. Now he can't be that. It's quite inconsistent.

133. You see, he admitted that he would find it hard to betray his wife if she betrayed the Communist Party. And that was inconsistent.

134. And when he said that, it was probably because he was a bit human, he'd already come off his Marxist perch.

135. A Marxist consistent is not human. Not in the real sense of the term. Human is a metaphysical concept. There is mineral, vegetable and animal, but there is no human. Because human implies choice. That 'H' in human is that higher power that inserts itself into the man - the counting device - and decides in which way the counting shall proceed.

136. Group Member: A lot of people call themselves Marxist and are not capable of reasoning on that plain are they?

137. No, they accept passively a name given to them. On one occasion we were asked to go and debate a certain point about some Marxist student. And to me it was not surprising - but to two of the other fellows I was with it was - that the leaders had not read 'Kapital'. They'd only read pamphlets. They'd not read Marx's 'Das Kapital'. They've not read any of the original works of Engels or Marx. They had read pamphlets about them. And they were leaders.

138. Group Member: It would be very hard work to read 'Das Kapital' wouldn't it?

139. Well it's always hard work to get down to a basic proposition.

140. Karl Marx starts with a triangle to show what a relation is. Not many people look at that triangle and consider what the relation is. They want to skip and get through. But if they do get through those fundamentals, all they find is a series of now outdated things. Discussions about socialist conditions that don't exist anymore. There's no revolution in England, why not? Because British workers have never been completely oppressed from above in the way that they have been in other countries. And if they're not oppressed hard enough, they can't kick back.

141. There's nothing better than to think about this matter of choice, and to realize that to be freer than one is, one must always find a higher concept than the one one's already gone.

142. Jesus Christ represents the incarnation of spirit. Now that's the highest concept you can possibly have. There's The Absolute and The Relative; The Eternal and The Temporal, and they're not divided. 'Very God - very man'. The Absolute has somehow condensed itself in a temporal situation. And that temporal man works absolutely, not temporally. He works immediately, not mediately by counting one thing after another. Because from his absoluteness he sees and feels the situation required from above, and then he inserts into the gross material situation a determinant word which causes everything to change, and there is no higher concept possible than that 'The Absolute should become The Relative'; that 'The Eternal should

become The Temporal'; that that which is absolutely unmanifestable should manifest. We can't go beyond that.

143. And yet factually, as soon as we consider a subject at all, freely in any way - that is, we're not mechanically determined by the form of our education - already The Absolute is breaking into the material world and incarnating itself at that point.

144. Most people are terrified of the law; of the police; of the army and so on. You go into a very poor part of Liverpool or any other big city, you'll find the appearance of a policeman at the door causes palpitations, (*Yes*) even in the innocent. See?

145. If they had another concept, though, that the policeman is a public servant, and he's there to protect people against anti-social activity. They would say, "Well, he's a public servant, he's working for me, I pay his wages, out of the rent and rates that I pay." They wouldn't feel any fear. But they've been completely conditioned so that when they see the uniform, they tremble.

146. Now, as long as they don't know the real position of the entities in the hierarchy, they must be intimidated by a quite low order of beings. But if they want to understand that inside everybody, the basis of authority is spirit, and that spirit is internal to every being.

147. Every being has an internal hierarchy. And no being of a law order outside can then come to you and tell you what to do. So your freedom consists in knowing a higher and higher concept, right up to The Absolute.

148. And if the man in blue knocks at the door, starts to walk in, you stop him and say, "You're a public servant. Have you a warrant to enter this house?" If he has, then he has a stated reason for having done so. You see? By understanding the law, one becomes free.

149. Group Member: There's a funny thing there though. For instance, I know about 'non-dualism', but how well do I know it? How much is it included in me? I may have an idea of it, but how much about it do I really know? And to what extent can it work for me in this hierarchical sense? For instance, with a Hippie or someone that, in spite of my knowledge of the non-dualism, could press upon me. How do I go on there? It means that I may know of it, but I haven't clearly got it worked in, in some peculiar way.

150. Well, you see, when I asked you to stand up there and incline your physical body, you knew that something that was very well-niched into your physical body, something you might

loosely call gravity. Because as soon as you inclined to a certain point, you felt a definite tendency to fall. (*Oh yes*) When you can find the same definiteness in your idea, you can call it substantiated.

151. You are talking about knowing. Without that knowing being real. Substantial. Now your nervous system and the synaptic gap in it - the whole electric system in your body, the field dynamics of your body - have to be made to manifest, at the gross material level, the ideas that you have. If you have an idea and you cannot make your body respond to it, then that idea is unreal to you.

152. Group Member: Well, this is one of the things that I often puzzle about, you see, because you may be able to make your body respond to the idea up to a point, and then after that point it doesn't. And what does that mean?

153. Well, it means that you've not yet substantiated certain idea levels.

154. Take a simple example of this question of the policeman. If you found any nervousness about a policeman in yourself, it might come from childhood, or from seeing films, or anything, Make yourself act physically at the true level. The first policeman you see in the street, go up to that policeman and say, "Can you tell me the time, please?" And when he's told you, say, "Thank you very much, because I was always told if I want to know the time to ask a policeman." And keep a straight face. You see? What's your reaction? If you're afraid of being arrested, your idea isn't substantial yet.

155. Now it is only by forcing your physical body to act upon an idea, that the idea becomes embodied, incarnate. Christ crucifying himself, is simply taking The Absolute idea and engraving it on his physical body to the final term in the crucifixion. If he'd have struck back from the crucifixion, The Absolute would have remained an intellectual proposition, not a gross, material fact.

156. Group Member: That's what I'm after. For instance, you're speaking about the policeman. Well, you may find that you can go up to the policeman and talk to him without feeling any difficulty, but you may then for later date, having done that and said to yourself, "Well, I don't think I've got any fear of a policeman," you may find yourself in a position where you've got two or three policemen grilling you, and then you mightn't feel that same way.

157. Well, again, you're deficient in ideas about the law.

158. Group Member: Exactly, well I mean there's a lot of this... How do you know when you have got it really worked in?

159. Well if you have got it you do know, because you can actually get it to function physically in you.

160. Group Member: Because, you see you may never really get into that situation, it may only happen to you once in your life, and you may feel that you're alright and you may not be.

161. You must create situations. If you don't create them and you just wait and see if they happen, then very little will happen to you.

162. Group Member: I feel that myself, that if you don't go into it, you're not really getting at it. But what I wonder about is, for instance, this idea that an extreme trial of that nature, say for instance a fellow finds himself in the hands of the police. He's supposed to be on a very serious charge or something like that, and there they are grilling him. Well in order to get yourself in such a situation you may have done something particularly drastic. Now the people normally that do those things are people that haven't gone into it consciously, they haven't given it a second thought, they're really classless people that don't think about things, they just rush in. And they're the ones that seem to get into the really drastic situation...

163. And they're the ones who don't profit from it. (*Exactly*). Because they didn't go into it deliberately.

164. Group Member No. Well this is the thing that I wonder about all the time. You see, I may feel that, for instance, I've heard about non-dualism, and I think I know a bit about non-dualism, and all the rest of it. But how do I really know it when I haven't been in such a situation since I found out about it?

165. You can create situations. If you want to make non-dualism real, then you must make yourself act as if it were true. If non-dualism is to be made real to you, you mustn't distinguish between the welfare of that organism and this one.

166. So if there were an apple there, and that apple is going to be eaten, it should be a matter of indifference to you whether I eat it or you eat it. If you watch inside yourself and you find an excuse for why you should eat it, rather than I, you're not yet substantiated in non-

dualism. And it's only in that kind of test that you can force the idea to incarnate. And if it doesn't incarnate, you've not completed the process.

167. The Incarnation means this. That an absolute truth has got to be put into gross material activity, and it can only be put there by an act of conscious will. It can't be put there accidentally. It can't be put there by a stupid criminal accidentally getting caught red-handed. It must be done by you watching your inclination and seeing that your inclination is not based on non-dualism but is based on egotism, and to contradict it with the concept of the non-dual to go against it and to do it.

168. It follows that if you have the power to do it, you must gain, because The Non-Dual Absolute will not refuse to take care of itself in you, just because you have acquired awareness of it.

169. Group Member: Well, this is one of the things that, for instance, I often feel that I do go about looking for situations in the little things that you see, and that I do attempt to reflect in situations, and I feel as I am applying the rule that 'Faithful in little, faithful in much' sort of thing, but what you come down to in the end is really testing it, don't you? I mean I may feel that having been faithful in the little things I will be faithful in the heavy trials. But until such time as I find myself in a really heavy trial, I don't know do I?

170. Well, now you're talking like an empiricist. If you're one hundred percent faithful in the most trivial thing, you know that you'll be faithful in a big thing. Because if you're one hundred percent faithful in the tiniest thing, you can't be more than one hundred percent in anything. And it's this whole commitment of the will.

171. If a pin fell on the floor, out of my lapel if I had one. And you thought, "Oh, I can use that to pin two papers together at home. I won't mention it." That's only a pin. But if you fall down on that one, you'll fall down on bigger things. But if you can get hold of that pin and give it to me, for the right reason, you'll do the same with the big thing. The essential thing is to be one hundred percent committed to act correctly in the little. Because one hundred percent of will is always the same – One hundred percent. It has no contradiction inside it. And it doesn't matter whether you're being faithful about a piece of feather or about the whole world. If you're once committed wholly in the will to being faithful about the little, you necessarily will be faithful

about the much. But if you have a little mental process, and a reservation about whether you give the pin back, you'll find it's there when you're going to give the world back. *(Yes well ...)* There's no difference at all.

172. So if you can actually accomplish that very tiny little whole-willedness in returning the pin that dropped, you'll find you can do it with the big thing. Because it isn't a question of degree. Because the wholly committed will is wholly committed regardless of the size of the object. *(Yes, I agree. I can see that all right).*

173. And the only thing to do is to try to find a greater number per day of opportunities for whole committal in what you're doing. To create them.

174. If you don't make your physical body act as if the proposition were true, the proposition cannot incarnate in your growth tissue. And if it doesn't incarnate, there can be no crucifixion - establishment. If it doesn't get crucified, there can be no resurrection. You can't re-ascend back to The Absolute unless you pin yourself.

175. Group Member: So, really speaking, you're working for decisiveness all the time?

176. For whole committal. Supposing you have...

177. Group member: You can't have reservation in a whole committal, can you? You don't have any second thoughts about anything. *(None at all).* So really speaking you're just being decisive all the time, you're not thinking about anything, are you? You're 'just doing it' sort of thing.

178. You're cutting indecision. *(Yes).* You're cutting from things that have nothing to do it with it. They are relevant. Some woman asked you to put a washer, a rubber thing or something, to fit on a machine. Now, you may have one, and there may be a little flaw in it. You could tell her that there's a flaw in you and say, "I'll put you in this one for the time being and I will bring you another one later." Or you could omit to tell her that there's a flaw in it, and put it on and say, "Next time I'll charge you for another one."

179. Now if you do the second course, you're not substantiating your concept, and you're in process of disintegrating because there's no middle course. It's either or. Either you are moving towards more and more opening of yourself to the absolute idea, or you are closing yourself. And if you close yourself, you will break. You pluralize yourself in your motive.

180. If you want unity of will, then you must remove all the ambiguity in the will. *(Yes)* It doesn't matter how tiny the thing is. If you are wholly committed in one thing - the smallest – in say in supplying a screw for a washer. Just one screw - value a half-penny or something - if you can be completely whole-willed in that, you can be the same thing with the whole world.

181. But if you watch yourself and find the slightest ambiguity in your will about that screw, you will necessarily find it a bigger issue.

182. And if you find that your will is pure in the little thing, apart from being startled at yourself, you will also find that you can be equally pure in a big thing. Because really, spatial dimensions - the bigness and the littleness of gross material objects - is irrelevant to the will.

183. Now, sorry, I must depart tonight.

184. Group Member (Ken Ratcliffe) Well, a strange idea here of what communism is and what democracy is.. *(NOTE: This, is, almost certainly, a fragment from the beginning of another talk).*

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