

## **‘THE PHARISEES’**

A TALK GIVEN BY EUGENE HALLIDAY LIVERPOOL, UK, AT THE HOME OF KEN RATCLIFFE SOMETIME DURING THE EARLY 1960's

Transcribed by Bob Hardy April 2023

1. ... (w)here he says, "I am come to send fire on the earth and what will I, would be already kindled."
2. There are two baptisms, one by water and one by fire. The first is through John, and the second through Christ.
3. The other question related to it is, "Was the error of the Pharisees, a spiritual sect, is that they were fixed upon clarity. If their righteousness was great, in what did it consist and how is greater righteousness to be gained.
4. Remember that Jesus on one occasion says, "Except your righteousness exceed that of these scribes and pharisees, you will in no wise enter the Kingdom."
5. We'll start with the first part about sending fire on the earth and will I be already kindled. In the New English Bible version of this, it's translated in such a way that it seems to suggest that the thing is not already kindled and has to be started by Jesus in the time process.
6. Unfortunately, this is not the very best metaphysical expression of it. He is saying, "I've arrived to start fire, set fire to the things. And already it is kindled, because I have arrived, the thing has started."
7. We know that if any being can respond to a stimulus, it must have inside itself something similar to the stimulus waiting to be activated. So we can say that if the stimulus has the character of a triangle, there must be a triangle possibility in terms of receiving organisms. So that when Christ says, "I am come to start a fire on the earth," which means 'to destroy certain errors'. The mere fact that he's talking to people at all and uses the expression 'start a fire' means that he assumes that people have at least the elements of vocabulary inside themselves containing the word fire - that it means something to them.
8. Funnily enough, the Pharisees are Persians, and Persians, as you know, were fire worshipers. When the Jews were in captivity in Babylon, they learned quite a lot about

Persian ideas. In fact, prior to the Babylonian captivity, there is no mention whatever of a spiritual doctrine amongst the Jews.

They show a remarkable clarity of mind in material things, but no concept of spirit as we understand it. But when during their captivity there, they acquired certain Persian ideas, they assimilated these ideas to their already existing system of thought. And this produced a division in the Jews. And we find two sects, the Sadducees and the Pharisees, arguing about the way to look at reality.

9. The Sadducees believe that if you behave yourself very well on earth, you will receive reward on earth materially. You will honor your father and your mother that you might live a long time on the land that your father can bequeath to you. The problem is that the Sadducees, as a sect, must be materially very wealthy, otherwise they won't believe this kind of idea. This idea justifies them being wealthy.
10. The Pharisees, on the other hand, are striving to acquire something other than the material benefits, precisely because the ideas were absorbed in a period when they were in captivity and had no material possessions to stress.
11. It is a well-known fact that any organism will strive to survive in any kind of environment. There are certain kinds of bacteria which are so resistant to boiling that you can boil them for several hours without killing them. What they do is they blow themselves a little bubble and they go and hide inside it till the boiling is finished. And when the thing is cooled down again, they revert back to their original form.
12. Now the Jews are rather like this historically. They are chameleons. Consequently, they change their form, like these bacteria in the boiling process. When they have no money, they are very, very spiritual. When they have a lot of material possessions, they are very sensible and realistic. And they can understand in the days of their success that God is willing them to accept where they're getting it. But if they have no material success, say during the great European persecutions in Poland or Russia, they become terribly spiritual, showing this kind of capacity like bacteria have, for changing form in order to resist the boiling process. They are typical of the life organism, adapting itself to any kind of situation.
13. The righteousness of the Pharisees is the righteousness of men who have done this with their consciousness. If we write 'Persia' in here, we know what this word means

basically. It means 'affirmation of the rational process'. To be quite logical is to be 'Persian' in this sense.

14. Persian religion is based on a dualism of good and evil; of black and white; of water and desert; of fertile and un-fertile - a series of pairs of opposites.
15. Now, pi-ra, pi-ratio, is that ratio of the diameter to the circumference of a circle. When we use the concept of oppositions, of opposites in logic, we draw a diameter to the circle and write on one point of the diameter, one term where it touches the perimeter, 'hot', You go right to the centre of the circle, to the other perimeter and write 'cold'. This is why we use the word opposite. It means 'posited on the all', ob-posite. And the B becomes P before another P, for phonetic reasons.
16. So when we are thinking rationally, we think in terms of opposites, near-far, and so on. And as we move towards the centre of the circle, from the perimeter, we come to a zone of indeterminacy where the opposite terms are not applicable.
17. Now the Pharisees are the men who like to be clear. Clarity is their aim. They are men who have decided it's a good thing to live in the head.
18. There's our man in his three parts, slung on the spinal cord. The pi-rational processes is in the head. And men who aim at clarity of reason progressively become cold. If you wish to be rational you must be formally clear, and if you are formally clear you must keep away from the center of the wheel.
19. Supposing we write 'hot' on one term and on the upper end of the diameter 'cold'. We can say the greatest opposition is on the perimeter, at the ends of the diameter. When we move towards the centre, it is going less and less and less hot, and less and less and less cold. So right through the centre we can write 'neither hot nor cold'. This is indeterminate: this is in-different, and we say, 'not different'. We cannot tell in the centre whether we are talking about 'not hot' or 'not cold'. Now this isn't clear enough for the Pharisaic man.
20. Supposing we take a concept like 'worshipping God' and 'ignoring God'. 'Worshipping God' might mean doing everything you do including blessing your sheep, with due regard to cosmic form. Which would require quite a lot of analysis about shape and size and number, of God's teeth and the cavity between, what size of bristle to use, and so on. This is the kind of thing that occupies the Pharisaic mind, the rational mind.

21. If you care to read through Deuteronomy, you will find quite a system of laws there, demonstrating this kind of thing. If you read all the law bits in the Old Testament, you will find they're quite detailed. And if you then - because you've got a little time left over - read the whole of the Talmudic commentaries, you'll find some more details worked out.
22. Now the Pharisees were these rationalists who were trying to devise a kind of worship that would be clearly defined so that every man would know precisely just what was, and what not, a righteous act.
23. In China, Confucius was trying to do the same thing. And we know that under Confucianism, even the size of your father's burial urn was determined exactly so that it would be bad form if you were to get yourself say, [a in European parlance](#), a tool to cut halfway up the vase. This was undoubtedly because the ancestral spirit would be very annoyed, and they didn't feed the number of carrots which grew in the coming years.
24. Confucianism was confusion-ism. In fact politically, when Confucius was given a territory to govern by his rational methods, it failed miserably. Just as Plato failed, when he tried to apply his rational principles of government, outlined in the Republic.
25. So this begins to make sense of Christ's statement that we had better exceed the righteousness of the Pharisees. So he didn't talk nonsense, he talked sense.
26. The Pharisees are aiming at clarity, and to get this clarity they have to define. 'Define', if we remember, indicates the limits of the application of terms.
27. We do not define things in the world. They are already adequately defined. If you put your finger in a fire it will burn you, because the fire is adequately defined already. Whether you apply the term fire to it, or fyre or fur, or whatever you care for it, it will go on burning you, because its nature is defined naturally. So we do not define the things of the world. They're already adequately defined. What we define is the limit to the application of terms.
28. Now this has been forgotten in philosophy to such a degree that most people, they define such and such a thing formally. And the average professor of philosophy will then proceed to define the thing. Well this is lunacy to do so. He is not. He is defining the limits of the application of terms.

29. **11.55** Now if we go back to our Pi-ro-cetic diagram, and we start defining what 'hot' is, as we're moving towards it's opposite 'cold', we must come to the central point, which is neither hot nor cold. That's two negatives - not hot, not cold. Well the funny thing about the negative is this. It is no definition at all. It's simply the rubbing out of a definition. So if I said it's neither hot nor cold, nor is it two tomatoes - these are negations. There's no relation between the tomatoes and the hot and the cold. But it's just as much 'not tomato' as 'not hot' and 'not cold'. So this zone of negation in the middle, the 'N' zone, cannot be handled by the man who thinks in pairs of opposites.
30. We have to say that for practical reasons, - that is for practical purposes, purposes of action - we can say when we put our finger in the fire, "This fire is so hot that I'd better not leave it in: this fire is not so hot that I should take it out immediately: this fire is not so hot that I can't leave it in all night. Because in fact this fire has gone out. It is called an 'out-gone fire'.
31. Now if you apply the terms carefully, you will find that the fire that has gone out isn't a fire. And yet you can use the expression 'we've gone out of fire', and remake it.
32. The center of negation in the wheel here is obviously full of more righteousness than there is on the perimeter. There's plenty of opposition between hot and cold. If you sit in a cold bath of water, jump out, let the water out, fill it up in boiling water and jump back again, you will feel the difference. Where, if you fill it with lukewarm water in the first place and jump in and out twice, you won't feel the difference.
33. If we examine this sense of negation, we find that at the point of approach to it, our discrimination must become very, very, very fine before we can decide at what point to stop using the term 'less hot' and start using the term 'less cold'.
34. Now in the kinetic theory of heat used in physics, heat is quite simply motion. Kinetic theory says heat is motion and wherever there is motion there is heat. Now if this is a correct definition, and physics says it is - that is to say it is a true statement - then there is no such thing as cold at all. **14.42** There can only be degrees: lots of heat; less heat; less heat; less heat.. And if any thing exists, because a thing is a motion compound, that thing must have a temperature. So we can say that the absolute zero is a negative potential unattainable. Science is trying to get down to absolute zero. It's got down to

about half a point from it. But to get to absolute zero, it would have to get to non-existence. So things are actually motion compounds, and motion is heat.

35. So when we start defining hot, less hot, less hot, less hot, instead of going at the center into cold, we should say it's still less hot, still less hot, and so on.
36. We must exceed the righteousness of the fellows who think in pairs of opposites. Men who think of pairs of opposites, if they were to get into the government, or if they were to be by magic placed on the bench in a court. If we were to make one of them arbitrarily, by act of will, into a high court judge, and he presumed that you could say hot and cold about a given case, he would be a nuisance.
37. What we actually find is that the more intelligent the judge, the more elastic he is in definition. But he defines the situation - that is, the application of terms - in such a way that it produces some good for some being, maybe for society, maybe for himself. But he's always got the good of some being at heart when he's making a definition. And consequently he cannot accept the straight hot/cold for the good/evil.
38. The funny thing about the definition of evil used by theologians is this. Good is called pure being and evil is an absolute negation of being. But a negation of being is no being at all. So that evil has no being. And therefore there is no such thing as an existential evil by this definition. It comes maybe if one man pokes another man's eye out, that is not an absolute evil. Although he loses an eye. Because if he poked it out efficiently there was something that wasn't evil, namely his efficiency. If he spoke it out with a good strong finger, the finger with a good strong finger, then good is not evil. So we find that the use of pairs of opposites blinds us, in the existential situation in a position where we cannot suffice.
39. In the case of the Pharisees they were trying to define all righteous acts and all wrongful acts. And they would do such things as counting the number of strands of cotton hanging down off their scarfs (or silk if they could afford them) or tzitits, the fringes. And the longer your fringes, the more righteous you were. And the more money you have, the longer your fringes.
40. Now, Christ is complaining, that there's no logicity about this. That the length of fringe is not quite the same thing as the meaning of the word 'spirit'. We can't make an equation that says 'spirit' equals 'long fringes'. which is what in fact they were tending to

do. Because as they gained in clarity, so they gained in perspicacity in the commercial field. They found that they could actually define situations in such a way that they came out on top in the social system. They were bright, they were doing as well as the Sadducees in fact, by their definitions.

41. And they were saying our logic - and we must remember this 'log' is the same thing as logos, which is the name of Christ in the gospel of John - their logic or rationale of the universe was so clear that they finished up at the top level of society pushing about all the other beings that weren't clear. And they defined their clarity as a good. 1906
42. They could see in fact that their clarity had gained for them many of the things called goods. Therefore they were worshipping their clarity. They were not worshipping the center of negation which included the pair of opposites. They weren't worshipping God, the free spirit, they were worshipping clarity or know-how, in the social set-up. And in the process, they were causing injury to people of less sharp wits.
43. Well Christ knew very well that if they were to carry on in the way they were doing with their heightened clarity, they would seize the dominion of society completely. And they would then begin to rest upon their clarity.
44. The peculiar thing about the rational mind is that it defines everything in a circle, and its opposites on the perimeter of this circle. And because of the nature of the rational response, the tendency to formulate, equate sense percepts. They would rapidly begin to think that they knew everything. They will have tradition, they had built it up, and they would be able to say, "We know what is happening because we know the law."
45. In Babylon from the Chaldean astronomers they have acquired the law of the eternal recurrence of celestial events. They knew about astronomy. They knew how to predict a solar eclipse and fool ignorant people with their knowledge. They began to think that they knew exactly what to do in any given situation.
46. But in fact they were being dictated to by the past. They had no idea of another level of being where form is of no moment at all. Namely the level of free will. Christ describes spirit as free. He says, "God is a spirit, and you cannot tell where the spirit goes to or from." And He defines every man born of spirit exactly in the same way. The man who is free is the man who is unpredictable. But the unpredictable man cannot be

rationalized by any other man. That is to say, in so far as you cannot reasonably say what the man is going to do, he is not pi-ra-dictable.

47. To be predictable is simply to be in such a position that somebody can say, rationally from your formal behavior, what you are going to do. But the free man is not formally determined at all. He is determined by will, not by form. And all the time that the rationalists are tying the world up - and the Pharisees are a type of rationalist - there are new emergents, biological emergents, new types of changes occurring in the cells of the human race. New ways of looking at things are emerging. Radiation from outer space can change the formal structure of the factors of humanity in the egg. A being can be born with characteristics not previously possessed by other beings of the same family.[22.37](#)
48. So that the rationalist who has gained his position entirely by study of the past and the application of logic to it, finds himself in relation to the mutant - the new character of emergence in the new egg - quite in the dark. He cannot say what it is going to do. So although looking back at tradition he knows all that it says in the book, and although he knows exactly the cycle of events within his society, he does not know what is going to happen with the new baby that's here. In fact it's like a mutant.
49. Imagine today with radiation techniques. In America about five years ago, some scientists said, "With our present knowledge of radiation, we are on the way to being able to determine the characters that a person will be born with. And therefore we are on the way to being able to create genius. And we might make a man who will be able to see the truth about reality." And at this point another man stood up and in the name of the 'H-R', 'Head of Function' and said, "If such a man is produced it will be our social duty to kill him because he will disrupt our cycle of events. He will spoil our predictions."
50. Now in exactly the same way, when the three Kings in the story - the three centers of being in your own organism - they go visiting a new baby. And this new baby is a mutant. That is to say, he's a change in the biological structure.
51. From Abraham, efforts have been made in a certain direction. These efforts have accumulated. Instead of giving birth to a musical Mozart, a philosophical metaphysical giant has been produced by these continuous biological strivings.



52. This baby is born with the potential of pure reason and pure will: and his reason is entirely subject to his will, although his reason is pure. He doesn't have to obey the mechanics of reason; he **will** do so. But he will apply those aspects of the reasons that are applicable with due regard to the necessary movement of the evolution of the human race.
53. Now those people already in possession (the Pharisees and the others) will have everything tied up. They don't want a man to give a new dispensation. They want everything in their own hands, in their own family's hands.
54. They don't even observe the old law that says, after so many years all the lands that have been taken away from the poor by the rich; all those possessions taken away from the dull whitchers by the sharp whitchers, shall be returned to the dull whitchers and a fresh start shall be had. This is the idea behind that old Jewish dispensations, which in a certain number of years was stated to be a necessary social thing. If we don't return to the people, to the families that we have robbed, the things we have taken from them, we will build a static society the haves at the top and the have-nots at the bottom. And therefore there was a Jewish law saying these things must be returned.
55. But in fact in His day these things were not being returned. They were breaking the law. They had a law and they were not heeded. So their righteousness was not yet made perfect. They were only obeying the law insofar as it suited their private purpose.
56. Now He knew the history of the Jews, and He knew that these Pharisees derived their particular concept from Persia, from rationalism. And He knew that the Persians, as fire-worshipers were using the same symbol, 'pyre', to mean 'fire' and 'reason'. So 'Pyre' means 'fire', and exactly the same elements mean 'reason'.
57. So the ancients at some point had a clear view that there is no reason other than the forms precipitated by energy. Fire is the symbol of energy. Heraclitus was a Greek, called the obscure philosopher, precisely because he said, "Energy makes reason." People couldn't understand it: the Greeks were trying to understand it - they were trying to be logical. And they thought that logic, which they thought was reason, was opposed to the pure impulse of the will.
58. So that Apollo, who is the god of order, of pi-law, of reason, situated in the head, was an enemy of Dionysus, situated in the belly.

59. So the rationalizing Greeks committed the kind of error that the Pharisees committed. They tried logically to tie everything up so that they would understand precisely what to do about everything in men's lives.
60. If you read Plato's Republic, you'll read a book that is taken seriously in universities all over the world, as if it were a serious treatise on government. When in fact no government in the world could possibly take that book as a textbook and apply it, from what Plato tried to say - a simple division of society into men who can think clearly and control the situation, warriors who will fight like men, and ordinary working people. It's a very nice, easy way of dividing things, but it does not correspond with existential people. Because, unfortunately, people can think a bit, and fight a bit, and work a bit, in varying degrees. And you can't find a man who can work that doesn't want to fight sometimes if you push him.
61. You can't find a man who will work, who is not able to think a bit, and fight a bit; or a man who can fight, but can't work a bit and think a bit; or a thinker who can't fight a bit if it's only verbally and labor a bit if it's only in a dictionary.
62. So this division is existentially untrue. Dionysus is the god of the life impulse non-rationalized. This Dionysus - the first part of the word is God, the last part of the word is savior. The middle part of the word means no/yes. - it's this peculiar center of in-definition. Where the hot and the cold cannot be distinguished.
63. Apollo is the principle of rationality. He is the fellow who has cattle in the myth that Hermes, the messiah, steals. Cattle means 'fixed animals', 'animals heads in', 'animals controlled'. But as the Dionysian force is the force of God himself saving people from rationality by pointing out that 'yes' and 'no' cannot be resolved in the center.
64. There is no pure black or pure white existentially in the void without the presence of its opposite. So somehow if we are to get into the kingdom of balance called 'Heaven': if we are to see that hot and cold are equally valid, that is to say the terms 'hot and cold' have an application, but the existential fact that they refer to, is not a duality at all.
65. As we see, if we take near-far, and I get my attention and I say, "I will take it near to the board. I'll start where my knee is. There it is. Now it is far from the board. I'm going left, far left, far left, far left, far left, far left, far left, far left." What am I going to say now I am near the board? Why not start here on the knee again and say, "I'm not as near to the board as

I will be in a moment. I'm getting nearer, and nearer, and nearer, and nearer." In each space that I place my pencil I can say either, "I am less far," or, "more near, than I was before." So in each space I can use both terms, 'near', 'far'. So in each space I can say 'yes', 'no'. So in the Dionysian figure we have God, and then 'no-yes', and then 'sius' - which means faith. 3133

66. We can swap our definition and still mean exactly the same thing. Only it doesn't sound like the same thing.
67. So if we say to the frontline soldier, "You are a hero. There is the cannon's mouth, here is the book of history, here is my friend ready to write your name the moment you get in the cannon's mouth. Here is the history book, here is the cannon, and here are you. Now are you ready? Set! Go!" and he goes. And we bring him back again, fresh incarnation, fresh start, new body. We now say to him, "Over there is a highly explosive device. And when you get near to it, there's a funny man behind it, and he'll touch a certain little spot, and you will promptly fall apart, and you'll need a fresh start." And on the other hand, here we have a funny little pile of papers tied together, by a clever fellow, and spread over the surface of the paper are lots of little bits of wiggly ink. "Are you ready? Set. Go!" Now you can't make the equation between being burnt to bits and the little wiggly shapes of ink on the surface of the book. So he tends not to move.
68. Whichever definition we use in the situation, If he doesn't know the rules, he will either be precipitated into the canon's mouth, or confused by what we have just said.
69. The man who can handle the 'yes/no' stimulus in the situation can determine the behavior of the man who can't. So that Spinoza said, if you remember, "Adequate knowledge equals adequate response, activity, happiness. Inadequate knowledge, inadequate response, passivity, misery." If you know all about it, you can dodge those men that know all about it or shake hands with them. If you know less than the man who knows all about it, the man that knows all about it could, if he had an intent so to do, try to fool you into doing something.
70. Now the men that have everything under control, the Pharisees, the rationalists, and other people who thought everything was under control are threatened by Christ with fire, when He goes back to the statement of Heraclitus who is 500 years before him, who says that the logos, the ratio of forms in the universe, is fire. That idea is will, that

reason is only will. That all their intellectual activities are merely ways that your will behaves.

71. Now supposing we draw a circle to represent a form. How did the form get there? We know how it got there. Forces came into it and rotated for a time, and when they're ready they go out. That's the sign of Torus.
72. Now, where the forces are rotating we can rationalize about it, because we can draw our diameters through it. But before the forces have turned and started to rotate, and prior them having gone out from the rotation, we can say rationally nothing whatever about them. All we can say about them is that they are energy that can generate the circle and may not.
73. So Heraclitus, when he says, "The logos is fire, that the form of the world is energy," he is saying that energy is formulating itself. And as it moves to be the form of the world, likewise it departs from it and the form of the world disappears.
74. Now the rationalizing Greeks didn't like this statement. Not at all, because if this statement is true, then all the structures that they are trying to make will one day disappear.
75. Now imagine a Greek temple like the Parthenon. The men who built this to exact geometrical proportions. Take one of the Greeks who first saw it put up – an "intelligent man - suddenly switch him into the 20th century and let him have a brochure from one of the airlines, "Visit To Greece And See The Ruins". He wouldn't like it. He's used all his geometrical knowledge to set up a monument to his eternal god. Only his monument has fallen down. This said something about his God, his God has fallen down too.
76. The God is the governing concept in a man that helps him to move in the way he moves. If he has a false concept he's got a false God, and his concept causes him to fall down in practice in the world. So he'd better get himself a better concept or go beyond concepts.
77. Now the highest concept of all, formally, is the concept of reason, of pi-ratio, of the Logos itself. But of the concept of the Logos, the highest one, is that there is no form other than energy formulated. There are no forms, spheres, ultimate particles, sub-atomic particles, electrons, protons, mesons, biathlons, and all the electrons there are. There are no forms whatever that are not simply behaviors of energy. And this energy is predictable, pi-rah-dictable, rationally talkable about, only in so far as it is rotating at the

time you make your observations. And you've no guarantee whatsoever that when you've made your observation of this molecular or metallic structure that it will be there in a moment.

78. Let the balance of forces in the galactic system alter ever so slightly and the solar system will go out to balance. All the rules on there will change.
79. If we take certain material elements today and do experiments, say, in super cooling, which is a relatively new study, we find funny things like a liquid will flow uphill instead of down it. Now this was unthinkable when you were at school a few years ago. But it is a common place at certain other levels. We're used to gravity and things falling down. But anti-gravity is a serious study. We're used to expecting to fall if we come to the edge of a precipice. There's no guarantee. If the molecular forces holding your body together were to slacken ever so slightly, so that the molecular distances were to increase, you wouldn't fall. You'd either carry on walking on a straight line in mid-air, or you might fly up, or you might just disintegrate completely through lack of cohesion power in the molecules.
80. Now, nobody can say from rational principles - that is from the consideration of the cycle of events - what is happening in the non-cyclic energy that has so far generated such cyclic events.
81. So when Christ says we have to get a righteousness exceeding that of the Pharisees, greater than that of rationalists, He says we must have a mind that is open to possibilities that the reason has never seen.
82. You remember the little quirky rhyme? 'Reason has moon, but moons not hers lie mirrored on her seas, confounding her astronomers, But O! delighting me.' Reason has moons. 'Moons' - the base of the word means to count, to measure, menstruation. But the moon is also symbolic of phasic change. Reason has phases. But there are phases that the reason cannot account for. And these are the ones where the 'no-yes' is in the middle. Where anything can happen, the realm of faith, when a person can change suddenly from a dying man under an operation to a recovering man, or a man that's come through an operation successfully, physically, can take a dive and die because a change has occurred at the level where opposition of logical thought has no application.

83. Christ then has come to set fire to the rationalist, the men that think they've got everything under control. He attacked very vigorously the whole structure of the Jewish society of his day and not only that but of the Roman society of his day. Whence the Romans feel they can participate in the crucifixion.
84. He refuses to speak to Pilate because Pilate – Pi-lat' is a rationalist and wants a definition of truth. How can you possibly define truth to a rationalist who believes, for instance, that the word 'truth' is the opposite of the word 'falsity' or 'untruth'.
85. Now supposing a man believes that the word 'truth' is the opposite of 'untruth'. Is it possible to tell an untruth if this definition is correct? When you speak, words come out of your mouth. Supposing I say, "Two and two are five." Have I told an untruth? Have I made a false statement? All I've done is taken a row of words out of a dictionary and uttered them.
86. Now I might be meaning anything. I might mean two people, a man and a woman, and two other people, a man and a woman, both got married, these two couples, they both tried to have a baby and only one has succeeded. When I counted them out then there were five. This is a biological truth. The mathematical one is merely a convenient definition.
87. So that we cannot say that any statement whatever is untrue in the ultimate sense because whatever IS, is true. So that the words that come out, which are said to be lies, are only said to be lies because 'lie' come from the verb 'to lay' and the lie is something laid down, and a pretense is made that it applies beyond the faith level. If it does so the whole of the laws of a country are lies. The law is from the verb 'to lay'. That which is laid down is a lie. And yet these lies are the grounds of social truth.
88. How can you explain this kind of truth to a rationalist who thinks in pairs of opposites? It isn't possible to do so. So what we have to do, if we want to exceed the righteousness of the Pharisees, we must realize that we can never by means of logic based on pairs of opposites – near/far; high/low; good/bad, and so on - come to the ultimate existential meaning of any proposition at all.
89. This means that we must continue to remind ourselves that when we define, we do not define things. We define the limits of the application of terms. And we have to know what the limits are before we can, in fact, define them.

90. Have we got any particular questions about this?

NOTE: *The occasional word in the Q & A session here that follows proved to be impossible for me to decipher. BH.*

91. Q: You said on one occasion, That Christ - one of his motives in attacking this system of the day was more to test himself and his own bodily dislike of the consequences if he does involve himself, is to avoid a schism in himself. He decides the best way was to get him to .. come up .. to intone in something which he knew he wouldn't like, and react accordingly. It's as though he were treating the rest of mankind as a plenitude to behave in a certain way. It reduces mankind to a sort of .. emm ... well.. all men to one man's world.

92. EH: It means we are making it so.

93. Q: Yes

94. Well, if you remember what we were discussing this problem at that time, we were talking a certain aspect – the human side - of Christ in the existential situation. When he's in Gethsemane arguing with himself and with God about whether he shall go through with this drama, it's his human side, not the divine side, that is doing the complaining.

95. We all have a physical body. And if you set out to do a certain thing, and when you are about to do it, we all jump on you. And the thing is terribly important for you to do, and we won't let you do it, your flesh will complain, and you will sulk. Even if you can see, rationally, that we number sufficiently to stop you doing it, the tendency in your body will be there, won't it?

96. Q: Wouldn't that depend on exactly how clearly you saw it?

97. Yes, it must be (...) If you see it clearly enough, you'd stop fighting. Now, in Gethsemane, this human side of Christ is arguing to get the clarity enough to go on with the job.

98. Q: The divine side is arguing.

99. The human side is doing the complaining. He has his orders from the divine side, but the body is saying, "Well, it's too painful." So he says, "I don't want to do it." And the

divine side says, "It must be done by someone. And there's been an awful lot of prophets predicting that it is you."

100. Now you're reviled, are you going to be like Jonah and run away from the situation, and refuse to fight the Ninevites? On the grounds that that they might reform? Or are you going to accept it?
101. It says that he sweats blood during this fight between the divine logic and the human flesh in himself. He has this argument.
102. Q: Jonah's Divine can't lose and He must know this.
103. The Divine knows it. But funnily enough the human doesn't
104. Q: Well where is the measure of identification (...)?
105. Do you mean the mechanics of the divine identification? Before we deal with that, we'll just go back to your point about Christ behaving as if the rest of humanity were one man, the mechanical man. He came to remind them of their potential freedom. And he said to the Pharisees, "You will not go in to that free spiritual domain, neither will you let anybody else go. You are not being freed." He had come to give them freedom and they were not given freedom.
106. So their behavior convinced him that they were mechanical and therefore he had to move along (...) except to the cross in order to convict them of mechanicality. They didn't believe they were mechanical. But two thousand years of argument had suggested that they were very mechanical. Because He annoyed them and they responded in a way that if they could have seen that two thousand years of persecution following his death, they would not have done with Him as they did.
107. When they said he's (...) upon our head, upon our children's, they didn't think it was serious. But that was the result of reasoning, so they factually responded mechanically to the similar situation.
108. He said, "I will bring fire and I will destroy your fire. Your rationalizing which is an energy has got in a groove. Now I bring you free fire, and this free fire will set fire to your bound fire and release it."
109. And they fought for the maintenance of their rational structure of society. And He set fire to it, and He pushed them to the point where they reacted to Him by crucifying Him. And He said, "I, when I have been lifted up, will draw all men to me."



110. First he agitated, spent a (...) sufficient length of time to get a sufficient number of people interested and emotionally charged about it, then He was crucified. So that the figure of him crucified has been controversial for two thousand years. And this could only have happened if there were responding mechanically. Therefore on the cross He has power to give them for they know not what they do. Because they are mechanical
111. People that don't know what they're doing are mechanical. They're responding to a stimulus.
112. Q: So they're people.
113. Yes they're people technically. They're bending the knee to the stimulus.
114. Now let's go to the point about identification. Let's put a line here and say down below here is a triangle representing humanity, and up here is a triangle representing God. Now the triangle below is concentrating on its finite centre, and the triangle above is radiating infinitely.
115. Now that is exactly the relation between the individualized human being who is focused on his body, whilst the divine is focused on the field which is infinite.
116. So the divine can feel the struggle of the individual within itself, whilst the individual struggling cannot feel peace. So the argument goes, I, the petty egoic self, don't like being pushed about by this field. I don't even know if the field exists.
117. If you ask yourself seriously, with perfect honesty (a rare commodity) when you're looking at your physical body, you don't think your physical body is more real than your feelings. Do you? Do you think it is? And yet it isn't. Even in physical terms it isn't? Because we know that your physical structures are simply modalities of the field. And the field is in principle, infinite.
118. The field is more real than any particular modality of it. And your physical body is simply a locus of a certain type of activity with which you are identified. And we know that that particular corpus which you focus on has within itself the inherencies of disintegration. And the death will arise. "It is appointed to man once to die. You were born, you will die. This is a statement about your physical body. How can you believe, logically, that your physical body is more real than the field which precipitated it and will disintegrate it?
119. Q: Well this is only just how much information you can react with.

120. You mean it's a merely intellectual proposition of the moment? Right! You're in a personal and private Gethsemane. The field is talking to you and saying "Look, I'm here, I'm useless" And today in the 20th century it says "You know what? I'm even a scientific proposition these days. How can you resist me?" Then your finited-focused, corporeal center says, "I still don't believe it."
121. Q: Where does it get its energy?
122. The field?
123. Q: No. To resist the field.  
Something you said earlier (...) something else.
124. The field supplies the finite individual with his energy to resist the field in order to characterize the individual. And even though this belief in God is imposed on you by God so that you can understand what it means to be isolated and fulfill the total gamut of experience.  
You'd be deficient if you didn't occasionally become atheists. How could you possibly comprehend an atheist if you didn't know what it was like? Say, if you could lead him to salvation which a part of you would like to for comfort, you'd have been there already. But you're not allowed there. There's a fiery sword on the Garden at Eden keeping you out until you've got sufficient character to make it worthwhile for God to talk to you and say, "How did you go on?"
125. Because you're not formally characterised, you're not worth talking to are you?
126. Q: But it can't lose though can it?
127. Of course it can't lose. Do you want it to?
128. Q: Well you've got me (laughter) But it still (... ..) information.
129. In-formation, yes. You are informed on the inside of the discussion. and the nature of the form is such that it will not allow an equilibration of a counter-mechanism based on the material existence. Will it?
130. Q: Well this is (...) with more information, I mean this could work.
131. Of course it can. Can you put your fingers in your ears or is it too late?
132. Q: Well once you realize it can work really well (...)

133. Hmm. Well you know the Indian story about there's a man who's going up the staircase and he discovers that it's a long way up and he turns around and wants to go down again. But someone has set fire to the staircase below him. He can't go down.
134. This is the same thing , "I bring fire to burn out the rationality of the Pharisees." The staircase is simply your experience. You are ascending in self-knowledge and you assess the universe at each step. And you have everything tied up.
135. When you were a little boy, you only had one ambition for one point of your life. There's a nice red rubber ball without pictures that will bounce high. Not one with pictures that bounces low. When you've got this ball, it's heaven. But there's no end to your ambition. It went on from ball to bat and tricycle and bike and car. And now we're looking into outer space. There's no limit to it. There's no limit to the ambition of egotism. And there is no limit to the field. There can be no limit to egotism because there is no limit to the field. It is the field that is feeding the egotism to force it to characterize itself infinitely. Making it worth the field's time having such an individual.
136. So your worst crime is divinely inspired. Because it makes for an interesting account.
137. Q: But what about the field-conscious man, that's manifesting form in the material world, in a magical sense. He appears to be willing too, by presenting the forms appearing.
138. He is identified with the field, otherwise he just can't formulate in that way. He is a non-dualist. He's not a dualist utilizing the field. He's a non-dualist utilizing himself in his infinity.
139. Q: Well in that sense, would that means that his his own vehicle was of no more consequence than somebody else's then.
140. There is nobody else.
141. Q: I know but in the ..
142. I was talking to a woman the other day and she was saying that she believed that a play she had seen on the TV (...) was absolutely marvelous.
143. In this play, a woman who loves the men commits suicide on purpose because he doesn't love her. And before she commits suicide, she studies the black arts. And after

she's dead she gathers together her astral body and she enters into the body of a girl which he loves and forces this girl's psyche out so she can't get the benefit.

144. Now, if she identifies with the field, she's a dualist because she forces that woman out. Now if she'd have been a non-dualist, she wouldn't have needed to commit suicide because she would have recognized that this other girl was just another body of hers. She could have enjoyed the enjoyment in that body directly without wanting to polish off the one that she started with.
145. Again it's a matter of the definition of terms. If you are a monist, you are in trouble because if monism is true, then the salvation of one man is the salvation of all. If you are a dualist, there are two ultimate terms, good and evil, which can never be resolved and must always be in conflict.
146. If you are a non-dualist, you just deny all the finiting boundaries whatever, identify with the infinite field, and proceed to enjoy all the operations that are taking place in all vehicles throughout infinite space
147. Q: Amazing (laughter)
148. It can be done...It's called the precarious enjoyment.
149. Q (Laughter)
150. If you read the (...) by Mr. Weston, 'The Good Wives' (?)' you read of a woman in there called Mrs. Voster (?). And she precariously enjoyed the seduction of all maidens in the village. Because although she herself was not seduced, she arranged it. And her only joy was arranging seduction.
151. Q: (Laughter)
152. It's a funny book isn't it?

+End of recording+