UNCONSCIOUS & SUBCONSCIOUS

Transcript of a lecture given by Eugene Halliday in Liverpool in the 1960’s

*We started by talking about worry. We said that no matter how much we try to control it intellectually, there's always that little squirrel inside, you see, that keeps going on. And we got on to more and more real and genuine worries, in fact, how difficult a real worry is to control. And then we got really more to the point then of the subconscious and the conscious. Now, before coming here I'd always thought of will as something you had here, some power that you exerted from here. But we refer to will now, don't we, as a lower department, the south……. and it seems to me that eventually I myself, and I imagine that we're going to have trouble with things like this, the relating of what you're learning here and what you've read, the previous misconceptions. What I'm trying to get at now particularly is how you in this work look at the conscious and subconscious mind, how they fit.*

*Khen- I wonder if I might say a word here. I did bring up the explanation you gave one night about the ‘un-conscious’ being the hare-like consciousness, and Jack remembered that particular explanation. What he found difficulty with was equating that definition with what he termed the ‘accepted psychological definition’, which when we examined it, we discovered that the psychologists themselves appeared to be none too clear on what they meant by that definition, or they may have been clear individually, but en masse they had various definitions for it and Jack feels that there must come a time in this work when he can link together what he's previously read on various subjects and the definitions that* ***we're*** *using here. We also mentioned this of course, that the majority of the books which he had read, he agreed, had themselves not always been too clear in definition. But this idea of the unconscious, apparently, was the problem.*

*So, the wider problem is that there must come a time eventually when you've resolved all contradictions in your mind, I presume. Yes, if we get that far.*

Well, let's start with the diagram, and we'll say this is the surface of the sea. If we had a lot of paper, we could draw this out to the right and the left and if we had an infinity of paper we could draw it infinitely if we had eternity to draw it in. But tonight we'll confine ourselves to this much. That's the surface. Supposing we have a small boat on it, and inside the boat there is a man, and he's lost his oars, not being very good at it, so he's entirely at the mercy of the motion of the surface of the sea. Now that man, we would say, is ‘conscious’ of the fact that he's going up and down. The reason he's conscious of the fact that he's going up and down is because, if he looks at anything at all across here, if he can see the horizon, it will, relative to the motion of the boat, be changing its position. So there's a variation of stimulus hitting him in the eye. There's another one in the fact that the inertia of the body itself and the fact that the internal organs are fairly loosely slung is such that when the boat goes up, the stomach relatively presses down, when the boat goes down, the stomach relatively presses up, which sometimes makes people sick. Now, if we go a little bit lower in the water, deeper, we find that the amount of disturbance is less. If we go down a few more fathoms, we find something like this. If we go right down to the bottom of the sea, and we'll assume the bottom of the sea is fairly level, the motion down there would be nil. So we say the storm is on the surface of the sea.

Now this is exactly the same as a diagram of the mind, except that we should imagine this is an infinite curve, the straight line is a line of infinite curvature, so if we projected it ever so far, it would eventually meet itself. So we can do another diagram now, a small one of a sphere, the whole of the surface of which is broken by wave forms, like this. At the centre, there are no wave forms; it is still. Now imagine this is a sphere, we’ll call it the hydrosphere, that is a sphere of water, like the Earth is a sphere, with a film of water on large parts of its surface. Conceive this sphere of water with all the agitation and turbulence on the surface, which is the outside of the sphere and then conceive that this line in the first diagram corresponds with a line drawn in the centre of the second diagram. So we can draw a little boat on here if we want, that's like the earth. There's the geosphere, there's the hydrosphere, there's the atmosphere, there's the pyrosphere, the ionosphere, and whatever other spheres there are outside it. (5:54)

So we talk about the storm being on the surface only and this is a diagram of the mind itself, so we can say in the depths of the mind or at the centre of the mind in the second diagram, because the depth of the mind is the same as the centre of the mind, the mind is eternally calm. This is what we call the subconscious, this is what we call the conscious. So here's our subconscious and there's our conscious. Now, we said before about the word ‘conscious’, con= with, the root ‘to see’ and the issue of it; the issue of ‘seeing together’. Now, it's quite obvious that what we see together on the surface is a series of waves, and on each major wave there are some little ones. Now this will tie up in a moment with the worry process.

All worrying is disturbance of the mind stuff itself. We’ll put down the yoga term for mind, put it in English phonetics. We call it chitta, we might spell it c-i-t-t-a and put an accent on it to remind us that that is pronounced like a ‘ch’ and it is then the same as the Italian word ‘citta’, which means a city, the same word again in English, because this stuff, citta, is Sanskrit for mind stuff, the substance of the mind, and on the outside of the mind there is turbulence, which when it is out of control and is breaking in little bits, we call ‘worry’. We’ve talked before about identification. You can concentrate internal to your being and you can concentrate on the very perimeter of your being. If you concentrate on the depth of your being, you will find, at the centre, no turbulence at all but if you concentrate on the very edge of your being, you will find you are becoming irritated. Between the two, there is a middle zone, where the amount of motion from above and the no-motion below, have a natural mean, and it is in **that** zone that we can learn to control ourselves. Somewhere between the very, very edge of our skin surfaces, which are being stimulated from outside, and the very, very deepest centre of consciousness, which is eternally still, there is a slow process, a relatively small amount of turbulence, which is slow enough to be seen and therefore controlled, and not too slow so that it's lost its interest and you fall asleep. (9:03)

Now, supposing we say the edge of that is the waking state, and the depth there is a state of deep sleep. Deep sleep is right in the middle, and this middle zone here, (I'll make it fairly wide), we call the dreaming state and these are called the three states that a human being has. He has a state; the waking state, when his mind is being agitated, made turbulent by stimulation from outside. There is a state which you know exists, and therefore proves itself in the fact that you can remember it, proves that it **is** a real state with its own qualities, because when you go to sleep at night and wake up remembering no dreams, you nevertheless feel that you have slept. There is a kind of process in consciousness you call ‘sleeping’. So that if you sleep well, you say, “I have slept well.” If you sleep badly, you say, “I have slept badly.” If you dream, you say, “last night I had a dream.” And therefore, the central experience, and really we should not use the word ‘ex-perience’, we should use the word ‘in-perience’. If we say this is ex-perience on the outside, and that's in-perience on the inside, the central fact of in-perience there, is that we are aware of our being without modification. I can be aware if I close my eyes, relax my hand, I can be aware that I've got a hand. If I open my eyes, then I see that I've got four fingers and a thumb, very clearly. When I'm simply aware of the hand, that’s my deep sleep condition. When I open my eye and count my fingers and thumb, that’s my waking condition and in between the two, I can have my mind half asleep, half awake, when I can wonder whether I've got a hand or whether it's a lily I've got on the end of my forearm. This is the same thing as dream or fantasy. (11:37)

Now no matter what school of psychology we take, we are concerned with the three-fold division. The so-called waking state is the state when we are under stimulus and consequently consciousness tends to be concentrated on our external, and that is called conscious, the ‘seeing together’. What we see together are the stimuli of the five orders of the five senses. If we go right down into a deep sleep when we are not dreaming and we wake up with a feeling of well-being and say we have slept well, we've had a kind of in-perience, to be technical, that we were **being** but not modifying our being. Our external is modified by a stimulus, our internal is not modified at all, and between the two, external modification and internal, non-modification, but pure being, there is a state between pure being and form, external form, which we call the dreaming or fantasy state, and it's in this dreaming zone that we can learn to control ourselves. And it's precisely this zone that modern psychology is trying to analyse.

If we go into the external world all we can find is a material situation hammering on the outside of our body. If we chase a person through into deep sleep, in deep hypnosis, we find our simple being and if we don't give them a stimulus to examine a formal content, called the dream content, then we cannot solve a problem, because every problem, remember our probe, probe-lem, is something you can stick, a stick into, and sort it out. Therefore a problem is necessarily form. So in the very centre of your being, where you are simply being, without formal modification, there are no problems. This is why we say that if you go internally to your real centre, you will be beyond all problems; you will transcend all problems by simply not identifying with the process of formulation.

So, this process represented in the sphere in the second diagram, and this enlarged one can be seen to be the same diagram. We can cut a little piece out there and say this first diagram represents that little bit of the second diagram. Now we can say, immediately on the surface here is a process of apparent differentiation. Remember we've had this before. There is the blade of a saw with its teeth, I put the saw upside down to make it the same diagram as this. There's your handle. This is the zone of serratedness, (that's only the Latin for teeth); the tooth side, where things are apparently separate; each tooth can be counted. The whole thing is a piece of steel. The steel is one, so we say the substance is a unity. The back of the saw is plain, which is the same as non-formed sub-consciousness. The top of the saw is toothed, and we say that the teeth are discrete. Discrete means ‘grown apart’. Really we know that the saw is one piece of steel, so the unity is not destroyed by casting a steel blade with teeth on one side and nevertheless, on the serrated side we can begin to count and we call the side we can count the Cain side, and the plain side, we call the Abel side. And this is very, very important because when Cain murders Abel, it means that the external stimulus situation is destroying your fundamental unity. Apparently. It cannot really destroy it. What it can do, the external stimulus can be so strong for you before you are trained, that it can cause you to slip from your centre to the perimeter and identify, (the dent in identity means tooth, doesn't it?) So, identify means, ‘do it as if I had teeth’, so the whole of your external self, agitated by stimulation, is apparently plural. (16:24)

So we'll say this is the realm of plurality up here, where the waves are or the saw teeth are. And down here is the realm of monism, the one substance. And in between here, in the middle zone, we have a duality, which is not quite a plurality, but there's a certain amount of motion up there and less here and the fact that there is more above and less below implies a limiting factor both ways. That is, downwards we'll go to less and less difference, towards pure unity, and upwards we will go towards more and more plurality, until we reach the term of possible differentiation, because the water, remember the diagram we did, the wave climbing up and going so high that it fell over, trapped air underneath it, and then exploded itself and became a spray; that's the term. The wave can only climb so high and then it breaks. Remember we said this break in the mind stuff is what we call the schizophrenic stage, where the mind apparently breaks and we said that the trapping of air symbolises this devilish or dividing tendency, and that air therefore signifies the devil; “the Prince of the powers of the air’ is his title. To curl over with your substance, trap the air and the falling, the gravitational fall of your substance onto it’s centre, causes the air to blow your unity to bits on the surface, the end result of which is apparently completely separated ideas.

Now the whole of the integration process that is to take place can only be a regathering of discrete or exploded ideas by the pull onto the centre. So there's a continuous movement going in to the centre, the movement to fall asleep when repair work is done, and there's a stimulus situation from outside trying to draw you back into the external identification when you are split. So no matter what school of psychology we are concerned with and no matter how we term it, the bottom part is called by some schools ‘sub-conscious’ and by others ‘unconscious’ when they assume that the prefix UN means **not.** Well, it does mean not in one sense, it means ‘not formed’, ‘not made discrete, not rippling’. We have therefore the three stages in one substance logically seen in the form of a simple sphere, which without any stimulation whatever, would be like an ordinary globule of water in suspense. We can actually suspend today, electrically, a drop of water within a field, and we can isolate it in such a way that no forces from outside of any magnitude get to it so that it presents a continuous surface and we say that it is homogeneous and its homogeneity is such that if it is assumed to be conscious, its consciousness will be pure being with no form, no ideation, no thinking. But if we then proceed to batter this thing with stimuli from outside, ripples appear, and the surface is more agitated than the internals, and at the centre all stimulation cancels out, producing the centre of nescience, of no-science, of able-ness. Remember, your ability comes from your centre, whereas your canniness depends on external stimulation.

Now let's take a baby now as an egg, a simple egg, and imagine for a moment that it does not get stimulated from outside. It would then be a simple homogeneous substance with no ideas, just a simple being consciousness. But imagine the next state is a stimulus comes from the mother, through the blood, into the centre of that being and then spreads out inside. The surface of the baby is stimulated, the stimulus is least at the centre, theoretically nil, and the baby is beginning to become formed and the totality of those forms, later on in its stage of maturity, we will call its ‘developed character’. Character only means ‘one is burned in by action, charred in the act’. So, the character coming from outside. We know this because if we get a baby and let it be brought up by animals, of which we have examples relatively recently, we know that their behaviour pattern follows that of the animals which brought them up. So we say that the character comes from outside and the being itself is purest at its centre.

Now if we think about the word ‘worry’, we can change the O for an A if we like, and call it ‘warry,’ which is the way some people pronounce it. When we use the O, the O, the roundness, instead of the A, we are referring to an intellectual process within the circumscribed limits of the being. So if we are concerned with the ripples on the surface, those ripples, if they become excessive, (I’ve drawn here on this first diagram some tiny ripples on top of the larger ones, and on top of the smaller ones, smaller still.) When the ripples begin to reach their limit, so that if they were to become any smaller, they would actually break the substance into bits, that process is what we call worry, with an O. The O refers to this circumscription, the whole cycle of the being breaking on its perimeter. So we say that the worry process belongs really on the outside of the being.

Now, (we will have to do another diagram I think.) We often hear people talk about being deeply worried. Now we've said that the centre is not worried at all, because the stimulus cannot reach the centre, there’s a series of insulations. If we like to think about that as the human being cut through the middle, and imagine that to be the centre of the spinal cord, there with an insulating substance around it, and then another zone with an insulator round it and then all this zone here is relatively perturbed by external stimulation. Now superficial worries are the ones that have their object recognisably in the external world now. We call that the extant stimulus. We've done this before. We said there were two kinds of stimuli, extant and nemic. But sometimes the stimulus from the past is pushed back, we call this repression, by a new stimulus coming in, which is strong enough to force identification on the perimeter of your being and an earlier stimulus has become relatively quieter and is physically pushed down from the surface. So that if you are identified with the surface of your being fully, you will automatically become unaware of stimuli still activating your substance more internally, but it is still turbulence. We call this turbulence down here which has been pushed below the threshold of immediate waking consciousness, pushed down towards the centre, but not to the centre, pushed down to the beginning of that middle zone, we call that ‘deep worry.’ And it's because it's pushed down into that zone, which we said before was the dreaming or fantasy zone; it is because it's pushed down that far, that the psychoanalyst is concerned to find out what your dreams are about, because the immediate stimulus coming to you, forces identification, a great pleasure or a great pain, brings consciousness to the outside, and makes it relatively so intense that you cannot see previous stimuli which are still problematic. So in order to become aware of the deep problem, the so-called ‘depth psychology’ problem, you have to go down to that level of your being which is necessarily, relative to your waking state, more hazy-mazy, and you will find that it is equivalent to daydreaming. In fact, daydreaming is simply the state of your awareness so far below the surface and then you have your night dreaming there. Day dreaming is the surface of night dreaming and the depths of night dreaming go right near to the centre of the subconscious and down there you have those dreams which you are aware that you have dreamed but cannot remember. (26:47)

Here you can daydream, that is superficially dream, and in the realm of the dream is the solution of the problem. But remember, every problem is something that's been pushed down by a stimulus coming from outside. Suppose a little boy is stealing jam. He's stealing jam consciously, there's the jam right on the surface. While he is enjoying the jam, putting his nose in it and licking the sides, like a bad boy, he is externally conscious. While he is doing that, a stimulus comes from outside. The mother, having seen him eat the jam, sends a message to his eardrum, “Willie stop licking the jam pot.” There arises in him a memory of punishments from previous misdemeanors and he promptly pushes down, though not by his own power, by the power of the threat stimulus from the mother, he pushes down his purpose of eating jam and responds spontaneously, “I am not eating the jam, I was looking in it to see if my tadpoles were there.” This is the kind of thing that goes on in the child’s mind. There's an automatic suppression of the crime and the emergence from below of the excuse mechanism which immediately mechanically explains the crime is no crime. It's a very simple diagram, but if we understand it properly and then learn how to do this kind of activity on ourselves, in other words learn initially conscious daydreaming and then carry it deeper and deeper, we will come down to the centre where there is nothing whatever problematic, the pure being.

If we get to the centre, the mystics will say, we will find all and nothing. We will find all because we will find the substratum of the whole sphere of our being, we'll find nothing in the sense we'll find no form whatever, so when we get there we won't see something marvellous, because there is nothing; all we'll find is ourselves as a pure being and when we get there, after we've stayed down there for a bit we will discover that we could stay there eternally but it isn't worth it, because nothing happens down there, so we start willing out again through the dream, through the fantasy, the daydream into the waking state and then we start doing something again. (29:22)

So this relatively simple diagram can be used to analyse and explain any system of psychology propounded whether in the West or the East and it is derived from the essential structure of a human being.

Now, if you like, an apple, if you take an apple, we have a skin and then a pulp and a seed inside. Inside the seed there's another apple, but it isn't doing anything at the moment, it's just being. This state of seed, or pure potentiality, is the state, which when we find it, all we will feel is that we are; there is no problem. When that seed taken out of the apple is put into the ground, it will start shooting and grow a tree and make another apple. In the same way, when you go to the centre of your being, you're finding your pure potential, and if you consciously evolve, turn out of it, evolve means ‘turning out of it’, you will pass through the whole realm of your dream or fantasy capacity and you will gradually turn yourself out and in so doing you will experience the whole of your previous mnemic content, that is your previous activities of all kinds. This is a question of remembering reincarnations or any other way you care to express it; the sum totality of ancestral experience is inside every human being born. The protoplasm of which you are made is continuous with that of your ancestors and has in it the total experience of the race. But, the nearer you go to the centre, the nearer you are to the original Adam. The nearer you go to your external, the nearer you are to your treasured modern individuality. (31:13)

Now, in the word ‘worry’, which is like making war, and this final pair of letters, we have a process there of differentiation and a process there of integration. Here we have a being fully circumscribed, differentiating, and here the differentiation has gone to the limit. The word ‘worry’ means to make war until the thing is reduced to bits. Total war. And it can only occur on your perimeter. Hence the command to the worrying person, if he can respond to it, ‘Be still and know that I am God’. Remember that the differences between people, there's another person, a bit younger and smaller, the difference between those two is not in the centre, because at the centre they are identical, namely they are substance, which is fundamentally spirit, so if you go right into your centre and I go into my centre we will not speak and therefore we say the final answer is silence and what we will find there, if we come out again and describe it, we can only describe it in terms of our experience external. So, unless the experiences are identical, the descriptions will not be identical. If the experiences **are** identical, the central experiences being identical, you will use the same words to describe them. So, all the differences between individuals are superficial and the identity of beings is essential.

We call a thing an accident if you can conceive it not to be and we call a thing essential if you **cannot** conceive it not to be. Now you can easily conceive these waves not to be; they can change their form, calm down and become less and less wave-like, and theoretically, in the absence of external stimulus, they can become quite smooth and unperturbed on the outside. This process then, of the outside we call ‘accidental’ because we can conceive it to be other than it is. But the centre, which is still, we cannot conceive to be other than it is, by the very definition of this being.

So, the question of assimilation of various systems of philosophy, of psychology or of science, (this is a very scientific diagram,) is simply this. We have stimulus externally, and the stimulus gives rise to formal reactions. If we carry ourselves right to the perimeter, all we will know is the perturbation of our own substance, which we call the object of consciousness. This is the realm, when analysed in terms of external stimulus and reaction, of science. If we analyse it in terms of pi-ratio, the necessary function, we call it philosophy and if we don't analyse it, but simply **feel** it, and say it's a good thing to be one, that's religion.

So there are three ways of looking at this diagram; the scientific way, when we count the number of teeth, this is why we say that science is essentially fundamentally mathematical. If we count the number of teeth and say how many there are, and say there's a ratio between the number of teeth, the depth of the trough of the wave and the force of the stimulus that hit it. That is science and we call that ‘a posteriori’ thinking ‘after the fact’. The outside is called the posterior, because everything generates from the centre; so that is prior to that.

As we are going to consider the whole circle in terms of the fact that the radius will cut it into six spontaneously and produce a six-fold being, whence the word ‘six’ appears in ‘existere’, existence; that we call ‘a priori’ reasoning. We don't need external experience to do it; we do it from our own being. We could do it with this quite plain being. We can break the plain being with our compasses into our six-fold form and consider the ratio of the parts, the internal angles, to how much they add up in the full rotation, that is ‘a priori’, or reasoning **before** external experience. Those are the two modes. But the feeling of the whole process, which makes possible those two modes of analysis, the scientific and the philosophic, the feeling of it is our religious consciousness, because religious is ‘religere’, to bind back into the unity. So the motion towards the centre, like this, we call ‘religere’. That is the religious motivation, always binding it back and if there are many such beings, there is always a hierarchical relationship between beings. This being is bigger, more full of form, and therefore its centre is so great that it begins to drag this one into it, and they form then a system themselves, a society. (36:37)

So, the worry process, the O represents the perimeter of this being, the fact that the R occurs twice implies breaking, like it does in the word ‘terrific’. Or, ‘terra’ itself means ‘to break’; Earth, terra, is that which is broken off from other substance like it, so that we say that all the planets in a sense are terrifications; they are terrible, as they are turned, turned to the point of breaking off. If you get a flywheel and rotate it very, very quickly, it will disintegrate; that's terrible. That means if it breaks into bits, each bit is a little earth, a little terrification and it all depends on the turn. So if we take the turn, (it’s very interesting to observe the way that vowel changes there.) If we take the turn of a sphere, I'll draw it in perspective, there's the equator, there's the pole, it keeps its sphericality, providing it doesn't go too fast. When it starts going very fast, the polar axis decreases, the equator begins to spread, until we get a very, very short polar axis, and a very wide, flat disk. That disk is the ‘Chakra’ of the Yogi’s. Chakra means disc or wheel and when they rotated very very fast, it reduces it practically to a disc and we then change the form of the vowel and call it ‘ter’; it is beginning to tear itself to bits and it is this process that we call ‘terrification’, or, spinning out until it starts throwing bits off its edge. So if we say that is the sun flinging out energy, it will throw off itself to planets as little bits and that is terrification.

The whole process arises first from the generation of the sphere, which we said was made solo, the world's soul, and outside it free spirit and then the gradual increase of the velocity of that soul to the point where the centrifugal force flings off it portions of itself, which become planets which continue to rotate around the parent. This is why we said that the centre is really the origin, because all plurality is created by condensation first, then rotation, the centrifugal effect to throw off little bits which we call ‘earths’. In the case of human procreation, these little things thrown off are children, but it's an identical process, fundamentally. The generation of sperms in a male and the ova in a female throwing off from the centre of certain energies taken in from their ancestors and from below from food, and the two meet and mix and this is the great ‘spin-dryer’ if you like and it throws it out in the form of sperms and ova which then meet, coagulate and produce new beings which continue rotating round the parents up to such time that they become large enough to move away to a distance where their own speeds become great enough to throw off some little attendants which then become moons or grandchildren if you like. But the process is identical. So that really there aren't two processes in the world, one a spiritual process and the other a purely mechanical process. There is only **one** process and we change the name of the process where we change the function as considered by us.

So if we consider the function of a major wave like this, and then the function of another sub-wave on that, and then the function of a tiny wave on that, we will change the name. Actually the smallest wave of all, if you like, is created first. If you remember we do the surface of the sea, and when the wind first blows on it, it makes very tiny little ripples. And after it's been blowing for a certain length of time, and certain force, it piles the water up a bit higher. The little ripples are still on it, and it piles it up higher still. There's the third order, which has got two other waves on it; that's like a carrier wave in radio, and here's the Northern Philharmonic or something, tiddling along, on it. We said there are three orders before the super build-up that collapses, trapping something under itself and blows itself to bits. So there are three safe modifications and the fourth one, or ‘unsafe’. Now is that fairly clear, Jack? (41:54)

*Yes. I take it that that is the diagram of the mind similar to…..*

Yes. You could say, it is correct to say, that no existence, whatever, can be static. To exist is existere, out of six, which means a wheel. Every being is already a rotating system. So that a static analysis of anything whatever, is quite false. A thing is always either coming to be or ceasing to be. If we take the concept... If we take the concept of **maturity**, we had a point of honour and a point of integration a couple of weeks ago, didn't we? Let's look at the word ‘maturity’. There's Victor Maturity, and we cut it there, and we see primary appetite, Ma, you know who Ma is, don't you? She's the lady that looks after your dinner. You've got one inside you, the one that's always hungry. And we put a little W to remind ourselves that's ‘maw’. If you go like that with it, and write this way as well, it's still maw. Now, this other one is the Tora, or Rota, so the Maw, the Maw, Rota, is maturity. When your primary appetite spins round itself continuously, instead of trying to spin round something else, then it is mature; it has decided it will spin round itself like this and that's what we call maturity. That's the same thing as the man of integrity, the honourable man, the man we can ‘tor ust’, (trust) because he's got a law in him.

If there is a being, we'll say this younger being here, and when he tries to go inside himself, the forces of stimulation from outside are so great that they bring him out and make him suck lollies instead, so much so that he can't even spare the time to go and work to get the money to get the lollies. He just says, “lolly please,” and this integrated being, recognising the process, says he's at the stage when **I** give him the lollies. So his consciousness is almost whipping out to the source of lolly supply. So we say he is immature, because his centre is outside himself. So the movement towards integration, the movement towards maturity, is no more than the movement towards self-centring. (44:40)

Now we have another use of the word ‘self-centred’, the negative use of it, when it's quite false to use it really. What we call a self-centred person of the extrovert order, is a person who is pitched, not on his centre, but on his perimeter, so that every stimulus that comes to him makes him react and he cannot **con**sider, that is **sit** with the whole constellation of forces inside himself but he must react immediately and go for what he wants. We say he is a very selfish, self-centred person. But he’s not self-centred, he’s self-perimetred. The centre that he's got is a little stimulus there. Where it impinges on his perimeter, the stimulus creates a little centre at the point of impact, and there's a ripple goes from it through the substance, and that is the centre. So when we say self-centred of such a person, he's not truly self-centred, he's only negatively so and his centre is a minute portion of himself on his perimeter. A truly self-centred person is the person that does not have to respond to an external stimulus and can whip into his own being and every time a stimulus comes he can carry the energy of the stimulus right in through the internal daydreaming into the deep dreaming and use it as an internal analysing energy and not let any of it out. This not letting it out we call ‘continence’, containingness. And the whole process, when completed, is the creation of the mature person. (46.19)

*Is the dream state necessary problematic in the sense that we can see no answer in it?* It is problematic if you can probe it. ‘Probe’ means stick something into it. You need a certain amount of energy. Let's take a simple idea. What's the simplest idea we've got? Well, a point is simple, isn't it? I'll make one. There it is. What is it? It's simple, isn't it? Can you define it? You cannot define it by saying ‘point’. That's merely to repeat it, isn't it? So, we cannot define unless we state the application of a term. We don't define the thing that's adequately defined already; we define the application of the term ‘point’. There's the word ‘point’. The root ‘po’ is power, and ‘in t’, that T is a cross. Power into the cross, we'll say x marks the spot to locate it. So a definition of a point is simply power going in to fix itself. And the point of fixation is the meaning of that point. We've had to go a long way round to define a simple fact. A fact is always simple, until you try to define it. The fact that you can define it means that you can start hitting at it. There's this pencil, I poke at the point, and I produce out of it what it is, power gone into a fixed situation; I have analysed it and it implies that round it there is a field. Now if the point is said to be ‘posited’, that's the same as PO, PO sit, that's the same as the verb ‘to sit’ in English, power sitting down, there it is, it follows automatically that because the positing of a point is the creating of a finite, that every positive is a negative, because finite is negative. So positive is negative, because what we posit is always a limitation. This is part of the resolution of contradictions that you mentioned before. If we can understand that to posit means to negate, because to create means to limit, then we can see that in order to define a point, we must define a zone, and then imagine that zone to be full of power, and then cause the power to contract, thus exhausting the surrounding, and the result is that the power has contracted, and the zone that it previously occupied is now empty, and we call that space the exhausted zone. And the point of positing, there we call ‘place’, that's the pi-law again, because every positing is really a rotation. When the forces try to posit, they always spin in and we see why if we apply two forces onto each other like that. We cannot stabilise those forces without using another force. If there is a force going like that, and that is a force, the moment they hit each other, they will start shaking and in the shaking process, if the opposition is to be maintained, the direction of this one will change a little like that; that is not a true opposition. This one must then rotate to remain opposite to it, this one, having started a direction like that, its inertia is to carry on doing that. To maintain opposition this one must always go round and so we say that rotation derives from forces in opposition. (50: 23)

So when Isaac Newton, reading the works of Jacob Boehme, the German mystic, saw this concept, he gave a mathematical expression to the simple fact that if you try to put your fingers together and press very hard, you'll have a job to keep them in line. They'll start dithering and you'll need an awful lot of control if you put a lot of force, to stop them spinning around each other. You can do that by trying to pick up a penny with two needles. You get two needles and put them on the edge of a penny, to balance it, you find it tends to spin, doesn't it? In fact if you have to hold it very carefully, it will begin to spin and if you don't drop it, you can make it spin very quickly by blowing on it as well. But in any case it tends to spin on its own, because unless you get the forces in exact equal and opposite application in perfect equilibrium, which is practically impossible, it will rotate.

So as the substance of the universe, prior to rotation, is not in equilibrium, it tends to rotate, because there's nothing there to stabilise it and stop it rotating. This is why we say that the universe ‘becomes’ out of the inherences of substance. A universe is one turn. The turn arises because prior to the turn there's no element of stability in it; it is power and the moment it tries to press onto a centre, not yet having set up its points of reference, which derive **from** the circle, it must spontaneously produce a disequilibrium, which causes a rotation. That rotation is the positing of a point, and therefore every point is a tiny rota. (52:17)

Now, you remember that we said that when a force tries to go into the centre, it cannot go into the dead centre because if it did it would stop everything. So if we start spiralling round like this, going closer and closer, if we actually found the dead centre, then the force there would stop and if it did, then every other force behind it would also have to stop. So the universe does **not** go to the dead centre; the forces spin in, they approximate to the centre and then they come out again, always leaving at the centre a zone there, where there is no motion going in. So we have the start, the perimeter of the being, on the edge, the beginning to spiral in, up to the term, where if it's got to keep moving, it must not go in further, or else it will stop, it goes in and then it starts spinning out again and this is the way the soul is created.

Now an external situation of stimulus from another soul, hitting that one produces the ripples, and you've got a centre there that **cannot** be disturbed, because the motion of the substance doesn't go into it. That is your eternal undisturbed ‘peace that passes understanding’. In fact it isn't a sentimental statement to say, “The peace that passes understanding,” because the understanding is standing underneath your perceptual world. Understanding means ‘underneath your percepts’. When Solomon says, “With all your getting, get understanding,” he means don't stand on your skin's surface looking at the lollies, study chemistry of lollies and become a manufacturer, and when he says, “Get wisdom my son,” he is referring to the whole dome. “Get wis-dome. Get understanding,” he says. Get wisdom. Two different words, one means the whole being, ……as a sphere, the other one means, that which is underneath your immediate superficial perturbation. And at your centre you are eternally undisturbed. If you manage to get into the centre, which you can do by a process of non-identification initially with the external, until you gradually pass through the fantasy or dream state, and you discover a zone there where form ceases.

Now in the centre of your being where form ceases, the rotation band itself stops. So if you want to get inside there, you will have to not desire form and if you abandon desire for form, which is the same as abandoning private purpose, because private means ‘pira vat’, which means ‘reason-going’ or discursive processes within here, if you abandon that, you then go into the Garden of Eden. (55.17)

Eden means ‘no judgment’. ‘Den’ or ‘don’ means judge, whence Oxford dons and the tribes of Dan, the judgment tribe. Eden itself is the central zone in a being in which there is no form and therefore no judgement, and that is the state in which Adam was created before the tora, which is the snake with his tail in his mouth, bit him on the perimeter, and caused the consciousness to be thrown out from the still centre into the perimeter, which is the expulsion from Eden. So inside every one of us there is a centre of Edenic bliss. To get at it, we must first of all train ourselves not to respond to an external stimulus and we then become aware of internal fantasy or previous stimulation that has been buried, mnemically, but is still determinant.

*That means it can still drive us back onto that perimeter?* (56:24)

Yes, yes. Because actually what you do, if you try to withdraw from the external stimulus, you will go down and say, well that is a red hat outside there, I'm going to withdraw from the red hat. You go down, and because you started with a red hat and withdrew from that, you have two things in your mind, red and hat. Red has association, so you find yourself in a Spanish bullring very quickly, in the fantasy realm, and the hat, who knows? Maybe it's Aunty Mabel's. Suddenly you find you're being chased by a bull that looks like a cow that looks like Mabel. That's in the fantasy realm. That's an association that might whip you up into buying a ticket for Spain. This is the way that mind actually works; It's the basis of advertising and political propaganda.

*I was going to ask you where you would place the primitives and the savage and the childish urges on the radius you have there?*

Well, let's do a diagram of that. Again, the same one, slightly modified. There's our still centre; that is **not** primitive. Primitive means ‘rationally thrown out’. So the primitive is here, just on that edge, it is not inside. That is primitive, the perimeter first, pre-mitive, that which is **first** thrown out and the rotation starts flinging, centrifugally, the substance there to its skin surface. So there is your primitive centre, and as that is not forming at all, the nearest thing we can think of as representing it, is pure feeling consciousness with no urge. But right on the edge there is your primitive urge, and already you can tell by the ‘pri’ in it that it is beginning to form. So we can say there's a certain amount of motion there, but there's none inside there. That's the limiting factor of motion. That's the same as the fiery sword round the Garden of Eden in Genesis.

‘Genesis’ itself means the earth flinging itself out, and in the process negating its wholeness. So there is the primitive, and a person with the consciousness there is in contact with his primitive urges. They are actually the force beginning to swing out, like that, but not yet formulated in this highly serrated discrete manner that we get on the edge. So we can say that the edge of that is the ideational form. The a posteriori intellect, although really the European word ‘intellect’ is quite false. We can call it ideation or mentation; it's the mechanical response to stimuli from outside. That is not primitive. In general, it is what we call ‘civilised’, because this external situation imposes upon us, and because we are born inside a city, a ‘civa’ or city, we are said to be ‘civilised’ or ‘city-lised’ by the external stimulus. Our centre, which is not educated at all, and is not informed or edificated, it is not edified, it is not anything at all in the true centre, but right here is the primitive. As we come a little farther, the urge begins to formulate itself as fantasy. As we come a little farther still, the fantasy begins to take some sort of order, which we would call a work of art. As it begins to move even farther towards the perimeter, the art becomes more articulated, until right on the edge, it becomes empirical science. (1:00:21)

*Would it be true to say in the primitive state it was self-conscious in the way of self-reflexive?*

Not reflexive, no; this is reflection.

You could just...

You see, that's reflection. From the primitive it must go right out to the external of ideation and come back, retaining the ideation and re-find its primitive centre. That's what we call the deep integration of the personality. We take every external stimulus, discover how it can arise in a sphere, relate it to primary drive, which is primitiveness, and keep doing this process all the time. If we go into a particular situation, say, what is the universal law governing this? You know that Yiddisher cookery book, you know it, right? Well, there's a little thing in there about the ‘mitzvah’, or good deed, done by boy scouts, and by ladies who are not sure of getting into heaven.

*Mitzvah manners.*

Yes. When they're not sure of getting into heaven, they do a good deed. So this is heaven, and when their primitive urge carries them out, it carries them into trouble and outside here there are some other beings, very big, we call priests if you like, and they stimulate the exterior of the non-educated and draw them out and inform them that there is a thing called the law, the Torah, and they say that in order to get back into that lovely state of bliss, first you must do a good deed on the perimeter, which is the mitzvah. So in order to get back there, they do a good deed and therefore the cynical remark that if they are doing good deeds, it's only because they think they're not going to heaven. Which means they're not good Jews, because a good Jew knows he is already in heaven.

*So, can I just continue on that a second? If he is to become universally conscious, then first he must fall out of heaven, out of the Edenic state, and move out to that perimeter. That is, he must become self-reflexive first.*

No, self-reflexion is the end.

*Self-reflexion here then is...*

Bending back, reflex is bending back. *This then is universal, being universally conscious as well, to be self-reflexive.*

Well, until you've been driven to the perimeter, and got all your scientific data right, say, until you can understand the lowest kind of psychology there is, namely mechanistic behaviourism, until you can understand that, you can't begin to pull yourself back.

*I say this because I'm trying to work out a man at the moment who's got three distinct terms, which he calls ‘conscious’, which I think he's equating with primitive; ‘self-conscious’, and then he's got a lovely word which he's calling ‘cosmic conscious’*. Yes, well, you mean Buckes …don’t you?

That's it, yes.

What he’s doing is this. The whole of that being, including the inside and all zones whatever, from the perimeter to the centre, the whole of it considered simultaneously is called Cosmic Consciousness.

*It's a valid analysis, then*. It's an application of terms. *That's right, yes*. But it must include the whole, you see; the external waking consciousness is there, there is a subconscious as well, or an unconscious, and there is a cosmic consciousness, and the cosmic must include everything that happens and also **being** which doesn't happen. All happening is in this zone of action here. This is the happening department, if you like, there's your word, Ha, which means spiritual activity, Pen. I put an extra P in there for phonetic reasons. If you put Pen, or Close, Spirit, that's ‘happening’. So here it is, here's the whole zone of happening. This is no sense touched, because that white paper has not been written on and the white paper underneath there is still there, and outside there is still. So the primary non-duality of the white paper is in no sense disturbed by my scribbling on it. (1:05:02)

So to consider cosmic consciousness, we must consider the cosmos itself, which obviously is not the highest concept there is, because it's only cosmic consciousness and there is another mode of awareness, which goes right beyond that limit. Cosmic consciousness only goes up to there, and beyond that is the Spirit which we said was the Godhead, which is transcending absolutely all concepts. The cosmos is a concept, and spirit beyond it is beyond conceptualisation because concept means ‘with the cuts’. You can put a K in there if you like, it's the same thing, kept together, which is a formal notion and in the process of formulation we have excluded the unformed beyond it and therefore there is something higher than cosmic consciousness. But as Bucke uses it, it means the whole content of the sphere of being and this part of it is the waking, and then underneath here is the subconscious becoming deeper and deeper, right down there. But this diagram is not applied by him, if it were, then he would see we'd have to account for this, and this, and the middle zone.

*It's a bit naive actually, isn't it?* Well, it is, it's European, and American as well, and therefore it tends towards a mechanical, scientific explanation and therefore superficial. Because all explanations, which are concerned with formal statements, belong on the perimeter, don't they?

*Mmm.*

And the only reason we speak, if we're learning integration, is to drive ourselves **in** towards the Edenic being. Driving ourselves in can only be by grouping these waveforms. If we can see that the essential character of a wave there, is the same as the essential character of a wave there, we can say, well whatever it is on the outside is fundamentally under one law, and therefore we can group the whole thing together as ‘perturbation’. If we say per, that's a pira form again, and turba is the great turn again. So per tur bation means ‘through rotation’. And that rotation is the product of the two forces pressing in and pressing out. So we call this the Turba or action zone and this is the zone of problems and particularly in the 20th century in the West, and at its extreme in America because that's the extreme West, we have a great stress on the mechanical analysis, mechanistic behaviourism of Watson in New York, like the Pavlov reflex of the Russians, carried to its exact term, where psychic content is denied absolutely. You have the pure identification with the serrated or discrete particular analysis, which ignores the unity of the substance underneath and considers only the form of the wave and the stimulus hitting it. It is essentially superficial. In that sense, all science is superficial. Philosophy is going deeper, it's round this zone here. But religion runs through the whole process, but has its origin in the centre, in the being. (1:08:50)

Now, funnily enough, if we take the three-part man, the middle part, the feeling part, corresponds with this, and that is our middle part, the inside, unformed and the lowest part is this zone, round here, we call primitive, which is flinging itself out. And that is down there, where the energy from food, broken down, digested, is flung out from its centres into the blood and is carried into the body and dispersed all over the body from that centre. That's pri-mitive. And it is then flung right up to the turn, which is the same, we'll put that for hair, those are the ripples on his worrying hair, worrying hair, you see. So this extension is really a mechanical extension of the logical implications of the three-foldness of a sphere, from the fact that the rotation cannot go into the dead centre.

*I'm interested in this process that goes on, you see. Suppose somebody does you a little injustice, not a serious one that you feel* ………*.Now, it will come into your mind, a little niggle there and, so you'll say, oh well, it's not……... It will come back on, and start again. You don't process……... You try to…….., but it'll come in. I'm interested in that process ……..and why that keeps increasing, and why you can't get shut of it, and how you do get shut of it?*

First of all, you don't get shut of it.

You must get open of it. Getting shut of it is the same thing as trying to repress it, isn't it? Well, it's the usual everyday expression, “let's get shut of it.” It means, “don't let's examine it, it annoys us.” When a stimulus comes to you, which you call an injustice, the concept of justice is a concept of a pair of scales, isn't it? With our central point of suspension. Now that stimulus arrives from one of the arms of the pans of the scale, and you are in the other. There is you, you see. So the whole of your being is balanced then against this stimulus, isn't it? Rotating, if you like, on the edge of your being. What you call an injustice is no more than the introduction of a disequilibrium from outside. Isn't it? (1:11:48)

So, supposing a stimulus comes of a certain order, and we'll call it the stimulus of the order X. And it happens on previous occasions, when that has been presented, you have been punished and the thing you have been doing has been defined as ‘wrong’. You do a certain act, it is defined as wrong, and you are punished. The experience of the pain is then associated with the time sequence, a serial relation where you do something and then you are punished, and doing that thing and being punished is set up as a mnemic situation. Your substance retains the memory of doing something and being punished. Now, another fellow comes along and he says to you, he **ac**cuses, which literally means he hits you, it just means to strike at, accuse, he strikes at your perimeter and the form of the thing he says, “I know you, you're the kind of fellow that smokes in lavatories when you're only five,” you see, and that goes diving down in the substance and impinges on this memory and because the memory has been got shut of it’s finited, isolated, and the stimulus goes inside and hits inside and begins to reverberate inside that concept, the definition. It then produces a zone of discomfort.

Now, if you don't understand that you should never have tried to get shut of it, and that you are guilty of everything. Not only the things you've done, but the things you haven't done, which you **can** do in the future, given the opportunity; you are guilty of those as well. If you then accept your absolute guilt, saying, “Undoubtedly, if it weren't for education, my **pri-**mitive instincts, which fling me out, would make me do everything there is to be done, if I can get away with it,” because that's true. So we assert of ourselves that we are very naughty boys, really, and the only opportunity is lacking for us to prove it. So if somebody says a rude thing about us and accuses us, then it goes in, and instead of having been shut off, we accept that we are criminals by our pri-mitive energies, which is only experience-seeking energies, so the definition of the stimulus, instead of being confined, goes through the whole being, and going through the whole being, it is absorbed in the substance and does not produce a discomfort, because ‘dis’ means duality. So discomfort means there are two zones, the one that's soft and the other one. So you cannot be discomforted by a stimulus unless you have already got shut of something; if you face it. (1:15:04)

So the question of injustice, properly understood, is transcended, because nothing that can be said to you is unjust, because either it's something you've done or something you haven't done that you would do if you could. And if you don't, it's only because you're aware there’s a policeman, if not a Liverpudlian policeman, a cosmic one. Because if you remove the concept of cosmic control, then we can do anything we like. “Vengeance is mine,” says the Lord, “I will repay.” God is not mocked; well if that's true, we’d better be careful. So what? So we're behaving ourselves because we must. Once we've admitted that, we don't mind if somebody says rude words to us. So, remember you said, “It is a process, how shall we deal with it?” A process is a rational. That ‘pro’ always means rational and the ‘cess’ is what is coming out of it, namely rubbish. You know what a cesspool is, don't you? A process is the same stuff without the poo.

In other words, all formal activity, whatever, if stressed or evaluated, is falsely so done because it is rubbish. It is literally rubbish, you see. You know you can sound shift S to T, don't you? So we can write T there instead of SH. It's a ‘rubbed bit’. There's a little bit on the perimeter, and you rub it against another little bit. That's a problem. You're irritated. The stimulus comes and rubs on the other little bit and then that makes it worse still. As long as you're extroverted in your attention, you will be in trouble. Your bubble will be turbulated, which is called ‘trouble’. So the solution of all such things is not to shut anything off; to learn to accept every accusation as a statement of fundamental guilt. We’ll define guilt so that we don't forget what it is. There's the GU which is the big Gull, not the one that flies over and drops things. The GU is your primary drive and the ILT is a statement of the fact that I have been working on a fixed situation. I have been doing something with my ‘gu’, my undifferentiated urge that comes out has been doing something, has been condemned by a stimulus situation from outside by the priest or the lawyers as taboo. You know we can induce guilt in a dog can’t we? We can train a dog to feel guilt, that is it does a certain natural thing and then we tell it off. The next time it does it, its tail goes between its legs and we say, “It is looking guilty.” Its prime drive has now had association with a stimulus, which we've given it, plus the sound “naughty, naughty, Fido, shouldn’t do that.” That's guilt. We can introduce it into the animal as we can into the human being and it is not essentially different in either. (1:18:34)

So the question of dealing with such processes of disequilibria introduced, of so-called injustices, is to understand that there aren't any, and if you analyse very, very deeply, you'll think how often you got away with it. That you've done things for which you should, if there were justice in the world, have been immediately tapped and you got away with it, apparently. But we’ve said before that karma, which means action, and its effect, is made of ‘kama’, we'll take the letter ‘r’ out, Kama is the Indian eros, desire, and ‘r’ is the tendency for it to break itself in bits. So Karma means the automatic tendency of a desire to lead you into a situation which will break you in bits, make you face the nature of what you've been doing. So the whole process is concerned, this kama is equivalent to the gullital urge, the whole process is concerned with becoming clearer about what we are doing.

The letter R, differentiation, is the same as ideation and means the ability to become clear about the effects of releasing our desires. This karma incidentally, if we spell it this way, is the origin of our English word ‘make’; the appetite closed, marka, which they say karma, all language being originally monosyllabic and you put them together in different orders for different purposes. Is that fairly clear now? (1:20:28)

*What is the value of worry?* The value of worry? It helps you to differentiate what would otherwise be a formless mass of undefined urge. It **has** a value because it is a movement towards the term of experience and until you have been disintegrated partially, you will have no compassion whatever for another being who has been disintegrated. You must experience these things in order to feel for other people in those conditions. If we say the totally undifferentiated soul presented with a highly differentiated soul like this would not know what to do with it. How could it relate to it?. It couldn't possibly solve what that thing was agitated about. So the best thing to do is to bring that one in contact with that. This one then does this and causes a highly complex ripple system in this one, with which it cannot deal. It then defines it as worry. Now it may not be worry to that fellow if he's learned complete self-reflexion like this, is no worry to him, it's just formal content. So we say, well we often hear it, that a man that knows his subject very, very well, explains it to somebody who knows it not at all, and then the negative partner says, “Don't tell me that, you're worrying me.” He means that you're formally perturbing me at a level to which I'm not accustomed.

We must ultimately come to the point where the most complex form in the universe rubbing against us cannot perturb us; only then are we secure and only then are we as rich as we should be in idea, in formal content, and in variety of willed possibilities.

*An integrated person should never be in a perturbed state then?*

In a perturbed state? He accepts perturbation as a positive contribution to universal knowledge. Perturbation is an essential part of the whole man. The whole man must learn to understand everything whatever, mustn't he? Including deficiencies in other beings and he can never understand a thing unless he goes through it, and therefore he must be subjected necessarily to every conceivable kind of process. (1:22:56)

*Before you came in, we were discussing the engine driver…….now he seems to be going to pieces, doesn’t he at the moment …..He might have been careless, he probably was, but there was no fundamental urge to do anything wrong in his case, was there? Most people feel a little sympathy for him, I think, in his ordeal.*

Now, that sympathy is only an ‘evidence’ that those people remember that they have committed something equivalent as far as they were led into a situation. Take the case of that fellow who dropped the first atom bomb. Since then, he has modified his whole behaviour and has gone into an activity where he's trying to pay back to humanity in good deeds the damage he did in dropping that bomb. Which shows that before he dropped that bomb, he was at a very low level of integration. He had to do that kind of deed in order that **he** could come to the level of understanding his real relationship with other beings. and he was stimulated from outside by other beings, who were so much more complicated, so much higher than he, that they wouldn't have dreamed of dropping that bomb. All they did was tell him to do it, and pin a medal on him for doing it; they were far above having to drop that bomb; they knew what it meant, but they knew that the bomb had to be dropped, and they knew it should be dropped by the right man. So when the right man came, they gave him the job. The right man to drop that bomb was the man who, doing all that damage, would benefit most from it, and through whom later, would come the greatest benefit to beings that otherwise he would not have benefited at all, because he would have remained a non-entity if he hadn't had a terrible job of that order. (1:25:06)

The worst thing, then, is as good as the best, and the best can be as bad as the worst, because best of all is security, peace. But we have that in Eternity. Then what are we doing in time? The answer is we are **ex**pressing, pressing out, our eternal possibilities and becoming aware, in the process of expression, of the precise nature of each thing we do, instead of simply a total impression of being with no form. Remember, in the centre, we are simply being, no formal content. There is no understanding in the centre. Of itself, there is simple being consciousness. We climb a little bit higher and we begin to understand. We go right to the perimeter of all experience, the outside of our being and then we cannot understand anymore; we are reduced to fragments by stimulation. Then we climb back in again and we begin to understand again, only this time in a much different way. We now have inside us the memory of all our external stimulus situations, tribulations, and we are going down towards consciousness in the centre of being, plus a memory of being flung out to the perimeter, and retaining the memory of the perimeter, taking it to the centre, we have then got the whole dome of our experiential possibilities as a unity and that is wisdom.

*During the next ten years, England becomes a police state we’ll say, and I make some indiscrete remark so the Gestapo comes…….Now if I have progressed in this way…… I'm trying to relate something here because there is supposed to be a behaviourist conditioning technique whereby you could be abused …..*

Yes, of course there is. You build a concept inside yourself beforehand, and establish that concept so that every energy coming from outside from a stimulus, is led by a line of least resistance into that concept. That concept then simply rotates within itself the energy of the stimulus and then if they put you on the rack stretching you or doing anything else at all, no matter what it is, the energy always goes into that concept. So if you build a concept of ‘I am the kind of man that keeps my mouth shut under torture’, and you keep engramming that, when they torture you nothing will come out.

…..in the situation. As a matter of fact, since the more external awareness of conditioning technique, a lot of cases have hit the newspapers, but a considerable number of cases have **not** hit the newspapers, of men in certain fields of espionage actually being trained and conditioned in this manner so that they can keep their mouths shut, even if you skin them alive, because it's only a question of self-conditioning. You remember that T.E. Lawrence, before he went off to Arabia on his projects, indulged in some very, very hard physical exercises, in order to condition himself to keep his mouth shut if he got captured; and later it was justified. (pause in recording) He was captured and he was very badly treated in some of the most terrible ways and he didn't give the game away, because it's a simple proposition, if you get your being and you set up a big concept that always goes right through your whole being, cannot go inside there, and you know your being so that every energy coming in is immediately whipped in and continuously rotated. Nothing will come out. (1:29:42)

On the other hand, you can take a baby like Hitler did with German infants, and you can condition that baby by concepts of faith and the state to betray its own parents. That simply means, setting up a particular concept in there. Good little babies always tell the Führer what mummy and daddy are doing. It's as simple as that. If you look at the German educational books for children of five of Hitler's period you actually find the whole thing laid out. A form is put in and a reaction emerges.

*Is it possible to anaesthetise yourself by this process?*

Oh yes, very easy. That's one of the easiest things to acquire. Physical anaesthesia is very, very easy to acquire; much harder than that is anaesthetising your soul so that you cannot be insulted. That's a lot harder. You know, when Shakespeare says, “Good name in man and woman is the immediate jewel of their souls,” he means it. Supposing we say, here is a soul, there is a centre with no form and supposing we say, this process is going round there. That's Jack. Now whatever else you refer to when you go inside, the last thing to which you refer is that name, isn't it? So, if your external skin surface is protected in some measure, this one is protected much more so because you know that if you go inside your organism, the farther you go in, the bigger the artery, the bigger the nerve, and the more danger there is for you. We can afford a cut of half an inch or an inch on, say, the thigh muscle. We cannot afford that kind of thing in the brain or in the spinal cord. So the nearer we go to the centre, the more dangerous the thing is and the more we tend to protect it. And most central to ourselves, our dearest concept, our dearest form is our own name because that name signifies the first expression, the most primitive expression of our pure being. That's why the child, when he's quite small, you say to the child, “What is your name?” He says “Billy,” and you say to him, “It isn't Billy at all; it's Sammy.” He immediately panics. “No,” he says, “I'm Billy” and he will cry if you insist that he isn't, because he doesn't know who he is unless he has a form. The form that has been recited for him, in case he gets lost, his name and address. So he puts name first and then his address round here. And this is an ad-dress. It's something that he gets dressed in, isn't it? There's no form here, then there's the form of a dress and then right on your perimeter there, the reactions to external stimuli. But apart from the centre, this is **all** dress.

So we say, of Christ's words, you see, he says, It's not the body, first of all, that's the raiment. There's external clothes, there's your body, your name, your blood, your blood is thicker than water. That is much harder and one of the simplest ways of solving a lot of external problems is to go directly to your name and ask yourself how many people you know who have got the same name and what you think about them and try and find the points of similarity and the points of difference. That way it breaks down the identification with the particular.

If we say every Tom, Dick and Harry, that’s Dick up there, that's Harry and that's Tom. You know Dick is Richard, isn't it? Richard means the ‘gruelling hard fellow’, this fellow. This is Tommy, this is Harry, the spiritual power boy. So we say, “Every Tom, Dick and Harry,” we mean any fellow who can think, who has power of feeling in him and who has tummy urges. It isn't accidental that that is the trio that we use to signify the plurality of men. (1:35:23)

We can see how important that name thing is because a particular friend of mine spells his name like that. His grandfather didn't, but he was determined to improve, so he changed the spelling. And it happens that that Y is an integration form of the letter I, whereas the I is simply the dot with a centre, there. This Y actually means integration, that he in himself is feeling, So when he called himself Smythe, you know it sounds a bit odious, doesn't it, compared to Smith? He's getting a little bit suave, isn't he, the Smythe man? Changes of name are the same thing as changes of function, so if you find a tendency to react to a certain stimulus, then you should go straight to the root that responded and the root fundamentally is your own name. Next to your individual name, your family name, then the name of the circle in which you were born, the name of the city, the name of the country. So if you wanted to gradually circumscribe a person and you want to insult him, (assuming he's a biped without feathers, as Aristotle called human beings,) you look at him and say, “You human being. ….” “…goodness gracious he means me.” And you look at him again and you say, “You Englishman. You Liverpudlian,” you see? We're actually bringing it down to this complex and then you know the family name, you see, and you utter that and then you say, “You jack of that ilk.” Now that's terrible, isn't it? But it's banging the consciousness in to identify it. (1:37:23)

It feels awful. So when you finally get a piece of paper and tear it up and throw it in the fire, in general the man feels awful and it's a very good technique. And the other way is to help somebody: you start with Jack and then you mention the family and then you say, “Well, Liverpool University. The Queen Mother was made a Doctor of Law yesterday, took a terrific battering during the war, Churchill came up and did some……" You see, probably one of the biggest centres of commerce in the country, in a country that's the heart of a colossal commonwealth and the fellows going... It's a technique; it's a process of identification with bigger and bigger entities. You should learn to do it both ways. It's a very good exercise if you're feeling depressed to remind yourself that you **are** an Englishman, if you are one.

The other day I heard a little yiddisher story about a family who recently had their nationalisation papers, they were refugees, and the father got the paper and looked at it and instead of saying, “Now we are British” he said, “Now we are no longer refugees, no longer foreigners, we are simply bloody Jews.”

Laughter

It's a process, of identification. And Bronowski was knocked on the knuckles by Punch about a fortnight ago, very amusingly. You know Bronowski is always on Brainstrust and he always begins by saying, “We British” and he recently made the statement that the future is in the hands of science, therefore we are all perfectly safe. To which Punch quoted Dr. Bronowski saying, “We've nothing to worry about, the future is in the hands of science.” And they said, “What about the present? Did he forget the present? We had an idea it was in the hands of statesmen, but we are very, very glad to know that the scientists have got hold of it.” And then he said, “The rising sap in the green plant, the little bud that puts a show forth in the spring, the flower that bursts out in glorious magnificence; all of these according to Dr. Bronowski are nothing other than the power of the H-Bomb.”

You see, they've got the power, in that particular editorial section, of taking whatever somebody says, which is a process of identification, and inverting it. That's because they've got ‘punch’. There's a ‘pun’ in it, and there's a ‘pu’ in it. And you know, Punch himself is a funny character, isn't he? He's very rude, beats everybody with a stick. He has a dog, Toby, which is the Hebrew Tob, good, faith. He has a wife that argues and gets beaten. He has a crocodile which represents that primary urge in him. He is a hunchback which implies that the time-being is crippled by the fact of existing in time. He's got a colossal sense of humour and he is never beaten in the end. So we say, “I'm a man that's got punch.” He's only a pu man, not quite a pur man. A pur man is a man that's breaking in bits. But the pu man is a man of poor; he's a pusher and he pushes himself from the inside to the outside, deliberately. We call him the prodigal. He drives from his centre right to his perimeter to get the experience as quickly as possible, because he knows that until he gets it he can't turn back. Because the fellow who doesn't leave home can't return and we know in the parable of the Prodigal that it doesn't do you any good to stay at home, because the father there, who represents God, has two sons and his youngest son says to him, “You're going to leave me some money when you die, why don't you give it to me now when I can enjoy it?" So his father gives him his portion and he goes out and he paints the town red and various other colours, and he's got no money left; he's then living with pigs, and he's eating the husks with the pigs and then he suddenly thinks, my papa is all powerful, omniscient, therefore he understands my motive, therefore he will forgive me, therefore I have sinned, that is separated myself, gone away. I know that he will forgive me if I return. I will arise and go to my father and apologise. So then he goes home and apologises. Already his father sees him coming and kills the fatted calf. And, at that moment, the son that didn't leave home shows that he should’ve left home, because he immediately complains, he says, “Now why do you not pay me this amount?” And the father says, “Is it not mine to do with as I will?” And he said, “There is more rejoicing over the one sheep that got lost rather than the ninety-nine that never went out.” And that's something like the percentage. If you get a hundred people, only one of them has the nerve to go out and see for himself, in real suffering experience, what it's about. Ninety-nine means negation, negation. I'd rather stay home, it's windy outside.

So a little boy that I know, when we were very little, he decided to leave home. I decided to leave home; he went one way, I went another way. When I came back, (I was brought back by a policeman actually,) he had already been home two hours before me. He wasn't very prodigal. He wasn't brought back by a policeman, he was brought back by himself, and when I said to him, “I was brought back by a policeman,” he hung his head in shame. I said, “Who brought you back?” He said, “I went on my own. I was hungry.” I had managed very well. I saw an old man in the park first, he was eating an apple. I looked at it. I said, “Is the apple nice?” and he said, “Would you like a bit?” And I said, “Yes, please” and he gave me half, because I was trained that if you ask, it will be given. If you don't ask, how will anybody know whether you want it?

*Are you sure he took you back to the right house?* I don't know about that. The rest of the family have questioned that.

*Until such time as you’ve completed the whole process, there will always be an attempted interruption from either fantasy or external stimulation, wouldn’t there?*

Yes necessarily.

*Bert asked this question before you came this evening and that was, no matter how much you attempted to remain in the present, where was the energy coming from, he wanted to know, which was pushing in the promptings and memories of the past and they were continually coming in.*

Well, we can do that on this diagram very easily. Supposing that is the world soul, outside of there is just spirit. That spirit has no power to interfere with the world soul itself, as such, because the world soul has already got its tail in its mouth, and is a self-stimulating system. Now, inside it, there are various subsidiary souls, which we call the hierarchies of the angels, and those condense smaller ones, which govern what we call nations on earth. There is an angel, if you like, controlling the French mind, the German mind, the British mind, and so on. This is why you find in Heraldry that each nation has a governing concept, the two-headed eagle of the Austrians and so on. Inside the nation there is a family, inside the family, a group of individuals, inside that, one member of a particular family.

Now where, we take that little dot out there and we enlarge it and there's a big circle and many other circles around it. Where does the energy come from in that one that forces it continuously into fantasy? The answer is it comes from a bigger circle, the family, ancestors, pressing in onto that still centre up to the limit of the pri-mitive, the primitive self, and then bouncing out again. And meanwhile, here is another circle in contact with it, acting as a stimulus on its edge. So you are then between two fires; the fire of the stimulus to rub between yourself and another individual, and the forces that come to you as ancestral forces, and ancestral forces and national forces, cosmic hierarchical forces and those hierarchical forces are from the world soul itself. And the world soul is concerned to develop every subdivision of itself right down to the tiniest individual. And therefore no individual can possibly liberate himself from the educational process until he is completed. So if we cry out and say, “I've learned enough this week,” that is a mechanical reaction, it doesn't mean we've learned enough, it's just something that springs out of us. When we can bring ourselves to understand that if a thing happens to us we need it, then we stop worrying when things happen and when we can take what happens to us in such a way that we don't worry about it, it is evidence that we are becoming more integrated and the next thing that happens to us must be qualitatively different from the previous things. So that continuously we are having newer types of stimulus, of temptation, as we say, of temporal presentation of events; the more integrated we become, then the higher is the type of problem with which we are presented, but never higher than we can deal with. (1:48:41)

If you think about the formal relation of problems, you'll discover that it's quite logical to say we are never tempted more than we can bear, because a temptation is no more than a stimulus. And we cannot become aware of a stimulus unless we have something of it already in us. We must have that in us that can respond before a stimulus can reach consciousness and therefore nothing can come to us that we cannot respond to adequately. If we respond lower than we need, well then we'll have to respond differently next time. If we respond at the level at which we can do, we'll get a higher test on the next occasion. And as we know that ultimately we are being led towards perfect integration of the action band, which results in realisation of the still centre, identity within, without, and the action band between, Infinite Spirit or God transcendent, Imminent Spirit, God imminent, and the action band between. We understand the three processes and then the education is finished.

*When you say a higher test, you mean a harder test?* It's not harder at the level at which you will be, it will only be harder for you before you've got it. It will be harder for somebody else at a lower level. You take a man learning to lift weights, you see, if he lifts, say, 70 pounds one week, and 80 pounds the next week, it isn't harder for him to lift 80 pounds the next week, then it was for him to lift 70 pounds the week before. He goes up to his limit until finally he can't lift any more and the moment he feels that he cannot succeed, he stops. As long as he conceives that there is a possibility of success, he puts another bit of weight on right up to the point where he can't move it and then he takes it off again for public performance. That's the meaning of working in secret and being rewarded openly. (1:51:08)

*So both are various limits to which you can integrate. Are you saying that there are various limits to which people can live with then?* …..Oh yes, yes. That depends largely on your … in the same way that an English-born person can. No matter how hard he tries, he can't do it. Destiny involves you being born into particular families and to go to particular countries because each country is under the dominion of a certain idea. When you change your locality, you are changing the influence upon you and it is evidence that you are moving towards another experience. That's why we say, “Blessed is he who is born an Englishman.” I should worry after six generations.

*Would you say then that if you have travelled to various places it was because you were going to have certain experience*. Oh yes, definitely. You can tell by the kind of place that a person wants to go, what part of themselves is deficient.

*Supposing that he had no control over where he's been sent.* We know that he hadn't had any control over it, otherwise he wouldn't be sent. His being is either free, in which case he doesn't need educating, or he is being educated and it is evidence he is not yet free. *What happens if you are sent to a lot of parts?* Obviously you have got a lot of parts of your organism needing bringing into consciousness. *Does that mean you were a relatively simple being to start with?*

Oh yes.

Simple doesn't mean stupid, you know. It simply means ‘not formally complicated’. Stupid means ‘stood in the pid’. It's almost like being a pudding... *The man who stays at home might be …., he might be fairly well along the road*. The man who has never left home at all cannot possibly have the formal knowledge. A fellow who stays at home may have been out, prodigaled on the quiet and come back, but I tell you, it has happened. My mother used to say to me when I was about 24, “Why don't you go out and do something? All you do is just sit and think.” She used to say, “You're slightly better than a (barn?) because I can hear you breathing.” *It might have gone out of the previous incarnation*. Oh yes, some of us **have** been out before. In general it’s the Cardinal signs that are new. It’s not a rigid rule, but it’s a general rule.

*They're the first timers*. Yes. The Cardinals are the undifferentiated, new beings, you see. *Well, the others may have been trying for several lifetimes.* Oh yes. Yes. Or they may not have been trying at all, they might have been enjoying prodigality. Maybe they managed to avoid the husks. Some of them get a job in a cafe, they don't do so badly.

*Cardinals?* Aries, Cancer, Libra and Capricorn. That’s a general rule, you can say that people in those positions are relatively innocent. The form that you see in them is heredity; it doesn't belong to them, it's the family that they've come into. (large break in recording)

You know that if you've got to do the whole twelve processes in order to integrate yourself properly, that rule is not an absolute. Because when you've been born, physically, you will go through a certain process, say born in Capricorn, you will go through the Earth Triad, which would be three incarnations, and then, according to the way you had behaved, you could be born in Cancer, and practice feeling, pleasure, and emotion, and then you would grow out of that and be born in Libra, and see, events, percepts, memory, reason, and then you'll be born in Aries, and start doing something about it in the Aries, Leo, Sagittarius, which will be then the 12 births. In general, you can say that, for practical purposes, you could treat a person and try that kind of stimulus gambit, with them, if they're in cardinal positions, as if they're new babies.

*I'd like to ask you to talk about reincarnation. I know myself and a lot of other people would.*

You know the Buddhists refuse to use the word ‘reincarnation’ because they say, well the equivalent of it, the Pali equivalent, they say that reincarnation implies the existence of a soul other than the body, which soul persists after the death of the body and then goes into another body, meanwhile having continued to exist on its own, which they deny. So they use the expression, which is translated ‘rebirth’, instead of reincarnated; it's rather a fine point. But the term means, that when your body disintegrates, it is evidence that **you** have disintegrated, otherwise it wouldn't disintegrate. That is to say that that which was concentrated in the body and kept it whole has now dispersed itself. Therefore it is not entitled to be called an individual, because it hasn't got reflexive self-consciousness. So the next time it is drawn together, it is the same and not the same; it's the same elements that were previously gathered together in one body, but not being reflexively self-conscious, it cannot be said to be a soul, because the elements have been dispersed and when a new body is there, it is itself the end result of a re-integration not caused by the soul, reflexively, but caused by external forces recurring in the universe itself, which causes the coherence of the individual parts with the rebirth of a being which has been dispersed.

Can you understand that, Jack? *Is that by having a constant factor of elements and they're reassembled in the same pattern?* Yes, that's why we say that Buddhism is fundamentally atomistic. Only instead of being materialistically atomistic like Western science, it is an atomism of souls, but the souls are simple and therefore not reflexive. In order to reflect you must have at least three, two parts and a third one to coordinate them. If you have a simple, with no parts, it cannot know that it is. So if we talk about a psychon or psychic atom, in its simplest form it cannot do anything about itself. When a stimulus comes it responds and it cannot control it but if we get a lot of such things together we get a complex, integrated being made of parts, the parts are then sub-entities, and the energy running through them all, enables them to reflect as a totality, and that, when integrated is called the soul. But until it is integrated to the point where it can reflexively maintain itself after the dissolution of its physical body, it is not technically a soul reincarnated. So it is said that for most people they do not reincarnate.

*But they could have reincarnation of a Buddha, couldn't they?*

Yes, but that's by an integrated being. It deliberately, does that

*Yes.*

But as for the generality, they do not reincarnate. They are reborn. Their elements split, and after a certain number of rotations of the Zodiac, similar forces cause them to vibrate and come together again. So that the reappearance of that individual is not under the control of that individual, it's under the control of sidereal forces, universal forces, whose vibration drive together the elements that were once integrated as a soul, then were dispersed, lacking the power to remain integrated, and are finally driven back together again.

*Hence* *the fact that he's got no memory,* I...

That’s why you can’t remember your previous birth until you get a certain degree of integration. When you drive yourself towards this centre here, you find all and nothing, but in the process you have to go through all your personal fantasies, personal dreams, deeper still through your ancestral dreams, right down through the human race dream, through the animal dream, the vegetable dream right into pure being. When you get there you can please yourself which direction you come out and therefore you can remember not only the individual that you started from but the other individuals as well.

*Does that mean that you can't even start then until you have achieved some measure in some lifetime of integration? (2:01:34)*

Oh yes. You cannot begin as an individual to do anything until you first construct a reference point of ideas, which ideas are true. When it says, “Know the truth and the truth shall make you free,” it means that you cannot make yourself free without the truth, and when you've got the truth in you, the truth integrates all other ideas to it. The end result of which is balance, equilibrium, and liberation. Liberation means equilibrium and without equilibrium there is no de-liberation. So you must have a modicum of integration. There is a fundamental true concept to which have been integrated a sufficient number of derivative truths and to those truths integrate all your experiences from day to day.

That’s if you understand that primary diagram we did of the three parts and the being consciousness formless at the centre, and this fantasy here, primitiveness springing out, driving you towards the external world, the external world battering you with a stimulus and you become aware that between the external stimulus and the internal drive **you** are being rotated or turbulated as a substantial being. When you understand that and realise it, that means make it real, which means put it into effective action so that you can sit in a chair and say, “I think I will now recall the dream I had in 1924 at 2.30 on a Tuesday, in May 3rd.” When you can do that, that is called realisation of the truth, and it depends on this progressive internalisation, consciously. You begin with the daydream. You know the process, Khen of rocking backwards at night. When you go to bed at night, when you feel yourself going to sleep, make yourself wake up again and ask yourself what you were thinking about and it will gradually start turning back into a dream. Every time you become drowsy, say, “What am I thinking about?” Wake yourself up. That carries the waking state into the dream state and then you will suddenly discover that it's morning again. At some point you forgot and you slipped into deep sleep. Now when you wake up in the morning, instead of waking up and jumping out of bed eager for work, lie in bed for a few minutes and say to yourself, “What was I thinking about immediately before I woke?” And try to discover what it was. If you're not careful you'll fall asleep again and then the boss will ring you up and say, “Where are you?” If you are very, very careful with practice, you can gradually carry your consciousness backwards in the morning into the dream state, forwards at night into the dream state and back into the waking state, and so you gradually eliminate that period of unconsciousness that you normally experience and call deep sleep. Then you discover that something is going on all the time underneath that you didn't know about. You can actually discover the processes of metabolism, of muscle repair, of nervous system repair. You can see the projects, the purposes for ten years hence. You can see yourself preparing what you will be doing in fifteen, twenty years, underneath. Superficially you don't know it, but you've written your life already. Now if you don't like the thing you've written, and you come down to it, rewrite it, but if you don't know what you've written, you cannot rewrite it.

So we say that people who are superficially conscious in the waking state, and not conscious of the inner processes, are entirely at the mercy of inner determinations, which are forcing them into situations to force them to integrate and necessarily into painful situations to teach them compassion and humility. When you think you've had enough, you drive inside to find out how to stop that writing of the wrong story on the inside.

*You have to know what else to write, don't you?*

What you do, it's very, very simple, you write, ‘acceptance of all experiences as they come to me because at each level I will be such a being as needs precisely that stimulus.’ That's the same thing as ‘taking no thought for the morrow.’ Come what may, I'll deal with it, or I won't, according to my level. Success and failure are equal. If you succeed you’ve learned something formally, if you fail, you've learned humility. (2:06:43)