THE COLLECTED WORKS OF EUGENE HALLIDAY

Edited by David Mahlowe

Volume Four

Book One

Contributions from a Potential Corpse

Editor's Note.

The first book of ‘Contributions From a Potential Corpse’ was written in the late 1950s as the beginning of the author's magnum opus. The opening five chapters are conventional in form, if not in content. Thereafter, the remainder of this Book and all succeeding Books become more episodic in form

Over the years, right up to his death in 1987, Eugene Halliday continued to write "Contrib", as he called it, as time allowed. The result may be called a Day Book of Wisdom. It contains the essence of his teaching, clearly set down and copiously illustrated in a manner fondly familiar to those who worked with him.

The separate Books of ‘Contrib’ will be presented as they were received, each in a separate folder. The only significant amendment to the material is a re-drawing of the original sketches and diagrams in the more precise manner which the author himself would have required.

The Foreword to the Book is, in fact, part of the MS. It is placed at the beginning as a fitting reminder of the author's purpose.

‘Contributions From a Potential Corpse’ is a manual of self-development for Everyman; and a unique treasury of wisdom.

Author's Foreword

What drives me incessantly to think, to read, to write? The will to love. Nietzsche says "the will to power". But I say that the will to power is perverted love, and that love wills to love, and that love is work for the development of the functional potentialities of being, infinitely. Not power as such, but functionality is the aim. Power has no significance unless it is expended in function. But function has significance even if power as power is never felt to be present in it.

And all function is interfunction. Petrol in the car interfunctioning with electrical sparks, cylinders, pistons, crankshaft, transmission, road wheels, roads, journeys; men seeing new sights, hearing new sounds, constructing new patterns of significance.

There is no function that is not interfunction, though isolating fools may believe or hope otherwise.

Involve ever more interfunctions with each other, and so create ever more complex and higher interfunctions. This is love ever expanding, love with no ceiling to its attainings.

I see that people who believe that function can be function without interfunction are leading very narrow and shallow lives. I am determined to broaden them, and deepen them. How I shall do this is through the word, written and/or spoken. Let the Word of God help me, or help Himself through me. For surely men are an irritant to God as long as they try to function without interfunction.

Is it possible for men to impede God? Yes, but He is not without power of response to their impeding activities. He has His prophets, his messengers and His Son, by the sacrifice of whom He can present men with a stimulus they will find it hard to assimilate without reaction of some kind. God has the whip-handle. Man, each man, is the whiplash wherewith God can scourge all men, until they of themselves will to co-operate.

Eugene Halliday

Chapter One

With the possible exception of some few persons mentioned in tradition as having passed from this world without being dead at their time of departure, it appears that most people who have been born have later died, and that on statistical grounds alone it is probable that most people born and now living will also die at some time in the future.

For most practical purposes, then, it is probably not too foolish to accept the Buddha's observation, and to assume that we shall, having been born, at some point of time die. For myself the idea of dying holds no terrors, because in the sense that I use the term, dying is a process that can apply only to compound bodies held together, not of necessity, but of temporal pattern processes which might well have been other than they are.

To die is to disintegrate, to fall apart, to undo a pattern of elements once brought together in time past by forces having their origin in the ultimate field of power which creates, sustains and dissolves all things.

That my body, having been assembled from various sources, from food, from radiation and so on, will probably at some time dissemble does not surprise me in the least. Assembling and dissembling processes are both equally understandable.

What is important is not the probability of my death but the contributing by myself of whatever is valuable from my experience during the period of my assembling. If death is highly probable for born beings, it may be asked of what value is the experience of life to anyone? I must answer from my experience of life.

Life, between birth and death, is a process, a series of actualisings of being, experienced by what I shall call sentient power.

By sentience I mean the principle of all consciousness, awareness, knowing-feeling. The Latin word "Sentire" *to know, to feel,* the origin of words like "sense", "sensitivity", etc., expresses the general idea of the function which exists in us as the ground of all our self-consciousness and knowledge, whether of thought, feeling, will or action, physical or otherwise.

"Sentience" is a word used less often than the words *consciousness, knowingness* or *awareness,* and therefore will serve to express the general activity which the other words express more precisely.

Consciousness, for instance, has the rather precise meaning of knowing things in a patterned way. It is used of knowing when it is fairly clearly defined; knowing in which sense elements, the data of the five senses, are cut out from their back ground, held in relatively sharp focus and integrated together to form a significant pattern of forms.

In the life-process, between birth and death, or conception and death if you prefer it, experiences show certain differences. It is these differences which suggest that my contribution to life may not be without value to others.

The differences of experience may be divided into categories. There are differences of physical action, of will, of feeling, of thought and so on. There are differences of pleasure and pain, of hope and fear, love and hate. It is these that induce me to write.

What I have to say about them I shall say as clearly as possible, for clarity is one step towards efficiency (cold word, but not cold meaning when properly understood.)

All the troubles of man's world arise from inefficiency, from failure to respond adequately to the situation in which he finds himself. Failure to understand what makes things work, what motivates life; failure to understand what to do about failure to understand. "With all your getting, get understanding", says the wise old man, looking back on his ill-informed youth.

The way to understanding is the way to that which *stands under* all things, the way to the ultimate substance upon which the world of appearances casts its deluding shadows.

To understand is to go below the superficial appearance of things, to go down to their root causes, to see the substantial reality which underlies the play of forms which present themselves to our senses.

But why should we bother to go down to the ultimate root of things? Is it not good enough for us to live and enjoy ourselves without seeking to descend into the causes of life and enjoyment?

Yes, of course, if we can do it. Perhaps there are some who do. Whatever is clearly conceivable in all its parts and functional relations is possible. So there may be somewhere some being or beings actually living and enjoying life. For a time. But if such exist, it is not for them I write, except perhaps to provide them with further amusement.

For those, however, whose living is not all joyful, I present the fruits of my own experiences of the life process, and show how, after many attacks on the dragon which guards the tree of life from the unworthy, it is possible to eat once more the fruit that everyone desires.

It is a peculiar thing, a strange thing, that the greatest and most valuable things are also the simplest. It is also a peculiar and strange thing that these simplest and most valuable things have been known to man from his first appearance on the earth.

The myths and legends and fairy stories of the ancient world contain these simple valuable things expressed in a manner once easily graspable by the mind of

man; graspable because his thought proceeded naturally in a mythic way. Long before Aristotelian logic began to cripple man's intuition his thought was illuminated with flashes of insight into the nature of reality.

Modern science, too, has flashes of insight into the nature of the world, or more accurately, certain intelligent men of science do. For science itself is only an abstract idea, except in the minds of the men who devote themselves to incarnating in themselves its principles and the knowledge derived from their application.

There is something man has known about himself from his beginning which still stands as the basis of anything else he may know or come to know. It is the simple fact that he has a body, a vehicle of experience, an organism through which the world acts upon him, and by which he acts upon the world.

This body, this vehicle of experience, is the material basis of the possibility of all the activities which man has called valuable. From this we may formulate our first law of life.

"Do not prematurely destroy the vehicle of your experience".

The Almighty has set His canon against self-slaughter. This great law is to he fulfilled as the pre-condition to the fulfillment of all other laws.

Why do I say, "Do not *prematurely* destroy the vehicle of your experience"? Because this vehicle is the only one has with which to develop oneself to the level where personal freedom becomes a significant reality.

Depression and misery are not so rare in the world that we can ignore their ill effects. Suicides are not so uncommon that we can reckon them of no account on the scale of the human race. It is not always those of low intelligence who destroy themselves. Many intelligent persons have been led by depression to destroy their material means of communicating with us. Often if these self-destroyers had waited a while, a new situation would have presented itself, a new idea, a new feeling, a new will would have arisen. The world would have changed and brought with its change a new possibility and hope of new life.

Something must be said of the real purpose of life to help those who have lost its purpose, or those who have never known its purpose.

What is the purpose of life - the true purpose? Goethe has defined the truth as "that which is fruitful." Let us reframe our question. What is the most fruitful purpose of life? What is a fruit? It is the end result of a growth process which contains in itself the potentiality of further growth and further fruiting to infinity.

What is life? Life is a function of love, an activity in which the potentialities of being are actualised, sustained, developed and transcended to infinity.

Life involves sentience and power incarnating, self-embodying, self-objectifying. Life implies love, and praise and bodily existence; of whatever substance the body may prove to be. The German words "lieben" *to love* "leben" *to live* "loben" to *praise,* and "leib", *body,* hint at this more clearly than our own mixed English words.

Life is Love embodied and praising all things worthy of actualisation.

What is love? Love is the working for the development of the potentialities of non-being into being, the actualisation of potentials which would otherwise remain unrealised, the manifestation of orders of being which would otherwise remain wrapped in chaos.

Well, supposing the potentialities were to remain unactualised? Supposing orders of being remained in chaos, what then? Would it be bad? Would it, as our materialistic age says, matter? Let us return to the consideration of the ultimate substance of reality.

The ultimate source of all things is sentient power, an infinite ocean of power which feels itself. This is what Hamlet intuited when he said, "Aye, there's the rub." For as this ultimate source of things feels itself, and as it is absolutely indestructible, an eternal, infinite self-sentient power, what it *does* is most important to it. For *what it does constitutes for it the content of its own consciousness.* If it does well, it feels well; if it does ill, it feels ill. The mode of action of the infinite sentient power source conditions that sentient power, determines its formal experience, its joy and pain, its self-activating and suffering.

To die to the material world is not absolutely to cease to be. Nothing can ever cease to be absolutely. The ultimate reality is eternal indestructible sentient power. This being so, to die is at most but to sleep. "And in that sleep what dreams may come must give us pause."

To die is to disintegrate. Dying is possible only for a pattern of forces, which has at some point in time integrated itself. Because it has come into being by integration of forces or motion-patterns, so it is possible for it to cease to be by simply disintegrating again. To the born death is certainly a possibility. But the disintegration of a pattern of forces is not the absolute cessation of those forces beyond the pattern. All forces are motions of the absolute sentient power. This sentient power is a continuum. A continuum is not made of discrete or separate parts which may be severed from each other. A continuum is a seamless indestructible whole, not subject to disintegration. (The seamless garment of Christ symbolises the continuum of the Infinite Sentient Power in eternal motion).

The eternal, infinite sentient power, source of all beings, cannot itself ever cease to be. "Whatever truly *is* can never cease to be", says the Bhagavad Gita, "whatever is not, can never come to be."

Because it can never cease to be, the infinite sentient power has a problem, somewhat like that presented to Hamlet. But whereas Hamlet's problem is "To

be or not to be", the problem for the infinite indestructible sentient power is, "To act or not to act". What it is, it is. This is unavoidable; but what it shall do or not do constitutes its problem.

In the great religions the infinite eternal sentient power is called "God". God is said to be omnipotent, all-powerful. It is said, therefore, that to God's omnipotence all things are possible. But for the all-powerful God there is one impossible. God cannot cease to be Himself. He, the eternal infinite sentient power, indestructible source of all beings, can never cease to be Himself. Thus, as He cannot cease to be Himself, a problem is presented to Him by the fact of His own indestructibility, "To act or not to act"

This fact is of such tremendous importance that we cannot do ourselves any disservice by repeating it over and over again until we have fully incarnated its significance in our own substance. Let us put it down again in as simple a form as possible. What the great religions have called God, in whatever language, is the indestructible infinite sentient power that is the creator, sustainer and destroyer of all forms whatsoever, in all worlds and times. This indestructible infinite sentient power, this God, because He cannot cease to be, is presented with the problem, "To act or not to act", "To do or not to do".

Let us try to conceive what this means to God. We will put it in the form of an imaginary conversation which God holds with Himself.

"I", says God, "am infinite sentient power. I am not made of parts. I am a continuum, partless, seamless and eternal. I am, therefore, indestructible. I cannot get rid of myself, cannot annihilate myself. Whether I act or do not act, I remain myself, infinite sentient power."

"Because I am infinite, I cannot get away from myself, for, as the Infinite, there is nowhere where I am not. There is for me therefore no escape from myself."

"As I am sentient I feel myself. If I act, I feel my action, its quality, its pattern, its intensity. If I do not act, I feel my non-action, its qualitylessness, its patternless formlessness."

"As I am power, I can activate myself, formulate an infinity of forms, create endlessly worlds upon worlds upon worlds, universes upon universes. But as power I can also inhibit my creativity, oppose one action with another, neutralise my own formative energies, and hold myself in perpetual self--contradicting voidity."

"If I, from my infinite power, act and create, I, from my infinite sentience, feel my own action and creation. If I act harmoniously, I feel harmonious. If I act discordantly, I feel the discordance in myself. If I create beings which function efficiently, I feel their efficient functioning. Their successes are my successes. If I create beings which function inefficiently, I feel their inefficiency as my own. Their failures are my failures, their malfunctions mine. If I create beings which

act mechanically, I feel their mechanicality as my mechanicality. If I create free beings, beings of free initiative, I feel their freedom as my own."

"For each of my actions there is a corresponding feeling. For my inaction there is the feeling of nullity."

"Some of my possible actions have feelings of pleasure, of happiness, of joy. Some have feelings of displeasure, of unhappiness, of misery."

"If, therefore, I act, I have to face the problem of what kind of action I shall perform, for I shall feel its effects in myself. I shall be "mine own executioner""

"If I refuse to act, I have no problem whatever, for a problem is an actual formal situation. But I have instead the feeling of non-action, the feeling of infinite power doing nothing, when it might do everything."

"I have various possibilities of action and inaction. I may act simultaneously in a uniform manner throughout my infinity, or serially propagate a finite uniform motion-pattern through my infinity, or confine it to a finite locality, and remain inactive elsewhere. Or I may act simultaneously in various manners throughout my infinity, or serially in various ways, formulating in some places, remaining formless in others. There are in my infinity an infinity of possible action patterns, or mixtures of action and inaction, propagated to infinity or finitely located. But whatever is actualised or not actualised, it is I who actualise or do not, I who feel it, I who suffer the consequences of my own decision or lack of it."

Having listened in to this conversation, it might occur to us to ask ourselves, in view of its import, what we would do if we also were infinite sentient power. "To act or not to act?". That is the question. The answer is simple. We can choose either to act whatever we choose it is we who will have to suffer the immediate and consequential results of our own choice.

Having thought this through, it is not improbable that we shall say of God, "He has our sympathy". Certainly we have His.

Chapter Two

God and we are similar in this: we suffer the consequences of our own actions.

But we, the finite creatures, suffer also the consequences of everyone else's actions, of other finite creatures, and of the Infinite God Himself, as He does ours. We might say that we share our suffering equally.

But although we share our suffering equally there is a difference in what we can do about it. We are finite creatures, of limited ability to adjust. God is infinite and therefore has infinite adjustability.

We may, as to our finite forms, our creatureliness, fail to adjust to our sufferings. We may perish under the weight of our problems. God, however, being of infinite power cannot fail, cannot perish.

If, therefore, there is to be any ultimate security, any freedom from the fear of final annihilation, it is to God, and not to our finite selves, that we must look.

From the beginning of human history the problem of survival has occupied man's mind. Man has in him an instinct of self-preservation. If his life is threatened, unless he is well-schooled at controlling his reactions, he will tend to take self-preservative action, either of fight or flight or adjustment.

The fact of the automatic tendency to preserve oneself implies various things. If we have experienced pain we can understand why we tend to move away from it. But whence comes our fear of death, if we have such a fear?

An instinct is the embodiment of an experience or experience sequence of sufficient intensity or quality or duration to have left a trace in our substance sufficiently strong to condition our response to certain situations or stimuli. We may say that instinct is involved rational response; rational because it has a purpose. Whether that purpose is relevant or not to a given present situation, depends on the similarity or dissimilarity of the situation to the situation or situations in which the instinct was embodied.

How did the instinct to avoid death get into my substance if I have not myself died before? An instinct is an involved rational response. If I have not experienced death, how can I have an instinct to avoid it?

Well, I might have seen someone else die, or I might have been told about death as an undesirable state. My experience of someone else dying might have been very unpleasant, the conditions of death very painful to the dying person. Perhaps he cried out in agony, or made horrible grimaces, or violently twisted his body in a manner which, if I myself did it, I imagine would be painful. Perhaps someone in a state of fear and excessive emotion described such a death to me, or a good actor portrayed the agonies of a dying man. But in all these instances if I

examine them, I cannot find my reaction of self-preservation to be caused by the fact of death but only by the horrible *mode* of dying, the agony and fear of pain in the *process.* The dead do not stimulate my self-preservation instinct, but only the *process,* the painful process of dying. If there is doubt about this, let us imagine a death scene which is not painful, not horrible to look at. Let us imagine a death scene which is peaceful, such as I have sometimes seen.

A young man is dying. He has no pain. His illness is one which, mercifully, is accompanied by a feeling of euphoria, a feeling of blissful happiness. Perhaps his euphoria is the result of certain chemical substances, certain toxins arising from his disease. Perhaps he is hallucinated by these same toxins and sees angels at his bedside welcoming him into the heavenly spheres. He dies smiling and gently singing a hymn about his reception into heaven. What is the effect upon us of this death scene? Is our instinct of self-preservation so violent now?

Imagine another death seen. A young girl, beautiful in face, well-formed in body, lies on an expensive bed. She is dying. Why? She is healthy and shows this in the firmness and vitality of her body. But her love has been killed in an air crash and she desires with all her soul to go to him wherever he may be in whatever world he now has his being. She is willing herself to die with a strange, intense anticipatory joy. Nothing the doctors can do can save her. She is determined to go to her lover, and she goes, a heavenly smile upon her lips. Where now is our instinct of self-preservation? Is it really *death* we are afraid of, or merely the painful or distasteful process which usually precedes it?

Apart from the processes which lead to death, what is death itself? Shortly we may say that death is the state of a body in which the forces of disintegration and dis-organisation have triumphed over the forces of integration and organisation.

The final evidence that a once living being is dead is the disintegration or falling apart of its elements. A body may *appear* to be dead, but really be in a coma, or in a state of suspended animation, as with certain hibernating animals. But we accept it as finally and definitely dead when its elements fall apart, corrupt or disintegrate. Death is considered final when the body's elements have dis-integrated and are now scattered from each other.

The living body is a functionally active, organic unity. The dead body is a non-functional, inactive, non-organic, disintegrated disunity.

To live is to be a functionally active integrated organism responding to stimuli with purposeful adjustments and suffused with sentience.

To die is to cease to function, to become inactive, for organisation to break down and disintegrate, to fail to respond to stimuli with purposeful adjustments, and to be insentient.

Because death implies disintegration death is only possible for a compound being. To disintegrate is to separate from each other elements which were

integrated or fitted together. An existential material body may disintegrate because it is made of separate parts. This is what Buddha meant when he said, "To the born certain is death". We might translate it faithfully, "To that which owes its existence to the gathering together of separate elements, it is not impossible that causes may arise which may bring about the separation of these elements again."

The earthy material body of man is composed of various elements which have been abstracted from food and gathered together into a functional organic unity. Because these elements have been gathered together, it is not impossible that at some time they will again separate. Death (or disintegration) is therefore a possibility for the earthy material body of man. Which will surprise few of us.

But is man merely an earthy material body? Some people, whom we call materialists, believe so. Notice we do not say "know so" but only "believe so". No materialist of any intelligence would state that he *knows* that man is merely earth matter. People who *say* that they are materialists are not always aware of the implications of what pure materialism means. Intelligent "materialists" are faced with the problem of accounting for their own intelligence. Actually today there are no intelligent believers in pure materialism, for matter, "the only reality" of the nineteenth century, has shown itself to be "the only unreality" of the twentieth century. Matter is now known to be simply energy-mass, so that today an intelligent man who says "I am a materialist" does not mean what he used to mean. He now means "I consider it to be fruitful enough for my purpose to act as if the energy-masses in the universe had a sufficient degree of persistence to justify my dealing with them in the manner of those men who previously did not know that matter is only energy-mass, and thought it to have entity in itself." Which is a trifle unwieldy.

Such a "materialist" knows now that man's physical body is a system of energy-masses. But insofar as these energy-masses are integrated together they may at some time lose integration and thus "die". So whether one is a materialist of the old school, or a qualified energy-mass "materialist" of the new school, the body is still subject to possible disintegration and death.

But man does not feel to himself as if he is merely an earthy material body. He has inside him certain processes which are little touched by earth. He thinks and feels. Let us examine first his thinking process and see if possibly this is free from disintegration tendencies.

It becomes apparent to us at once that the thinking process may suffer disintegration, because thinking is the presentation of ideas in the mind, and each idea, insofar as it is clearly defined, is separate from the others. When we think, we temporally gather together separate ideas and link them, we integrate them into patterns and so build complex idea-structures. But because they are gathered together, they may at some time fall apart again. The thinking process is subject to disintegration, and therefore it is possible to talk about the death of an idea, the death of a "brain child".

The earthy material body of man is subject to disintegration or death. The thinking process is also subject to it. Is there any thing in man not subject to death?

Chapter Three

Mind.

Some thinkers would say that the thinking process might disintegrate and yet the mind may not. These people treat the mind as if it were an entity in itself, an entity which conducts in itself a process called thinking, but which still persists when thinking ceases. Whether this is true or not depends on how we define the word "mind". Let us define it. But first let us define what we mean by "definition".

A thing is said to be defined when its limits are detectable. An artist might talk of "a well-defined image", meaning an image whose binding contours are clearly seeable.

When we define a word we are indicating the limit of its application. This is most important to understand. We do not define *things* with our words; the things are, if they exist, already defined by the fact of their existence. What we define when we define a word, is *the limits of its application.*

If we define the word "box" we simply indicate to what category of things we shall apply the word "box". The word is a sound, or if written or printed, a symbol or group of symbols which we use to indicate certain contents of our consciousness. All things, situations and events which exist for our consciousness are defined by their existence. One of the groups of elements in our consciousness we call "words". A word is an element in our consciousness which we use to order other elements. A word is a sound or sign of something other than itself. By a word we indicate on what elements of consciousness we shall concentrate our attention. The word orders the content of consciousness, and possibly of unconsciousness also.

When we use the word "mind", to what elements in consciousness are we directing attention? Language may be a great tyrant and rule us to our disadvantage. If we say "the mind is that which contains and arranges ideas", we have suggested that ideas are contained and arranged in and by something. We have given the mind entity status in which to contain ideas, and power with which to arrange them.

When we define a word we are indicating the limits of its application to some elements in consciousness. What are the elements in consciousness to which we are limiting the application of the word "mind"?

An idea we can image because an idea is a form in consciousness. A series of related ideas we can also image for the same reason. But where in consciousness

is the element to which we limit the application of the word "mind"? An idea has a form we can recognise, a characteristic binding line that defines it. Has the mind such a characteristic binding line? We cannot find one in consciousness. To what, then, does the word "mind" refer? It refers to the space in which ideas are presented singly, or in groups, simultaneously or serially. The word "mind" refers to that which has no form of its own, but in which the forms called "ideas" appear and relate themselves. We have used the word "space" here, and therefore, to distinguish it from the space which we say exists between earthy material bodies, we shall call it "mental space" or "mind space".

Mental space us that in which ideas appear and are patterned. It us simply a zone in consciousness in which we observe ideas presented and related together.

This zone is marked by the presented idea-patterns. Apart from these idea-patterns the zone would be undetectable as mind. The mind with no ideas in it is no mind. This is the Buddhist doctrine of "No Mind".

If the content of consciousness is eliminated then there is no mind. Only where consciousness is presented with some content can we say that mind exists.

The word "mind" comes from a root word meaning to count, or to evaluate. When there is a process of counting or evaluation in consciousness then it is permissible to use the word "mind" to indicate the zone where this process is taking place. Where there is no such process occurring it is incorrect to refer to it as "mind".

Counting or evaluating is a process in which words are used to determine the quantity or quality of elements in consciousness. Because the words represent forms or ideas we can say that counting and evaluation is a thinking process. "Thinking" is the general term we use to cover all kinds of processes in consciousness which are conducted by means of the presentation of forms or ideas.

What is the origin of the forms in consciousness? They are simply the product of the play of power of the Infinite. When the infinite sentient power acts, its motions produce within it various patterns. These patterns constitute the contents of the Infinite Consciousness.

In any given locality the formal pattern may be stressed in some degree more or less than in others. When the stress is very heavy we say that there is a thing existing there. Where the stress is less, we say that there is thinking there. Where the stress is ever finer and its edges are ill-defined we say there is feeling there. Where the stress is absolutely undetectable we say there is no thing and no thinking or feeling there. We say there is nothing there.

We might say that thinking is lightly stressed thinging, or that thinging is heavily stressed thinking. The difference between a thing and a think (an idea) is only a difference of lightness or heaviness of stress of a form in consciousness, which is basically merely a mode of action of the infinite sentient power.

Ultimately we have to say that all things we know, all the ideas we think, and all the feeling states we experience, the totality of phenomena of all worlds, are merely modalities of the motion initiated and sustained by the Infinite Sentient Power we call God. As we may use the word "mind" wherever there is a content of consciousness, it is permissible to talk of the mind of God.

At this point some student of philosophy might cry out "Pantheism!" as if this were some kind of disease of which a philosopher would be ashamed.

A pantheist is a man who believes that God is all there is, and that all is God. But this depends on how we use the words "all" and "is". As these words are declared by some of the world's greatest thinkers to be difficult to handle, we will proceed with care in using them.

"Is" is part of the verb "to be", which is the verb "before which", it has been said, "Gods and men tremble." Not *the* God, just gods and men.

"All" is ordinarily taken to mean "the totality" of something.

"All is" would mean "the Totality of Being."

We must now examine the meaning of these two words. We will begin with "Being".

The confusion about Being arises from unclearness about the proper application of the word. The word "Being" is the progressive or continuous form of the verb "to be". It means "to continue to be", or the continuance of whatever is meant by "to be"; to be continuously for some time. What does "to be" mean? Let us examine this notion carefully. Whatever exists we know of from its action upon our senses, however many of these may ultimately prove to function in our organism. Ordinarily there are said to be five: sight, hearing, taste, smell and touch. But suggestions have been made, not without foundation, that there may be further senses yet to be demonstrated, the radiesthetic sense and so on.

Whatever changes occur in our sense, if the sources of them persist and are formally recognisable, we say that they must *be* in order to stand as stimulus originators.

Whenever we recognise a thing (re-know it or know it again) we do so because it has some form or shape. This is most obvious with the visual sense. The eye sees forms or shapes. It is less obvious with the other senses, although the sense of touch may convey a fairly good amount of *inform*ation or shape-content. Hearing, taste and smell are the least obviously formal, but yet sensitivity in these fields will detect even here a formal value. With sound the Chladni figures may make visible the shape of a sound-wave.

Form is characterised by contour. That is to say, we can represent any form by a binding line. The simplest type of binding line is a circle, but as long as the two ends of the line are joined together, and there is a space enclosed by the line, it

does not matter if the line waves or wiggles about before joining.

The line that binds its ends together and encloses a space may be said to circumscribe that space. When an artist draws a binding contour on his paper of a certain character to represent an object, say a human figure, he suggests by this binding line the form of the object in two dimensions. His drawing is confined to the surface or plane of the paper. When a sculptor makes a model of the same figure he makes binding contours in three dimensions. To length and breadth he adds thickness. The sculptor's work, having one dimension more than that of the artist's drawing, gives a more objectively real impression.

Whenever we say a thing is *being* we do so because we can detect, or represent it, by a binding contour or contours. We can say that the verb "to be" may be symbolised by a circle or any circumscribing line or contour.

What we cannot represent by a binding contour we cannot legitimately say has being. To be is to be circumscribed. This is why we say that to come into being is to be created. The word "create" comes from a root word meaning "to circumscribe" or bind with a contour. If we remove all the characteristic binding contours from a drawing with an eraser we remove the "being" of that drawing. The drawing no longer has being.

If we erase the end of Pinocchio's nose contour with a wood-rasp, the end of his nose loses its being. If we take a mason's chisel and remove the contours from a Michelangelo sculpture (sacrilege) it likewise loses its being. Whatever loses its characteristic binding contour loses its being. To be is to be circumscribed.

Once we have thoroughly understood this fact we can begin to make sense of certain philosophical ideas about the ultimate source of reality beyond all being.

If we represent being as a circle, what we mean by non-being is simply whatever lies beyond the circle, and which is not circumscribed by any other circle. Non-being is that which lies beyond all binding contours.

The word "all", or "totality", means whatever is contained within a binding contour. If inside a circle there is simply space, we can talk of "all" of this space. If within the circle under consideration there are many smaller circles, we may count them up and say that the "total" number of circles is X, "total" meaning every one of the circles taken together.

The expression "all being" may therefore be represented by one circle inside which are a number of smaller circles. But always the concept of "being" is representable by means of a circle or binding contour.

"What is best for me to know?" asked King Midas of Silenus. "Best is not to come to be, but now that you have come to be, soonest to die is best," answered Silenus.

Why so? Because to come to be is to be circumscribed, to be bound, to be limited by a binding contour. Being and createdness mean limitation and bondage.

To be is to be bound. It does not ordinarily occur to us that this is so, but nevertheless it is. To be is to be bound. To be bound is to be in bondage. Is bondage a bad thing? Let us look at the implications of bondage.

Bondage is the state of being bound. To be bound is to be circumscribed, to be enclosed within a contour, a line that goes round and joins its ends together. An artist draws a line round the form he wishes to represent. His drawing is on a flat surface, paper or canvas, etc. We say it is a two-dimensional drawing. It has length and breadth. It lies on a plane. The sculptor chisels a figure from stone. To do this he mentally sees it from many viewpoints, each of which gives him a characteristic contour or binding line. The result of his work is a figure with length, breadth and depth. It is solid, three dimensional.

The body of a human is also three-dimensional. If we see the body as a three-dimensional system of contours or binding lines we can say that the body is in bondage. To exist, to be, is to be in bondage.

Suppose that we decide that we hate the bondage of our three-dimensional being. We decide to free ourselves from this bondage. We take a knife and cut our binding contours. The blood runs out. It is escaping from bondage. We continue to cut. Everything must be released from bondage. We cut out our muscles, our organs, our nervous system if we can carry on with our work.

But it appears that something is happening to us. We have perhaps steeled ourselves against the pain of releasing our body from bondage, but we find ourselves getting weaker and weaker. Before we have time to finish the work we find that we have become incapable of finishing it. Too much blood has escaped, too many muscles and nerves have been freed by the knife. Is release from bondage good or bad?

To eliminate the binding contours of a being is to cause it to cease to be. If all the binding contours of all the beings in existence were removed all being would be no more, would become nonexistent. But whatever it was which had been held in being by the binding contours would not have lost its essential properties. Its essence would not be lost or annihilated.

What is enclosed by a binding contour within the ultimate source of all things is sentient power. This sentient power is the generator of the binding contours which come into being within it. The sentient power is itself infinite, yet it generates within itself by its own power the circumscribing or rotating forces which bring binding contours, and therefore beings, into existence.

The Infinite goes beyond any binding contours, beyond all circumscribing forces, and therefore beyond all being. To be is to be bound. To go beyond all bounds is to go beyond all being.

The pantheist, the man who says that God is all being, and all there is; or that all there is the totality of being, is making the mistake of thinking that all that is *being,* all that is *bound,* absolutely covers the infinite sentient power.

But the infinite, the not-finite, is not bound.

The pantheist says Nature is God and God is Nature. But Nature exists, Nature has being, therefore Nature is bound. The bound is finite.

The Infinite is not finite. Therefore Nature is not God. God is the infinite sentient power and source of Nature, but Nature is a finiting process and is therefore not the infinite God.

The Infinite never manifests itself as itself, for manifestation is a finiting process. But the finiting process (which brings Nature into existence) is generated by the circumscribing rotatory motions initiated and sustained by the Infinite Sentient Power.

If we use a circle to represent the greatest conceivable being which contains all other beings we can understand another idea about God and Nature. This circle represents the whole of Nature. Whatever goes beyond the binding contour of our circle we say *transcends* it. The circle is finite. God is infinite. He is the sentient power which stretches beyond all circles. Therefore we may say God transcends Nature. And because beyond this largest conceivable circle the Infinite stretches out infinitely, we may say that God transcends all Nature, all Being, absolutely. God is absolutely transcendent of Nature or Being.

But the Infinity of God is not limited by any binding line whatever, not even inwards towards the zone enclosed by the circle. The circle's binding contour is only a circulation of the sentient power which stretches infinitely beyond any particular zone of circulation it may produce in itself. The binding contour is sentient power circulating.

The sentient power beyond the circle is transcendent of the circle, and the sentient power within the circle we may call *immanent* in the circle. The sentient power beyond the circulation band, at the circulation band, and within the circulation band is a continuum not made of parts. The infinite sentient power is in no way severed from itself by introducing into itself, by the activation of its own power, zones of circulation. The binding contours it generates bring all Nature into being within it, without cutting Nature or being off from itself. The tornado, which appears in the air, is not severed from the air. It is brought into existence by the motion of the air, which stretches also beyond the zone of the tornado motion. There is air beyond the tornado, constituting the tornado and within the centre of the tornado. So it is also with the Wheel of Nature generated by the Infinite Sentient Power.

The Infinite Sentient Power is God, God transcendent of Nature, God constituting Nature, and God immanent in Nature.

Nature we may conceive of as the zone of being between God transcendent (the Absolute Spirit) and God immanent (the immanent spirit in man).

Nature is the action band or wheel of being in which is developed the formative and evaluating process. This Nature-wheel spins inside the infinitely transcending sentient power which is God.

Therefore we say, "In Him we live, move, and have our being."

Nature is in God, less than God, produced by God for God's purpose. The Spirit, the Intelligence and the Will of man is God's spirit within Nature, put into Nature to raise Nature in man to consciousness of God transcendent, God creative in Nature and God immanent in man. Man is God embodied and struggling in Nature to return through Nature to Himself.

God transcendent is *beyond* the problem. God Creative in Nature is the problem. God in man is the immanent *solution* of the problem. This is why we look to the Incarnate God, the God-man, for salvation, for the resolution of all things, for the wiping away of all tears from our eyes.

Chapter Four

Feeling and Fielding.

The body, being made of parts, may corrupt, disintegrate and die. The system of ideas in the mind-space also may disintegrate. All compounds whatever are subject to corruption, to disintegration. Is feeling a compound? Can feeling disintegrate? To answer this we must examine the nature of feeling. A feeling, as experienced, is not usually so clearly defined as an idea. It is possible to produce a relatively sharply defined feeling by sticking a pin into oneself in a sensitive place, but even here the feeling does not attain the same degree of sharpness we find in a clearly defined idea such as we use in considering a geometrical form.

There is in a feeling, no matter how clearly it may be defined, a sense that it is somehow edgeless, lacking in hard contour. When we seek for the origin of our consciousness of clearly defined forms or shapes we find it in our visual sense. It is the eye which gives us our consciousness of sharply contoured forms. These visual forms recorded in our memory are what we call clear ideas. The word "idea" means form or shape, and because of the course of the development of philosophy, has come to mean a form in consciousness, or in the mind, rather than in the material world.

Ordinarily, if the lighting conditions are favourable, and if the objects from which they come have clean edges, the eyes register clear-cut shapes. We do not feel any emotion when we see a clearly defined geometrical shape (unless this shape is associated with some pleasurable or painful situation. In which case, the emotion belongs to this and not to the shape itself).

The eye is a directional organ. Our eyes are on the front of our face and look in one direction at a time. From what is presented to the eye in one look, which look is itself an abstraction of the total visual possibility of the universe, interest abstracts a relatively small area of the visual field in which some shape, or form, or object is presented. Thus our attention, our interest, ordinarily jumps from one object to another across the visual field, ignoring large areas of what we call "space" between the objects or forms which interest us.

Usually we are not conscious of this process of leaping from one interesting form to another. We are conscious of the leap across the "space" between. But if we stop for a moment and ask ourselves whether we are not, after all, aware in some degree of the "space" we have leapt over we have to answer, "Yes". We are aware of what is between forms which sharply interest us. We are aware of "space", of the background of the interesting forms, but not in so sharp a manner as we are of the forms themselves.

What is "interest"? Simply we may say it is *emotional charge*. It is a degree of liking or disliking of a content of consciousness. (We will not say here "of unconsciousness" because we shall deal with this later.).

Interest is emotional charge or stress. What is emotion? It is feeling mobilised in relation to some form or object, feeling on the move towards or away from something. We talk of a "moving" experience, meaning one which sets our feelings in motion.

Emotion is feeling mobilised, feeling on the move in relation to something. What is feeling when it is not mobilised, not on the move in relation to something?

Feeling not mobilised may be immobilised negatively, that is held in check, inhibited by contrary stimuli, as when one may feel like walking north and south simultaneously. This kind of negative feeling results in general tension from the inner self-contradiction of the opposing feeling directions.

Feeling may also be stationary from lack of surrounding stimuli, so that it has no ground for moving. This leaves the body relaxed (and possibly hypo-tense, or under the normal level of slight tension which living beings usually exhibit and which we call the tonic state).

Feeling may also be standing in the tonic state of readiness to receive stimuli positively, ready to respond to any stimulus which may come. (This tonic feeling state is the precondition to certain states of higher consciousness such as those attained in Yoga exercises.)

But, whether immobilised negatively, or stationary from lack of surrounding stimuli, or standing in the tonic state of readiness to move, feeling has no sharply defined limits, no hard contours. When we feel to find the edges or limiting contours of feeling, we do not find them. Feeling always goes beyond the hard binding lines that the visual sense gives us.

If we increase the sensitivity of our feeling to find the limits of it, instead of finding limits, we find that our feeling extends further and further out. Continued increase of sensitivity and refinement of feeling merely extends feeling further. With feeling sensitivity increased we begin to realise that feeling will always extend beyond any clearly defined form we may experience. Feeling goes beyond all definition. It is infinite. Ideas or forms or objective things are all circumscribed and therefore finite. Feeling is infinite.

But although feeling is in itself infinite, nevertheless, within the circumscribed zone of a form or object, feeling is characterised by the object. That is to say, wherever an object exists in consciousness (or in the unconscious), feeling is ordinarily conditioned by the object.

When feeling is mobilised in relation to an object, towards, away from, or around it, an emotional charge is placed on the object. The emotional charge is the pressure or stress of feeling placed on the object. To place this stress on an

object the feeling contracts upon it. If we feel very carefully, we can find in the stressed feeling the sensation of contraction or holding in of tension to the object.

If we deeply value an object then, in our mind, we hold the idea of this object with an extra tension, a tension more than that we place on other ideas not related to things we value. If we do this with several valued objects which we relate together into a pattern, we create a feeling-compound determined in its quality by the feeling-stresses or emotional charges placed on the objects or ideas of objects constituting the pattern.

If we now take the group of ideas which we refer to as our individuality, the particular group of ideas which is ordinarily habitually presented in consciousness and referred to as "I", and place upon this pattern and the "I" group a special feeling stress which we call the sense of ownership or property, we have created an emotionally charged state we call the state of identification. The "I" group of ideas now has tied to it the value-stressed pattern in such a way that the destruction of the pattern or of part of it will have an unpleasant effect in the zone of the "I" group. The feeling in this group will then feel the damage done to the value-stressed pattern as injury done to part of itself. If the whole pattern is destroyed or disintegrated the feeling will be one of disintegration. Thus although feeling itself is infinite not finite and therefore indestructible, in the identified state, where it has pressed upon a group of objects and deeply valued them, the disintegration of the group is felt as if it were the disintegration of the feeling itself.

But feeling is infinite; it cannot disintegrate. Therefore the feeling of disintegration produced by the disruption of a group of value-stressed ideas is an illusion. This is of the utmost importance.

What is feeling itself? It is the self-experience of the infinite sentient power. If then, instead of identifying with groups or patterns of ideas, feeling returns to itself, it returns to infinity. But infinity is not finite. What happens to the objects with which feeling had identified when feeling removes the value-stress from the objects?

The objects are forms of motion of and in the infinite sentient power. When the value-stress or super-stress is removed from them they still have their characteristic form, they are not lost. But now they do not stand out from the infinity of other forms produced by the motion of the infinite sentient power. They are there without super-stress.

They may again be super-stressed by the introduction by the sentient power of special localised tensions, or they may be left at the general tension level of the infinity of other forms. Whether they are left at the general tension level or super-stressed and thus made to stand out from the others is determined entirely by the sentient power itself.

The coming-to-be and ceasing-to-be of superstresses in the sentient power is the creation and dissolution of all beings individual and universal. Worlds come

to be and cease to be merely by the introduction into itself and removal from itself by the sentient power of super-stresses.

Wherever sentient power actualises itself we may say is *a field* of activity. A field may be defined as a zone of influence of a motion pattern. (A field is sometimes defined as a zone of influence of a force, but "forces" manifest only as motion.) In principle, in a continuum all motions travel throughout its whole substance. In an infinite continuum all motions are propagated (travel) to infinity. The sentient power is infinite. Therefore all motions within it are propagated infinitely. This means that all motions usually interpenetrate each other. No motion is absolutely shielded from any other.

When we experience anything (idea or thing) we do so because of its characteristic motion pattern, its form of motion. As the zone of influence of a motion-pattern is called a "field" we may say that when we experience a feeling what we are experiencing is a field state. We may say that to feel is to be subject to a field.

As ultimately there is nothing other than the infinite sentient power and its motions, and what is experienced by this sentient power is simply its own motion-pattern, and the zone of influence of a motion is called a field, we may talk of the infinite field, and say that what is being felt by infinite sentience is its own infinite field. As the field is characterised by its motion-pattern, and feeling feels the field's motion-patterns as its own content, we may say that feeling is field consciousness; or to make a simple mnemic sentence, a memory aid, we may say that feeling is "fielding", by which we mean that the content of a feeling is the field-process or motion pattern in the zone where the feeling is experienced.

In an infinite continuum we have seen that all motions travel (are propagated) to infinity and are therefore wholly mutually interpenetrating. As this is so we are forced to conceive the infinite continuum of sentient power as traversed by motion patterns interpenetrating each other so that the whole continuum or field is entirely filled by motion.

When we talk of the infinite sentient power, in using the word "power" we are implying causative motion, for no power can exist other than as cause of some effect. Power is that which pushes something. (We are not here using the word "power" as it is used in mechanics, where it means the rate of doing work. We are using it in accordance with its root significance, *ability to push.* The word "cause" also conveys the related idea of applied force, for it comes from a word meaning *to strike.*

Therefore for "sentient power" we might really equally well say "sentient motion". No motion can occur without producing some effect; therefore motion must be conceived to be a cause. The effect of the cause is the outer or external motion arising from the inner initiating motion. There is no discontinuity between a cause and its effect. Both are the same motion; but the effect is that part of a motion which is received by a sense organ from outside.

The usual idea of causation in Europe and the West is that a moving object striking another object imparts some of its motion to this object and so changes its state or location. This is the idea of causation, which treats things as happening one after the other in time, the cause being earlier in time and the effect later. We may call this idea of causation the "serial causation" idea. Causes precede effects in time.

But the other view of causation is quite different and has a different application. It is a fundamental of oriental philosophies. This idea says that both cause and effect are motion-patterns; that they are essentially identical, but that a cause is the motion not manifested to a sense organ, and the effect is the same motion experienced by a sense organ.

In other words, when a motion originates from outside a given sense organ, the psyche using this sense organ calls this motion an effect. "Effect" really means "outer fact" or action upon a sense organ not originated in that organ.

At the point of originating a motion the sentient power feels this motion as a cause. Where this same motion is received by a sense organ and attributed to an external source it is called an effect.

All motions whatever originate within the infinite sentient power or motion. As we say that a causal motion is one originated from within, we must say that for the infinite sentient power all motion is causal. At this level of comprehension there is only causal motion and there are no effects. Where then do effects come into existence? They come into existence where the causal motion patterns are functioning as circumscribed formal beings receiving motion-patterns from other formal beings outside themselves.

"Outside" does not, and cannot, mean "outside" the infinite field of sentient power. It means outside some finite motion-pattern (formal being) within the infinite. We can illustrate this very simply by letting the paper of this page represent the field, and the letters printed on the page the motion-patterns of the field. All the letters are within the page but each letter is outside the others. From its own centre each letter is a causal being keeping itself in being by its characteristic formal motion. But each letter receives information about the other letters from outside itself and interprets this as fact external to itself, that is, as an effect.

If we imagine each letter to generate itself, to formulate itself, we may view it as self-caused. If we imagine each letter to be sentient, to have its own consciousness, it will treat every motion coming to it from outside as an effect of an assumed external cause. Yet the cause and the effect are the same motion, the cause at its point of origin, the effect at its point of reception.

So also it may be conceived of human beings. Each of us feels a causal motion or power within ourself and sees this motion to have some effect on others. The same motion, liberated in one person as a cause, becomes in another person an effect.

A motion is not called an effect until it manifests externally, that is on or beyond the periphery of its being.

If we remember that the ultimate source of all beings is the infinite sentient power which has nothing external to it, we will see why we may refer to it as the absolute cause of all things. If we remember that this infinite sentient power produces within itself by its motion an infinity of patterns which as circumscribed zones of motion are outside each other, though internal to the infinite, we may see that each being may stand as the causal centre of certain motion-patterns, and yet these same motions impinge on other beings and there be interpreted as effects.

When a pebble is dropped on the surface of a pool the impact causes ripples. These ripples travel through the water and produce motion in the weeds and other things, the motion observed in the weeds etc. being called the effect. If we draw a circle for the edge of the pool and a dot in its centre for the point of impact of the pebble, this dot represents the initial causal motion, and the circle its effect. Yet the circle represents only the expanded original motion of the dot at its centre. Cause and effect are not two separate things. In the same way, when a man initiates a motion in his mind, this motion traveling from its point of origin through his organism becomes at his perimeter an effect, which we call external action. External action is an effect, a cause become visible to other beings.

Chapter Five

Spirit

In the 20th century, dominated by scientific concepts, the word "spirit", except as a synonym for vitality, or significance, is in disrepute. We may talk about a spirited horse or woman, meaning one with plenty of vitality or life-force. We may talk about the spirit of a play, or novel or piece of music, meaning its significance or meaning. But if we use the word "spirit" in the sense in which a theologian would use it, most people begin to feel slightly uncomfortable, as if a foreign anachronism had entered the drawing room or lounge, without invitation.

Not many people today, outside church congregations, would allow the word "spirit" to mean more than *vitality* or *significance.* The idea of "spiritual" beings living on some plane other than the material one would receive little assent from other than religionists or spiritualists. But even more unlikely of acceptance to people in general is the idea of Spirit as an absolute, Spirit as God, Spirit as Creator and ultimate Source of all being.

The word "spirit" derives from a word meaning several related things, *wind, air, breath, vital force.* Early man saw a connection between the air he breathed and the life principle within himself. Therefore he used the same word to express both. When a man is breathing, he is alive. When he ceases to breathe for more than a few minutes he dies. (A pearl-diver may hold his breath for about three and a half minutes) A dead man does not breathe. Not surprisingly, therefore, primitive man saw a connection between breath and life-force.

Later on man discovered that air (oxygen) was necessary for combustion processes in his body, but thought life-force separate from air as such. This is roughly the present-day attitude to the facts. But whatever we may think of the relation between air and the life-force in the individual, we have still the problem of the life-force as a universal.

In general it is believed that life-force is dependent on a material organism, that life-force is inconceivable except in association with a special kind of body, a body organised in a special manner, consisting of many complex parts, having a definite functional relationship.

But there is a real danger that we may here put the cart before the horse. When we say that life depends on an organised body, we are forgetting that this body's organisation is itself a function of life.

If we take the body of a living human being and reduce it to its constituent chemical elements by crushing it, heating it, and so on, we shall still have the same

material constituents of the body, but its characteristic organisation has gone. The problem of life is this: How does the organisation get in the material elements of a living body?

It is quite useless to say that it gets in from the material elements themselves. If we take the material elements of a once living human being and place them in a container and leave them there forever so long we shall not expect them to organise themselves and re-build the human being from which they were derived. It is no use pretending that a stroke of luck or lightning might effect the necessary organisations.

Some materialistic thinkers place the origin of the organisation of living forms in a series of accidents, sometimes called "happy" accidents. Darwinian evolutionists would say that of all the accidental arrangements in which material elements fell in the course of time, some of these had greater survival value, greater stability, greater capacity for adjustment to the new arrangements of surrounding material elements. Thus by a series of happy accidents the material elements flying about in space gradually fell into the increasingly more stable and adjustable forms that we know as the molecular compounds, plant forms, animal forms, and finally human forms. Stated shortly in this manner, the accidental evolutionary theory, the theory of natural selection, sounds like a pipe dream. We shall see reason to believe that it is.

First of all the view that material elements exist in empty space is untrue. They exist in a field of force. The naive materialism of irreducible material atoms popular in the 19th century has been exploded with the atom in the 20th century.

The idea that space is the nothingness in which material particles and bodies exist is no longer held by any clearly thinking person.

Whatever space is, it is not empty. It is full of forces, full of happenings, full of events. We do not refer here to the vast amounts of radiation forces coming to us from beyond the earth, or beyond the solar system. We refer to the infinity of force manifestations yet to be discovered and as yet utterly unmeasured by scientific instruments. No intelligent scientist today would pretend that the physicists and astronomers have done more than touch the hem of the garment of absolute power.

When we look at an organised living body we are looking at something to which the word "accident" cannot be applied. The word "accident" means that which is neither essential nor necessary for a subject. It is only accidental, that is, not essential or necessary that a rational being (such as a human being) should be white. What constitutes essential or necessary humanity is not a particular colour of skin but something else. Whatever is essential to the human being cannot be accidental. Ultimately the idea of the accidental is utterly against the idea of causation. Yet there are few people today who would deny the doctrine of causation, that is, the idea that prior events influence subsequent events.

The idea of a cause is the idea of a force necessarily producing an effect. The word "cause" is from a Latin word meaning *to strike,* that is, to apply a force. We cannot conceive that a blow applied to an object will be absolutely without

effect, either on the object, or on the thing giving the blow. When a hammer strikes the head of a nail in a piece of wood we expect from experience that both hammer and nail will undergo some change. The nail will be driven some distance into the wood. The hammer will become a little worn where it hit the nail. We cannot conceive an existential material hammer and nail remaining after a blow absolutely the same as they were before the blow. We can imagine the *idea* of a hammer, the *idea* of a blow, and the *idea* of a nail put together and still leave the ideas intact, but not the existential hammer and blow and nail adding up to exactly the same effect as the hammer and nail without the blow. We cannot conceive that the hammer blow or the nail might "accidentally" have no effect. Causes always necessarily have effects.

Now there is one effect which is of great importance for the problem we are examining. It is the effect we call "consciousness" in ourselves. Absolutely there is no effect without a cause. Therefore consciousness has a cause.

The cause of consciousness is a formal patterning of sentient power. But causation is not accidental. It is necessary and essential that causes produce effects, that effects follow causes. Therefore the effect called consciousness necessarily follows from its cause. Therefore consciousness is not an accident. The appearance of consciousness in the universe is an effect which has necessarily, not accidentally, followed its cause. Consciousness in the universe is no accident.

The problem of the appearance in the world of consciousness is a problem only for a being possessing consciousness. That which has no consciousness whatever has no problem. A problem is a patterned situation held within a consciousness in order to discover the relationship of its parts, for some purpose.

The patterned situation which presents itself to us as conscious beings is the universe in which we live, the stars, planets, atoms, molecules, organic compounds, plants, animals and human beings.

The purpose we have in probing this patterned situation is the gaining of more consciousness, more life. We seek to have life, and have it more abundantly. But life is only life to a being with the consciousness to experience it. Life implies some degree of consciousness. Increase of consciousness is increase in life's possibilities.

Now there is a very peculiar thing about consciousness. All conscious beings know what consciousness is like in experience. Yet no conscious being has ever seen his consciousness in the way he has seen the objects within it.

We may know the *content* of our consciousness in an *objective* way. We may know our consciousness only in *a subjective* way. What do we mean by this?

What is an object? Simply we may say that an object is a form, a something characterised by a binding contour which allows consciousness to know it, precisely because it has a characteristic binding contour.

What is not characterised by a circumscribing line is not an object of consciousness. Thus a vague, undefined feeling is not properly called an object. It is called *a subjective* experience. Only that which we can formally define is an object.

All the objects in consciousness, the totality of all possible objects which exist or may be conceived to exist, cannot exhaust the whole field of consciousness, because objective knowledge is only of what may be defined, and consciousness has within itself subjective experiences, feelings, emotions, urges etc., which do not come within the realm of objective knowledge.

Until recently scientists have been concerned only with objective knowledge. Subjective experience has been the prerogative of artists, musicians, poets and sensitive people. Now scientists are becoming aware of contents of consciousness not categorisable objectively. Recent attempts to disclose the roots of consciousness and conscious processes have led to awareness that fields of force exist having a close relation to the processes in living beings which border on the problem of consciousness.

In America bio-magnetic fields have been measured. In Russia human will and wishes have been shown to exert measurable forces on appropriate instruments. These phenomena have been given a pseudo-objectivity by being made to influence measuring instruments, but in themselves, as experienced by consciousness itself, they remain subjective. Let us say a little more of what we mean by subjective. The subjective is what a consciousness experiences in itself which is not objective, that is not defined with a characteristic contour which enables it to be recognised. It is by their characteristic contours that we distinguish one element of objective knowledge from another.

We differentiate our subjective experiences not by their characteristic contours but by immediate felt experience. Our subjective knowledge is of feeling states, emotions, urges, felt or sensed in ourselves as states of ourselves.

Objective knowledge has with it the consciousness that it is other than ourselves. If we see a thing in the world, or an objective idea of a thing in our mind, we do not think this thing or idea is ourselves: we think it is other than ourselves. We think of it as something thrown into our consciousness either from outside by some external stimulus, or from within ourselves by the power of our imagination or will or intellect. It is because we think of a thing or idea as something *thrown* into our consciousness that we call it an object. An object is an orb or sphere or thing thrown into consciousness. What is a subject? It also is thrown ("jecere" - *to throw)* but instead of being an orb or definable thing or idea, what is thrown is merely the consciousness itself. It is thrown under (sub) the state of feeling, emotion, or urge which it experiences as its own.

Where feeling, emotion or urge are experienced they are experienced as belonging to the consciousness which experiences them. Consciousness feels that it is feeling its own state.

But where knowledge is objective, consciousness does not experience it as its own self, except in certain exceptional psychic states which we call states of

"identification". States of identification exist whenever we become excessively attached emotionally to any thing or object. Extreme identification with things or ideas exists in certain mental disorders. But it is also deliberately induced as an exercise in certain Yoga practices where the Yogi aims to fuse his consciousness with that of some divine being or cosmic intelligence in order to extend his own consciousness beyond its usual level and so gain information and power otherwise not accessible to him.

In grammar we use the words "Subject" and "Object" in a special way. The Subject is the doer of the action indicated by the verb. The Object is that which receives this action upon itself, or that to which the action is directed. As for example, "The Sun shines on the sea." Where "the Sun" is the subject, the word "shines" is the verb and "the sea" is the object.

If we use the word "subject" to indicate the doer of an act we will find that the grammatical use of the word is related to the real function of the consciousness as Subject.

The peculiar property of consciousness is that it is able to induce changes in events without changing its own nature in *the* process. We may say, therefore, that consciousness is a catalyst. When we become conscious of something of which we were not previously conscious, our thoughts about that thing and other related things and feelings change, and from these changes our action tendencies are also changed.

If a man driving a car down a road well-known to him suddenly becomes aware that a part of the road ahead of him has been taken up for repair, the new information in his consciousness releases a whole series of ideas and feelings, resulting in a complex physical response to avoid the broken part of the road. It is consciousness of the new fact which has released the new chain of responses, without consciousness changing its own nature. Something that induces change in other things without changing its own nature is called a catalyst. Consciousness, therefore, is a catalyst.

The knower of an object is called a subject. The knower is called a subject for one reason, because he in a certain sense may be said to be "thrown under" the influence of the object. But the knower is also called "subject" in the grammatical sense that he is the doer of an act.

When an object is presented to consciousness it imposes its form on consciousness, or subjects consciousness to, or throws consciousness under, its influence. Here consciousness is the subject as that which is thrown under the influence of the object.

But consciousness also acts back upon the object, and thus is the doer of an act which exerts its influence on the object.

Consciousness, then, is both the doer of an act affecting an object, and the receiver of the object's action on itself. Consciousness is the subject both as giver and receiver.

Let us consider some implications of this. Consciousness is both giver and receiver of stimuli. It receives stimuli from objects within itself, and it acts back on those objects.

Consciousness is an effect of causes and itself a cause of effects. Whatever its original causes it is now acting back upon those causes to produce effects.

A cause is a force applied. Consciousness acts upon its objects, produces new effects in them, and must therefore be a cause, that is, a force.

The objects of consciousness act upon consciousness and produce changes within consciousness, and must therefore be causes, that is, forces.

Consciousness is a force. Objects are forces. Both subject and object are forces. Consciousness and its effects have this in common - they are forces. What have they not in common?

Objects have form or shape. Consciousness itself has no form.

We can conceive an object without attributing consciousness to it. That is, we can conceive an object which is not in itself conscious. Consciousness, however, is consciousness, and we cannot conceive it to become an object which is not conscious.

How do we conceive an object which is not conscious? First we look in consciousness and find an object, that is, a form characterised by a binding contour. Then we postulate that this form might exist outside consciousness. Then we pretend that it is outside consciousness. Then we repress the form, that is, reduce its energy so that it loses stimulus power, relative to other objects and subjective states, feelings, etc. Then we convince ourselves that the object which we had experienced and the energy of which still reverberates in what we call our memory, still exists, as we had experienced it in our consciousness, but now outside it.

Under the appropriate conditions we can conjure up in consciousness, from our memory, the form of the object. What is happening here?

In the first place, consciousness as we know it at the objective level is always associated with one special object which remains its centre of reference. It is our body. Our body is the one object which serves as the centre of reference for our objective consciousness. We may say that our objective consciousness depends upon our having some such object as our body precisely to serve as a reference point to which all other objects may be referred.

During our waking state we usually have this objective body as our conscious reference centre. We must say, therefore, that consciousness is here in some degree identified with the body-object.

Identification is emotional charge, or feeling pressure upon an object greater than elsewhere in consciousness. When consciousness presses upon this body-object with pressure greater than on the environment, it experiences in the zone of the body a sensation or feeling, more intense than elsewhere, because of the greater pressure. It is this greater pressure which keeps the body-object central to consciousness.

In dream and deep sleep, however, consciousness reduces the pressure on the body-object to somewhere about the same pressures as elsewhere, with the result that objectivity in consciousness diminishes. Consciousness now experiences, instead of the objective contents of the waking state, only the subjective state of relatively undefined feelings, emotions and urges. Occasionally some feeling may resonate with the related feeling tone of a given objective content, and thus intensify it and bring the object partially back into consciousness, so creating a dream, in some degree objectively memorable. At other times consciousness reduces the tension of its contents so much that we enter the state we call deep dreamless sleep. But even here consciousness functions, although purely subjectively, for when we awake in the morning we have consciousness that we have been in a deep dreamless sleep.

When we come out of the state of dreamless sleep, or of dream, to the waking state, to what do we return? We return to the body-object which we allowed to lapse in consciousness in order to go to sleep. The body-object to which we return on waking from sleep must be kept in a sufficient degree of tension for us to be able to centre on it again, otherwise we should not be able to return to it.

Those of us who have experienced a horrible nightmare have been glad to be able to centre consciousness on our body-object and so wake up and rescue ourselves from the terrible, uncontrolled, subjective emotions of the nightmare. We struggle violently in the nightmare to return to our objective body consciousness, to wake up and so escape the nightmare's horror.

Later we may be able to recall to objective consciousness certain half-formed elements of the nightmare. We may then integrate these forms with other objects filed in our waking consciousness and memory.

To integrate these forms in our conscious memory, we keep our body-object as the central reference in consciousness, and find some point of association between the forms to be remembered, and other forms already associated with our body object and stored in our memory.

Later we can call up these forms from our memory simply by referring to those elements in consciousness associated with them and with our body-object.

Always our body-object is held central to consciousness and to it we link all other objects by association law. Consciousness holds our body-object in continuous tension more than other objects, so that it may function as reference centre for all else. It is upon this fact that we base our belief that we exist as individual human beings. Our individuality is no more than the persistence in consciousness of the form of our body-object with whatever other objective content has become associated with it. Consciousness holds our body-object central to itself, integrates other objective forms of experience round it, suffuses the whole with correspondent feelings, and activates it from its objective and subjective content.

Consciousness is then a force which may know an object or definable form, or experience a subjective state of feeling, emotion or urge. Consciousness we may say, therefore, is sentient power. The word "sentient" is from the Latin "sentire", meaning *to feel, to know.* Sentience is that which may know objectively or feel subjectively.

Sentient power is both knower objectively, feeler subjectively and doer actively.

To know objectively is to have ideas, or defined forms or objects. To feel subjectively is to have degrees of pressure with accompanying sensations of pleasure or pain. To do actually is to be a creator, an introducer into consciousness of a pattern of forces constituting the world of actual events.

Sentient power feels, thinks, and acts, and so produces an actual world, with correspondent ideas and feelings.

But this sentient power, possessing such capacities, sounds suspiciously like the vital force the ancients felt in themselves and called Spirit. We shall therefore not be afraid to use the word "spirit" as a synonym of sentient power.

"Spirit" is a very expressive word. It would be a pity to throw it away on the grounds that religious teachers have failed to clarify its meaning. We shall therefore use it as an alternative expression for sentient power. It is shorter and therefore more economic to use, and providing we do not forget its meaning, we have a lot to gain from its continued use. There is far too much weight behind the word from the past thought and feeling of the human race, to be able to justify its complete abandonment. It still has power to evoke the highest feelings of which the human soul is capable, and to refuse to use a word of such powerful associations would be, to say the least, ill-advised, considering the high aim we have set ourselves, that is, the attainment of the highest possible development of our consciousness.

From this point on, the book becomes, as mentioned in the Editor's Note, a daybook of the author's wisdom.

Love

Two pairs of eyes look into each other's depths. Two mouths frame the words, "I love you". A little girl croons, "I love my dolly". A Bunter-boy rolls his eyes and mumbles, "I love muffins". A sad-eyed bachelor whose mother died when he was forty sits up to the table loving his marquetry. A preacher cants from his pulpit, "God is love".

Here are many loves hard to harmonise, or one love disguising itself in many forms, many activities.

When a boy and girl say to each other "I love you", what do they mean? One of the things they mean is that they want to be together, to do things together. They want to protect each other from harm, to help each other, to please each other, to possess each other. "The Lord thy God is a jealous God." The Lord thy Lover is a jealous Lover. The Lady thy Lover is a jealous Lover. "Thou shalt have none other Gods but me." Thou shalt have no other lover but me. Why?

Behind all the forms of love there is one supreme love. Behind love of the body, love of the mind, love of the soul, and all other particular loves, there is the love of the spirit which speaks in the great imperative, "Develop thyself and all beings". This love of the spirit may be defined as a "will to work for the development of the potentialities of all beings".

The love of bodies aims to develop the potentialities of the relation of bodies. The love of the mind aims to develop the potentialities of all mental things, ideas, philosophies, and sciences. The love of the soul aims to develop the soul's power to feel, to relate itself to other souls in universal compassion. The love of the spirit aims to develop all things as expressions of the creative power of the source of all.

When a man loves a woman, when he says, "Thou shalt have no other man but me", what is he aiming at? He is aiming at the projection into being of the potentialities of himself and the woman. He is willing the perpetuation of certain characters, certain qualities of body, mind, soul and spirit he sees as potentialities in himself and in the woman. He and she may develop these characters and qualities in their own being, or they may develop them in their children, or they may do both.

I HAVE AN INSTINCT which tells me when some conception of the world is unwholesome. It tells me to suspect those persons who pluralise the world and deny unity. But it also tells me to suspect those who, in the name of unity, would

deny all individual values. The first suspicion warns me against atomists and materialistic scientists generally. The second warns me against dogmatic religionists.

STAGE FRIGHT, on the stage or in life, is fear of opinion. Its cure is to place one's stress in the "I" (not the objective "me"). This "I" consciousness is not a formal conceptual version of the ego, but the pure consciousness behind all forms - that to which we refer when we say "I" in full awareness of its significance. This "I" is not different in different individuals, neither is it the same; for difference and sameness are empirical and the "I" is non-empirical. Seated in the real "I" we have no ground of fear of the opinion of others - there are no others. Otherness belongs to bodies, not to the "I". Pure consciousness has no differentiating marks. Of what, then, should pure consciousness be afraid? It is untouched and untouchable. Who shall harm it? There is no other "who" to harm it. It is the supreme, the centre of all security, the formless unshakeable.

WHICH IS MORE DANGEROUS, stupidity or ill-will? Everything for the stupid depends on circumstances. No harm can be done by the stupid if the means to harm is lacking in the environment. But if the means is there the stupid can be very dangerous. Our safety in their presence depends on our vigilance. Our danger is in assuming that the stupid will not deliberately harm us. It is because they are incapable of deliberation that we need to guard against their actions more than against the intelligent man of evil intent, for he will not endanger himself by stupid action against us, and we know what to expect from him.

IS THERE ANY REASON for assuming that all things whatever are cyclic in their being and behaviour? First: to exist is to rotate, for without circulation of motion there can be no circumscription and without this there is no finite existence. It is thus proved that being is itself rotatory. What of the behaviour of beings? What a being does is either determined from within or without. If from without, whether its behaviour will be cyclic depends on whether what is without is cyclic. If from within, its behaviour must be either rational or irrational. If rational, it must be determined by the forms within itself. But rational form is form in relation with other forms, and relation implies some repetition (recognition) which is cyclic. Then if behaviour is rationally determined from within it must be cyclic in some degree. If irrational and internally determined there is a contradiction, for determination is form. Therefore if we say that behaviour is irrational, we must not say that it is determined. Irrational behaviour is itself a contradiction, for behaviour is directed motion, and this is form. There is therefore no irrational behaviour. Every behaviour is rational (formed) whether we see its rationale or not. If one says that X's behaviour is irrational, this means only that the rationale of X's behaviour is not understood.

CONFUSION is simply the fusing together of forms so that they cannot be discriminated. Confusion is, therefore, not a multiplicity of forms as such, but a multiplicity of forms so intermingled that it cannot be decided what is proper to each. The confused mind is the mind unable to allot to each form what is proper to it. Such a mind may be too slow in action to deal with its data as fast as they are presented.

GOD'S BODY cannot be made of material particles, for its unity would be impaired, and the material world without an underlying unity principle could not cohere. God's body is, therefore, an indiscrete X, not perceptible by material organs of sense. Sentiency (which is not discrete) is the only way of becoming aware of God's body. Sentiency = field awareness: this awareness knows all its contents, that which is discretely known to a material sense organ being here known simply as a zone of intensified feeling.

MIRACLE as opposed to law-bound action pre-supposes that some freedom from law is in the miracle doer. To pretend that miracles are simply unusual facts, or facts resulting from the operations of unknown laws, is to say that "miracle" is another way of saying "unusual fact", or "fact, effect of unknown law". This is not what "miracle" is taken to mean by people in general. It is also not what "miracle" means. "Miracle" means the breaking of the law of matter; the mirror-world thrown open. It is by free will that miracle is performed. Bound will performs nothing except mechanical reflexes.

IF I WERE A JUDGE trying a prisoner in the dock, I would say to him, "The reason why I am here and you are there is because I use my terms correctly". Correct use of terms is correct thought; correct thought tells us how we stand in relation to the facts we can describe. To have only a few words, if these are correctly used, is to be equipped with the knowledge necessary for a proper action within the described situation. Suppose a man has the word "murder" in his vocabulary. If he uses the word correctly he will see that it means *to kill.* His own feeling will tell him if he himself would like to be killed. If he would not like to be killed, and he goes to kill another man, there will be fear of death in him as he goes to do the deed. If the intended victim is able to defend himself, the would-be killer will not be surprised if he does so. He will not be suprised if he is himself wounded or killed in the struggle. If he kills his victim he will not be surprised

if the victim's family or friends are angry and seek revenge. He will not be surprised if humanity at large become afraid for their own lives and decide to catch him and put him to death.

OF SECRECY. Is secrecy needed? A truth expressed may cause some reaction of violence. A Protestant stating some of the historic facts relating to the Roman Church may find himself involved in a heated argument. In the world as it is, it is not always expedient to speak what one knows. But wherever possible truth should be opened and made available, though what are the circumstances in which truth may be told may require a very sensitive and intelligent person to determine.

INFINITY has finity permanently within it. Creative activity is that which keeps finity within infinity. Creation endures as long as infinity is what it is. How then does it appear that a temporal creation takes place? Time is the serial mode of the eternal simultaneous content of infinity. Nothing appears in serial time except abstracted events or objects of infinity. The Infinite must be aware of all its content simultaneously.

What is serial consciousness? It is apparent that it cannot be the infinite "eye" which sees things as "serial", "one at a time". We must therefore say that a special "eye", finite, must exist to account for serial "one at a time" presentation. What is this finite "eye"? It cannot be the infinite; it must he a finite; every finite is a formed object. This finite "eye" is a formed object. Now, when we think in terms of subject and object we are separating Being into two aspects. The subject is the knowing aspect, the object is the known aspect. Every object iscircumscribed; it is circumscription which characterises the object. What characterises the subject? Nothing. For "character" is form, and form belongs to the object. The subject-aspect is therefore formless and non-characterised. Every form is in and of that which lies behind the subject-object relation. Every form is a finite; that which lies behind form is infinite. This infinite is that which lies behind the finite subject, "eye" or "I". Behind the finite object is that which occupies infinite space. Behind the finite subject is that which has infinite awareness.

The finite subject (knower) is not characterised, for this is form. Why, then, do we say "finite" subject", when finity is formation or circumscription? We do so only if we tie the subject to an object, this object being what we call the subject's body. What is this tie? We shall call it identification. How does identification occur? Is it permanent, or is it impermanent? Does it come to be and cease? If it comes to be and was not, it can only be a form of motion or action, for what does not move does not change.

We know that we have the power to tie our consciousness to an object and to release ourselves from it. Identification is therefore an action and as such belongs in the objective aspect of being. The subject aspect is not that in which we conceive action to occur. Identification therefore is not of the subject, but of the object. Forms are circumscriptions. What is seen in each place is the formal

content of that place. If the form in a place were simple, then we would have to say that the content of the subject's awareness would also be simple.

Now, as every judgment requires three elements, the subject with a purely simple content can perceive no judgment, or no judgment takes place within it. As there is no judgment in the subject of simple content, it follows that the subject cannot there say "I am I", for this requires three elements, "I", "am" and I". If the form in the subject becomes complex enough, judgment will occur, that is, the subject will be aware of contents in some respect different. The subject will then be aware of some degree of identification, that is, of "fittingness" between the forms within it.

It is important to realise that the existence of a *finite* subject depends on the circumscribing line of some motion internal to this line. The quality of the motion must differ from that outside, for if it did not, then there would arise no difference in the field of awareness, and consequently, no finite subject. The Infinite Field knows the whole formal content of itself. Where the formal content of a zone is sufficiently complex, "judgment" takes place (i.e. balancing of motion forms).In each different zone the Infinite sees the formal content. It is the difference in each zone which we call the individuality of that zone. In each individuality, creation of form takes place according to the "law of increasing freedom" i.e. the form within each zone must be brought up to the level of complexity and internal relation such that it constitutes a sufficient instrument in its environment for the purposes of the infinite awareness. It is apparent that we must here proceed with great care, for we are on the edge of the greatest problem of philosophy. How does the Infinite relate to the finite subject? How does the world soul relate to the finite partial soul of the individual?

We have said that the differences are on the object side. On the subject side are no differences. Yet in each different zone the subject is aware of its formal content and this formal content constitutes its objectivity. We must therefore say that wherever there is a zone of action, there is a difference of awareness content, and therefore a different "subject". We mark the different subjects as different, not as subjects, but as zones of different formal activity. Thus without destroying the unity of the subject, we disclose a mode of ascribing plurality to it in terms of the different zones and formal contents which exist in them. We see from this that the empirical individuality is merely formal and objective. "Identification" may occur wherever form occurs.

DOES THE ABSOLUTE feel the pains suffered by individuals in the relative world? What is pain? It is that feeling experienced when an event is considered undesirable, and may he of varying degrees, according to the intensity of the undesirableness. What is the cause of undesirableness? It is the interference with some purpose of the desire or will. How does this interference arise? It arises because individuals have not sufficient power to further their purposes. It

appears, then, that what is omnipotent cannot suffer pain, for it has no desire which it cannot fulfill. How does the suffering of a finite individual appear to the Absolute? The Absolute is aware of the thwarting of the individual's will, but is itself not thwarted. Either what the individual is willing is consistent with the Absolute will or not. If it is, then the Absolute will give the power to the individual to do the act; if it is not, then the Absolute will not give such power to do the act; the Absolute will *will* be done.

WHY DOES GOD CREATE? If God = Spirit Infinite, why does Infinite Spirit produce finity? Either He does so by necessity or not. If by necessity He is determined by His own being. "Determined" means formed or circumscribed or finited. Infinity cannot circumscribe itself, for that would be to contradict its own infinity. But infinity can produce within itself a zone or zones of circumscription. This circumscription is in the nature of some form of motion. Creation itself is another name for circumscription. Why does Infinite Spirit produce circumscribed zones within itself? Either because it cannot help it, or because, being able to inhibit it, it yet wills it. If we say it cannot help this circumscription process, we are faced with a view of creation in some sense mechanical, or completely determined. If Infinite Spirit has the power to inhibit this creative process, and yet does not, we are faced with a view of creation as a willed act. For what purpose would Infinity will the finite? Not being determined by other than His own free decision, we have to say that Infinity would will finity because so to will is more satisfactory to His own being than not to. To be able to create and not to do so, would be to inhibit a process which, if expressed, would produce innumerable varieties of forms. Fortified in love, Infinity would not inhibit creation, having no inhibitive function other than creation. Creation is inhibition, for inhibition is limitation.

Infinity, therefore, considered apart from creation, is absolutely free from all inhibitive processes, and is, therefore, the supreme or absolute positive, or fullness of non-negation. The Infinite, therefore, has no inhibitive process in itself to stop its creativeness from passing into existence. This does not mean that Infinity is *compelled* to create, for "compulsion" derives from dualistic thinking.

Infinity prior to creation is under no compulsion or constraint whatever, for there is nothing to constrain it. Of course, for us as created beings, to talk of infinity as being itself prior to creation is to indulge in extremely abstract thinking. Actually we do not know infinity. We are aware that every finite has space around it, and we therefore posit a very close relation between "space" and "infinity".

As we do not allow exact identity between the significances of two or more terms (there are no exact synonyms) we must distinguish between the use of the term "space" and the term "infinity". Yet so closely are these two terms related that we must proceed with the greatest care. The word "infinity" means "not finity" or "not-finite subject". It is the word "finity" which is characterised by circum-

scription, simply negated. Consequently to conceive infinity we must first circumscribe one only zone, and then erase the circumscribing line. What we now hold in mind is a notion of the removal of limitation and this we call "infinity".

Now of "space". In general we talk of space as being that in which objects exist or are situated. Where an object is or may be we call a "place". The totality of "places" which exist we call "space". Each place is defined by the circumscription of a zone in defined by the circumscription of a zone in which an object may be or is existent. The totality of all such zones we call "space". As a zone of circumscription is a finite, the totality of all such zones includes all finites. This brings the notion of space very close to that of Infinity. We may say that Infinity is co-existent with all space, whether occupied or not, just as we may say that every finite exists in a place, which it demarks or demonstrates. "All space" and "infinity" are therefore very closely related terms. We may talk of objects as modalities of a substance, as finites within infinity, or as places in space. There is, therefore, a close relation between the questions, Why does Infinity produce finity? Why does space have places within it? and Why does substance modalise itself? Either Infinity has reason or not. If not, then we must say that creation has a non-reasonable origin. But if we say that Infinity has a reason for creating, then we are saying that Infinity has finity within it. For "reason" is "ratio" and "ratio" is formal relation, and form is circumscription. If then there is any reason for creation it is demonstrated that "Infinity" without finity is an illegitimate abstraction. Infinity has finity within it as its permanent possession. What then *is* creative activity?

AN EMBRYO BECOMES A CHILD, the child a youth, the youth a man, the man a greybeard. These changes are changes of form. Behind them substantially is the human being. Of what form and nature is this hidden human who produces these changes? Whatever his form it cannot change, for if it did it could not retain its unity, nor could it produce a child like itself. The growth process is in the material world a mere accretion, absorption and re-arrangement of particles by the forces of the human being. The cycle of egg-embryo-child-youth- man-old man is not in the material particles, for they may be absorbed by a plant or an animal instead of a human being. This cycle is therefore in the human being.

What is its purpose? It aims at liberating a man from a finite behaviour pattern derived from one environment and time, and precipitation, through one egg, of a new form in some measure freed from the behaviour pattern of its parent. The real man contains all the phases through which he must go to liberate himself from any situation. He assumes egg-form in himself, and every other phase which he may manifest, all being in him as a whole "plan" of campaign. At each life-stage he accretes and absorbs the matter necessary for making the form of that stage existent. The chemistry of the egg, the embryo, the child, youth, man and old man, are all different because the chemistry of each stage must "match" the form of its correspondent stage. Through all stages runs a basis of common chemicals, but in each stage some particular chemicals predominate. Behind all stages stands the whole unchanging human, just as behind all chemical differences stands the whole unchanging "matter" of the world.

IF BRAHMAN, THE UNDETERMINED, contains the highest determinant, Ishvara, this must be itself in some relation with Brahman as its ground. The Brahman as ground of Ishvara, the highest existent, creator of the world, must be such a ground as has in it such a creator. Ishvara is therefore established as the highest existent being in that it is inside the absolute (Brahman), dependent upon it, and justified in its dependence. If there is to be worship of an objective personality, Ishvara is that. If there is to be worship of what is above Ishvara, as that above is the absolute (Brahman), it must be worshipped as the source of Ishvara, the universal object, for if worship is to be done, some object is necessary, and Brahman considered as nirguna is not an object, either of worship or any other relative state.

IF THE CREATOR IS CONSCIOUS and spiritual, how does He produce in Himself that which is unconscious and unspiritual (matter)? For either we must say that the conscious creator can produce unconscious matter, or we must say that matter is not unconscious. What is matter? It is a substantial rotation within consciousness. Is it aware of itself? This depends on to what we refer when we use the word "matter". If by "matter" we refer only to the *rotation* within consciousness, we are thinking abstractly, and must, therefore, conceive the action of rotation apart from the consciousness in and for which it exists. In this case we must say that "matter" is unconsciousness. But this is merely to say that the words "matter" and "consciousness" have different referents.

As "matter" is merely rotation within the absolute, and consciousness is "seeing-togetherness" in the same absolute, both "matter" and "consciousness" are considerable as aspects of the absolute. The absolute itself, whilst transcending all distinctions, is that without which no distinctions can possibly arise. What appears to us as finite observers, logically requires some one substance as unity principle relating observers and observeds.

This unity principle is not "matter" (rotation), and "substance" may therefore just as well be called "superstance", for it transcends concepts of "below" and "above". If we use the word "substance" to signify the "unity" principle underlying the diverse appearances of the world, we must not attach to this word any significance derived from "material" experiences (inertia, resistance, etc.) for that to which we refer is beyond all determinations whatever. If we are to indicate it in any positive way, we must assert that it such as to be necessary for whatever else has arisen, is now, and will arise, and has no need of anything other than itself to account for these events or things.

WE DO NOT DEFINE THINGS; *things* are already well defined. What we define are the limits of the application of terms. We do not say what *a dog* is; we say to what we shall apply the term "dog". Very great confusion has been caused in philosophy by an attempt to define things, rather than to indicate the application of terms. Either the universe of things is independent of man's definitions or not. If it is, then man can only indicate the field of application of his terms. If the things of the universe depend on man's creative power, then it is possible for him in the act of definition to bring something into being which before was not. But this is equivalent to ascribing to man the power to produce form out of no form. For if the form he produces is in any way derived from other than pure formlessness, we cannot say that he has produced something not previously existent. But to produce form from the formed is not pure creativity. For a man to be a pure creator we would have to assume him to be completely formless; but this is to make him non- existent

---

THERE IS NO ABSOLUTE TRUTH. This means that the word "absolute" is not applicable to that which "truth" signifies, or the word "truth" is not applicable to that which the word "absolute" signifies. Truth is form (tora); the absolute transcends all forms, therefore there is no absolute truth: or, we should not use the term "absolute" and the term "truth" for one significance, or for one referent.

THE UNIVERSAL CONSCIOUSNESS is aware of all subsidiary beings within itself and also of its own being. As aware of its own being we may say that it is reflexively self-conscious. It is in this reflexively self-conscious mode that its freedom manifests to itself. Reflexive self-consciousness is essential to freedom, for without it there is identification with objects and states of being.

CONSCIOUSNESS HAS SOME RELATION with its objects. What? Consciousness itself is an infinite ocean of sentiency. This ocean is turbulated by itself. The turbulations interfere with each other. This interference is relative darkness. This relative darkness is "zoned" by the turbulations. These zones are the "objects" of or in consciousness. The objects are, by definition of "ob", zones of turbulence or circumscription or active limitations or darkness (DRK). Consciousness is therefore related to its objects as the sea to its turbulences.

THE QUESTION OF THE RELATION between the intellect's need for an ordered world and the world order which exists is resolved thus: There exist phenomena in consciousness. These phenomena, being by nature finite must eventually repeat. The cycles of repetition small or great constitute "order", for order is but cyclic presentation. As there is nothing in consciousness but phenomena and these phenomena are necessarily cyclic, therefore the content of consciousness is orderly. Consciousness as recogniser of order is called "reason" or "intellect". Phenomena are modalities of consciousness. Phenomena are cyclic. The modalities of consciousness are therefore cyclic, which is ordered. Consciousness, as modaliser of its own phenomenal content, is the source of the world order; as perceiver of its own ordered modalities, it is called "Reason".

SUBJECT-OBJECT THINKING cannot exhaust reality, for the predicate cannot exhaust the subject. Between predicates remains always an unexpressed link, an internal infinite regression. therefore related to its objects as the sea to its turbulences.

THE QUESTION OF THE RELATION between the intellect's need for an ordered world and the world order which exists is resolved thus: There exist phenomena in consciousness. These phenomena, being by nature finite must eventually repeat. The cycles of repetition small or great constitute "order", for order is but cyclic presentation. As there is nothing in consciousness but phenomena and these phenomena are necessarily cyclic, therefore the content of consciousness is orderly. Consciousness as recogniser of order is called "reason" or "intellect". Phenomena are modalities of consciousness. Phenomena are cyclic. The modalities of consciousness are therefore cyclic, which is ordered. Consciousness, as modaliser of its own phenomenal content, is the source of the world order; as perceiver of its own ordered modalities, it is called "Reason".

SUBJECT-OBJECT THINKING cannot exhaust reality, for the predicate cannot exhaust the subject. Between predicates remains always an unexpressed link, an internal infinite regression. (S=P1, P2, P3, P_n. Between Pi and P2 and P2 and P3 a link is necessary, and this link necessitates other links between itself and P1 and P2, etc.

ABSTRACTION is merely the taking of a part of reality instead of the whole. Therefore every finite thing perceived is an abstract object. It is this abstraction of the finite from its whole dynamic context that makes the abstract idea seem "cold", because by "cold" we mean "isolated" or "nonfunctional". In this sense of the word "abstract" every material thing is abstract, when considered in isolation. As ordinary men think that "abstract" means "immaterial", the material object is called by them "concrete". But as "concrete" means "grown together", and an isolated material thing considered alone is disjoined from its context, the apparent "concrete" is really "abstract". It is only with regard to an atomic hypothesis that we may legitimately use the word "concrete" of a single material object

UNINTERRUPTED MOTION IS LIGHT. Such motion in the absolute makes the absolute an infinite ocean of light. In this ocean the infinite motion ceaselessly passes through itself, intersecting itself, interfering with itself and transcending its own interference. This ocean of light is also pure sentiency feeling itself and its motions infinitely. Its motions are its life. Where its motion--interference momentarily produces a rotation or vortex, there at once is an object in the ocean of sentiency. The appearance of such a vortex is the emergence of vision, of consciousness of an object in an ocean of sentiency. Such a vortex, for the period of its persistence, casts a shadow, that is, interferes with the motions occurring around it. This vortex or object is therefore the introducer of darkness into the infinite light-ocean. This is the "great interjection", the appearance of Intellect and of the logical processes of subject/predicate thinking. From this moment the absolute motion is obscured for every S/P-identified zone of consciousness.

It is apparent that apart from mutual interference of motions there is no darkness, no relative knowledge, no intellect, no mind, no fall into sense-stimuli. The whole process of the fall originates in the great interjection, in the initial vortical process which casts the first stone and the first shadow. Here arises relative judgment and its seat, the intellect. Here sits the Accuser, the slanderer, the devil, the disintegrating forces of identification with a myriad darknesses.

SPIRIT NON-ROTATING IS ABSOLUTE. Rotating spirit is soul. When spirit first rotates a new soul is brought into being. Such a new soul is not yet conditioned by experience. (Experience is what the new soul suffers when it is acted upon from outside itself.) At first the soul does not know the precise result of its movements in a space peopled with other souls or beings. It must therefore just move under its own inner determination. In this state we may say that the soul moves always from within itself, from its own will. If its will is not opposed from without, not contradicted, we may say that it has a sensation of self-satisfaction.

At this stage we may think of the soul as entirely self- seeking or self-satisfaction seeking. But if the soul's will is contracted from without then there arises in the soul a sense of frustration, and an attempt to overcome the opposing will or being resistance. If the soul never suffered contradiction from without it would believe itself omnipotent. If the soul suffers contradiction and fails to overcome the opposition it then becomes conscious of its lack of power. Also it becomes aware that there are other centres of will, other souls than itself, other resistant wills in existence. This new awareness forces a modification of behaviour. From this awareness and its subsequent behaviour modification arises all that we term "character" in the soul.

Frequently a soul is opposed by forces so great that it cannot move effectively. This is the first stage of education of the soul for humility. If the soul were to learn its lesson too quickly and become prematurely humble, it would be impoverished in character. It would lack understanding of other souls in different degrees of development more complex than its own.

Every soul tends naturally from itself, from its spirit-origin, towards absoluteness. This means that a soul cannot be easily satisfied with less than omnipotence and omniscience and omnipresence for itself. This is its original source; this is its origin. But a soul must become aware of itself, aware of its powers; and this it can become only through a rigorous process of self-examination. For this there must in general be supplied some stimulus from without. It is external stimulation which at once provokes reaction and also proves to the soul that there is work to be done. Reaction is provoked and at the same time proves that the soul can never dictate absolutely to things external to itself. No being can control beings beyond its own limits absolutely. (One being may control another, distant being, through mediating beings, but all control is basically immediate, that is by contact.)

Sometimes a soul has been contradicted so much that it "loses heart", becomes depressed, and refuses to act upon its environment. External stimulation must then be changed in order once more to provoke reaction. For every soul must be brought to perfection and this requires growth of self-knowledge.

Sometimes after early contradiction, a soul decides to adapt itself to the environment and not to struggle further. Now there is required a stimulus such as to provoke the soul to re-assert itself in its own purpose, lest it prematurely ceases to struggle and therefore remain deficient in character. Sometimes a soul would allow others to have their own way in order to avoid conflict with them. This requires a stimulus such that it is provoked to change its will and thus to re-assert itself. The hardening of Pharaoh's heart was part of the Exodus strategy. Would the Jews have fled so eagerly if they had not first been restrained?

Sometimes a soul wishes prematurely to give up its egotistic actions because it has discovered them to be productive of pain. If it is allowed to give them up it will remain undeveloped in certain aspects of its character. A stimulus is here required to re-stress the soul egoically so that it is once again made passive to

a stimulus acting upon its egoic success-complex. Thus the soul is forced once more into experience to continue its edification.

When a prematurely passive soul prays for deliverance from temptation, how can it be possible to answer its prayer if the answer will make it impossible for it to reach perfection?

WHEN SHELL IS SEEN AS SILVER the glitter is the same in both. What then determines that the shell is taken for silver and not simply as shell? Simply the cogniser's interest. If the silver is more valuable to the cogniser than the shell, it indicates that the silver memory is more energised and responsive to the glitter stimulus than the shell memory. To a natural historian the shell memory may be more important than the silver with the result that he may mistake silver for shell. Every important memory element is more energised than unimportant ones.

P URE CONSCIOUSNESS is that in which every object exists. If therefore one gains pure consciousness, one gains all objects. "Seek ye first the Kingdom of Heaven and all things will be added unto you." Impure consciousness is simply consciousness tied to some object or objects, such that some other object or objects are hidden. If concentration on some object or objects causes a lapse from consciousness of other objects, then the consciousness is not pure. Pure consciousness contains all objects whatever. Pure consciousness is not void of objects, but full of them. The impurity is the IM purity, or individual substantial stress or partiality which by overshadowing other objects stops consciousness from including all things whatever. Universal consciousness contains all things in the universe. Absolute consciousness contains the universal and all beyond it in a supreme transcendent awareness.

The man who wishes to gain all things must gain pure consciousness, for it is only in this that all things subsist. That man must transcend all identification with individual beings or states.

WHEN I READ, *there are other eyes reading with me,* eyes of sub-entities, eyes of impulses, of ancestors, eyes of devils and of angels. If I choose my books carefully I can determine which eyes shall look with me, for eyes have their likings and dislikings. So then, I can bring angels to me by reading only what they alone desire to read.

SELF-JUSTIFICATION is sought by people because Justification equals Balance and Balance equals Peace and Security of Being. Unbalance, disequilibrium, is Disquiet and Insecurity of Being. No wonder so many words of explanation flow out of people's mouths!

Where is the man who, unjustified, unbalanced, disquieted and insecure, yet is able to hold himself human? Has he not a balance and justification in his power so to hold himself?

INDIVIDUALITY is maintained by the unique nature of each spirit, which is eternal. The man who does not know the eternal uniqueness which is the ground of his individuality, is not very likely to find in himself the strength to oppose the highest temporal powers which seek to suppress his uniqueness.

IF WE ARE ABLE TO THINK of the origin of all things we shall find it useful to have a term of no particular, general, or universal significance. Of no particular significance because each particular excludes other particulars; of no general significance because the general is only the particular raised to cover many particular instances, or is the origin of a given group of particulars; of the universal because it covers only all that which is in the universe i.e. all things considered as a synthetic whole, a unity of discrete parts, this unity, being circumscribed, being disqualified to stand as representative of whatever is beyond the circumscription. The term "Absolute" may be used if it is defined as "that which remains when all determinations whatever are washed away".

CAN THINGS IN TIME BE CAUSES?
Plotinus says not. But if cause is applied force and things are but modalities of force, then the applied thing can be a cause.

TO SEE THE ABSOLUTE AS THE GOOD is to see it as the object or aim of the highest will. For Good is simply that which is willed. The Good is the Object of appetite, the "universal wolf which last eats up itself'. The Good is then eater and eaten, the wolf and the lamb, Samson's riddle, the slayer and the slain, the eater and the meat. If I eat meat it is me at the place of the meal; the meal is me at the point of being eaten by me.

THE SLEEPING BEAUTY IS THE SOUL; killed by a prick of a spindle on a spinning wheel (the wheel of forms). She falls asleep for a hundred years (10x10 – ordinal perfection to the least detail) but is then awakened by the kiss of a Prince (Pira-nce), the ratio of all experience, which enables the soul to awaken to its full actuality. Freedom implies balance of all forces, for if a disequilibrium exists action is necessarily introduced in order to produce equilibrium. But

equilibrium once disturbed cannot be reintroduced until all the forces of the being are brought under control. For the soul this involves becoming conscious of all determinants of its action, for only thus can “10x10” be produced, the ordinal perfection necessary for free activity.

TO DESCRIBE IS TO DRAW A LINE round a zone of space, to indicate a limit. Description therefore refers only to finites, no matter how large. It follows that the Infinite cannot be described. What then is the Infinite? It is simply the negation of the finite. But to finite is to negate. The Infinite is therefore a negated negation. But two negatives make a positive; *the not not is* the same as the *yes.* The Infinity is therefore the supreme positive beyond all circumscription.

HOW DOES TRUTH EXIST IN THE VEDA? To every sage who knows the real significance of each letter there is a key to world forms. For each letter as sounded is a form which appears somewhere in existence. If the letters are understood, then the relations between them must correspond with relations between existents. The explication of the relations of the letters in the Veda must give the relations between existents.

HE WHO THINKS THINGS AND PERSONS different will have to be reborn in every life until he sees all as one. One should participate in the experiences of all beings and avoid the necessity of going through every stage separately. "All things to all men."

IF IN RELIGION OR PHILOSOPHY a being is made to represent the whole Truth (as Christ) then whatever is discovered to be true must be ascribed to him, and all truths must be harmonized and related in his person. All truths must be gathered together and made into one corporate functional system.

CHRIST HAS OVERTHROWN ancestral dictatorships. We can re-name ourselves and our new, self-chosen name is more our own than the one our parents gave us.

SO-CALLED IDENTIFICATION of consciousness with an object is really only application on the object in consciousness. Energy habitually flowing onto an object in consciousness, becomes permanently associated with the object. Consciousness

of energy flow to an object is said to be identification, though really it is not consciousness which is so identified, but the energy flow with the object.

WHAT IS THE REAL essential substance of consciousness? As pure consciousness we deal with an abstraction, for to relate two things we need something common to both. What is common to the subject and the object, to consciousness and its content? The content of consciousness is necessarily of and not merely in consciousness; otherwise we have a dualism. Consciousness is related to its content as the sea is related to its waves. The sea may exist without waves. Waves cannot exist without the sea Consciousness may exist without any content; no content can exist without consciousness to contain it. As the one sea has many waves, which we may conceive it to know, so the one consciousness has many contents. As the one ocean knows different waves in different places, so the one consciousness knows different contents in different places. Thus all differences, all individualities are entirely modes of action or motion. The individual self is simply a motion complex in infinity.

SOME PHILOSOPHERS DOUBT the existence of "space". This can mean only that they have not discovered the proper use of the term "space". Pace, place and space are closely related. "Pace" is both the distance stepped from one foot to the other during walking, and also the number of such steps per minute. "Place" is that which is occupied by a body either actually on it thought. "Space" is the totality of all possible places. If we consider the substance of the Absolute as a continuum, we may say that it occupies all space. This continuum may be viewed as endowed with the power of increasing its action-intensity at any point throughout itself (The continuum cannot be "matter", for matter is composed of discrete parts of motion. The continuum is that in which and to which this motion belongs.)

Although the continuum itself may not be thought to increase or decrease its general density, yet the motion of the continuum may be viewed as traveling through the continuum as an undulation or vibration or number of such, the intersections of undulations producing at each of their places an apparently vortical activity. Such a vortex-zone may be considered as a body. The distance between such vortices may be considered as "empty" space. ("Empty" = resting, leisure.)

In this view space is called "empty" where the continuum-motion is not sufficient to stimulate a sensorium (which must itself be a vortex-complex). If we consider the amount of motion of the continuum as fixed (conservation of motion law), then increase of motion in one place (as in a vortex) must mean a decrease of it in the vortex environment. The vortex must then be viewed as of high motion density, and the space around it as of low motion-density. There will be high pressure in the vortex and low pressure around it. The high-pressure zone will offer resistance to other high-pressure zones (relatively impenetrable). Impenetrability will be simply motion-density (not continuum-density).

Saturn may be used either for the point of high density of motion or for its opposite. When the Bible says that the world stands in the curse it may mean that the world is itself a cause of motion, a vortex system. Saturn is the urn of being. The urn is itself a vortex. The continuum itself is not a vortex. The motion of the continuum generates a vortex. The largest vortex we may conceive we call the universe (one turn). Saturn may represent the urn or vortex of being. If we use Saturn in this way, we must use Jupiter to represent the relatively motion-free space surrounding the vortex.

As the continuum is infinitely responsive to motions within it, it must be traversed by motions arising in the vortices within it. The continuum frequency must be the highest there is, for all motions whatever must travel through it. The vortex frequencies must contain low frequency elements from the fact of their finite diameters. Where several vortices impinge on each other their reactions as total systems must generate low frequency waves, determined by the diameter of each vortex. We may thus allot a quantitative value to Saturn according to the vortex-diameter. The larger the diameter, the longer the wave and lower the frequency it develops. If we take zero as the level where Saturn would be indistinguishable from Jupiter, then Saturn would be the first distinguishable difference and would represent a vortex of the least conceivable diameter. This would be considerably smaller than that of a physical atom and probably even than that of the electron or other known sub-atomic particle.

As every vortex necessarily has an "empty" centre, properly represented by Jupiter, it follows that every finite being (Saturn) has in it a centre of highest sensitivity (Jupiter) able to respond to the motions of the Jupiter transcendent. This Jupiter centre is the source of true conscience in the individual.

FOREIGN BODIES NOT ASSIMILATED by the organism irritate or destroy it. Therefore the organism tries to throw them out, or to destroy them. Ideas may be unassimilable to a certain person. Again, they are irritant or destructive and the mind strives to throw them out. But every idea is valid as an idea. It is thrown out of the mind because the mind has in it ideas already arranged in some manner which cannot integrate the new idea. This is frequently a mechanical problem of formal relation.

FINITE SPIRIT ARISES by simple rotation. Sentience or awareness, an attribute of the Infinite, occurs everywhere. There is nowhere it is not. Awareness comprehends the motions of itself. Infinite awareness is aware of infinity. Finite awareness is aware of the finiting motions of itself which make it what it is. Awareness is of motions of the aware subject. No being knows other than the motions of its own substance. No being can avoid being aware of the motions

which constitute it. A finite being is aware of its finity. Once we allow finite awareness, we have allowed the soul, for the soul is simply an aware finite, a finite zone of sentiency.

What transcends all souls whatever is the Absolute. Once we allow that one soul can arise by rotation, we have allowed that any number of souls may arise, for any number of rotations may be conceived. As the soul knows only the motions within its own zone, and as no two souls occupy the same zone or series of places, or have the same history, it follows that souls are unequal in content.

WHEN AN ARGUMENT REACHES THE POINT where it has become a mere clash of wills, it is time to restate the formal basis of the argument. It must be agreed that the parties to the argument are both pursuing truth. It must be agreed that both are prepared to accept the same laws of thought. Their data must be presented and their inferences displayed step by step. Only by such mutually honest discussion can truth be reached.

WHEN IN ACTION, in applying a force, we experience a resistance, we say that there is "something there", some "matter" or substance. When a phenomenon appears and offers no resistance at all we say that it is an "insubstantial". Somehow substantiality is related to the experience of resistance. We do not conceive that a mere non-being can offer a resistance to an applied force. We believe that what resists us is somehow "there" substantially. Now a force is a direction of somewhat, some power, spirit, or whatever it is named. Without direction of power, we have no application of a force. Undirected power would be indetectable. Every detected motion is a directed motion. In such a motion there is always some inertia, some resistance whereby we know it to exist. Motion is not of non-being, not of non-substance. Where resistance is experienced there is what we call substance.

As we experience degrees of resistance so we tend to believe in degrees of substance, in "density", in impenetrability. When we for thought's sake conceive the least degree of resistance we are conceiving the least degree of motion. We see in our bodies some parts with great resistance (bones), some with little resistance (soft flesh). We tend to equate the degree of resistance with that of substantiality. In an X-ray picture the dense bones offer more resistance to the X-rays than does the softer flesh. If we identify density of substance with amount of motion, we are led to see that the densest substances of the physical world (diamonds, etc.) are most full of motion. As the amount of motion in a given place is related to the "frequency" of that place, we are led to say that in diamonds and other dense substances the motion frequencies must be high.

Now high frequency is, at another level, quickness of consciousness or intelligence. This is strange, because the seat of intelligence is supposedly in

the very soft matter of the brain and nervous system. Yet the vertebrate, bony animals are more intelligent than the jelly-like boneless ones. It appears at first sight, that the densest matter is most dead, yet the most intelligent beings have dense skeletons. The mineral world is quite passive externally to the action of animals and men, and often to plants. Yet the resistance of the mineral world argues high frequency impulses within and this, in a psychological reference frame, is related to intelligence.

Are minerals intelligent? The gross material world is in the grip of the devil. The devil's sin was intellectual pride. Is a mineral a compacted centre of intellectual pride? If we deprive a man of mineral salts his intelligence suffers. Is intelligence in man the result of absorption of minerals of certain kinds? Are men in eating food, merely making themselves the vehicles of mineral intelligence, which in man gain expression in activity?

EMERSON SAYS, "Every man is God playing the fool". This is the ground of the use of the Latin for "layman" - the Idiot (I-dio-T).

THE CHIEF PROBLEM OF PHILOSOPHY. How does Absolute awareness relate to individual consciousness? It is not answered by ascribing limitation to the individual consciousness, for limitation is only of form, not of consciousness. Consciousness has forms within it. How is consciousness identified with form? Strictly it is only by will that identification occurs, for consciousness is not formally related to individuality. Formal relations are of forms. The terms of formal relations are forms. Identification is only formal similarity. What is not formed is not identifiable. Consciousness is not form, though form is within it. Consciousness is therefore not identifiable. The consciousness is therefore not identified with the individuality.

What, then, is meant by "identification" of consciousness with its object? Identification is here a misnomer. What is meant is that consciousness "concentrates" upon an object, devotes itself to an object, not as to itself, but as to its instrument. The power we have to concentrate our attention on an object is a matter of experience. We will attention on an object; if for a long time, there may arise a flow of energy always into the object.

DARKNESS IS PRIVATION OF LIGHT. "Privation" cannot mean non-being, for nothing which really is can cease to be. Privation can, however, mean pira-va-tion, and this means to go in a rotating manner. Rotational progress most certainly interferes with non-dual awareness of the Absolute, for rotation is turbulent or vortical, and must turn every motion which enters its zone. If we conceive for a

moment that light is translatory motion, then at every point of rotatory motion there will be an interference with this translation. Such interference is what we call darkness (DRK-ness).

We here see what is meant by "Darkness from excess of light", i.e. interference from multiplex translations of light. At the intersection points of light translations occurs vortical motion, generated by the light. The generated vortex, though light, yet now interferes with the free translation of the light surrounding it. Vortex- motion is the only motion which can make form, for form is circumscription. Vortex-motion is therefore the formulator (Logos). It is this vortex- motion which is, relative to absolute motion, the divider or devil. The devil (circumscriber) is one with the Christ (Logos).

How is Christ, then, the Saviour? Before answering this we should always ask ourselves: If there is to be saving, from what are we to be saved? There are two basic fears; fear of the unlimited, and fear of the limited. The unlimited threatens the limited with infinite expansion, a dispersal of awareness which would ultimately mean loss of finite being as effective reference point. The limited threatens the unlimited with possible bondage, The Free and the Domed are opposed as Infinite and Finite. Yet neither is of meaning considered alone. The Absolutely Free alone is pure non-existence. The absolutely domed is pure bondage. Only the Free and the Domed together can constitute value and meaning; and these together we call *Free-dome* or Freedom. Freedom is the state of that which is sufficiently bound to maintain itself, and yet sufficiently free to be self-determined and not imposed on by other existences from without.

As darkness is interference of vortex-light with translating light, and light is rotated at intersections of various translating light-motions, the question is raised: Is the vortical-motion at the intersection points of translations an unavoidable thing? If so, then we would have to say that the vortex-behaviour is entirely conditioned by the translation-intersections. If now we see that every finite being is a vortical system, we will have to say that the finite as such is entirely determined by the translating light-motions which constitute it. But this is to say that every human being as a finite creature is entirely dependent on the translating light-motions, for his actions, feelings and thoughts, i.e. for his whole behaviour, and that he can do nothing from himself. This looks like "Of myself I can do nothing". Yet it says also, "I can do all things through Christ". What does this mean? The vortex-motion which keeps us in existence, which *is* our existence, is a vortex-motion of light. This light-vortex is a product of the intersection of translation of light in various directions. Is the translating light translated by necessity? Must it translate and precisely as it does? Can it not alter its direction, or its mode of impulse, its wave-character, or its intensity? Must it ceaselessly translate and produce forever those vortex-centres we call creatures? If this were so then the whole multiplex of forms constituting the universe would be eternal and unalterable. (This is something like the Hindu view of Samsara.)

But we have not said what this light is, this light which translates and produces these vortex-centres we call things and creatures. "Light" refers to the effect of

certain motion stimuli on our visual apparatus. Stimuli on the ear do not produce light but sound. Stimulation of the nerves of touch, taste and smell produces its characteristic results. Motion, which is common to all sensation production, is one. The different effects of this one motion are dependent on the nature of the organ which receives it.

To call the motion of the Absolute "light" is to select the reaction of one of our sense-organs (the eye) and elevate it to a position above the reactions of the other sense-organs. Why do we do this? The reaction of the other four sense-organs is as valid as that of the eye. The ear hears as well as the eye sees. Is there some valid reason why we should elevate sight above the other senses? The Bible places sight above the other senses in the words "face to face". (But "Hear, 0 Israel!" is the first command to the Jews.) Is there some greater surety in sight over the other senses? Sight may deceive, mirages are not uncommon, coloured glasses change the world's appearance. But although the eye is charged with deception, yet in general the healthy eye is not deceived. It translates the motions which fall on its retina into shapes and colours. If it is not interfered with from within, from memory association. It will tell the truth about what is happening to it. In general the eye is less often cheated than the other senses (except perhaps touch)

The ear may hear a sound from the left, when it originates on the right. Echo may easily deceive the ear, and the motions of the air may carry a sound and smell in very strange courses to the confusion of ear and nose. The sense of taste is much dependent on that of smell. The sense of touch, at first sight perhaps the most sure, tells us less than we believe. It tells us nothing beyond resistance, texture and temperature, the last being easily deceived.

Sight in general gives us reliable information about the direction and form of a thing. Only when the air is unusually disturbed by heat do we experience the mirage. The eye, then, we may say, is in general for us the most useful and reliable sense. That congenitally blind people manage without sight does not alter the advantage of sight to those who possess it.

If, then, we are for word-economy to select one of our sensations as most fittingly applied to the character of the absolute motion, sight is probably the best one. Yet we must not forget that in characterising absolute motion in this way we are indulging in abstract thought. We have abstracted from our fivefold sensorium but one of its modes of operation. We should remind ourselves that absolute motion, falling on five different sense organs in us, produces five different effects, each one as valid as the others. To the fully developed and alert being of five senses the motion of the absolute is received as a fivefold datum in which sight, hearing, taste, smell and touch all cohere. Such a fivefold datum is what we mean when we talk of concrete existence as opposed to abstract thought about such existence.

If we, then, allow that motions of translations give rise at their intersection points to vortical activity, and that when this motion is conceived as light we must conceive the vortex-centres as points of interference or darkness, so likewise, if we

conceive other senses as characterising motion, we must allow that each vortex interferes with hearing, with taste and smell. But how of the sense of touch? Contact depends for its very possibility on the existence of finite things. Things are vortices. The rim of the vortex is the edge or limit of the thing. No things, no contact; no vortex, no thing. The vortex, then, is the basis of the possibility of the sense of touch. Instead of merely interfering with the sense of touch, the vortex guarantees its possibility by providing the thing to be tactually experienced. There is here something very important. Contact is possible only if there exist finite things to touch each other. Darkness is tied to the ground of contact, the vortex, the finite thing. (Here is seen the value of touch to the blind.)

Touch is that sense which tells us of the resistance of things, of their relative impenetrability. Sight is that which tells us of the penetrability of space by motion falling on the eye. Somehow Sight and Touch are opposed as Light and Darkness.

If we now equate Light with Truth and Free Spirit, we may equate Darkness with Falsity and Bondage. We see Truth, we touch Bondage. We see the light shining outside our prison; we touch our prisoner's walls. (Touchstone and the Devil?)

The Absolute in its wholeness, its partlessness, lacks nothing. Whatever we assert of any reality we must assert of the Absolute. To do otherwise is abstract thinking; it is to abstract some of the contents of reality and deliberately refuse to attribute them to where they belong.

The Absolute *is* all value whatever. The Absolute awareness contains all of man's fivefold experience, and also untellable othernesses which fivefold man knows nothing of. For man to know more, he must become more. To know what the Absolute knows he must become Absolute. He must contain and transcend all divisions; the whole multiplex of existence must be simultaneously comprehended and transcended.

This is what the Absolute awareness consists in: immanence, existence, and transcendence, a trinity of awareness from which nothing whatever is excluded. This transcendence is the excess of light. This existence is the darkness arising from light's excess. This immanence is myself, knowing light and darkness, at once eternally free, infinitely flying, and temporally bound, finitely crawling.

To realise this, to make this real, is the aim of human effort. We crawl on the floor of time, we fly in the eternal light, both at once. With our body vortex we crawl, with our non-vortex spirit we fly. At once the low and high are ours. To lose the low would be to lose that which gives value to the high. To lose the high is to wallow in darkness and bondage below. Somehow we must comprehend the finite and the infinite, the atom and the field.

How can we do this? Only by increasing awareness. We must wake up. To dream is to be involved in a vortex of form. To wake up is to see the dream for what it is and to see beyond it, to infinity. "Awake! For Morning in the Bowl of Night has flung the Stone that puts the stars to flight." The flight of the stars is pendant on the precipitated stone and prime vortex of the world. Beyond it is infinity. Within it

is the world of men. Itself is the Christ-Satan, the Satan-Christ who tempts and saves us from our non-self and our selves.

THE END OF BOOK ONE