

THREE PART MAN

A freely downloadable audio-file of the following transcribed talk is available from the www.eugenehalliday.com archive site.

NOTE: Transcribers comments are between square brackets []

Nut-shell

A talk upon the basic three part analysis of the levels of human self experience, defining them clearly and describing methods of how to consciously integrate these to achieve the highest attainment.

Three Part Man

A talk given by Eugene Halliday probably at Liverpool or Manchester in the early sixties. No firm date is known for the talk yet.

Préci

Eugene begins the talk by outlining the three orthodox levels of the being, describing drive as conation, feeling as affective and ideas as ideational. He then describes how the three words 'shape', 'form' and 'idea' are synonymous and all mean the shape enclosed or circumscribed by a continuous bounding line, joined at the ends. Ideation is serial presentation of forms. Showing how caricature faces can be formed from a simple child's game in the same way as all living beings can be seen as distortions of the original spherical egg shape. He then describes how the eye 'photographs' shapes by reflected or direct light as shapes. To give the meaning of any 'idea' is to indicate the particular, peculiar modes of the shape of the content. Abstract ideas, are powerless shapes in the mind. Concrete ideas have their own associations independent of the individual hosting them; whose individuality is simply a complex of shapes also. We can suppress these associations and abstract ideas from any emotive or conative drive power, but we hereby lose our unity and innocence. This is done to separate painful experience from the visual images but retain the image as clear as possible.

In the same way we can also abstract feeling and conation levels, so we can squash an idea and retain a feeling that we like or dislike something without being aware, formally, of what we like or dislike, or that we even have drives that are socially unacceptable. Eugene explains the establishment of these separations in childhood processes to avoid unacceptable anti-social states in consciousness. William Blake's poem about Dr Fell is mentioned in this context.

Then Eugene goes on to explain how by this same process of abstraction and suppression we can suppress drives that are, for whatever reason, unacceptable at that time. And how we can suppress ideas and retain the feelings but be unaware of what formal presentation – idea, they relate to. Similarly with feeling states so that we become unaware or

un-conscious of our feeling assessment of a form of situation or of a particular drive. The concrete fact behind these three isolated or abstract worlds is the fact of directly experienced power. He then quotes Hume's laws of association, 'First similarity, then contiguity of space and time, and then thirdly, causation,'. This Eugene simplifies to similarity – 'similarity of form, similarity of place similarity of series,' so that - these laws are simply the laws of the way power behaves when it rolls itself up in a certain way. The syllable SIM being seed potential. So it is a definite amount of field force which is involved in the idea or form of action into which this drive has put itself. Our danger is in being unaware through such suppression of any of the ideas, feelings, or drive elements of any of our experiences. Eugene quips that this is the basis of modern psychology.

He then refers to a diagram of these three elements of three vertical centres, with the ideas above, the feeling level in the middle and the drive level beneath. This is used to outline how feeling can bias ideas and drives, positively and negatively, and how opposition between levels can create turbulence. He relates how Byron deliberately stepped outside of his defined idea limits to extend experience and describes how Socrates 'Daemon' relates to the turbulent intermediary level of solar plexus. D.H.Laurence is then quoted in support of the solar plexus's value as a guiding influence. The solar plexus is the lower intermediary and hence turbulent zone, the throat or larynx is the upper such zone.

He then numbers the levels with feeling first as the infinite field power, conative drive as second, and third is idea the formed level. These levels can be numbered alternatively, if the field is numbered as zero as it is in some mystical, occult and alchemical symbolic systems. Eugene describes a variant form used by materialists of placing the physical as one etc.. The 'cause' in causal, means to strike.. Eugene then stresses that we watch our organism on three levels, as threefold function. If we have a feeling, we know it must be abstract if we haven't got an idea and a conative drive with it. We can then deliberately feel for the drive energy in the feeling and deliberately allow the feeling to clarify itself as idea; and then work similarly for abstract, isolated ideas, or conative drives. This makes us concrete, more integrated and ultimately immortal.

The things acting against this are our memories and the traces of ancestors patterned into us. Ancestral influences acting through the protoplasm cause the drive to give up and feeling to turn negative. This tyranny is greatest at the idea level, forcing the organism into idea patterns. The universe is an individual filled with many smaller individuals all threefold powers. To become aware of this, to make ourselves feel, think and urge simultaneously is the aim'. Eugene then goes on to answer a question about the fusing and generating of ideas by deliberate emoting or intensifying feeling.

Transcription – Three Part Man

[The copy begins mid sentence.]

E.H

.... inside the individual . . we can examine them and see the kind of problem that arises through their faulty interaction. We've already divided the being up into three parts. In the orthodox terms the drive part is conation, for the feeling part affection, and for the idea part either ideation or cognition. Ideation itself – I like to call it ideation. But ideation itself is a process simply of formal presentation. It can be serial and it need not fit, itself, as it is going along, it need not be consistent. In fact most frequently it isn't - it's just a serial presentation of forms at the mental level.

The word 'idea' is the Greek word for form, and 'form' is the Latin word for shape, and 'shape' is the Saxon word for idea. And if we say that the shapes of things depend entirely on the mode of circumscription; in any shape form or idea we are concerned with some finite – something with a limiting factor, a binding contour. And according to the way this contour wiggles about, you recognise a given form or shape, or idea. It doesn't matter how you bend it. If you get a piece of string, wiggle it about - the two ends tied together. As long as the ends are tied together and there is some space between it there is a binding contour and a contained form.

You might have seen a card that children play with. It has a piece of loose chain on it and the drawing of the back of a man's head. And then you shake the card and the chain wiggles about and produces funny caricatures. All the time the chain on the card is bound into a circle but the way you shake it, makes it produce different types of forms of individuals.

And we can say, in exactly the same way, every living being starts from an egg, a sphere, and this sphere is the type of being. In fact it is the original form of the letter 'B'. Which is the circumscribing letter used to signify 'being' itself. And then every individual recognisably different from another individual, can be considered simply as a distortion of the primary sphere of being. So that in so far as we differ from each other, and from this prime spherical shape, we can claim to be distorted.

Now if we look then at the idea level, we're looking at the level at which we are conscious of circumscribed forms or shapes. We derive these primarily from the visual sense because it is eye that photographs the contours of objects as presented by light. Reflected light in the case of light hitting a surface, or by direct light impeded by an interposing obstacle which we then see as silhouette. If we see a tree against the horizon at evening, with the light behind it, the light is coming directly into your eye and the shape of the tree is impeding it and standing out as a silhouette. You're getting direct light into your eye and the silhouette of the tree is blocking it.

On the other hand if you look at a tree with the light on it you are seeing it by reflected light. The tree is throwing the light into your eye. The sun may be behind your head and the light of it is hitting the tree and bouncing into your eye. So you can see by reflected light or by direct light. But in either case you are seeing a binding contour, and this binding contour and its peculiar characteristics are what we mean by 'idea'.

[4 min 31]

And we recognise one idea from another idea simply by the particular mode of its formation. In fact when we say, 'define a term, define an idea,' we mean indicate the particular, peculiar modes of the shape of the contour, or the contour of the shape. So that at the idea level all we have, actually, is a kind of visual image of a circumscribing line; and the way this line is distorted is the so called individual characteristic of the idea we're examining. Now an idea in its abstract form – using 'abstract' in the sense it should be used, that is - taken away, drawn away from the whole concrete reality. The idea, abstracted from the emotive level and from the conative level, is simply a shape which of itself must be considered to be powerless in the abstract sense.

The abstract idea is powerless. It is powerless because we have abstracted it and it is powerless only because we have abstracted it. Real ideas, non-abstract, concrete ideas in the mind are not powerless because they happen to be packets of energy formulated in certain ways. They are behaving and driving about in the mind. They are making their own associations with each other – quite independently of the so-called individuality, which in any case is just a simple complex of ideas.

So when we talk about ideas in the abstract sense we are talking about the kind of shape we get with a visual impression whether by direct light, as we see a silhouette, or by reflected light as when the sun shines on to an object and the object reflects the light into our eye. When we think of idea in an abstract sense we are deliberately eliminating the affective, or feeling correspondent and also the conative, or drive, urge, which normally accompanies it. Now by repeated inhibition of feeling and drive of the affective and conative responses, we have gained the power, this is simply to dupe ourselves, of separating the form of the situation from the affective emotional and drive responses.

In so doing we have created an abstract world of abstract ideas, which we erroneously believe stands still and does nothing unless we push it about. If we remember that an idea, in fact, is a definite amount of energy that has gone into our substance, has formulated itself within our substance, has got its tail in its mouth and is now spinning about in a peculiar characteristic mode of its own; and by means of its own resonance, its frequency, and its characteristic contours, is very busily, energetically engaged in making associations with other ideas with which its resonance, its frequency, will fit and with which its peculiar characteristic contours have some likeness.

[8 min 20]

At the concrete level then an idea is a definite amount of energy with its own feeling – that is its field around it, feeling is what we experience when we directly apprehend the field - and its own tendency to move about, its driving power. That's the idea at the concrete level, but when we are thinking of the idea at the concrete level we are also thinking of the emotional and primary urge correspondents and accompaniments of it. And as we say by abstracting the form of the thing, by deliberately suppressing the emotions and conative drive, we have managed to deceive ourselves into thinking that ideas, as such, are powerless. In fact they have become practically powerless in many cases. That is to say that many ideas have been completely, for practical reasons divorced from their corresponding feelings or their corresponding urges. Thus it is possible to talk about largesse or about great heartedness and so on without feeling as if one had either of these qualities or tendencies.

We have gained this power to separate the idea from the emotion and from the conative drive. If this separation were really complete it would be of no damage to us because all that would

happen would be that we would have visual presentations and they would have no affect whatever upon our emotions or our urges. Either the abstract nature of the idea is merely an illusion caused by repressive processes. We see that initially - to the baby - the form of the mother, that is the visual image the baby has from the reflection of the light on the mother's face onto eye of the baby. The form of the mother, the idea of the mother to the child is not yet separated from the sensations of warmth, the sensuous delight in suckling, absorbing milk and so on and its natural tendencies to drive towards the source of its comfort and nourishment.

These things for the child are not separated out, they are not analysed, so that its responses to its mother are threefold, it sees a form, it feels, it urges simultaneously, non-analytically. We say 'the child is innocent', it's swallowing the whole of reality at one gulp. But very quickly something happens to stop the child doing this, because the will of the child is that everything shall be pleasant. And it finds, in fact, that sometimes the supply of the milk is unpleasant. Maybe the mother is married and she might start shouting at the husband, and this noise might disrupt the hearing mechanism of the child, and cause some discomfort.

As soon as discomfort arises then the child tries to avoid the negative emotion from the experience. In other words it tries to push it out of consciousness but whilst it is doing so it is also trying to retain in consciousness, the visual image of the form to be avoided. In other words we try to sharpen our formal awareness, and to get rid of the negative emotions associated with the form we are trying to retain. We want to lose the painful part of the experience and have a very clear image of what caused it - so that we can dodge it in the future.

So by this process of inhibiting the emotive response and at the same time sharpening the visual image, we manage to give rise to the erroneous idea that ideas of themselves have no emotive charges and are not connected directly with the will. But we do this only at the expense of destroying our basic unity and innocence.

Now in the very, very same way that we can abstract the idea, by deliberately suppressing the emotional responses and inhibiting the conative drive, we can also by the same process abstract feeling and conation, so that we can squash an idea and retain a feeling that we like or dislike something, without being aware formally of what it is we like or dislike. William Blake, not liking Dr Fell and not knowing why but still not liking him.

In the same way we can suppress the awareness of the urge, we can stop an urge, we can stop the primary power tending to move into the musculature and force action. We can stop it functioning so convincingly that we can deceive ourselves into believing that we have no such urge. There are many urges that are socially unacceptable, and in order to live in society we ordinarily - that is by order - curb these drives. And because we would be censured if we were to exhibit these drives, in the actual inhibition of them, we also tend to hope that nobody has noticed that we even had a tendency towards it. And to make quite sure they don't notice, the normal reaction is to declare that we have no such drives, and that we're not really that kind of person.

So not only do we manage to suppress the drive, we also suppress the idea that there is such a drive in us. And by sheer repetition we eventually come to believe that we are good boys and girls; that is socially adjusted people.

We can then convert any two of the three functions and thus focus on the other one, and this one then becomes an abstract, that is to say it is something taken out of the concrete, whole unity of the being, considered as a isolated entity. And a pretence is made that it has no real relation with the other things. We can therefore take an idea, abstract it, throw away the feelings – that is the field around the idea. And the conative drive – that is the charge to action upon the idea. And we can take the shape of the experience and pretend that is an abstract idea with no motive power or emotion of its own.

[15 min 27]

In the same way we can take a feeling, we can deliberately hide the idea that gave rise to it, and we can suppress the drive that would put it into action. Thus we can see that a child who has a feeling that it likes a certain type of lolly pop, and it has found that when it expresses this liking perhaps its mother says ‘You’ve had enough,’ and stops it. And the mother might notice when the child is tending towards the lolly pop and the child will discover this. As soon as it starts to move towards it or clearly formulates what it wants, the mother tends to anticipate it and to stop it. So the child then learns not to express to its mother what it wants.

It learns to hold in the conative drive towards it and to keep its mouth shut and not to speak about what it wants. But nevertheless the urge to the lolly is seen in little muscle twitches; and the idea of the lolly is in the eyes staring out. And by this method, of suppression, suppression of two and the retention of one, we have given birth to three worlds of abstracts. That is a world of ideas abstracted from feelings and conation. A world of feeling abstracted from idea and drive – this is the aesthetic world of the arts. And a world of drives abstracted from the aesthetic and ideational sense – and this is the world of delinquents.

When we see this we see that the only way back to our wholeness is to find the missing pair for any one that we are concentrating upon. Now we know it must be there because, absolutely we are dealing with power. Matter is power, the behaviour of matter is simply the behaviour of power. Bodies, material bodies are bodies of forces, there is nothing absolutely other than power. This power appears in three modes, it appears as shapes, it appears as feeling and it appears as drive but it is always this power that is represented either as idea, or feeling, or drive.

[18 min 00]

The concrete fact behind these three abstract worlds is the fact of directly experienced power. If therefore we have an idea and we feel that this idea is getting a bit abstract what we have to do is say to ourselves, ‘How do I feel about this idea? Do I like it or dislike it?’. And further, ‘Is there in this idea a drive towards or away from something? Is it destructive or creative?’. If we actually formulate verbally to ourselves in this way, we can capture the feeling that goes with an idea. We can capture the amount of energy on the idea. And, when we say to an idea, ‘What is the feeling on this idea?’- what we are really doing is saying - ‘What is the form of the situation which, if we put ourselves into we would derive some degree of pleasure or pain from it?’ The aesthetic sense is only concerned with pleasures and pains. And that is because, of course, it is primarily a feeling awareness and feeling only has these two aspects, the aspect of pleasure and the aspect of displeasure. And this depends on the mode of motion of the power substance. In other words the ease with which a certain movement is accomplished, the ease with which a certain amount of energy is assimilated into an organism; or the lack of ease, the discomfort, the discord, disharmony of this assimilation process. Or perhaps even the complete failure to assimilate.

When we then look at an idea we should ask ourselves, 'Do I like it, or don't I?' To do this we have to see the way this idea fits with a lot of other ideas. And very, very quickly, when we ask ourselves, 'If we like this idea, or dislike it?' it forces us to consider other ideas because all ideas are really linked together. So the attempt to find out whether we like an idea, or not, will lead us to find associations for that idea. And then we discover that the real association factor underlying all association of ideas has always been the emotive field. Something around the idea has caused the idea to link with another one.

Now if you remember Hume's definition of the laws of association – he says the laws of association are: first similarity; then contiguity of space and time; and then thirdly, causation,'. Now he has seen three categories here: similarity, he means similarity of form or shape; contiguity - 'touching' – touching together in same place or same time; and causation, which he defined as invariable sequence.

Now in fact these three are one, namely similarity; similarity of form, similarity of place similarity of time, similarity of series. There is only similarity at the back of it all. The SIM in similarity, of course, means 'seed', which means 'potential', which means 'power'. The laws of association are simply the laws of the way power behaves. When power rolls itself up in a certain way it produces a characteristic idea. And because it is power that is doing so, it is a definite drive to formulate in that way. You can't have this idea without this drive to formulate. Therefore it is a definite amount of field force which is involved in the idea or form of action into which this drive has put itself.

So you cannot have an idea without a conative urge, or a certain amount of field force involving itself in the idea.

When we examine the feeling, if we have a feeling of pleasure, or displeasure and we can't find an idea to account for it, it simply means we are not looking properly. There is one there. And the funny thing is, because feeling is the direct awareness of the state of power in the organism, if we have a feeling, and quietly say to ourselves, 'What is causing this feeling?'. That is, 'What is the invariable sequence that leads up to this feeling?'. There always appears in the mind, after a little waiting, if we don't hammer too hard, a series of ideas or images - the ideational process.

[22 min 52]

And if you then watch it very, very carefully, and question each bit as it comes along saying, 'Do I like you? Do I dislike you?'. Then the idea series will give its culprit up. And in the same way, if you find that you have an impulse, conative urge, towards or away from something and you don't know what's causing it – you might think it's a bit of local tumescence. If you feel very carefully whether you like or dislike it, in the case of a conative drive, generally you will find that you feel ambiguous about it. There is obviously something there demanding to be done. But something is saying, 'Don't do it,'.

This is how you know that it's there, because there is a resistance to it. It's the resistance to it that has forced it to become aware of itself. But then there's a peculiar ambiguous Saturn/Jupiter 'something' about the conative urge. In the case of the sexual experience you know that you experience simultaneously a Saturnine compression and Jupitran release simultaneously as pain/pleasure.

The point is that as soon as you get hold of this conative drive and ask yourself whether you like it, and you feel its ambiguity and then you switch your attention from the drive to the feeling level of it. If you hold your mind in a relaxed state, images will begin to present themselves, ideas will come into consciousness. You will begin to see a series of situations in which precisely this conative drive has appeared before.

And the law of the eternal recurrence states that everything is going on all the time and therefore we know that every form of idea is an eternal. Every feeling of liking or disliking is an eternal correspondence, and every conative drive is an eternal power correspondent with that idea.

So you see that we have these three levels of being, we see that the danger is of suppressing two and abstracting one and then assuming that this one has an independent existence of its own. And thus becoming unconscious of the other two elements., which does not eliminate the other two elements but leaves us in the dark about their activities. In fact the basis of modern psychology for the last sixty years is just a restatement of this elementary principle. And where you are unconscious about this threefold activity, you are at the mercy of this activity.

Now let's look at our diagram. Let's put it here very, very simply. In the middle we've got feeling power, and a sort of symbol of the heart around it. Which in this case has got broken in the middle, and we've got an arrow going down. And we are saying this feeling power may influence the conative power below. We know that if we get into a situation which is pleasurable to us, then the mere fact that it is pleasurable will tend to mobilise the field. Remember we experience the field as feeling. The pleasure in the feeling will tend to mobilise the field force, and it will become drive; so that if we like a thing, we tend to do it again. So that feeling may influence the conative drive below.

Which means to say, at the lowest level the appetite for food can be influenced by feeling. If one likes it. And if one likes a certain kind of food one tends to eat it, if ones dislikes it one tends not to eat it. And in the same way that the feeling can influence a conative drive, and the positive feeling of pleasure can release drive power, a negative feeling of dislike can inhibit it. It can cut it off so that a man who dislikes a certain kind of nose on a face can actually find that his basic urge to food, family or sex diminishes, or even disappears.

[27 min 04]

And the feeling power can also bias ideas. In other words pleasure can mislead the reason. It can cause funny kinds of errors in mathematics and logic. Liking a thing can lead us to select those particular ideas, out of all the idea furniture we have, which will lead to permission to indulge this particular liking. And this 'liking an idea' can cause the suppression of all those ideas that say, 'This particular thing should be done'. Feeling then can bias either for or against mathematics, logic and geometry. This goes to say that mathematics, logic and geometry are really the particular studies mainly concerned with form with ideas, and feeling power can and does influence us and make us un-geometrical, un-mathematical and illogical.

So the feeling power can press down and up – and influence the drive power and bias the idea power. If we'd like to be awkward we could say we bias the drive power and influence the idea power. We had a bit of a debate about which word to put where on this diagram actually.

Now in the same way that the feeling power can work up, and cause illogicalities in the arrangement of ideas, or cause negativity, or feel the positivity in the drives centres. So an idea, presented perhaps by an outside stimulus, a simple form and the idea is form, supposing we have the idea in the head of a triangle, and this triangle has been previously emotively biased and a certain amount of conative drive has been released, and the body is now pre-disposed to do the same thing again. And then out of the corner of ones eye one sees a triangle perhaps on a ladies hat. It has nothing to do with the original triangle, but it is a triangle. And consequently this triangle rattles about in the head, stimulates the triangle within and this immediately then may inhibit the feeling power below. The idea may say 'No don't have such feelings'. As a matter of fact it may also say 'Do have such feelings,' but certainly it can interfere with it.

Now you may be feeling very positive about something, which means that you want to do it, but your education - that is the insertion of ideas through your eyes and with correspondent verbal terms through your ears - the presentation of these ideas may say, 'That is not allowed'. And when these ideas are presented they actually have the power to interfere with, to inhibit the feeling. So that one feels that although one does like so-and-so and has said one will do it, one feels that one should. And if the tendency to do it is very strong, then one feels the shadow of punishment, which is called guilt.

Now if the idea power inhibits feeling power, and makes the feeling power negative - as a moral idea does - in the feeling level saying 'Thou shalt not have any other gods but me etc.,' or any other kind of thing that I do not commit. Then the feeling power has, in its negative form the ability to switch off the conative drive. It can actually kill positivity of the will, it can make a relation impossible. So that we find in many people this idea that something is wrong, anti-social, not permissible can so impede the positive feeling of delight, so cover it with guilt and the fear of social censure that it actually has the power to turn off positivity of the conative drive and the person then becomes devoid of will power.

[31 min 08]

Now in the same way, the drive power itself, which derives its energy from food, from solar and cosmic radiation. This drive power has a nice habit of ignoring the individual through which it is working. You know very well that in the case of all those forces in us which are not peculiar to any given individual, like the desire to eat food, the desire to belong to a herd, the desire for sexual relations - we can't really call these forces, forces confined to a given individual. We find them all over the place. And one has to say that they are super-individual forces.

These super-individual forces function through us, they are connected with cosmic forces, and solar forces, some of them getting into us through eating food, others by direct radiation from the sun, and so on. Certainly all these forces are super-individual cosmic forces in their origination but they do not have regard for the individual purpose of that being. And consequently, that drive power, that conative urge, that cosmic insertion of power, can disturb feeling power.

So that one may have a feeling that something is nice or not nice, and the drive power coming in may say, 'It is a matter of no importance whether it's nice or not nice it must be done'. So that regardless of the aesthetics of the situation, the drive power will say, 'Do this!'. And the aesthetic sense may say, 'No, no it is not nice. Grandmother wouldn't have done it and she

was well brought up'. And the drive power says 'Well she's anachronistic,' and you will proceed to do it.

So the drive power can disturb the feeling power, and the feeling power which could have evaluated the situation aesthetically being driven by this super-individual cosmic force is disturbed, overthrown, and then proceeds to fool about with the ideas as in the first case we considered of the feeling power biasing the idea power. Only now the feeling power itself is being determined by the super-individual cosmic force, which has overthrown all aesthetic considerations. Made Byron get himself two bears and the washerwoman's daughter and has overthrown his idea of what constitutes an Englishman and a gentleman, and led him into certain cosmic relations that he would – as an individual – have avoided.

Now wherever two of these forces meet [*unclear word,s suggest – 'they are pushing'*] in opposite directions because they are forces moving in opposite directions and meeting we have a zone of turbulence. So we can see immediately that between the feeling power and the conative drive power, if there is opposition. If the drive power is moving up to express and the feeling power is moving down to try to inhibit. Then between those two centres we experience turbulence. And we can see immediately that we have two main centres of turbulence here: one between the drive and the feeling; and one between the feeling and the idea.

[34 min 35]

Now if we say that roughly the feeling power is above the diaphragm and the drive power is below the diaphragm, then somewhere on the level of the diaphragm itself – say about the solar plexus level – we experience a peculiar kind of turbulence whenever the feeling tries to negate the drive power. We feel a kind of vortical spin and a peculiar sensation of loss in the solar plexus. And a voice like the Daemon of Socrates saying, 'No !'. Remember that the Daemon of Socrates used to say nothing until it was time to say 'no' and then it spoke. Well it's like D.H.Laurence saying, 'I always trust my solar plexus'.

Anybody engaging in any work of art, if he feels very carefully and he starts to put a brush mark down, if that brush mark is wrong he'll feel a slight sinking sensation in the region of the solar plexus. A little bit of centring on this zone gives rise to a very good sense of what is and is not, fitting. The drive power is trying to express itself, and the feeling power is saying, 'No, no that's excessive, and that's the wrong direction,' - saying something not nice about it and trying to stop it. And it registers in the solar plexus.

Now in the same way, between the feeling power and the idea power, on the level with the throat, one has another zone of turbulence. Where the feeling power is trying to do one thing and the idea power is trying to do the opposite. And this invariably produces the sensations in the throat of tension, of constriction, and so on. You may notice that before you are about to cry, you often get what you call a lump in the throat and you feel a definite movement of the larynx. This is the result of the conflict between the feeling and the idea. Invariably the feeling says, 'Burst into tears,' and the idea says, 'No, don't do that because you are in public and they will think you're a bit of a fool'. So the idea is saying 'No,' to the tears, and the feeling is saying, 'Yes,' to the tears. And the result is a funny feeling from the larynx.

So wherever two forces meet they produce a turbulence if they are moving in opposite directions. Now from the level at which this turbulence appears we can say which of the two forces is winning.

Now if we had to number in order of ontological importance the forces of being, the three levels, we would have to say that the feeling power, the central feeling power, is prior. We'd have to say that it is number one. Write number one on the feeling level. Now that is because, absolutely prior to any specific behaviour of form, of power, whatever, that is the field of power which is infinite. So that the feeling – the field awareness – which is infinite, is absolutely prior, to any specific form or action of it.

So we write number one at the heart level, in the feeling centre and this means field power is absolutely prior to all its manifestations.

[38 min o2]

Now we've got to write number two. Will it be drive or idea that is number two? There's been a lot of debate about this for a few thousand years, but a little logic unbiased by feeling can help us. The field power un-mobilised produces absolutely nothing whatever. But at the point of mobilisation it has the name of initiation, or drive, or urge, and therefore we have to say number two is the drive power; first the field, then the mobilisation of the field. The field starts to move, Jacob Boehme says, 'The soul gives the lift, nature executes,'. This means to say that the whole field of nature is a power, and that if from an individual centre there is the starting of a direction at all, that is the movement we call conation. Then it will lift it – just as water is lifted – by the air blowing on the surface of the sea. And once that initial lift has occurred, by the law it will fall again.

It can't lift and go on lifting uniformly, because that would take the whole of infinity with it. What it does if there is a finite application of power that causes a lift and then the lift drops, as the wave crest has a trough; and then a ripple starts from the centre of initiation. Nature is executing. So that the form of the lift is the form that nature will propagate.

Number one is the feeling awareness, the field awareness. Number two is the mobilisation of the field awareness, which is the appearance of drive, conation, primary urge and so on. But as soon as this force starts mobilising and running along, by the very nature of finite energy expenditure, it rotates. It is moving in a field, into a resistance. When two forces come into opposition the result is a rotation, so number three then, is the idea, the form. Idea means form. The third thing is form.

So then we can say, absolutely prior is the field power, which is sensed simply as feeling without a contour, infinite field awareness. This then mobilises itself, lifts itself up in a certain characteristic way, by expenditure of energy. Let's itself go, and it falls and the continuum round it, the field around it, must do the same. So nature, the field, executes the form of the decision of the will.

And as it's going along it spins around by the very nature of forces in opposition, but rotating is circumscription and circumscription is idea. And so the idea is the third level of evolution from the field.

Now if we like to change the numbers of these, which we can do, we can say as absolutely prior the first is the field, and we should call it zero. Because zero is nothing at all, it is that which is before the unity of the one. But even a zero is almost a circle so that won't do. So we write this circle zero, and then we rub it out. And that is the infinite field.

And then the next thing we write is one, but that's really two. That is the first thing, the mobilisation, the unity of the drive - down here - is already the second ontological order, but the third temporal order. Remember, the first is head of a series, and time is serial. So the first impulse that generates the time is the head of the temporal series and is called first. Prior to this there is only the eternality of the infinite field. And to be aware of the reason why we say 'zero' instead of one and one instead of zero, and two instead of one, and three instead of two and so on, can help to clarify some mystical, occult, alchemical symbols. Now these things are not always stated too clearly.

[42 min 38]

Quite simply, to represent infinity we shouldn't write anything at all. As we must make a mark to let us know that we are thinking about nothing, we have agreed to draw a circle, which is something and say, 'Rub it out,'. Then we've agreed to put a vertical stroke and call this one. And this one funnily enough, is an O N E, another circumscription, it is a finite and therefore the first of a series.

The word 'first' the F, R, S, T, function in it, and the word fourth, where the F, R, T, H, function is the same, both mean fire, they mean energy. But the 'first' one means - the head of a series, and the 'fourth' marked one means - the externally manifested. It has gone forth. Now the feeling awareness is absolutely prior ontologically, and then it mobilises itself as the drive power, and this drive power then circulates and produces ideas. Now the ideas by repeated ingestion of power gradually become made gross. They are grossed by inviting energy into them. Cosmic energy inserted via the sun, through food into organisms, but it is simply cosmic energy forced inside a form. And the form is simply the way the conative drive has mobilised itself. And the conative drive is simply the absolute field self mobilising.

Now in Yoga terminology there are three states of being and a non-state beyond. And we can call these the causal, the subtle and the gross, and the *turiya* - that which is beyond these. Now if we say the 'causal' from the use of the word causal, caus - is to 'strike', the causal must be the moment of strike, that is the point of initiation, the first mobilisation of the field force. 'Cause' means strike, and there is no strike in the field considered abstractly as infinite field. And at the precise point when we consider the field to mobilise itself - lift itself up - then the lifting up punches into the infinite continuum, and acts in that punching as a cause.

So we say the causal level is the drive power or will. But the phase following the causal power is the idea. And the idea is simply the form, and this idea world, this formal world then, is called the subtle world. The causal world - that's the world of will, the subtle world - the world of ideas, the gross world - the world of mass inertia packed into the form. Remember there is no matter other than masses of forces. These forces are condensed, packed into the form that is, into the idea. And as they are packed in the idea then becomes gross, it has mass inertia.

So it goes: causal, that is the conative drive; subtle, that is the ideational level; gross, that is your food body, mass inertia. But the fourth is the absolutely prior one that was the first. That is to say, the absolute infinite field is that force that lies beyond, if you count will, or conative drive as number one. So as we start, ordinarily, in practice, with an effort of will, if we say the first step to realisation - because first means head of a series - is an act of will, the will to understand. When we make this first act of will we have released a cause. This then proceeds to ideate, that is to formulate itself. And then it proceeds to ingest energy into it, to absorb food and to pack itself and become mass inertia.

And thus: one, the drive power; two, the idea power, subtle world; three, the gross world; and four beyond it is the field again.

[47 min 11]

On the other hand, if we started as gross materialists, we could say, 'Let us start with the known and pass from the known to the unknown'. Which is always very amusing because the materialists always start with the gross physical body, and call it the known. And they actually believe that they are passing from the known to the unknown when they go from the gross material body to an idea. But in fact they have no awareness whatever of the gross physical body other than a form of resistance of a force. But because of the materialistic bias and their desire to eliminate intelligence from the universe, they pretend that they are starting from the known, namely the gross physical world.

Which, in fact is no more than a complex of sense, sense impressions, and they go from that. And count: gross world, one; idea world, two; causative will world, three; and the beyond, the turiya again, beyond, is number four. Number four is still the field, so it doesn't matter which end we start at. Whether we start at the conative end – will number one, or whether we start gross world number one, the fourth one is always the same one, namely the field.

Field awareness is absolute the first fourth, and first and fourth are both derived from the same root, and both of them mean fire. And fire is the symbol of energy, and it is precisely this energy which is expressing itself 'in work' – *in erg* – and is really the absolute power itself.

So from this we see that in practical terms, for exercise, what we have to do is watch our organism on its threefold levels, threefold function. And if we have a feeling, deliberately, because we know it must be abstract if we haven't got an idea and a conative drive with it, deliberately feel for the drive tendency in the feeling and deliberately allow the feeling to clarify itself as idea.

And if we have an idea, and we can't feel it - like a mathematical idea two and two is four. And we can not find a conative drive about it. It simply means we are not looking carefully enough and our duty to ourselves is to get hold of the idea, and feel whether we like it or not, and then feel how much energy is pushing this idea.

And when we get hold of a conative drive, which is super-individual, we deliberately try to feel why it is pointing in one direction rather than another. And in so doing, we pass from the feeling to the idea and we see that this conative drive is actually pushing through individuals in order to propagate certain forms. In other words the conative drive has its biological preferences.

[50 min 08]

Now if we do this threefold exercise we are making ourselves more concrete, more whole, more grown together; concrete means – 'grown together', and it's another way of saying integrated. And of course integration of being is the same thing as the substantialisation of the self, and the growth of the awareness of the possibility of immortality. That is, integration, resistance to breaking, resistance to being dis-integrated. And if we can get hold of this threefoldness of our being we have the power, if we wish, to resist disintegration to a remarkable degree.

In fact if we get hold of it properly, we have absolute power to become immortal. The things against this of course are the mass inertia of the mnemonic [*sic*] traces, all the things that have happened and been grammed into us, we can call them [*unclear word suggest – ‘plasmo-grammes’*] if we wanted. The experiences of our ancestors passed through the continuity of the protoplasm. To us all these experiences are driving us to believe in death, driving us to believe that we must disintegrate when we’ve done our ‘three score years and ten’ – misquote. And this kind of inertia is causing our conative urge to give up, at a certain point; and it is causing our feeling level to become negative where it could become positive.

The greatest amount of tyranny is actually exercised at the idea level. You see the conative drive is rather a funny thing, it is very, very hard to abuse it. It’s very hard to abuse the sex instinct itself. It’s very hard to abuse sexual activity because once it is expended it doesn’t start again, until it’s built up again. Now it is not a question of abusing sex, because you can’t do that, but an idea can abuse your body, quite easily. It can drive you to wear your muscles down. It can drive you to do all sorts of silly things, but it is not sex that is being abused. It is simply the organism. Sex once discharged is discharged and that’s the end of that, there isn’t anything else to abuse, for the time being.

But you can abuse the organism by forcing it through idea patterns, through concepts that one should be able to do ‘x’ – whatever ‘x’ might mean. And this idea that one should be able to do certain things, may release energy, influence the feeling, determine a kind of conative pseudo-drive to force the body beyond its proper limits.

The whole thing consists really in the recognition of the absolute non-duality of the power of the field. This infinite field of power mobilises within itself spheres of force, each sphere of force is an individual. The universe is a big individual and within it there are many little universes and each sphere of force acts as an individual, and is three fold. It is formed and therefore an idea being. It is aware of the field of its action, and therefore is a feeling being. And it is a certain mobilisation of force and therefore it is a conative being.

To become aware of this, to make ourselves feel, think and urge simultaneously, is the aim. The baby does it without knowing it’s doing it – before it gets stopped. The baby’s action is perfect, as the *Tao Te King* says, ‘The baby can cry all day without getting tired,’ because the baby’s idea, and feeling and urge are not out of harmony. But once this harmony has been destroyed, by the inroads of educational stimuli, then it takes a lot of work to regain the state that the child has unconsciously, only this time consciously.

The point is that if we do manage to gain the level the child had unconsciously, only consciously, we do not have to relinquish it again. We can deliberately maintain this threefold activity within ourselves. In which case, our evolution as individuals can be said to be finished.

[54 min 42]

Q - I wonder if you would clarify something from a few weeks ago? Talking in a similar vein, regarding the feeding of the three centres, where: the gross material is fed with gross material food; and feeling was fed by tuning into feelings; and idea by tuning into ideas and truth. You gave some examples where you could get two ideas and by emoting about these ideas and pushing them together, you could produce a new emergent.

Then you spoke about feelings, where you said, 'Alright, you take a feeling of love, which is - the feeling for developing the potentials, or the feeling of hate, which was - love deprived of its object, and you directed this against a similar feeling in another being'. Now this was prior to saying you did this internally at a higher level in yourself.

E.H. – Yes.

Q - If you directed this against a similar feeling in another being, again you got the new emergent. Now I wonder if you could clarify what you mean here by 'Directing this feeling against a similar feeling in another being'?

E.H. - Yes. Well we've said that love, actually, is God. That is to say, is the absolute power. As absolute it cannot be thwarted, and therefore it remains love. But at the finite level, where it functions finitely by deliberate mobilisation in a finite manner, it exposes itself to the possibility of being thwarted. Now if we say draw a line for force, if I put – the force is trying to get to a place 'x' and I put a wall between the force and the object 'x'.

Now the force hitting the wall turbulates, and that turbulation is hate. Now supposing we actually find that we have said something that has put a wall up to another person. And we see that their love, that is, their direction towards the object they had, is now thwarted by the wall we have put up. We can re-actively try to justify ourselves for producing this hate. We can justify the wall we have put up, reactively.

Or we could, just as re-actively be afraid of this turbulence we have caused, and apologise and withdraw the obstacle. Now whether we hit back re-actively – that is without control or suddenly go quiet and retract our damaging obstracular remark, if it is negative it is not the best thing for us. But if somebody is rushing towards a target and we insert an obstacle and they then turbulate. If we remain positive in the situation and we see that they are hitting us like mad, and stopping them we can produce a new emergent either by deliberately, freely, converting the obstacle to an aid by re-defining it. Or we can deliberately pile the obstacle up and make it thicker and thicker, so that the person actually hits very, very hard against the obstacle and reacts more violently than he would otherwise have done.

In this case we are consciously and deliberately opposing the force and therefore we are acting in a hate creating manner. But if we are doing it deliberately we are forcing a new emergent in the consciousness of the person we are opposing.

[58 min 45]

And likewise we are presenting ourselves with some new emergents in the new behaviour patterns of this person whom we are opposing. Now it doesn't really matter whether we do it with going with them in the way, or opposing them, providing we do it freely. If we are doing non-reactively, that is freely, we can always stop if we find the fellow's blowing a fuse; if we are really sensitive.

Or we can take it up to the point when he's become aware of something in himself, that previously he would not have known about, would not have admitted. So that, we can actually present an obstacle to a dear friend who is trying to prove a point.

And when he gets really mad at us, instead of withdrawing and apologising, we can deliberately and consciously support the obstacle with other concepts, we can make the

obstacle bigger and better, until we can flatten him completely so that he cannot even conceive the possibility of getting the object. And this causes his turbulence to go through various phases of characterisation and he exhibits all sorts of funny ideas.

And when you think he is sufficiently turbulated to have given birth to a good idea, then you can remove the obstacle. So smile when you call *me* [*unclear word suggest – 'fisher'*] . Which is the principle that William Blake called 'Opposition is true friendship', meaning 'free willed' opposition, with love. That is, with the will to develop the potential - is true friendship. Friendship is that which frees one. And more violence has actually been produced in the world by negative failure to oppose an erroneous idea, than there has been done by deliberate opposition.

In the case of feeding an idea it's fairly obvious inside your own head, you can force an idea to turn into another idea by emoting about it. A young offshoot the other day said she wasn't very good at drawing the third dimensional figures. She was in despair about it and thought she'd never be any good at that, she couldn't see three dimensions. It was obvious she couldn't feel them either.

So I said 'If you emote about the idea of '3 D' , then you will get the feeling of what '3 D' means.' And I said, 'Now imagine I am sawing, over your eyebrows through the skull. Close your eyes and feel that I am sawing you'. And she immediately felt uncomfortable and a feeling of three dimensionals appeared in her gestalt and she discovered . . .

[the recording finishes mid-sentence]