

## **TALKS by DAVID MAHLOWE - 1**

David Mahlowe's detailed notes for his talks - given at Tabley House, Knutsford, Cheshire.

Delivered sometime during the early-mid 1990's

### **CONTENTS**

1. And All For The Love Of A Lady
2. The Engram
3. Quabel
4. Symbology of the Zodiac
5. The Last Supper
6. The Shepherd Speaks (A Christmas Monologue)

## **AND ALL FOR THE LOVE OF A LADY**

**By David Mahlowe**

I was sitting at a professional seminar the other day; the kind of seminar which only a few years ago would have consisted mainly or exclusively of men. On this occasion when I counted heads, just under half and rising were women. And this count can be repeated on your television screen and elsewhere. Indeed, a female executive producer at the BBC recently was heard to say, "We do, of course, employ the token male!" It's a sign of the times, and a source of anguish to the beleaguered male, who has recently been seen in America joining a growing movement of men who are using Gospel metaphors and religious fervor at mass meetings to whip up the flagging male ego. Their fervor is, no doubt, made more intense by the fact that apparently, women now outnumber men in the population.

It reminds me of a tired Henry VI leaving the battlefield saying, "This battle fares like to the morning war, when dying clouds contend with growing light." Then he goes on, "First one the better, then another best; both tugging to be victors, breast to breast." So it is with the war between the sexes. And it goes on and on and on, in every age, in the same sort of seesaw.

And, of course, the protagonists on either side have excellent and existential arguments, and whoever is for the moment on top is duly triumphant, and scathing about the losing half. It's like the New Labour government comprehensively damning every single act of the government they have just trounced, and then going on to behave in much the same way, U-turning the while! It's a merry go round.

It never ceases to amaze me that when men are in the ascendant, they scorn the works of woman, and when woman rises, she reciprocates. From the macho male and the feminist sister, Good Lord deliver us. Fortunately, He does. When sperm banks are held out to threaten the male with redundancy, God has at hand a universal spanner to throw in the works. When at some other point in the historical ding-dong woman is reduced to a chattel, God whispers in her inner ear some devious ways to get even. And both males and females have historically hit on the idea of withholding sexual favours from each other in order to gain the upper hand.

How did we come to this pass? Not to the historical war between the sexes, but to this pass after attending a seminar? Well, as you probably know, there is a great deal of hanging about on these occasions, and I decided to use the space to start feeling into the subject of my next talk - this one tonight.

Immediately there was heard internally a snatch of song (Sing it) which ends in "...and all for the love of a lady." Increasingly in my old age I take up these suggestions - they save so much time! And so that is the title of our talk tonight, "And all for the love of a Lady." I have a song to sing, Oh! And what a song! For those of you who do not know the origin of the quotation ( and I didn't) it's from 'The Yeoman of the Guard' by Gilbert & Sullivan.

It's a song of a merryman, moping mum,  
Whose soul was sad, and whose glance was glum,  
Who sipped no sup and craved no crumb,  
As he sighed for the love of a ladye.

That is the first verse. But it is the twist on the last line - "and all for the love of a lady," which interests me. The spirit often uses music to initiate in the mind a train of thought. Its a good idea to listen the odd whistled or sung phrase from someone who is unaware that it is betraying his or her inner preoccupation. It is very revealing. So in this case. The spirit was guiding the conscious mind to the subject it was interested in airing, so the tune comes into consciousness, but the spirit twists the word a bit to suit its purposes more nearly. In future when you find yourself singing or whistling something, ask yourself why and you will gain interesting information! Music is the carrier of the word.

So let us pursue this subject. What is a lady, for a start? Certainly not simply the loose attributions we find today. Obviously it indicates the female of the species, but what else? Well, originally, the term indicated "dough". That is intriguing, and if we examine this a little further, we find some speculation that this was because the female was a kneader of dough. So what's noo, man? They still do!

But underneath all jokes there is a yoke, as we know, and this dough connotation is no exception. "Dough" is the substance which can be kneaded or formed. It is in itself shapeless, but substance can assume an infinity of shapes according to how it is kneaded. The very stuff

of which the universe is composed is a dough, that is to say a power involved into a mass, resistant enough in its constituency to be able to hold whatever form is impressed into it. And the slang word for money is also the same word 'dough', which tells us that money is capable of being turned into anything which it is kneaded into by those with the necessary ability.

Money is a basic substance of society, and can be moulded into an infinity of guises. So this 'lady' term is to do with dough, and also to do with the German version of the word 'loaf'. What does the word 'loaf' mean? (ANSWERS). Yes, it means that which is shaped and baked from dough, and also that which lies down and does nothing. A loafer is one who does nothing.

Who will define a 'lay' person for me? (ANSWERS) Yes, it means one who has no professional qualifications, and who is therefore uneducated, and therefore passive to the gentry above him or her in rank. You know Russian peasant soldiers lay down on top of each other to fill a ditch so that the Tsar of all the Russia's could walk over them dry-shod? Well, they were laymen, persons who were passive or laid down. 'Laid' has another, slang meaning to signify someone who has been subjected to sexual intercourse. One who has been laid. One who has been subjected or underthrown by some superior power.

All these meanings imply a passive acceptance of an imposition, a lying down to something, a horizontal or non-vertical position which by definition is not active, not initiating change, but subject to these being imposed upon it. But what has all this to do with the love of a lady? Everything, as we shall see; but first a little digression. You know, the spirit never makes a frontal head on approach - it prefers a more subtle and sideways function. It comes upon one unaware.

Women are very sensitively aware of this subtlety of the spirit, and indeed, they themselves act in accord with it. They prefer the indirect, the non-frontal approach. They prefer to be taken by surprise, and find nothing more irritating than the conventional, and, we have to say, male approach. If it predictable, it is not exciting! This predictability is not a necessity for the male, but it has all too often become the norm for him, because of the way the male has evolved in the history of the world.

There is a Hindu myth of the creation which EH quotes in his book 'The Tacit Conspiracy'. In the myth, before the creation God was alone. He realised His aloneness and thereupon created for Himself a consort with whom He tried to copulate. But his consort, knowing Him to be her origin and thus identical with her, refused to relate herself to Him and fled. He pursued her. She changed into various animal forms, but each time she changed He caught her. Thus from their various conjunctions came forth all the creatures of the universe.

The important thing to note here, says EH, is that after being created by God, His consort, knowing Him to be her origin, and thus seeing herself as non-different to Him, fled away from Him. As identical being their stimulus value to each other would be very low. By fleeing from Him she created an actuality difference, that is, a difference of mode of action which immediately raised her stimulus value to Him. He, delighted with the new stimulus emergent, joyously pursued her. Each time she changed her form the stimulus level of the new mode of relation climbed to a higher level. *La donna e mobile*. Here is the root of woman's pre-occupation with changing fashions.

Like all good myths, that one contains very deep intimations of the meaning of life. We do well to mark all such stories about the creation, because those forces described are still operative today in exactly the same way. The only difference between the behaviour of God and His consort, and the behaviour of His creatures man and woman (who are made in His image) is that man and woman are not as clear as God is about the nature of the process He initiated. By virtue of the Fall, men and women have become bemused, confused, and even amused sometimes, by the nature of their relation.

Let us return to the subject of "dough". All the linked words with this term "dough" are those which suggest malleability (like clay) and formability, and stick-ability, like glue, and such like. Some of its derivatives are interesting, too, such as the American word for its soldiers - "doughboy". It means a boiled suet dumpling! But what is most interesting is this. There is a strong and very marked link in the etymologies of various languages between dough, and clay and walls, with paradise!!! So the Garden of Eden, that enclosed park which was made for Adam's delight, is inextricably linked with the concept of the female of the species, the lady. The paradisaical garden was given to Adam for his own, his ground, his enclosed and guarded space - a walled garden - in which he could develop in safety, guarded from the chaos of non-formulation beyond the garden. The park, the walled enclosure, is

always the place of the female of the species, and in it the male works to develop its possibilities. But, of course, Adam and Eve were thrown out of the garden, were they not? They were excluded from the paradisaical place because they disobeyed the original order of their being, which was to be the image of God in act.

I do not intend on this occasion to go too deeply into the question of the Fall. It is a subject for many talks, a series of talks, a series of talks which will last as long as the regeneration of man and woman in time. But we know that this Fall is an explanation of why man and woman are in the terrible state of war which has persisted throughout their joint history. And we know that in every mythology there is an attempt to explain according to the psychology of the people concerned, how the universe came to be. (It is actually quite important to observe differences in myths of creation, because it tells us a great deal about the psychology of the people who formulated the myths. It helps us to understand their world view).

For now it is enough to suppose that everybody here present has read "The Tacit Conspiracy" of Eugene Halliday. We will take it from there. The Creative Power, however we like to name it, cannot create unless it makes for itself some kind of resistance to itself. If I move, I do not know I have moved unless I feel some resistance, some impedance of my movement. Resistance makes me aware, it gives me a sense of presence. If I attempt to move through a vacuum, a void, I have no sense of place, no reflex activity to mirror to me what I am doing. I have no sense of self. I do not exist. In order to exist, or stand out, which is what the word means, I have to make some effort. And effort can manifest itself only in the presence of resistance to my activity.

So the Creative Power enters into a secret conspiracy with itself, like the conspiracy that never lets the left hand know what the right hand is doing, or the conspiracy which occurs when someone plays chess with themselves alone. At the level of the Creative Power, which we will call God because it is easier to say, this conspiracy is a very high level affair. It is God addressing His own substance as if it were different from Himself, which, of course, it cannot be, for He is all in all. But what God is doing in this act is technically called a Play.

Let us examine for a moment the function of play. At the level of God, the play is the drama of opposite forces in a highly aware process. And it is conducted at a very fast pace, a

tremendous quickness. The reason for this is that at the highest level of awareness, the resistance which God puts up to His own willed movements is light, not heavy. The resisting substance is not yet clogged up by condensation and inertia. It resists the input of the God activity with a delicate, diaphanous pressure. And on His part, the Creator/generator is very gentle, for He is not at odds with His substance. He is full of joy at the resistance which He feels, and it creates in Him a cosmic excitement, a supreme sexual arousalment of which the earthly kind is a very pale imitation.

But this originating dance of God as His own Male and His own Female is in the best sense, a play. The nearest analogy I can find, linked with the idea of the play, is the One Man Play, in which one person plays all the parts. In this case, the actor has to be enormously quick to change roles as he becomes alternately the male initiating function, and the female reciprocating receptor/resistor of his advances. If one slows down in order to change roles, the play falls apart.

At the gross material level of being, this quickness is very hard work and causes great heat in the organism because one is having to quicken up the slow and heavy flesh and fixed response tendencies of the particular organism. It is a very enlivening experience. Indeed, in certain schools of initiation, there are exercises where a novice has to change his function or role or direction instantly at the command of his teacher. Be a monkey! Be a fish! Be an elephant! Be a mouse! And because the novice feels he has to think how to make the change, and work out what movement or sound is appropriate to each, he is very slow, and becomes very hot and frustrated.

The heated frustration is necessary, of course, in order that the student becomes quicker. He must burn up the inertia of ordinary living, and in doing so, take on a more spiritual intuitive awareness. The student learns that if he rationalises he cannot perform the required changes at the speed required. He has to learn that immediacy is the return to the inner centre of his being in which he is instantly aware of what is necessary, and in which he is instantly what he wills to be, for he has all possibilities within him. In other words, he learns, if he is successful in his studies, what it is to be like God the Creator.

What we are describing is a long climb out of the darkness of the pit into which we have fallen.

But to return to God and His self-play, his willed self-deception. He must be totally committed to the whole performance. If He were not and there was some reluctance in Him, His performance would be slowed down, causing an increasing impatience in His waiting substance. God must put His whole Self into the play, and indeed, He does, for He makes a paradise, a perfection of a play.

Now the only difference between the relation of God's male with His female self, and that of man and woman in time is this. God is wholly aware of the Tacit Conspiracy He is performing within Himself. And His responsibility, that is, His ability to respond properly and adequately in the situation, is complete. And we see this in the word 'play'. As we have said, it means light, quick movement, speed of response. But it also means 'to pledge' and to 'plight'. Very interesting consequences hang upon those meanings, ladies and gentlemen all!

To pledge to someone is to promise to take care of them. It is a promise which implies the taking of responsibility for the plight of the person to whom the pledge is made. To pledge and to plight is both to recognise that what you propose is dangerous, and also a guarantee of the security of the person so exposed by your personal pledge.

In other words, what God has plaited together, let no man put asunder. Why? Well, as Jacques says in *As You Like it*, "The why is plain as way to parish church." Because 'plait' and 'pledge' and plight are closely related functions, they indicate a marriage. God marries Himself in a supreme act of self-plaiting. Take a piece of rope and twist it together. If we disregard the closed end of the plait, do we not see only two pieces of rope apparently twisted together? That is the original twist, the original pleating or plighting together of God as initiator and God as acceptor of His own initiation. Read the old marriage service of the Church of England, and you will find it full of echoes of this original marriage contract. "The way to parish church," is the way to that marriage which mirrors the original marriage which was made in heaven in order to create a difference, and therefore an excitement and an incitement to creative activity. When the Absolute Sentient Power plays games with itself in this way, it is much more fun than doing nothing.

But, of course, this original act of marriage between God as actor and God as receptor, led to dire consequences in fallen man.

The only reason why God the female agreed to play the game in the first place was because she knew that God the male knew what He was doing. The fact that He did not tell her in advance what He was doing was irrelevant - and exciting. The fact that the Creative Power had promised that He would look after his willing spouse, and pledged that no harm would come to her, and that, indeed, she would find much joy in this play, was enough. She took Him on trust - though, woman-like, she continued to test Him to see that He was still playing the game properly! (And when God reassured her by saying, "You are the only one for Me," she knew He meant it, literally!)

The fact is that God was wholly acceptable to his female half because she knew that He was wholly involved with and in her. And so all was sweetness and light in Heaven and the great union took place from which resulted the universe itself, of which the generator is God the Father, and the substance is Sophia, His wife. These are names, of course. We have to describe function with names which describe the function, and so with these. The Father is that power which posits or puts here what His will initiates. The Sophia is the wisdom sphere, the sphere of substance which contains within itself the seed of all there is to be. She is the willing nurturer of what her husbandman has placed within her fertile clay. But all names are names of God's functions - we must never forget this. All names are names of God. There is nothing in all this but God acting all the parts within His own play which He writes, directs and stage manages and also watches and listens to as audience. It is all God, and it is meant to be a comedy, not a Jacobean tragedy of blood, as it later turned out to be.

God created the first difference, which sent a frisson of excitement throughout the substance of the field of power. The universe was alive and in being, but it was a being of light and quickness of act and immediacy of response. The inertia which is called resistance or opposition was only sufficient for there to be a sense of presence, a reflexive awareness through being pressed back upon when one presses. And God being very sensitive, He does not need much resistance to feel Himself to be.

God makes a play for His woman. A play is what is posited and laid down. It is a situation which has to be developed. That is what the universe is about. It is God manifesting His potency through the medium of his substance, which lays itself down before Him in obedient submission to his initiating will.

In this fairest of all gardens God builds a paradise, a place of light and quick sensitivity of advance and response. All possibilities rise and fall in their interplay. It is like a wonderful and continuous intercourse of spirit and soul.

And then comes fallen man. I say nothing at this point of fallen woman, though, of course, we must remember that in marriage it is always six of one and half a dozen of the other. And this fallen man, seduced by Lucifer through the medium of the man's wife, has fallen prey to the machinations of the intellect. None of this subjective difference/non-difference here! Let all be plain as pikestaff! And there is nothing plainer than that - or is there? We could have another hour's talk on that saying alone!

But enough - let us back to fallen man. He, poor deluded fellow, has allowed his mind to become dominant in that he has swallowed the fruit of the knowledge of good and evil. He has in that act started the division of the universe into the bitter disputes of this or that. Man the counter is also man the divider, for one must set things aside from each other in order to count. When we count we also judge whether this or that is worth counting or not. "Does it count?" we ask ourselves. And if it does not, we cast it aside. In this way, man made the fatal error of supposing that what he liked was good and what he disliked was evil. That shows how faulty Adam's logic was. The trouble was that he had had no experience of these terrible things, and could make such judgements lightly because he had no existential substance on which to base them. The intellect ungrounded in substance can make such fantastical assertions blithely. The world was to suffer grievously for Adam's faulty processes of logic. And he himself was also made to suffer for another dreadful error in those early faltering steps to individuality.

The dreadful error was, in the presence of an accusing God, to duck responsibility and blame the whole sorry affair upon, "the woman thou gavest me!" In one sentence he blames his Maker and his wife for his fall from grace. Well, as we know, God said, "Get out!" and woman, who also had to get out, has never ceased to belabour Adam's representatives ever since. Adam did not come up to scratch. Unlike God in His first espousal to His woman-self, Adam was not totally involved, not totally adequate, not totally responsible, not utterly pledged.

We know this must have been true because otherwise why would the woman have been listening to the seductive tones of Lucifer in the first place? If her husband (and we must remember that to "husband" is to look after one's ground) if her husband had been entirely satisfying to her in every way, it is not in the nature of woman to wander off on her own and meet a strange fellow in the woods. Is it, girls?

It cannot be but that Adam was wanting. He had not the all-embracing performance that God had. And with every mistake he made, Adam's potency was diminished, until he was reduced to earning his bread by the sweat of his brow. But even then God was merciful. He cursed the ground for Adam's sake. God said that the earth would be full of problems which would sharpen Adam up and make him more and more discriminating about the nature of being. The trouble very often, though, was that Adam tried to do this with his head. The enmity which had been set between Adam and his woman made him very wary of making judgements based on feeling - very unsafe stuff, feeling - not subject to the test of intellect.

So, let us stand back for a moment and consider the position. God had made a potentially perfect universe based on the willing cooperation of initiative and form, and feeling and substance. God had made a bond with Himself and plighted His troth to this holy marriage, or hieros gamos as it is called. (There is another hour's talk there, too!) And until God undid the bond, it must stand. What God had joined together, let no man put asunder. Because the fact is that however hard we may try, that bond made by God cannot be broken. The universe can be worked out and understood only by accepting the fact of God's marriage with Himself in a Tacit Conspiracy of power. Power to initiate deliberately forgetting that it was also the power to feel the initiation. Power to form deliberately forgetting that it was also the power to nurture and substantiate the form. What a wonderful joke!

But, "man, proud man, dressed in a little brief authority," as Shakespeare puts it, has judged the woman to be guilty of his fall, and henceforth she is not to be trusted. He and she are separated. God and she were separated too, but God and she knew it was a joke, this separation, and that underneath the apparent division there was an underlying non-difference. But man, now reduced to intellectual abstractions, had forgotten the joke. He thought the differences were the reality. The woman, Eve, whose name means, "The field of power in which God arises," has never forgotten the original pact, the original marriage. Deep inside herself, she is aware that there is something wrong, and that man is going about it the wrong

way. The way he has chosen, which is for the most part scientific investigation in as clinical an atmosphere as possible to avoid the possibility of error, is just the one calculated to get him into the worst possible trouble.

Can anyone here tell me of a more certain route to refusal and failure than to tell one's business partner that they are useless except for making the tea, and that all decisions are to be made by man alone? Well, actually, I can. It is the refusal to listen to the voice of reason in a situation in favour of personal like or dislike. It is to make judgements based on bias and favour. That is often woman's way. But, as we said earlier, that is another story. Indeed, we have passed over so many stories tonight that I am confirmed in my belief that we are very deeply in to a very complex argument. So we had better keep it simple. One thing at a time. Man first.

Man's fall was a pall over his intelligence. He was plunged into ignorance and so required some very sharp and prolonged opposition over a very long period of time in order to sharpen him up again. That opposition was, and is, provided by his Eve, his other half.

But what is the point of all this? Why could not God call it a day and start again with a different script and cast for this play of His? Well, He could, of course, have done so - He had the power - but He would have failed in his first endeavour, and it is not God's way to be beaten. The whole point of being God is that one is capable of making capital out of every so-called accident that befalls.

God had pledged Himself in the first place to His ground, His substance, His female self, that He would husband her, guard and guide her, produce out of her His kingdom. She, the mother of the universe, was to be honoured as the matrix of all things. That it all went what is called "wrong", which means only to become twisted, does not absolve God from His pledge, His plight. Eugene always said, "The way out is the way through." God does not back away and make His escape as fallen man mistakenly tries to do. God sees it through to the end, whatever it is, for He knows that if one pursues a goal to its furthest end, with utter faith and commitment, it must eventually be successfully reached. Out of the apparent evil of the Fall into Time and sequence would come the realisation, the paradise regained after much suffering. But how was it to be done?

Through the lady. "By Our Lady!" was a favourite oath at one time. Our lady was to be the instrument of man's redemption, his re-judgment of the events which led to his fall from grace, and the realisation in him of what the Creator had intended in the first place. The perfection of man by woman began when they separated in the first place. She has been ribbing him ever since!

Really, there was a secret conversation of God with His Sophia and all her derivatives in time. In that conversation, God set out a process by which the wounded body of the universe, which is female, would be healed and brought to perfect wholeness again. But not before the woman had expiated her side of the first sin of disobedience.

God's argument ran something like this:

I, God, promised you that if you cooperated with me in a Tacit Conspiracy of power with itself to pretend that we were separate sexual entities, I would serve your interests as if they were My Own - which, indeed, they are - and that in return for your sensitive accommodation of my world-making purpose, I would husband you in a true and heavenly marriage, full of joy. Now - In your true and heavenly self you are Sophia, the Dome of the Wise, and you have never left your awareness of this Tacit Conspiracy of power. But in your derivative, woman, you have become dimmed in your awareness of the fullness of this conspiracy. This has to do with the fault which caused the fall into ignorance and darkness of Adam and Eve. As woman in time you see things as through a glass which has been darkened by the smoke of confusion and conflict. Even so, you are more aware at that level than is my son Adam.

But if my male and female self is to become at one with itself in endeavour, it can now only be through my son Adam. He is made in my image, as Eve is made in yours. But I gave Adam free will to do as he saw fit with my creation. And lo! He went down a cul de sac, a dead end. And he must be turned about from the end of this dead sac, and brought back into the light. And because Adam has become so confused and inert in the concentration of his separate purposes, he is a difficult pupil. In many parts of him he is convinced that the end of that sack is his proper place. And being pigheaded and opinionated, he does not like to be seen to change his mind. This is where you, my dear female self, come in.

Man has to be educated into perfection. He is My representative on earth, and he must become reflexively worthy of his place. At the moment he is not worthy, because "worthy" means the affirmation of the wholeness of being, and man is in bits. There is little health in him.

The female on the other hand, is not in bits. But her unbittiness is not the wholeness of health. She is constantly wounded, as is the earth itself, by man's insensitive probing of its mysteries. She suffers terrible indignities in the attempt to obey her deepest instinct, which is to make a relation with the male. That instinct was born in the first great relation ever made, the one between myself as Creator and myself as matrix.

Despite the indignities the female suffers, they are not greater than the suffering which the male endures. Their separate sufferings are similar in their intensity, differing only in their mode.

In the day when I cursed the ground for man's sake, you, my dear, were the ground. And we must be clear what is meant by "curse". A curse is a course which must be run. It is a circular course, a cyclic race, and the going is hard. It is cursive, this ground, which means to run, and you shall never be still, never the same from one moment to the next. No man will bathe twice in your waters, for you move inconstantly on in your course. In you also will be a cure - a means of health; and a cur, or contemptibility, for your loose running will condemn you in the eyes of men - who nevertheless run after. There will also be a cross.

Until the cursive road is run to its end, you will be the object of man's desire, and also that which makes him despair and turn to frustrated violence because of your inconstancy. Because of your constant tripping of his foot, your ability to seek his weakness and place your needle therein, you will be the object of his hate. But you know that hate binds equally with love, and you will bind him to you in hate and love. Your ground will be his cross unto an end.

This end is resurrection. My Adam image must be reconstituted through impediment and suffering into a new-born, enlightened self, who will climb the ladder of all high design unto a new heaven. And that new heaven shall declare a new earth also. That new earth will be you, my Sophic self, my substance, my well-tilled ground. As Adam enters into his own so

shall you. Your suffering of my imposing hand shall be requited not a thousand but a thousand thousand times. And because of that in you which is willing to be of service, so also shall the woman Eve be saved, because in all her cursings she remembered in her deepest heart our marriage pact, that two who were one should never be truly parted but only seemingly so.

Now get this woman Eve unto her work, and whisper in her ear the secrets of your eternal wisdom sphere, that by her wiles she shall ensnare the man and in marriage or association hold him in subjection so long as he fails to recall that he is the son of God, and that rulership means service.

I will give you comfort in your toils. My other sons will come into your historic earth and proclaim from your ground my word again and again. And when Adam's descendant shall finally turn to dig your earth to find its jewelled mysteries, he will not scorn the ground, but honour it for its rivings, and spoilings, and renew it by his tears and labour, and make it fruitful once more. He will finally become my true image when he learns properly to initiate, direct, guard and guide in love his other half as I do mine. Until he does, of course, she must ever rebel against his lack of direction, and try to direct herself in her desperation.

But as Adam's son becomes adept at his task, and ascends that last step into my heaven, he shall turn and pull her after him. So shall they both be saved, each by other. And you shall be better in your new state even than you were in your first, because by your labours you shall become reflexive, knowing that you are you in me and me in you.

But should the woman in the earth who is your lower self despair so that she would wish annihilation to ease her pain, whisper in her heart some essence of this talk of ours. And if even then she wonders whether it is worth the effort of resuscitating this, my son, say finally to her:

“You are the beloved of God and man. God knows but man forgets that Man is God and God is man. Your unimaginable job is to goad your man towards the cross on which he recognises who he is in me. In his illustrious state his light will shine on you and he will see his saviour, and draw you to him. So shall Adam's sin be made to shine, and you, who brought him low, shall be exalted.”

That is what God said to Sophia, His female self. If you don't believe me, ask Him!

Now. We have a definition of love. It is, "The willingness to develop the potentialities of being." And the title of this talk is. "All for the love of a lady." The lady is the ground of our being. She is the full potential of all things which are possible in a universe, laid down by the Absolute Sentient Power so that the All-Father might work in that substance to reveal its mysteries and bring them into play.

In consequence, there is nothing at all worth loving or developing which is other than this lady. The whole universe was made for the love of this lady. The whole universe IS this lady. In the Tarot pack, the World card is shown as a beautiful female figure. All - that is the whole of everything - is dedicated by God to the development of this laid down sphere of substance which is Himself. He, self-held in self-opposition, is this lady, this substance. And she is cursed because to curse is to cross. This lady, this universe, is the crucified body of God, laid down for man to raise up again. He can only do it by becoming this figure on this cross of self-opposition, and taking this woman, this lady, back into himself, which is where she originally belonged before she was taken out of him for a joke. This lady is this man. This man is this lady.

If we would end this sorry tale of the war of the sexes; if we would like to re-unite ourself with the self which we have lost sight of, then believe that 'The Tacit Conspiracy' of Eugene Halliday is the Bible of the sexes. Without it and its supremely clear vision of the problem and the process of solving it, no one can be saved from the battle. None of us can survive unless we read, mark, inwardly digest and operate the Tacit Conspiracy as set out in that book. To those who may claim to have read it, and whose behaviour is not transformed into the love of their lady, (and the love of their knight, as well,) then we have to say to them, "Reading is not enough. We have to mark, and inwardly digest this bread, and use its energy to operate its idea in our lives. If we do not we shall never find the kingdom."

It is said that a man cannot go to heaven without a wife. That is certainly true, for she goads him on the way to heaven. Equally it is true that a woman cannot enter heaven without a man, for she must stay always behind him to make sure that he gets there. We deserve each other. "Vive la difference!" And, "Honour your Partner !"

E N D



## NOTES FOR A LECTURE ON THE ENGRAM

By David Mahlowe

Tonight I would like, with your permission, to say something about what has been called variously an engram, a psychogram, a biogram, a neurogram, and even an ontogram. As many of you know, 'Engram Therapy' is a system pioneered in the highly precise formulation in which we have received it, by Eugene Halliday. He himself said that there was nothing new about the encapsulation and suppression of unpleasant stimuli. It is called by other names in other and earlier psychologies. Gurdjieff refers to it, as do many others. I heard on radio the other day someone talking about it as a therapy for accident trauma victims. He did not mention the word engram, but that is what he was talking about.

But so far as I know, there is no one, apart from EH, who has formulated the therapeutic method so clearly, practiced it so successfully, and placed it in the wider context of the psyche, be it individual, group, national or cosmic. Eugene laid out the logic, the geometry and the metaphysics of protoplasmic recording, and used it as a very powerful, non-drug orientated, non-invasive technique. Many people, including many here tonight, have found their lives altered greatly for good by the 'Halliday Method'.

It is not my intention tonight to talk about the specifics of engram therapy except insofar as it touches upon two words which are of vital importance to our well-being. The words are 'encapsulation' and 'assimilation'. Let us look first at the word 'encapsulation'. It means to enclose, to make a separated zone with a protective integument round it.

'Protective' is a key word here, because every encapsulation is made for this purpose. Every capsule is an enclosed and guarded place, made either by outside forces in order to keep something in, or by inside forces trying to keep something out. Thus, the state makes capsules called prisons in order to keep in those whose activities are not acceptable by the ordered state. Mental hospitals are of the same order of capsule.

But for our purposes tonight, let us consider the capsule chiefly from the point of view of the individual human being. We are each of us here tonight, prisoners of our education and upbringing: our fears and desires. The net result of external pressures from parents, friends,

the state, educators, and so on. Of course, we may have lessened the impact of all these things by the amount of work we have done to mitigate them. But for all practical purposes, we can say that most of us are the prisoners of our own time-capsule.

That is not very surprising when we consider that the word 'engram' means simply 'to write upon. We find the root in 'telegram' and 'gramophone'. We have all been written on by innumerable pens. We contain and continue the written records of all our ancestors, as well as our own myriad of experiences. The only difference between us and a conventional book is that our written records are impressed on to our protoplasm, the most efficient recording material there is. It is far more sensitive than paper, and it records chiefly the feelings and emotions which surround given forms. It is rather like saying that every word we speak or hear is wrapped in a field of emotive energy which conditions us as much as the empirical meaning of the word spoken. Indeed, we may go so far as to assert that every word is a product of a feeling energy expressed in comparatively rigid terms so as to be more useful as a tool of communication.

Everything in existence is a record of a feeling intent. Everything in existence is therefore an engram. And in their totality, we may say that these are the engrammic content of the Almighty God. The only difference between His engram content and ours is that He is in control of them, and they are largely in control of us!

Consider for a moment the Creation of this great globe, as Shakespeare called it. Being a sphere it is a three dimensional capsule. We write it thus: If we were to write this enclosing line on metal with a sharp instrument, we would call it an engraving. It is indeed a kind of grave in which is buried the intent of the will that set it down. Now, I set that enclosure down, and my consciousness therefore transcends the limit of the circle. I can see a world beyond it. I am not bound by the engram I have made except in so far as I agree to keep it in being, along with any inconvenience it may cause me. But what about the contents (whatever they are) of that enclosure?

Suppose for a moment - only for a moment, because we don't want to get personal - that I have placed within this circle a name. Let us call it DVD and write it thus. Symbols are very useful because they encapsulate - that word again - a great deal with all sorts of stimuli, but each of them contains an address. I love you, DAVID. I hate you DAVID. DAVID is a

dunce. Put the squeeze on DAVID. After some time, this circle will begin to be convinced that its name is DAVID. And whenever the name David is mentioned, the circle will respond with a frisson of emotion according to the totality of its experience of the stimuli I have bombarded it with. We may now with justification call this the DAVID record.

That is a simplistic statement of name and form and feeling and function constituting a being. But in fact it is a true explanation of the making of a being. Every being encapsulation is an intent of an absolute and intelligent power to express itself in a certain way. But every intent has its own resonance, and this resonance, expressed in sound, is its name. We know that there is a very ancient saying that each of us has a secret and essential name, known only to God, who gave it to us, and which expresses in itself our unique function as a being. The name by which we are known in the world is but a factor in our complete name/function before God.

But back to the process of making this record. A large amount of information has been hitting this sphere, and all of it is accompanied by energy input and emotional or feeling input. Now if the energy input is at an appropriate rate, the sphere can assimilate it, examine its components, and apportion different places in which to store the information, feeling and energy. But if the stimuli is too highly charged for the sphere to assimilate it, it is conceived to be a danger, and the being tries to stop it coming in. It throws a protective barrier around the dangerous in-comer, to prevent it from damaging the encapsulated being. So now, as in this diagram, we have an encapsulation within an encapsulation.

And if we multiply these sub-encapsulations by the number of times incoming energy is deemed to be inassimilable, then we have a being filled with pockets of encapsulated energy which has not been properly assimilated, but only contained.

The net result of all this is a being whose available energies are tied up in protection of itself against non-assimilated stimuli from outside. This is the basis on which Eugene touched when he said that 85% of our available energies is tied up and not available to us. Now, there is a very important factor here to be considered. Let us go back to the first diagram showing how the incoming energy is blocked by a protective wall. Because the incoming energy was coming in at too fast a rate for the individual to comfortably assimilate it, he or she blocks it with a wall of protective energy. But this not only prevents the dangerous stimuli from

flooding the organism; it actually prevents the organism from gaining further knowledge of what it has blocked out. It is a perfect example of what goes on in a nation which declares a protectionist and separatist policy. It deprives itself of all knowledge of what goes on beyond its borders, while the intelligence without the border is free to formulate new methods of invasion of the protected zone.

But there is another factor which is if anything even more dangerous to the well-being of the individual. The energy which is encapsulated, which now constitutes an engram, is a kind of self-governing sub-entity within the being. Let us take an example, a fairly obvious one. A little boy, totally absorbed in doing what he is naturally interested in, namely, examining his own genitalia and excretory apparatus, is utterly shocked by a sudden blow to the head, together with a shriek of disapproval from his grandmother. Incidentally, the little boy is very fond of his grandmother, who has never shrieked at him before. The incoming energy charge is so great that the little boy shuts down on it so hard that even fifty years later he cannot allow himself to look inside the protective barrier at the scene it contains. The nearest he can get is a view of grandmother's yard. What is the result of that encapsulation?

The now grown up being actually runs from the room when he hears a female voice raised in what he calls hysteria. He also has an irrational fear of authority bearing down on him. He also has an extraordinary interest in excretory matters (to the extent that he became a plumber), and a great interest in sexual matters. But, he feels so guilty about both that his interest is balanced by an equally powerful and irrational guilt about indulging in either. As a result he can show under pressure from any element of this picture, gross physical symptoms such as crippling anal reflexes and genital sores, uncontrollable vomiting, and distressing coughing fits which are exhausting.

That may sound extraordinary, but it is fairly commonplace in the essentials. That is, that if incoming energy is coming in at too great a rate for us to assimilate it, then we are at the mercy of it, for we have consigned it to the level of the unconscious mind. And at any time when any element of the engram is stimulated, the being has an unaccountable reaction which baffles him, and which he cannot link to his experience. When this person we are talking about receives a threatening letter from the tax man, or is shouted at by an angry woman, he can exhibit any or all of the symptoms I have mentioned.

If you or I had been watching that incident, we might easily think nothing of it, and not find the energy level of the outraged grandmother at all upsetting. And in that case we do not engram ourselves with the unassimilable energy. And when this person finds that engram again, he will be astonished to find that it contains so little objective force. But that is not the point. The point is that all engrams are TO THE PERSON, and all the elements in them contribute to the total effect. For example, if the boy had been surprised by one of his peers on that occasion, he would not have been unduly alarmed, and would have been able to assimilate the energy. Result: no engram.

So this tells us something else about the encapsulation process by which we are trapped in so many ways. It tells us that incoming energy can be multiplied in frequency many, many, times by the mode with which it is perceived by the receiver. One of the most potent of all these multipliers is the act which is perceived to be not in accord with the social norm. If what you do or want to do is frowned upon by your community, then when you do it, you are engrammed with the guilt you impose on yourself, and with the fear of punishment if you are found out.

Let us now examine for a moment the effect of an engrammic record which contains elements of social taboo. This could be any act which goes against authority and could call down punishment. The fear of this can be sufficient to hold down a quite powerful desire to do the act. But if we do encapsulate the energy for fear of the police or the clergy or big Daddy or something, what happens to the energy which cannot now find expression? Sometimes, the desire energy will break the barrier of the taboo and defiantly express itself. Whatever happens after that can be the occasion of a new engrammic record. But suppose the desire is not great enough to break the taboo? What then? Well, as we know, energy cannot do nothing.

What happens is that the repressed energy of frustration bursts inwards, rupturing the psychic cell wall of the encapsulation, and flooding the organism with toxic precipitation from the repressed emotions. The result is illness and disease, both psychic and physical. This is not a theory, but an observed fact of human existence. It is happening now even as I speak and you listen. I have no means of knowing whether someone in the theatre has already been triggered by some word into an engrammic pattern which is causing distress signals to appear in the psyche or body without the being's permission or knowledge. It is happening all the time, and

as we are 85% encapsulated energy, and that energy is reactive in so many ways to so many stimuli in the environment, we have to ask ourselves how much freedom we possess, and how many decisions we make are not decisions at all but reactions to engrammic records?

Of course it is important to say that the vast majority of these records when triggered have no catastrophic effect. That is why we can ignore the engram as a major premise. The fact that I do not like beetroot or horse radish or Ibsen is something which does not unduly incommode me. But when I realise that a large proportion of my responses to situations are not responses at all but reactions to records in my protoplasm, then I am more likely to protest at these impositions. But what can I or any of us do about this state of affairs?

First of all it is essential to look at the difference between encapsulation and assimilation. Encapsulation is the action of emergency. We cannot assimilate the incoming stimulus, and we throw a wall of energy round it to contain it and save us from threatened harm. Assimilation is quite different. The word itself means, as we know, taking like to like. We take the complexity of the incoming stimulus and examine its different parts, allowing the various aspects to be matched with our own internal experience. If I see a bus coming towards me, and its approach is perceived to be such that I can be on the pavement before it runs me down, I can assimilate the fact of moving bus. I relate it to previous experience of such events, including the perceived rate of approach, and my own speed and the distance from the pavement. All the outside elements are matched to previously established norms, and I am enabled to act sensibly and not reactively. My assimilation capacity has been sufficient to allow the stimulus of the bus to pass through the filter of my experience.

But this is not always possible. Sometimes the assimilation capacity is not enough to examine the elements of the stimulus. Suppose the bus bears down on me whilst my attention is elsewhere, and when I do see the bus coming, I have to jump for dear life in order to survive. At that point there is no time for examination, and therefore assimilation. If, when I reach the pavement, I do not look back on the situation and examine it, I will not assimilate the experience. I will not have sorted it out and understood it, and therefore be in conscious of its elements. At that point I would have set up and perpetuated an engrammic record of the event which would affect me whenever I came into contact with a similar event. But very often we replay such an incident. We do what we call going over and over it. And we are able to thus sort out the various elements of the event into their appropriate categories in our minds. In

that case the memory of the incident is assimilated, and though it remains within us and can be recalled, it is not a traumatic or energy filled record.

The difference between the unassimilated and the assimilated record of an event is the difference in CONSCIOUSNESS of the observer. If the stimulus event is highly charged and dangerous, we consign it to the unconscious as being too unpleasant to go through again. And indeed in engram work one often finds that the subject is unable to "get into" a record because there is such an energy of fear around it. It is unconscious. And it is the so-called unconscious that contains all these records of past experiences too unpleasant to contemplate. Our protoplasm is full of such records, our own and inherited ones. We suffer not only from our own personal experiences but from the records of our family, our ancestors, our nation and our race.

The implication here, and it is a vitally important one, is that we are constantly being pulled back into previous experiences. We are constantly triggering off unexamined responses to past events. A little cogitation here will bring to mind a possible way of dealing with this problem. The distress felt by the individual from a repressed energy record is conditional upon allowing the consciousness to go back to the record. In other words, the consciousness leaves the awareness of the present and is pulled into the inertic round of a previously established response. It is NOT in the present moment. This is the total justification of the great rule, HERE AND NOW. HAN. The NOW MOMENT. How many times have we heard that rule? And how many times have we ignored it in favour of slipping back into the inertia of previously established attitudes and reactions?

Let us consider for a moment the implications of staying in the here and now moment. It implies that consciousness is sharply focused on what is actually happening to us NOW. Our mind is filled with the impressions of the senses in the NOW. How can an engrammic record enter consciousness in such circumstances? It can do so only as a referent in consciousness, such as the smelling in the here-now moment of smoke. The consciousness contains all the possible referents for smoke, and it will check immediately for what kind of smoke it is, whether it is toxic, whether it is dangerous to breathing, whether further action is needed. But it is doing this NOW. If the consciousness is confined to sharp focus on what is happening now, then there is no slipping back into the inertia of a previously established record.

If the being is triggered by the smell of smoke into regression to a traumatic record in which smoke plays a part, then the being may well be overwhelmed by the panic contained in the record. The result might be the over-reaction which characterises such triggered responses. The smell of a burning match may trigger the response appropriate to being badly burned or having seen someone being badly burned. So it is essential to hold consciousness in the now moment.

When our consciousness is so focused, something happens to our assimilation capacity. We find it greatly increased. And this is because we are concentrated on all that is happening in the now moment. All our energy is available to us in that moment, creating the conditions of maximum efficient response. In the conditioned response, we regress to a record, which immediately plays and we are identified with it. We effectively lose consciousness at that moment. Our response is unreasoned because unconscious.

Now, you may say, and indeed I will say, that's all very well, but consciousness does get pulled back into records. We do not, and some say cannot, stay in the now moment, when so much of our available energy is tied up in conditioned responses. That is true. But nobody is saying that living in the here-now moment is easy. In fact, there are a million reasons not to do so, and each one of them is an engrammic record, each one of which behaves as if the entire universe is contained in its record. The consciousness so encapsulated cannot see beyond the protective barrier. It is only when the being has suffered so much because of his or her engrammic reactions that they attempt to find some relief. It is only then that such a concept as the here-now moment can be entertained. And there is a large mass of inertia which would not bother to apply the concept anyway. Only desperation drives one to it.

But what happens when one does begin to look at such a possibility? First of all there is a simple equation. It may be true to say that at any one moment we have only 15% of our total energy available to us, and 85% is tied up in engrammic records. But in the here and now situation, that 15% is ample to deal with all ordinary situations. We are not assailed at once by all the energy of all our engrammic reactions. And in any case, we have another rule - Faithful in little, faithful in much. We cannot be faithful in much if we do not first practice faithfulness in little. We have to start small and work upwards. But the rule applies in all circumstances, that the here and now rescues us from inertic responses.

There is another vital component in all this which we have now to look at and learn from. We know that the imagination of man has carried him from the cave to the skyscraper, from the survival level of the cave man to the sophistication of the university professor, from simple practicality to the highest levels of spiritual attainment. Eugene used to say that the basis of the word "imagination" was "image" and should be pronounced "ich mage", which means, as we know, "I make". In our imagination we fabricate our universe. There is no limit to the uses of imagination. It has its base in the fabrication power of the absolute. In this sense we truly call the imagination "creative". It is by creative imagination that we can turn the protective engram into the assimilated, sufficient response.

If we look at the sphere of the individual being, and posit inside it all its engrammic records, then we see a sphere or balloon full of smaller balloons. The total energy of the sphere is not available to it as a whole, but only within the balloons. If we will to have all our energy at our disposal, we need to prick those balloons, and this is only possible with the needle of sharply focused consciousness. Whenever an emotional record is triggered, and we feel some like or dislike, some unwonted distress signal, we are to focus consciousness sharply on that feeling. If we then either run the engrammic record, or insist on here and now response, we will find that in the one case we deflate the balloon and in the other that we prick it by sharp observation. I am not going tonight to go into the details of engram therapy, and certainly do not advocate any attempt to go into a traumatic record without advice and help and a trained therapist standing by. But there are many, many, occasions when we can take a lesser record and examine it by consciously taking the discomfort or the unexplained phenomena, and pushing it back in consciousness through the time line of our own life, until we come to the source of the record. Lesser records are quite easily picked up in this way. The difference between such a record being triggered unconsciously and playing its distress signals into the organism, and the conscious triggering of the engrammic record by focusing consciousness on it, is enormous. But in either case, consciousness is the catalyst. Merely by being aware that there is a record present, and that it is affecting our behaviour, already changes the situation. We are no longer at the mercy of the engrammic stimulus reaction. Consciousness manifestations of has noticed it. And just as the naughty child alters its behaviour pattern as soon as it becomes aware that an adult is watching it, so with the record emotion.

Now we could spend all night and many more nights exploring the high ways and byways of this therapy, with all its exceptions and rules. But the fact is that consciousness is the main

weapon in our hands, and when consciousness is working in sharp focus in the here and now, the mass of ancestral and personal records has less chance of operating us reactively.

Let us recapitulate the difference between encapsulation and assimilation. If we encapsulate, it is because we cannot assimilate the energies incoming. We have no time to sort them out, for that is all assimilate means. We have no time to link like with like in our experience. In consequence, there is a mass of unexamined energy locked up in each of these balloons. And the unexamined life is not worth living.

What we could not assimilate at the time of the creation of the record, we can do now with sharpened consciousness. We can probe the balloon and let out its energy, channeling it into what we now see as appropriate places. And we can employ another technique to help us with inertia patterns like these records. We can by the use of creative imagination, replay distress situations and negative situations in a manner more appropriate to our present awareness and knowledge, and thus change our previous history. We can actually transform the content of a record simply by replaying it and placing consciously upon it a more positive interpretation.

Even in a highly charged record like the example of the little boy earlier, one can change the event to something more assimilable by creative imagination. So, for instance, the grown man in whom the little boy operates has learned to use various techniques to combat his negativity. For example, when he has been writhing on the floor in agony, vomiting and making terrible noises, he has heard the voice on the telephone insisting that he repeat, "My name is John Smith, and I am 63 years old, managing director of my own company and sitting in my study talking to Eugene Halliday". He has also learned that he can release himself from the distress of a record replay by saying to himself, "This is a record, and I do not have to allow it to replay itself." Both of these are modes of returning consciousness to the here and now. He can now use such techniques himself without anybody being on the telephone because his consciousness has recognised the value and efficacy of the techniques.

Similarly, the same person has learned to place a positive interpretation on any of the/his record pattern that comes up. Whenever he is assailed by terrible feelings of guilt, and feels God in the Sky about to condemn him, he now says, "You are a figment of my imagination, imposed on my mother by priest-craft, and imposed upon me by her. I am the real god, so go away."

It is this sharp focusing of consciousness on the realities of the now moment, that helps us to sort out what is happening actually and now, and what elements are from previous usually uncomfortable or painful experiences. Let me give you an example used by Eugene on one occasion. He deliberately broke a piece of chalk with a sharp SNAP! and asked for the reactions of those present. He pointed out that at least one person in the room would be likely to associate the snapping of the chalk with the snapping of a bone, and that they could in such a moment replay the pain and shock of themselves breaking one of their bones. Only by seeing the link can the two incidents be separated out and the energies safely assimilated. It is consciousness that says, "The bone break was then, and the chalk break is now. The only link is the emotion engendered protopathically."

Some years ago Eugene wrote a piece called Creative Imagination in Auto-Therapy. This is an extract from it.

QUOTE PAGE parts of 4 and 5.

To conclude what we have been examining, let me quote from another piece by Eugene Halliday, this time one called, "Techniques of Psychic Release." As I read it I want you to note the masterly clarity with which the logic of protopathic records is explained.

QUOTE FROM TPR, pages 3 and 4.

We have, I hope, said enough about the role of consciousness in relation to emotional records is the psyche of every being to convince us that there is no substitute for a consciousness which does not become identified with a substantial rotation pattern or record. If it does, it goes under the law of that with which it is identified. Only when the consciousness is in the here and now, sharply focused, can we say with St. Paul that we are, "Of the law and not under it." That is to say, that we know about our emotional records, and the effects they can have if we identify with them, but that we also know that consciousness can transcend all records and not be bound by them. Non-identified consciousness can assimilate what the identified consciousness can only encapsulate. We must assimilate the contents of every encapsulation if we are to be free. Free, that is, of all the records except the great record of Being itself. For the resolution of that we need the help of the Great Therapist Himself, He who posited the first engram record of all, the Creation itself.

## QUABEL

By David Mhlowae

In a talk a little time ago, I referred to the Quest upon which all mankind is engaged, whether it is aware of it or not, and whether it likes it or not. The Quest is a fact. We are all searching for something, and finally that something cannot be anything in the gross material world, because all such things decay and waste away. So if we pursue such ephemeral things, we are always disappointed when it turns, as it were, to dust in our hands. We find, sooner or later, that what we are looking for is ourselves. But what is that Self? And how shall we recognise it when we see it?

The first thing to recognise about this quest is that we are searching for something we have mislaid, not for something which we have to achieve and add unto ourselves. We *are* already, in the inmost recesses of ourselves, complete and perfect. We shall never learn anything we do not already know in ourselves. We shall never find anything which we do not already have now within us. The Quest is for what we once knew, and which our outward-turning consciousness has mislaid in time.

I likened this Quest to the Prodigal Son, the son who turns away from his Father's house, and seeks experience and fortune in the world beyond. The Father's house is really the source power of our being, our generative power. And when the Son goes out into the world, his portion of that power is expended in experience of the things of this world until he is destitute of power, and reduced to eating husks - husks being the outermost of the external world, the dead outward cover of the seed.

When the Prodigal has reached this uttermost outward far thing of time; when he has reached the term of the time process, then he turns and goes back on the second half of his journey, this time inwards to his father's house again. In other words he goes from his generative source outwards to seek experience; goes to the term of exteriorisation, and then returns to where he belongs - in the heart of power.

In that previous talk I made a controversial statement. I said that the type of the prodigal son I was going to use as an example was not Jesus, although He was the prodigal, too. The Questing prodigal I used as an illustration was the first Son, the first offspring on earth of the first man. And this first son was also the first murderer. His name is Cain. Cain is the symbol of man as prodigal, man as pilgrim, man as explorer and knower of God's universe, and the first great criminal.

Tonight, I would like to explore this idea further with you, because I believe that it is a tremendously important concept. And without a thorough grasp of this concept of Cain, we cannot accelerate our quest for ourselves. For we are Cain. Each one of us here, through our ancestry backwards in time, are heirs of this man who started off a process of alienation from the source of all good, and finally must return to it after many days.

That sounds a fine, dramatic statement on which to build, does it not? And quite rightly so, for the story of Cain and his murder is, after the story of his parents, the earliest act of theatre there ever was.

But before we go on, let me make one thing quite clear. I am not concerned here with a historical personage in a particular time. I am concerned with a fundamental function of the human being, enshrined in myth, and a potent force in the development of the human psyche. In one sense I am saying that Cain is an aspect of certainly my internal being, and I believe, of yours also. The mythical force of Cain is far greater than that of a historical figure, and his act has had incalculable consequences on us all. Cain and Abel, Adam and Eve, are archetypes of humanity.

Let us first consider the story. Cain's father and mother, Adam, had disobeyed the order of their God that they should not eat of the knowledge of the tree of good and evil in the paradise garden. When they did so, God, their source power and begetter, excluded them from the garden, and condemned them to the unguarded and unworked world beyond. The mystical symbology of this is that the original unity of man was destroyed when he elected to make a differentiation between what was good and what was evil, without knowing the parameters of either, except through the medium of liking and disliking. By destroying the unity of his being, man was excluded from paradise (which means "beyond judgement") and sent into the wilderness. Henceforth, Adam and Eve were to gain their living by the sweat of

their brow, and travail was to be their lot. This was entirely logical when one considers that if one breaks one's unity, one is no longer in a non-judgemental position, namely Paradise. One is self-excluded from it within oneself because one has elected to judge, or have preferences. In this analogy, Eden represents the internal life, and the outward body represents the wilderness beyond Eden.

In consequence of their act, Adam and Eve were excluded from wholeness, or Eden, for they had fallen from perfection into partiality, and their wholeness was lost. They were henceforth to live in the duality they had created, the oppositions of yes and no, high and low, far and near, love and hate. Everything they did after the first division was to be in doubles. Always they would have to choose between pairs of opposites, and judge them to be either good or evil, according to their lights. And having no experience, they naturally tended to judge what was good as being what was pleasant, and what was evil as being what was painful.

So Adam and Eve departed from the paradise garden and began to earn their living by the sweat of their brow. As God said, "The earth shall be cursed for thy sake." That was an odd thing to say, was it not? "For thy sake." That must mean that in this cursing there was a hidden benefit for Adam. The difficulty he was going to experience was to be, "For his sake". And God being an absolute, sentient, and therefore loving power, this must be so. God cannot will utter and everlasting evil for His creatures. At some point the evil He visits upon them, or which they visit upon themselves, must be swallowed up in an ultimate good. How could it be otherwise?

All rejection is a tin-owing back, a re-ject-ing. When Adam disobeys God, it is as if he had thrown a ball of defiance at God. All God did in return was to hold up his bat, and the ball of defiance bounced off and returned to hit Adam. It was Adam's own ject-ion which caused his rejection. That is logical. Let us go on with the story.

It says in the book of Genesis that Adam knew his wife and she conceived and bare a son who was called Cain. And she said of Cain, "I have gotten a man from the Lord". So Cain was the eldest son of Adam, and the first son of time, for Cain was born out of the garden of Eden in the time or wilderness process.

The firstborn is the inheritor of the family line. In him are carried the seeds of the work of that line, inherited from his father. So Cain in his actions is further developing a route upon which his father Adam had already stepped when he disobeyed God. Adam had already begun a course of individual action apart from His source power in God. Cain was to take a further step on the road to human individualisation. Cain was to be committed, as was his father, to exile, and the long course of evolution through suffering.

Cain had a brother, Abel. Their names are important, as are all names, for they describe functions. Cain means "to fix, to be a spear (in the sense of pinning)" and it also has connotations with a Hebrew word for humiliation. Abel means the opposite to the fixed Cain, for it describes the ephemeral, or what the Bible calls "vanity", meaning insubstantiality. Abel's name is also connected with the word for a field or meadow. This is a reference to the sentient field of power. So here are the two off-springs of Adam and Eve, and they already show the split in humanity.

Cain is a fixer and a fixed one, a kenning or knowing man, one who turns the ground over, or differentiates it. He ploughs the ground. Abel is a non-fixed being, for he is a herdsman, who wanders over the face of the earth leaving no mark. Cain later proves to be the first maker of cities, the first to make his mark definitely on the ground and in it.

All this fixing capacity shows in Cain's relative stability on the ground. If you till the land, you have to stay in one place. Abel was not fixed - he had to wander with his herds. There was bound to be a conflict between these two, just as there was conflict to the death between the ranchers and the agrarians in the Wild West of America. In fact, the pattern of conflict between these two types of men has been more or less constant throughout history.

But why, when Cain brought the fruits of the ground as a sacrifice to the Lord, did the Lord respect it not, but did respect the sacrifice of Abel's flocks? God knew - indeed He knew from before the beginning, for he is the all-knowing - what was in Cain, and in Abel, and in Adam their father. He saw that man, by his original disobedience, and by his new found differentiation between good and evil, was embarked on a journey which would take man ever further away from God as source, and towards the establishment of man as a supreme individual power capable eventually of challenging the works of God himself.

Now, God is a realist, the only true realist, and He knew that if He was to capitalise on man's choice of individuation apart from God, then He, God, would have to find a way to channel man's energy in such a way that eventually, he would come full circle back to where he started. We must remember that we are dealing only with principles here - Cain is the eldest, and carries the line. Abel is the side of the family which says, "God is my Father", which is what his name means if we split it into AB (father) and El (God). So Abel is no threat to God's supremacy, and he leaves no permanent mark upon the ground of God's universe. He is innocent

So God rejects Cain's offering, in order to fix him, to put him on the spot. God helps Cain along the way he has chosen by saying, in effect, "If this individualisation process, which effectively will exclude me, is your choice, then I hereby help you upon your way by turning you back upon yourself, rejecting your offering".

Now it is well known that anyone who brings a gift to a beloved person, and who is identified with that gift, is rejected in his person if the gift is rejected. The being himself feels rejected and therefore hurt, and therefore determined not to be hurt again. Thus the rejected being becomes a rejecter himself.

Now what will Cain do? Well, he is no fool - his name means the cunning or kenning man. He recognised what God had done, and that he had been worsted. His gift, rejected, caused great rage in Cain. But God was unrepentant. "Why are you enraged? If you do well, shall you not be accepted? And if you do do not well, sin lieth at the door." Then God said something very interesting, "And unto thee shall be his (Abel's) desire, and thou shalt rule over him." In other words, Cain was the superior of the two brothers, not only in being firstborn, but because he was naturally a magnetic personality and a powerful being, and because his knowhow was greater.

Remember, Cain means "to be fixed" and any being who is fixed and erected in one place is a point of reference in an otherwise undifferentiated place. Thus he becomes a natural

standard to which his brother is drawn. "And thou shalt rule over him," Why is that? Because Cain was the one who had already shown that he could differentiate between things, and that he was a natural enquirer, a natural turner-over of the ground of being. Cain was a k-knowing being. Abel, on the other hand, is a more evanescent and shadowy character, reminiscent of the Edoinite kings of the Bible, who appeared and disappeared and of them nothing remained. Abel relied on God as His Father, and therefore his grip on the time process was less firm, less sure, than was Cain's in his presumption.

Abel is a representative of that side of Adam as first man which looks back towards his father in paradise, rather than to the time process to which Adam has been committed. Abel is anachronistic, therefore.. It is too late to expect to return to the Father-God, because the Adamic man is self-committed to a path on which he set foot when he first purposed to go his own way in disobedience to God's commandment. In a real sense, Abel is never fully alive in time. His death is inevitable, when the other side of Adam's character, the individualistic and separative being, the Cain, is provoked by God to rage.

So Cain meets Abel in the field (that is, the field of absolute sentient power) and slays him. Have you ever heard the saying, "Each man kills the thing he loves?" Well, in a sense that is what Cain did. Symbolically, Abel is his spiritual self, his field-aware other half, his innocence. By Cain's rageful separativity, his separation from God, Who has rejected him, he has already made a division between himself and the field of Abel, the god-aware preference of his own nature. To murder is to make such a division, such a wall. That is the meaning of the "mur" in the word "murder". When Cain murders Abel, he creates a divide over which he cannot step. The field is his brother's name, and Cain ploughs that field up. He destroys the pasture.

Imagine that first murderous situation. Cain in his rage slays Abel. This has never happened before, and Cain must realise for the first time that he can no longer communicate with his brother. His brother does not reply. For the first time, man has cut himself off from communication with the whole field of sentient power by his separative act. That must have been a terrifying revelation to Cain.

When God comes to Cain and asks him where Abel is, Cain lies. "I know not. Am I my brother's keeper?" God's reply is swift, and again, exactly cognate with Cain's own act. God is simply giving back to Cain what he has sent forth.

"What hast thou done? the voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground. And now art thou cursed from the earth, which hath opened her mouth to receive thy brother's blood from thy hand. When thou tillest the ground, it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength; a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth."

We must pause here to understand the nature of this curse under which Cain is to labour. It is not a malevolent gesture, this curse. The eternal God does not anathematise his creatures in that sense. "Curse" has its origins according to some in the word "cross", which is fairly obvious sense. But the other root is from words meaning "to run", and it is not far from the word "course" which is a running ground or round. Cain is committed to the long course of experience and suffering in the world which will eventually bring him face to face again with his murdered brother. That is his "curse". And it is more than he can bear.

This is the first murder and its aftermath. And it is committed by a being who has first hand experience of direct conversations with the living God. How does he feel, this being, when he realises that by his act he has walled himself off from communication with his family, his brother, and with God his generative source? What a terrible situation Cain is in.

But now God is even more definite that He will not allow there to be an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. Cain is not to be killed in his turn. He is to live, and to unravel all the implications of this murder. He is now committed irrevocably to the empirical world. Why? Because he has killed his own faith. Abel has faith in his Father-God. Cain has killed Abel, and with him, Cain's own faith. If there is no faith, there is only reason by which a man may try to live. Reason, empiricism, science, these are to be the ways henceforth by which Cain is to survive. He is to learn the hard way, by painstaking examination and probing.

God curses Cain because it is the only available way in which Cain can be saved. The raising of Cain is the raising of the fallen man from the gross empirical world to the world of spirit again. But only after toiling round the long course of time. Cain set his foot upon a pathway which he now must complete until he reaches the uttermost far-thing of payment for his debt. Then, like all things carried to their term, it must invert and become its opposite. Science must be seen to be spirit precipitated the body to be God in act.

Cain is the great civiliser. He goes out and makes a city with walls to protect himself and his family from natural calamity, and we also protect ourselves in every conceivable way against the natural world. Cain was the first insurance man, the man from the prudential! as well as being the first empirical scientist. We can see how his propensities work out in his line by looking at the list of his descendants in the Book of Genesis. They include Jubal, who is the father of those who handle the harp and organ; Tubal Cain, who is the instructor of every artificer in brass and iron; and Lamech, who continued the tradition of murder in the family.

So here we have the tradition in man of violence, separativity from the field of power, and the will to self-determination through empirical experiment. None of this is separate from God, however. How can anything be separate from the source power of all there is. No, the separation will is in Cain, and Cain is a function of the absolute sentient power. So God must have a reason for His Cain function, a purpose which must ultimately result in good.

We may say that the result of Cain's choices is that man has been condemned to suffer from Cain's violent reactions, his empirical scientific endeavor which has led to so much despoiling of the earth and the atmosphere, and to so many egotistical phantasies of power which man's knowledge has given him. It is true that the world is full of murder and may-hem and property consciousness and grab because of the Cain function in all of us. But we have to look at the other side of the coin, too.

There is an ancient tradition that man is destined to become higher than the angels. He is destined to become the highest created being, and to know that he is so. That can be done instantly, or it can be done by the long course of finding empirically and egotistically

the meaning of everything in the universe. This last way is the way of Cain. He is not allowed to take his hand from the plough he took up until he has ploughed every furrow in the field of power, backwards, forwards and roundabout. Cain in us has to become knowledgeable about every single law of nature. So far that has taken us to the moon, and will take us to the nearer planets in a relatively short time. The techniques necessary in order to do that are near miracles of brain power. In our own day we have seen the Cainish pace hotted up to a point where those of us who were born before the second world war were living then in a world incomparably less complicated and sophisticated in its technology than the one we inhabit today.

But Cain is not yet finished with his long course. Even when he comes across a concept like that of the splitting of the atom, and with it the release of unimaginable energy from that infinitesimal point; even then Cain could not admit that his attempt to explain everything in terms of empirical science was doomed. He could not admit that he had proved that behind the smallest particle of matter was power, and that the universe was not a material entity, but a being of power.

And although it is now the fashion for Cainish scientists to talk about chaos theory and the multiple universe, and so on, Cain is still in search of individual power. He is still not willing to admit that he owes all this knowledge gathering ability to his source, his God. He is still trying to prove a point. The inertia of that attitude runs deep in every one of us. Even when Cain shall prove the existence of God, he is in danger of patronising God because he, Cain, discovered Him!

I remember that our friend and teacher Eugene said that Cain - that is, the empirical scientist, the atheistical technocrat, would have finally to unravel every so-called miracle and wonder in the Bible, and prove it to be true as written. He has not got that far yet, but he has gone a long way. But what happens when Cain has completed the long course? What happens to a man when his life work results in utterly refuting the motive with which he took it up? What happens when Cain proves that matter is only spirit precipitated and concreted? What happens when his probings and provings result in the final realisation that everything is a product of an absolute sentient and intelligent power, and that the word "God" which Cain has dodged for so long, is shorthand for that power.

It is at this uttermost far thing, the finishing line of the course, that Cain will meet again the situation which he first engendered when he slew Abel. He must meet Abel again. He must refer all his immense experience of the world, of science, of theology, of morality, of politics, and all the other disciplines he has studied in order to bolster his egotistical stance, to the problem of what he will now do. Because it is at this point where Cain has proved all God's works to be true that he comes face to face not only with his brother, but also with God, his source-power.

At this denouement, Citizen Kane, for it is he, will be faced with the fact that all his power gained through knowledge, and it is an immense power, and an immense knowledge, is actually nothing, because everything he has done has been a reaction to God's rejection of his works in the first place. Cain, at the end of the long course, is utterly refuted by his self-knowledge. He has argued his position out of existence. And he is left with nothing but the fact that whatever he has done is what God has done in him. All that is Cain is God's, for God's is the power that brought him into being and keeps him there. Cain's study of the laws of the universe leads him finally to the maker of those laws.

But can Cain at this point bow the knee and offer all that he has and knows to the onlie begetter of that knowledge - namely God. You will remember in our last talk that we examined the tetragrammaton, the Yod Hay Vav Hay. We said that the Yod Hay was God the creator as an eternal seed-reality, and that Vav Hay was that same seed translating through time as the creative finger of God writing the world into being. Now Vav Hay is the same as the Mr. WH to whom Shakespeare dedicated the flower of his genius, the Sonnets. "To the onlie begetter of these ensuing Sonnets, Mr WH." Sonnets are sound-nets, and the universe is one big sound net, for all is sound, the logos word, the shabdabrahman. Can Cain admit this? Can he gain the whole world, and then give it all to God?

Cain is intelligent. He is the High Priest, the KoHane of this world. He has built an empire parallel with God, and he has subtly manipulated every universal principle in order to guard his position on the king's and the bishop's throne. And when he is utterly refuted in every point of his argument, he is too intelligent to disobey the logic that says all things carried to their term invert and become their opposite. God must win in the end. Indeed, He won from before the beginning. Cain is God as individualist. Cain is absolute power defying itself, resisting itself in every way, in order to create a reflexive and willing instrument of

God's will. The cunning in Cain is God's cunning. And remember, Cain is in each one of us.

Before we go on with this denouement, let us return to the beginning of the process, for we have as yet not mentioned another potent force in this family of man. When Eve lost Abel, she conceived and bore another son, whom she called Seth; "For God hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel, whom Cain slew." And here we should pause and say that the word Seth, as it is pronounced in English, would be roughly the same as the word "set", meaning "fixed". It would also be like the word "sett" meaning a stone, or a brick. But in Hebrew that "s" sound at the beginning of the name is really a shin, which makes the name SHETH. It really means that which is put or placed or appointed. Sheth is appointed to be in the place of the dead Abel.

We have continuously to remind ourselves that we are really not talking about human beings as such when we talk about Cain, Abel and Sheth. They are archetypal forces functioning according to the value of their names within the human psyche. They are not historical figures necessarily, and we are not talking about them in that way. They are intelligent forces, aspects of God's power, and therefore the makers of history.

This Sheth is the ancestor of the line out of which eventually Jesus came. And he represents a force in the human line of evolution which runs parallel with the line of Cain, and in opposition to it. Out of Sheth came Noah, and Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Moses and David, and so on to the culmination in Jesus the Christ.

Cain represents the rationalist, the civiliser; Abel represents the natural man. The murder of the one by the other is repeated in many myths, and in the history which the myths engendered. Cain and Jacob were both agriculturists. One killed his brother, the other cheated his brother out of his birthright. In another myth Gilgamesh, the civiliser, kills Enkidu the natural man. Romulus, the city builder, murders Remus, who scorned his walls. Set, the brick city builder, murders Osiris. And so on throughout man's history.

The natural man, the simple man who calls upon God, is so often a sacrifice to the rationalisers, the priests and kings of the earth, the vested interest boys. In every generation it is the Abel figure who is sacrificed in order to make a civilisation. And yet we must not forget

that all this takes place within God's creation, and God himself is a kind of Cain in that he made a sacred place of order in which to manifest his creative powers. In that sense, God is a slayer of his own peace and a binder of all men into cities, or guarded places. What is the garden of paradise itself but a fenced and hedged in place, a refuge from the chaos without? We are dealing here with very difficult matters, and any attempt at a moral view would be to miss the point altogether.

The whole point of this exercise upon which God is embarked is to save and to raise Cain. Fallen man from Adam onwards must be regenerated, and if encouraging Cain to survive and carry on in his empirical mode is the only way, then God is a realist, as we have said. Nothing is said about regenerating Abel, but this is because we are talking about universal functions, and Abel is the field of feeling itself, and not strictly incarnate. It is Cain, the first born, who carries the banner of man forward from Adam. When, however, he effectively kills his feeling self, he is provided with another representative of the field of power, Sheth, to take Abel's place.

But Sheth is incarnate. He is a man, made, as the Bible says, in Adam's likeness and image. But the difference to either of the other sons is that Sheth is appointed by God. He is the head of that line which develops parallel to that of Cain, and is an opposition and a thorn in the flesh of the Cainites, who are often guilty of killing the Sheth-men down the years. But Just as God keeps Cain alive, so does He keep the sons of Sheth alive. These latter are the purveyors of God's word to the men of darkness, the Cainites. Sheth attempts to raise Cain, and Cain attempts to ignore Sheth in order to carry on with his empirical activities. Each develops and refines the purposes of the other through opposition. We might well describe the process in terms of this diagram.

Here is Cain, erect, like a spear. And opposite him is his brother Sheth, who is appointed by God, and therefore also upright. The opposition between them is the bar which creates the letter H. "H" always stands for power, power gained by opposition, and expressed with effort. The effort creates a hierarchy, and H is the symbol therefore of hierarchy. And if we continue this opposition between two uprights, or beings, we have a series of such oppositions, which create a ladder, like this. Our old friend, the ladder to all high design, is born out of the conflict between Sheth the man of God, and Cain the man of time.

Strictly, of course, we have to remember that both Sheth and Cain are the Creator in disguise, pushing Himself through a process of creation and development which is possible in no other way. There is no room in this analysis for morality and pettifogging constrictions. This is a story of power self-opposing itself in order to make a lasting and hierarchical creation. These are two brothers, like Christ and Lucifer, Jacob and Esau, and many others, who are the light and the dark side of God. Our problem as fallen beings is that we continue with the sin of Adam and suppose still that we know what is good and what is evil in this story. We do not, and if we pursue our argument very closely on such a level, we shall be in danger of seeing God as evil, for He allows Abel to die and Cain to live. Let us keep away from morality and look instead at reality, at what is.

God's intent is to find Himself an irrefragible representative of Himself in the time process, a permanent instrument of His power, and a paradigm for all men to follow. It cannot be done without Cain. Cain is the satanic or resistant spirit, and without him, there is no opportunity for a Christ to arise. Jesus the Christ, born of the line of Sheth, is the anti-stroke to the Cainish spirit, and Cain is a mighty opponent. This is a titanic struggle which has continued throughout Time. Perhaps this is why one of the other meanings of Sheth's name is "tumult". All Messianic lines lead into tumult because they are in direct conflict with the egotistic motives of Cainish man.

Now, let us remind ourselves that we are microcosms of the macrocosmic reality, and that this terrible struggle is going on **in us**. We are Cain in that we want our own way, and are prepared to be violent in order to get it. We are Sheth in that we are appointed by God to find a new way to regenerate Cain and make him the body of the Logos in time. Sheth is God in us, Cain plays the devil with him. But out of that war in the body of God's creation comes the perfect representative in time of all that long struggle.

Jesus Christ could not have appeared in time as He did until the Cain-Sheth struggle had reached a crescendo of importance. Jesus the unbreakable son of God and of man is, as we have so many times said, no Italian plaster saint. Tradition says he was a man of sorrows, unprepossessing, and perhaps crippled. But then, all the best people are. Not until we have fought with God and showed ourselves as worthy opponents, as did Jacob, can we be given our new name, as Jacob was given the name Israel, which means, "He shall rule as God."

The inescapable fact is that unless we have to fight with something, we shall never become strong, we shall never build muscle at whatever level of being. We need the darkness as much as the light if we are to be balanced and capable of holding to ourselves, whatever the onslaught from God or devil. And do not question my including God in the fight. You know, the God of Moses told him to go into Egypt and God would look after him, and then God tried to kill him in the night! We all need to be tested. If Moses had given in, or Jacob, or Jesus, under attack, then God would have had to look for another champion.

Our only choice in this matter, then, is the side on which we are to fight. Fight we must, if we are to survive as beings, and not fall into the receiving earth as did Abel. We have to fight on the side of either egotistical, power seeking, empirical scientific and godless Cain, who is still apparently very strong; or we fight on the side of the descendant of Sheth, Jesus Christ. And there is a joke here, much like the joke when God says, "I have this day laid before thee life and death, therefore choose life!" Is that a choice? Well, yes, it is a choice, because we can fight on either side. But the joke is that God, who is all-powerful, and all seeing, knows that if we choose the Cain side, it is self-refuting in the end, leaving us, and Cain, face to face with ourselves as self-refuted beings.

But why, asks Cain in us. Why do we have to be self-refuted? Why cannot we eventually succeed in our intent to be all powerful and rulers of the world? The answer is clear, and it is the nature of time itself. Cain as a finite being has his time and then must die. History shows how even the greatest of kings, with the greatest of triumphs, must eventually come to disaster as his powers wane, and those of a young opponent wax. Each Cain must fail finally because time is against him. His grasp crushes what he holds. And in any case a man's reach should exceed his grasp or what's a heaven for?

Any attempt by the intellect to usurp supreme power is doomed to failure, simply because the intellect is **contained**. It is circumscribed by its own processes and can never break out of its own circumscribings. It is contained within the consciousness. "I am *conscious* that I think" is a far more potent statement than to say "I *think* that I think." The latter is a tautology, whereas the former says that consciousness, that in which intellect operates, is greater than intellect. Indeed, consciousness is beyond any of its objects, and is therefore the only truly irrefragible. The intellect, or Cain, is composed of parts, but consciousness has no

parts. It is the seamless garment of the Christlike being, and envelopes him in all he does or is.

It is Sheth's descendants who develop in the course of time an understanding of this God-consciousness. Sheth's first son is called Enos, and the Bible says that in his time men began to call upon the name of God. In the middle of the Cainish power pursuit for private gain, there is another strand of humanity which harks back to the days of Adam the first man, who walked with God. This line develops as strongly as does that of Cain, and always in opposition to it. The ancestors in time of Jesus had to suffer and experience and suffer again to a tremendous degree in order to compress the human soul until it incandesced and was flooded with the light of real understanding of the whole process.

When that enlightenment occurs in us as human beings, we too understand the whole process as Jesus did. We do not blame or condemn any of these great forces at work in the guise of Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel and Sheth. We see that they are players in a cosmic drama, and that out of their clash of wills and motives there emerged the world we live and have our being in. It is a battlefield between the sons of God and the sons of men, between the Cainites and the Shethites. *Both* are sustained by God, who loves both darkness and light, and understands that neither has any meaning without the other.

If Adam and Cain after him had not elected to objectify themselves in the fallen world, the Absolute would not have been able to experience substantially what they presented from their functions. We have to deal with the world as it is, not as it might have been if Adam had not fallen. And in this world as we know it, Christ came because Cain had to be opposed. The perfect God-Man was enabled because of the struggle in the fallen world. Cain makes Christ real, as all opposition makes us real. Cain is the dark side of Christ as the son of man. Both are sons of one father, and they elected, one to take the high road and one to take the low road. But both roads lead back eventually to where they started from, because the world is round. But unless Cain had started out on his road, there would have been no need for a Sheth and no need for a Christ. God would be watching a different scenario.

But that is phantasy. We **are** fallen from grace, and a large part of each of our beings is still behaving as Cain. We strive for personal pleasure and murder anyone who gets in our

way. Murder takes many forms, and all include putting up a "mur" or wall. The world is a series of separate selves in Cain's view. Only in Christ's view do we hear about the vine that climbs over the wall, or, in other words, how love makes communication possible across the divides of our world. And in any case, Cain strives always to manipulate such statements to his own ends. The Hebrew word for a priest is Cohane, and that is a word uncomfortably close to the word Qaheen, or Cain. Cainish vested interests can use even the word of God to their own ends. And do so, very effectively.

But in the end, as we have said, all comes full circle. Cain has completed the long course to which God committed him in the beginning, and now he is brought face to face with himself. Slowly, his knowledge, born of his experience in the world, has proved that there is a God, that each of us owe all to that God, and that Cain of himself can do nothing. All his power is by permission. His empirical scientific endeavour has proved to him the existence of an ineffable power beyond even the most fundamental laws of nature Cain has fathomed. He has come face to face with the exemplar of that power in the line of Sheth. He has come face to face with that other prodigal son, Jesus Christ.

Cain is a prodigal son - indeed, the first - but so is Christ. The only difference is that Christ is *appointed* to his prodigality and pursues it knowingly and with full consciousness. But now they are jointly returned to their source. And here, for God's delectation, they argue their case. Cain with all the worldly knowledge he has gathered through the ages, Christ with all the knowledge he has gathered through the ages. There is a difference, however. Christ, son of Sheth, Noah, Abraham, Jacob, Moses, David, has always worked in the world, but he has always walked with God. All his experience has been lit by inner listening to the voice of God. His knowledge is transformed into wisdom by that fact. Knowledge is serial, wisdom is immediate, in apprehension.

And what of Abel? Well, when Cain is utterly refuted in argument, as knowledge must always be by wisdom, he is finally broken down. When we say "He has broken down" we usually mean that he is weeping. That is so with Cain. When neither his knowledge or his anger prevails, then his grief must come to the fore. The realisation of his sin, or his departure from the point, which is all that sin means, that realisation is like a light breaking into him. Suddenly, in a flash, he sees his long course like a drowning man is supposed to see his whole life in a single moment. Cain is broken into by light and in so doing is stricken with

grief at what he has done, and relief that it is over.

But the light that breaks into Cain is the light of Christ. In that light, Christ breaks into Cain, and the two are no longer separate. They are aspects of one being, one man, Adam Qadmon, the universal man. And then Cain realises and loves all that God has made him go through in order to come to this point of enlightenment. Cain could have had this from the beginning, had he learned his first lesson well, namely the reason for God's rejection of his sacrifice of the fruits of the earth. But never mind, the story he has to tell in his actual person is a fascinating one, and when joined with the parallel story of Christ his brother, it is enough to keep God up all night!

It is the grief of Cain at what he has done, and the joy of his forgiveness, which causes the tears which are salvation. The salve in salvation is the precious ointment distilled out of sorrow and sweetened with joy. When it is applied to any wound that wound is healed. In that moment Abel is brought back to life in Cain. The natural feeling life is restored in man, and he can again hear the voice of God in his substance.

If Christ is the second Adam, as the scriptures say he is, then He is also Cain and Abel and Sheth. He is the three in one which are co-functions of the Absolute Sentient Power. At this point, for the first time, the sons of men are rejoined with the sons of god.

When I first gave notice, if me it was, that this talk was to be called Qabel, it was assumed that the word Qabel was the jointure of Cain and Abel. (Cain should really be spelled with a Q or Qoph). But it is much more than that. A "cabal" in English means a secret gathering, but it comes from the Hebrew word Qabalah, meaning "a secret doctrine received". It is also a cable, or means of binding together. All these apply in this mysterious process at the beginning of time. And they apply in every moment of our lives as individuals in whom the Cain-Abel drama is still being played out. We are none of us yet attained to that final denouement where we shall find a joyous and tearful reunion of our divided selves. But we have the method given to us in the Bible. The Cain in us has to give way to the Christ in us, and this through a thorough going prodigality which ends in the outermost husks before returning to the Father's house.

But perhaps the biggest secret is kept to the very end. That secret, hidden in the cabinet of the mysteries, is the answer to Cain's question to God after he had slain Abel. "Am I my brother's keeper?"

There we will leave it, except for a final short piece by Eugene Halliday on the subject. As usual, he sums up in a few words what takes others an hour.

"In man Cain (Intellect, Apollo, the Civiliser) has murdered Abel, the sheep herder, for Abel was unaware of the results of Cain's intention. Abel thought of God as his Father and wandered with his sheep, and built nothing, and so came to nothing (vanity =that which is vain, that which passes). Abel's blood nevertheless cries from the ground for vengeance. The "ground" here means the Unconscious mind, which knows that it has been dispossessed, like Esau by Jacob. The natural man (Abel) is killed by the Civiliser (Cain, first city-builder). Cain is condemned to dig in the earth (=empirical science) until Abel is reborn. One must regain one's lost ability, and not stay forever as a city-building murderer. Somehow a balance of Cain-Abel must be found.

Cain's city was built as a defence against natural calamities. But the city must not remain as a mere defence. It must find room for natural Abel to be re-born. The city must have places in it for wild things to grow. There must be a garden-city with parks and zoos and woodlands where nature can live unspoiled, or there will be a machine-city of steel-concrete-plastic, with robots for inhabitants.

The Qabel or secret place, is in the heart of every man. It is the Eden from which he is self-excluded until he knows enough to resuscitate within himself the Abel he killed when first he practised to make a city. The city Cain built is not to be destroyed. Instead, it is to be transformed into the New Jerusalem, the culmination of man's endeavour, blessed and enlightened by God's grace. And that is what will happen to all serially acquired knowledge and techniques. When the light of the Logos Christ shines upon them, they are made immediate, not serial. They resume their place in the wisdom sphere. Such a Qabalistic solution is bound to come, if only because we are here prophesying it, and the prophecy comes from Christ in the midst of us.

The desire of the Abel-field is for incarnation, and the incarnator is Cain, who is destined to rule over the Abel-field. But only when he has embraced the regenerated Christ in his own heart, and cognised him as his own self, self-realised. Then Abel, avenged, shall rise again, as Cain is raised, and Christ is raised, and as we shall be raised, all of us.

END

## **SYMBOLOLOGY OF THE ZODIAC**

**by David Mahlowe**

In today's talk I would like, with your permission, to continue our examination of basic symbology. Without a system of symbology, the internal and external geometry of the soul cannot be understood, and development of spiritual potential cannot be sustained. Every culture in the history of mankind has observed and worked within, its own system of symbological meaning.

All geometry, and therefore all symbology, come out of the implications of the geometry of the circle. By dividing the circle in various ways, we can draw out various combinations of symbols, and, by attaching specific meaning to each of these, control the content of our minds in a logical way. Thus, when Eugene Halliday instituted the Yantra classes at Parklands in 1972, he called the yantra, which was in this instance a zodiac, a, "Thought machine". By this he meant that the geometry of the circle and its implications controlled and kept within logical bounds and relationships all that was posited within it.

For the purposes of our work today I am not going to enter into the subject of astrology. The Zodiac we are going to examine has an existence independent of any influence on us of that imaginary belt of animals in the sky whose powers may influence our doings on the earth. "It is not in our stars but in ourselves that we are underlings," says Shakespeare. Please understand that I am not criticising star-based astrology; I am simply showing that the Zodiac is a logical statement independent and self-sufficient as a thought controlling process, and as a mode of understanding human nature and types. The zodiac is in itself a symbologically exact representation of humanity and its characteristics, worked out by very wise men and developed over many centuries

The elements of our study consist in twelve so called 'houses' or 'signs' of the zodiac; and a system of seven planetary powers which create and control the twelve houses. When I talk of 'planetary' powers, this is not a reference to the planetary spheres in the sky merely, but more essentially, a reference to the seven basic power-functions by which the universe at large or in little, is run.

This is the diagram of three part man. He has a head, a heart, and a belly. These refer to the psychological equivalents of intellect, feeling or emotion, and conational drive.

Everything we are has these three aspects within them. Everything has a form ( intellect), a feeling, and a drive aspect.

These three are the Holy Trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Father is the drive or belly function; The Son is the formal or intellective functions; and the Holy Ghost is the feeling that maintains a connexion between Father and Son - and proceeds from them both equally.

This Trinity, this triangular function, runs throughout the whole of creation. In the case of the individual human being, if we wrap these three in the cartouche of the human body, then we can say we have a four part being. Every human being has an intellective function; every human being has the power of sentience; and every human being has the power to activate his form and his feeling in some way. The container and experiencer of these three is the substantial body. So we have a being with a fourfold function.

We are all of us aware of the classical division of humanity into four humours. These were called Fire, Air, Water and Earth. They refer to these four functions we have been describing. Fire is equated with the energy, and specifically the nervous energy, in the being; Air is the symbol of the intellective or formal capacity in the being; Water is symbolic of the blood system, or the feeling aspect of humanity; and Earth is the symbol of the digestive system. These four 'humours', as they were called, are the basis of any study of human kind.

Let us take Fire as an example. A being characterised as fiery is a being of nervously orientated energy. Such a being is one of initiative, drive, and general dynamism. It has little inertia to impede it, and indeed, if it meets any such impedance, it kindles in the being irritation and eventually, anger which attempts to destroy the impedance. In the four major divisions of society, the fire type is a king or a soldier. These are the major characteristics of Fire, but we need to be a little more specific if we are to cover all aspects of Fire. So we divide the Fire type of activity into three phases. Like everything else in the universe it is a trinity!

The first phase of any activity is the entering into the new mode. Remember, we are talking about energy characterising itself in various ways. It is always the same energy but it appears in different guises. Here, the energy appears as Fire. Its first appearance is universal, pre-

individual, and what is called Cardinal. In the case of Fire, it is designated as Aries, or The Ram. Ram actually means Fire in Hindi. Wherever we see a Cardinal sign, we are looking at the universal, undifferentiated and therefore non-individual phase of energy.

Once the energy has established itself in the new mode, it becomes more settled and substantial in its manifestation. It is more identified with the new mode, and therefore inertia is apparent. It is stuck in the mode, and is there called Fixed. The fixed signs all manifest this inertic identification and individualised consciousness. The tentative identification of the Cardinal sign with Fire is now the stubborn insistence on it to the exclusion of all else. In the Fire triad, this is the position of Leo. So the energy function called Fire has gone through the universal, non-individuated phase - the inertic individuated phase - and comes now to that which partakes of both Cardinal and Fixed behaviour, and can choose between them. This phase we call Mutable, and in the Fire triad it is signified by Sagittarius. Change is possible here, and this mutable phase is the most sophisticated of all the signs. Energy has moved into Fire mode, become fixed and identified with it, and finally become free enough to choose between Cardinal and Fixed behaviour, and even to choose another humour.

Each of the four humours is a triad; and we now go on to the humour of Air. This is always the symbol of energy in the intellective mode. (The Devil, who is the great intellective separatist, is called the Prince of the powers of the Air.) (Phrenos root here?) Air symbolises the priest and the clerk, and is in mutual opposition to the Fiery warrior king. So we place this triad upside down to that of fire.

Notice that the opposing triads press through each other. That is to show that this is not a heedless and destructive head on collision. That would be catastrophic. All the mutually self-opposing forces which compose the universe press through and into each other. There is no such thing as absolute separativity of function. All function is inter-function.

We follow the same process in the humour of Water, which is, again, in three phases, and is opposed by the humour of Earth. Notice that we have observed a hierarchy of density here. Fire is the least dense, Air is its first precipitate. Water is the next densest down from Air, and Earth is the most dense of all four.

If we now combine all four triads in mutual interpenetrating self-opposition, we have a mandala like this. It is a twelve fold division which, if we encircle it with a containing line, becomes the symbol of man. These are the twelve basic activity possibilities within each being, and they are the twelve basic types of human being to be found in society. And they come out of the implications (the logical implications) of the geometry of the circle.

4 x 3, or 2 x 6. The six is the geometrical result of the compass which drew the circle being placed on the perimeter and marking off six places. Out of this comes all the law and the prophets. All the symbols in the world come out of the six in one. It is, for example, the symbol of the Logos. And when we double it, we have by far the most sophisticated means of measuring, comparing, relating, and controlling man in society. It is very difficult indeed to exhaust the possibilities of this mandala.

(GO INTO 6 X 2; 4 X 3; AND 3 X 4. THE THREE CROSSES AND STRAIGHT OPPOSITIONS, PLUS PERAMBULATION OF THE TWELVE) (GO INTO DIAGNOSTIC CAPABILITIES OF THE ZODIAC. IF CONFRONTED BY A GIVEN BEHAVIOUR, PLACE IT IN SIGN, AND GO INTO OPPOSITION, ETC)

Having set out the four triads, which compose together the twelve basic types of human being, and the twelve basic modes of behaviour in the individual, let us now look at the so-called planetary forces which control the activities of the twelve signs. They are seven in number. For the purpose of this talk I am going to ignore the three later planetary additions of Pluto, Neptune and Uranus. These are to do with universal, supra individual forces in any case. We are concentrating today on the traditional zodiacal planets. What we are really talking about is a system of seven originating forms of motion. There are only these seven forms of motion, and they figure in every created thing in the universe. The individuality of a being is dependent on the hierarchy of the planetary forces at work in him, and their relative strengths and weaknesses.

Let us briefly go through the logic of the creation in terms of these seven types of energy function. These definitions are extremely ancient, and find their highest evolute in the works of men like Jacob Bohme, the Teutonic Philosopher who has influenced practically every philosopher of note since the 17th century.

In a field of undifferentiated power prior to creation, there is nothing to say because there is nothing doing. Doing and saying are synonymous. In that sense all words are verbs! But when there is a movement to create a difference in the undifferentiated field, there is only one way to go - inwards onto a point. This initiates a movement of contraction or condensation onto a centre. When we talk about Saturn, this contraction and its implications such as exclusion, are all we mean.

The field of sentient power feels this contraction, and is disturbed by it. It is painful; which simply means that there is a desire to say, “No,” to the incoming stimulus of contraction, and return to the original bliss. This contraction is, after all, very sharp, and sharpening. So there is set up in the field the first dialectical statement of reality. There is an opposite movement to expansion. This expansion process, together with its implications (such as, for instance, the fact that expansion includes and therefore is comprehensive), is all we mean by the term “Jupiter”. Saturnine contraction and Jupitorean expansion are now in opposition, and opposition always causes rotation. This is a law of nature. The rotation, whose implications include inclusion and exclusion, and all dialectics, is the establishment of the first difference. It is the establishment of the first Word or *verbum fiat*, and is linked closely with the idea of the Logos.

Now, all the planetary functions are eternal, and each must continue to be what it is. So now we have three, namely contraction, expansion, and rotation. None of them can get away from the others, and each insists on its own function. The rotation is the first enclosure or sphere, and the oppositions of contraction and expansion keep it turning, and also heat it up. Heat is possible only in the presence of opposition.

The vehement motion of heat, which includes acceleration, irritability, desire, and so on, is called Mars. The frustration of the condition created by Saturn /Jupiter within the circle generates a black heat which, because it cannot get away and be dissipated in the field beyond the sphere, makes the sphere hotter and blacker. There is anger at the frustration. That is Mars, the motion of desire.

At a certain point in the frustration and heating of the ever more blackened sphere, the whole thing incandescens, and out of the dark heat is produced light. This light radiates out through the whole sphere and enlightens the substance as to the meaning of the process which

is going on within it. This radiation function is that of Sol, the “Sun”. It involves intelligence, because intelligence IS light.

When the substantial sphere, now enlightened as to the process, sees what it has done, it loves it. This is the conscious acceptance of the fact, and the will to develop the process further. This acceptance or receptive quality of love, is called “Venus”, the motion of waiting.

Now the whole sphere is enlightened and loving, and warmly turning and alternately condensing and expanding within itself. This six fold function is a balanced process. It is a vibrating or pulsing process, like the systole/diastole motion of the heart. This is the basis of the circulation system which sends the warmed blood of sentient love flowing round the whole process, enlightening itself in the process.

Finally, there is Luna, the ‘Moon’, which is the function of phasicity. If the whole of the six were to operate in perfect balance, there would be no change of pace or stimulus, no waxing and waning, and no mirroring to the whole sphere of its process. So the Lunatic function is one of phasic change, and the mirroring of that change to the whole.

These, then, are the seven basic motions of the creation; contraction, expansion, rotation, desire, radiation, receptivity, and phasicity. It all sounds very logical and straight forward when put like this. But I should warn you that Jacob Bohme, who sets down these functions just as you have heard, then says, “Nevertheless it ain't like that!” What did he mean? Well, he was saying that we must not take any finite series, such as one to seven, and suppose that to be the be all and end all. We could, for example, start at seven and go to one, or start at four and proceed backwards to one and forwards to seven simultaneously. And, says Bohme, we could take but one of these names, and find all the seven functions wrapped up and presupposed within that one. And, indeed, provided one knows the rules, one can take the name of any of the planets, and draw out from it all seven of the functions. It does not matter where one starts, one ends with all the seven.

But how do we apply these functions to the signs of the zodiac? How does seven go into twelve? What is the logic whereby Mercury rules in Gemini, and why should Saturn control Aquarius? Well, there IS a logic, and it originates in the polarised nature of power at the creation. Power enters into a conspiracy with itself to behave as if it were two, although

that is not possible. It apparently divides itself into an originating and initiating drive, and an accepting and receptive cabinet or container of the driving initiative. One to make, and one to nurture; one male and one female; one father and one mother.

In the planetary explanation of the workings of the creation, the male or initiating function is called Sol, and the reflective cabinet of this endeavour is the female function of Luna. Whatever Sol initiates, Luna reflects it in substantial act. And from the interaction of these two come all the other functions, working outwards from Leo and Cancer.

In a sense we can call the other planetary functions the children of these parents, and like all children, they have both father and mother in them. The first child is Mercury, who is the equivalent of the Christian Logos. Mercury is the great articulating and differentiating function implicit in the first rotation. (Rotation, we recall, is the result of opposition, in this case of Sol and Luna). But Mercury has aspectually different functions according to whether he is on the father's side, in Virgo, or on the mother's side, in Gemini. On the Father's side he is called the making or holding together wheel; on the mother's side he is called the breaking or disintegrating wheel. On the father's side, Mercury is working to conserve; on the mother's side, he is working to break up. There is no pejorative judgement in this - both functions are essential. Because of his setting everything in motion, Mercury is called the work-master of the universe.

Now we move on to Libra and Taurus. These two are ruled by Venus, the quality of receptiveness, and of love, therefore. The Mercury function is hard, in that it differentiates the substance of the sphere, which causes anguish in the sentient field of the universal being. Venus calms and soothes this anguish on the father's side by a cool perception of the process which has gone on in Virgo, and an appreciation of the images which have arisen in the field of power as a result of Mercury's articulation process.

On the mother's side, Taurus, which is the allowing aspect of the Venusian function, lets the bits and pieces of the Gemini mind come together at leisure and associate themselves in their proper places and categories. Venus in Taurus calms the Mercurial Gemini down and assimilates his work.

But one cannot be calmly receptive forever - that would turn into passivity, as, indeed,

it often does in Venus. So there is generated a counteraction in the next planetary child, which is Mars. On the father's side in Scorpio, Mars hotly stings the process into action, heating it up and making it move with his probe. Mars in Scorpio opposes Libran waiting with martial action and devotion to the point. On the mother's side, Mars has a similar function, except that in the case of Aries, the devotional drive is in all directions simultaneously. And whereas in Scorpio the desire drive is to one object, and very persistent, in Aries the desire is to multiple objects, and non-persistent. But in the case of both Scorpio and Aries, the fiery speed of their function makes them intuitively aware.

The heated activity of Mars makes it necessary to apply an ameliorative process once more, for otherwise the system might seize and fuse into a coagulated mass. The next child, therefore, is Jupiter. Jupiter is always closely linked with Venus because he like her is an ameliorative force. There is always this alternative of hard and soft, sting and soothe. The special force in Jupiter is expansion. He is literally jovial, comprehensively accepting through including. On the father's side Jupiter rules in Sagittarius, which is the combiner of Mercury in Virgo, Venus in Libra, and Mars in Scorpio. Sagittarius gathers these together and shoots them at the centre in an attempt to reach into the original wholeness, the original purpose of the whole creative exercise. Hence the centaur is depicted as the teacher of high ideals.

On the mother's side, the combining of the previous planets into Jupiter in Pisces makes the waters dance. This is in consequence the house of the performer, the actor, the artist. It is the function of sentient movement through a field of power.

Now we come to the crux of the whole process. At the opposing pole of Sol and Luna we find two houses ruled by Saturn side by side. On the father's side is Capricorn, which is the house of incarnation into the physical body, the contraction onto the most dense centre of being. Next to it, but on the mother's side, is the house of Aquarius, which is the Saturnine function centred in the head. Here, the concentration is on the holding again, but this time of ideas in the memory.

Now we come to a very interesting dialectic, and one of extreme importance in the evolution of the human being. You will notice from the diagram that the father's Saturn in Capricorn is diametrically opposite the mother function of Luna, and the mother's Saturn in Aquarius is opposite the father function of Sol.

This is how it is to be interpreted. The male and the female function have each gone their own way in the evolution. The war of the sexes is persistent and universal. But at some point the apparently separate energy systems of the male and female have to discover that they are really one energy behaving in different ways. There is no essential difference between man and woman, but only a difference in stress of a polar being. This is why at the culmination of the evolutionary process there has to be a swap over of the father's and mother's line of offspring. The father has to re-discover his spouse, and the mother has to re-discover hers. The male must commit himself to the female and the female must commit herself to the male.

This can be done only if the experience of the father, concentrated in the saturnine impress of existential, incarnated Goat, can meet and agree with the mother energy he forswore in the great parting of the polar ways at the beginning of time. And the mother has to agree at this point with the father's impacted and concretely presented experience. Male at the end of the line has to return to the female at the beginning of the line.

The same is true of the mother's Saturnine function in Aquarius. It is sometimes thought that as Aquarius is an intellective air sign, it must be male. But Luna, the Moon, is the great counter of the universe. In her waxing and waning she measures all things. The oldest method of counting was the lunar count which woman observed in her menstrual cycle. And Shakespeare says of the intellect, "My brain I'll prove the female to my soul ." The intellect is a female function therefore. If man is initiative and form, then form is female to his initiative.

Each of us, male or female, has to pursue our progress on one side or the other, until we reach the saturnine end of our experience as one or the other. It is here that we have the opportunity, and eventually the necessity, of returning to our opposite, ignored up until now. Each of us has finally to acknowledge our debt to the other side, and our deficiency without it.

This, then, is another and a secret way of using the zodiac as a prognostication device. We can use this process in yantra to discover exactly where we are in this exercise of polarised forces moving further and further out from each other, and then curving inwards to

a final resolution of the problem of female and male polarity. It is by such exercise that the initiates in the temple schools became adepts in the science of living.

We owe an incalculable debt to the intelligences which worked out the processes of the zodiac. It is one of the most powerful devices for study in the world. Nobody here is likely to exhaust its possibilities in one lifetime. And its influence is very deep, far below the superficial disbelief in astrology which abound today. For example, have any of you found a being yet who does not know his or her sign of the zodiac, however they disbelieve in it?

We do not need a twelve foot yantra circle to work on this symbolic system. If we place the zodiacal circle on the plane of the diaphragm, with Aries to the spine and Libra to the front of the belly, and ask questions of the yantra so laid down, it will provide invaluable advice on an immediate basis. Suppose, for instance, we have been summoned to a meeting with the new and unknown boss. If we concentrate on the yantra within, and stand in the centre of it, we can ask for a direction in which the new boss stands. We then rotate mentally on the internal yantra, until we feel a blip coming from a certain point. Suppose that we feel such a resonance on Cancer, which is on the left side of the diaphragm. From this we know that we can expect probably a man who is sensitively aware of any change of feeling, and who scurries for cover if necessary. He will not make a direct frontal approach, preferring a sideways crab. He is afraid of anybody getting at him on his sensitive inside, so he builds barriers or shells to protect himself. He is also quick to irritation, and to offer a quick nip to the unwary.

How to deal with this phenomenon? Well, suppose we go into the opposite polar point on the right side of the diaphragm, which is Capricorn. Capricorn is down to earth and practical. It is a structured and somewhat serious soul, which does not take easily to being put off by emotive pressures. It is solid and unlikely to be affected overmuch by the quick nip of the Crab. And if necessary, the contractive power of the Saturn can crack open the shell of the lunar power in Cancer, and eat it up!

Can you see how easy it is to plot a play or a book from these interplays of functions and signs? The zodiac is a wonderful plotting device.

Let us suppose I have a psychological problem which, when examined, seems to

reside in Taurus. It could be an inability to make a decision instantly without consideration. Or it could be a certain inability to grasp a situation because of the pain involved. In both these cases, we can consciously invoke the opposite sign of Scorpio, with its powers and preferences. Remember, all these signs and functions are in every being. Scorpio provides the decisive and instant devotion required, even if it means pressing through extreme pain. There we have the medicine for our Taurean ill. All we have to do is to call up Scorpio within ourselves and stress it. The reverse is equally true. Scorpio, for instance, is well known for getting its water very hot indeed because of the intensity of its martial drive towards any object or goal. The application of Venusian balm from Taurus works wonders. Taurus has calm and consideration, and the ability to watch things fall naturally into place without forcing.

You probably know that there is a traditional placing of the zodiacal signs on the human body. Here again there is a hidden logic. Imagine the human body wrapped round on itself to form a circle, and place the signs within the circle in the usual way, and there you have the rationale of the placing. Aries in the head, Taurus in the neck and burden bearing muscles, Gemini in the two arms, Cancer in the chest, Leo in the heart, Virgo in the digestive system, Libra in the kidneys, Scorpio in the genitals, Sagittarius in the thighs, Capricorn in the knees, Aquarius in the calves, and Pisces in the feet. The placings show clearly the psychological and physical co-relations. There could be no better diagnostic instrument. If we subscribe, as I do, to the psychosomatic nature of disease, then we can relate pain or discomfort in any part of the being with the traits of a particular sign. If our thighs ache, we have been overdoing the enthusing of Sagittarius. If we have stiff necks, we are having Taurus trouble in bearing our burdens. Knee trouble betokens the difficulty that Capricorn has in bending the knee. And so on and so on.

There is another way of using the zodiac, too. If we start from Aries as first or originating fire, we can trace the evolution of the universe or the individual human spirit. We come from fire, the universal intuitive energy of field. It makes for itself a body in Taurus, a centre of reference around which to revolve and evolve. This is the first in-working or inertia. Then it works within that inertic round to differentiate it and analyse its contents. That is Gemini, and it ends the first quadrant. To counter the separativity engendered in the sphere by Gemini, we have Cancer as the next evolute. This is the re-establishment of the original field of power, but this time in the watery or sentient sense. Cancer re-centres the being in the

feeling which makes whole the separativity. That is the beginning of the second quadrant. Each of the quadrants is governed by a different one of the four qualities.

Cancer is the undifferentiated field of sentience, as Aries was of fire. This has to be individualised, this time in Leo, the very symbol of individualism. Leo is the pioneering spirit which makes a track through the trackless wilderness of Cancer. But in himself Leo as pioneer is always seeking new fields to conquer. It is left to the next sign, Virgo, to gather up and nurture all that Leo has pioneered. Virgo is the circulator of all the riches of the Cancerian field, and the distributor of its new found goodies.

Now we come to the third quadrant, whose primary quality is Air in Libra. Libra looks upon what has been done so far, and is clearly aware and balanced about the whole field of form she surveys. But she does nothing about it in the sense of initiative. Her job is to perceive. It is for the next sign, Scorpio, to re-assert individual effort and concentration onto particular endeavours. He drives into the Venusian field of Libra and excites it. The evolutionary process then moves into Sagittarius, where the whole energy is gathered to a point and fired in the direction of the centre of the yantra. It is the first time that this has become possible as an aim, and it governs the rest of the zodiacal process. Sagittarius inherits the energy of Scorpio and adds to it the philosophical intent to centre itself.

The last quadrant is headed by Capricorn, the sign of both appetival eating and also of incarnation. All that has gone before is eaten in Capricorn and used to make a body of experience which incarnates the spirit in a permanent body. But the grip necessary for this can be dangerous and become too inert, so the process moves into Aquarius, which is the house of the memory of all the experiences the being has so far had. Aquarius is the sign of man as individual. Man is the microcosm of the macrocosmic process, and it is stored in the memory of Aquarius. But finally, this too has to be superseded, because it dwells too much in the past and on precedent, which kills endeavour. So Pisces returns us to Jupiterean flow. Now the spirit rejoices in the comprehensive and proportional flow of the infinite field of power, and rejoices in the dance of creation.

And finally, the round is made up by a return to the origin, Fire, Aries. Here where the whole process started with the sacrifice of the eternal fire into creative bondage, the being returns to the knowledge of its eternal origin in pure fire, and is now ready to return to the

centre. The importance of the centre is that each sign feeds its experience into the centre and is equidistant from it, so that here is the point of balance of the universe. The centre is the seed and the fruit of the zodiac, and is called Ram 13, which is the number and symbol of Christ as the great Sacrifice for the world. Unless the eternal power is laid down and crucified in the place of the world, there can be no zodiac, no life. And at the end of its experiential round, the spirit returns to the centre as a self-consciously reflexive being, a permanent reference centre for eternal power to use.

Seen in this way, the zodiac is the perambulation of the soul through the life of experience with all its riches of joy and pain, and its return as a refined and self-aware being to the centre from which it emanated. This is the story of the Prodigal Son, and, indeed, the word Prodigal means Fire going round a wheel. This is the cycle of life itself, and we are all bound to it until we have paid the uttermost far thing in experience of all its vicissitudes. Once on that wheel, we are not allowed to step off it until we know it through and through.

So for us who are at any given moment on one of these twelve points, it is given either to suffer unknowingly these processes, or to realise that the processes are inevitable and logical, and that to cooperate with them by learning them is to do the will of Him who sent us here. Finally we have no option but to learn what life, the zodiac is about.

By coming here and listening to this talk, we, for I include myself in this, have opened ourselves to the idea of the zodiacal process. Once we let an idea in, it takes hold of us, whether we like it or not. Let us like it, and get on with it. Life, the zodiacal, is for living, and it is essentially a joyful progress.



## **THE LAST SUPPER**

**By David Mahlowe**

The subject of tonight's talk is 'The Last Supper'. It seemed appropriate that at this time in the cycle of ISHVAL's life, that we should take a similar point in the life of Jesus, and relate the two.

As you know, the Last Supper was held at the Jewish feast of the Passover, which celebrates the angel of death passing over the houses of the Israelites to strike at the Egyptian's firstborn. It was eaten standing, ready to depart into the desert in the search for the Promised Land. They were commanded to eat only unleavened bread, the reason for which we may discuss later.

The important point is that this feast is like all other great and symbolic feasts; it is a gathering together into communion of the whole community. Communion is the great power of the feast. It is why the Christian rite of the Lord's Supper is called the Holy Communion. It is that solemn moment when there is a ritual enactment of the union of the source power with its creatures. It is a time when the people come together to pray for deliverance; it is the occasion of a great and awful expectation of some great deed to be done.

But before we come to what is to be done, let us look at the geometry of the affair. Here is a great teacher, a charismatic being around whom many have gathered, but chiefly the twelve he has chosen as the instruments of his purpose. He is at one time supposed mystically to have conducted a sacred dance with the twelve, according to the gnostics. Now he is conducting another great and symbolic ritual with the chosen few. They compose, these twelve plus one, a yantra, a mandala of the whole process. We may say that they echo, each of these men, the functions of the Zodiacal yantra. They symbolise in their totality, and in their individuality, the cycle of Jesus's experience.

We have said often that this Jesus is the symbol on earth of the Logos, the ratio of all things, the measure of all things, the structure which manifests the will of the Father. The Father is ever unseen, but the Logos is His image. Who hath seen me hath seen the Father. I

and the Father are one, etc. As the Logos, the whole process of the Last Supper takes place **within** Jesus. He **is** the process.

When the Absolute Sentient Power decides to manifest itself in a great Kalpa or cycle of existence, it must first posit a point at which to begin. Strictly speaking we have then to say that the process is a development around that point, which we place in the centre. But in another analysis, we may say that this point is the beginning of a process, and place it on Aries as the first statement of power. It is the head of all, and it symbolises the terrible sacrifice of the Absolute free into the bound. Aries the Ram is that agonised beast whose head is caught in the thicket of the time process and sacrificed. All beginnings have this sacrifice and death. Without a death there can be no new life expression, at whatever height we view it.

But this intent, this point of in-held energy, is the seed of the whole of the universal manifestation. It contains in potentia all that there ever will be to manifest. The process round the rest of the zodiacal round is an explication of the implications of the Ram. Hence it symbolises intuition, because in-taught into it are all things necessary for a successful conclusion. We do not need to go in detail into the rest of the zodiacal process, for that is a different subject. But when the cycle has been fully experienced, we come again to Aries, only this time we call it, not Ram One, but Ram Thirteen, and it is customary to place it in the centre because the essential being seed, peripheralised and brought to ground, has to grow and realise in act and fact what is implied in it from the beginning. It must fulfill its destiny. When it has done this, then it returns to the source centre from which it emerged, and the kalpa of existence is completed. The first is Aleph, the thirteenth is either Lamed, if we count the letters, or one plus three makes four equals Daleth, if we are being qabalistic. Symbolically, then, this re-centred being is both Lamed, which means to bind, link or goad, and Daleth, which means a door. Christ is he who is both the binder into the process of manifest life, and its goader into development. And he is the doorway through which all must go in order to do what he has done, namely go through the entire process of seed positing and developing through to harvest and beyond.

Jesus the man has to go through all those processes laid down in Jesus the son of God, and to make manifest the process to all other men who are able to recognise that he has consolidated and made flesh what they too have to become. He is the Way, the Truth and the

Life. His command is Follow Me. His life is the symbolic statement or manual of self-development.

At the point of the Last Supper, Jesus is willing to gather together all his experiential energies, symbolised by the disciples, and ingest them so that their energies may sustain him to the cross and beyond. **And they are unsure.** He has not gathered around him a group of saints. The disciples with their uncertainty about who he is, their fight for the place at his right hand in heaven, their hotheaded betrayal to come, and the final and terrible treachery of one, all these are part of Jesus's own internal process, all gathered at the Last Supper for one final group manifestation and consumption by him. He does not deny any of them their place in him, including the choice of that one, Judas, son of Simon, who will betray him. One of the first things that Jesus says in the story of the Supper is that there is one of the chosen who will betray him.

None of the disciples is at the level of Jesus in comprehension of the logos process. Hence their quarrels and their doubts. But they are like the soldiers of Henry V, talking to the disguised king before the battle. One says that if they die, their obedience to the king wipes the sin from them. Another disagrees, "I am afeard there are few that die well that die in a battle; for how can they charitably dispose of anything when blood is their argument? Now if these men do not die well, it will be a black matter for the king that led them to it; whom to disobey were against all proportion of subjection."

The king replies;

QUOTE KING'S SPEECH Act IV Scene 1 (Henry V).

The fact is that the disciples are like the soldiers in the play, subsidiary entities, engrams, if you like, of the king. They are what he inherits to work with, and his spirit has wrought with them in the case of Jesus to the point where he has gathered them together to celebrate his last supper.

If Jesus is to succeed in his task of being the saviour of all, he must suffer what men suffer. By this we do not mean that he suffers vicariously. He must suffer actually what his people suffer. He must know their terror, their sin, their despair. And then, good, bad or indifferent, Jesus has to eat of all he has experienced. He has to consume what he has

gathered together, so that he may finally digest, assimilate and apply what he has experienced. Nothing that is in man must be neglected; all must be accepted and consumed. This is the real meaning of the communion of saints.

None of the gospels is totally the same in its description of the Last Supper. But there is a majority that say Jesus was clear that one of the twelve would betray him. And yet he also says that he has chosen all twelve for himself. That must logically mean that Jesus knows within himself his own possibility of self-betrayal, and knowingly uses it for his ultimate and heavenly purpose. He tells Judas, "Go and do what you have to do." And the gospels say that at that moment Satan entered into Judas, and he went out and betrayed Jesus.

Let us examine this very carefully. Here is a man who claims to be God incarnate, and who yet allows an inferior being to betray him into the hands of his enemies. Why? Because the righteous man can use any means whatever, even the most apparently negative, as a positive function by which he can achieve his aim. Such an apparent negative was Judas. We have already heard in the previous days how he, and not only he, criticised Mary for pouring over Jesus the precious ointment. It could have been sold to buy food for the poor. etc. Jesus says, let her alone, she is anointing me for my death, and whenever this story is told she will be remembered. Likewise Judas will never be forgotten.

Each of us contains within ourselves the potential betrayer of our souls. Each of us has that within us which would trip us up. Jesus says, "Spend no time in denying this as an evil; steadfastly affirm the good." He did not attempt to impede Judas Iscariot from his purpose. He seized on the natural bent of Judas to fulfil the purpose on which Jesus was already resolved. And yet ... he did not WILL Judas to betray him. Jesus taught Judas what he had taught all the others. If Judas decided for whatever engrammic reason to misinterpret what Jesus had said, that was the responsibility of Judas, as it was the responsibility of Henry's soldiers to bear their part in their decision. We are each of us our own executioner. We have no right to blame others for the will which is ours alone.

Jesus himself is ready to bear his responsibility. He has gathered all his experiential life together to celebrate the feast of his life, and use the energy of its nourishment to carry

him into his next phase.

We have spoken about the zodiacal symbology of the last supper, the twelve and the one who fulfils the twelve in the thirteenth. Let us remember how the last supper was set up. Jesus said the disciples were to come upon a man carrying a pitcher of water, and were to enquire of him where the room was where the supper was to be held. In zodiacal symbology the water carrier is Aquarius, and Aquarius is the symbol of Man, the carrier of all his experiential memory in his protoplasm. At the point where the last supper is convened, the zodiacal cycle from Aries round, has reached the penultimate phase, the gathering together in one place of all the feeling and experience of the being.

We remember, do we not, that Jesus is called the Fish, the symbol of the prolific, he who sows his seed among the great waters so that much fruit de mer may come forth. That age of Pisces cannot be inaugurated until this great ritual act of remembrance has been carried out.

Because Jesus has eaten of his own experience, eaten the bread and drunk the wine of his own flesh and spirit, and digested its lessons, he can call forth his disciples and ask them to do likewise. We have only the record of the outward ritual. But we have also the words of the master himself. He broke the bread and gave it to each of his disciples, saying, "Take, eat, this is my body".

There are several facts about this bread which we must examine if we are to begin to comprehend the ritual. First of all, it is bread. We in this community have been taught to look on that word as B - the beth or house of being, and read, that which supposes that our being is a book in which we are to read. To read is to differentiate, to divide and analyse, to digest, to counsel, to count, all words to do with learning about the house of our own being. When Jesus says, "Take. Eat. This is my body," he is referring to himself as the Logos, the structure or reading book of the whole universe. In that sense we all must eat his body, for we all must experience, and evaluate, what is contained in the Logos or body of form in the universe. If we do not eat of this body, we starve as to our spiritual nourishment. We have no experience. The bread of life is the experience of life. Not to chew it over is not to have a reasonable faculty. Not to have a reasonable faculty is to be animal merely, not human. Jesus has, in gathering this feast together, demonstrated that he is willing to consume his body of

experience, to extract from it maximum nourishment for his spirit. He requires his disciples to do likewise. This eating of the body of the great man is recognised throughout ancient ceremonial usage. To eat the heart or brain of your respected enemy when you had killed him showed a proper sense of value. You were taking in the courage and the intellectual quickness of the great man.

So with Jesus. We have to cannibally eat him up. He is the Logos of God, the structure and substance of the universe. If we do not eat him up without leaving a crumb, our feast is not finished, we are not satisfied in our hunger for eternal life. What did he say? "I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.

Before we leave the bread, we must address the fact that it is unleavened. There are two aspects to this. First of all, there is the fact that experience in this world, until it is taken up and vivified by understanding and digestive reasoning, is flat and unleavened. We have to lift it with the yeast of the spirit if it is to be the staff of life. We have to ferment the inertia of our substantial life to make it rise to its maker anew.

But before we do this we must be unleavened, un-raised, ourselves. If too early we ferment ourselves with an idea of our rising, like those disciples did at the last supper when they argued for their top place in the kingdom of heaven, if we are like them we have added the yeast of ego to the bread of our experience. Then our bread, our body of experience, becomes swelling and rises in arrogance. We must come before the lord in the feast with our spirits un-raised in ego. We must be prostrate, unleavened, before our maker, if he is to raise us. Likewise, in many of these ancient ceremonies of bread taking, no salt is allowed in the bread. Again, this is the salt of compressive saturnine harshness. We must not be unduly sharpened in our individual bodies of experience, if we are to be open to the seasoning of God.

Then Jesus takes the cup and says, "Drink ye all of it; For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."

What does that mean? Well, the wine is the symbol of the spirit and the blood. The bread alone is dry, difficult to swallow. If we eat our dry experience, it is like the dryness of the school book as against the moist richness of the book of life. The wine is the symbol of that

in us, the spirit of the Lord, which moistens our parched lips, softens the bread of experience, as tears soften grief.

And Jesus says this wine is his blood. Blood has always been the symbol of the carrier of life. The blood is the life, the life is the blood. It is the fluid, non-separative carrier of all the goodness, the nourishment. It is the cleanser of all the parts of the being, exchanging the dead for the living. The word itself, BLOOD, is from the same root as BLOOM and BLOSSOM, a root which conveys the sense of spiriting or springing forth like a life-giving fountain source. That source is Jesus as the Logos, the giver of all life.

All sectarian dogma is separative and not conducive to the work of the Holy Spirit. So that when the Christians say that you cannot be a Christian unless you take Communion at least twice a year, that is a dogmatic separation of themselves from the rest of humanity. That can lead to sectarianism and conflict, because they have misunderstood the nature of the ritual. But in the highest sense of the Communion, it refers to the communion of God's creation with itself in all its parts. Unless we can make ourselves accept all that is and eat and drink it as the body and blood of Christ, we cannot call ourselves human or Christian. We must commune with ourselves and with all others. We must gather together to defeat the breaking apart.

In all great occasions such as the one Jesus is embarked upon, there has to be a breaking apart, there has to be a betrayal. No great enterprise can succeed unless the old is destroyed. We built on the debris of prior universes, as Eugene used to say. So in the life of Jesus, the life of each of us, the life of every organisation, there has to be a betrayal of some sort, which, if used positively, is the ground of a new beginning, a resurrection. We see this most plainly at this end of the century, and indeed of the Christian era of 2000 years. Every institution, every figure of note, is under attack. It is a time of breakdown. Those who know the rules will hold firm, see the breakdown as an opportunity for a new crucifixion and a new resurrection, and accept it. We have to eat the bread of affliction as well as of joy.

Not all can believe in the Son of Man and of God. When Jesus said he was the bread of life of which all must eat if they are to know the Father, his disciples murmured amongst themselves. This is a hard saying. They said, "Who can hear it?" When Jesus knew in himself that his disciples murmured at it, he said unto them, "Doth this offend you? What and

if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before? It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life. But there are some of you that believe not.” For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who would betray him. And he said, “Therefore said I unto you that no man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father.”

From that time many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him. Then said Jesus unto the twelve, “Will ye also go away?” Then Simon Peter answered him, “Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God.” Jesus answered them, “Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?” He spake of Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon, for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve.

Jesus chose Judas. He took on the instrument of his betrayal knowingly. There has to be a traitor to bring down the doom, in order that the supreme purpose of Jesus could be carried out and he be lifted up as an example for all men to profit by. Judas is a necessity. But he is there to be overcome, the last traitor, the last problem, is within one's own twelve fold being. When Jesus told Judas to go out and do what he had to do, the way was open for Gethsemane, when even the closest of the twelve, Peter James and John, should forsake him in sleep. Here, at the entrance to the crucifixion of the ego, Jesus is alone with his Father, and with his final decision to make. He makes it because he does not make it. He says, “Nevertheless, not what I will, but what thou wilt.” He gives himself up as a whole sacrifice. He has consumed all the experience of his line of man, and of his personal experience, and offered it to God. It is an acceptable sacrifice because it is whole. “Of those whom thou hast given me I have lost none.”

What has all this to do with us in our lives, and in the life of our community of ISHVAL? Well, each of us will have his or her own interpretation of that. But whatever each of us does with the bread and the wine we have been give, sure it is that at some point we shall come face to face with the necessity of eating all our experiential bread, sour or not, and drink the blood of our suffering, transmuting it in the process to spirit. Only when we have done this can we approach Gethsemane. Only when we have done this can we face the necessity of our crucifixion of individual self-will so as to resurrect in joy to our real selves. Because without the body and blood of Christ in us to fortify us, we cannot face even a little

of what we have to do. With him in us we can overcome the world, the flesh and the devil.

But for each of there is a time for this, and before that time comes, we have to prepare ourselves to be able when the time comes. In the meantime we are asked to do nothing else than this: to eat of the knowledge of these sacred things, so that the words may sink deep into our substance and formulate for themselves in us an instrument which will inform us. We do not inform ourselves, the word of Christ in us informs us, despite ourselves. He overcomes the devil in us, the separative private purpose, the bag carrier, the thief of the good.

If we continue to eat of the body and drink of the blood of the spirit of the Logos, then it will in us re-orientate us towards what God wills for us. I find that a comforting thought. You know how when one wrestles with an unknown text, or subject, at first it seems very strange and we have little point of contact with it. Then, if we persist in reading this unknown and puzzling text, it begins to speak to us by little and by little, until we are familiar with it, and it speaks in us. Just as when I started out to study Shakespeare, it was the strange contorted stuff of 400 years ago, and now is as familiar to me as my own handwriting.

The wisdom of Shakespeare appears in my mind as and when it is needed. Why? Because it has been eaten and digested, and it speaks in me when it is appropriate, without my having to do anything about it. Thus it is with the bread or word of life. If we are familiar with reading it and then in applying it, the more difficult bit, it tells us what to do. It is part of the pattern of our lives, and it guides us.

It is the same with what we have been given here. Because be sure that what we have been given here is from God. We have studied and spoken here of what the great scriptures have taught, and we have heard it, as all men hear it, through an individual voice. In our case it is the voice of Eugene Halliday. He has been historically our interpreter of the Logos. So when those of us who have listened to him or read him for a long time, have a particular problem, how often do we hear his voice or see his words on a page, and how often that word is appropriate to what we have to do?

I am not suggesting that Eugene Halliday is Jesus Christ. How could he be? There is only one Christ. Just as there is only one Eugene Halliday. But what I am saying is that each man who has heard the word of Jesus and loves it, (and Eugene to my knowledge did that)

has the task of becoming as like that Christ as is possible to mortal man. And each man who has had some insight into what that implies, has the task of imparting what he knows to his fellows. Eugene did that, certainly for me, and insofar as he has done that he becomes a type of Christ for me. Not Christ, but Christ's friend. If we are to follow where he led, we must also be friends with Christ. And eat him up.

Next month, we shall be holding or celebrating or mourning the last meeting of ISHVAL at Parklands. We shall do so by performing one of the more joyous pieces that Eugene wrote for this stage. But for tonight, I have the task of bringing the talking to an end. I shall be eternally grateful for the work this place and this cause has made me do, work which otherwise I would never have been challenged to do. The committal to work is the only possibility of working. Eugene helped me into that committal. He also helped to keep me committed in the times when I rebelled against the constraints, and argued with him to be rid of them. He was always heedful of Christ's statement about not losing any one whom the Father had sent to him. He fought hard with my devil. I am glad he won. I expect many of you feel the same.

It is nearly thirty years since I first had the privilege of standing here and speaking. It was a talk called Shakespeare and Reflexive Self-Consciousness, and it was given in July 1965. The following year again in July, I gave a talk about Shakespeare's *Tempest*. The theme was that *The Tempest* was the Time play, and showed the process of the creation through the magical works of Prospero. He caused all the sinful and wrongdoing men of his former life to be brought to his island exile to be chastised and to be finally harmonised into one communion, before the consummation of days. The Consummation of Days is the very Last Supper of all, when God eats up all he has created, as Saturn ate all his sons, and replete with His doings, rests in pralaya before the play begins again.

The play always begins again. When our play at Parklands is over in July, it will begin again in other venues, wherever there is an actor or actress to take on the roles required. You who go forth as did the disciples after the supper and the drama of the next day and the death of Jesus, go forth with bread in your pouch and wine in your bottles to sustain you on your journey.

So will Zero and I. We shall all meet at the crossroads, just as all actors meet on Sunday mornings on Crewe Station.

At the end of the Time play, Prospero says to his new son-in-law and heir,

You do look, my son, in a moved sort,  
As if you were dismayed: be cheerful, sir.  
Our revels now are ended. These our actors,  
As I foretold you, were all spirits, and  
Are melted into air, into thin air:  
And, like the baseless fabric of this vision,  
The cloud-capp'd towers, the gorgeous palaces,  
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,  
Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve,  
And like this insubstantial pageant faded,  
Leave not a wrack behind. We are such stuff  
As dreams are made on; and our little life  
Is rounded with a sleep.

Or, as Eugene with Lancashire economy would say, "Don't worry, dear; it'll all be the same in a hundred years."

END

**THE SHEPHERS SPEAKS**  
**A Christmas Monologue by David Mahlowe**

*(The Shepherd speaks in a northern accent, and with great simplicity and directness. Everything he says is from deep within him, but not ponderously. No acting!)*

You may think you seen me somewhere, on television or owt like that. But you haven't; I'm much more famous than that, and yet, at the same time, not, if you see what I mean. Which you don't, of course, and I sound like a right gowk, so I'll start again.

I'm known to you, but not by name or face. You see, I'm one of the shepherds who saw that star over Bethlehem. You've got me now, have you? Aye. Well, it were a right to do, were that. You know the story, of course, who doesn't; but there's a kind of inside story to it that doesn't rightly come over from the stuff that was written down about it afterwards. That's very often so, of course. But me and my friends have often felt we'd like to give our side of it.

You may think it's a bit late after nearly 2000 years, but you have to be given a doorway to get through, and its only now that its, like, appeared. So my two friends have nominated me to speak on behalf of all three of us, to tell you how we felt about what happened that night.

Its a funny thing about stars. Where we were, out on th' 'ills of a winter's night, they're very bright. Very close. And shepherding being a lonely sort of life, you get very fond of the stars. It might sound a bit daft to you in yer bright streets, but I felt that I could talk with the stars. They were friends, like. I've had many a good thought out there on the hills that I don't feel I'd ever get in a public house, or a public worship house, neither.

Anyway, the three of us had got together that midnight over a bit of a fire - just for an hour, and very unusual. And as we were talking about this and that, we all of us became aware of this feeling up above us. And it were this star. Now I know about shooting stars and comets, and stars of all kinds. But this star were different. It kind of ... insisted. Don't ask me how. It just did.

And it were moving, very definitely, from East to West. We none of us said owt, but we watched it as one man. It stood over the village, and kind of, hovered. We none of us said owt. We just looked at one another - and I remember noticing how very calm we all looked in the pale light. And we just *moved* towards the star, mesmerised in a way. We'd just got to the outskirts of the village, still gazing up at this star (and it felt very personal, you know, like it were just for us). And then, suddenly, it dipped, almost as if it were pointing, and right in front of us was this stable.

It weren't but a second after that that the star itself seemed to descend onto us. We were bathed in light. It were just as if we were embraced in wings of light. We felt a great whoosh of warmth and a kind of elation; and then we heard this voice. Heard? No, *felt* is more like it, for I heard nothing in my ears. It was as if we felt the words sounding inside us chests. Very strange to talk about, but it felt alright and quite natural at the time.

We told everybody afterwards what the words were, and not one word was remembered differently by any of us. It's as if they were engraved on our insides.

"Fear not: for behold I bring you good tidings of great joy,  
which shall be to all people.

For unto you is born this day in the City of David a Saviour,  
which is Christ the Lord.

And this shall be a sign unto you; Ye shall find the Babe wrapped  
in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger.

Glory be to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards  
men.

That last bit were marvellous. It felt as if the whole earth and the sky were shaking with the sound. Yet it couldn't have been. Nobody else noticed it as far as I could hear. So it must have been inside us. We were, as it were, exalted.

Anyway, the light went out, and we just stood there in the starlight, wondering. We

never looked at each other or anything. I moved first, and the others followed me in, into the stable.

Then I knew where the light had gone. That shed was ablaze. I remember that the straw round the baby was just like gold, shining away. It was so bright that I had to shield my eyes. It was like a great sphere round the manger, and the animals, three or four of them, had their heads in the light and their bodies in the shadows. I could see the lady, and I could recognise Joseph, because I knew him and his family from way back.

But it was the baby really. You couldn't look at anything else at all, not properly. He were looking straight upwards, absolutely fixed on something, and his whole body kind of - listening. I just stood there, thinking, "So this is the Messiah. It's a turn up for the book, is this. Where's the chariots of fire and the sea of spears of the Lord's Anointed?"

And then - that babby turned his eyes and looked on me. Well. I never have before or since experienced anything like that look. It simply took me all in. I felt there weren't a cell or syllabub of me that he wasn't totally acquainted with at the deepest level of my soul. It stopped me in my tracks. I stopped breathing, stopped everything except looking into the eyes of the oldest babby in the world. What that child hadn't seen weren't worth seeing. And it took away from my eyes every veil, every shadow, and I was made to see as he saw. It was as if he had made me a companion of his soul. I didn't feel different from him, except that he were lying down and I were standing up.

In fact even that changed. I couldn't see him as a babby lying there, and me a grown man. All I could see was a kind of pure intelligence gazing right into me, into every motive power I had. If anything, *I* felt like the babby.

When he turned his face away again, I felt that the light and the life had gone out of me. I felt as if I'd lost the most precious treasure in the world. It was like the worst bereavement you could possibly imagine. And if it had gone on like that, I don't think I could have gone on living, somehow. But it didn't last.

As I turned to go, I felt as if he'd suddenly touched me, deep inside, as if to say, "I know. I know". And that touch was like a seed of his own light kindled in me. It spread in me

like the comfort of a warm fire after the cold, and by the time I'd reached the door I was crying like a babby. Cos that's what I felt I'd become, a babby. That babby. I felt as sure as I'm standing here, that that babby was in me, and I was that babby's now, and not me own.

And that's how its gone on ever since. When I met the eyes of that babby, I felt everything was stripped away, and I was gazing clearly, without let or hindrance, directly into Reality. And when he turned his eyes away, I felt as if I'd lost all meaning. But that inward touch as I turned to go was like a comforting flame in me. And every time I look inside myself, I see that flame as it was when I looked into his eyes. Total reality, the meaning of everything, was there, is there. 'Cos I look at nothing else, now.

And when I look at you, in the shadows, on the edge of the light, like the animals and the parents were in the stable, I see you only in the light of that babby, which is inside me. Its that babby which is looking out from me into you now. And all I see is what is real, enduring, eternal. I see the real in everybody, because I'm only a babby. Like you are, really, did you but know it.

You could say on the outside that I'm an old shepherd, with no family, no roof over me, and only the clothes on my back. I've no book-learning at all. But I'm an old babby, really, dependent on what I am given.

And if I looked and listened to the state of the world and how people behave, I'd feel in a poor way. But I don't. I don't see what you might call the bad things, the lying, the thieving, the cruelty. And I don't see the good deeds and the respectabilities of people, either. I see the Real in them, and then I'm not afraid, because the Real is the Good, the God, and its there in everybody I look at.

*(Turns to go. Stops)* And by the way, if you think you have to see the babby in order to get saved, and its too late 'cos he's gone, think again. Everybody who's ever heard of that babby being born has had that light kindled in them. Every time you look at a fellow human being, you can shine the light of that babby on him or her, and it only illuminates the real, the love in us all. So its light to light through the eyes to the heart. Very comforting, is that. That's real good will, that is.

*(Turns again to go. Stops at wings)* You know, the Good Shepherd is in every- body, in disguise. Think on. Happy Christmas! *(He goes, and the light fades, except for a single spot on the cyclorama)*

THE END