



What is Intelligence?

Sam Fryman

What is Intelligence?

Sam Fryman

CONTENTS

Introduction	2
Chapter One – What is Intelligence?	3
Chapter Two – What is Human Intelligence?	9
Chapter Three – Evolution, Morality and Society	14
Chapter Four – Intelligence, Emotion and Intuition	34
Chapter Five – Intellect and Intuition.	46
Chapter Six – How Society is Repressing Your True Intelligence	72
Chapter Seven – Intelligence and Hypnosis	78
Chapter Eight –Intelligence, the Media, Kundalini and Sexuality	94
Chapter Nine – Intelligence, Psychology and Spirituality	110
Chapter Ten – The Psychological Flaw in the Modern Scientific and Atheistic Mind	117

Introduction

Most, if not all of us have been through a school and state education system which from day one has assessed what it described as our “intelligence”, and in many cases has judged us as “high” or “low” on that self-same system’s opinional basis.

In the main, we are assessed by tests devised by academics and so called “psychologists”, such as the famous Binet test of IQ, which in the final analysis is merely an assessment of certain skills in verbal and numerical reasoning.

Then we have other perspectives on the subject, suggesting different kinds of intelligence, as implied for example by the title of the book “Emotional Intelligence” by Daniel Goleman, which though we have not personally read, we know has influenced many people.

Then again, we have the transcendental meditation guru, the Maharishi Mahesh Yogi, well known for his connection with the Beatles and other major celebrities, who spoke of the concept of “creative intelligence.”

Next there is for example so called “animal intelligence”, such as the cunning plans devised apparently by some species of animals, for instance that shown by cats in cunningly stalking and capturing their prey, or alternatively, that exhibited by the angler fish, which almost incredibly has a kind of fishing rod suspended from its head enabling it to capture its prey, just as a human with a man-made fishing rod does.

Which information itself raises the question – are other animals intelligent in the same way as humans are? Is their intelligence just different *in degree*, or it is different *in kind*?

But in answering this, surely we must address an even deeper question, which is to ask - just *what is this intelligence per se* which we talk about in such glib terms? Where does it come from, and why do some beings and species seem to have so much more of it than others?

And finally, how is this intelligence, which has made us the predominant species in the entire animal world, functioning in the modern human world today? Is it serving our best interests, is it helping us create a happy and peaceful world, and if not, why not?

Chapter One – What *is* Intelligence?

Let us start with a typical dictionary definition:

Intelligence: the ability to think and learn: the ability to learn facts and skills and apply them, especially when this ability is highly developed

We would like to re-define this more precisely as follows:

Intelligence is the faculty which enables the possibility of the understanding of, and where appropriate, the power of action with regard to all things.

Surely this is the context in which “intelligence” becomes a vital and truly meaningful concept to us?

It is like the genie which can give us unlimited wishes – we understand Nature and other people, and then we know either how to gain power over them, or else how to behave correctly in relationship to them.

Why?

Because our goal in life is to solve all our problems and satisfy all our desires.

Therefore, such a faculty of knowing and understanding the reality of Nature and the human world surrounding us is the only meaningful definition of the term.

But in practice we see that the standard dictionary type definition stated above, as *the ability to learn facts and skills*, is what society in general is regarding as “intelligence”, and not the definition we have given here.

To put it slightly differently, we are saying that “real intelligence” is a faculty of *potentiality*, whereas the dictionary is currently telling us it is more concerned with the accumulation of “facts”, “information” and “skills.”

And that is what our current educational system and society generally regards as intelligent.

That is, the man or woman who has read a lot of books and crammed a lot of facts into their mind is called intelligent, or who has made some extraordinary efforts to acquire a “skill” such as playing the piano expertly or speaking a foreign language, which we see also in general means this same accumulation of knowledge, together with some mechanically learned, parrot fashion routines of dexterity of tongue or fingers.

There are some people for example who can perform the solution of the geometric toy/puzzle “Rubik’s Cube” in sixty seconds or less, but does this mark them out as truly *intelligent* or is this something that any “idiot” can do given enough time, motivation, information and practice?

(for those who don’t know, descriptions of Rubik’s cube are freely available on the Internet or in encyclopaedias).

Of course the ability to solve *how* to do Rubik’s Cube is a different proposition, rather than to find a ready-made solution and learn to carry it out swiftly by extensive practice, and surely indicates a different *kind* of intelligence.

And it is the latter kind of “skill” which we would describe as “intelligent” rather than merely the ability to perform a sequence of memorized procedures like a well trained parrot.

Equally therefore should we distinguish between the performance of an “expert pianist” and the person who composed the music.

The person who expertly plays the piece of music is showing a sometimes startling ability to memorise and carry out a complex physical task, a physical skill.

But is it really so remarkable, when we consider the average concert pianist *after a preparation and training period of years and decades*, spends around seven hours or more a day practising the skills which they display before us in just a brief few minutes?

Obviously none of us who are unwilling to commit ourselves to a similar level of training, which at minimum is going to take months of constant effort, and more likely years, can ever hope to equal his or her skills, and naturally find dazzling such a highly trained display which is the product of so much unseen tortuous concentrated effort, that it almost defies belief, just as the performance of the person who gets into “the

Guinness Book of Records” for being fastest at solving the Rubik Cube does.

On the one hand this makes the world a fascinating place, in that there are so many highly skilled people who have these peculiar talents, or are willing to make extraordinary efforts, such as those who painstakingly take weeks or months to arrange a pattern of countless thousands of dominos, which by the knocking down of a single one are then made to topple one another in some kind of spectacular and amusing display.

But on the other hand, are such skills really of any *human value*, are they anything more than just clever and very time consuming tricks?

Above all, are they any sign of the real intelligence we have discussed?

And the answer we would suggest is emphatically *no*.

The person who composes a piano concerto is usually a very different being than the one who plays it almost flawlessly before an audience in a packed concert hall, just as the actor like Laurence Olivier or Richard Burton who performs brilliantly some speech from a Shakespeare play is different than the original poet or bard who created the words or drama.

Of course performing is a kind of “art” or “science” in itself, a skill of a different nature than composing music or writing words in a meaningful sequence and format.

And thus we get to the issue also of exactly what is an “art”, or speaking even more generally, what is “art”?

For example, in a well known educational mathematics text “What is Mathematics?” by Richard Robbins and Michael Courant, one chapter poses the question –

Is mathematics a science or an art (or both)?

We think we know what a scientist is – someone who does experiments, collects data, and then formulates theories and conclusion where possible based purely on evidence and rational reasoning and “facts.”

But what on earth is an artist?

Surely this is an issue of “intelligence”?

For at the very least, the “artist” like Picasso, Salvador Dali, Mozart or Beethoven become famous and possibly rich according to this extraordinary “art” they display, to a degree that is possessed by only a very few of the population in any era.

But the “artist” is not the same as the “scientist” surely in the general way in which their “intelligence” functions?

The difference superficially is that the scientist *appears* to be devoted to rationality, whereas the artist *appears* to work with the so called *imagination*.

The point we are making here, is not to necessarily authoritatively *answer* these questions, but to point out the *vagueness* of the terms we use, and the consequent vagueness, and to some degree therefore *invalidity* of these questions we so freely imagine we can pose expecting a valid and conclusive answer and explanation.

i.e. if we are not crystal clear on what an “art” or an “artist” is, how can we legitimately ask such a question as “is mathematics an art or a science?”

Let us ask a scientist for example, where the imagination is located in the brain. They can tell us to some degree where such things as “the speech centre” or the part related to sight (“the visual cortex”) seem to be, but where is this thing called “the imagination” located?

And in everyday terms what is the imagination anyway?

Surely it is the ability to mentally create pictures or images in our minds, or even sights, sounds or smells – therefore *sensory experiences* – that don’t exist in our current “external reality”, just as we apparently do “involuntarily” in the dream state.

It is our ability to produce “what if” scenarios.

We could *imagine* for example - *what if* we won a few million pounds or dollars on a lottery, what would we do?

Then we see pictures in our mind of whatever it is that our desires formulate for us – the grand mansion in the country perhaps, the

luxurious car, or the handsome man or beautiful woman whom we rightly or wrongly imagine we could get if only we had all that money.

And we see at other times, not only will our imagination, our “what if” faculty conjure up ideas in our minds based on our desires, it will also do so when we have fears, for example - what if our heart stopped beating, or what if the powers that be decided to launch a nuclear war?

Whole books, novels and plays are written it seems wholly on the basis of this “what if” faculty of imagination, and we spend huge amounts of our lives indulging in or obsessing upon these *unreal fantasies* produced by our own minds or the minds of others.

So is this imagination a sign of intelligence?

A famous best selling novelist like J K Rowling of Harry Potter fame is definitely regarded as of high intelligence isn't she?

But if we asked her to come up with a cure for cancer, or fix our computer, likely she couldn't do it. Or is it just she is concentrating the efforts of her “intelligence” and “mental power” in the wrong place to do such a task?

And we might ask in passing, in a world full of serious unsolved problems, whether of war, disease, crime, economics, terrorism and so on, if it is really an *intelligent* thing to do, to create huge masses of fantasies, whether in film or book form, if this power of mind could be used to solve these serious human problems instead.

Then we have the work of the non-fiction authors, who write books on philosophy, or yoga, or religion, or “spirituality.” Are these persons the ones whom we should regard as truly intelligent, or are they merely deluded, and manufacturing plausible or implausible fantasies, as the case may be?

So again, we are going to at least for now, trample upon or side-foot away all these ideas, and redefine intelligence in the following way:

The faculty to correctly perceive and act in regard to reality.

For what is the use of imagination if we do not see what is real and deal with it accordingly?

If we imagine that a car coming towards us as we cross the road is a “cellophane taxi” as John Lennon wrote in his “Lucy in the Sky With Diamonds”, we may not successfully get across the road in one piece.

If we imagine the enemy who tries to attack us with a knife is a nice person whom we can reason with and preach words of love and kindness at to fend him away, we may get stabbed or even killed, if our assessment is not real.

So it appears that *intelligence* is *not* imagination, though it may use this faculty of imagination to carry out its “experiments.”

Then there is the question of whether there is some kind of “intelligence” in Nature.

Again, this question pre-supposes that we have defined properly what we mean by intelligence, and further that we are *agreed* about our definition.

But the reality is, many people, especially those of a scientific persuasion, define intelligence as a purely human or animal quality.

They doubt even the idea that plants have some kind of intelligence, as their basic definition of intelligence is that possessed by some kind of sophisticated nervous system, such as the human or animal brain, or in simpler life forms such as starfish they say it has a “neural net” – i.e. a set of neurons or brain cells that carry out the “intelligent” behaviour, but not a cumulative, organised and specialised mass of brain cells in a single location which we would call a “brain.”

But let us for the moment cast aside this issue of whether plants or lower animals have intelligence, as we would define it, and let us now look deeper into what *human* intelligence actually *is*.

Chapter Two – What is *Human* Intelligence?

If we look in a science or biology text book, we can see pictures of the comparative sizes and structures of the various animals including the human brain.

We discover that not only is the human brain the largest with the exception only of a few species like elephants or possibly dolphins, but is by far the largest as compared to body size, and more importantly perhaps is far and away the most complex in structure and most convoluted.

In a sense however it might be considered a tragedy that such species as dolphins appear to have effectively gone up an “evolutionary blind alley” in terms of the fact that they have massive brains in comparison to all the other fish and animals apart from man, but not the physical structure to properly control their environment.

No dolphin is ever going to build a space rocket and visit the moon, because it doesn't have the limbs to invent and manipulate the tools that would be required to do so, regardless of whether it has the power of intelligence or not to create such tools and machines.

But therein lies the next question.

Is it merely this lack of ability to walk on land on two legs and manipulate tools with the hands that is holding the dolphin back, or is it we have got that something extra in intelligence terms which *none* of the other animals has got?

And there is of course a huge debate on this subject.

For example, there is one anecdote (i.e. story, let's not call it *research* or *evidence* because we don't know if it's true or false) that a dolphin once responded to a sequence of whistles which counted up from one, two, and then three, by replying with *four* whistles of its own, thus supposedly illustrating its ability to *count*, to understand the concept of *numbers*.

And lately, another story and “piece of research” is suggesting that dolphins can recognise themselves in the mirror, and use the mirror as a tool to check themselves out.

Perhaps the equally interesting question here is to ask whether this is really a sign of *intelligence* or rather of *vanity*?

Some people could also argue that the fact that dolphins don't walk on land and build space rockets and computers doesn't mean they are less intelligent, they might even be *superior* in intelligence.

For example, a so called "enlightened" man or woman, or for that matter someone high on drugs does not desire anything much from the material world, due supposedly from some deeply satisfying or thrilling inner state of consciousness.

So perhaps, this argument goes, that because dolphins are "enlightened" creatures in comparison to us and constantly in a state of "inner bliss" they don't bother to create the nasty polluting technological world that we do, they just send their high pitched "Morse code" to one another and spend a lifetime of swimming, acrobatics, eating, dating and mating, which for many humans plausibly would seem to be a heaven of sorts, and further explain perhaps why dolphins seem to have a slightly roguish smile etched permanently upon their faces.

Based on this kind of thinking, some people even worship dolphins, and go swimming with them to pick up on "the good vibes."

Whilst we are not condemning people for finding ways to make themselves feel better that don't hurt others, and we regard dolphins as fascinating and wonderful creatures, again, we must point it wouldn't be truly *intelligent* to indulge too deeply in these imaginings without any greater evidence.

Then there are the chimpanzees whom supposedly have been taught a few hundred "words" in sign language.

But before getting too deep into the whys, wherefores and maybes of these experiments, and their conclusions, let's remember that firstly, parrots can quote a line of Shakespeare, but don't show any other indication they know what they are talking about, and presumably all that we have hit upon in "teaching them language" is that they have a remarkable facility for recognising and imitating bird, animal and human speech sounds, which would in theory suggest this facility is a definite evolutionary asset.

But do we find for example, such birds using this facility to imitate the noise of a tiger to deter approaching predators, and even if they did, would this indicate a “human-like” *intelligence*, or merely some kind of *instinctive* “learned response” acquired “accidentally” somehow over thousands or even hundreds of thousands of years of evolution?

So some animals, such as the aforementioned angler fish, which has an almost humanly designed fishing rod dangling from its own head, clearly don't have the size and complexity of brain which would indicate an order of intelligence which could have “thought up” such a strategy.

The current scientists and biologists reject the concept of “intelligent design” – i.e. of some kind of intelligence immanent in Nature that functions *like our own, only greater* but see these events as the occurrence of an extremely long sequence of accidental refinements by “genetic mutation” over huge time periods.

That however, is a different question, and not one we will dwell on in this chapter.

But in terms of this issue of animal versus human intelligence, these experiments showing signs of human-like “intelligence” and “behaviour” in animals all apparently have a motive.

The question is – is there anything *unique* about *human intelligence*, or are we “just the same” as all the other animals?

And surprisingly for some readers no doubt, we are going to say – *hang on, it doesn't actually matter very much.*

It appears for example that gorillas – also a species possessing very large brains, we note - have a kind of curiosity when examining things which looks almost human, and any number of animals use some kind of a tool in one way or another, even if it merely is collecting twigs to build a bird's nest or a beaver's “dam.”

And do cats or dogs dream as some studies seem to suggest?

Maybe they dream about other cats and dogs. Who knows, and frankly *who cares?*

For yes, without answering the previous question, surely already we accept they have some semblance or aspects of what we call “human intelligence.”

But even a mongoloid child can learn to speak and function in many ways as a “normal human being”, yet no other species of ape can learn to talk in verbal terms.

No other kind of species has any sophisticated kind of tool use, such as we would see in building a simple house such as an African native’s mud hut or an Eskimo’s igloo.

But let us compare the behaviour of *humans*, even in so called “savage” or “primitive” races.

For example, one black African race of hunter/gatherers it was revealed in a fascinating documentary film, use a clever technique to find water which no other animal has ever had the sophistication to employ.

Their technique is to catch a monkey and tie it to a tree. Then they feed it on a cake of salt for a while.

The monkey unwittingly loves the addictive taste of the salt, but little does it realise that this will produce in it a burning thirst.

Then the native humans untie the monkey, and it hurtles at top speed to the nearest waterhole, which it has on its endless journeys already located, and the humans simply chase after it and locate the water hole.

What an “elegant solution” as they like to say in mathematics!

This is but one small sign of the superiority and *the genius* of the human brain, the human intelligence.

So though we can admire and love the remainder of the animal and plant kingdoms, and note with fascination that clearly some level of intelligence is manifesting itself through at least the animal sector of them, why is there such enormous interest in the fairly primitive expressions of the development of intelligence throughout the animal kingdom as compared to humans?

Scientists deny the concept of “intelligent design” in Nature, meaning that they deny that there is any kind of “universal intelligence” in any

way *conscious* and thereby comparable to our own, which is orchestrating everything we see in Nature.

But surely, the point is, that wherever this *design* is coming from, in humans, the architecture, machines, computers and space rockets that we make unquestionably *are* products of *intelligent design*.

And we credit other animals and maybe even some kinds of species of more primitive life-forms like starfish with having *some* of this *intelligence*, which we find only in a dramatic and properly blossoming form in the human animal.

So there is surely only *one* kind of intelligence in fundamental terms, which is merely displayed to a different degree in different species according to the relative size and sophistication of their brains.

The only question then remaining is whether the existence and expression of this intelligent quality is totally confined to an animal “nerve net” or “brain”, or whether it can exist in a different form, independently of such a structure.

So for the moment our conclusion here is that, we have identified as “intelligence” this capacity for analysis, contemplation, imagination, expression and design that humans have, as existing in other animals to a lesser degree, and only fundamentally different in humans as to its magnitude, just as amongst human beings themselves, only a small proportion would be regarded as authentic geniuses in any way.

Chapter Three – Evolution, Morality and Society

Now we have discounted as *relatively* unimportant the debate regarding whether is there any special quality in humans not available to other species, the need surely is to find out how to make that human intelligence function in our own best interest and that of the race.

In this connection, we might also ask as some *species* of biologists do, what is it that the complex human brain is really *for*?

The evolutionist will tell us that it is an instrument which gives us maximum evolutionary advantage, in that it enables us to develop skills and strategies, including tool and machine use, which give us a superior advantage over other species, and even of other subdivisions of our own species who have not sufficiently developed or utilised their mental equipment.

For example, in the cold war, and continuing international struggles, so called *intelligence*, is regarded as the primary weapon in gaining advantage over “the enemy.”

By *intelligence* in this context of course, is meant “intelligent gathering and analysis of information for purposes of military advantage” but we should definitely point out that it takes a great deal of “intelligence” of any kind to win such a *war of information*.

But there is an interesting corollary of this model of *intelligence used as a weapon*, which is that if the brain and its intelligence is just there for Darwinian reasons of *survival* and *reproduction*, then what in society, regardless of the existence or non-existence of a “god”, we describe as *ethics* or *morals* play little or no part in this, except in what the biologists describe as “culture.”

The evolutionary biologists say the we need our big brains, not only for the power of intelligence as a weapon to design ways of defending from and attacking our enemies in other species or our own, but also to form coherent social groups.

The principle there, is presumably that in groups lies power, and therefore survival advantage. Most animals gather in herds, or families, because this gives much more protection than lone animals which can be picked off much more easily by predators.

Part of the reason for this, is for example, that animals can warn each other of the first appearance of a predator and therefore have the opportunity to take some kind of evasive action, before the stalking animal is too close to fend off or escape.

But on the other hand, animals do not always easily live together in crowds as each demands its own territorial space, mating rights and so on, and obviously where a lot of animals occupy the same space, more potential conflicts can arise.

Thus we see in various species all kinds of ritual battles, like those of stags or goats butting each other with their horns, and gorillas making their chest-thumping displays to similarly claim their rights to dominance on some patch and in some group.

Some biologists have reported that amongst ape groups, there are much more complex behaviours going on, for example, that two apes may form an allegiance to support one another against a more powerful ape who tries to dominate the group, in order that they may also claim their territorial and mating rights.

These kinds of complex social behaviours they say need a larger brain, which by retrospective analysis suggests it is the reason it evolved.

So we are encouraged by the evolutionists and their endless TV documentaries telling us what Nature is like, and affirming this idea of animalistic duelling and “the survival of the fittest” that really, our human society is little different.

And it appears in many ways to be so, especially increasingly so in our modern society.

Because, the object we see, of this advanced brain, according to their theory, is not to be “good people”, but only to be clever “social operators” whose goal is to produce the maximum personal advantage for themselves in terms of surviving and reproducing.

Professor Richard Dawkins has documented all this kind of thing in his book “The Selfish Gene.”

So the implication for human society is that being a “goody goody” moral person is really just “a mug’s game” and “nice guys finish last.”

So really, that means doesn't it, as does the principle of "the survival of the fittest" that society is an animalistic, head butting battle for as much territory and as many mates as possible?

And that further means surely also, that all the power, territory and mating rights are given to the toughest, the strongest, and the cleverest social operators.

Which is exactly what we see before our eyes.

In such a society, the weak, the poor, the disabled, the old or unsound of body and mind in some respect are not properly cared for.

Which depending in what country and locality we live is more or less the case all over the world.

Some have said, that the test of a truly moral society is *how it cares for its old people*.

Let's face it – they can't work, they contribute little, their growing incontinence can disgust us, and their infirmity makes us afraid and reminds us we'll go the same way some day, and that's we'll die.

Surely that is the principle reason why some of the young hate the elderly – they see their future, they fear it, and therefore wish the elderly did not exist.

So surely such concern for the weak and the elderly as the "civilised", "humane", "caring" person is supposed to feel, this is all mere sentimentality – like religion and mysticism, surely it's all rubbish – the real fact of the matter is that *the strong will survive* and the rest can just feel themselves lucky to be tolerated and left alive?

So here, we are just pointing out, using our faculty of true (i.e. objective, impartial) intelligence, that the direct consequence of the evolutionist thinking and rejection of religion and mysticism *whether it is true or not*, is this man-against-man, everyone-for-themselves, animalistic "survival of the meanest and toughest" battle for existence and domination.

But unfortunately scientists like Richard Dawkins, cannot see this, for generally speaking they are nice "civilised" chaps, who don't go round molesting other men's women or beating other men to a pulp in the pursuit of their biological needs.

They imagine falsely that we can impose some kind of “ethical” or “moral” ideology on the mass of people, such as communism or “humanism” or god knows (or *doesn't know if he doesn't exist*) what other –ism, which will make people behave themselves in a “civilised way.”

But we have seen for example that communism - though sounding great in theory – never seems to work in practice, because once again, a small but significant number of Darwin's “fittest” (toughest, meanest, most cunning and ruthless) manage to get into the hierarchy of such a system and pervert it to their own ends.

They systematically wipe out anybody who would oppose them, or point out their corruption, such as did Stalin in Russia and Mao Tse Tung in China.

So in the absence of any other plausible alternative, which history has been trying to find for countless millennia, this would appear to suggest that the firmly adhered to religion such as is still found in some Muslim countries, whether it is actually factual or a fantasy, is the only safe way to order a society, in that it protects the rights of all based on moral principles, which would not otherwise exist if society were allowed to be a free-for-all based only on self-interest as it is in the West.

This is *not* however to suggest that all Westerners should become Muslims, or that all Muslims should become Westerners.

But we are just pointing out the *fact* that in such religious dominated countries, if they truly adhere to the principles of their founders such as Christ, Moses or Mohammed or Confucius, we can guarantee that the old and weak would be taken care of, and all people would be respected and given the rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness as they say, in so far as is it possible for each individual to possess those rights and freedoms without impinging on the rights and freedoms of others.

But this does not, we repeat, necessarily mean any set of religious believers has the right to inflict their views on everybody else.

What we are saying, is that even though “morals” and “religious views” are not proven by science, or any kind of visible consequence of Darwin's theories of evolution, if using our intelligence we decide that the safest course in society is the adoption and belief in such principles,

whether in fact they are true or not, we have an interesting problem on our hands.

(note Marx said “Religion is the *opium* of the people” but apparently didn’t count for the fact that if you take the “religious opium” away from the people, that sets the stage to addict them to *the real thing* – or cocaine, marijuana, LSD, “ecstasy”, etc.).

For what we have right now in the West and much of the rest of the world also is the domination over the many by the few.

A fortunate few are kings or billionaires, but most of the population still scabble and toil increasingly hard to make a modest living.

Which means inevitably, as we have seen throughout all history, that the many will eventually join together to overthrow the few, or else, the few will wisely decide to be more equitable in their control over and distribution of the world’s resources, and less personally aggrandising, *in order to not make themselves into targets of revolution or even assassination.*

For example, consider the cold blooded slaughter of the Romanoff dynasty members in Russia, at the time of the 20th Century Russian revolution.

History shows that sooner or later, most dictators are overthrown – those who live in grandeur, while the rest are in poverty – just as are most gangsters – few of them die in their beds of “natural causes.”

So though no scientist can so far prove a scientific basis for religion or morality, the fact is that history has shown that there is little security for *anybody* from the top to the bottom, whilst holding these divisive views of “survival of the fittest”, which in practice in modern human society means domination of the few over the many.

Why are we suggesting that only *religious* beliefs – i.e. those which hold belief in a “higher intelligence” which has a plan and purpose for our existence and a possible “after life” – can persuade people to behave themselves?

Understand we are not suggesting or justifying *blind belief* here, we are being *purely logical based on the psychological reality of the average human as we know him or her.*

The truth is, we are *all* scared of the dark.

We may try to deny, say we don't care, but when it comes to the crunch – e.g. we have a life-threatening accident, or get told we have cancer or whatever - we are *all* scared as hell, and eternally grateful to any doctor or medical staff who can take away our pain, and put us back in one piece, where possible, which unfortunately many times it is not.

It is however easy for the young and inexperienced of all ages to “mock death” because they think it will never happen to them, but as time goes by and they gradually see it happening to everyone around them, or even have a close brush with it themselves, they soon change their tune.

People, for example, like US tycoon Howard Hughes, depicted recently in Martin Scorsese's fine movie, *The Aviator*, can get obsessed with germs or other things they imagine could threaten their health and survival to the extent that their behaviour becomes virtually psychiatric.

Or do you honestly think a man who had no fear of death, and felt himself invulnerable, could possibly behave like that?

Equally, there are those who explore the avenue of cryogenics, leaving instructions they are to be frozen immediately upon death, in the hope that medicine will advance and one day be able to revive them, as depicted quite cleverly in the entertaining movie, *Demolition Man*, starring Sylvester Stallone, although of course the character he played was put into a suspended animation state whilst still alive.

It appears to archaeologists there was some similar sort of “personal immortality plan” being conducted by the Pharaohs, in the elaborate design and grand structure of their famous Pyramids, death chambers and sarcophagi.

So let us not base our philosophy on the lie that people are not scared of death, for everyone but on the one hand perhaps a saint, or fanatical believer in heaven, or on the other hand, an utterly deluded person is very much so.

Of course, there are many other horrors in life possible apart from death, such as being tortured in a prisoner of war facility, or having some tragic accident and ending up in a wheelchair, and so on.

One can very easily lose one's hair, teeth, get facially scarred, become lame, or experience the horror of having a virtual death sentence placed upon one by the announcement that one has cancer or some other awful terminal disease such as is currently presumed of AIDS.

Or we can just live an average life of such misery, endless toil for little reward, traumatic disappointing personal relationships and so on, that there seems little real purpose in existing apart from mere survival itself.

We might add as a likely unique aspect of this *human intelligence* we have, that we are seemingly the only species whose members decide to end their own lives, which seems to be totally against the principle of evolution itself.

Of course, the biologists and scientists can easily think up answers for this kind of behaviour too – calling such members aberrant or genetically defective – but the fact that we have many extremely successful people in worldly terms who do this, such as British comedian Tony Hancock, possibly Marilyn Monroe and Elvis Presley, philosopher Arthur Koestler who wrote *The Act of Creation* and *The Ghost in the Machine*, and many more, suggests to us that a better explanation is needed.

Again, doctors or medical researchers will point to the deficiency of some chemical in the brain, such as serotonin as “the cause”, but can our complex human problems really be reduced to such a simple biological formula?

And if so, what is the point of all this so called “therapy” that millions of Westerners indulge in, when presumably all they need is “a chemical fix”?

The real truth of the matter however, is that brain physiology and chemistry is not yet sufficiently understood to come up with all these kind of facile solutions and consider them reliable explanations.

For example, let us statistically compare the suicide rate in religious and non-religious societies, and see what that says about things. Our guess is it is *many* times higher in the secular societies than the religious, particularly if we leave suicide-bombers out of the equation.

We are not going to try to present statistical data on this matter however, because apart from anything else, the gathering of *reliable* and *accurate* statistical data is not necessarily such an easy thing to do, and in many cases, probably impossible, due to the usual defects in the collection of the data – e.g. how are we going to locate and question a “representative sample” of members of the Muslim, Buddhist or Hindu worlds? – and the formulating of a correct questionnaire.

But with *logic* and fact-based understanding of how the human psyche works, we can say that those who believe in nothing will obviously suffer from a sense of insecurity and fear that those who believe in a God will experience far less so, just as those who have the comfort of a marriage partner *on average* fair better in health and happiness than single people.

Doctors and medical researchers have long been aware of the mind-body connection, in their growing awareness of the apparent equivalence of the mind and the brain.

By experiencing emotional states such as fear, we can induce medical problems in ourselves of various kinds – even a heart attack could be brought on by extreme fear, for example, and some people have had their hair turn white or even fall out completely overnight, following some kind of a serious shock.

So again, this is to imply *logically* that if a belief system (*regardless* of whether the “beliefs” have any reality or not) provides us mental comfort and psychological and emotional security, we are better off with one than without one.

For as “Sufi Saint”, Hazrat Inayat Khan, pointed out: if the beliefs are wrong and there is no afterlife, then the non-believer will be as well off as the believer in the state of non-existence and oblivion – i.e. will simply not have any existence at all of a conscious kind.

But what the scientist and “rationalist” overlooks, is that even if his or her beliefs are not founded on reality, the believer will spend a life which has hope and meaning in it, whereas the non-believer will spend a life of doubt and misery comparatively speaking.

This in itself can be an *evolutionary* negative – the believer is motivated to marry and have children – to “go forth and multiply” – as we see all religiously founded nations all over the world have always done – whereas the typical view of many “rationalists” and “non-believers” is

why have children? Why inflict this misery upon them for no purpose? Why cause them to exist knowing they must age, suffer and die?

And that view is of course, *utterly rational*, given their “beliefs” – i.e. there is no god or “spiritual dimension” or “afterlife.” There is merely the here and now, and a lot of this *here and now* is pretty scary stuff right now, and has been throughout most of history also.

Even in the relatively peaceful and privileged Western Nations, we might catch AIDS or the recently developing “bird flu” and be dead in months or hours respectively, or maybe have our limbs blown off by a terrorist bomb.

As Marlon Brando says at the end of *Apocalypse Now* before he is slaughtered by his military sponsored “terminator”, Martin Sheen:

The horror...the horror...

So note – the scientist and rationalist have actually got themselves a scientific “belief system”, or at the very least we could call it “a non-belief system” which is liable to cause them not to carry out, or at the very least to seriously curtail, their evolutionary mission of reproducing.

In a late 1960s and early 1970s in at least one issue of esteemed British science journal *New Scientist*, an article pointed out this adherence amongst the modern educated intellectual adults to the philosophy of “2.2 children and a Ford Concertina” (a *Ford Cortina* car), and urged the scientific elite to breed more, so that they wouldn’t be swamped further by the plebeian classes, who quite happily rattled out huge families, whether they believe in a god or not.

But history shows it didn’t happen.

“Civilised intellectuals” just don’t want ten or twenty kids in their tidy, ordered, rational lives, and some of them are so “tidy and ordered” there’s no place whatsoever in their lives for smelly, screaming and demanding babies at all.

It is an interesting and currently statistically unanswered question as to how many modern men, who of course all want *sex*, would want *children* also, were it not the more or less inevitable price in most cases for getting their wife or girlfriend’s cooperation in the conjugal bed.

But the fascinating and ironic corollary of this situation, is that we see that those who believe in the Darwinian evolutionary view of human existence, are the very same people who have decided to partially or wholly stop breeding.

Can we be forgiven for almost bursting out laughing about the fact that those who believe most fervently in “the survival of the fittest”, and therefore in the human number one motivation to reproduce and pass on their “selfish genes” at all possible opportunities, are possibly the only sector of human society who are *deliberately* choosing not to do so?

For instance, surely a man of the fame and fairly handsome looks of Professor Richard Dawkins should be using every possible opportunity to pass on his “selfish genes” with every young dewy eyed student and desirable female fan or willing acquaintance that he meets?

Since for example, for a long time now, Mick Jagger, Hugh Hefner of *Playboy*, and suchlike have been following such an *evolutionary, survival of the fittest* agenda, bedding every available and desirable woman in sight; so one might legitimately ask just where did Professor Dawkins and so many other unmarried or “traditionally married” 2.2 children type evolutionist scientists go so wrong?

Without wishing to be any further mocking, we would like to offer them a *theory*, which does not require any “religious belief” as such, as we are quite confident they would coolly reject any such as an “irrational” proposition.

Merely passing on one’s genes randomly and “will-nilly” is not how human evolution proceeds most effectively.

Why?

Because the truth of the human psyche is that regardless of whether we find it in “science”, “art” or “religion”, what we are all pursuing as increasingly intelligent beings is *love, truth and beauty*.

Whether the motivation for these desires can be traced to some kind of instinctive or infantile origin, is not the issue, because the *fact* is that we are *all* seeking those things.

Even Al Capone goes to the opera. He says as is now well known “the show ain’t over till the fat dame sings.” But he still goes to see the show.

He could go instead to an illicit display of “fighting cocks”, like that visited by Ann Margret and Steve McQueen depicted in *The Cincinnati Kid*.

But he doesn’t. He wants fine clothes, fine furniture, the company of beautiful women and even enjoyment of “the fine arts.”

The fact that he has to crack a few skulls, or shoot a few rivals dead over the dinner table to afford those things doesn’t really bother him, so we wouldn’t really call him a *civilised man* by “moral standards” would we, but he is still seeking beauty and a truth and love of a kind.

As he died, did he pray to a God?

We don’t know, and surely we can’t ever now know, as could not even those at his death scene, excepting only what he did and said.

But the fact that *he*, apparently a murderous despot, is still seeking beauty and thinking of himself as some kind of philosopher – i.e. a pursuer of knowledge and meaning - tells us clearly that these impulses are planted deep in us all.

So then the evolutionary question becomes - should we as men fire our sperm like spatter guns at every female in sight, or should we very carefully choose a very small number of females, possibly even only one, with whom when we combine our genetic characteristics with will produce as amazing and startlingly beautiful, intelligent and wonderful children as possible, which as a stable family unit, we are in a position to assure the maximum chance of careful rearing and survival to?

This question clearly applies equally to women, in terms of whom they should choose to make available their eggs and wombs to in terms of a mate.

And clearly, the more *intelligent* in society are choosing this option – they are going for *quality* and not *quantity*. They are breeding *pedigrees*, *champions*, not herds of wild sheep and pigs.

So the implication here is that evolution *may* not be as random as the mainstream evolutionist scientists think.

The actual *behaviour* of the evolutionists themselves, modern intellectuals, and the educated and more highly evolved humans in general demonstrates this fact.

For example, just statistically speaking, to pass on this “selfish gene” effectively would seem to suggest having as large a brood of children as possible, to ensure maximum chance of at least several of our progeny surviving and passing and distributing in turn their genes as far and wide as possible.

But we “educated” and “intelligent” citizens think *small is beautiful*. We don’t seek families of dozens or thousands like farm yard animals and insects do.

We demand *quality* of life, not mere survival.

We like to immerse ourselves in art, music, song, and indeed scientific exploration *for their own intrinsic worth, for their own sake*.

And *regardless of our evolutionary imperative* of “survival” and even “reproduction”, we will if our quality of life is sufficiently lacking decide to “end it all” – we will commit the ultimate anti-evolutionary act of self-destruction and personal extinction.

And we can call it “chemical imbalance” in the brain if we wish, but there is a greater demand for this *quality of life*, the need for wonder, magic, sparkle and happiness in life, and a correspondingly greater capacity for self-destruction amongst the *more evolved*, the “bigger brained” (or more complex brained) than the less intelligent members of our species and race.

What on earth is going on?

Again, we have merely a *theory*, so as we said, we are asking for *consideration*, not *belief*.

Suppose there *is* a supreme intelligence underlying Nature, expressing itself as Nature.

Then nothing in Nature is accidental. All is causal, all is *design*. But not everything is “made perfect” at once. There are trial designs, failed designs, rejected designs, outmoded designs, and so on.

Even *we* may become “outmoded designs” in time, and be replaced by something superior, something which we may even in time evolve into.

This intelligent designer is having “fun” creating things, just as we do when we invent the electric light, the telephone or the motor car, and even having fun destroying things, just as we do when we dynamite and orchestrally demolish a huge old tower block or apartment building. We might even play Tchaikovsky’s *1812 Overture* as it’s coming down.

But this *theoretical* supreme universal intelligence has as *its* kind of fun creating planets, stars, galaxies, and species of life, and sometimes wiping them all out.

We howl when it either does or permits what appear to us *destructive acts, cruelty* and so on, such as endured in the Nazi Death Camps in World War II or the Japanese Prisoner of War camps, or on the other hand, the vast suffering of the Germans in the bombing and molestation of their cities and people at the end of the war, or of those Japanese citizens caught in the fires of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki nuclear attacks.

We cannot understand fully the motivations of such a “God”, such a “supreme intelligence” which seems to have created and allowed these things.

But firstly, its “prophets” tell us how to evade this kind of catastrophic and cruel state of affairs of wars, famines, disasters and social injustice.

Like Moses or Christ they issue laws, commandments, which *if obeyed* will bring us to peace and harmony, and live in a “promised land” of “milk and honey.”

We only get this awful suffering as at present when we get *arrogant* and start to think we know better than this God, and start making up our own laws and ways of life instead of following *Nature’s*.

And secondly, even if we are too stubborn to obey the commandments, the prophets tell us that nobody really dies anyway, that life is in essence eternal, and that however much we are suffering or have suffered, in time we will experience such overpowering joy and happiness, that we will forget and deem insignificant every last throe of it, such will be the reward we will eventually receive.

And this is not merely an empty promise, because the prophets and saints allege repeatedly in all the spiritual literature with which the history of man is littered over the past several thousand years that they *personally* have experienced this state of bliss, known in various traditions as “Valhalla”, “Heaven”, “Satori”, “Nirvana”, “Samadhi”, “Enlightenment” and so on, for which undergoing tortures or even dying on a cross is seen by them in that light, as only a very tiny price to pay.

But with realism, accepting our lowly status in the Universe, we have to also accept that we, as limitedly intelligent humans are simply not in a position to know fully the motives or state of such a God, or of possibly other far more advanced beings in the universe, just as a dog or a tortoise is in no position to understand the mental states we experience and the complex thoughts and ideas which captivate and motivate us.

No dog cares to hear a Beethoven Symphony, no tortoise cares tuppence whether Rembrandt or Vermeer paints a masterpiece or not. There is lettuce, there is a mate, there is a warm tough shell for protection, and that is enough for our little tortoise he declares, thank you very much.

But there seems no limit to our human ambitions in terms of the demand for ever more thrilling, satisfying and broader experience.

If we can't find our joy and adventure anywhere else we obsess upon it in the form of excess use of drugs or sex.

But as we evolve we look for it more and more on a mental level – at the opera, in the music, in the literature, in the “arts.”

As Spartacus says to his love Jean Simmons in the movie:

“I'm free. But what do I know? I want to know where the rain comes from. I want to know why a leaf falls and a star doesn't - where the wind comes from, and where the sun goes at night. I want to *know*.”

We are *homo sapiens*, the man who knows, seeks to know and must know and understand.

This desire and thirst for understanding is as great in the intelligent man or woman as that for food and drink.

Do we not see the frustration of a gorilla, as it examines some branch or leaf or thing it has found?

It looks at it blankly, it seems maybe it wants to know *what it is*, but it is stumped, it has no advanced human brain, its efforts to seek further are doomed to failure.

But in the movie, the godless or near godless Romans don't want Spartacus to be free, and to *know* and *understand*, and when he tries to escape his slavery, they eventually send a huge army against him and kill him.

The wily politician *Gracchus* played by Charles Laughton, has taught Julius Caesar, who hovers in his loyalty been Gracchus, the Republican, and Laurence Olivier's *Crassus*, the Imperialist, and Caesar says to Crassus:

“Well, at least Gracchus has taught me one thing – that Rome is *the mob*(the people).”

But Crassus haughtily answers:

“No, you are wrong, Caesar. Rome is not the mob (the people). Rome is *an eternal thought in the mind of God*. You must serve her. You must worship her. You must abase yourself at her feet.”

So Crassus wins, and the society becomes a dictatorship, with a small ruling elite, and everyone else is enslaved.

He is an *alpha male*, lesser men fight to the death for him for his amusement and that of his courtesan like beautiful but sadistic and bloodthirsty female consorts. Enemies (i.e. opponents) of the state are rounded up and imprisoned or executed. The helpless weak, the old and the disabled, for whom there is no longer anybody to speak up for, die of starvation, poverty or neglect.

Crassus's Roman elitist society is that of the survival of the fittest, it is our modern society in disguise, and is the direct outcome of the Darwinian view of humanity, untempered by any *morality*.

His “morality” is only one of respect for the high and mighty, of the strong and cruel, like himself.

His Roman gods are even more strong and cruel than he is, which is why he respects and worships them.

Christ's "God of love" and "love of the neighbour as oneself" which Spartacus embodies, is an aberration in his society, which stirs up the minds of the masses to *rebellion* (i.e. freedom) and therefore cannot be tolerated, and must be exterminated, just as Spartacus was exterminated, and Christ before him.

Were Emperor Crassus a modern man, he would no doubt have employed some scientists to prove evolutionary theories of survival of the fittest and so on to justify and consolidate the "status quo" - that is of the domination of the strong over the weak - just as did Hitler's eugenicists, who deemed the Aryan race superior to all the others, despite Jesse Owens' triumph at the Berlin Olympics of 1936 in front of his own eyes.

But again, Hitler himself, originally an artist, like Al Capone was *a seeker of order, of beauty*, just as was our Crassus in the Spartacus story.

But if we are to have a harmonious and secure society, such desires must be tempered by a morality lest they turn into elitist and racially intolerant dictatorships and vicious empires, for example by the true following of morals of the Christian kind, or based on fundamental moral principles such as the commandments of Moses.

Failing that, we have an endless and often bloody local, national and international struggle, along the lines of "survival of the fittest" Darwinian evolutionist thinking.

That is to say, if "survival of the fittest" is our principle – if the Germans can wipe out the French or the British. *So be it.*

Or if the Chinese can wipe out the Japanese, or the Arabs can wipe out the Jews, or the Jews the Arabs. Then equally, so be it.

From the *Darwinian* point of view, there's nothing *wrong* with that, is there?

This is merely *evolution* after all, this is a job for which those of a moral persuasion *need not apply*.

It's *survival of the fittest* isn't it? It's the way things have to be.

Thank you Darwin. And for Darwin, if there is a God, let us say thank you God.

But obviously, if there is a God, Darwin – the enlightening element of the information he has provided and the fears he has engendered – is part of that plan.

But surely, it cannot be part of either a God's plan, or an evolutionary plan of a "blind watchmaker" that man should create nuclear and biological weapons, with which not only can he extinct himself, but can likely wipe out all life upon the entire planet?

How does an *intelligent* species, whose goal is above all *survival*, get to such a pass that it can wipe all its members out, as well as likely all the other species on the planet, without which it could not survive anyway, dependent as it is for its own existence on the food they provide?

Our *theory* again says that this god or "supreme power" tries out all the options it can to try to persuade the little critters on this particular planet to adjust their behaviour to its wishes, such that they may earn this fantastic reward provided by evolutionary development.

Nuclear weapons or other "cataclysmic force" only appears *when all else fails*.

After all, this "supreme being" doesn't ask *all that much*. In the *metaphorical* (not *literal*) garden of Eden it only asked – *eat whatever you like, do whatever you like*, but don't eat *that one single apple*.

What would we think of a gardener who said, eat any plant or fruit in my garden without charge, but don't eat that poisoned mushroom over there, because that could kill you?

We would think he was a jolly good and caring guy, wouldn't we?

The prophets don't ask much either. They merely say –

"Have (generally speaking) one man or woman each as partner, guys and girls, and be faithful to them at least until they die, or actually *want* to divorce you.

Don't kill your neighbour, be *nice* to them. Is that so hard? After all, if they are following the rules too, as is the plan, they'll be nice to you too.

Then you can lead a peaceful and secure life, and sleep easy in your bed without fear of burglary, murder, rape or nuclear or chemical attack."

So why has this *intelligent and sensible* theory of “religion” – i.e. treating others fairly and loving one another - got into such disrepute?

Because scientists have used their “intelligence” in the “forbidden way.”

That is, it is not forbidden to *speculate*, but it is “forbidden” to *adjudicate* on matters which science itself accepts are outside of the zone of science, such as “is there a god?”

Science was not wrong for establishing the *mechanism* of evolution, of natural selection, of establishing that man is related to the other species and has evolved from some kind of common ancestor to at least some of the species existing today.

On the contrary, this was an essential form of *enlightenment* for the modern age, which must be accepted eventually by all on our planet.

Science did not make any error by (more or less) proving the evolutionary theory in its general message.

But it is what it did *next* that was the problem. It said:

We are all descended from a primordial one celled bug.

(fine, no problem, we can live with that, we are so much greater than a one celled bug now).

But...

And therefore religion is nonsense, therefore there is no god.

And here, lies the fallen crown.

Of course we know that scientists, atheists and rationalists will howl with anxiety at the term and idea that any activity of a scientist or even human being in general apart from perhaps rape, motiveless violence and paedophilia is *forbidden*.

What we mean is that *nothing is forbidden*, as neither in theory is murder, paedophilia or rape in human society.

But that such “laws” are passed to save humans individually and collectively from horrors.

We *can* and *do* in some cases do these things, but there are *consequences*.

And in the case of the scientists, declaring *no god*, because they are an “authority” and are believed, this first causes people to stop believing in god, and then they say to themselves and each other “no god, why obey morals?”

And thus society deteriorates into an animalistic battle, of “survival of the fittest” in which adultery, crime, violence, prostitution, usury, fraud, abuse, injustice and exploitation of all kinds appear, in which only the strong, violent and ruthless prosper and rule, and abuse and damn the rest.

Politically, we see cruel dictatorships (masquerading in one form or another) instead of benevolent wise monarchies or democracies, and then follow unceasing wars launched by such dictatorships to subjugate and enslave other nations, regardless of the suffering and loss of human life of even their own citizens who are regarded as insignificant pawns in a game, and mean less to them than the pieces on a chess board.

We fully accept that science has the right to *investigate* and explore and *speculate* upon *any* question of human or non-human life.

But we feel scientists must act with *responsibility* in the light of the consequences of what they report to human society.

For example, supposing there were an asteroid discovered hurtling towards the earth and unstoppably going to destroy us.

Unless there was some positive benefit in this being reported to the attention of the public, of what purpose would it be to report the imminence of human extinction, and thus cause all kinds of wild and savage panic behaviour, which would be a million times more productive of suffering than merely a relatively speedy death for *billions* in the face of a global conflagration like thousands of hydrogen bombs going off simultaneously that would likely ensue?

Therefore, much of these words are directed to the atheist scientists, such as the very influential Richard Dawkins, who must eventually realise for the sake of all, that a position of non-belief in religious principles can

bring the entire race only to destruction *whether those religious principles and beliefs have any basis in reality or not.*

Richard Dawkins recent assertion that religious belief is the cause of the global havoc is a total cop-out.

The Muslim is strapping dynamite to him or herself and attacking the “enemy” with it, not because of *religion*, but because of the intolerance of the rest of the world to the Muslim way of life, and the desire of these powerful elite in the world to control their natural resources.

Had the Muslims not been threatened and provoked, they would not be attacking the West, except perhaps for a few extremists and zealots who on their own could not achieve very much, lacking widespread support.

If this seems unproven theory, let us give a fact.

There was for example *not ever* any Muslim attack on England before July 7th 2005 - in other words, after the British had engaged in the second Iraq war, and had been warned by terrorist leaders such as Osama Bin Laden to withdraw their forces repeatedly, long *before* any attack on Britain ever took place.

Note also, that these words of the author are the impartial dispassionate opinion of a man who is neither a Muslim, nor a Jew, and was born and raised as a Christian and has no intention of converting to either faith, and has no desire and nothing to gain from his viewpoints, except the hope that someday there will be a comprehensive and enduring world peace.

Just as Oppenheimer and the other scientists involved in the production of the first atom bomb wrestled with their consciences, let our modern scientists also wrestle with theirs, and cease where possible to allow the use of their high intelligence and extraordinary knowledge for low or destructive purposes, not good for the individual or the global society.

For surely, any other action on the part of the intellectual elite, towards the mass of the people who are the comparatively non-intellectual non-elite, is an act of social destruction, and against any civilised, peaceful and evolutionarily sound organisation of mankind.

Chapter Four – Intelligence, Emotion and Intuition

The free expression of our emotions and the free expression of our intelligence both seem equally desirable goals in theory, but in practice we find many times are opposing and mutually frustrating activities.

That is, the expression and sensation of strong emotions tends to blot out rational thinking, and the practice of clear rational thinking correspondingly seems to demand the suppression or absence of any powerful emotions.

We are all aware that when we are in a mood, for example of fear, passion or anger, our normal thinking processes can be seriously affected, and our normal reasoning faculties may fail to operate.

We regret things we say in the heat of such moments, and at leisure repent the misjudgement of saying them, and decide we would have chosen our words or actions more carefully had only we been “in our right minds.”

The two types of mode of mind operative are somewhat represented by the fictional characters of Mr Spock and Doctor McCoy in the original Star Trek TV series.

Spock is the emotionally controlled rationalist who tries to decide all by cool, clear logical thinking, whereas McCoy is the heated, passionate and emotionally indulgent foil to him, with Captain Kirk standing in the middle of their war of *Reason versus Emotion*, like an unwilling referee.

But both Spock and McCoy irritate us at times. We see they are both incomplete. We tire of Spock’s boring perpetual logical deductions, and we tire also of McCoy’s constant heart-string pulling emotional pleas.

We would like to at times ask Spock to *loosen up, let his hair down*, whereas on the other hand, we would like to tell McCoy to stop ranting and whining, and “pull himself together”, and show a little restraint and military or stoic “stiff upper lip” like Spock does.

This example is not trivial.

For what we are saying is that on the one hand, the ceaseless expression of cold logic, bores and dulls us, yet on the other hand, the overindulgence in emotionality drains and weakens us.

We thus need a balance of emotionality and rationality to keep us in a healthy and positive state.

However, though it is fairly clear just from the image of Mr Spock what the rational mind is about, the emotional nature is far more difficult and amorphous to so easily define.

The trouble with *emotions*, is that like colours, we are talking about a spectrum of feelings, which seem as different to us as the spectrum of colours with all its subtlest shades.

For example, music and art seem to stir in us the widest imaginable range of feelings, each piece of music we hear or picture we view gives us a seemingly unique and different experience of *feeling, emotion*.

Let us consider even the different kinds of emotions stimulated by music, which is surely just one area of feeling, as we get a different range of feelings again for example when contemplating the natural world, such as if we see a tiger in the wild, or we view the starry sky at night.

For example as to music, listening to a Bach fugue is a very different experience than listening to a “heavy metal” piece from a band like Led Zeppelin in their classic track “Whole Lotta Love”, which in turn is very different again from listening to a sensual and hypnotic pop song such as Donna Summer’s “I Feel Love”, which by clever combination of its suggestive singing and warm throbbing synthesizer accompaniment could plausibly even induce an erection in some males.

We do not mean to be vulgar or provocative with our last remark.

We are merely pointing out that the word “music” covers a vast, seemingly infinite array of possible forms, emotions and ideas, and that two different pieces are regarded even by different people as different in “emotional effect.”

There is the issue of *taste*. How can one person “love” a particular piece of music, and another one “hate” it, when surely the music is heard as the same sound vibrations, rhythms, timbres and melodies by everyone?

(note: *timbre* means *tone colour* in music, e.g. that of the *quality* of the drum, the saxophone, the flute, the voice, etc. e.g. a *sombre* drum, a *blaring* trumpet, a *sensual* saxophone, etc.)

The issue is *choice* of emotions.

Different people like to indulge in different kinds of emotions to others, just as some people like to watch a romantic “weepy movie” and others prefer a tough guy “action movie.”

Music evokes diverse emotions within us, in that it stimulates different centres or aspects of our body and/or mind.

For example, heavy metal music’s pounding and aggressive rhythms, vocals and screaming guitar solos are clearly of a “passionate” and “aggressive” nature.

The aforementioned “Whole Lotta Love” is obviously sexual in its “thrusting” rhythms and guitar riff and is almost like a “hot” and “wild” sexual encounter in sound – particularly the middle section, which uses tape loops, screaming vocals, echoing throbbing drums and disorienting phasing effects to stimulate the “mind blowing” nature of a powerful and animalistic sexual encounter and orgasm.

Compare what this is doing to the human body, “emotions” and “mind”, with the effect of listening to a Bach fugue, which is almost wholly a mental or “cerebral” experience which doesn’t really “reach the parts” below the neck, except perhaps the “heart.”

Music, and we can likely say *emotion in general*, is directing itself to broadly speaking four aspects of our being – mind, heart, gut and loins.

We experience *meaning*, or lack of it, in the mind; we experience joy or sadness in the heart; we experience a feeling of strength or weakness in the abdominal area (as in ELP’s song *Pirates* “If you’ve the *stomach* for a broadside, come aboard me pretty boys”), and we experience sexual desire in the loins.

But interestingly, there is a “hotline” to all these zones of feeling via the medium of *words*.

This makes the song the most powerful musical form because it can stimulate us on two levels – adding the descriptive and suggestive power

of words to what Aaron Copland in his classic music educational book “What to Listen For in Music” describes as “the purely musical meaning.”

Incidentally, that of course makes it arguably a greater achievement to express something satisfying purely in music with no words, nor even suggestive title, which explains why only truly great composers like Bach or Mozart can thrill millions with the power of their instrumental music, e.g. Bach’s famous “Tocatta and Fugue in D minor” - made a chart pop hit out of by artists such as “Sky” or the Chinese violinist Vanessa Mae; as can sometimes fine modern musicians like Jeff Beck on his hit track “Dance With the Devil” or Scott Joplin with his famous rag “The Entertainer” used in the Newman/Redford movie “The Sting.”

But the power of words – and of course, the emotions with which they are sung – can render a piece of fairly repetitive and rather incomplete musical backing track, such as in Donna Summer’s “I Feel Love” - which otherwise would have just given a nice warm fuzzy feeling - more or less into an aphrodisiac in sound.

Compare again, the emotions aroused by tracks like the Donna Summer and Led Zeppelin we have mentioned to the listening to one of Bach’s preludes or fugues, or even Keith Emerson’s fine “Fugue” off the Trilogy album, and as one advert said, the feeling is less of sexual arousal and passion, than “live in peace with your pipe”, or to put it differently again, as Tim Rice said in “One Night in Bangkok” from the musical “Chess”:

I get my kicks above the waistline.

So depending upon our “taste”, our “nature” – whether it is really “Nature” or “nurture” we shall discuss elsewhere – we are drawn to desire different bands of the spectrum of emotions, just as people have different favourite colours, which equally have equivalent emotional effects.

In general, obviously “cold” blues and dark colours are relaxing or depressing, and “hot” reds and oranges are warming or exciting. Yellow or gold is obviously neutral – it is balanced and thus balancing. Thus the yellow or golden sun makes us feel healthy and relaxed – neither too hot nor cold, and we have such phrases as “the golden mean” which indicate this state of balance associated with yellow or gold.

However, yellow and gold are found in Nature in short supply. A little of either goes a long way, because like red they are such powerful colours.

Again, just like “emotion”, anyone who has ever tried matching paints will be staggered at how subtle the variations of colour can be – for example, who off hand could definitely identify what was a “vermillion red” or an “ultramarine blue”, a “bottle green” or a “pearl white”?

For example again, depending upon the settings of the red/green/blue colours on our TV or computer monitor, those named colours will appear quite different, as will they be also on the varieties of printed colour materials, as we can clearly observe for example by looking at different copies of the same book, newspaper or magazine.

But we are perhaps not yet defining our terms clearly enough in this analysis. Just what *are* these feelings, and emotions which we so freely discuss and toss around to one another in describing our everyday experiences?

Like sounds or colours, it is in fact not so easy to say what any particular feeling is.

For example, let us try to describe how a piece of music makes us feel, such as Beethoven’s well known slow movement of the “Moonlight Sonata.”

There are all kinds of things in there – we can say, it is *like* the lapping of waves, or gives us an image of a lake at night with the moonlight shimmering on the water, as its title suggests.

Beethoven however did not name it so. This popular title was tagged on only later after his death.

And moreover, if we could say what it meant precisely *in words*, what would be the point of the music at all, why would we need it if words could produce in us the same *emotion*, the same *meaning*?

So we are hinting here that the power of words in expressing our *emotions* is generally speaking somewhat vague and limited.

For example, if we say someone is *sad*, that could in itself mean a whole spectrum of degrees of what we call “sadness.”

So we get “sophisticated”, and try to assign more words to express the intensity and type of sadness. For example, we could say someone is desolate, melancholic, or heartbroken, or we could even use a kind of metaphorical term and describe someone as “devastated” or “shattered”, though of course the latter words normally mean something completely different, not directly related to emotion.

Thus, if someone is asked “how do you feel right now?” there is really no exact way of answering that question.

So people say things like:

“I feel kind of strange” or “I feel good.”

Whereas we could legitimately ask “what do you mean – *strange* like you looked in the mirror and saw two heads, or strange like you feel like you have never been here before?”

Or as to good - “you mean you feel good like you just won the lottery, or good like you’re a well behaved little girl or boy?”

Then we might ask regarding *degrees* of emotion, and the terms for them, who is the most upset - the person who is “desolate”, or the person who is “melancholy”? Or are either of these two as sad or more so than the person who is *depressed*.

The truth is, when we start examining dictionary definitions we tend to go round in circles, and end up finding that most of these terms mean much the same thing, and there is not necessarily a generally agreed understanding of what they mean as to degree.

For example, *melancholy* has medical overtones – that is, it is allegedly a state arising from a medical condition. Which implies it may be a more persistent state than a mere fleeting spell of sadness, for example, which would occur when we discover our lottery numbers did not come up.

But what is the point of this discussion and analysis?

The point is – we are saying that emotional states cannot be discussed in a purely rational or logical way, because *they are not precisely definable, and therefore not agreed*.

As a final example, after all, just what do people mean by the word “love”?

If you say you “love” someone in the context of a one-to-one relationship it is surely meant as the supreme compliment.

But then there is the love of a parent for a child, or of a teacher for a pupil, which will generally not include the sexual overtones of when a man declares his love for a woman, or a woman declares her love for a man.

And then there is the problem that people often address one person with this “supreme compliment”, which the recipient believes to be applying therefore only to them – which it *logically* must, if it really is “the greatest compliment one could ever give another person” – but then the originally complimenter soon offers that self-same compliment to someone totally different.

So of just what value then is such a word at all?

Clearly, it depends upon *who* is saying it.

There could be many people who have said those words a thousand times to one person or another in their lifetime, and some who have said it only a few, or maybe even only once, or maybe even never at all.

Likewise, when someone who is routinely depressed, negative, and despondent, and spends most of their time moping around, if they say they are “sad”, it means something very different than when someone who is a super-optimist, and normally full of joy, love and goodwill reports the same.

In the first case, the declaration of “sadness” will hardly move us at all, and in the second case, it could arouse in us a state of “shock”, just as we would be shocked at seeing a small black cloud in an otherwise blue sky.

When we express our emotions and “feelings” to one another, they are vague approximations. They are not a reliable guide to our expectations of the behaviour of others, except in a very general way.

The feelings we report to one another are not quantifiable like numbers we can add.

One person could say they are sad, but if asked on a scale of 1 to 10 exactly *how* sad, they might say 5. Whereas another person might say 9.9 and be almost ready to kill themselves even though they have reported their feelings using exactly the same word.

So does this suggest we should go around qualifying our emotions with numbers on some kind of a numerical scale, like the famous Richter scale, which is used to measure the intensity of earthquakes?

Even then, the subjective – i.e. opinionial – element of personal assessment would come in.

So it is clear to anyone who looks at these issues realistically, there is *no* reliable way of categorising or describing our own emotions, of saying precisely what it is we really feel.

There are only people who are better than others at finding similes and metaphors for their feelings, or describing those which they perceive or imagine to be in others, and understandably at least some of such people become novelists, playwrights or authors.

But the more general point is that we therefore are largely isolated from one another – that is, therefore largely unable to communicate properly with one another *by verbal means*.

Of course this causes massive problems in relationships, because we regard words as our main communicative tool, and it is especially important to most of us that others understand how we feel, which in practice, now as we can see, is quite unlikely, when we can rarely even express it fully or clearly ourselves.

Thus, when we find someone who appears to be an *understanding* person, and seems to know exactly what we feel, it seems to us as if we have discovered a great treasure, and many people can become deeply attached to another such person for that reason.

We say person X or Y *really* understands us, and this is a great comfort to us, we do not then feel so totally isolated and alone in the world, for by pure logic, if no one even *understands* us - what we really *are* and *feel* deep inside - then how can they possibly care about us, or even above all *love* us, which is the thing that most of us want the very most?

So what has all this got to do with *intelligence*?

The point is, we may find someone who scores very highly on a so called “IQ” test, but we may also discover that their understanding of us *emotionally* is poor.

Though they can read and study hard books, and pass tough written exams with flying colours, we don’t put them into the category of an understanding human being.

But guess what? - to become a “teacher”, a “psychologist”, “psychiatrist” or “therapist”, and for that matter, generally speaking even a *politician*, depends almost wholly on the ability to read difficult intellectual books, and pass difficult written exams.

So that means, that those people who *should* be the most understanding of human behaviour and emotions, are appointed generally speaking on quite another basis, which may be wholly unrelated.

Thus we see that this form of *intelligence* they exhibit which enables them to get these jobs of such enormous social and human importance, is *no guarantee whatsoever* they will be truly fitted to carry out these roles they hold effectively.

So what quality or form of intelligence *should* we be looking for in others whom we hope to be understanding of us, and thus able to make *wise* decisions about our lives and know how to relate to us properly?

We have all heard of the term “commonsense”, but we find nowadays, that there is little that is “common” about it, as it is a quality which is rarely to be found, especially in the so called “educated classes” who run the Western world.

What we mean by *commonsense* is somebody who whether tutored in academic thought or not, is able to *see and deal with everyday reality as it really is*.

This person is often found to be *not* the same person as he or she who is exceptionally good at studying textbooks and passing written exams.

In a famous ancient Chinese book, the *Tao Te Ching*, is found the statement:

Those who follow the Tao (i.e. the way of Nature, of wisdom) *are not extensively learned*.

Could this be why that in a world full of vast cut down forests of “learned journals” on every subject from “child psychology” to “comparative religion” we still are governed by not terribly wise people, who have almost equally unwise people from “academia” (i.e. the colleges and universities) advising them?

Please note, we are *not* talking about those who are expert in or work in “hard sciences” such as mathematics, chemistry, engineering, electronics and so on, whose scientific knowledge is proven to either work or not, by the products and machines and technologies they provide.

What we are especially concerned with is the so called “social scientists” – the so called “psychologists”, “sociologists”, “economists”, and so on who govern and organise society using the technology the *real scientists* provide.

What we are saying is that the ability to memorize and assimilate books full of someone else’s ideas and parrot them back in a convincing way to the satisfaction of an examiner, is certainly a sign of a certain degree of *intellectual* achievement, and most definitely an ability to doggedly carry out this form of “hard work”; but it is most definitely *not* any guarantee of this quality of *real intelligence* which we have earlier defined, which would certainly be based upon this quality we have just described as “commonsense.”

To put it differently, there are chess grandmasters in the world who could play and beat any ten of us ordinary mortals simultaneously, whilst even wearing a blindfold, but does this mean we should make them the president or prime minister, because they can turn some very clever intellectual tricks that few others in the world ever could?

Generally speaking, obviously not.

But we feel that this term “commonsense” is too open also to misunderstanding and abuse.

For example, a butcher’s boy who knows how to pack a truck load of chickens efficiently might be regarded by many as having “commonsense”, or a smart girl in a clothes shop who becomes “salesgirl of the month.”

So we are going a step further.

We are going to ask from *where* did all the *genuine, valuable* knowledge that is recorded in the science, mathematics, engineering, biology and even psychology books come from - in so far that they contain any - which our modern “intellectuals” then go to and try to imbibe?

And the answer is that there once was a time when man (as species) knew virtually *nothing*.

He just scabbled in the dirt, and chased and hunted other animals and picked nuts and berries much like any other animal.

So from where did all this knowledge that our modern intellectuals worship and congratulate themselves and each other so proudly upon absorbing come from?

It came from *individual men and women* who could see into reality *with no prior knowledge*, and elicit it for the first time.

And those beings, therefore had no teacher, but for their own “teacher” *within*, which we will describe therefore as their *inner tuition*, or as in its commonly accepted shorter form, their *intuition*.

Clearly, at one moment or another in history, *all* scientific and other knowledge that we have was produced by this *intuition* operating through one human brain or another.

We see that this *fact* – it is obviously *not* a theory, because it is the only *logical* explanation of the origin of knowledge – is quite different than what the average intellectual believes about how human knowledge has been created and developed, i.e. bit by bit, by a long line of contributors, rather than in the “giant leaps” of *intuitive discovery* such as the discovery of fire and the wheel.

For example, Robert M Pirsig in his universally known of (at that time) 1970s book, “Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance” believed that new ideas came mainly from combining old ones upon a cycle of associative thinking that ran around our minds like the carriages of an enormously long train on a track.

It is for this reason, that “intelligence” is seen as just a “happy chance” combination of already existing ideas or facts that the proponents of so called “artificial intelligence” believe that they may one day duplicate the “intelligence” of the human brain or, rather of the human mind, leaving a

space to question whether those two concepts are *always* wholly equivalent.

For those who have studied a little Eastern philosophy, we should point out that no book of yoga philosophy of course says anything else other than that thoughts are linked by association.

But the unanswered question is *where do the associated thoughts individually speaking arise in the first place?*

The answer is that within us we have a faculty of “tuning in” to what we see, and from this mysterious and unseen inner faculty, which we have labelled *intuition*, or *the real faculty of intelligence*, up pops a new *insight* or an *intuition* (noun, as product of the *faculty* of intuition) such as Newton’s Theory of Gravitation arising from some observation and contemplative process upon Nature, as for example dwelling on the *why* or *how* of the alleged falling apple.

And we earlier asked, where is the faculty of “imagination” located in the brain, and equally now we might ask - where on earth is this *intuition*, and if we cannot find it, how can we actually propose that it exists?

No doubt, with current scientific limited knowledge of the brain, it cannot currently be located, and perhaps never can be.

But such a visual identification is not necessary, because we have defined it as *the equivalent of its function*.

That is, it is the true intelligence of the brain, that can derive *first principles*, and is able to see the depth and *root* of problems, rather than just skim around their superficial and familiar aspects.

Equally, when functioning in a wide rather than narrow way, it is the same faculty which can see into the lives – emotions, thoughts and feelings - of others.

The person who can understand us is more likely the intuitively awake person, than the intellectually driven one.

So the next question we must answer is *why* some people are intuitively awake and others are not.

Chapter Five – Intellect and Intuition

In the preceding chapter we asked the question why so many intellectuals turn out to be not very understanding people, lacking in what we regard as “commonsense.”

As Krishnamurti put it, no doubt based upon long experience of the many scientists and academics whom he took part in discussions with:

There are Ph D's who couldn't put a flower on the table.

We are not here however particularly concerned with such *practical skills*, but with the ability to *solve problems* in the human world, and for that matter, in the material world in general.

But our focus here is going to be on the social and psychological problems of mankind, because we think the rest can be solved easily enough, once the former are.

However, what we are about to say *is* wholly relevant to the scientist who would seek to be a *creative* scientist, perhaps originating new scientific discoveries or even fields of study or technology, because as we are about to explain, his or her ability to do this will depend upon a correct inner perspective and an expanded understanding of the working of the human psyche, such as we now intend to provide.

In science as in all other fields, there are *the leaders* and *the followers*.

Not that there is any shame in being a follower. We can't all be Einsteins discovering *relativity*, or Max Plancks creating a field such as *quantum physics*.

The shame and crime however, is when a new leader emerges, and perhaps overturns the knowledge or theories of the former leaders, but all the *followers* who cannot see the correctness of his new findings stand in his way.

Whilst we accept this process as inevitable in logical terms to some degree – that is, if the leaders were the equal of the followers, they would have come to the same conclusions already *themselves* – we feel that it is necessary to explain the psychology of what is going on in academia and

the human intellect in general, such that those who are able to awaken to this realisation, will either themselves become the new leaders in their field, or else at least not act as such a ball and chain upon those who would become so, thus slowing the overall progress of mankind.

For example, where are the safe new and cost effective equivalents to the dirty and dangerous nuclear energy plants we have, and to the petrol engine and petrochemicals which are so damaging to ourselves and our environment?

These same technologies of the petrol engine and nuclear energy have been around for the last fifty or sixty years with little improvement or change, and no plausible replacements in sight?

What on earth is going on? Are the massed ranks of scientists upon this planet in numbers never before seen of any use at all?

For some people say – “ah, the new formulae and alternative engines and technologies are already there. It is only big business and ‘vested interest’ that is holding them back.”

But this theory of suppression does not quite satisfy.

For surely, if enough of academia could see them for what they are, if they really exist – like “cold fusion” etc. – then *no* greedy conglomerates or unwise governments could stand in their way, were the gossip of the good news to travel round so unstoppably.

So here, we are going to also try to wake some scientists up, as well as academics in general.

Not to the awareness of such proven or un-proven “new age technologies” however, but to the processes of their own psyche.

For example, let us take a genuine scientific genius of our age, sadly now gone, British Professor Eric Laithwaite, formerly of Imperial College, London, inventor of the linear motor.

The linear motor he invented provided an alternative to petrol driven engines, in particular, the production of trains that floated above the track and therefore were frictionless and required little or no track maintenance.

But the British government pulled out its initial investment in his “home grown” genius, of which it should surely have been theoretically extravagantly supportive, just on a purely nationalistic basis, and he was shunned by the Royal Institution itself of which he was a member, when he demonstrated to them some of his later developments.

Incidentally, a few trains similar to but likely inferior in technology to what he was developing have now been produced, such as a Chinese “Maglev” (*magnetic levitation*) train, which has been the fastest train in the world, far faster than the Japanese “Bullet” train, and feels to the passengers more like a flight on a plane than a conventional clackety-clack, bumpy train ride.

We can say it is possible the British government may have been influenced by the vested interests coming from the existing and perhaps threatened industries.

But the fact is that if the *awareness* and anger was coming from the scientific community *in general* at this suppression of his work, rather than the vilifying of a *leader* by a group of *followers*, as apparently the “prestigious” British Royal Institution did to Professor Laithwaite, no government or industry could have resisted the public uproar and resentment that would have ensued if there was general awareness of the power of the new, superior, technology.

So why didn't they?

Did they all receive a brown envelope stuffed with cash?

Or on the other hand, perhaps some kind of threatening phone call or whatever, telling them that old technology was best *if you know what's good for you?*

We don't think so. The British media is too quick at catching on to those kind of stories, such widespread bribery and intimidation could not long survive as a secret in a news hungry and shamelessly nose media country like England.

The truth is alas far *more* disturbing.

The majority of scientists and academics in general in the Western world are not only not *leaders*, they are not even worthy *followers*.

Many if not most of them have no business being in academia or science whatsoever, but being a university lecturer or a researcher is a relatively esteemed and well-paid *job* in society, and so too many people study hard those often dreary tedious books stuffed with other people's theories and ideas, and obediently learn them like a parrot to pass their exams and get their academic pips and stripes.

The examiners themselves are part of the same system, and are only interested in many cases in preserving it, and the "status quo", just as the academics in the Royal Institution who insulted and rejected Eric Laithwaite, by refusing even to write up his speech and demonstration they have invited him to give in their journal.

He "rocked the boat", and he was a "self-made man", a plain spoken, and rather blunt Lancashire man, somewhat like a glorified Fred Dibnah, for those who are aware of the nationally famous in the UK British ex-steeplejack and steam train and engineering enthusiast.

But Professor Laithwaite had this genuine genius known on one level as "commonsense", or as we have said, more accurately as *intuition*.

Such men and women start again where the teacher leaves off, and *surpass* the existing teacher. They are *the future*, and it is time for those who cling to an outmoded past to either move on, or step out of the way.

So why do they not?

Because like most of the rest of the current misguided population, they do not understand their own minds.

They do not appreciate that they have been programmed with emotions like pride to hold views and take actions which nobody in their *right* mind ever would.

Furthermore, they have not clearly understood this vital difference between *intellect* and *intuition*.

For example, we have psychologists who are Ph D's and have a list of patients with various personal problems and addictions whom they treat.

One such was once explaining to me how he worked with troubled youth, and how he was using this therapy of *intervention* to "cure" the ills of these young people.

When his wife arrived to collect him, and thus put a finish to our discussion, she groaned visibly when she observed the subject matter of our conversation, of which, she was clearly, thoroughly bored.

It was equally clear to me, that his work had become an obsession to him, which was on the one hand quite likely not effective with regard to his teenage charges, and on the other clearly damaging to his current relationship.

I heard a year or two later that the couple had split up, and he was personally in a bad way.

This guy was a Ph D in psychology.

Another acquaintance who was a trainee doctor undergoing a basic psychiatric training period, reported when he asked a consultant psychiatrist in the hospital to advise on a patient who was worrying him, “please leave me alone, I have problems of my own.”

This is not the exception, this is closer to the general case.

Numerous doctors and psychiatrists have addictions of various kinds, most visibly alcohol and various drugs, despite their psychology Ph D’s or whatever, and there is no evidence to suggest that their personal relationships are any more successful than anybody else’s.

In fact, the more likely reality is that the ordinary population who live in a simpler, less intellectual way are generally speaking happier and more successful as *human beings*.

And one of the major reasons for this assertion is that the current intellectual training and education that the average “educated intellectual” is getting, is actually contrary to the operation of this *intuition*, this spirit of genius, or in its lesser manifestation of *commonsense*.

Why?

Because as we have said, excepting the “hard sciences” (meaning *purely rational* ones, whose findings are proven as *fact*) academia is largely an *escape into abstraction*.

Let us give an example.

Suppose a man is having a problem with his neighbour, regarding some overhanging tree branches which are blocking his access to sunlight.

He knocks on the neighbour's door, and asks politely if he would mind lopping them off.

The neighbour looks at him coldly, says some rude words to him and slams the door.

Supposing he is an ordinary non-intellectual man with no psychology degrees, what does he do?

He likely either learns to live with it, moves house, or if it means that much to him he might complain to his local authority and see if he can force the man to do so by legal means.

But suppose now that he, or just as or even more likely *she*, is a university trained psychologist.

He decides this man is not quite sane. He clearly has "cognitive problems" or is suffering from some form of paranoid delusional state, schizophrenia, or has a latent psychopathic personality which is about to emerge.

For as a character in a fine young people's novel called "The Pigman" said (approximately) : "I read a book on psychology and when I read the symptoms, decided I had nearly all the conditions mentioned in it."

Which view we would all agree with, were we to do the same, as really the difference between any of us and a so called "clinical case" is only one of *degree*.

For we are all at least *a little* paranoid, *a little* unfeeling (like the "psychopath") and *a little* schizophrenic (two-faced) are we not?

But the wholly unjustified perspective that our imaginary psychologist takes towards his neighbour, is the sort of thing that happens when people who are not very wise, whose own intuition is not properly functioning, take on intellectual knowledge and even worse, get certificates to prove it.

They develop an arrogance in which they start believing they have got this superior view of life to “ordinary mortals” who have not studied in their “elite” and “privileged” classes.

But the proof of any psychological knowledge must surely be if it enables the resolution of - i.e. permanent, sustainable *cure* of - psychological problems, such as addiction, unhappiness, problems of child development, criminal tendencies, and so on.

And to date we have seen little evidence from our own considerable personal experience, research of psychological literature and reports, and long observation of the world in general that such is the case.

Moreover, the *fact* that countless psychologists and “therapists” have been through this academic training, and gained good, or even top degrees, yet still have *their own* unresolved problems of addiction and failed and disharmonious relationships, proves conclusively that these ideas are generally ineffective.

For surely, if it was merely a deficit in the learning of the psychological operative that was the problem, it could be solved with the assistance of a more highly skilled colleague or superior.

But no. We do not see such support working in practise any more than the Christian Church can control or properly support its wayward members, a number of whom have been accused of child molestation, and no doubt some of them have actually carried out the same (most likely *Catholic* priests, who being denied normal sexual relationships *may* develop sexual perversions and unbalance as a consequence).

And the principle reason for this – we do not in fact wish to focus our “attack” on psychologists in particular – is that the way of the intellectual mind in general is to deal with things in a linear, fragmented fashion, whereas the *intuitive* mind deals with things *holistically* – that is, looks at the problem or person before it as a whole, looks to the depth or essence of the person, object or situation.

As the 20th century philosopher Krishnamurti said “the solution is *in* the problem.” The difficulty as mathematicians know is often in precisely defining the question, and then the solution tends to reveal itself easily, once we have properly understood the implications of the problem or question.

The lack of understanding of this “holistic” nature of real human intelligence, i.e. *intuition*, is why as we have said, that many of those who work in artificial intelligence believe it is just a matter of time before we can duplicate human intelligence, or that is, design a computer program with a number of “sequential lines of code” or even a so called “neural net” that will “think independently.”

For example, as we have said earlier, they imagine intelligent discovery or “creative thinking” is merely a happy chance “bisociation” (coined by Arthur Koestler in “the Act of Creation”) of two here-to-fore unconnected ideas floating around in the brain, and equally therefore, that given enough time, this intelligent machine or “mechanical monkey” can type out a Shakespeare play.

But for example, Mozart tried composing by arranging lines of music in sequence using the throw of a dice. All we need report on that exercise, was that these pieces were *not* subsequently found to be his famous or successful works.

The reason is that if we study not some of the hundreds of conflicting and largely inconclusive schools of psychological thought, or focus on the mentally deficient and deranged, but rather instead look at the mentality of the genius – he who invented or *realised* the technology and so on that has *created* this modern world and its libraries and universities – such beings as Newton, Kepler, Einstein, Bach, Beethoven, Mozart, Shakespeare, Edison and so on – we find that these extraordinary beings had a *contemplative mind*, an *intuitive* mind, not one which gorges on masses of information like some kind of demented and hyperactive bookworm.

Most of these great discoveries were also made before the age of mass entertainments and TV sets and hi-fis blaring in our ears.

Life was lived at a gentler, slower pace.

There was a great deal of peace and quiet, and anyone who could be magically transported from the era they lived in such as Newton or Kepler, to experience the modern non-stop lifestyle we insanely accept as *normal*, would be thoroughly traumatised and likely almost die of shock at the contrast.

For example, take one of our modern nightclubs with its ear-splitting rock music, stroboscopic and flashing laser light display, and a pounding

throbbing beat which seems to penetrate our whole body from head to toe.

Likely a sensitive person from a few hundred years ago, accustomed to hearing only gentle music, and rarely at that, and otherwise just the sounds of Nature, suddenly entering such a “den of iniquity” and intolerable noise, would likely believe they had been transported to hell.

For example, even as recently as 1955, a London man was fined three pounds and ten shillings (a huge sum in those days) for creating in public “an abominable noise”, which turned out to be a recording of Bill Haley’s “Shake, Rattle and Roll”, now considered relatively *tame* in comparison to much of our modern pop music.

And when we examine the rhythm and tempo of music as it has developed over the past two hundred years, we see that it has become more and more powerful in the rhythm section, from the first use of kettle drums in the orchestra, for example by Beethoven, through to the pounding “trance” rhythms of today.

Even in the latter half of the last century, we can see how the beat from the gentle Glenn Miller type swing era gathered pace, to the percussive rock and roll of the fifties, and then to the still faster “hard rock” of the 60s, 70s and 80s, until finally it became the hypnotic superpowered “ghetto blaster” type pulsations of today’s disco and “rave” music.

This is obviously paralleling the disharmonious, drug ridden and violent state of society in general, but people in general fail to make or care about this connection, and ask themselves if this over loud ultra-stimulating music is really good for them even *medically* speaking, bearing in mind that listening to a music CD on one’s own hi-fi at 50 or 70 decibels or whatever, is quite a different experience and effect to hearing it at well over 100 decibels in some smoky, alcohol drenched, drug filled nightclub or wherever.

And this is a principle generally speaking - we are *hypnotised*, in a sense *bullied* into accepting all kinds of things in our lives, which again, no *sane* person ever would.

The *leader* scientist or thinker in any genuine field of human enquiry whose aim is to advance the cause of knowledge and understanding is therefore like Professor Laithwaite, not generally speaking a conformist.

This does not mean he is a bad citizen, but the hostility he inevitably receives from the insecure people who fear any kind of change, and cling staunchly for what they believe to be their personal security to the “status quo”, tends to make him *look* like one at times, as he expresses his outrage in unfortunately not sometimes the most diplomatic ways at having his greater truths and advances mocked by lesser beings, and moreover his freedom of thought and action therefore curtailed.

For example, in the case of Professor Laithwaite, he had his funding cut and was even forced to accept financial help from a private citizen who was an amateur inventor, to continue his research in later life.

For just what sort of a nation and society is it that throws its best members on the scrap heap? And so thus, surely such beings are *entitled* to be outraged to at least some degree.

That is, we find that the thinkers and scientists who don't “rock the boat”, don't challenge their professors and teachers, and thus *don't advance knowledge or understanding one iota* are awarded endless degrees and honours, and sit at the top table in the prestigious “Royal Society” dinners, but those who do are “cast out into the wilderness, where there shall be much weeping and gnashing of teeth.”

But how is it that the average academic can still feel good about themselves in the light of the true picture which says they will achieve nothing of any significance throughout their whole academic career?

The answer is, *the escape into abstraction gives the illusion of progress.*

For example, there was a wonderful British TV comedy series which ran in the UK during the 1980s which was called “Yes, Minister”, and developed into an equally if not more successful sequel called “Yes, Prime Minister” starring British character actor Paul Eddington, also now, sadly deceased.

Eddington played this basically good intentioned, but rather flawed and *vain* political character, who first was a minister, and then in the sequel was the prime minister of the UK.

Quotes and script fragments from this series can be found at various places on the Internet, for those who would care to take a look.

The genius of this series however – which surely should be made a standard part of every school or college course on politics, sociology or psychology – was to show how commonsense and progress can be utterly diverted and defeated by the escape into increasingly perverse but plausible abstraction.

The foil to Eddington's character, *Jim Hacker*, was a British “old school tie” snob who headed the civil service, called *Sir Humphrey Appleby*, played by famous “Madness of King George” actor Nigel Hawthorne, whose goal was to always maintain “the status quo.”

The acting is wonderful, and at times a “virtuoso performance”, especially from Hawthorne.

But it is the *educational value* which most concerns us here.

For example, Prime Minister Jim Hacker would decide upon some philanthropic and seemingly commonsense kind of policy such as providing free school milk for children (which incidentally *real* British PM Margaret Thatcher took away in the 1980s, earning herself the title of “Thatcher the milk snatcher”, despite allegedly being a huge fan of this particular TV series) but Sir Humphrey would give him twenty different arguments why it couldn't be done.

He would say in his smooth and smug way – “Yes, this may *seem* like sense Prime Minister, but, this is not *politically sound*. It *will* you see upset the Milk Marketing Board, whose profits will fall, because you see, the anomaly in the subsidies via the Third World extemporization policy will engender intransmutable issues, which will ultimately turn out to be irresolvable, and suggest substantive intransigencies in the economic amelioration of the G8 policy steering committee's policy on social integration in the principle features of its initiatives on social policy modification and consolidation, thus you see, inadvertently producing negative media reports, which will you see, cause *you personally*, Prime Minister, much embarrassment, and ultimately causing an inevitable decline in your ratings in the opinion polls and subsequent performance in the upcoming general election.”

And then after such an unintelligible outpouring of utter gobbledygook, as the above, Sir Humphrey would fix the prime minister with a smug, oily smile, and say “You *do* understand, don't you, Prime Minister?”

And then Paul Eddington as Jim Hacker would give a look of utter blank horror, and mutter “My god?” or “What?” and the audience would roar laughing.

And at the conclusion of each episode of the thirty minute comedy show, the Prime Minister Jim Hacker would usually end up repenting of all his good intentioned plans for change, and do exactly what Sir Humphrey wanted all along, thus preserving “the status quo.”

The *real scripts* are of course much cleverer and more convincing than our rather hastily contrived off the cuff “stab” at simulating one of Sir Humphrey’s speeches, but the point we are making is that just as Sir Humphrey frustrated Jim Hacker’s commonsense ideas and good intentions, so the misuse of the intellect in general, and the escape into abstraction of the intellectual mind, can block all the common sense measures that the *wise* would put into effect throughout society, thus preventing peace, harmony and happiness.

Thus, unwise and badly intentioned and unfair governments keep a bunch of “tame” academic experts handy, to use as “authorities” to blind with science or other specious or *sophisticated* (false, but plausible) arguments and render as insensible as Jim Hacker the population in general, so they can continue to carry out their unjust and ill considered plans with impunity.

For example, if bio-tech industries are breathing down the government’s neck to support the introduction of genetically modified plant foods or even *animals*, the government will wheel out some scientist or other on TV and say “this food is good and safe” even though ten times as many scientists may disagree on this issue.

We are not saying here, that GM food is safe or is not. We honestly confess we *don’t know* for sure.

But what seems clear to everyone, is that Nature in general and “the food chain” which is of such vital concern to the *personal survival* of all of us, is a finely balanced mechanism, and to start creating species or variations on species which never existed in the history of our planet before, surely has to be an unknown and unquantifiable risk, and therefore *should best be avoided*, unless somehow this GM food is *proven* safe, which to the best of our knowledge *it is not*.

For let us forget for a moment the argument over whether there is a God or not. But let us just consider *Nature* which none of us argues over the existence of.

Those who have *sensitivity, intuition*, like musician, philosopher, philanthropist, and medical doctor, Albert Schweitzer, for example, feel a respect for Nature, or as he put it “reverence for all living things.”

Such people – as in fact do *most* of us – apart from the “mad scientists”, industrialists and politicians – feel that for *us* to start playing around with genetic forces and causing mice to be born with human ears growing upon their backs is a living horror movie too far.

It is really, as the psychologists like to term it *psychopathic*.

The same people who are doing these things, would in many cases, happily we would suggest have conducted the savage and inhumane experiments upon the Jews and others, under the Nazi regime, if the stories we have heard are to be believed, as appears.

This is not however, any kind of excuse to persecute those who are currently engaged in this research, for society should be improved by *volunteers* who awaken to a more humane, sensitive and higher realisation, not *conscripts* who will be put before a firing squad if they refuse to obey our “orders” and “demands.”

Rather, we would be better directed in examining the genesis of the intellectual mind, and its consequences.

But if we look for the answer to such an issue in a library full of psychology and sociology books, we will find ourselves getting lost in an increasingly obscure and argued over set of “jargon” and “schools of thought.”

We are not saying there is no value in any of this material, but personal and social change has never, and *will never* be brought about by abstruse and inaccessible intellectual abstraction which are not the common property of or possession of even the non-specialist intellectual elite of the society in general, let alone the masses.

This, we must appreciate, is part of *the vanity of the intellect*, which as we have stated is by feeding on an ever more sophisticated – yet ultimately meaningless and valueless in any practical sense – set of abstractions.

For example, suppose we attempt to discuss “the maternal instinct” with a psychology Ph D.

They may say (according to their particular favoured schools of thought), the maternal instinct is a fiction and has been disproved by “research.”

And we reply – “but hang on, this seems to defy the commonsense everyday observation of how women throughout the ages have behaved. i.e. like animals in every species, with few exceptions, they devote themselves to their offspring, they protect them at risk of their own life in most cases, and we see the same in humans. Try reading a few paragraphs of Richard Dawkins’ book “The Selfish Gene” and you’ll see what the issues are in biological terms. So we *are* animals aren’t we? So how on earth can you have ‘proven’ otherwise?”

And the psychology Ph D will reply (for example):

“Yeah – but what you don’t understand is Heidelborn’s work on substantive transmogrification in subspecies of antipodean fruit flies. That’s *your* problem.”

And what can we say?

We don’t have time to read the millions of crazy research papers on such “hot and relevant” topics as “the statistical and social significance of navel variation in African culture” which come out every year, we don’t even have time to read the summaries, or “abstracts.”

So how can we know that we are not missing something in our education, that they have found tucked away in some obscure piece of research which will change the entire perspective on human life?

I will tell you how. Because if we look at *their lives*, if we look at the current utterly confused and tragic state of society as a result of all this intellectual obscurity and “obfuscation” going on, we see, Q.E.D., as they say, that it has *no practical beneficial effect*.

Because, we have placed the escape into and indulgence in intellectual abstraction into the forefront of decision making, personally, nationally and globally, and put into the background *intuition and commonsense*.

If we have personal problems, no one understands us, we are *unhappy*, we go to a doctor who gives us some “happy pills” to give us a chemical

oblivion or we go to a therapist who listens to us patiently, and says in a soothing voice:

“Yes, I understand you. You are not a bad person as they say. You are a good person who is misunderstood. You are not really an addict, and in any case it’s *a disease*. It’s nothing to be ashamed of, you aren’t responsible, and “they” (i.e. the mad scientists) are researching into it right now, to find out the genetic basis. When they find it and figure out how to cure it we’ll let you know. But in the meantime, let’s get you hypnotised and we’ll recall some traumas from your early childhood, or even from *one of your past lives*, and hopefully we’ll resolve them. It might take a few sessions. But you have to be brave, and stick with it. Rome wasn’t built in a day you know. Just keep saying those affirmations – *every day and in every way I’m getting better*. The thing is you see – *positive thinking*. We are what our minds think we are. So if you can make yourself believe you are not an addict, then the addiction goes. It’s that easy. The problem is people just don’t believe you see. That’s why you’ve got to work on the affirmations. Be sure not to miss a day. And if you are a bit uptight any time during the day, just remember your “happy phrase” that we discussed, and say it to yourself at least ten times. The “spiritual you” is the real you. You just have to believe in your spiritual self and that you are above all material things, and addictions, and when you can master that trick, you’ll be addiction free. I guarantee it. Now – when shall we book you in for your next session? And by the way, leave the cheque for \$100 at the desk please.”

Convinced yet? Sadly, *millions are*. But hopefully not *you*, and definitely not *me*.

As *Ghostbusters* actor Dan Aykroyd said in the amusing movie “The Couch Trip” at his award acceptance speech (he had been impersonating a psychiatrist, and done so well, the psychiatrist’s association gave him an award):

“And people ask me – just *why* does therapy have to take so long? (sombre pause to build up anticipation). And I tell them...there’s nothing that can be done in a short time, that can’t be done just as well in *a long time*.”

But this game of “intellectual sabotage” goes on in more arenas than psychology.

For example, a senior executive in a PLC once told me that at board meetings he attended, quite often *the stupidest idea* would gain precedence over far more intelligent and sensible ideas put forth at the meeting.

To put it politely, he called this phenomenon:

“Balderdash baffles brains.”

But you see, the balderdash wasn't fooling and baffling *him*. But it was taking in the generality of the board, and presumably even the chairman.

So he found his superior understanding, commonsense and intuition residing in a minority of one.

The loudest, or most bootlicking, or “politically cunning” operative such as our “Sir Humphrey” in the aforementioned “Yes, Minister” series, often can and *does* get their own way above more sensible and wise and reticent voices, and thus the madness not only of *King George*, but of our whole society carries on.

So these are the *symptoms*, but as we said, we are going to explain in so far as we can the *genesis* of the intellectual *non-intuitive mind*.

But we are not going to do it with quotes from learned journals or thousands of research paper buried so deep in somebody's attic or basement archives that we couldn't read them anyway for the *dust*.

As a quick aside, is anybody keeping statistics on *the number of people* who ever *read* all this endless stream of research papers on every petty little topic under the sun that our academia is daily producing?

For example, in most countries every Ph D gets a bound copy of their own thesis on their shelf, and the faculty or wherever gets one for its archives.

But does anyone ever read it thereafter?

In likely at least 95% of cases, we don't think so, correct us if we are wrong, though it wouldn't much matter in any case.

The point is – it's all just a game. An information explosion that goes nowhere.

The real research that affects us is carried out by the industrial giants, who alone have the power to finance it properly, or bring its products out into the public arena.

For example, many major papers in mathematics appear each week, and of the thousands that have appeared over even the last few decades, mathematicians admit themselves that there is no guarantee than *any of them* will ever have any *practical* significance to society or even *science in general* whatsoever.

Clearly far less likely is that any social benefit is probable in the field of the so called “social sciences.”

But our *vanity* will not let us see this, or rather will not let these researchers see this, because at the end of the day, they are looking after their salaries and their jobs.

And we do not *blame* them for that. This is not *judgmental*, as such, this is not *personal attack*, as such.

But society as a whole has to wake up to this, for we are being ruled and educated and administrated by a spirit of madness. A blind spirit of intellect which has kicked commonsense and intuition out of the ball park and into the morgue.

And when our wisdom, our intuition, our commonsense forever sleeps as if dead inside the morgue, then we too shall die.

And that’s not a “prophecy”, that’s a *logical consequence* of confused and ill-founded decision making. The evidence before our eyes is the scary, violent, crazy, unhealthy world.

And if we look at which is the scariest, most violent, crazy and unhealthy society in the world, it is probably *big city America*.

They have the most crime, the most murder, the most rape, the most child abuse, and the worst health problems excepting perhaps some currently war torn regions in other places in the world.

And guess what – we also find America has the most “social scientists” in the world, and not only are they dominating America, they are dominating the rest of the world also, except those parts cut off by

politics or language, like most of the Arab world, and some *small* parts of Africa, Asia and South America.

So as we said, we aren't going to seek the answers in one of *their* American Harvard or Yale or wherever psychology texts or research studies.

We are instead going to look at the knowledge that comes from *intuition*, from *common sense*.

And the fact is this – the average little boy or girl in our society grows up not properly cared for, not properly educated (in the true sense), not properly *loved*.

But when we say *loved* we don't mean the sentimental smothering and molly-coddling that the now “social science” reprogrammed parents imagine is correct “parenting.”

We mean, they don't grow to be healthy, self-sufficient, balanced, aware and mentally mature human beings.

The parents destroy them by neglect. Let's be specific what we mean.

Tommy or Jane aged four and a half.

“Mummy, where did I come from?”

Reply

“Darling, don't ask stupid questions. You're too young to understand.”

Wrong answer.

The right answer is e.g.

“You were born from mummy's body. Later when I have a moment I will show you a tape of animals being born on a wildlife program. Or I might even take you to the zoo or a farm and show you.”

That is not to suppose that *every* child will make such an enquiry so young.

But the point is *when a child asks questions* we have to treat *its growing intelligence and curiosity* with the greatest respect.

Example 2:

“Daddy, where does the sun go at night?”

Reply:

“Hey sugar, give me a break. I’ve been working my butt off all day, and I am just trying to rest now and enjoy this ball game.”

Wrong answer.

The right answer is:

“Hey, let’s switch the computer on, and I’ll show you a program that shows the working of the solar system. Or maybe we’ll even visit the planetarium. That will really be fun.”

Example 3:

Child asks *baby sitter* or child minder:

“Why do cats meow?”

Reply: “listen you stupid brat, I’m getting two bucks an hour so your posh folks can go to some swanky party. I ain’t no teacher, just shut up while I watch the movie. I’ll make you a peanut butter sandwich later as long as you shut up and don’t bug me again.”

Wrong answer.

Parents should not have attended swanky party. They should have devoted their lives to their child until it’s old enough to start thinking properly for and taking care of itself.

For if it gets a few more experiences like the above, it will develop a fear of strangers, and a fear of *asking awkward questions* forever.

Which is how most of us are.

We are scared to ask an “awkward question” even if it's something we desperately want to know. We don't want to upset anyone – we don't want them to howl at us, and make our security feel threatened.

So we may even go through a period, as is typical, of being called *stupid* by our parents, teachers, brothers or sisters, or school friends.

Or we just get ignored. Maybe we are a girl, and our parents make an incredible fuss of our younger or older brother, and act like we don't count, and don't really have any right to exist.

So then our little mind warps, and we have got an agenda – we think to ourselves – “*I will show them.*”

Like in “The Birdman of Alcatraz” with Burt Lancaster as a murderer, who eventually becomes an acknowledged expert on birds and gets books published.

But in the early days, when he adopts a little bird with a broken wing, the bullying prison guard says (approximately) “that boyd is just a punk like you, that won't never fly.”

So the bullies (teachers, parents, brothers, sisters, schoolmates, etc.) say we too are a little bird that won't fly. You count for nothing, and are worthy of no praise.

Then with that burning desire to right their wrong judgment on us, that spirit of “I will show them”, we study hard at some subject – it hardly matters what – and study and study and study until we pass those exams, and get that certificate, and then that degree, so they will say:

“Hey – maybe he or she is not such a bad, stupid kid after all. My kid just got a degree. I must be smart too somewhere down there. *I am proud.* He or she is ‘a chip off the old block’ after all. Let's celebrate over a drink and remind each other how great we all are.”

And then we feel proud too, and feel a little grudging love towards us, a little twinkle to us from that judgmental eye that has punished us and ignored us for so long.

But as our reputation grows, and the accolades pile up, we think ourselves far better than our parents ever were, and as we get the approval of the wider world, what our parents think no longer matters much any more.

We start seeing them for the decrepit and sad shell of a burnt out human being that most people over thirty, forty or fifty years old inevitably are.

We wonder how we could ever have considered that their opinion of us mattered much.

And we feel superior not only to them, but to the “unwashed” and “ignorant” masses who dumbly walk the streets and paddle the treadmills of the capitalist machinery which keeps our current consumer society spinning round.

When we support our government in confounding them further, in some way that is not actually in their interest, we don't much care, because we are superior beings after all, we are the elite.

We join academic circles and have our names mentioned in learned journals.

Other “gods” of academia occasionally show us some respect by quoting our work or opinion in their work. If it works well, we do the same for them and “scratch each other's backs.” If it doesn't work well, and they happened to disagree with our findings, theories or opinions, an “unholy war” and vendetta starts, and we do our best to character assassinate them or discredit their words and works at every possible opportunity.

Why?

Because they have *dared* to disagree with us. They have dared to threaten our status as “intellectual gods” far superior to the ordinary man or woman in the street.

If we can, we will have them kicked out of the association or society.

So *now* do we see that when up pops someone who actually has a brain of their own, a powerful spirit of true enquiry and some genius, like Professor Eric Laithwaite, the “Royal Society” is not pleased, but *horrified*, when he gives some demonstration of revolutionary work, which threatens all that they have taught and lectured upon, and therefore *built their reputations upon* for decades.

For if he was shown right, and we *fools*, then even our old despised parents could mock and laugh at us for living a life so proudly that in fact turned out to be an ignorant sham.

So it is clear now we don't need to look deep into some dusty old research paper to find *the truth*.

The truth is in fact *simple*.

Shakespeare – another intuitive genius, who did what hardly any author ever since has, and whom some of the “mad social scientists” now want to discredit and say is “politically incorrect” and thus forbid the teaching of in schools – said it all in simple terms *around four hundred years ago*:

All is vanity.

And because most psychologists and researchers, and intellectuals are vain, damaged people themselves – and let's be fair, as *are we all* to some degree – they won't admit that life is this simple.

They won't accept that their activity is not motivated mainly by reason and logic and the best interest of humanity, but by feelings like “bow down and acknowledge me as a wise, intelligent person, a socially superior and enlightened being.”

And of course, to have a *reasonably* big *private* office – lesser mortals rarely get them now, they get “open plan” offices laid out somewhat like tables in a school room – and a bunch of “patients with problems” coming through one's door every day saying “please help me”, as the average psychologist or therapist does, this assures them that the *illusion* is real.

They have daily or weekly meetings with their colleagues, and they all get together and talk “shop”, and assure each other that *progress* is being made.

But the reality is mostly that the patients don't get “cured”, they get drug treatment programs, or else they just heal naturally over time from say a traumatic event like a car crash or surviving some other disaster, whilst the therapy goes on, thus *giving the illusion* that the therapist actually did something other than listening patiently, which admittedly *is* a genuine service in these days when so many people have only therapists and psychiatrists whom they can trust as confidantes, when at one time they used to have *friends*.

But we see, when we have a society based on *vanity*, rather than *community*, then society is an inevitable man-against-man, woman-

against-woman battle, and therefore it is unlikely that apart from those immediate people who *need us*, any of us actually *can* have true friends.

As great a tragedy in all this, is not only does the activity of the intellectual damage society, by raising irrelevant, confusing or damaging ideas – at the expense of intuition and commonsense coming from the wise and the natural feelings and instincts of the general population – is that they damage *themselves* thereby.

We are not conducting any kind of witch hunt here however.

We are merely seeking to save the present generation – in so far that we can, without self-aggrandizing delusions, not truly knowing how much effect we can have – from any more misery, and hopefully the future generations also, who then may not need to suffer like the present one.

There must be a place for *everyone* in society. So what if we have pricked the conscience and awareness, and *intuition* of any particular current intellectual and academic with our words?

What should they do?

They have their jobs and status to protect?

Can they possibly confess to themselves and the society that their jobs are relatively valueless?

In the case of psychology or psychiatry itself, they might end up in “therapy” themselves, mightn’t they, were they to “blow the whistle”, and “fly from the coop”, being conducted upon them by the ones who refuse to have the status quo challenged and will go to virtually any length to see that it is not, for example, by kicking the renegades out of the club?

Well, we have a few suggestions for them.

Firstly, at the end of the day (or *lifetime*), there is no satisfaction in anything else but being *true to yourself*.

It is from *that mentality* that the intuition flows.

What first will seem as awful fear and pain (we mean *mental pain*, not physical) will later flow into realisation on one level or another.

We shouldn't imagine our old colleagues or associates or even our own family and friends will understand, because usually they *won't*.

If we say – I am quitting the office, and going to be a gold prospector in Borneo, or used to be a handsomely paid psychologist and now we want to make wooden furniture like Harrison Ford, except unlike him, that's all we will have to survive on, likely the wife or friends or colleagues will be condemning us as having lost our senses.

And does that not just prove the trap we are all caught in?

If we dare to be *ourselves*, our social status and security and relationships will quite likely be severely threatened.

That is, if we attempt to use our real *intelligence*, and have our own “innervisions” as per Stevie Wonder's album title, we will be the subject of attack.

In a truly civilised society, we would be *encouraged* to be ourselves, but now, not just the smart and intellectual, but *everybody* is getting crushed.

Let's quote a verse or two of a Randy Newman song to make the point, from “It's Money That Matters”, a nice track, with guitar collaboration from Mark Knopfler of Dire Straits:

Of all of the people that I used to know
Most never adjusted to the great big world

I see them lurking in book stores
Working for the Public Radio
Carrying their babies around in a sack on their back
Moving careful and slow

(Chorus)
It's money that matters
Hear what I say
It's money that matters
In the USA

***All of these people are much brighter than I
In any fair system they would flourish and thrive
But they barely survive
They eke out a living and they barely survive***

When I was a young boy, maybe thirteen
I took a hard look around me and asked what does it mean?

So I talked to my father, and he didn't know
And I talked to my friend and he didn't know
And I talked to my brother and he didn't know
And I talked to everybody that I knew

(they said)

It's money that matters, hear what I say
It's money that matters in the USA
It's money that matters
Now you know that it's true
It's money that matters whatever you do"

Well, we would go a little further than Randy Newman, and say it is *money and status and social acceptability*. Money alone won't necessarily give us the worship and respect we seek, except from the obviously greedy, needy and larcenous.

But there is a guy – Randy Newman – who had nothing much to lose or gain from anything he did by that stage in his career, whose words more or less confirm all that we have been saying.

When we have made *the wrong* choice of way of life, as we grow older, we grow more cynical, we lose the hopes and dreams of our youth which we by then regard as unreal fantasies.

We have a position and identity to protect. We don't rock the boat, and fear and attack anyone who does, like an animal threatening those who would intrude into its territory.

So can we really tell an intellectual who in horror has his or her intuition suddenly awaken what to do?

Not really. They'll have to figure it out for themselves.

Everybody of adult age is ultimately responsible for themselves.

All we can say, is that the only journey really worth the trouble in life, is the journey to becoming a real human being, and when most of the world is against that right now, it is going to be a quite painful journey for most of us.

But there are compensations, mostly on *the inside*, though these can be on the outside too.

For example when we break through the fog of fear and preconceptions which is normally dominating the mind of the average intellectual and academic, and our intuition is freed thereby, we will have increasing access to a facility and faculty of *true understanding* that we never had before.

Let's not imagine for a second that because we are old we are finished, and that we can't grow *mentally* and *creatively* any more.

The current author is well out of his youth, yet makes fresh discoveries that hold personal significance for him, more or less *every day*.

Perhaps *you* could be the one to retake up the work of Professor Laithwaite or one of the other "cranks" who claim to offer the world something that the current society needs but lacks.

The truth *is* most definitely out there, but the authorities aren't necessarily going to help or support us, so *we are going to have to discover it for ourselves*.

Next in our study of what is "true intelligence" we are going to look in more detail at some of what happens to those who would try to use their *natural born intelligence*, and how society is currently trying to stop them, seemingly at all costs.

Chapter Six – How Society is Repressing Your True Intelligence

In a well known and loved British comedy TV series, about a motley group of mainly middle aged men and ex-old soldiers, who were deemed unfit for military service in the second world war, and thus became by default what was known as “the Home Guard”, we have a good illustration of how intelligence is suppressed by society.

Of course Groucho Marx said “military intelligence is a contradiction in terms” long before this TV series, but the exploits of this hotchpotch of pretend soldiers proved the point most conclusively, as well as giving us a good insight into the current human condition.

In particular, the local bigwig, the pompous bank manager, Mr Mainwaring (mysteriously pronounced as “mannering”), though totally unsuited to a position of military command, became the captain of the group, and weekly displayed his incompetence in a whole variety of hilarious ways.

But his *authority* we see, had its compensations.

In each episode, he would find some excuse to tell the only young member of the troop - who somehow had evaded military service likely on the grounds of mental feebleness - that he was “a stupid boy”, in a dismissive manner, which “catchphrase” would bring the house down with laughter from the viewing audience.

But in actuality, to call *anybody* stupid, is really a very great social crime indeed, especially a child.

For as Forrest Gump said “Stupid is, as stupid does.”

Or put differently, if we call someone stupid often enough – which understand, might at the wrong moment only take *once* – they end up feeling like it, and worse, even *acting like it*.

But imagine for a moment that some aliens landed on our planet with huge skulls and brains several times the size and complexity of our own.

They might be able to compute things in their heads which we can only do with the fastest modern computer, they might laugh at our science as

primitive and immature, when they can do interstellar space travel with ease, and so on.

If such test scores were possible, even their dullest children might score one hundred points above even our greatest intellect on an IQ test.

In comparison to *them* we would *all* be seen as “stupid” boys or girls.

And how are we to determine that such vastly superior races of beings do not exist elsewhere in the galaxy or universe, or even in our own solar system who may somehow be hidden from our view, by virtue of their far advanced technology and mental or physical powers?

So the truth is, that *none* of us are so smart, that we should get so vain about it, but unfortunately we still like to mock those whom we believe are not as clever as ourselves, and call them “dummies”, “idiots”, “blockheads”, “half-wits” and so on.

In different countries, quite often whole racial groups are attacked.

For example, in the UK, for generations, it has been the *Irish* who have been labelled as “stupid” by *the English* despite a vast amount of evidence to the contrary, for example, George Bernard Shaw, Sir William Rowan Hamilton (mathematics), James Joyce (author of *Ulysses*), Paul McCartney (who is at least 50% Irish), President Kennedy, and a great many others have shown.

As England however has filled over the last fifty years with so many other more potentially scary races, the racial hatred has been largely diverted elsewhere.

So the repression of intelligence and the human spirit is so systematic at certain times and in certain places, that even *an entire racial group* can be condemned as stupid.

So why does society want to repress *your intelligence*?

Well, let us consider the famous Hans Christian Andersen tale of “The Emperor’s New Clothes.”

The wily salesman sell the emperor his “new clothes”, on the cunning basis that the material is so fine that only the wisest and noblest and most worthy members of his society and kingdom can see them.

So as usual, out of *vanity*, the Emperor insists that *by definition* he can see them, as being the highest, noblest person in the land; and of course all the “nobles” and “courtiers” claim exactly the same, though of course undoubtedly they decide that the stupid common people will not be able to do so.

And is this analogy also not exactly applicable to the “intellectual new clothes” with which the academics clothe themselves as we have pointed out in the preceding chapters?

But the problem is, what happens when the little boy says there are no clothes, the Emperor is “in the altogether”, is naked?

Does the Emperor also say “stupid boy” like our rotund and pompous buffoon, Captain Mainwaring, from the “Dad’s Army” TV series?

Well, we are sure he *would*, but in the story at least, it is too late. For the *common people* see that the Emperor is naked, and they roar with laughter.

And we are not sure quite what happens to the cunning salesmen, when the Emperor finally sees the same is *true*, but we imagine they leave town “just as fast as their legs can carry them.”

And there must certainly be this fear too in those fakers in our modern age, who know in their hearts they are holding positions of power and responsibility in society that they really oughtn’t to, and claiming to know and understand things that they really do not.

And thus they fear “the little boy” who will blow their cover, although we may not realise, they are terrified of outspoken people like maybe *us* who might just say things that will bring out into the open matters they would rather keep well hid.

So they *go on the attack*.

This is why it is often – not the weak, but *the strong* who are the subjects of bullying. Because the weak are no threat to anybody’s “empire”, anybody’s “regime.”

But the strong person who can see into the dark corners of society and the individual heart and mind and bring what he sees out into the light might overthrow the evil empire, and so he or she has *got to be stopped*.

And thus, because *everyone* has got *some* of that ability to see, we are conscripted into this conspiracy of silence by various means, and widespread bullying is one of them, because that makes people scared to be “different”, to be “individual”, that is *to be themselves*

So we have a society of people who in theory all want to be themselves, but in practice can't and don't dare to be.

What a sad and awful state of affairs!

But it's hard to break this “cabal”, this “conspiracy of silence”, because when there are large groups of people all lying to themselves and one another, and only a few “renegades” who are willing to speak or point out the truth, it is rather like the well known psychological experiment, in which nineteen of a line of maybe twenty “plants” are all asked some question, e.g. is this object I am holding green or blue? – and the “plants” are all told to *say* “green” when they know it is really blue, and then the twentieth in the line feels compelled to say *green* also, even though the evidence of their own eyes tells them the total contrary.

Otherwise they fear to be labelled “heretics” and maybe get “burned at the stake” to whatever extent that is allowed in modern society, which though in the end may mean only being kicked out of the association or royal society or whatever, may have the effect of *destroying their life as they know it*.

Thus, is the conspiracy of silence *about the truth* maintained.

Therefore we may have to be very brave in some ways, if we want to try to change this mess.

But the question we would have doubters ask themselves, is – how long can the truth really be suppressed?

For example, the fearsome power of the Roman Church and “Holy Inquisition” eventually crumbled before the astronomical facts which proved the earth was round (i.e. more or less spherical) and that the earth and other planets rotated around the sun, rather than the other way round, and so on.

It may take time, but this wall of concealment of the individual mind from the broader light of truth must inevitably crumble and fall, as has been shown time and time again over history.

But even if all we dare do is whisper the truth, as long as we all keep whispering, eventually the whisper will turn into a *roar* and then the Walls of Jericho or wherever else will come tumbling down, and “set the people free.”

We all want to be free to think, and speak and in so far as is fair to our neighbours, to act and express ourselves and our feelings of love as freely as we can.

But in *this society* few of us can get that freedom, so we escape into abstraction.

Most of us live in some level of fantasy, whether in books, movies or whatever, or if we are more *intellectual* we write books or research theses and try and prove to ourselves and others what clever chaps or chappesses we are, and get a position in society of which we can be *proud*.

We are then a *success*. And then we ask proudly to anyone else we may meet, whilst our degree certificates, caps and gowns hang on the wall: who are *you*?

So we settle for pride, vanity, a nice flat and car and the ability to look down on others who didn't get our degrees, and we feel *superior*.

When we feel a bit of guilt or anxiety about what our lives really mean, or why our relationships never seem to be working out quite as planned, we reach for a bottle, a drug, or a new lover.

The media society doesn't talk about all this, because they are mostly all playing the same game. Anybody who starts speaking like this, i.e. the truth – they shout down, they refuse to publish the books of.

And so not just one little human being, but all we little human beings – because we all *are* little in the grander scheme of things, the Universe, from the king, pope, emperor and prime minister and billionaire downwards – we stay locked in a prison of fear, vanity, ignorance and silence.

The media feeds us endless dumbed-down *sensational* pop music and TV and movie fantasies, which thrill and excite us and keep our minds off the bigger questions, for example, about how we got into this state of fear, suppression of our true selves and slavery in the first place.

Just watch on a TV chat show how when someone starts talking seriously and discussing these big issues *vital to us all*, they get shouted down, mocked, diverted and so on.

People on such shows are constantly monitoring themselves and each other, mentally asking themselves *do I dare say this? Do I dare let the other person say this?*

As in the George Orwell story, *1984*, Big Brother's greatest and ultimate success is that he has got inside our heads.

The hero of the piece, Winston Smith, who is really as much of an anti-hero in his ultimate lack of heroism, just an ordinary human being really, says to himself – “they can torture me, beat me, get me to say anything they wish, but I will still have the possession of what I really think and feel and believe in that so many cubic centimetres of private space within my head.”

But in the novel, he realises he has lost that too, he realises he has been taken over by Big Brother, and he dies loving Big Brother, as he is shot in the back of the head.

The question we have to ask ourselves, now that “Big Brother” and his counterpart “Big Sister” have got into the private space inside our head, leaving us scared to say what we think and feel, or let others say it also, is - *will we die without any real identity or spirit of our own, but only loving these false idols and torturers also?*

Chapter Seven - Intelligence and Hypnosis

In the Sherlock Holmes movie “The Green Lady”, Holmes’ indefatigable, and loyal but somewhat dull assistant, Doctor Watson, played wonderfully by Nigel Bruce, cries “poppycock!” when Holmes takes him to the “Mesmer Society Club” to see a demonstration of *hypnosis*.

Watson claims it can only work on a “feeble, uneducated mind”, but within minutes a club member inveigles him to take part in an experiment, and he rapidly succumbs and wakes up a short time later in horror, to find that he has one shoe and sock missing, but doesn’t remember taking either off.

The point we are making here is, that the so-called intellectual member of our society is inclined to take the same attitude towards hypnosis of any kind, believing that he or she is in total possession of his or her own mind.

Many intellectuals refuse to “believe in” the validity and reality of hypnosis, and of course the movie we have mentioned is certainly no proof whatsoever in itself.

But we are not going to debate here the validity or invalidity of the “formalized” methods of “on the couch” hypnosis, because we are concerned with the much broader and *undeniable* issue of “mind control” in terms of even the simple issues of media advertising.

It is perhaps worth mentioning that as early as 1921, a “Behaviourist” psychologist, J B Watson, whose take on psychology was “controlling human beings via their minds”, after being dismissed from his university post was recruited on the basis of his mind control ideas by J Walter Thompson, which today is a huge international advertising agency with outlets all over the world.

Thus we see already the clear connection between advertising and mind and behaviour control, which was explored in considerable detail in Vance Packard’s famous 1957 work *The Hidden Persuaders*.

But we intellectual people who like the fictional Dr Watson believe we cannot be hypnotised – i.e. have our minds controlled, and our wills perverted to someone else’s plans – are ready for the advertiser’s tactics

we imagine, which can only successfully enslave the masses, but surely, not such highly *sophisticated and educated* people as *we*?

But unfortunately mind control does not depend on someone's intellect. It depends upon *our emotional and psychological vulnerability*.

That is, for example, the intellectual man can be conned just as easily by a pretty face and the charming patter that flows from it as the average man - her "charm" and "sex appeal" bypasses all bands of the IQ spectrum and takes control of him using other means - his *instincts, emotions and desires*.

The reality is that freedom of thought and action does not depend upon how high we score on the Binet or some other test of so called "IQ", but upon our willingness and ability to see life exactly as it is, *however much it hurts, frightens or tempts us*.

High IQ people are no less likely to play national lotteries than low IQ people, unless of course they are so smug and wealthy they don't actually feel they need the money.

It doesn't bother us too much that the chances of winning are infinitesimal, because we are controlled not by logic, but *by fear and desire*.

For example, in this society, which one of us can really say we have got "security"?

Which one of us feels that our job will always certainly be there, that we are "made for life", that we will not one fateful day be supplanted by some younger, smarter person, or if we run a business, that we will never be ousted by some bigger, stronger competitor, or receive some fatal damage to our personal or business reputation and go bust?

Or on the other hand, is any one of us really so *certain* that our lady or man friend will not someday stray or desert us, and rock our world in an equally shocking and traumatic way?

The whole of modern life *in the West* is now structured to threaten our security ever more, right down to our very real fears of not having a pension and how we will be treated generally in our increasingly helpless old age.

And that is also how we are persuaded to go to war after all isn't it? – by threats to *our security*, by playing with our *fears* and *desires*.

First they (like any good advertising team) *paint us a picture* of the monstrous “enemy” and what it will do to us if it isn't stopped.

That is, they put us into a state of *fear*.

Then next, they launch a “glorious” military campaign, in which many “heroes” will be made, and create in us a *desire* for victory.

We cheer and applaud our TV sets as Saddam Hussein's statue is toppled, or whichever other “dictator” the West has sought fit to remove *on our behalf, for our benefit*, so they have told us *repeatedly, hypnotically*.

UK “Respect” party MP, George Galloway is currently under investigation for allegedly profiting from Iraqi oil, though no proper evidence has ever been brought against him on what appears to be an old, dead issue now, and seems merely to be motivated by him being a thorn in the side of the current Blair government, due to his persistent anti-War campaigning, and concern for the fate of the Iraqi and Muslim people.

In his defence he recently said.

“This is all a tissue of lies, *and a lie doesn't become a truth through repetition.*”

But unfortunately, that is *exactly* how propaganda – i.e. hypnosis – works, and the worrying fact is that it *does* work on most of us, the repeated lie *does* start to appear like the truth to most of us, in the absence of any hard facts to the contrary, which in most cases, we are simply not in any position to obtain about national or international matters, let alone the goings on of our neighbours down the road.

All we get is *rumours, gossip*, because we simply *were not there* to witness the events ourselves.

So the technique is that we tell a single lie about our “enemy”, the person or country we wish would either “behave itself”, shut up or disappear, and then we repeat it over and over through different channels, and then others unwittingly start repeating it as well, and when the rumours/gossip seem to be coming from so many *different sources* – even though all the

stories originated from exactly the *same, single source* – we, the public, think there must be truth in it, we think *there's no smoke without fire*.

But if the “liar” in question is a rich and powerful being or a government, it doesn't need a network of rumourmongers, it has the powerful trumpet of the mainstream media to repetitively blast its propaganda at us, and because most of us succumb to the *authority* of the media or the government, we easily believe whatever they want us to believe.

For example, they tell us despite the “terrorist” bombs that the world is now a “safer place”, and if we argue that it doesn't feel that way, they say “ah yes, but you don't see what would have been your fate had dictator X or Y not been removed”, or else “it was our moral duty to give country X or Y ‘democracy’ ”, and so on.

As the dead bodies pile up, the denials and evasions increase, and are dealt with best by showing us as little news of what is actually going on in these war zones as possible, and filling our minds (i.e. *hypnotising* us) with all sorts of other exciting, fun and non-scary things, like the latest antics of the vastly overpaid celebrities whom we are all taught (*hypnotised*) to worship, again by endless *repetition* of the images and actions of them filling our minds.

David Icke calls the technique of the authorities controlling us through fear “problem-reaction-solution”, and it is surely a good way of putting it.

He further points out that, at times a misguided or evil government or other authority will even deliberate *create* the problem, such that when we *react* to it (and typically *overreact*) with fear, horror, judgment and so on, and demand “something must be done”, the authorities are then able to carry out some new policy or introduce some new law which we never otherwise would have accepted, had they not created the “set-up” scenario to make us do so.

Typically the law or policy they introduce centralizes more power in an ever more privileged and powerful few who rule over the many with an ever firmer grip thereby.

The conspiracy theorists then of course capitalize on this idea, and say that virtually every bad thing that happens – e.g. the death of Princess Diana, which also is currently undergoing a fresh investigation – is some kind of cover up which has a “hidden agenda”, and of course, unless we know the facts personally, we cannot say whether they are right or wrong.

So this is all *hypnosis* and we are mostly all “buying it.”

We accept the often baseless “evidence” that makes us afraid – like about non-existent weapons of mass destruction poised to strike us any moment – and equally we accept the glitzy and enticing entertainments and distractions they place before us, to keep our minds off the scary big issues and the global power games.

All the doctors and dentists and most of the university professors have all got their DVD players and look forward to the latest movie releases.

The highbrow types favour opera, Shakespeare remakes and so on, and the lowbrows get Tom Hanks in gritty but photographically stunning movies like “Saving Private Ryan” or else teasing, pleasing movie stars like Rene Zellweger in 21st century neo-musicals like “Chicago.”

The subtlest hypnosis is more by use of fiction than trying to blare facts and “hard sell” pitches at us, which as Doctor Watson rightly said can by this stage of our social evolution only work on a weak, ill informed mind.

The masses have their soap opera dramas by which they can be manipulated into seeing what seems like real life, but isn't, to be real, and representative of how people do, and more importantly *should* behave.

It is high time that soap operas were exposed for the pieces of either deliberate or unwitting *social engineering* that they really are, forever setting bad and unwise examples of behaviour before the masses in a hypnotic fashion, causing them to carry out real life negative behaviours which damages themselves and the whole community.

For example, the bullying scenarios portrayed in series like *Prisoner Cell Block H*, which encourage girls and women to have a tough and mean bullying “gang mentality”, or the promiscuous antics of those in series like *Sex in the City*, *Desperate Housewives* and countless other similar dramas, which if emulated in real life will merely cause untold human misery, and in particular the destruction of families and consequent traumatising and neglect of children.

But though the intellectual may not be conned into significantly changing their lives due to watching soap operas (as most intellectuals simply *don't* watch them), or into buying the *specific* product the glossy advertisement shows him or her, he or she is hypnotically taking in *the background*

props in what he or she sees. He or she is being hypnotised despite any IQ rating into *buying into a lifestyle*.

For underneath the proud intellectual achievements, there is still a fragile emotional creature inside the shell of confidence in one's numerical and verbal reasoning prowess, degree certificates and society memberships.

We all have these awfully difficult and complicated feelings of need for "love" and "acceptance." Above all, we do not want the "opposites" of those things i.e. *hate* and *rejection* directed at us.

So whilst we may not be influenced to buy any *particular* product, we are "educated" on how the "successful member of society" is supposed to live and behave.

The images we have in our heads have been implanted there so consistently and effectively that they spring to mind *immediately*.

We see in our minds the car, the clothes and the homes of the "quality member" of society. They eat in a restaurant, not a burger bar, they wear silk or cashmere, not polyester or nylon, they drink fine wines or spirits, not vulgar pints of beer, and they go skiing, yachting or safairing, not on supervised package tours.

We *know* what a real "success" looks and lives like.

He looks and lives like *Thomas Crown*, in either the Steve McQueen or Pierce Brosnan version of the movie.

In our age of disrespect and informality, he is one of the few beings left whom people might legitimately address as "sir", and of course in our "woman liberated" age he has his female equivalents who drive equally fine cars and wear the most fashionable clothes, and feel it is equally their right to be addressed as "madam."

We are all tricked by these constant suggestions, these "hidden persuaders", into obsessing on our social status, and being made to purchase all the props we need to belong to whatever group we wish to be regarded as members of.

We may have to labour far harder than we would wish to afford these props, because those who seek to "mind control" us not only don't care how hard we must work, and thereby damage ourselves in that process,

but when we finally crack up healthwise, or psychologically under the pressure of stress and depersonalization, they have got an equally huge compendium of “solutions” – some medical, some not – to what happens to us when we have succeeded in destroying ourselves under the hypnotic agenda of their “motivational therapy” (i.e. *purchase and be happy*).

The *real agenda* of government and the power brokers of our society is well demonstrated in the John Carpenter “cult movie” *They Live*, as is also demonstrated the stubborn difficult one has in trying to make the mass of people see their hypnotic state, which by definition is almost impossible, as hypnosis *implies* unawareness, ignorance, mindlessness.

And this hypnosis of us, carried out almost entirely by the media is a never ending process. Every day we are told not only what to buy, but what to think, what to feel, what to be, because we are continually confronted with images of what others feel and think and are doing, and we feel compelled to join in.

If on television tomorrow was announced that the leading members of our society had decided that pogo-sticking, nude yoga or whatever was the most important thing to do in our leisure time, huge numbers of us would join in, no matter how crazy and ridiculous it seemed.

First we would shake our heads, and momentarily think “this is stupid, this is crazy”, but they would first show us images of the “leaders” and “authorities” in celebrity society doing it, you know - Jennifer Anniston, Madonna and the equally feministic Nicole Kidman, or their male counterparts Tom Cruise, Brad Pitt, Guy Ritchie and so on - and think up increasingly sophisticated arguments – just like in the Emperor’s New Clothes story – to persuade us that such is the way to behave.

For example, millions of people go to rock concerts and blaringly loud discos, where one can’t even hear what the person next to you is saying, merely because it is what everybody else is now doing.

We have already mentioned the psychological experiment in which twenty people in a line are told to identify the colour of a blue object, and when the first nineteen (“plants”, told to lie) say it is green, invariably the twentieth (innocent person, unaware of the “conspiracy”) will say green also, despite the evidence of their senses totally to the contrary.

This “peer pressure” now directed to us all via every channel of social activity is absolutely staggering.

As David Icke also points out, we are kept prisoner and thus *policed* principally by our fellow woman and man, who are ready to judge and condemn us, should we *dare* to break with the current whimsical and ephemeral social fashions.

Thus, we are all absolutely *terrified* to be different than the next person *in our group*, yet we laughably say we celebrate our “freedom” and prize our “individuality.”

The few people who are truly successfully and arguably shameless in celebrating their individuality, who deliberately rebel against the general trend, like for example Rasputin in early 20th Century Russia, or David Icke in our present era, are regarded as public menaces and feared by people in general.

Not so many generations ago they burnt witches and persecuted and threatened with torture scientists who dared to defy the Biblical version of creation.

The sanctions are now usually only “social leperhood”, but such ostracization can be nearly as bad as being burnt at the stake for some, who not infrequently decide to kill themselves after enough public mockery and character assassination has made them feel they have socially speaking passed the point of no return, and their “social identity” will never recover.

But the imprisonment in social fashions, such as the kind of holiday one takes, the clothes one must wear and the hobbies one must have to be “socially acceptable” in whatever class one seeks to belong to, pales into insignificance beside the control exerted over us in terms of our beliefs about religious, philosophical, psychological, medical, sexual and scientific issues.

Somebody somewhere decides what you or I are *allowed* to do, say and even *to think* about every issue under the sun. Now if this isn't mind control, please tell us what is?

For example, the average Westerner one hundred or two hundred years or more ago grew up with the indoctrinated belief in a God in the sky, who was his creator and absolute judge, and would decide after his life was over whether he would enter Heaven or Hell, or arguably even worse,

some kind of indefinite “purgatory” where he might undergo any amount of purificatory torture until he was deemed fit to enter “Heaven.”

This theoretical average man however did not make the decision to believe this for himself. He was, as ever, just meekly obeying the status quo, or else he would have accusations levelled at him, and made to feel ashamed and afraid.

And now of course, the pendulum has swung in the totally opposite direction.

Now in much of the West he must *disbelieve* in this same God, or else he is equally going to have shameful accusations and mockery targeted at him, and equally neither now has he made this assessment for himself, but has been persuaded and “programmed” (i.e. hypnotised, mind-controlled) to do so by the current “authorities” – e.g. Professor Richard Dawkins of “The Blind Watchmaker” fame.

Let us define hypnosis therefore in the following way as opposed to the *lie on the couch* or *watch the swinging pendulum* definition.

We are saying, that *hypnotic suggestions* are constantly being fed into the average person’s mind since the time they can understand words, and that - *hypnosis* is the process of getting the mind to accept an idea that it has not come to independently by a process of reasoning, or for that matter, persuading the mind to carry out suggestions which again it would not cooperate in doing, if it were to assess the suggestions with a rational, properly informed and normally aware consciousness.

Hypnosis is in practice generally either a form of mental bullying or seduction.

As we said, the pretty girl or attractive woman who talks us into buying something we would not otherwise have bought, had we just looked at it in cold print and assessed it rationally, is a hypnotist.

Equally is the teacher or the priest who tells us *convincingly* all about God when we are five years old, though he likely has no personal experience of such a being in a direct way.

Because in each case *their suggestions bypass our reason*.

Watching young children express their opinions to some interviewer frequently produces hilarious jumbled and half-formed ideas, which obviously did not ever originate in the child's own mind, but demonstrate to us clearly that he or she is learning already at such a young age that the thing to say is *what you think people want to hear*, in accordance with what you have already been told is the right thing to think and say.

The common factor in all these examples, as we have indicated, is that we have taken on ideas or beliefs or carried out actions that *bypassed our reason*. We never mentally engaged in properly assessing the suggestions and ideas put before us.

As we have been at some pains to point out, the use of *authority* is a major part of this.

After all, even in conventional "lie on the couch" hypnosis we are by implication led to believe the hypnotist is an "expert", and therefore an "authority" who knows what we do not, and therefore we become passive and submissive.

We imagine unrealistically that no idea could be put into our minds without our knowledge or consent, but the reality is that since we were knee high, literally thousands of such ideas have been placed in our mind in exactly such a way.

We accept *the authority of the scientist, the expert*, for example.

We believe for instance that the earth has a crust that averages about 25 miles thick, and a molten iron core, though we have no way of verifying either of these "facts" personally, and that the sun is 93 million miles away, on the scientist's say so, which again, unless we are scientists ourselves we have no way of determining whatsoever.

We believe Mount Everest is the highest mountain in the world, at 29,028 feet (or thereabouts) but again, we only know what we have been told and cannot possibly determine such a figure ourselves.

Many of us *now* believe that fatty meat is bad for us, but green vegetables are good for us, but again, these views were not necessarily believed in the past, and we are just following the views of the "authorities" and "experts", mindlessly accepting these ideas and telling our friends and neighbours they are wrong if they don't see things as we have been programmed to do.

Food issues however tend to affect us more physically than emotionally, but at times this general media and interpersonal hypnosis and bullying becomes so powerful and against our natural instincts that it creates a serious problem in our lives, both individually and as a society.

For example, we are constantly fed the idea from the media that sex is good for us, a major goal in life, if not *the* major goal, whether or not our subsequent life experience teaches this to be true.

But this perspective would we suggest seem to be *very far indeed* from *natural* sex activity, as we perceive it even in other members of the animal kingdom.

For to continually stimulate us with ideas of sex is we would suggest like the experiment that has been done by stimulating the “pleasure centre” in the brain of rats.

Electrodes were attached to a rat’s brain, and a handle was placed in its cage, and each time the rat depressed the handle this would electrically stimulate its brain and give it “pleasure.”

So what do we think the outcome was?

The outcome was that the rat (any one of many) made this connection between the pressing of the handle and the pleasure it received by the scientist’s electrical stimulation of its brain, and continued to press this handle repeatedly until it fell down in exhaustion and was unable to depress the handle any more.

And almost unbelievably, when the rat was revived, it returned to the handle again, and repeated its behaviour pattern of *compulsively* depressing the handle until it again fell down in exhaustion.

So how can we save the poor little rat from such a dubious “death by pleasure”?

Of course we simply take those electrodes out of its “pleasure centre”, take it out of the cage and let it scurry away into its natural environment, in which it will have to wait for an opportunity to mate when the season comes, just like any other rat *in Nature*.

So likewise, it seems only sensible that we should disengage ourselves from this particular aspect of public hypnosis in so much as we

realistically can, and observe only a healthy *moderation* in our sex activity.

This is true of addictions to *sensual pleasures* in general.

As always, we find the *idea* we hold of things we don't actually have experience of turns out to be very different from *the reality*.

So some would say, we are only animals in any case, so what is all the fuss about, we are surely not better than they, what does it matter how we behave as long as it's our "free choice"?

Of course we are all at least fifty percent animal, and those like evolutionist biologist, Professor Dawkins, would no doubt say *one hundred percent* so, and that such an alleged *fact* is nothing to be ashamed of.

Not that we wish to conduct any kind of hate campaign against Professor Dawkins, who appears to us to be a decent, moralistic but misguided man, as indeed seemingly was Charles Darwin himself in many respects.

Yet humans do many other thing apart from having sex, going to the toilet and eating, which animals do not, such as creating beautiful art, music, architecture, science, literature and systems of law and spiritual thought, which surely separate us from the rest of the animal kingdom.

It is in *that* sense, it is suggested we are only perhaps fifty-percent animal, as we do at least fifty-percent *something else* in those activities listed.

So surely the essential factor in distinguishing ourselves – should we desire to – from the rest of the animal kingdom, is in maintaining our own self-respect and respecting others.

This would suggest that we do not unduly exhibit or inflict our private animal nature upon them, whether it be of a heterosexual or homosexual nature, as equally neither should we embarrass others with their unavoidable bodily functions or unnecessarily draw their attention to our own.

Clearly, the mass media bear as much or more responsibility than the individual on this account, yet again, seem to be increasingly ignoring their arguable *duty* in their ceaseless quest for ratings.

But surely none of us can have *absolute* freedom, because if allowed free rein, our desires when put into practice, such as an “inappropriate interest” in our neighbour’s wife or daughter, husband or son, would offend and interfere with the freedom of others, and not infrequently have violent and in some cases even *fatal* consequences for ourselves.

So freedom we find can *logically* only lie in *limiting* our desires, because there is otherwise no possibility of a *peaceful* society, and how can we possibly imagine we are free, if we have no peace?

But we see, that over time, the mass media has *hypnotised* us into believing that “freedom” is to let free rein to all our desires, it is to do whatever we like.

As Aleister Crowley said:

“Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the law.”

Yet, though they called Aleister Crowley “the Beast” and “the wickedest man in the world”, it is the philosophy that most of us have been persuaded to follow to a greater or lesser extent ever since.

And of course, that *persuasion* is *hypnosis*, in the simple clear and undeniable meaning of the word – that is, it is the continual repetition of images and suggestions coming first from the media and then in consequence reflecting back from our fellow human beings, which *take root in our minds* and tell us to “*do whatever turns you on, baby*” – and the more that it shocks our parents, teachers or the other “squares” in the pompous smug and utterly hypocritical “straight” society, the better.

And this practice of hypnosis – that is of programming us *by suggestion, persuasion, temptation and shock* with beliefs and desires we have never properly exercised our own minds and thoughts upon – is far more widespread than that practised by big business through its advertising campaigns, and Hollywood through its simulations of reality, which were never reality before they made us make “reality” that way.

For it extends into almost all areas of life, including science, politics, religion, psychology, romantic and sexual relationship, and “spirituality”, as we shall see in later chapters.

Finally, in this relatively brief survey of the hypnotic techniques being used on us all – the point is, once we have started spotting them, we can and *should* therefore, work the rest out for ourselves – we will discuss another form of hypnosis used by advertisers and media people amongst others.

It is *hypnosis by shock*.

That is, defined alternatively, hypnosis is *the enforcement upon the will of one mind by another*.

In this respect, “shock tactics” are often used to gain power over us.

For example, as to the *media* use of shock, the actual revelation of the news of the 9-11 disaster in which America’s modern “Towers of Babel” – the former financial Twin Towers in New York – were brought crashing down by aeroplanes, was a general shock to all our systems, and the endless *repetition* of the images ingrained these events into all our minds in a more or less permanent way.

We were persuaded that something *very big* indeed had happened, such that *a very big* response was to be expected. And thus soon was announced the unending “war on terror.”

But these shock tactics are being used to “get our attention” increasingly in our everyday lives, and rarely we would suggest, for our own good, or in our own interest.

There is as we have just mentioned for example, the increasingly daring and revealing dress of women, to gain attention and shock men, make them catch their breath and fall at women’s feet in adoration and reverence. This is of course not just in regard of attracting mates, it may just as well be done with the goal of making a sale, or getting a job.

Because what is a “state of shock”?

It is one where we lose our senses, not infrequently our *memories* and normal thinking processes, and become *submissive* in the face of what is happening to us. We lose our *power of will*, and isn’t that just what these

manipulators who want to reprogram our “beliefs”, viewpoints and thought processes clearly want?

In terms of advertising, the *scantily clad* lady of the 60s or 70s has become the *naked* lady in the 90s and early 21st century, because shock only works by being *progressive*.

So the advertisers are stuck with the same problem as the TV and movie drama producers are, as their initially clever tricks gradually fail to grab our interest, as we have become more “experienced” and “sophisticated”, we have “been there and done that” – *how to get our attention*.

So for example we are seeing more and more graphic images of naked women in TV, magazine and billboard advertising, and even sometimes naked men, in increasingly risqué scenarios.

Many adverts now also have sadomasochistic elements sneaked in them somehow, e.g. there is one currently showing in the UK in which two ladies with Russian accents dressed in leather and high heels talk suggestively to a naked man in a bath, then drop live lobsters into the bath, and walk away haughtily smirking.

But most Western societies will not generally speaking allow advertising to go into “non-family” viewing, like porn, so the advertising agencies have got another tactic – they use this technique of *hypnosis by shock* by producing images of *ugliness*.

For example, to sell us “oral health” medicine, they may show a girl who suddenly flicks out a sickening looking tongue full of blisters or warts or whatever, like those awful pictures one can see in medical books of various extreme medical conditions.

There is desperation behind all these efforts to hypnotise us of course.

They have to make *sales* or they are going to lose their contracts, and ultimately their jobs, so they have to get our attention in whatever desperate way they are allowed.

If they could sell us a TV set that had a giant hand come out of it and grab us by the scruff of the neck, and blare a speaker in our ear saying “LOOK AT THIS, BUY THIS OR ELSE!”, they surely would, but fortunately for us all, they are not currently allowed to do such things.

But in our current society, chained as we all are to the capitalist machinery, we might well ask, what else on earth are they to do?

The broader point we are making however, is that if our minds are not really our own, and we can be brainwashed, persuaded, seduced, scared or shocked into thinking and doing what others will us to do, how can we call ourselves intelligent?

That is, if we are merely *hypnotised* pawns in somebody else's power game, which alas we *all* are to a lesser or greater degree, but perhaps for true "masters" and "saints", if such exist, how can we think ourselves *truly* intelligent, which surely would imply total freedom of thought and action within the bounds of social responsibility and respect for our fellow human being?

As Krishnamurti explained, a truly intelligent mind is surely free from all conditioning, all prejudice, all preconceived notions that we cannot logically or rationally justify and verify.

In the absence of such mental purity, spontaneity and clarity, emptied of all hypnotic ideas imposed on us either by the educational authorities, religion, science, the media, society at large, or those around us in our everyday lives, just how can any of us call ourselves free-thinking and therefore *intelligent*?

We do not however wish to merely set up a problem without a solution, and those who are interested in ridding themselves of their mental imprisonment – which we are *all* in of course, to some degree – may consider reading the author's earlier work *How to Meditate*.

Chapter Eight – Intelligence, the Media, Kundalini and Sexuality

At this point, we feel we have no choice but to introduce what we regard as the *missing piece* in virtually all modern mainstream scientific, psychological, secular *and* religious thought.

For those who have led such a strictured and manipulated life to have not explored this area of thought, we are briefly going to give a *theory* which should in a general, and in some cases specific way, address most of the human problems that have been bothering them for so long, as so long left unanswered by our modern educational system and “experts” and professors of academia, or even of religion, who have decided they know better than the rest of us about the true significance and origin of life.

In the mid 19th Century Darwin explained how we evolved via the evolutionary process of *natural selection* to become human animals, from some common ancestor which must originally have been the progenitor of all the existing animal life forms we see on our planet today.

How that first presumably single-celled creature itself however came to exist, is a somewhat separate issue, and not one we will trouble over at this point in the discussion.

Why any religious group should have any problem with the generality of Darwin’s theory is a mystery to the present author, because there doesn’t seem to be any reason to fear the fact that human beings may be only unique in *the degree* to which they exhibit intelligence, consciousness and so on.

For surely, anyone who has seen the death throes even of an insect cannot believe it possesses no feeling, as it squirms in agony, much as we would if we were skewered by an enormous needle, or suddenly enveloped in a huge cloud of poison gas.

Nevertheless, we are not trying to organise any animal rights campaign here. We should not of course be cruel to any creature unnecessarily, but we have to draw the line somewhere in that to take this principle too far threatens our own survival.

For example, John the Baptist is said to have lived in the desert on locusts and honey.

Are we to ask, how dare he be so “cannibalistic” to eat “poor insects”, how dare he steal honey from the bees?

If we took that principle far enough, we would surely have to include plants as sentient life forms on some level, and by rejecting eating them, we would all surely die of starvation as no man or woman can live long on water, dust and rocks.

So as we have said, we are at least partly if not wholly *animals*, and therefore, in addressing those who believe that we are nothing else, why should we have any qualms about eating anything, even *each other* as possibly some primitive and remote tribes still do?

So we are suggesting that the difference between humans and other life forms is mainly one of degree. I mean, supposing it is of *kind*, that we can truly say we are “superior” beings, what is the difference really in any case?

Do cats and dogs dream in colour and 3D as we do for example? Who knows, and who cares? It’s interesting, but as likely difficult to ascertain, why trouble with this issue, when there are so many more urgent human problems to solve?

Do dolphins have some kind of superior intelligence to us, do they compose some kind of “dolphin symphonies” in their undersea playground, which if we could understand or translate them might even become top of our hit parade?

Again, who knows, and who cares? It would be fascinating if they could, would it not make life and our world *more* interesting rather than less?

But again, we are human beings, and so let us please stop burying our heads in the sands over human issues, and the very real desperate problems in the human world, such as people in African countries starving to death, who sometimes have to walk across deserts on the rumour of finding an aid agency who will feed them, and in many cases inevitably die of exhaustion and starvation in that process.

While we molycoddle and want to hug the lovely dolphin, which in the wild is more than capable of looking after itself, or angrily protest over those who dare to wear a fur coat, even if the animal had first died a natural death, millions of *humans* starve and die needlessly, but because they are not a pretty sight, unlike the wild life we drool over and embrace,

we ignore their hopeless and tragic fate, and thereby surely are in some ways less human than we would like to believe ourselves to be.

How is it that we can be so obsessed with protecting endangered species, but apparently seem to often care so little about our own, other than our immediate circle of family and friends, and the celebrities who entertain and hypnotise us?

And for once, we are going to lay the blame in a very specific place.

Oh no, we are *not* going to blame the poor struggling little average citizen, lost in his or her own little world of pain and pleasure, working hard to feed and take care of his own little circle of family and friends and fed news of the wider world only by a very selective and often misleading media.

We are going to lay the blame firmly at the door of where it right now in our opinion truly belongs – that of *the mass media*.

Because, as explained in the previous chapter, our average citizen is not really properly in control of his or her own thoughts and feelings, and is not even properly informed.

Our average citizen is rather *hypnotised*, so really not somebody who can truly be held accountable for what is going on in the wider world.

But on the other hand *accountable* he or she is made to be.

It is this average citizen, who does most of the work that *really* counts in society – you know, nursing the sick, milking the cow, driving the delivery truck, extracting a painful tooth, or clearing and maintaining the sewer system – who has a job without which the rest of us would be in a sorry state, who is being made to pay.

Not generally speaking the celebrity, or the privileged classes of media and entertainer who have jobs that the rest of us would *all* like to do, and in most cases don't necessarily have any very special talent that millions of other do not also have which entitles them to deserve such a feted role.

Rather it is he or she – that doctor, teacher, bank clerk, civil servant, taxi driver or building site labourer or even vicar – who generally speaking is going to “cop for it” when the terrorist bomb goes off some place, whilst

the leaders and celebrities are well tucked away behind security doors, body guards and bomb and bullet proof vehicles.

We are saying – the media chooses – under the duress of capitalistic and governmental forces no doubt we accept – what we shall daily be subjected to and made aware or unaware of.

And we are therefore saying to the media – *J'accuse*.

We are saying, stop living in your *very* privileged little world, in which everyone knows your face and name and loves you, whilst the ordinary average person in the street remains anonymous, and in pain, and a pawn and potential sacrificial lamb in the global power games.

For after all, imagine a nuclear war was immanent.

We know already there are nuclear bunkers for the British Royal Family and other “privileged personages”, as no doubt there are tucked away some place for almost all the “big shots” in the world, and if you think about it, quite likely the only reason a nuclear war never happens, is because, without the rest of us, the average people, the effective *slaves*, just who on earth would do all the bloomin’ work?

Who would run the hospitals, teach in the schools, maintain the roads, make the cars, harvest the corn, milk the cows, make the wine, and all the other endless tasks that the poorer people have to do to prop up the extravagant lifestyles of the celebrity and rich classes.

And by clever media manipulation, we are taught, we are *hypnotised*, into loving *them*.

For example, the currently dominant British TV chat show host and film critic, Jonathan Ross, a few years back shocked and offended ex-*X Files* star David Duchovny, by pointing out that he never attended the fan club meetings of those who have been hypnotised to obsess on that particular TV series.

Well known for offending his guests, though usually in a clever less obvious way, Jonathan Ross shouted at him indignantly “Attend those fan club meetings – *give something back!*”

(to those countless nameless nobodies who have made you famous and rich)

But we are not seeking to demonise or attack any *individual*, and certainly not David Duchovny, who seems to us as nice and innocent *or not so* as any other man as far as we can see. We are not in the habit of judging those whom *we do not properly know*.

Many of those in the media are fundamentally decent and kind hearted people, though no doubt with a touch of vanity, which surely most of us would also exhibit if put in a similar privileged position.

Of course, we are addressing not only those who are the *visible façade* of the media world – the news presenters and reporters – but those behind them who are more directorial and controlling in their role.

For example, in theory it is supposedly the view of the media to present an *impartial objective view* of societal and world events.

But in practice we find this is rarely the case, and probably impossible.

Someone, somewhere has got to decide of the thousand or more theoretically newsworthy events that occur every day, which ones should be reported, and how many seconds or column inches they should get.

So where choice exists, we are pointing out that perhaps it is time for more people in *the media*, including the celebrity world, to as Jonathan Ross suggested *give something back*.

The rich king in the palace is after all only as secure as the love of his people. If he is a hated ruler, his subjects and rivals will sooner or later plot to kill him, as all history has proven.

Even seemingly *nice* people like British TV journalist Jill Dando and John Lennon have been murdered for no other apparent reason than their fame, and as long as we continue to live in a world of such glaring inequality and *privilege*, no doubt such occasional terrifying blips on the radar screen of celebrity glory will continue to occur from time to time.

So somewhat in passing, we are just pointing out that *the media* has a power like never before to challenge and *direct* all that is in the news, and steer the thought of the masses to the most desirable destination for the benefit of all.

Surely life has got to change. We observe for example that soap operas are going through phases of struggling for ratings, and forced to make

more and more ludicrous and sexually provocative plotlines – gay kissing etc. – to keep our attention, whereas *reality TV* shows like the worldwide “Big Brother” series are on the up.

Can we infer from that, that eventually, we still stop devoting our lives to the antics and performances of celebrities, but instead choose to devote ourselves to the study and appreciation of the fellow human beings surrounding us in *real life*?

Perhaps such an inference is premature.

But what we are saying is that eventually, TV *must* turn from the emphasis on entertainment and escape to the emphasis on informing us of the most important events in our world.

If the world was peaceful, what would it matter what they showed – that is, in terms of frivolous or stimulating entertainments – as long as it did nothing to encourage breaking of that peace?

But as things stand now, the balance must surely turn to addressing our problems, and confronting the hypnotised sleeping mass of people with that information and investigation before it is too late.

In pursuit of that goal, and of a general understanding in society we would like to place before those readers who may in some way be part of the media, or able to affect its content in some way – if only by posting a comment or writing a letter – what we consider to be the most vital and stimulating segment of information in our possession.

And that is of *the yoga kundalini theory of human evolution*.

As we have discussed it at length in our other works, such as *Kundalini, Preventing the Apocalypse*, we will here try to be as brief and succinct as possible, focusing on its relevance to the present subject matter.

And that relevance, we submit is *total*.

The whole of society has been disturbed *wrongly, needlessly* we feel, by the work of Darwin and others in supposedly unearthing the “origin of species”, and therefore unearthing “the meaning of our human existence.”

But Darwin’s theory is ultimately only a theory of *process*.

It shows the mechanics of the survival of different species, of how adaptation to environment is key to this, such that for example chameleons who can change colour will tend to survive and thrive better in a given environment than will a comparable relative or species who has no such physiological ability to camouflage itself.

We cannot argue against that, that is *common sense*.

But the real argument is surely over *the cause of genetic mutation*.

And *this* we submit is the eternally unanswered question.

They say, the genetic copying equipment somehow “makes a mistake.” It may be a cosmic ray or the background radiation from the earth itself which *somehow* “puts a spanner in the works”, and thus some little alteration in “the genetic code” occurs, and over long aeons of time, the advantageous bits of code survive and are passed on, and the rest diminish or die out, as do the species who carry them.

So it is this *somehow* that we are concerned with.

And according to the yoga kundalini theory, this *somehow*, is not a random factor at all, but a kind of subtle but intelligent energy which permeates every organism without ever being detectable by our scientific equipment.

In yoga philosophy it is called *prana*.

We cannot *see* it, just as we cannot see a magnetic field – we can only see *its consequences, its effects*.

And in humans, the yoga kundalini theory explains, this prana energy functions in particular via what is known as the kundalini force, whose seat and activation area is at the base of the spine.

Before we dismiss this *prana* as nonsense, we would like to ask the scientists in what form “the laws of Nature” which they daily speak of and formulate as undeniable realities exist?

Can we *make* a law of Nature out of something, e.g. as some kind of sophisticated computing circuitry; can we see, hear, smell or weigh it?

Of course not.

Laws of nature are *immanent* to the things in which they exhibit their actions. They are evident only by *their effects*. Otherwise they are, like our theoretical *prana*, totally invisible, and exist only as an abstract idea in our minds, with which we attempt to organise and interpret the reality of our sense experiences and experimental findings made on the basis of those sensory observations.

But what we can observe in those in whom this *kundalini* energy awakens in a dramatic way are *the symptoms* of the functioning of this prana.

And for example, by studying the accounts of currently living or very recently living people whose stories are available on the Internet, we will find there is a common set of phenomena there.

These people are typically not *ill* in any definable way.

Yet what they all have – the *genuine cases, that is* – is far above average in intelligence and sensitivity, experiencing a lot of strange mental and physical states, and sometimes receive insights and so called “spiritual” experiences, which accompany their changed bodily symptoms.

In particular, they all – as we have said, the *genuine cases* – report feelings of heat and “stirring” at the base of the spine, just as is reported by ancient yoga texts on this subject, as well as more recent reports by the likes of Ramakrishna, a 19th Century Hindu “saint.”

Above all in modern times, we have the clear first hand detailed accounts in English of the Hindu born Gopi Krishna regarding this phenomenon, and also of Krishnamurti, in the Mary Lutyens biography, in which the often painful and scary activity of major kundalini transformation is described as “the process.”

Equally, we have the example of David Icke, whom whatever we think of his views was previously a fairly meek and insignificant looking TV sports presenter, before becoming *very suddenly* (that is, within a matter of months) transformed to being some kind of a New Age “firebrand preacher”, like a modern John the Baptist, going round trying to set kings and governors aright, at considerable personal risk to himself we might add, though fortunately for him, the public media gaze and modern “civilised laws” are preventing him from gaining the same fate as John the Baptist apparently did, so far.

But let us try to be scientific about this, and steer clear in so far as we can of unneeded jargon and “mystery mongering.”

We are simply saying, that in some smallish percentage of the population there is a possibility that in later life – typically in one’s mid to late thirties – there can be a reawakening of an “energy” in the body, however we wish to name it, which functions in the same manner as did whatever “Natural laws” or energies in the womb that constructed the foetus and baby from a single cell, in particular in developing its mighty and complex human brain.

This kundalini energy apparently seems to gradually fizzle out somewhat in most of us as we mature into our teenage years.

Then the body after passing through adolescence reaches a comparatively stable state, which we regard as “adult”, and we are able to successfully apply ourselves in most cases to living a balanced adult life, and to mating and reproducing to continue the race.

That is to say, if we wish, we could call this *kundalini* (literally *kindling*, as in “fire”) a “growth process”, though far too complex and comprehensive in its actions and effects to be attributable to any single hormone or combination of known biochemical effects.

Or do we really think it is so easy to grow a baby from *one single fertilized cell*, when we are alleging the two transformational phenomena and forces are one and the very same?

And the evidence for this, is as we have seen for example in the cases of David Icke, Krishnamurti and Gopi Krishna, there is generally a *transformation* of the personality, and if the “awakening” of this energy proceeds *rightly*, it is a socially healthy and personally enlightening one.

These beings (and they are all still *human beings* we should point out) also report states of “inner bliss” and “expanded consciousness” that have got nothing whatsoever to do with any drugs they may or may not have ever taken.

To use a slightly misleading but still relevant example, as an adult, having active kundalini can be at times rather like being on an LSD trip that never ends.

It can overpower us, and experts in this field as we presume Gopi Krishna to be (because right now, arguably there *aren't* any others, due to insufficient personal *experience*, take a look at his shorter autobiography *Kundalini the Evolutionary Energy in Man, 1970* for example) report long periods of both “ecstasy” and “horror”, which may equate somewhat with what LSD and other hallucinogenic drug users have referred to as “good” and “bad” trips.

Whether the “kundalini trip” is good or bad depends upon many factors, such as for example the general condition of the body, again, just as in the case of the drugs users, who know from long experience hallucinogenic drugs are *not* recommended in the case of those who are not currently in a healthy physical and psychological state

(not that your *current* author would ever approve *any* kind of stimulating drugs apart from *moderate* use of alcohol, which is not deemed by Gopi Krishna as being of potential damage to the genetic structure, proven he said by the appearance of the geniuses of the Renaissance, who arose despite its long term use in their society).

But further still, when applied to the ongoing kundalini experience, which lasts not a few hours like a drug, but for week, months and years at a time in cases, if the body, behaviour and in particular the *nerves* are not in good order, and pure, the bad trip can actually create *a distorted personality*.

We can either see moderately disturbed people who display sometimes extraordinary talent, yet have mood swings, manic-depression, etc., or we can see seriously disturbed or malignant people, who are having terrifying visions and need to be sedated in some cases for their own sanity and safety.

Many if not all of the mentally ill are according to this theory, as explained in modern times mainly by Gopi Krishna in his numerous talks and books, are suffering from a kundalini awakening gone wrong.

We generally speaking have numerous examples of “wayward geniuses” in our society, who have great talent, but various mental and psychological problems the rest of us don't, which often result in addictions and disturbing out of control episodes of behaviour.

That is, in a sense, in the case of a significantly active kundalini, we could say that we almost have a permanent adolescent on our hands.

Not of course, that we are saying *all* bad behaviour is a result of this, it may simple be bad parenting, but could also due to this same theory be based on some developmental malformation, probably in the womb, rather than of specific genetic origin.

The vital part for our society to understand is that *all* modern people are transforming and evolving to some degree due to this kundalini energy being at least slightly active, and this has implications for us all, in terms of our every day lives and behaviour.

This significance becomes more so for those in the higher intelligence categories, in whom the flow of kundalini is greater, but is surely of import to any one of at least average intelligence, which as we have early explained, is very difficult to assess and quantify in an objective sense in any case.

And the main point here is that this kundalini energy is created in the region of the sex organs around the base of the spine, and is either

- a) sent up the spine along the spinal cord to *the brain* where it has an energising, healing, stimulating or damaging effect (if the energy is *impure*) or
- b) it is converted into gross form as the sexual fluids with which we are familiar, specifically sperm in the man, though it is less clear what happens to this converted energy in the case of women who of course only produce a small number of eggs according to their monthly cycle.

But in both sexes, if the energy is *not* transformed by sexual activity it can enhance, balance or actually *evolve* the brain, either quickly or slowly, depending on the flow.

By *evolve* we mean, that according to this theory as expressed by Gopi Krishna, the prana or kundalini energy when awakened powerfully is said to “irriagate” various parts of the brain, and the consequence will be some form of talent or genius depending upon which parts have been irrigated.

We know that most geniuses have their talent in only one or two areas such as musical or chess geniuses.

It is very rare that we get a “universal genius” such as perhaps *Leonardo Da Vinci* who seems to have possessed not mere cleverness, but actual

genius across several fields such as fine art, and various branches of science.

That is, we don't know of any Einsteins who can also paint like Rembrandt or the converse.

Note that this theory also explains the cases of "idiot savants" who may have generally damaged facility of understanding, excepting this unusual and outstanding talents they display, as for example the well known "Rainman" as depicted in the Dustin Hoffman movie, based on a real life and still living case.

For what we discover is that, this same kundalini or prana energy can also *damage* a brain and nervous system that is unprepared for its powerful flow.

Then we get some peculiar phenomena like schizophrenia, or hallucinations, delusions, voices in the head, strange physical symptoms and so on.

These negative phenomena may turn out to be temporary or permanent, which usually only time will tell, as the fate of the mentally ill shows.

Unfortunately at this point in time, the theory of kundalini does not tell us how to *fix* such problems, though Gopi Krishna says that when this "new science" is properly developed and investigated, it may do so.

But what it does tell us is perhaps how to *prevent* such disasters, and as we have been explaining, one of the main ways of stopping this onset of mental illness caused by a "morbidly" functioning kundalini, is to address one's sexual behaviour.

For as we have explained, the sex centre can produce either evolutionary energy which is sent up to evolve *and* balance the brain, or else can be used up in sexual acts.

That is to say, that excess sexual activity can unbalance a sensitive mind, though neither does the theory recommend any kind of harsh enforced celibacy, but rather *moderation* in sex activity.

According to Gopi Krishna this moderation would typically be sexual activity two to three times a week or a fortnight, depending on the

constitution, but clearly many people in our society are having a lot more sex activity than that.

When we say *sex* of course, we do not mean merely a sexual act with a partner, but any form of stimulation of the sex organs which produces an aroused state, which will begin this process of transformation of the subtler evolutionary and balancing energies to the grosser materials which comprise the sexual fluids and typically for a male at least will culminate in orgasm.

For the sake of completeness, we should point out that in some cases, for example, where the prana is found to be impure, some people will experience a maddening desire for release, caused by impure energy which would otherwise damage their brain or nervous system to some degree if sent up to the brain.

But all this is a subject for long term study and research, and we would not advise anybody to hastily start using this *very limited* knowledge we have placed before you here, apart from the general prescription of *moderation* in most cases, as a basis for any “self-treatment.”

We would just advise, as did Gopi Krishna against *extremes* of sexual behaviour – that is, either total enforced celibacy, or on the other hand, gratuitous sex activity on a daily basis.

The moderation we are advised to apply to sex behaviour applies also to “energy practices” such as some forms of tai chi or Chi Gung or whatever you like to call it.

If these exercise make you feel fit and healthy, that’s all and good. But if they make you feel “bursting with energy”, “supercharged”, we would suggest this is a warning sign, and to “take your foot off the pedal” just as quickly and safely as you possibly can.

Because an important issue here is that because life is so unnatural and hyper-stressful for so many of us, we are seeking ways to make us stronger and more energetic, including probably in many cases punishing sessions in the gym.

On the contrary, we are suggesting, that the mistake here is to push ourselves so far and hard in the first place. We should instead moderate our working lives, take more rest, moderate exercise and so on.

It would be better for many people to work part-time, and have more rest but less money, than to push our minds and bodies to their limits and suffer the many bad consequences of overstress.

As we have pointed out, the powers that be don't currently seem to much care about how much we damage and exhaust ourselves, so we are going to have to complain more about this issue, and *force them* to re-order society so that we can all have an easier life, but without that leading us into poverty.

One measure we can all take is to become less materialistic and reduce our luxuries, trying to focus our energies and finances on what we really need rather than the extravagances and dreams which fire our imaginations but also drain the energies of our bodies and minds due to what we have to endure to get the money to afford them.

This also brings us to the issue of behaviour in general.

And as we have explained in a previous chapter, intelligent and very emotional behaviour do not march well together.

We are not talking *morality* here, we are talking *brain chemistry* or *physiology*.

We know the brain is an organ made of physical tissue, and evidently it tires out in various ways and needs repair just like all our other physical tissues, such as our skin, which is repeatedly replaced completely over time.

And the questions we would have general readers, doctors and psychologists ask themselves and therefore *research* are: what do powerful emotional states like anger, fear, passion and so on do to *our brains, our nerves?*

And equally what does a powerful *orgasm* do to our brains, our nerves?

It can certainly get our heart up to a fearsome rate, causing some people to go into cardiac arrest under the strain for example.

Why is it that it seems we have to get into a condition of "near death" before we can get our bodies to produce the fluid which will create the next generation?

All these questions are currently unanswered by mainstream medical science, but surely they are very obvious ones to ask, for any *serious medical researcher*.

But we see that “traumatic experience” such as rape, molestation, serious assault or attempted murder of us, or even the *fear* generated by undergoing and surviving some event such as a war, car, train or plane crash can remain with us seemingly forever. It appears our brains can be *scarred* by emotional experience, on a very deep level.

So here we are just asking whether it is possible – as seems to us most likely – that these powerful experiences we have of sex, anger, and so on are damaging our *brains*, rather than just our hearts, stomach linings or whatever, which of course would be bad enough in itself?

Is it possible that the punishing *overwork* (particularly *mental* overwork) that so many of us Westerners daily endure, is doing the same?

As we have discussed these questions in our other work, *Kundalini, Preventing the Apocalypse* we will not repeat further that material here.

But we wish to point out that all these issues come into our present subject – that of the nature of *intelligence*.

For can we be properly intelligent if we have a damaged brain, scarred with traumas which pulse around our minds and inhibit and darken our lives?

And doesn't this tell us if true, that therefore we should re-order our society, our pastimes and sexual pursuits to a more gentle and moderate level, that perhaps we should focus more on the emotional satisfactions of love, togetherness and peace, instead of seeking out conflict, gratuitous sex, thrilling, exciting pastimes like jumping out of planes and so on?

But as we have pointed out, the authorities currently have hypnotised us *not to* seek our satisfaction in moderation and peace.

Because unfortunately if we did that, they can't *sell* us all the exciting and stimulating activities which keep us stimulated and smiling to mask the underlying exhaustion and misery and background fears of our live.

Hobbies like art, or playing a musical instrument or rowing a boat not too ferociously on a lake, are in general, *really cheap*.

But the capitalist businesses don't want to us to be quiet and economical.

Like the Romans, they want us to buy our tickets to *the circus, the carnival*.

There's no love in it, there's no peace, no real happiness or security, only thrills and spills.

Whether we want more of the same is up to the individual and collective conscience and choice of each one of us.

Chapter Nine - Intelligence, Psychology and Spirituality

What we now regard as modern psychology, founded by Freud, Skinner, Adler, Jung, Maslow and the rest, has amazingly come about in just the last one hundred years.

But without going into undue detail we are going to present an argument here, which amounts to the fact that modern psychology has mostly had the effect of disregarding commonsense, and therefore condemning our society to a state of confusion it would not otherwise exhibit.

For example, B F Skinner, the founder of *Behaviourism* said that punishment of children doesn't work, using prisoners as an example of how it fails to rehabilitate them.

But like so many arguments of the intellectuals whose ideas have taken dominance in mainstream society, displacing *commonsense*, on closer scrutiny, it misses *simple logical truths*.

For example, in this instance, we are given the *premise* that punishment of children doesn't work, based on the "evidence" that punishment does not work on prisoners incarcerated in correctional facilities.

They don't get to be better people due to a harsh regime, they just come out hating society more than ever.

We accept that in many cases this is true.

But the simple logical flaw is that this fails to distinguish between punishment of *adults* and *children*.

Punishment of children in suitable non-abusive forms may well prevent them from becoming out of control, problem adults, so this is but one simple example of how modern psychology has got gaping holes in its thinking at everybody's expense.

We are making some fuss of this matter, because most of Western society has experienced a breakdown of discipline in general in its youth, and we feel it is high time to lay the blame at the door of those to whom it really belongs – the feeble and erroneous theories on child psychology which have created this situation.

But the *real* psychology with which we should be concerned, is the study of the egotistical nature of children, and adult men and women, and their motivations which clearly expose their behaviour.

This *real* psychology is simple yet subtle.

The practice of it depends as we have said, upon one's ability to resist the hypnotism and lies coming to us from the media, and from the next human being we meet, or see on a public platform.

The real psychology we all need to know as humans as Krishnamurti explains starts with the following principle.

We are all fundamental selfish, fundamentally interested in looking after number one.

If we have to choose if it is *we* who gets the prize, rather than the next person, we always choose ourselves.

Even the so called "saint" is perhaps not necessarily free of this selfish-tendency, because the saint has simply made the decision that the things that the average person wants are not worth having, so for him or her to reject what others hunger for so desperately, is not a true sacrifice, as he or she is seeking a reward on a higher plane, e.g. "heaven", "enlightenment" or whatever we like to call it.

We are all seeking *happiness*, and the only issue is whether we choose a dumb way or a smart way of getting it.

So the saint or "holy man" would say, those who seek golden trinkets and treasure chests, fine clothes and palaces, seek what can be taken away, what will turn to dust, what "does not endure."

Whereas the materialist would reply, "you can keep your mythical and likely delusory heaven in the sky – I will settle for the here and now thank you, and trough as much of it – the wine, women, song and luxury - as I possibly can while time allows."

And that is the agenda that a good proportion of the world is following, perhaps the majority.

Of course, some psychologists try to advise us that real happiness lies not so much in *things*, but in *human relationships*.

But there is a major problem with that. We are almost all so emotionally needy and immature, that our relationships are inevitably catastrophic.

It is this simple.

Everybody wants love, acceptance, kindness.

But the *givers* of love, *the providers* are *few*, that is - those who are so secure in themselves that they don't *demand* the constant attention and ego stroking of other people.

Those who desire love however – the *takers* - are *everywhere*, they count up as the vast majority of people alive.

So we have a situation with few who are truly kind, grown-up, caring and loving, and able to almost selflessly *give*, and many who are selfish, unforgiving, greedy and immature, and are ninety-nine percent intent on selfishly *taking* and giving little in return.

Kind mugs of both genders find themselves easily picking up any number of these *takers*, but to their horror they find that these takers often don't wish to give one percent back of what they so ungratefully take, and then unless the kind people want to stay total mugs, the logical outcome of this situation is that everybody ends up alone.

And that is our society. We now have more single people living alone than ever in recorded history. People are too selfish, self-obsessed and unable to cooperate, care and share to live together peacefully.

A good person could live with another good person, but they are so thin on the ground they find it hard to locate one another, and even when they do, they will normally find any good person of either gender has a substantial number of “hangers on” and “users” surrounding them, who will do their level best to sabotage the relationship of the good people, just as a bunch of vultures feeding on the carcass of a lamb *don't want to share*.

And that really is what much of our modern society is like. One big-hearted mug or another is busy servicing any number of selfish, greedy people emotionally, and sometimes even financially, and anyone else who tries to sidle up to the established group of human scavengers is hissed and booed at and if possible scared away.

But then the givers, the lambs who can be fed upon by the rest are scarce.

So many takers, scavengers, cannot even find a giver, a lamb to feed upon.

So then the modern psychologist or therapist comes along to “service the need.”

He or more likely *she* will listen to our problems, pains and heartaches and offer “empathy” (that means they will pretend to understand our feelings, but not actually *care* about us personally, as the “sympathetic” person would, that is asking too much.).

When we analyze what they are getting paid, and that our life is actually not “getting better every day in every way” despite their “therapies” and “advice”, we realise that they are scavengers too.

Then, when we give up on therapy, we can go to a bar, and sit on a bar stool getting drunk and tell the bartender about our woes.

They listen too, as long as we keep buying drinks. But when we get drunk and troublesome they throw us out.

So in desperation we might even try a vicar or a priest to see if we can get some human understanding, warmth and sympathy.

But all most of them want to do is indoctrinate us with their ideas, tell us that “Jesus Loves Us”, though we haven’t seen much evidence of that in our lives so far, and they aren’t really able to offer us any.

They say he changed the water into wine, but all we can do is the other way round.

They say he was the product of the virgin birth, but nowadays we can’t even *find* a virgin to give birth to our children via the usual method.

So this is what is really going on in society. But modern psychology is not addressing it. It is not addressing the utter chaos, confusion, misery and so on in our everyday lives and communities.

It is not addressing the failed relationships, the delinquent, abusive and disrespectful children, or the neglect and abuse of the unwanted and old.

And that means *all* of us, just a few years or decades down the line, for we know not when that fateful day will come, when we will have some life changing stroke or heart attack, or develop motor neurone disease or something, and be confined to a wheelchair and have to be spoon fed and bottom wiped by people who don't know or care about us, because our children and families quite understandably don't want to know us any more.

And when we realise that psychologists and psychiatrists can't actually help or cure us, we might wonder, just how do they keep their jobs, how do they justify their existence at all?

But ah – they have another trick up their sleeves, and a very good one too.

It is called *drugs*. Nobody with a mental illness ever gets “cured”. They might recover their balance *naturally*, just as a cut heals without any doctor's help.

Of course a doctor might put a few stitches in a cut to help Nature by stopping us bleeding to death from a gaping wound, but *Nature* does the real work and patches up our skin.

What the “unhappy” or “mentally ill” however get is *drugs*. Virtually all treatment of the so called mentally ill or “terminally unhappy” centres on drug treatments of one kind or another.

If we can't fix the pain and misery in someone's mind, we can at least chemically smack their brains with a sledgehammer so they don't actually *feel* the pain and misery anymore.

But where is the alternative the modern psychologists say? We are doing our best. Surely we cannot be blamed for that?

What modern psychology needs to realise is that there is *no* cure for unhappiness other than the establishment of *meaning* and *purpose* in life.

Why?

Because otherwise, how can you ask a being that knows it might die at any moment – even from a terrorist attack – and has relationships that aren't working and all other life's hardships from being depressed and dissatisfied with its lot?

You can't. You can only give it "happy pills" to put it into a somnambulant stupor.

Some people do that for themselves – alcoholics and drug addicts.

But what you *can* do is stop telling the public that you can cure its ailments which are caused not only by spiritual desolation, but by the suffering created by the entire social structure, of undue competition, materialism, greed and overwork.

You can say – let's bring up children to be balanced by applying correct mild discipline and not addicting them to sensual things.

You can say, let's stop running off into complex and unworkable abstract theories but instead just teach them to be honest, decent, thoughtful understanding citizens, instead of aggressive competitors in an unjust capitalist, self-destructive and globally destructive economy.

You can say – we psychologists can do little while you use the media to fill people's minds with unreal fantasies of violence, material glory and limitless opportunities for sexual experience and romance.

You can say – look, we are all scared little creatures on planet earth, struggling for survival in a big nasty world, just doing the best we can.

But you can also do something *new* with your good intellect, as long as it is now accompanied by *an open mind*.

As modern psychology has largely failed to reform the individual and society *in practical terms*, you can explore the thousands of years of "spiritual" and "mystical" literature to see if there is any sense in it.

Forget the Bible and the other major "Holy Books" at least for the moment, and study the works of for example Gopi Krishna, and the philosophy of J Krishnamurti and one or two other similar beings.

And we have in our previous chapters given *the key*, the kundalini theory that suggests we all have this evolutionary mechanism in us, and *some of us* as we have said, are actually *aware* of it functioning in us, and have seen how this can lead to different states of awareness, just as drugs can, but the states we are talking about are without drugs, and can be of a permanent and undistorted nature, as eventually happened in Gopi Krishna's case.

Sufi “saint” Hazrat Inayat Khan wrote that “people will return to religion (in a scientifically acceptable way) because there is nowhere else to go.”

We have a world full of confusion, in which the population is all running round like headless chickens, trying to get as many thrills as they can before they die, and causing a whole lot of trouble in that process of self-interest and self-aggrandizement.

Psychology does not answer it – spirituality alone we would suggest *does*.

But blind belief will not do any more.

As we have explained in our work, *Kundalini, Preventing the Apocalypse*, all capable scientists should investigate this field of research into how *consciousness*, the greatest human mystery, can be developed by evolution of the brain caused by this kundalini mechanism.

This will then explain the origin and purpose of all the true mystical literature – i.e. that produced by or regarding those who transformed to a genuine higher state of consciousness, as we assume Christ and Buddha and others to have done.

In the final chapter we shall look at how modern science has in our view attacked religion and spirituality unreasonably, thus taking away hope and the possibility of the higher development of humanity from not only the average members of society, but from the scientists themselves.

Chapter Ten — The Psychological Flaw in the Modern Scientific and Atheistic Mind

We are told that the philosopher and subsequent evolutionist T.H. Huxley said upon reading Charles Darwin's *the Origin of Species*, published in 1859, "How extremely stupid of me not to have thought of that."

And surely that is true.

Darwin's theory of evolution is extremely obvious to anyone who can think independently who is confronted with the vast array of creatures and a few dinosaur relics freely available in our environment, which almost *all* have some kind of eyes, nose, mouth and limbs.

Of course, with our knowledge of all the different species of apes including the chimpanzees and gorillas, which in some cases, on a dark night might be mistaken for a human being, the proof is virtually conclusive already.

Though the concept of *natural selection* took a little more thought, the idea that it takes a *genius* to come to the general conclusion of the evolutionary theory, of descent from a common ancestor, is surely wrong.

Darwin, admittedly a very intelligent man, was simply in the right place at the right time, and made the right decisions to gain the observational data he needed to prove his case, without perhaps being aware of what he was doing.

The modern Western man or woman who has seen any number of TV Nature programs, from Jacques Cousteau to David Attenborough and so many others however, clearly has a great advantage that no ordinary person or naturalist like Darwin ever had in any previous generation, and that is surely *the real reason* it took so long to figure out.

If we don't have enough pieces of the jigsaw, we obviously can't solve it, and until Darwin undertook his famous journey to the Galapagos islands, neither did he have enough pieces of the puzzle.

Of course, at a time dominated by immature Creationist theories, whose dogma was that God had created the world only a few thousand years ago, to draw the conclusions he did was an extreme act of independent thinking, and for that reason alone we would say he stands out.

He was as we have said, like the man in the line of people who all said the blue object is green, yet he was one of the few amongst the human population who dared to *see for themselves* counter to the views of all his peers, and dared to say the object is *blue*.

He was in a sense, therefore, also like the little boy in *The Emperor's New Clothes* story, who dared to say the king was naked.

But that Darwin's general theory was clearly correct, in no way disproved the concept of a universal intelligence underlying everything, popularly known as God.

All his discovery actually achieved, was to add further mystery to the "mysterious ways" of such a God, who may well have still been assumed to have created the world in six days, but not six literal modern solar days, but rather metaphorical ones of indeterminate length.

This new Creationist "Nature God" was thereby merely found to be a lot more complex in his plans than anyone had theretofore suspected.

But as this unsuspected broader explanation of the modus operandi of such a "Nature God" became clear, Darwin obviously could not correlate this with the dogmatic beliefs of his era.

After several personal tragedies in life, in particular the death of one of his young daughters, he became less certain of any kind of religious belief, and though he did not become an atheist, he clearly expressed the position of an agnostic – one who admits that science does not tell him definitely whether God exists or not.

Surely, this is the correct position for all scientists and humans in general to take, that is, one of *uncertainty*, rather than an atheistic declaration that "there is no God", and that any such idea is "nonsense", which is surely not a rational and logical position, due to lacking *proof*.

And here, we intend to show such, offering a simple theory of why some scientists like Darwin favour belief in God or agnosticism, whereas the mass of modern scientists and scientifically informed members of the population in general favour the atheistic position.

We have in another of our works, asked the question "why does the believer believe, and the non-believer disbelief?"

And now we are going to give a detailed answer, not on a rational level, but on the level of *emotion, of psychology*.

Few or none of us are truly rational beings. To be wholly rational like the fictional Mr Spock was supposed to be, but repeatedly showed he was not, is not likely humanely possible.

We have emotions, instincts, passions, and no known human being has ever demonstrated the lack of these.

Certain beings like Buddha or Christ have apparently had these emotions and passions wholly under control, but they are so long ago in history or so rare, they do not come into this discussion.

The real truth is that if a great enough tragedy happens – for some people it could even be that their share portfolio crashes – we *all* end up in tears.

If an exciting and attractive enough member of the opposite sex shows us their favour, we *all* respond to that with delight and in some cases *passion*.

None of us are so different in these emotional and instinctive responses.

But where we *do* differ is the degree of care, attention and love that is either showered on us or not so in our formative years.

We have already mentioned that there are two principle types of beings in society, the givers, the provider or love, and the takers, the ungrateful stealers of the goodness and generosity of others.

Of course, these are poles, and most of us are somewhere in the middle, but the takers at this point in human existence seem to be swamping mercilessly the diminishing supply of givers remaining.

We could quote (roughly) the New Testament if we wished and say:

“the world will grow smaller and more wicked, and men’s love will grow cold.”

And whether that passage was really spoken by a man who walked on water or not, or whether it was meant to be applied to a future time such as now, we do not particularly care, but it seems to be descriptive of a stage of human development, of a time like *now*.

So the reality is, that many of us, likely the vast majority, did not receive a loving and caring upbringing. Rather it was loaded with trauma of various kinds.

And thus many if not most of us grew up hating our parents, and in particular we find that in the modern era of the last fifty or sixty years, *father hate* in particular has been the prevailing tendency, particularly in this era of “feminism” and “women’s liberation” in which the “sport” seems increasingly to demonize men and blame them for everything.

The parental influence has moved from being *male dominant* – that is, the image of the strict and dominating Victorian or early twentieth century father – to being the *female dominated*, that is – “mum’s are best, dad’s are the beast” type of family structure, that has so easily deteriorated into countless one parent families, with only a mother, and no present father at all.

So of course, you can still hate your father, even if you’ve never seen him, and this is made easier in many cases, by a betrayed or deserted mother’s willingness to “stick the knife in”, and make sure the kids are fully informed on what a beast and so and so their dad really was, and how they are therefore so much better off without him.

But on the whole, the father hate is found to be most intense if he is there, and has done some apparently mean things to you or your mother.

Whether these things were really as mean as they appeared to you as a child however is debatable.

For example, suppose your father ran away because he could not cope with some affair your mother had, he could not cope with the betrayal and disloyalty.

We suggest your mother is not likely going to tell you that *she* was the guilty party, or it was actually *her* who caused him to desert you, rather than whatever story she cooked up to make herself look good to you.

So the result is, you grow up hating him anyway and trusting in mum, whether he deserves that hate or not.

And things can get a lot more complex than that in this simple yet subtle world of human relationships – *simple* in the respect that it is based on the *fact* that we are all looking out for ourselves, number one, but subtle in

the respect that the ways we go about looking after number one can be subtle and devious indeed, and not visible to anything but the most well trained and experienced eye.

For example, a woman may simply be jealous of her child's love for its father. She wants that child to see *her* as the source of love, the centre of things, and so she goes on a one-woman campaign to drive him out, make him the bad guy.

Obviously, few *decent, loving, giving women* behave in such a way, but as we have mentioned, the ones who aren't so decent and loving far outnumber the ones who are *as things stand right now* and have done for the past fifty years or more.

Of course, your father *could* have been a bad person, and your mother a saint, but we are focussing here on what happens to those who have this *belief* about the nature of their father, whatever the truth may really be.

So there you are, a fifteen or twenty-one or fifty year old angry person, and you are (internally) still blaming your "bad dad."

And this is reality.

People carry these childhood resentments throughout their whole lives.

That's why it's so hard to relate to the next person we meet.

Two decent forgiving people get together and it's relatively easy. They already know how to give and take. They don't expect to get their own way all the time.

But two of the damaged ones get together, the ones who won't compromise, back down, give in, and so on, and then you have fireworks 24/7 as they say.

Which for example, we can easily see in the celebrity relationships once the initial excitement and passion had died down, and they discover what one another are *really* like.

Then in the press they say "amicable parting, but *we're still friends.*"

Yes, right – friends who want to live about two hundred miles apart and go to bed and live with someone else who doesn't bully, cajole or needle

them into doing everything they want, and gives them a little space to be their own person, their own human being.

In short, what happened to their “beautiful relationship” was that two “takers” mistook one another for “givers”, and when they finally figured that out, they both ran off and tried to find another “giver” before it was too late.

But many of us have suffered so much in our childhood, bullied by our parents and so on, that we grow up seriously damaged, though because we aren’t much different than those around us, who are also growing up in an uncaring atmosphere, we think it’s *normal* when it’s really not.

And after years of sulks, pain and tears, or even just being neglected and ignored and locked in our own little world, we are thrown out cruelly into the big wider world of the school where we get bullied some more.

Even the teachers bully us, not only the other children, but the teachers have got the gall to say they are “good people” and then they tell us about this “God” whom they go to Church and worship every Sunday or whenever, depending on the particular religious culture we find ourselves trapped in.

So what we have in our society are an awful lot of damaged, unloved people, and naturally when they have grown up in a living hell, how on earth can they be persuaded that there is any kind of loving god?

Clearly therefore it seems to them, there is no justice in the Universe.

There is no benevolent being watching over them who cares (just like their parents, you see) because otherwise it would never have let them undergo all those tortures and trials.

And then we have the minority of people who grew up feeling *loved*.

They hear about this loving God, and even though there seem to be a few logical problems with the theory, they think – “Great, a being that can love me even greater than I am loved already!”

And of course, the fact that they have already been loved, had that feeling of someone kind and powerful and benevolent watching over them (i.e. a good parent), acts as *evidence* that such a being does, and should exist.

So they choose to “believe” in God, as the concept of God reaffirms their psychological state.

They see the world as a place to be enjoyed, a place that they can feel secure in, though they are dimly aware of those other “bad people”, the “malcontents” who just seem to want to wreck everything and mess everything up for the rest.

Why can't those “bad people” be satisfied they ask themselves?

And now we have the answer for them – because unlike you privileged ones who were loved, they grew up without proper care and love.

And if a man or woman *of this kind* becomes a scientist, or in fact aspires to and attains any other kind of esteemed career or job, he or she is generally doing this to create feelings of self-worth and respect from others to compensate for these feelings of being unloved in childhood.

Certificates, medals, badges of honour, and memberships of esteemed societies are very important to this kind of person.

They don't have love, but they get *respect*, they feel they are superior beings due to their hard won achievements which place them *as they see it* over other men and women.

They are “professors”, they are “Ph Ds” – *doctors of philosophy*. What a grand title that really is!

They spend their time busily working hard, beavering away, trying to stack up their own self-importance and rise in worldly fame or position, because that is what unloved people do, seek self-aggrandizement.

Whereas people who are loved, are like the idle boy who sleeps in the hay stack chewing a straw, enjoying life, while all the vain fools toil needlessly to achieve goals that matter only to posterity, but not right now.

Of course, the “fool” one day decides to make his fortune and win the princess's hand in marriage, but he doesn't do this by working his fingers to the bone and being a *slave* like the mugs do, he does it by doing something absolutely remarkable, like solving a riddle no one else in the kingdom can.

He is a rock star like Eric Clapton or he is an artist like Dali, or even an author like Douglas Adams.

But the action of the vain unloved person in society, who becomes an atheist scientist, or merely an atheist without the detailed knowledge of science, is unceasing toil to win and maintain his place in society.

He had no “God” to support him, he achieved all by sheer hard work, by his own merit.

This in itself proves to him there was never any god, because if there was a god, he saw fit to make his life a misery, until he rose by his own efforts to escape his unjust lot.

But if there is no God, no afterlife, surely there is a problem. He might die at any moment, he might have all taken away from him, be “cut down like a flower.”

So what is the solution to such a problem that troubles the conscience of any truly honest, sensitive and rational woman or man?

The answer is *denial*.

Only the “here and now” exists. He says “I am a *success* in the here and now, and there is nothing else.”

He is feeding *emotionally* on plaudits, “honours” and back slapping from his colleagues, and if he is lucky he will even get a woman who will worship him and give him sexual pleasure and make him feel he is a great guy.

And nothing will shock him from this state unless the world becomes so hostile and dangerous that he sees his existence is uncertain on a daily basis.

And as we can see, that is what is happening now.

Gradually the walls in our glamorous and “safe” Western society are beginning to crack. In many parts of our Western towns and villages it is not safe to walk the streets.

There are crazed drug addicts who might burgle you and kill you even if you hide inside your house imagining you are safe.

There are crazy people with serious mental problems who attack people at random for no good reason.

There are animal rights and other extremists who may harass, attack or even murder you if you are doing some scientific research they disapprove of.

And of course, there are the political terrorists who blow people and office buildings up at random for some cause or another that you can never quite fathom.

Then, there are all these awful natural catastrophes and scary diseases which seem to come from nowhere in an ever increasing pace and are like those Hollywood disaster movies come true.

And finally, there are the weapons of mass destruction lying around somewhere, that we don't want, but somehow can't seem to get rid of, that are waiting to be used someday.

What is one to do?

The scientist by destroying the religions faith of the common man over the last one-hundred something years we would suggest has led us to this pass.

We would suggest, that the atheist scientist confesses this error he or she had made in denying the spiritual without any proof to say so.

We would suggest that scientists be humble, confess their ignorance, do not lie to the public about the extent of their knowledge and achievement, do not say there has been conclusive scientific proof of the non-existence of God, as for example Richard Dawkins does, when such a position is obviously not rational, lacking conclusive evidence one way or the other.

For let us look - as a final piece of evidence, at a September 2004 article in the esteemed British science journal *New Scientist*.

The mysteries of life

New Scientist vol 183 issue 2463 - 04 September 2004, page 24

From sex and sleep to ageing and aliens, there's still an awful lot we don't understand about the living world. But what are the biggest unanswered questions, and how close are we to solving them? Here are New Scientist's top 10, plus the experts' choice on page 30

1 How did life begin?

IN 1953 an iconic set of experiments showed that some of the chemical building blocks of life, such as amino acids, could form spontaneously in the atmospheric conditions thought to prevail on the primordial Earth. This gave rise to the idea that the early oceans were a "primordial soup" from which life somehow emerged.

The idea still holds a great deal of water, but 50 years on the details remain sketchy. It is still unclear, for example, how a primordial soup of simple molecules could give rise to today's system of DNA and proteins. It is a classic chicken-and-egg problem: DNA codes for the proteins that catalyse the chemical reactions that replicate DNA. How could one exist before the other?

One theory proposes that the first genomes were actually made of RNA. Like DNA, RNA consists of chains of nucleic acids, but due to its slightly different chemical properties, RNA can catalyse some reactions without the need for proteins. This self-sufficient RNA world could then have been superseded by our present DNA one.

Another idea currently in vogue is "metabolism first", in which the chemical reactions necessary to liberate energy and support life arose before self-replicating molecules did. According to one version of the model this could have started out at deep-sea hydrothermal vents with the formation of pyrite from iron sulphide and hydrogen sulphide.

Another bone of contention among biologists is how the basic chemical building blocks of life could have become sufficiently concentrated to meet, react and form more complex molecules such as proteins and nucleic acids. Researchers have speculated that the chemically "sticky" surfaces of certain minerals - clays are a particular favourite - could have been life's first incubator. Or alternatively it might have been droplets of seawater thrown into the atmosphere, or perhaps small chambers inside rocks.

One of the key issues is to work out when life began - do that and you have a better idea of the conditions under which it formed. Easier said than done. Some researchers think there are chemical signs of life in rocks 3.8 billion years old, a "mere" 0.2 billion years after the Earth became habitable. Others believe that signs of life do not show up until 2.7 billion years ago.

Yet another idea has it that life did not originate on Earth at all, but arrived from space cocooned in asteroids or comets. Experiments have confirmed that the basic chemicals of life, including amino acids, exist in space and that microorganisms could survive an interplanetary trip. But, wherever it came from, this still does not explain how life began in the first place.

Claire Ainsworth

2 How many species are there?

LIFE on Earth remains largely uncharted territory. In the two and a half centuries since Carl Linnaeus devised his system for naming and classifying organisms, scientists have formally described and named about 1.7 million species. (No one knows the exact number, because there is no central clearing house for this type of information.) Everyone agrees that many unknown species remain, but just how many is anyone's guess. Estimates range from 5 million to 100 million.

In the past couple of years, evolutionary biologists have begun to clamour for a Big Science project to provide an answer.

Not because the final count itself makes much difference, but because the real prize lies in understanding who lives where. That knowledge - woefully incomplete so far - forms the bedrock on which much of conservation biology, evolutionary biology and ecology are built.

So is it 5 million or 100 million species? Biologists have tried to get nearer an answer by extrapolating from detailed samples. More than 20 years ago, entomologist Terry Erwin of the Smithsonian Institution in Washington DC fogged 19 trees of one Panamanian rainforest species with insecticide and counted the insects that rained down. If other tree species hosted a similar number of insect species, he estimated the world might hold upwards of 30 million insect species alone. But more recently, researchers in New Guinea have shown that the same insects often feed on several different tree species, leading them to make a lower estimate of around 5 million insect species.

Microbes, though, are the real terra incognita. Just a few thousand species of bacteria have been described, largely because they are so featureless to the eye. But when geneticists compare gene sequences among a collection of microorganisms, they find vastly more diversity hidden there. Two years ago, Thomas Curtis of the University of Newcastle upon Tyne, UK, used this diversity to calculate that a single gram of soil might contain between 6400 and 38,000 species of bacteria, and a tonne of soil might hold as many as 4 million.

A better count of the world's biodiversity might at last be in the offing. Several groups are making plans to collect and classify species, using both molecular and more traditional physical characteristics, on a scale never attempted before. This mass-production approach should reveal the diversity of obscure groups as well as taxonomists' favourites. If the plans are put into practice, the question of how many species inhabit Earth may have a better answer in 20 years' time.

Bob Holmes

3 Are we still evolving?

HUMANS are not like other animals. We have contraceptives to control the number of children we produce, aspirations beyond reproduction, medicines to sustain life and postpone death, and the potential to engineer our own DNA. It is tempting to think that we have moved beyond the clutches of evolution. Tempting, but wrong.

Evolution is built on two cornerstones: heritable variation and selection. Plainly, humans vary. The source of that variation is genetic mutation, which still occurs at around the same rate today as it has throughout our evolution.

But what about selection? In the west we certainly seem to have wriggled free of natural selection. It is no longer just the fittest who survive and reproduce. Modern medicine allows people to overcome diseases and injuries that would once have killed them. Birth control and reproductive technology make reproduction a matter of choice, not adaptive quality. Likewise, the power of sexual selection has been blunted because the mass media has a strong influence on who we find attractive, and because "beautiful" people do not necessarily have the most children.

But that still leaves artificial selection, the force more usually associated with the domestication of animals and plants. Obviously, we do not systematically direct the evolution of our own genome in the way our ancestors did to produce high-yield wheat or miniature poodles, but there is a parallel: many human traits only exist because they have been selected for artificially. The invention of spectacles has allowed myopia to proliferate, dairy farming has given many adults the ability to digest milk sugar, and stone tools allowed our earliest ancestors to extend their physical abilities without evolving bigger muscles. These and countless other innovations have affected our gene pool.

Other forces are at work, too. Humans are changing the environment, altering the climate, filling the world with pollution and creating the conditions for new diseases to emerge - changes that are almost certainly driving human evolution.

And while we may think that genetic technology will give us control over our future, it may actually send human evolution in unexpected directions. It is hubris to think that we can engineer our genome to a particular end. We know so little about how our genes interact that any attempts at engineering sperm or eggs may well have unpredictable results. All we can say for sure is that our gene pool is changing, perhaps faster than ever. But where evolution will take us remains a mystery.

Kate Douglas

4 Why do we sleep?

THE average person spends a third of their life asleep, and going without it kills you quicker than starvation. Sleep seems to be fundamental in biology: all animals do it, and even cultured neurons in a Petri dish spontaneously enter a sleep-like state. Yet we don't know what sleep is for.

There are several ideas, of course, ranging from obvious ones about restoration and recovery to more elaborate theories dealing with memory processing. But none has been confirmed, and the only thing sleep researchers can agree on is that there is no satisfactory answer.

Part of the problem is that sleep comprises two very different states: rapid eye movement sleep (REM), when the eyes flick from side to side, the brain is very active and most dreaming occurs, and non-REM, which is a deeper state of unconsciousness. These are so

unlike one another that they surely cannot have the same purpose. But they are somehow intertwined. In natural sleep, non-REM is always followed by a bout of REM, so their functions are probably linked in some way.

Amid the confusion, one thing is clear - sleep is for the brain. One reason we know this is that animals sleep but plants do not. And other organs, such as muscles and liver, do not sleep. This might seem trivially obvious, but it was only this year that a large region of the brain called the cerebellum was shown to participate in sleep.

Armed with the knowledge that sleep is a whole-brain phenomenon, researchers are starting to unite behind the idea that non-REM sleep, at least, is when the brain makes good the damage done by free radicals, the toxic chemical by-products of metabolism. Other organs repair this damage by sacrificing and replacing injured cells, but this is not an option for the brain. So it switches itself off and, like a highway-repair team working at night, gets on with the job when things are quiet.

Several pieces of evidence have emerged to back this up. One is that animals with a high metabolic rate, and hence a faster rate of free radical damage, sleep more than those with a slow metabolism. Another is that the brains of sleep-deprived rats suffer unusually high levels of oxidative damage. And earlier this year gene-expression studies confirmed that the brain actively switches on genes involved in protein synthesis and membrane repair during sleep.

But what of REM? Some researchers have proposed that this is the brain booting up to test out the repairs it made during non-REM. Others suggest it has something to do with early brain development. But we don't really know. Looks like we'll have to sleep on it some more.

Graham Lawton

5 Is intelligence inevitable?

IT IS comforting to think of human intelligence as the pinnacle of evolution. But cast that anthropocentric snobbery to one side and consider this: intelligence is just another adaptation. It evolved because it is the best way to survive in a particular ecological niche.

Intelligence is evolution's answer to unpredictability. If an organism lives in an environment that is predictable then it can get by on instinct and hard-wired responses. But animals that live in shifting environments need to be flexible, they need to be able to weigh up new situations and act accordingly. That is where intelligence can come in handy.

But hang on, does that mean that once life appears, the evolution of intelligence is inevitable? It's not as simple as that. Natural selection only favours a trait if the benefits outweigh the costs. And there are some serious costs associated with intelligence. For a start, the brain is a gas guzzler. In humans it accounts for 20 per cent of our energy requirement, while making up just 2 per cent of our body mass. There is also the cost of being naive. A newborn animal with hard-wired survival responses will be at an advantage in some situations compared with one that must work out the best way to react. And intelligence seems to carry other as yet unidentified handicaps, as suggested by a study published last year showing that fruit flies bred

for braininess survive less well if food is scarce.

Nevertheless, during the evolution of life on Earth, the benefits of intelligence have undoubtedly outweighed the costs on many occasions. That is why even very simple animals often show behavioural flexibility that denotes a level of intelligence. But our own creative intelligence is qualitatively different. Is this type of intelligence inevitable?

Maybe. As well as being evolution's solution to unpredictability, intelligence creates unpredictability of its own through the complex behaviour it generates. So there is positive feedback. This is particularly strong where one animal's behaviour affects the survival of others - which might explain why intelligence is common in social animals such as bonobos and Caledonian crows.

Humans are the ultimate social animals. We manipulate the world to such an extent that we create our own fast-changing environment. But positive feedback is surely not the whole story. There must also be an element of serendipity involved. So, if you were to rerun the tape of evolution would the world inevitably end up with a creature with our unique blend of mental skills, from complex language and tool use to symbolism and morality? The odds against all of them coming together in one species, in less than 4 billion years of evolution, are extremely long. That is not to say it couldn't happen again, though, given enough time.

Kate Douglas

6 What is consciousness?

IT IS fairly easy to describe what consciousness feels like. Being conscious is all about being awake and aware, having a sense of self and a feeling of embodiment, of knowing the difference between you and the world around you. It is also about having a history or narrative made up of a continuous flow of thoughts, images and sounds - your stream of consciousness. But most importantly it is about how it feels to be you.

But herein lies the problem. Consciousness is a really difficult question for science, because it is entirely subjective. That is why the study of consciousness has long belonged in the realms of philosophy and religion. But now biologists, especially neuroscientists, are getting in on the debate. Some hope that brain imaging and electrical recording will reveal the "neural correlate of consciousness". That is, we should be able to find what is going on in the brain when people are conscious, but not while they are unconscious.

Researchers are making progress with this. But it is still not at all clear what it is about brain activity that makes us conscious. There is certainly no single brain area that is active when we are conscious and quiet when we are not. And there doesn't seem to be a simple threshold of neuronal activity above which we are conscious, nor a type of activity or neurochemistry that always accompanies consciousness.

But even if you accept that consciousness is something that comes from the brain (and not quite everyone does), and you find a pattern of brain activity that correlates with a conscious experience, there is still a problem. Why should the activity of a mass of neurons feel like

anything? Why does pricking your finger feel like pain? Why does a red rose appear red?

This has been dubbed the "hard problem" of consciousness, and some people have tried to explain it away by calling it an emergent property of active networks of neurons - in other words, something that arises from the interactions between these neurons, but which is not found in the neurons by themselves. That, however, seems a bit of a cop-out. What is more, this "explanatory gap" has attracted a number of oddball theories proposing weird quantum states that produce consciousness, mathematical explanations as to why synchronous oscillating brain waves may be the key, and so on.

Some say that the gap will never be bridged because our brains are ill-equipped to understand their own consciousness. And some researchers argue that consciousness is just an illusion anyway.

Helen Phillips

7 What is sex for?

SEX sells, and not just in popular culture. Biologists have been fascinated with it for more than 100 years and there's no danger of them losing interest.

Why sex? Surely there is no mystery there - the reason 99.9 per cent of multicellular species reproduce sexually is because it is the best way of passing on your genes while ensuring there is plenty of variation in the next generation. But this argument has a fundamental flaw, which is the immediate and short-term wastefulness of sexual reproduction.

Imagine a population of fish living in a lake and competing for limited food. The fish reproduce sexually so each new generation contains both females and males, all competing for the same resources. Now imagine that one fish discovers how to reproduce asexually. All her offspring are females, and in time they will all produce their own female offspring, without the wasteful need for males. In just a few generations the descendants of this single fish will outnumber their sexual rivals and drive them to extinction. In the day-to-day battle for survival, sex is a seriously losing strategy.

In the long term, of course, this does not hold true. Without sex to shuffle the genetic pack, species accumulate harmful mutations and quickly go extinct. The majority of asexual species last only a few tens of thousands of years. But this is not a satisfactory explanation for the near-ubiquity of sex. Natural selection doesn't care what happens many generations into the future. To win the day, sex must confer benefits right here, right now. And that's where things get sticky.

How does sex win? There have been dozens of suggestions, most of them focusing on its ability to generate variety. Because the environments in which species live can vary so much in space and time, the argument goes, only those that can adapt rapidly survive. One of the most popular versions of this idea concerns the never-ending arms race between hosts and parasites. Problem solved. Except that no one has been able to prove that this accounts for the overwhelming dominance of sex in nature.

Perhaps there is a way out of this conundrum. Sex may be

everywhere not because it confers short-term advantages, but because it is difficult to give up once it has evolved. Some biologists believe that the type of cell division that gives rise to sperm and eggs evolved very early in the history of life and was only later incorporated into reproduction. They argue that sex is etched so deeply into life's operating system that abandoning it is all but impossible. It is a promising answer, but not a complete one. In some ways all it does is transfer the mystery to another area: how sex evolved in the first place. And that one will keep us guessing for at least another 100 years.

Graham Lawton

8 Can we prevent ageing?

NO ONE seriously believes they can live forever, but most people would gladly forego the tribulations of ageing. The problem is, we don't know enough about why ageing occurs to be able to intervene.

The orthodox view is that ageing is due to an accumulation of random damage. Among the main suspects for inflicting this damage are free radicals, toxic by-products of the chemical reactions that release energy from food.

Some researchers are testing this idea by developing anti-ageing strategies based on fighting free radicals. Vitamins and natural antioxidants in food seem to help, a fact that has led to a buoyant food-supplement industry. Another school of thought is that simply eating less will cut the number of free radicals produced over a lifetime. Semi-starved mice can live up to half as long again as well-fed animals. Some people are trying this out on themselves by permanently cutting their calorie intake by up to a third. A recent small study showed this strategy does seem to improve cardiovascular health, but its long-term effectiveness is unknown, and few people want to feel hungry and tired most of the time.

An alternative view of ageing is that it is a programmed degeneration that evolved to reduce competition with offspring. Supporters of this theory point to recent research showing that knocking out a gene called *daf-2*, or its equivalents, makes worms, flies and even mice live longer. The gene encodes a hormone receptor that controls numerous functions, suggesting this pathway is the "master switch" of programmed ageing. But a gene could affect ageing without having evolved specifically to cause it, so the *daf-2* findings remain compatible with the random-damage theory.

However it is interpreted, *daf-2* is sparking a good deal of excitement in longevity research, as it suggests there may be a relatively simple way of boosting lifespan. Of course, what works for animals will not necessarily work for people. But it's a good sign that the pathway exists in mice.

Steven Austad of the University of Idaho in Moscow certainly thinks so. He famously bet a colleague \$500 million that someone living in 2001 would still be alive and sentient by 2150. "I'm feeling very good about my bet," he says.

Clare Wilson

9 What is life?

IT SEEMS such a simple question. After all, we know life when we see it, don't we? But just try to pin down a precise definition.

We can certainly describe what living things do, but that is not enough. For example, living things take in nutrients and excrete wastes, but so do cars. Living things replicate and participate in evolution, but so do certain computer programs, while some life forms such as mules and post-menopausal women do not. The best minds of biology and philosophy have tried for decades, and failed, to agree on a universal set of criteria for life on Earth, or wherever else we might find it.

If you took a vote today, the most popular definition would probably be the one proposed 10 years ago by Gerald Joyce of the Scripps Research Institute in La Jolla, California. He describes life as a self-sustaining chemical system capable of evolving through Darwinian natural selection. This definition captures the essence of life on Earth, but critics worry that, broad as it is, it may not be broad enough to encompass absolutely everything we would want to call life.

The reason the task is so difficult is that we only have one example to work with. All life on our planet is descended from common ancestry, so no one knows whether its fundamentals - membranes, proteins, carbon-based biochemistry and the like - are necessary, or merely accidents of history. As some experts have noted, it is a bit like trying to generalise about what makes a mammal when you only have a zebra. We need a second, alien life form for comparison.

And we might have one within a few years, not from another planet, but from test tubes here on Earth. Several groups are trying to synthesise life from scratch, and some of their efforts bear little resemblance to our familiar life forms. One under development by Steen Rasmussen at Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico, for example, is based on fat droplets rather than watery, membrane-bound cells. Another, by the Venice-based company ProtoLife, aims to repeatedly select the most "life-like" features from a chemical smorgasbord, essentially letting life reinvent itself. If either of these efforts succeeds, we may suddenly gain a totally new perspective on what it means to be alive.

Bob Holmes

10 Is there life on other planets?

TOUGH one. So let's rephrase the question: do you want there to be? If your view is that there is something special about the Earth, then there is plenty of scientific scope for saying the answer is no, there is no evidence of life on other planets. If, on the other hand, you do not subscribe to the idea that a pale blue dot in a humble corner of an ordinary galaxy should be bestowed with such significance, there is evidence, of a kind, for you too.

But it's not just a matter of taste or opinion. The UK's Astronomer Royal, Martin Rees, considers this the most important question facing science today.

Finding an answer comes down to resolving the issue of how - and how easily - life gets started in the first place. Is it a freak event, or an inevitable consequence of the laws of physics? As yet, we don't know.

Of course, science abhors a vacuum, and so scientists have formed opinions based on whichever set of proofs they like the sound of. Asking for the received wisdom is rather like asking what length a skirt should be. A couple of decades ago, the fashionable opinion was that life is pretty hard to kick off, and thus probably not widespread beyond Earth. These days it is more in vogue to say that life is inevitable, and the universe is probably crawling with living things.

What has changed, scientifically speaking, in those 20 years? Very little. But using the mathematics of probability to reach your conclusions happens to be all the rage. Given the vastness of the universe, the diversity of its environments, and the fact that life has certainly evolved once, you can argue that the chances are pretty small that Earth is the only place life exists.

The fact remains, however, that the search for extraterrestrial intelligence (SETI) operating out of the SETI Institute headquarters in Mountain View, California, has found nothing conclusive in 40 years. And Tau Ceti, a star system that was considered a frontrunner to host life, was recently declared too comet-ridden. Even if we discover life on Mars we cannot draw any conclusions because the Red Planet regularly trades rocks with Earth.

Anyway, what kind of life do we mean? We don't know whether we should be looking for the carbon-based life so familiar on Earth, or some other form. And if we can't agree on a definition of life, and what it might need to evolve and exist, the argument just gets woollier and woollier. So, at the moment, it all seems to boil down to a different question: do you want us to be alone?

Michael Brooks

The experts' choice

Although *New Scientist* came up with the 10 questions presented here, we wanted to know what the experts think. So we canvassed some of the world's leading biologists. Here is a selection of the answers we received:

Chris Stringer

Palaeoanthropologist at the Natural History Museum in London, UK. He is known for his work on the "Out of Africa" theory of human origins

"I think the biggest unanswered question in biology is whether life is unique to Earth. Evidence from Mars may help to answer this question, even in the next few years. As for my own field, I think the biggest question is: what was the last common ancestor of humans and chimpanzees like? Knowing the answer would help solve many questions about our origins. I would also like to discover the key factors that led to the success of our species. Why are we here and not people like the Neanderthals?"

Tom Kirkwood

Gerontologist at the University of Newcastle upon Tyne, UK. He

proposed the "disposable soma" theory of ageing

"Why are people living longer and longer at the moment? What we are seeing is something quite extraordinary. In the 20th century, life expectancy began to climb for all the obvious reasons, such as improved healthcare, vaccines, antibiotics and sanitation. Since most of these measures stop people from dying young, everyone predicted that the rate of increase in life expectancy would plateau as the benefits of keeping young people alive pushed up average lifespan. But the rate has not slowed. What seems to be happening now is that we are beginning to change the nature of old age itself. What is driving this and how far will it go?"

Simon Conway-Morris

Professor of evolutionary palaeobiology at the University of Cambridge. He is known for his work on the early evolution of animals, particularly the fossils of the Burgess shale

"One big question concerns convergent evolution - the finding that life comes up with remarkably similar solutions to the same problem more than once. The camera eye is a good example. What is it that makes life navigate towards particular solutions? Is there a deeper pattern or set of principles at work, some kind of underlying "landscape" across which life is forced to move? If we could discover that landscape, we would have a general theory of evolution."

Frans de Waal

C. H Candler Professor of Primate Behavior at Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia. He studies social intelligence in apes and monkeys

"I want to understand why we empathise with others, and why we do so automatically. A one-day-old baby already cries when it hears another baby cry, and few adults keep a dry eye while watching a sad movie. Our closest relatives, the great apes, show similar emotional sensitivity. It must mean that we are programmed to be highly cooperative. People seem to interact against a background of emotional connectedness, the evolution of which biology has not even begun to explain."

Susan Greenfield

Professor of pharmacology at the University of Oxford and director of the Royal Institution of Great Britain. She is particularly associated with research into neurodegenerative diseases

"I think the biggest unanswered question is how the brain generates consciousness. It is the question I would most like to solve and the one I would tackle if I were starting out again. In my own field, I think the key question is what is the critical mechanism triggering Alzheimer's disease?"

It is clear from reading the above article, that science, despite its great achievements is in no way as “all knowing” as some scientists like Professor Dawkins and to some extent physicists like Stephen Hawking like to make out.

The above confession by the UK’s leading and respected popular science journal *New Scientist* (i.e. the equivalent of the US *Scientific American* magazine) is really staggering in its admission of ignorance upon *the major issues* of all times, though this particular list has not even touched on the “origin of the universe” question, which also is still under debate, with the current thinking favouring “the Big Bang Theory” first suggested by George Gamow.

The trouble with modern science in particular is that its practitioners have the habit of deciding that when they have made some new discovery they have found “the final answer”, or are just a mere step away from discovering the “ultimate.”

But a few years down the line, somebody comes up with some unexpected “finding” which rocks the current theories, which they previously imagined to be the ultimate picture of reality.

Science has indeed made some marvellous advances, but we find that is it often far more flawed and uncertain in its theories than the scientists like to admit.

Throughout the history of science, amongst the advances, have been some nearly shameless efforts to get the facts to fit the favoured theory at all costs.

In particular, a large mass of scientists reject and label “heresy”, what others consider to be proven fact such as Bell’s “action at a distance” quantum physics experiment, in which two particles are apparently proven to be interacting with one another *instantly*, beyond the effect of any force or field science has ever previously encountered, which it has long been assumed since Einstein has the maximum potential of operating at the speed of light.

We were told by Einstein and convinced up until the Bell experiment, that nothing could travel faster than the speed of light, and that such instantaneous “action at a distance” was impossible.

But it seem now even Einstein has been overturned by Bell’s work.

Additionally, the *wave-particle duality* problem – i.e. is light a wave or a particle? – has also not been conclusively solved by science.

The Bell experiment however seems to say something very deep about our universe, our reality, and when we combine it with Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle, which says we can never know *both* the mass and velocity of any particle in the universe, this all suggests that the dream science once had of predicting the behaviour of reality with a set of equations or formulae is a pure fantasy.

Then Godel's work in mathematics, has cast doubt even upon the certainty of our logical and mathematical processes.

So *rational* science is riddled with uncertainty regarding *the ultimate questions*, and if Godel is right, perhaps always will be.

Another problem we have touched upon, is the mass of information which is coming from all the research department of the colleges and universities all over the world, that is ultimately mostly unusable.

Thousands of new research papers are published every week, that are only known to and understood by a handful of people in the world, and on the whole are destined to make absolutely zero impact on it.

But we have a broader criticism to level at science, especially of the social kind, which as we have mentioned is this *escape into abstraction*.

There are desperately serious world problems all around us, but we can use our intellect to produce endless plausible but ultimately unworkable solutions to them, and then the problems get not better but worse.

For example, we have the growing fascination with ADHD or ADD (Attention Deficit Disorder) which many *children* with "learning difficulties" are being "diagnosed" with.

So they get given a drug or whatever, to deal with a problem that likely simply exists because of the deeply unnatural way that children are being brought up – i.e. not properly supported by the constant presence of a trusted parent, and subjected to stimulations – e.g. being sat in front of 24 hr TV with almost stroboscopically quick changes of scene, like witnessing *from the inside* some kind of mad drug crazed episode.

Or children are strapped in car seats with a dummy shoved in their mouth to keep them happy, and driven hundreds of miles round the road and so on.

When you are a little baby, it's very *scary* and over-stimulating to be rattled round a supermarket in a truck, but you can't complain too much about it when you have a dummy shoved in your mouth, can't speak anyway and in any case are in fear of your life at this strange busy place you have been unwillingly made to circuit round.

Of course mothers in general don't remotely realise that these kind of frantic environments can harm a young child with too much activity going on and too unpredictable an environment.

For have we not noticed for example how babies react to a stranger with great anxiety?

As adults we can feel quite scared being in a strange place with people we don't know, so how do we think a helpless child is going to feel?

Above all of course, the most critical factor in a child's early development is that it must have the security of one *constant, familiar, loving, gentle* presence, i.e. generally speaking *its mother*.

If its usual "carer" - i.e. mother - is suddenly whisked away to work, or a party or wherever, and it has to deal with another far less predictable presence, what is that going to do its psyche over time?

It is going to create insecurity.

If the carer is as good or even better than the mother, that *might* not be a problem, but how does the mother *know* what happens when she isn't there?

There are a thousand ways parents can get it wrong - the raising of children - and it isn't too difficult to see the consequences all around us in the damaged people we daily meet and see.

But instead of giving this vital patient and consistent care to young children up to the age of at least seven, and preferably ten or eleven, we wake up to the fact that something is wrong with our child - it can't cope with school or lessons or whatever.

And because the last thing we want to accept is that it's *our fault*, we go to a doctor or "psychologist" and then they relieve our minds by saying, "Oh, here's another case of ADD. Here are some drugs we believe will increase your child's concentration and improve its behaviour."

The same is true of teenage delinquent behaviour and the treatment of adult criminals is going the same way.

This is a "behavioural problem" they say, so we need *treatment plans*, drugs and "therapies." But they don't work any more than the present ideas are treating the problem of bullying in schools.

The time tested methods of centuries must return.

Parents must devote themselves to their children until they are well-formed fledgling adults, and if they don't wish to do so, then they simply *should not have* children until they do.

Children are *not* a fashion accessory to be bought and put in a safe place and taken out and used only when it's "show time."

They require the greatest hard work that a human being can give, because they are the future.

Michelangelo gets to paint the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel, he goes through "agony and ecstasy" to get it right. That is what we have to do with our children if we too want to produce *a work of art*, rather than just another confused teenager ready to be medicalized, snapped up by the psychiatry industry, and drugged and "therapized."

So why are we making such a fuss about this issue here?

Because the "glory and adventure" and false feeling of empowerment that is coming from the scientific community towards itself and to the general public is happening at the expense of our humanity.

We can build an atom bomb, but we can't make world peace. We can see into the deepest darkest oceans, and far reaches of outer space, but we can't look ourselves in the mirror, and see into one another's hearts.

We can make supercomputers, which we imagine one day will even think creatively – though they likely *won't*, they will just be world chess champions and ever more sophisticated information and process control

systems – but we can't make our personal relationships with our neighbours, spouses and children work.

We feel we are approaching understand of the creation of the universe, but we can't understand and control our own negative and savage emotions, such as envy, anger, inappropriate passions and hate.

The question above all we should surely ask is not enough asked - is science creating a better or worse world?

Thus if we are doing any science that is making the world better, let us continue it. But if we are not, then let us please stop.

For example, modern dentistry is wonderful, and the kind of plastic surgery that can right a major deformity is also a great good; but what of the sort that will presumably end up with all men looking like a slimmed-down square-jawed version of Arnold Schwarzenegger, or have all women looking like a Barbie Doll or Jennifer Anniston clone?

So here, we have presented a new perspective, which is equally really an old one. In fact ancient.

What is the purpose of our lives?

Surely to grow as human beings, to become beautiful people, especially on the inside, rather than just the outer shell.

Because the state of bliss promised by the prophets and saints – which surely due to too many unexplained ancient and modern accounts, science must take seriously and investigate – is part of all our lives to some degree already, but just needs to be nurtured and intensified.

Surely the first task and goal therefore is not to meddle with the fundamental forces in the material world, but to gain mastery over ourselves, rid ourselves of our savage emotions, and establish personal and global peace on that basis.

And this has to be done by looking at the psychological, moral and social issues in our world in a rational but compassionate way.

Surely we have to make certain no one suffers needlessly on our planet, and surely the first step in that is to solve the needless international

disputes and feed those who starve when there is plenty of food to go round.

Let the Muslims and the Jews *share* their Holy Shrines. Surely they both agree there is only one God, so how can they be enemies, how can the differing forms of their rituals and creeds divide people who should all be batting on the same team?

Clearly, it is not religious philosophy at all – whatever the mischief makers may allege – but a power game that is only using religion as the excuse, like the “Christians” in Northern Ireland, who all claim to worship the same Christian God, but somehow are still fighting.

Clearly, they are of course not fighting over *religion* at all – as usual, it is just power – lands, privileges, jobs, territories, vanity of one tribe claiming superiority to another.

Thus let us please drop once and for all this idea that any race is greater than another as the great and good have come from all races in all ages.

So we have to set our course as not to live in abstraction, unconnected to our daily reality, but to understand ourselves, as we have explained in our earlier work *How to Meditate*.

And in that process, we can it appears find solutions *in a general way* to the problems that still baffle science and perhaps always will to some degree.

For we are saying, based on our own limited experience, but moreover on that of countless saints, prophets and so on of many countries and eras, both Western and Eastern, that life is not in essence *material*, but is the expression of *intelligence*, just as the Universe is also not in essence material, but the expression and embodiment of an unlimited *consciousness*.

Thus, we have in this work or others more or less answered all the *fundamental questions* posed by our *New Scientist* journalists – which science here by its own admission has yet failed to do – according to this theory of Universal Intelligence and Consciousness, which as we have said, expresses itself through the human being in the form of the kundalini mechanism and its superintelligent vehicle of *prana* energy.

In conclusion to our work therefore, let us state or restate them and briefly *answer* them in this philosophical, yet *in so far as we may ever be able*, also in a *rational, scientific* way.

1 How did life begin?

Life was created by a Universal Intelligence. In fact, in a sense life was “never” created. It always was and will be, because the only true “living reality” is that universal intelligence, which is a non-material consciousness, awareness, not dependent on any other thing, and therefore popularly known as “God.” The life on this planet and no doubt countless others was and is merely an expression of the infinitely subtle operations of this God, which incidentally is not distinct from us, but clearly because of its all inclusive nature we are *part of*. There was never any “random factor” in genetic mutation. Just a supreme intelligence playing in its own way – creating galaxies, planets, life forms out of nothing, or rather out of an infinite, timeless, formless consciousness.

2 How many species are there?

Well on the one hand, who cares, why not let’s just enjoy them? But on the other hand, the scientists say above they have already catalogued 1.7 million and that it may be as much as 100 million. Does anybody really think that all these different species and more could have evolved on our planet in such a short few millions of years by “random chance”?

3 Are we still evolving?

According to the kundalini theory, we certainly are. It is our brains, the increasing subtlety of which will bring the entire race to “higher states of consciousness” as experienced by saints and enlightened beings like Buddha, Christ, Mohammed, Ramakrishna and so on. Read Gopi Krishna’s autobiography “Kundalini, the Evolutionary Energy in Man” for a modern first hand description of such an evolutionary transformation.

4 Why do we sleep?

In our other works we have explained how sleep acts as a reparative and psychological balancing mechanism, via in the former case the deep dreamless sleep and in the latter case, via the REM dreaming sleep. Sleep is also the principle time that the transformative activity of kundalini is

greatest, and this is reflected in the widespread phenomena of men developing erection during sleep, which is a side effect of the working of the sexual organs in creating the prana that is sent up to the brain. This erection is routinely mistaken for being caused by sexual dreams, but occurs regularly without any sexual dream whatsoever.

5 Is intelligence inevitable?

As the universe itself is the product of an intelligent consciousness, rather than being only a randomly created consequence of “dead lifeless matter” or of even “a blind watchmaker”, of course intelligence is inevitable because it is the Nature of the universe itself. Intelligence is reflected in all the known laws of Nature, and the many yet to be discovered, and we are therefore illogical to imagine it is just a human or animal phenomenon.

6 What is consciousness?

The individual consciousness is merely a spark of the universal consciousness functioning through an individual nervous system. If there were no universal consciousness, there surely could not be any individual consciousness. Either the universe in general is conscious, or else it should surely all be dead and unconscious, whether animate or not. That is to say, that in reality there is only one consciousness which animates the whole universe, but it appears to us to be separate which must therefore be an illusion. Those who have reached a higher state of consciousness, such as Gopi Krishna report that the Universe and world around them is no longer experienced as a material thing, but as a vast, immeasurable consciousness. Thus consciousness is seen to be the *a priori* constituent or “first cause” of the Universe, not matter, which is merely its instrument, and which the universal consciousness apparently creates from a vacuum.

7 What is sex for?

It is clearly a means for the universal consciousness to create life forms which reflect different degrees of its own consciousness. Sexual attraction is based on genetic desirability. Through sex we have created more and more evolved beings and this process is continuing to its ultimate limits, whatever they may be.

8 Can we prevent ageing?

Whether we can prevent it completely is not currently knowable, though would seem to defy what seems to be a natural occurrence in all known species. But by the judicious use of our sex energy, i.e. sexual moderation, we can prolong life and also prolong the quality of life far beyond the current lifespan. The kundalini theory explanation of this, is that some of the sex energy if not used for reproduction goes back into the bloodstream and heals and rejuvenates the body generally. If this process of healing and rejuvenation is starved by excess sex for long periods, then we will experience a premature and debilitated old age.

9 What is life?

Life is an expression of the universal consciousness in any of numberless increasingly complex and sophisticated ways. Life is the universal consciousness “at play.” In that sense, rocks and stars can be said to be alive, in the sense that this universal consciousness must be at work in them all, and not just in the life forms which we categorize as such.

10 Is there life on other planets?

If it is a universal intelligence that is at work in our universe and therefore galaxy, and not merely “dead”, “lifeless”, “unaware” matter that has somehow come together by random chance, then surely the galaxy and universe must be teeming with countless life forms. Any other conclusion is clearly a form of unjustifiable vanity, and rejects the staggering statistical unlikelihood of our planet being unique in that respect.



How to Meditate

SAM FRYMAN

How to Meditate

by Sam Fryman

(the cover painting is *The Son of Man* by Rene Magritte)

Copyright © 2005 Sam Fryman, all rights reserved

CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Chapter 1 – A Brief Review of Existing Meditation Techniques	9
Chapter 2 – How Your Psychological Balancing Mechanism Works	19
Chapter 3 – How to Really Live in <i>the Now</i>	31
Chapter 4 – Awareness is the Key	45
Chapter 5 – Inhibition – the Power of <i>No</i>	61
Chapter 6 – Hypnosis – the Modern Psychological Disease	81
Chapter 7 – Heaven and Hell – Meditation and Kundalini	103
Chapter 8 – Meditation and Authority – seeking the guru inside	115

INTRODUCTION

Since the days of the Beatles and the Maharishi in the 1960s, *meditation* has become a household word, and millions of Westerners have ever since apparently been engaged on a “journey to enlightenment” which previously had no precedent in Europe and the Americas in recorded history.

Of course millions in India have meditated in one form or another for generations, whereas the Western principally Christian and Arabic Muslims worlds appear to have had only “prayers” as their form of communication with “God” or “the Divine” or “the higher dimensions of consciousness.”

In particular, in the West, the priest, the bishop, the cardinal and the Pope have been the “intermediaries” between man and God, though as long ago as the fifteenth century, in England, with the support of Cambridge university intellectuals, Henry VIII decided he would appoint himself as the direct contact between the English Christians and God, which title of “Head of the Church of England” the current British Queen, Elizabeth II, still holds even today.

(we shall assume for the purpose of this book that God exists either as an impersonal “Nature God” or a “Personal Deity” as the reader pleases, though no “belief” in God as such is required to benefit from the meditation technique described throughout).

But the modern, scientifically informed mind is no longer satisfied with the rigmaroles offered by the mainstream Church, not that we are denying the right of people to attend churches and get whatever comfort and sense of community they are able thereby.

For since the 1960s in particular, with its quest for experiences rather than mere words and promises – whether by drug use, sexual exploration or “spiritual” or meditation techniques – the hunger and indeed demand is now for *direct contact* with some kind of “god” or higher states of consciousness.

But the whole premise of our book is that *most* of the efforts at “enlightenment” to date by use of meditation techniques and drugs and even sex, as per the “Tantrik Sex” practices, have been flawed in a fundamental way.

That is, they have been pursuing *sensation*, and not *understanding*.

That is, most users of drugs and seekers after sexual delights are unashamed and honest about just what it is they are looking for.

They are seeking a powerful sensation, they are seeking a glorious and delectable feeling of floating in a velvet haze that entices and torments and “blows their mind.”

We are not condemning drug users or those who seek out more than a moderate amount of sex for desiring these things, though neither are we saying they are wise or “right.”

For most of Western society enjoys sex and some form of drug, most popular of which currently is obviously alcohol, so it would be hypocritical to deny the right of anybody to a certain amount of sensual gratification and pleasure.

But what we are saying, is that to obsess on these matters beyond a certain measure can only be regarded as immature *from the spiritual point of view*, as equally therefore can be meditation techniques whose main goal and consequence is the pursuit and attainment of such states of *gross physical sensation*.

The point we are making, is that “enlightenment” on any level *must include* some kind of expansion of one’s faculty of understanding, there must be a “mental expansion” in one’s perceptive, intuitive and creative powers, or else all we have is just like any drug user or sex addict, a compendium of experiences of having “a quick buzz”, no matter how satisfying or intense.

We would however also wish to demystify the idea of a “spiritual quest” altogether, as something reserved only for the “high minded” or “ivory tower” class of beings, who consider themselves far above the ordinary run of the mill “pig at the trough” kinds of people, whom they see the rest of society as being by comparison.

Of course no uneducated or illiterate person is going to read a book such as this, but it is not right to deny the mass of humanity a spiritual goal, as is the current status quo, because all can advance according to such spiritual luminaries as “kundalini guru” Gopi Krishna, apart from really the lowest or subnormal classes of society, which means that at least seventy-five percent of humans alive can advance spiritually, so that nobody desiring to do so is incapable.

But then not everyone who meditates in some fashion thinks in terms of a “spiritual goal” or getting “enlightened” anyway, many millions – perhaps the majority – are just seeking some kind of yoga or meditation techniques out as a means to gain an “inner peace and harmony.”

Again, we should point out that if this is the goal, then the pursuit of exciting or thrilling experiences via meditation is obviously not the goal, as the states of excitation and peace are clearly incompatible.

For we live in a very stressful, nerve jangling society, whose goal seems to be to destroy our peace in every conceivable way.

The national governments of our world, are all becoming ever more concerned with this term *security*, because really, we have before us a world which has threatened our security in any number of ways, in terms of our job security, the security of our close personal relationships, our individual security in the face of crime and terrorist threats, the alarming appearance of so many scary new diseases, and the background fears of weapons of mass destruction whether of biological or nuclear kind.

Yet we feel mostly powerless to do anything about all these threats to our personal security, so then we seek escape and solace in our various pleasures including sex and drugs, and if we are still not happy after that, we may finally turn to some kind of religion or spiritual practice to try to take away our pain, or give some kind of meaning to our lives which they otherwise now lack.

So this preamble has been felt necessary, because it is surely essential to ask ourselves when we are considering embarking on some kind of meditation or other “spiritual practice” exactly what it is we are trying to achieve, and what our *motivation* really is.

So we see, the answer to the question implied by the title of our book has begun already, because most of us are not in fact quite sure what it is we are trying to do when we “meditate” anyway.

If we think we are seeking “enlightenment” what do we really mean by that, what is it that we think “enlightenment” really is?

From the point of view of Gopi Krishna or J Krishnamurti, enlightenment is a state of consciousness, a state of intuitive understanding, it is a state of knowing and understanding.

Whereas if we are honest about it, what most of us are really seeking is not a level of understanding which may in fact have a great burden of knowledge and responsibility attached to it, but rather a state of pleasure or worry-free “ignorant bliss.”

And this we see, is why drugs, alcohol and lots of sex are so popular, because this use of powerful physical *sensations* blots out at least temporarily the feelings of insecurity and thoughts of worry which are continually to be found occupying our minds.

There may be war in our world, unresolved pain and conflict in the relationships all around us in our personal lives, our career plans may be going astray, our finances in some desperate condition, but if we have a good session on the juice, or get lost in some sexual pursuits, we can at least temporarily blot out this near constant torture of mental anxiety and worry which *our mind imposes on us whether we like it or not*.

The last words of the previous paragraph have been emphasized as they are *the key* to this situation, to what we would here describe as *real meditation*.

We have identified that our uncontrolled and compulsive thinking is the problem, so the answer is that we must learn how to “discipline” our minds, whereas when we fail to do that, we have to run to a doctor for a tranquilizer tablet to *chemically* subdue our wild and self-abusive minds, or else we go and find a powerful non-prescription drug to do the same, to give us that sense of “blissful ignorance” and “freedom” that our minds currently lack.

For we must be aware above all that whenever we have got *a problem*, whether it is we cannot get a date with a member of the opposite sex, or we have a leaky roof, there are going to be a million exploiters out there who are going to *sell us* solutions to our problem, so they thereby make a living or get wealthy, regardless of whether these solutions are genuine ones or frauds.

But in the “spiritual field”, the motives can be far more complex than merely money, because the activities of the people who offer us cures to our mental problems – whether of a conventional medical or “alternative” kind – can make those people feel very important indeed, so that they get to seem like some great guru whom every one bows down to and speaks of in hallowed terms.

But as *Master Kan* said to *Kwai Chang Caine* in the famous *Kung Fu* series when it was time for him to leave the temple forever, a really wise or “great” man or woman should not seek out the worship and adulation of others:

Remember always, be humble . . . like the dust. A wise man walks with his head bowed.

We do not of course mean bowed *literally*, we do not wish anyone to develop a crick in the neck - what is meant is that *the wise man or woman must always be ready to give respect to others, rather than seeking it only for him or herself.*

Of course, as the famous five thousand years old ancient book of Chinese wisdom, *the I Ching*, says - there will always be high and low in society in terms of *natural endowment*, and thus in that sense “equality” is impossible.

We are not all born equal, all our human characteristics such as intelligence, physical strength, height, weight and even “beauty” are possessed by individuals on a kind of Gaussian or bell-shaped distribution, meaning that most people are only averagely intelligent or beautiful, and only a few are either very ugly and imbecilic, or on the other hand, very beautiful or at genius level intelligence.

But the thing to do is to not obsess on comparing ourselves with others, which will only screw our lives and minds up and theirs also, if we envy them and hate them, or alternatively despise and look down on them if we feel superior; but to simply learn to accept ourselves as we are, and learn to make the most of whatever natural attributes we do possess.

For we *all*, barring perhaps those really unfortunate few percent, have an equal chance to *evolve*, to expand the horizons of our mental worlds and lives, so the basic outlook is surely an optimistic one for all of us.

Thus our goal here is to help every man and women deal with this most important issue of gaining peace and happiness by *gaining control over our minds*, which as we will see, cannot be learned by any simple technique in five minutes, or merely the possession of a mantra to chant, not that we are saying such techniques are always valueless, depending upon the person and their circumstances in life.

But what we are offering here we might subtitle as *the intelligent persons' guide to meditation*, and when we say intelligent, we mean only whoever has the patience and natural ability to listen and understand, so this is wholly regardless of any preconceptions you may have about yourself, or have perhaps had forced onto you by other teachers, gurus or miscellaneous advisors and opinionated people in your life ever before.

Chapter one – A Brief Review of Existing Meditation Techniques

As we have said, the Maharishi was perhaps the first major populariser of meditation amongst *the millions* though there had long been Western fans of other earlier gurus and Eastern yoga type techniques since probably the Victorian era in England.

For example, there was around the turn of the twentieth century a “Ramakrishna mission”, conducted by Vivekananda, his closest disciple, and Gopi Krishna for one has identified Ramakrishna as a genuine enlightened case.

But not all the missions of those who would seek to offer us “spirituality” are so honest and philanthropic as Vivekananda’s.

We meet many people in all walks of life who aggressively seek to gain power over us, and it is a sure sign that this tendency alone identifies them as not high in true spiritual terms, which would imply they were “caring and sharing” rather than desirous of dominating and enslaving others.

Many of the techniques offered to us may for all we know also not be safe.

The outcome of deliberate attempts to meditate such as using mantras, concentrating on an object or idea, or other “forcible means” of stilling the mind, can sooner or later be very disturbing or scary in their outcomes.

Just as *for some* so called “psychedelic” drug experiences can be terrifying, and even result in a person’s death.

Those who believe otherwise about drugs do not realise that what may be relatively harmless *for them* may be extremely dangerous to *someone else*.

(not that we are ultimately implying these drugs are safe for *anybody*, as there could for example be genetic damage, which may only appear in one’s children or grandchildren, as Krishnamurti suggests).

We are *not* all the same, mentally or physically. Some of us are tough, hardy and insensitive, and others are more finely tuned and fragile both physically and mentally than a Stradivarius violin.

Just as the same food ate by a Neanderthal, virtually savage man hundreds of thousands of years ago might cause merely a burp and a grunt in him, but would likely cause a modern man or woman to be sick to the stomach and hospitalized for maybe a week.

In assessing all these matters, we have to realise that we are as humans not all the same – we are as different as the animals in the jungle or the creatures in the sea or sky.

Some of us may be like snakes, slithering around, looking for a quiet and sandy hole to hide away in, some of us don't like the sunlight too much, and only come out at night, some of us are repulsed by the idea of eating even an omelette due to its containing eggs, whereas others could wolf down an egg and bacon breakfast without hesitation, but rather delight.

Some of us even found we could do such things in youth, which now repulse us in older age.

We are not saying anyone is “right” or “wrong”, we are saying, we have got to stop believing that just because some activity or meditation or food or drug is suitable and safe for *person X*, it will necessarily be suitable and safe for *person Y*.

In the “privileged” Western nations we can now eat and drink and do pretty much whatever we like, and so superficially it may feel like *we have never had it so good*, but then why are we all cracking up whilst surrounded by all this extravagance we have got?

But we do not question this indulgent lifestyle hardly ever at all.

Instead we believe that we can live a decadent, over-stressful life, with inadequate rest and sleep, burning the candle at both ends, having orgies of sex, drugs and food, but then still imagine by somehow finding some yoga technique or mantra, or relaxation method to do a few minutes a day, we can retain our sanity, mental balance, happiness and health.

So before rushing off to a guru to get ourselves a mantra, perhaps we should stop first to think what it is exactly we are doing with our lives, more specifically, what we are doing *to our bodies and minds*.

The odds are that if you are the average person, even a young person, you are now reading this book before you, only by stealing a few fleeting minutes in your otherwise busy and non-stop day.

Because there are a hundred other things you have been persuaded that you should be doing, you likely will feel guilty if you spend too much time reading this book, when you should *so you have been led to believe* really be mowing the lawn, or booking that exciting holiday abroad, doing your never ending academic studies, chasing members of the opposite sex, or formulating some new and clever plans to make that business of yours prosper ever more and succeed.

So we would advise you most urgently, do not think merely in terms of some “panacea” type meditation technique to save you, which at best would be a “sticking plaster” solution to fix the gaping wound, rather it is time to press the *stop* button now and rethink your whole life afresh.

We imagine we can just squeeze a few minutes of meditation in here and there amidst our crazy, out-of-control non-stop life, and everything will be alright.

But no, it can't be done that way, and only a *liar* who will take our money regardless of the truth of the matter, will tell us that it can.

That is, when we say *liar*, we are not suggesting that such a person actually is *consciously* lying, and doesn't actually believe in what they recommend, though that cannot be denied as a possibility, as we know there is pretty much nothing that people won't do nowadays to make another pound, yen, rupee or buck.

But it is a lie *against Nature* nonetheless, because they are saying – *bleed all day long, and here is a little syringe you can use five minutes a day to pump the blood back in.*

If we were all being bled only a little, a little syringe and a little time might do the trick, but that is not how the body functions in terms of the huge *energy* which we are encouraged to put out due to the demands of the frantic modern Western, and now increasingly so, the modern Eastern lifestyle also that is being thrust upon us.

We have to be so *smart* and “with it” don't we, they tell us, or we will “miss the boat”, we will get left behind in the race of life.

Shall we put it differently?

We all want to be *free*, don't we?

But we think we can accomplish that miracle whilst daily signing up to commitments and pursuits that make us ever more a slave.

For example, let us say that a friend calls us up on the telephone.

He or she says "well, are you up for it? Are you coming?"

They are inviting us to a parachute jumping session we have almost agreed to this weekend.

That is, when our employer or college finally lets us out of the pen for the weekend to get some recreation, and ceases to whip our mind and body to exhaustion with a metaphorical cat-o-nine-tails, to get some relief from being imprisoned all week we decide that the only sensible way to spend our free time is to "live life to the full", to do something exciting and crazy, even jumping out of a plane, scaring the pants off ourselves, and not too occasionally more or less risking death.

So we are suggesting rather – hang on, our body and mind has been active all week, going at full throttle, so isn't it time for some rest?

The truth is we cannot waste our powers of body and mind as if we were racking up huge debts on a credit card, and get away with it. *Nature* will come knocking at our door one day, and like *Shylock* in *The Merchant of Venice*, will demand its *pound of flesh*.

For example, what of these people, so many so very young, who get what is known as *ME*, or *chronic fatigue symptom*?

The doctors and the scientists are looking for some virus or allergy or genetic deficiency as the cause, but maybe a lot of these people just *burned out*?

They had a sensitive body and mind, and they took it out and made it exercise hard everyday, as if they were training a race horse, and it might have won a few races, but after too many years at being forced *beyond its natural limits and survival needs* for the entertainment and gambling of humans, it may soon be fit only for the knackers yard.

Recently in the UK, we had a half-marathon in which thousands of amateur runners took part, and was televised and thereby popularized as an entertaining and worthwhile event.

But four people *dropped dead* during it. The experts said it was rather tragic because usually *only* one or two died during such runs!

No doubt a good number of the participants were “conned” into it, likely under some kind of peer pressure or duress, as many were running for charity, and therefore likely manipulated into doing an otherwise entirely useless and dangerous activity – as to their own personal survival, health and evolutionary development you see – which actually resulted in a number of deaths.

Many people also get addicted to jogging or other forms of “high energy training”, pushing themselves near or beyond their limits, because apparently there is some sort of chemical effect such as *endorphins* – the body’s own version of morphine or whatever – which happen when we put ourselves into such pain for long enough.

That is, we can feel some relief by cutting ourselves or pushing our bodies to their limits with athletic training, but we are also risking damaging ourselves physically by such methods, which may be quiet and stealthy damage that will not surface for many years in any discernible form.

For example, we have all heard stories of top athletes – e.g. ex-Olympic champion runner *Florence Joyner Griffiths* – who suddenly drop dead for one reason or another, but seemed by all appearances to us to be in “perfect health” or “fit as a fiddle.”

Whereas some versions of the ancient Indian largely *preventative* Ayurvedic medicine, suggest only three sessions weekly of *moderate exercise* lasting perhaps thirty minutes each time as suitable for *most* adults.

Similarly, some kind of discontent must be driving those who climb dangerous mountains, or go into equally dangerous caverns in the ground, dicing with death in both cases.

We have got to stop thinking of all these activities as *normal* and start asking, just *why* are people doing all these dangerous things that put their limbs and lives at risk?

Are they trying to make a name for themselves?

In many cases, that certainly is the answer, but by no means all.

For there are many *other* ways of more safely making one's name, and finding a place in life.

Is this about meditation?

It certainly is, because if we don't know what is going on in their minds and ours, how do we know we will not end up like them?

Perhaps we will get sucked into the next bungee jumping group outing from our office, lured in by the excitement that we will enjoy doing something "crazy" to escape this mindless imprisonment we are in all week, and we might end up having a heart attack or something when we fall those several hundred feet in a few seconds, which if the elastic snaps will anyway most certainly result in our death.

But well, you know, they will tell us – *thousands of people do bungee jumps everyday.*

Why doesn't the author stop whinging?

It's normal. It's safe. It's OK.

Yes, we agree, not many people have heart attacks or die, at least not *immediately* after these exercises. But then what about a few days, weeks or month later?

Is anybody keeping such statistics?

In this high pressure, no-time-to-stop-and-watch-the-sunset world we live in, we very much *don't think so.*

So we are saying, this subject *is* about *real meditation* because it is about freedom.

The bungee jumper is saying *we want the freedom to do something crazy.*

But if they don't know what is motivating them to do what in the author's opinion *no one in their right mind ever would*, how can they call themselves free?

Perhaps next they will be tempted to do “fire walking” and thereby lose a few toes, or become an Arctic explorer and lose a few fingers too.

We had for example British “legend” Donald Campbell, who broke land speed record after record in the 20th century, in his “Bluebird” series of cars.

These “Evil Knieval” type pursuits fascinate children of all ages. The British SAS has the slogan “who dares wins.”

But they don’t point out to us an equally or even more likely truth:

who dares often DIES in the process

And of course, many of these “daredevils” eventually prove the truth of that, as did the aforementioned Donald Campbell who finally killed himself in 1967 in the process of breaking the water speed record at over 300mph on Coniston Water in the British Lake District.

So we have a society that functions on these kinds of ideas, of taking risks, and subjecting ourselves to extremes of activity and risk *as a hobby, as a legitimate means of entertaining ourselves.*

Thousands die yearly in motorcycle accidents, usually in collision with a relatively invulnerable car or more or less wholly invulnerable truck, but they keep showing *Easy Rider* on TV, so people keep buying motor bikes, and feeling the thrill of the sun and wind on their skin, and imagining they are invulnerable, at least for a while.

Shall we summarize?

We are saying only, our purpose here in life is to enjoy what we can, to have relationships with others, to have children, and to *evolve.*

How does risking death come into this, when there is *absolutely no need?*

But others will say - *live on the edge, drive fast and dangerously, and thus live short and gloriously, if so be it.*

So all we are saying is – do what you wish, but are you *really* free, or is this desire to dice with death coming from a dark place in your mind?

Are you hiding a death wish? Are you in a sense *worshipping death* while pretending to celebrate life?

So we are going into some detail here, not because we wish to conduct a personal campaign about road safety, but because we are trying to show that some immature concept of meditation, that involves merely reciting a mantra or concentrating on a candle flame or image of a lotus in one's mind, is not going to be enlightening if we already have a mind – as most of us one sees certainly do – which is full of wild and unnatural desires, like the death wishes of those who pursue dangerous sports.

For do we not see that there is surely here a kind of “shaking a fist at God” in these “dicing with death” pursuits?

For example, astronomy is a nice, safe and enjoyable hobby, as we do not know of one single person for example who has been hit by a meteor whilst peering through a telescope, and being struck by lightning is also unlikely, because the stars, moon and planets are not much visible on a cloudy or stormy night.

But that would not be shaking a fist at God, one sees, but rather an admiring of his handiwork.

As Marlon said to Truman in the *Truman Show* while sitting on a rock together admiring the moonlit sky:

“Yeah, that’s *the big guy*. Quite a paint brush he’s got . . .”

But this quiet contemplation will not do for the “sophisticated” modern man or woman, so again, we see that the issue is *the troubled, rebellious mind*.

It is what is in our mind that is controlling our life, and that is what we have to do something about.

We have mentioned that deliberate meditation techniques can also be dangerous.

But there are many who learn these techniques without realising the risks, and some have got into awful states thereby.

But how can that be, how can this mere “meditating”, have got them into trouble, which seems to be just some innocent and ineffectual piece of spiritual claptrap?

Those who know nothing of meditation think it is all nonsense, and that merely doing something in one’s mind cannot possibly have any serious effects on either mind or body.

What little they know!

And what is more, we *do not* recommend they try it, in order to find out!

It may be in fact that some people are naturally resistant to these ideas of meditation practices *for very good reasons*, because were they to use these techniques, they might stir up all kinds of “monsters” in their minds.

That is, let us be “scientific” about this.

We are saying, what many meditation techniques will do is to “stir up” the unconscious mind, they will place the mind into a passive state somewhat like a waking sleep in which it starts to output repressed materials as if one heated up a cauldron of impure metal, and all the “scum” and impurities started to rise to the surface.

If this “stirring” is done sufficiently this can be very disturbing to one’s mind.

It can if pursued long enough almost be like having nightmares whilst one is awake, which one cannot necessarily switch off.

We are in summation merely saying – unless one is drawn to meditation of the types mentioned by an overpowering desire which the present author cannot dissuade you from, it is best not to use what are from the strict yoga point of view, deliberate or *forcible means* of stilling the mind.

Some people may practice these techniques all their lives without much problem, but others could get into dire straits just after a few sessions of these forms of meditation, perhaps even *only one*.

As we have said, *it depends on who you are*, what your genetic make-up is, how sensitive or insensitive you are, and also the general level of activity in your life and other lifestyle factors.

We are going to explain in more detail why in the next chapter.

We will however finish by saying that this does not mean anyone is helpless without some kind of way to stabilize their mind and control their thoughts.

For we are rather recommending a more natural way of achieving these goals which we will explain in due course.

Chapter Two – How your psychological balancing mechanism works – the importance of sleep

Were we just the same as the other species of animals, which therefore can legitimately be called *lower*, we would not be aware that the source of all the thoughts appearing in our minds is a convoluted and indescribably complex organ inside our skulls known to human beings as *the brain*.

This piece of information which we are aware of and the other species are not, is absolutely vital to understanding our thought processes.

That is, merely given the information that the brain is a biological organ composed of cells just like the heart, liver or kidneys, we have a starting point for understanding our minds.

That is, just like our muscles, other organs and nerves generally, we can assume that the brain undergoes *wear and tear*.

We get tired and we cannot think so clearly any more, and though we can somehow force ourselves to stay awake sometimes, eventually involuntarily will come sleep.

This tells us that our body needs this sleep very badly – all animals sleep – and so obviously repair of various kinds is taking place.

So the question is – is it only our other bodily tissues and organs that need sleep or does our brain need it also?

Fortunately we do not need to speculate on this subject, as modern science has already done enough work for us.

What has been discovered, mainly using brain wave monitoring techniques and observing and questioning the subject themselves in the sleep experiments conducted, is that there are two kinds of sleep, both of which we need to maintain our mental efficiency and psychological balance.

The first kind is the well known REM or “*rapid-eye-movement*” sleep, which is the dreaming sleep. We can observe others in this phase, as we see their eye-balls swivelling about under their lids, which is a little creepy the first time one observes it.

The second kind is a deep state of dreamless sleep, which must be the nearest thing that we ever get to a state of “living death”, as obviously we have some kind of awareness during the REM sleep, even though its memory may disappear quickly, sometimes immediately on awakening.

The two sleep patterns alternate throughout the night, though the precise ratio of dreaming to dreamless sleep will depend on any particular individual’s age, make-up and other lifestyle factors.

If we awaken a person in REM sleep - which we do not recommend you do, as this is an important phase of sleep for them - we find that they have been dreaming, and their eyes are swivelling in order to follow round the scenes of their inner vision of dreams, which at the time they and we also when dreaming may believe to be real.

But the researchers went on to find out that if we deliberately deprive experimental subjects of this REM sleep by waking them up every time they begin to enter this phase, after a time they becoming very irritable, and after several days of this treatment they start experiencing mood swings, and can become paranoid and even violent.

So this suggests that if we deny ourselves the REM and dreaming sleep we will find the same happens to us. We will become moody and paranoid and therefore unbalanced.

So this implies the REM sleep is some kind of a psychological balancing mechanism, and therefore to miss adequate sleep regularly for any length of time will inevitably affect our mental health and well being.

But not only can we miss out on the REM sleep by failing to get enough sleep, it can also be interfered with by certain drugs, such as tranquilizers and also alcohol.

The researchers however also discovered that when someone who has been deprived of REM sleep for some days is finally allowed to have this phase of dreaming sleep once again, they dream continuously, and sometimes the dreams are far more powerful and frightening than normal.

This phenomenon is known as the paying off “*the dream debt.*”

But as we have said that alcohol and certain drugs, such as some tranquilizers and sleeping tablets can inhibit or completely prevent this dreaming sleep, we see that such people will also acquire a large *dream debt*, so that if they suddenly withdraw the drug use after a long period, they will find that they get masses of scary or even terrifying dreams.

In fact, after long term or heavy sedative, “hypnotic” drug or alcohol use, on stopping suddenly the person may even start to hallucinate and get all sorts of other unpleasant symptoms whilst awake, such as in the delirium tremens experienced by alcoholics, so therefore anyone with such a long term drug use situation should come off these things slowly, just as all doctors recommend.

Those who use alcohol will also notice that they dream more in the morning hours of sleep when the alcohol is wearing off, and this may cause them to have heavy eyes which have been swivelling about continuously in REM sleep for perhaps an hour or two or more to clear off this dream debt.

So what is this dreaming or REM sleep trying to do?

Why do we need it?

The answer basically appears to be “undigested psychological material.”

For example, if we have some awful experience, such as a car crash, or being raped or beaten up, or caught up in a war, we may have nightmares about it for a short or long time, or possibly even for the rest of our lives.

So it is our emotional and physical response to some “traumatic experience” – light or deep – which seems to cause some sort of “stress imprint” upon our brain and nervous system, which is required to be “ironed out” or balanced or repaired, with this REM sleep “output” occurring as a side effect.

Some gurus however such as Krishnamurti say they no longer dream, because their system has become so balanced and purified that this REM sleep is no longer required.

This would if true however seems to be an extremely rare achievement, and we would suggest with confidence that those who claim not to dream, simply do not remember the dreams they have, as in fact, most people do not remember the vast majority of dreams they have had in the sleeping phase, as this information is generally not helpful or necessary during our waking state.

But we now however can make a simple model of how experience affects the brain, and how the brain repairs itself.

We have some powerful experience or “stress”, which makes some mark on the brain, like a small graze on our skin, but in a few hours it is healed and gone, perhaps with some dreaming or other sensations as the “side effects” as we heal.

If the “cut” is deeper however, that may take far longer to heal, maybe a few days or even weeks or years.

But if we don’t give our brains a chance – by adequate sleep – these inner “scars” may not ever properly heal.

Then we find that we have a “congested mental system” in which many thoughts pop into our minds unrequested, and interfering in our ability to conduct our life and relationships in general.

In its extreme form, this may be the cause of something like “Tourette's Syndrome”, the sufferers of which may express involuntary movements, sounds and even rude speech.

We surely have to assume that any kind of “compulsive-obsessive disorder” must have this kind of “hard wiring” into the brain, which is not easily resolvable, due to some ingrained pattern of stress having created or forced the troublesome behaviour trait.

For example, a person who feels threatened or has been molested or whatever, may develop some kind of “nervous habit” to compensate, which may in time become more or less compulsive.

So we see that the problem is not the nervous habit but *the energy*, the “case of explosives” that sits beneath the habit and is causing it to continue as a symptom of the underlying problem.

As body language analyzers will easily point out, most of us develop some kind of nervous habit when placed under enough stress, such as holding our chin, shaking our heads, or drumming our fingers on a table top.

But we find we cannot *think* our way out of these behaviours, because we cannot get at “the hardwired circuitry” in our minds.

In the innovative movie, *The Eternal Sunshine of the Spotless Mind*, Jim Carrey volunteers to have his thoughts erased by some sophisticated technique which purports to track down his unwanted memories and erase them one by one.

But as in reality, no such technique exists, and as even the savage attempt by the psychiatric and medical communities of the not too distant past to remove “malignant behaviours” by “lobotomy” (cutting pieces of the brain out) or ECT (electro-convulsive or electro-shock therapy) has failed to change the behaviour patterns of mentally ill or obsessive patients, we are left with a serious problem on our hands and in our minds.

But in this problem let us observe something else – which is how *adults* often deal with their emotional traumas in comparison to children.

We see that more often than not, adults deal with their problems by *suppression or repression*.

That is, say we have a relationship breakdown, or are disappointed and rejected in “love.”

We tend to go through an awful series of emotions, mostly typically blaming the other party for everything that has gone wrong, whether this is justified or not.

But we do not necessarily simply allow the emotion to express itself and have a good cry or allow rage or whatever.

We sing songs like “I Will Survive”, we show *bravado*, we pretend we don’t care about that person, or their rejection of us, we say it is “their loss”, etc., we have all these “strategies” to paper over the immense pressure of this overwhelming emotion and pain we feel.

But really the only solution *from the point of view of normalizing the brain* is to (preferably in the privacy of our rooms) allow ourselves to *feel the agony*, to allow the *natural* release in tears or anger of the pain we really feel.

On the other hand, we typically see little children having some awful or even not so awful disappointment of getting hurt in some way, and *their response* is to bawl the house down.

But when they are finished – *hey presto*, they are bright and fresh and new – *it is like the tragedy never happened*.

And *there* we see a key.

If we cannot be wise enough not to invest our emotions and hopes in places and people it isn't safe, we have to allow ourselves to accept our own suffering without running away into denial.

For then we can come out fresh and new just like the child *as if it never happened*.

We do not recommend men bawl in front of their girlfriends or wives, or that mothers do the same in front of their children, because a woman needs to feel the security of having a man who seems to be in control of himself and invulnerable – *even if he isn't* – and likewise a child would be too distressed in seeing such pain and sorrow in its mother.

But this is all a last resort, and really should only be used for unavoidable pains, like for example one's close relatives or friends dying.

So we see now that the sensible thing is to avoid traumas to begin with, mainly by not having unreasonable expectations of the actions and loyalties of others towards us.

In a sense, we are all alone, as no one else can ever fully share our inner mental world, except perhaps our God, if such we believe in.

So really we have all got to build an armour of independence inside us, like Superman's "*Fortress of Solitude*" in which we can be ourselves, and at peace with ourselves in our own private inner world.

We would all like to be recognised, understood, but we discover like in Sting's *Message in a Bottle* that everyone else is seeking the same:

*I'll send an SOS to the world
I'll send an SOS to the world
Hope that someone gets my SOS
Hope that someone gets my message in a bottle*

*Woke up this morning
Can't believe what I saw
One hundred billion bottles
Washed upon the shore*

Seems I'm not alone in being alone

Others are not so interested in recognising and understanding *us* as they are desperate to have those things offered to themselves.

So the sensitive person feels the pain of seeing that others do not care much about him or her, as these others are too busy trying to find others to acknowledge and care about them.

But we do not run away from this *reality*. We must learn to live with it as a fact.

We can expect loyalty only from those whom we are important to by virtue of us giving to them in some way.

So we are saying, this *too* is real meditation.

This awareness of one's own pain, and that ultimately, except for a few remarkable people and close relatives or friends, and frequently not even them, nobody cares about us very much, unless they have something to gain from us.

If we just discovered oil on our land like *Jed Clampett* in *The Beverly Hillbillies*, we find a lot of people interested in us suddenly, who didn't much care that we existed or didn't before.

And then we hate them and we think – the greedy so and so's – they didn't care about us when we were poor, so why should they care about us now?

Whereas of course, the truth is, that they didn't care about us before and *they still don't* now. It's only *the money* they want, they don't even know who we are.

But then, we can get very hard and selfish, and we retreat into an angry little world, and we count our pennies and are ever on the guard for those idle, good-for-nothings out there who are trying to cheat us – so we become a mean-spirited Mr Scrooge.

So we see when we realise that only *we* care about *them*, but *they* don't care about *us*, that we have only two choices.

Either we don't give to them at all, or we give *without expecting anything back*.

So if we don't want to give, because we don't get anything back, that is up to us. But we have to be aware of it.

This is meditation too.

It is being honest and aware of ourselves, our own feelings and motives, accepting ourselves as we really are.

So then maybe we feel guilty, so then we give, not out of true desire to help, but to rescue our bad feelings about ourselves, to try to preserve in our minds the idea that we are charitable and good people when we are not.

But that is again *repression*, or *denial*.

If we hate, it is better we learn to live with our hate, be true to ourselves, and then one day we may not hate, but only we see when we stop pretending that we *love*, and not hate.

Because we are saying – love cannot be switched on and off like a tap – it is not definable by *positives*.

Love is only there *when hate is not*.

So we have to stop hating to become loving people, and if we can't, then we just live with the *fact* of being hateful and see how long we can last that way.

We need to find the root of it, because it is no good saying “ah, I will be a kind person” and then we give some money to a tramp, and he says “thanks granddad, you sucker!” or some other insult, and we are furious we gave, though didn’t even get a thank you, but worse, rather an insult.

Have they no gratitude, we ask?

So they made us angry after we gave charity to them.

So perhaps we should ask why we gave?

Did we want them to like us, respect us for being a good citizen?

Or did we feel they really needed it, just as the good Samaritan gave half his cloak regardless of the hate of the other person he was supposed by tradition of the hatred between their two tribes to have expected and received?

In the UK and other places we have had “aggressive begging.”

If we give a pound or dollar to such people, that is not enough for them, they then demand five or ten. If we give them five or ten, they demand still more.

So even “giving charity” becomes a problem for us, if our motives are not clear.

So where is the answer to all this?

We will find out as we proceed.

But for now, we have found out that we need sleep, probably more than the average person is getting, and we have discovered also that it can be interfered with by drugs, including alcohol, if we have more than moderate use of these things.

We have established a model of brain functioning, in which the mental stresses of life are relieved via this adequate sleep, mainly in the form of dreams, and that this is ultimately a process of healing or “purifying” the brain.

We have also become aware that the key to the healing of our mental states lies in not suppressing or repressing out true thoughts and feelings, but rather learning to live with them, and thus ourselves, as we really are.

Chapter Three – How to Really Live in “the Now”

Many yoga teachers, psychologists and New Age popularisers have used this phrase – “*living in the now*” – as some kind of a panacea for all our mental ills.

But they don’t tell us *how*.

For most of us easily fall into some dream state, or fantasy or thoughts which have got nothing to do with the present, *the now*, whatsoever.

This is very tempting to do for most of us, because *we are not happy in the present*, we are not happy with the so called “now.”

So why on earth would we want to live in it?

So therefore, most of us tend to have regular escapes into either comforting memories of the past, or else fantasy imaginings of our future hopes, which in most cases can never be.

In our minds, if male we can be a glamorous VIP like the one *Steve McQueen* originally or *Pierce Brosnan* latterly portrayed in *The Thomas Crown Affair*, or even a fearless, heroic womanising figure like *Sean Connery’s* incarnation of *James Bond*.

If female, we can dream of being the belle of the ball, the Queen Bee, who “has it all” - career, family, riches, beauty, clothes, mansion and prize man; or if we are less ambitious, we can just settle for being loved and not too fat, somewhat like the goal of the fictional *Bridget Jones*.

So in this as Krishnamurti explains, is *the escape from what is*.

We don’t think we are so handsome or pretty, so we either have surgery, or we stop looking in the mirror, or we deny the greater attractiveness of others, or any combination of the above.

Or maybe we say – *ah, beauty and looks are only skin deep, I have values in me much better than that*.

But we don’t say to ourselves – why and how did we decide beauty or handsomeness was so important anyway?

And as it is impossible to define precisely, to say exactly who is beautiful and who is not, and why, we thus see we are living with an idea which has no real meaning.

We are tortured by an idea which is ungraspable, just a ghost or apparition that we can never capture or pin down.

For as Krishnamurti also explains, *we live by comparison*.

We measure ourselves constantly against what others seem to be, what others have got, and then we punish ourselves for not living up to them, or else we try to deny the value of or punish those others who seem to be and have what we are not and do not.

So what do we do with all these thoughts we have, all these escapes from “the now”?

A million self-help books, therapists and gurus appear to solve our problems, and as we have said, frequently take a lot of money off us for on the whole failing to do so.

So here, we have a different solution – we are going to solve them for ourselves, instead of going to the “shrink” or the “guru” to tell us how and what to think, we are going to *take responsibility for the content and management of our own minds*.

And we are going to do that not with some hazy *idea* of “living in the now”, which in practice doesn’t happen, but by *actually living in the now*, by learning *to live with ourselves as we really are*.

For suppose someone were to write a book, which boldly claimed as its title *How to Solve Every Problem Under the Sun*.

How long would we expect such a book to be?

A few pages perhaps?

Surely at least a few thousand?

Obviously no such book could ever be written, which could solve every problem we have ever had or might conceivably ever have in the future.

The real answer however is rather like the man who is given only three wishes by the genie, and if he is wise, he makes as his last wish that he should be given *an unlimited number of further wishes*.

The genie which gives us unlimited wishes is *the state of genius*.

It is *a brain that can solve all problems* that we need - that is the size of the book, it is the book of *intelligence*, not of limited *information*.

And that intelligent mind only comes about when it is not trapped in limiting ideas, and it is not tortured by forever flitting from memories of a troubled past or escaping into the fantasy of an imaginary future which does not exist.

So how do we live in *the now*?

How do we stop all these regrets and hopes like two opposite ends of a seesaw, swinging us up and down all our lives?

As we have said, we learn to live with our thoughts and selves as we really are, we learn to live with as Krishnamurti says *what is*.

So how do we do this?

Our mind is like an enormously long tape upon which all our memories and experiences are laid, or like the data on the spiral groove of a record or compact music disc.

On this long tape, not only are memories recorded and laid, but emotional content is also added to them, like the pitch and volume of sound.

Some parts of the tape are smooth and there are gentle experiences and memories there which do not disturb us, but other parts are like the scenes from some horror movie and are so shocking we would if we were able like to cut those pieces of tape out.

But the parts which disturb us tend to be the ones that keep popping up, and the more recent they were, the more they pop up.

So we have got as we have said a lot of techniques for ensuring that these memories don't bother us too much, but then the trouble is, those memories never purify in our system, the cut or scar in the brain never heals, and so we never get our mind straight and clear.

The techniques used are many, but after a while, our minds get dulled, especially as adults, so the thoughts from long ago do not disturb much, only the recent ones, but the consequence of all this is that *our minds stay dull*.

It is as if we were once a great athlete, with the quicksilver mind of the young child, whose burning desire and powerful focus enables it to learn to speak a language without any teacher in just a few short years; but now we have taken so many bumps and bruises, we are not lean mean runners any more, but the "walking wounded", who struggle just to keep an even keel amongst the never ending pressures and demands of our lives.

Or again, we might once have "floated like a butterfly, stung like a bee", but now we are old punch-drunk boxers, still fighting to earn our bread, but taking three punches for every one we give out, and often swinging blindly as if in a fog and missing without any real coordination any more.

So we are down on the canvas. We are weak and tired, but is the next step only being knocked out?

Where do we begin our fight back?

And the answer is, we begin and *end* our fight back in *the now*.

But we are going to make this *living in the now* real.

That is, we live with our feelings and our thoughts on a moment to moment basis without running away.

But we know our mind wants to run away into fantasises of empowerment and grandeur, in which all our problems are solved, and we are happy all the time; or alternatively it runs into self-punishing moods of despair, taking all our regrets and bad memories out of the cupboard and brooding upon them and our "bad luck."

So *here* come the great step, the step that stops those thousands of therapists and self-help guides, with their “one day at a time” plans, and “affirmations” (*every day in every way I am getting better, etc.* – what a lie!) invading our minds and lives and taking our hard earned money away.

The step is not a step, but *a realisation*.

The realisation is that we cannot *do* anything about what we are, what we think, except *become aware of it*.

For example, person X has entered our room and won't leave us alone.

He or she is driving us crazy when all we want is some peace.

So what do we do?

Do we take it - this verbal assault on us, telling us of things we don't want to hear, demanding the attention from us which we don't want to give?

Or do we send them away and feel cruel for not listening?

As we said, *we do not have the book of answers here*, we are *not* unlike your “therapist” going to tell you *what to do*.

Because you see, the answer is not a verbal solution but *a state of mind*.

Let us keep simple.

This person enters, and proceeds to annoy us, and we first try to smile, but then sigh.

We consider trying to reason with them, tell them we are busy, but we know from past experience this just produces a wounded “you don't care about me” response, so we keep listening to avoid the guilt.

But then a moment comes when we can't stand the torture any more and we verbally lash out. We say “you are driving me nuts! Can't you just write it all in a diary or something?”

And who knows, that *might* work, and when we have assessed all the angles of the problem by becoming *fully conscious* of the game in our minds we are usually playing, we may find some such answer we never thought of before.

But if we just go into some awful conflicted state, *as is typical*, we never find the new solution, we never rise above the same problem, it being one of many that goes round and round ceaselessly in our lives, driving us to despair, and sometimes drugs or drink, or perhaps even to an illicit sexual partner or "lover" to get some peace, sympathy and relief.

So we have to *face the reality in our minds, and live with it without running away, see it as a whole.*

That is, suppose we were in the dark, fumbling around with some kind of package, unable to open it, as it is fastened or taped or bound with cord in some complicated kind of way.

We blunder in the dark, not really seeing its shape and the details of its packaging.

But if we *switch on the light*, if we have that *clear light of consciousness* we can see the problem for what it is, and then we can solve or master it.

So that means becoming a lot more understanding of ourselves and all those around us, not running off into a dulled anaesthetised oblivion by for example reaching for the bottle, but rather being more sensitive to the subtleties of the situation and problem than we have ever been before.

For instance, we may feel emotionally blackmailed and be unable to say *no*. We see that is what is happening inside us, in the feelings in our body and in our mind.

We become as fully aware of all that as possible, and then maybe we say – *hey wait, I don't have to take this any more.*

We perhaps – remember, we are not giving answers – say to the person – *you are placing a burden on me that is unfair, please stop it.*

Then they may howl and scream and hate us for not being the emotional punch bag and convenience which they were accustomed to us being.

So we *feel, become fully aware of* the guilt, the pressure they try to put on us, we take it just as a hardy sailor who gets a flogging takes his punishment without flinching.

If it is a life partner, if we give them enough of this kind of response, they may then even leave us.

So of course if we are scared of that happening, *we don't dare* treat them like that, we don't dare ask them to be fair with us, as we see it.

So then we live with *that*. We realise – we are slaves, we are taking abuse for the convenience of having this person in our life, whatever benefit we get from them.

So in that process we see that *we are trapped by need*.

So then we have a choice. We can either be the permanent slave of others, due to our need for them, or we can choose to emotionally *grow up*.

That is, suppose we stand our ground and say we won't let ourselves be abused any more.

(but let's be careful, we are not saying *be intolerant or impatient*).

Then that person may turn against us, and desert us, we may lose that relationship.

But then you see, that could be *their chance* to grow too.

They could realise – which note, *they never will unless we do this* – that they too are not so grown up, and should learn to stop sucking on and taking advantage of others for their own emotionally immature needs.

But they might not, they might just run off and find some other mug to exploit.

So let us say they do that, and *in the now*, we find ourselves *now alone*.

Then maybe we miss them. We feel pain. We put on some comforting songs or a movie to make us feel better, but it still hurts.

Then they call us. They are in pain. We are in pain too. And maybe they say “let's get back together.”

And then we have a choice. They may mean – let us go back to what we were before, let me abuse you again, give you the good and the bad.

But you say – I want *only the good*.

And they say – you are immature, you can't have the good without the bad.

So what is the answer?

As we have said, we are not definitely giving any answer to any particular problem because that is no good.

We might solve *one* of your problems, but what will you do when we are not there, and you have so many new ones?

It is like the saying:

Give a man a fish, and you feed him for a day; but teach a man to fish, and you feed him for all his life.

So we wish hear to *teach* how to fish, and not give you a fish that fills today and leaves your belly empty again tomorrow when a new hunger appears, as it always does.

So let us continue our little imaginary drama.

Let us say you decide – *I am not going back to that life before, I am going to tell him or her so.*

So you tell them you still care, but you are not going to be a doormat any more, you ask them to grow up.

But of course, you can only do that if you are playing fair, if you are going to be grown up too.

If you want them to listen to all your moans and worries, but won't listen to theirs, then you merely ask *them* to be mature, while you remain *immature* yourself.

By “mature” we mean “self-contained”, “self-sufficient”, “emotionally stable.”

And maybe then in their pain and frustration at you not accepting them as they used to be and still currently are, they say some angry, rude or insulting words to you.

So then you get pain. When they hang up in frustration, you are alone, it is all silence, there is a wall between you which wasn't there before.

So we can either have a society and family structure that lives on hugs and emotional compliments and tributes to one another, telling us how wonderful we are, or we can be a bit more stoic, and learn to stand up without the crutch of someone patting us on the head, saying a kind word about us, or rewarding us with a smile and a hug.

We can have a bit of "austerity" as the true yoga texts such as *Patanjali's Yoga Aphorisms* recommend.

We feel great admiration don't we for a "*Spartacus*" who is willing to suffer a lot of pain for what he believes in, maybe even die, or *General Maximus* in the movie "*Gladiator*" who shows this same stoic heroism; but we have the choice not only to be a feeble spectator of such beings, such warriors, but *to live like a warrior ourselves*.

For we respect *them*, those heroes, but we do not respect ourselves.

We don't mean a warrior with a sword in his hand which is only the superficial aspect of what a warrior is, because *the real warrior is inside the man or woman*.

It is the determined spirit of freedom and justice, both for oneself and others.

In the recent *Spiderman* movies we see Peter Parker is constantly attacked and humiliated, and even as Spiderman he is tried to be murdered and persecuted, even by those whom he would help.

So this is what being a hero is all about.

No matter how much they kick us while we are down, or try to kick us back down when we are up, we still stand, we are still a man, or if a woman, we are still being true to our self, we are still standing for our dignity as a human being, our rights.

So we put it to you that a *real meditator* is not some kind of Houdini escape artist who uses a mantra or magic spell to zip off into another peaceful yet oblivious dimension, but someone who heroically faces all their faults and weaknesses in a brave way.

What do we mean by brave?

Do we mean like *Li Mu Bai* or *Shu Lien*, the male and female master warriors of *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon*?

Well, on the mental level, *yes*.

What we mean is *someone who is capable of enduring pain for the sake of what they believe to be right*.

Because that is what we are going to get from *real meditation*, though we are also going to get *joy*.

That is, early twentieth century Russian “wise man”, *G I Gurdjieff*, for example upset some of his wealthy followers who sought him out as a teacher by first giving them a spade and telling them to dig.

They wanted to hear words of wisdom, but instead he gave them a spade and told them to dig, which they felt to be insulting, and only a labourer’s work.

His purpose was to teach them to enjoy labour, which many of these privileged visitors had never really done much of before.

For example anyone who has taken a “summer job” doing maybe fruit picking or other kind of manual labour may recall it as one of the most enjoyable times of their lives.

But in the modern society we are all asked to be intellectual and to tax our brains to the limit in the pursuit of knowledge, or more typically *profit*, but nobody stops to ask if this kind of work is really making anybody *happy*.

For when we work with our hands, our minds can be free, which explains why a good many saints did such work, even we might recall, Christ as a carpenter.

In the complex intrigue and chicanery that constantly surrounds us in the business, educational, political and even “spiritual” worlds, we have lost this concept of “honest work” as a worthy goal.

For example many people in the UK have given up professional jobs to develop property. They have discovered they would rather paint walls, lay carpets and plaster walls than do some complex but too mentally demanding job in law, accountancy or whatever.

As Gerry Rafferty sang in *Baker Street*:

*This city desert
Makes you feel so cold
It's got so many people
But it's got no soul*

*And it's taken you so long
To find out that you were wrong
When you thought it held every thing.*

Or as Elton John sang:

I've finally decided my future lies, beyond the yellow brick road.

These are sentiments felt by millions trapped in the hostile, overcrowded urban environments, so very far away from green pastures, and roaring oceans and seas, upon which the bright orange sunlight twinkles, but the city dweller almost never sees.

So it is part of this dulling also of the average adult mind, that such feelings dim. We live in the maze, and we accept it - this stealing of our lives - as normal, as the only way to live.

So the meditator seeks freedom.

But how can you be free and in a cage?

The Maharishi said that the test of a true higher conscious state, would be to see if a man still has this “inner bliss” whilst stood in the middle of Manhattan with all the traffic blaring and raging around him, in this atmosphere of almost deranged hyperactivity.

But many New Yorkers say they love the constant, ceaseless throb of activity in the city that never sleeps.

But it's addiction. It's work non-stop, it's drugs and drink non-stop, it's shopping, partying and sex orgies that never end.

It sure ain't *peace*.

Perhaps one of the strangest of all the Beatles songs was *The Fool on the Hill*.

It depicted some kind of a scarecrow-like idiot, who grinned foolishly, but then was he really a fool?

*But the fool on the hill
Sees the sun going down
And the eyes in his head
See the world spinning round.*

The strangeness of this number came partly as it was not remotely a "love song", it was not about a hero, it was not about any kind of figure such as "Eleanor Rigby" whom people had any real interest in or could easily relate to.

We are inclined to suspect it was a kind of "nonsense song", as inspired by the kind of "nonsense poetry" of Hilair Belloc and others, but the teasing aspect here seems to be – *is the fool on the hill really stupid or is he really wiser than any of us because he does nothing but live in harmony with nature?*

Fairy tales have frequently depicted some idle loafer or supposed worthless person such as "Jack" of "*Jack and the Beanstalk*" who when the circumstances were right, suddenly sprang into action and did something very remarkable, such a solving a riddle, or something heroic such as "fighting a monster" and typically ended up with the Princess's hand in marriage and a chest of golden treasure, even though he had originally rejected the "normal" life that others led and was considered therefore *just a fool*.

But we ask *who is the fool?*

Is it *we*, trapped in the technological competitive society, who barely get a chance to watch the sunset, our eyes hardly raised from our TV screens and computer monitors, frantically typing out “urgent messages” and “making the world go round”?

Or is it the fool on the hill, who free of worries and anxieties *lives in the now*, doesn't seem to want or need the relationships we have, which never really seem to work out anyway, and who walks in the golden gleam of sunrise and sunset each day, simply observing it all like a silent sage?

But we must have *responsibilities*, we cannot ditch human relationships as those who run off to some temple or monastery do, as traditionally has been the “sannyasi” path in India, and thereby leave our friends and families without our support.

That is, we cannot really “drop out” from society and expect to have any meaningful kind of life.

For when alone, cut off from society, we become like parasites feeding on ourselves.

We do not have personal experience of being in a monastery or temple, but we would guess except in rare cases it is pretty well much as petty and unsatisfying an existence as any life “in the world.”

The difference can only be, that all those who run off to a temple have made a kind of “pact” with one another to say “*I am holy, you are holy, so let us all feel superior to the scum of the world, and feel holy about one another.*”

Of course we are not denying the validity of a real temple, with truly wise or enlightened masters in it, as depicted in the *Kung Fu* TV series in the 1970s, but we would guess that finding a real life temple of that calibre is very far from being easy, especially in the corrupting modern age, where temples are opening their doors to all who would come, and often getting money from such “tourists.”

But the point is that running away from society, or becoming a “recluse”, is not generally the way to develop ourselves as human beings, because as Krishnamurti explains:

We only discover ourselves in relationship.

Relationships should be an opportunity to grow. The other person is in a sense always our “training partner.”

Just like with a training partner in a sport, sometimes we laugh and have fun together, but other times there is conflict, battle and rivalry.

So the only relationship between two people that can be always peaceful and without conflict is one either between two wise saintly people, or alternatively between two very repressed people who never challenge each other and thus never grow.

As Sufi “saint”, *Hazrat Inayat Khan*, pointed out, some of whose words were used on the Dutch rock group *Focus's* very good indeed *Moving Waves* album - *we are mirrors to one another*.

If we do not see another person, and therefore our reflection in them, in terms of how they respond to us, we do not see ourselves at all.

We just become a self-obsessed narcissist who doesn't evolve and grow.

So if the fool on the hill is really hiding out from human relationships, then yes, the odds are he really *is* just a fool.

We think there is security in isolation, because it brings freedom from conflict, but what we don't see is that the conflict is still locked inside ourselves, is just laying dormant, but will emerge as soon as we go back into relationships once again.

So we fail to grow.

Too naïve or unrealistic parents have unwittingly brought too many of us up to believe that life is just a bowl of cherries, they didn't prepare us to expect that it was going to be tough, by helping us develop this wisdom and stoicism, that is – qualities which are fit for being a warrior in battle, rather than a self-indulgent party goer and pleasure seeker.

But neither does that mean we should throw ourselves into tough battles, unequal contests, which we are not ready for.

We have to keep picking fights we can win.

Using a martial arts analogy, first we learn the basic moves, perhaps exchange a few slow and light slaps and block and parry one another, but we work up to fast and powerful moves and blocks, so that the fight is gradually more like *the real thing*.

But the real battle is *within our minds*.

If person X or Y says “we are no good”, bullies us, we can either crumble like a soft biscuit, or we can learn to take the punishment, we can watch our mind protest about them being unfair.

We may be able to defend ourselves verbally, which may or may not be wise.

But what we have to do is be aware of *our reaction* to this attack on us, and watch our minds play out all the scenes of revenge it typically will plan.

We may say to ourselves “who the hell does he or she think they are!”

We may tell ourselves we are better than them in a thousand ways.

We may decide what they need is a good slap, or picking up by the scruff of the neck and setting aright, for daring to talk to us like that.

But such people may have pursued a lifelong hobby of insulting people and enjoying watching their resentful reactions in this way.

So we have to know that people do play such *games*, of putting other people down to build themselves up, to intimidate others to gain power over them, etc.

On our first meeting with others, this kind of thing often happens.

If it is our first day on a new job, others are sizing us up, and at least some of them are going to try to “take liberties” to see what they can get away with and what they can’t.

But we are new, we can’t turn nasty and offend everyone, and get ourselves a bad reputation, so on such occasions, it is perhaps best to think in terms of this potentially humiliating initiation ceremony as a way for us to size *them* up, for us to discover *who is who*.

By observing very carefully on such occasions, we can gain information about others whilst they are not on their guard – because they feel powerful, and established in their identity in this group we are joining – which may be difficult to assess in them later on, when their true selves have “gone underground” again, acting all day long, as most people do in the work place, as well as in many other arenas.

So to gain this information, we have to be *there*, we have to be in *the now*.

We may feel anxious, scared, unsure what will face us, but we live with those feelings too, don't deny them *to ourselves*, and we will still see more clearly.

So in brief, the only true way to live in *the now*, is to know and follow all the pursuits of our minds which would take us away from it.

As time goes by we will find we get better and better at playing this “inner game”, and then our minds will grow clearer and quieter, and we will see more and more clearly in them, the reflections of others and the external world, and progressively see many more things that we have never seen before.

Thus meditation of the kind we speak of here is *not* something we do with closed eyes, without any awareness of the outer world, but something we do with our eyes *fully open*, and fully aware also of what is going on in us *inside*.

Chapter Four – Awareness is the Key

As we have said, our concept of meditation does not involve hiding out from the world in some quiet little room with eyes closed, seeing and thinking of nothing and no one, except for perhaps the monotonous chanting of some mantra or more sophisticated kind of process or variation on that theme of technique we might be engaged in.

Not that we are denying the value of being alone and quiet at times, which surely must now and then be essential for our mental health and well being.

Neither are we denying that forms of meditation with closed eyes and some kind of contemplative or concentrative process can be of benefit to some people at some times, though as we have also said such forms of meditation may be dangerous to certain people in certain circumstances.

But what we are saying is that we are offering something here instead, which in one sense could not even be regarded as a technique at all, because in fact it is merely a natural process of our mind which in this stressful and deeply unnatural Western society we have overlooked.

That is, ancient man used to live with his thoughts, feelings and pains, he did not have the thousand escapes we now do which interfere with what really is a natural process of *awareness*.

He had no prescription drugs to take away his pains and anxieties and maybe put him to sleep, except in some civilisations or tribes who had discovered various drugs naturally growing and made use of them, which we would have to say that except for medical reasons was therefore the start of the modern corrupting process of drug dependency and addiction which we now see around us almost everywhere.

Equally he had no TV, radio, music recordings, books or magazines to lose himself in and help him put undesired thoughts out of his mind.

He even had no church to go to, and not necessarily any idea of a god to pray to.

So in a sense, we are saying, all these modern aspects of life, which most of us regard as essential, have been very much man's downfall in terms of the purity and clarity of his mind.

These machines and drugs, and rituals and beliefs have become the avenues of escape from *reality*, from *what is*.

But wait - how can we say that?

Surely the machines, the technology and other trappings of modern life are *real* too?

Of course they are, but they are not part of the version of *Nature* that existed in man's infancy and early youth – they are the products of his intellect.

And as such, they have taken over his mind and his life.

For hundreds of thousands of years man has been a hunter, a nomad, a farmer, or sometimes even a warrior with a club or spear.

But only in the last fifty-years has he become a *couch potato*, and the increase in his waistline is showing this fact.

Thanks to this *rise of the machines* only a small proportion of society in the developed Western world now does any significant physical labour to earn its bread.

The heat and light and energy we need comes out of a wire or a pipe at the flick of a switch.

The food we eat, we no longer have to forage and hunt for, we just go along to a supermarket and it is sitting there already prepared for us on the shelf.

If even the effort of having to push a shopping trolley is too tiresome for us, we can just speak some words into a piece of plastic and somebody brings it to our door.

So we are not going to debate the philosophical question of “natural versus unnatural”, but we are going to point out that throughout perhaps a million years of evolution, man's life – what he habitually does with his body and mind each day – was never like this before.

And we wonder why we are having problems with our minds and bodies???

Have we all gone insane???

Well, it would likely seem to an observer from another planet that the truth is *pretty much so*.

For what would we think of a bull in a field that decided to charge at a stranger with a red rag no more?

What would we think if it put its feet up all day long, sat on a settee and spent its time checking out the TV guide?

And if the farmer said – hey, you are a bull, you must charge and stamp your hooves and be aggressive and snort – it might just say – *go away, I am living a more luxurious life now, the life of a stupid bull is no good to me any more*.

And then just like we, the bull grows fat and lazy and obsesses on trivia, takes up bad habits like overeating, drugs and smoking and gets no exercise, because when it wants to go someplace, it is only willing to travel by car.

What a sad sorry specimen that once proud and glorious creature will become!

But we are not bulls in a field you might say – where is the comparison?

Well, we *are* animals aren't we? We need exercise, don't we? We have a body that if we pamper it, abuse it and overindulge it will make us as impotent as a fat old castrated bull, won't it?

But surely our subject is *the mind*?

Well yes, but we are doing the very same to our minds also.

If we feed our minds on dross, they become dross, we *dumb down*.

Most TV does little to stimulate our brains or our natural feelings of admiration, respect and even *reverence* for Nature as *Albert Schweitzer* put it.

What it forever does do however is *stimulate our emotions, our passions*.

We are mentally drunk on *emotion*.

We have the scary movie, we have the weepy movie, we have the *sexy* movie.

We spend our lives engaged in utterly convincing simulations of what appear to our minds and bodies real events, but of course, do not actually exist.

We watch *the Battle of Waterloo* with Napoleon and Wellington doing their battle cries, or the *Battle of Britain* with Spitfires and Messerschmitts doing battle in the skies.

We experience the agonies and ecstasies of all these great men and women and great events of the past.

Sometimes we squirm at some scene, sometimes we are elated, sometimes we cry.

All these powerful thoughts and emotions we have, about events depicted upon a glass screen in front of a box of clever electronic equipment, which are not real.

But our *real* lives lack freedom.

We are prisoners of stress, we have to drive ourselves unwillingly to the office or factory, because if we don't do it, we don't get any money, we lose our security and place in society.

Many people say they enjoy their jobs. But why?

We want to know before we believe them what they would do if their lottery numbers came up.

There are many who enjoy their jobs of course, because of the respect that it brings them, like for example being a TV presenter.

But what if society became enlightened - do we think a bunch of enlightened men and women would spend their days as couch potatoes watching TV?

So what would be the value of the TV presenter then, with no worshipping audience to adore them and write them fan mail?

For does any genius spend his or her days watching TV?

No – the genius is busy working on his next great thing – his novel, his painting, his album, his concerto or symphony.

He gets to be creative and do what he loves, and the rest of us get to watch his efforts on TV, or more likely the efforts of those who are rather more mediocre, but as we have said, simply know how to whip up our emotions and excite us with thrilling car chases, onscreen rows or sex scenes.

A book on sales technique claimed to tell us the great secret of selling – people do not want *goods or services*. What they want are *feelings*.

That is, suppose we want to sell someone a worthless wooden block for a thousand dollars or pounds, or even a million.

If we can make them *feel good* about the deal, they will buy, they will pay.

So we tell them, this is *not* just any block of wood, this is *the* block of wood, the greatest there has ever been.

It is the one that *Pharaoh Tutankhamen* stepped upon several thousand years BC. It is the one *Beethoven* rap-tapped out the rhythm of the famous theme of his Fifth Symphony upon.

And if we believe those wild claims, we get *the feeling* of being part of history, of something great, and so we hand over maybe our life savings for some worthless block of wood.

Every con artist and manipulator uses *our feelings* against us.

The gangster in *The Sting* is lured by the emotions of *pride, vengeance* and *greed*, into trying to destroy the enemy who has made a fool out of him in a card game in which he has lost what to him was a trivial amount.

But because he is driven by *vanity, hate and greed* he ends up losing half a million dollar, he gets *stung* as if by a bee, but he doesn't get to float like a butterfly no more.

And neither do we, when others *use our feelings, our emotions against us*.

This is partly why all these emotions – greed, lust, anger, envy, hate, etc. – are all decried by all genuine spiritual scriptures and religious creeds.

A true religion does not wish to dominate or enslave us – it wishes to set us free *in the true sense*.

For how can any man or woman be free if they are emotionally manipulable?

Politicians for example know how to use our emotions against us, to gain cooperation for their sometimes dastardly deeds.

For example, if they want us to go to war, they paint us a picture of “*the enemy*” as a beastly monster, their race as one of ruthless cold-blooded killers, rapists and savages who have no respect for us, our culture or our liberty to carry on our lives in peace.

So like in George Orwell’s *1984*, they teach us to vent our savage emotions on “the enemy” as in the *two-minute hate*, and then once they have *our feelings* in their hands, they can get us to agree to whatever military retribution they deem is necessary, and we will shout “*yes, kill the beasts!*” in agreement with their usually evil plans.

So we have got to become *aware*.

Not just chant our little mantras in a quiet room and then think we are holy and getting better every day in every way.

We have to watch the TV screen and *feel what it is doing to us*, feel what *they* are doing to us with it.

For example we innocently start watching some drama or movie with an innocent sounding name, and we might think it is some kind of “safe” historical romantic drama, but within five minutes there has been a murder or some shocking scene of rape or explicit sex.

Then we are *traumatised*, and *hypnotised*, we are thinking – “this is awful, these things can’t happen, where is the justice? That bad person has got to get their comeuppance, the good guy has got to hunt them down and punish or even kill them.”

So we go through another sixty or ninety minutes of anxiety watching the good guy threaten a lot of people into giving information to track down the bad guy, and eventually near the end, we get what we have *really* been waiting for, which is to see the “hero” giving it to the bad guy in no uncertain terms.

At minimum he has to get the handcuffs on him and have him sent off scowling and cursing to the pen.

Or we might get a better feeling of justice, vengeance and relief if there is an exciting “*Dirty Harry*” style chase and shoot out, and the bad guy ends up floating in a ditch or slumped on an iron fence post that sticks all the way through his body, which we know nobody, no matter how evil, could possibly survive.

So the TV dramas and movies so often feed on our feelings of fear, of blood lust or vengeance, and somewhere along the way they will - in those countries where they can get away with it - throw in a sex scene or two, to make us feel good in that way also.

And what is it all for?

It’s called *entertainment*, but in reality all they are doing is showing us what hooks us so we watch the adverts in between, buy the products, and pay them the licence fee.

Just think of the thousands of hours watching *total fantasy* that most adults now spend most of their spare time doing, that they could have used to do something else, something real.

Christmas time shows us what the game is really about, because all the TV stars and celebrities and presenters aren’t there any more.

They are busy partying and taking fabulous holidays abroad and celebrating *their success*.

On the TV we are all fed repeats of shows or movies or other productions made long before.

We watch their “entertainments”, they give us the privilege of having a little glance into their glamorous lives, while they are on a yacht in the Mediterranean or having wild extravagant parties and sex orgies at some mansion with security gates and ten thousand acres of grounds.

So are *we* trying to use *your feelings* against you, just as they do, are we trying to whip up *envy*?

Not at all.

But realising, becoming *aware* that we are far too often manipulated mugs, is surely a necessary process in becoming free.

Would there be any life, if we turned our TV or hi-fi off?

For most of us there would be only *emptiness and pain*.

Psychologists and other commentators saw what was coming in the technological age.

In centuries gone by men and women were kept busy just dealing with the survival needs and everyday tasks of their lives.

Women in the past for example could spend *hours* cooking, cleaning and washing clothes, whereas now those tasks are mostly automated in one way or another by the machines.

And as the robot factory machines – such as those incredible ones that make cars without any human participation on the production line – have taken away the need for men's labour, they too have got too much time on their hands.

So the “future watchers” saw that as the technological march of “progress” went on, there was going to arise a great need to deal with what they called “*unstructured time*.”

If we only work seven or eight hours a day or less for five days a week or less, there are going to be an awful lot of hours in which people will somehow have to be *occupied*.

So huge industries have evolved to tell us what to do with this *unstructured time*.

We have DIY, we have hi-fi and TV, we have now almost the ultimate “time stucturer” - the modern multimedia PC.

Like in *The Matrix* or some similar movie, one day we fear all that we will have to do is stick some wire running from the PC into our brain, and then maybe we will just spend our whole life sat in a chair, living a total fantasy of our own imagining *or someone else's*, and when it is over and we die, they will just take us off to the incinerator.

Because just what are we supposed to do with our lives anyway?

If we suddenly had to decide what to do for ourselves, how to live our lives, we would be in a state of shock and maybe even terror, just like any drug addict who suddenly has all their drugs taken away.

So as we said *we are not giving answers*, because the answer is for *you* to decide. But what we are saying is that you cannot decide what will be a meaningful life for you, when you are being hypnotised successfully by everybody and everything else.

The movie actor, TV chat show presenter or sporting star maybe earns millions of pounds or dollars a year, but we earn a tiny fraction of that.

Yet they *enjoy* their work, and most of us at least partly hate what we have to do.

Does that seem fair?

They get paid huge amounts for doing what they love, and doesn't look too hard, and we get paid not a lot for heavy responsibilities or drudgery we often hate.

So it's *not* fair, is it?

So why do we all worship *them*?

Because they are the people *we would like to be*, we live *by proxy*, we live by following their lives and at least for a while *pretending we are them*, just as in the movie or TV drama, we pretend we are the hero or the heroine.

So where is the answer?

Shall we organise and march on Hollywood and burn the TV and film studios down?

Surely, that's not the way, the path of *blame*.

Not that they are *not* to some degree to blame, but this is not about attacking others, it's about *gaining freedom for ourselves*.

We must start by blaming *ourselves* for being so stupid.

No one takes us by the scruff of the neck and makes us watch the movies and the TV.

We just have to realise that we have been *hypnotised*.

We are all like in *The Truman Show*, but whereas Truman is trapped *inside* the TV studio, and does not realise he is on TV, we are trapped *outside* of it, watching it, and still not realising we are prisoners, but thinking *unaware* that we are free.

For the only real freedom or imprisonment is *in our minds*.

So at times people point something out to us, or we hear something on TV which shocks us, and we suddenly realise that although we formerly confidently felt that we knew everything about everything that was worth knowing, we now realise that *we did not*.

We feel a bit naïve, though we will try our best not to let anybody else know that we were so ignorant and ill informed.

For example, we are admiring a nice young man or woman in our office or local gathering place, whom we would like as a friend or partner, and we think they are so special, and ever so discriminating in their choice of friends, and "the faithful type."

But then we find out from some gossip one day that they take lovers as regularly as they visit the hairdresser, and that we were the very last one to find this out (that is, if the gossip is *true*).

Then we experience a big fall and loss of faith in our own judgement, and after that we look with great suspicion at every person we are attracted to whom we see.

So the *fact* is that we are all to a greater or lesser degree *unaware*.

It is all relative. We know and understand something the person over the way does not, and they know something also that we don't.

Because most people are acting, not being what they pretend to be, we are always at risk of being taken in, deceived.

So what do we do?

We put it to you that there is only one kind of true therapy in life, and that is *reality therapy*.

We have to face facts, and when we become good at that, when we stop living in dreams and fantasies about others and about life in general, and start living with what is real, we start becoming truly *aware*.

But let us look at what is *awareness* in simple terms.

For example, J Krishnamurti, who is the main inspiration for much of what is written in this book, told a short story about the subject to make the point crystal clear.

He said he was once travelling along a country road in a car full of passengers who were all chatting away merrily, when suddenly the car ran over a goat.

But they all carried on talking away as if it hadn't happened, and he asked them "Excuse me, did you not notice that our car just ran over a goat?"

But not one had noticed, no one had been *aware* of it.

Or as the blind *Master Po* from the 1970s TV series *Kung Fu*, asked the boy *Kwai Chang Caine*:

You feel pity for me as I am blind, but do you not hear your own heartbeat, do you not hear the grasshopper at your feet?

And the boy Caine asked in reply:

How is it, old man, that you hear these things?

And Master Po answered:

How is it, young man, that you do not?

So we have the question of *how* to be aware.

And the answer is that there is no *how*, there is only awareness of the fact that *we are not*.

In the last sentence, perhaps you were not *aware*, but we have just unveiled perhaps the greatest “secret” in this book, so here we must repeat and explain.

For example, in some Zen Buddhist temples a monk with a big stick would give a whack to those monks who fell asleep while they were supposed to be meditating.

Is that really the way to go?

Is that how we learn awareness?

It is certainly how we learn *fear*, if we live in worry that the big stick is on its way.

It is *not* the way to develop *awareness*, because fear diminishes our awareness, all our senses and powers of observation contract.

We go into some scary situation, like a job interview, or an encounter with some very bad criminal type person, and sometimes we hardly remember what was said, or even what happened.

The fear overpowers our senses, and sometimes people in such states of fear, for example those who are asked to speak in front of hundreds or thousands of people unaccustomed, go into a state of paralytic shock unable to say or do anything.

So we may try to “beat ourselves” into awareness, but it is not possible.

All we can do is *be aware that we were unaware*.

Let us be clearer still.

We are sitting in the car at the traffic lights on red, waiting for them to change. All of a sudden someone beeps us from behind, because they are now on green, so it is time to go.

We were in a dream, lost in thoughts. The person is complaining with the beep of the horn that we were unaware.

So what can we do?

Nothing.

Just be aware we were unaware.

We were lost in thoughts, worries, and we see that when this is the background of our minds we will be caught unawares many times.

J Krishnamurti said to solve all our problems, we need *a mind that has no problems.*

That is, a mind that is not forever lost in dreams, memories, analyses, worries.

So *here* is the magic.

If we find that it *is* in such a state, we simply become *aware* of that. Then we are in *the now* again.

Every time we notice we are unaware we simply return to *the present moment, the now again.*

But we see this is not actually *a technique.*

This is *the normal action of a sane mind.*

But it is not happening in us now, because *we have lost our minds, our control over them.*

It is like when our computer locks up in some kind of a “system crash.”

Our minds cycle over and over, churning up the same material going round and round, and it may be minutes or even hours before we “come to.”

Particularly after some traumatic or unpleasant experience – e.g. somebody insults us unexpectedly – our minds can churn on and on for hours with feelings of resentment, hate, fantasies of revenge and so on, which mostly it would be extremely unwise for us to take.

So we have to learn to merely *watch* this. We are aware of it, and eventually it dies down.

Only *when all this struggle of the mind has died down*, does some solution come to us about how to deal with the situation, or even if it does not, at least we then once more have a feeling of peace, of calm.

When we gradually regain our minds, by practicing this awareness – which we will recall implies *no effort*, but merely *realising that we were unaware*, and therefore *automatically* being in a state of awareness - we find in time that our mind starts to become quieter, we are always *more aware* than we used to be.

Our attention can then get so fine, our concentration can then *naturally* become so intense, that we find a great joy in being able to see and feel things which we formerly did not, and we soon become aware in feeling and seeing these “new” things that many times others do not – *we hear the grasshopper*.

But what we never do, when we realise we were unaware, when we catch ourselves being unaware - lost in thought and dreams at any particular moment - is *get angry*.

Because that ties us to the past, that puts new blocks on our mind, lays down deep cuts on the track of our memories.

But if we *do* get angry we observe that *also*, for then the anger starts to fade already, as soon as we become aware of it.

Do we understand?

The mind is trying to pull us toward emotional whirlpools to escape into, and its never ending games of analysis, trying to solve *intellectually, linearly* problems that it cannot.

That is, we cannot see clearly with an angry, anxious or fearful mind, or one full of wild and confused thoughts.

We see clearly, just like the sky and mountains being reflected in the calm waters of the lake, only when *we have cooled down*, when we are relaxed but poised in our minds.

These savage emotions of anger, hate, vengeance, etc., dull our minds, blind us to commonsense, to clear observation.

So we must if it happens just become aware of and *see beyond it*.

Be aware that our teeth are gritting, our eyes are narrowed, there is a snarl upon our lips, we are like an animal ready for battle.

And then when we *really* see ourselves, it is gone, we are human again.

Once in such an excited state however of anger, passion or fear, it may take hours for it to die down completely, but each time we see our state, we regain control a little more, we are less likely to do something stupid than before.

So in this process we see that our business in life has changed somewhat.

We are not so much judging and blaming others for all that happens any more, but rather turning our attention on our own thought processes and “habits” as being the real cause of our misery.

For we have become aware that we are unaware – we keep running over goats and not noticing, we are so caught up in thinking about other things.

We sit hypnotised by our TV or PC screens, lured in by some images that draw us in like a magnet and take away all our free time.

Or even if we can turn the TV or PC off, which we don't realise how hard it may be until we try, and feel the awful silence and emptiness that happens to us when we are stimulated no more, then our minds start developing escapes of their own, fantasies and dreams.

So let us first be aware of one simple fact. We are unhappy because *we are losing our minds*.

They don't belong to us any more. They belong to the advertiser, the politician, the seducer or the bully, who has planted fears or temptations there with which to control us.

We imagine we are free?

What a joke!

All our lives are mapped out with “dos” and “don’ts” almost from the cradle to the grave.

We are handed from one person to another who bullies us into doing what they wish and tells us what we should think, and those who are by now totally in paranoia of this realisation, may well think that the author is trying to do the same to them also.

But no.

For we are saying only - *retake possession of your own mind.*

Make it your own, make it “a holy place” to which are admitted only those whom you voluntarily allow in.

And this you can accomplish merely by *being aware* that you are currently not your mind’s own true master, and this awareness alone *will set you free.*

Chapter Five – Inhibition – the power of *No*

We are all the products of our past, or every experience that ever happened to us, and every response to that experience that we made.

Krishnamurti calls this shaping of us as human beings *the conditioning process*.

We are in our early years trained principally by our parents just like any other animal is trained by a trainer – either well or badly – and likewise that training process continues with the teachers at school.

Those who enter the armed forces of any nation also go through a period of strict disciplinary training, as do those who take up a martial art.

In most occupations in general, it is necessary for us to learn rules and acquire habits, which when eventually fixed firmly in our minds enable us to do the job without too much difficulty.

So habit is key to our lives, and habit come from our training, from being *conditioned*.

In this process of learning habits, the essential thing is that we have to make a persistent effort to establish the habit, for example to learn to play a scale on a musical instrument or master some verbs of a foreign language takes us a lot of hard effort over and over again, until it then becomes easy as it has become *automatic*.

But once a habit has got to this automatic stage it then becomes hard to change. It is in fact harder to change a habit than to create a new one, once it is formed.

So our minds are full of habits, or little routines cycling over and over, and it is the major part of the “awareness” process we have introduced in the previous chapters to identify these habits in our minds, especially if they are unhelpful ones.

Awareness alone may release us from the imprisonment of all habits eventually, but in the short term it is easier to change a habit *by force*.

But in dealing with an ingrained habit, we must realise we are in the position of King Canute, trying to force back a stubborn tide.

To defeat a bad habit, such as an addiction, we have to *never give up*.

For example, suppose we have a gambling addiction, and cannot get past a betting shop without being lured in.

We have to keep fighting it day after day for as long as it takes.

All modern people under fifty or so in the West have been brought up in what has been called *the permissive society*, that is, the society which doesn't like to say *no* to any desire it may have.

But we *must* learn to say “no” both to others and *ourselves*, or we are prisoners to our desires, we can never be free.

The point is this – any addiction or habit can be changed. We just have to *desire to change it* and never give up.

And in fact, this *desire*, this decision to give up, is the real problem.

Because many of our bad habits are actually some kind of self-destructive act, only on the superficial level of our minds do we often “want to give them up.”

So we have to realise that our addictions are because we are *self-destructive*, and we gradually have to become *aware* of what is causing this self-destructive tendency in ourselves.

But where there is a powerful *peer pressure* for example, to either do or *not do* some kind of activity, we see many people defeating these “incurable addictions” much more easily than it might have otherwise seemed possible.

That is, the majority of the people's most powerful psychological desire is *to belong to a group*, which in modern terms amounts to *being fashionable*.

Our lives are controlled by the desire to “fit in.”

We all like to think we are individuals, but actually most of us are desperate *not* to be truly individual – which would mark us out as “different”, “strange”, “odd”, maybe even “eccentric” – but only to become “fully paid up” and accepted members of whatever group we wish to belong to.

For example, a man or woman who desires to be a big business person or lawyer, is generally going to have to dress in a “high profile” but dignified way which befits the image of those who belong to those classes of beings - with perhaps a pin-striped suit and well shined, expensive looking shoes.

Similarly, someone who wishes to be a “heavy metal” rock musician is likely going to have to get at least one rebellious looking tattoo or piercing, adopt an unkempt or wild kind of hair style, and wear some leather and studs.

Such “rebellious dress”, as worn by some classes of rock star and the teen rebels who idolise them everywhere, are really just as much uniforms as the business suits of the business executives.

One is the uniform of the so called “conformist”, the other is that of the so called “rebel” who is not really the free person he or she thinks himself to be, as such people are only doing *the opposite* of what the “square” person does, which is just a different kind of conformism.

Really free individuals don’t follow any fashions slavishly, but rather seek their freedom mainly on the inside.

They are perhaps the fashion leaders rather than the followers, though a truly free person does not desire to lead others into any kind of slavery, including that of fashion.

But like say Picasso, Dali or Mahatma Gandhi they simply develop their own *style*, their own *individuality*.

But if we look carefully, there is nobody who in matters of dress or style is not imitating someone or something. We often just don’t see where it is coming from, because it is often a mix of other influences or ones that are long forgotten, and the same is mostly true in music also.

For example in music, rock and New Age music legend *Vangelis*’ classic album *Heaven and Hell* sounded like the most avant-garde album ever made to those teenage listeners of the 1970s, but when many of them matured, they realised that he was heavily influenced by others before him, such as *Carl Orff* and his well known *Carmina Burana*, though of course in fairness to Vangelis, this has been true of *every* composer or artist who ever lived.

For example again, in dress, over decades the same styles are rotated over and over again with only the barrier dictated by morals on what is permissible.

For instance, those who believe that the kind of modern day revealing fashions such as short skirts, etc. are unprecedented, do not realise that these were the same kind of fashions that were in vogue at the time of the decline of the Roman Empire, and no doubt many other societies and empires of former ages deteriorated into the same kind of decadent fashions, when the society become morally unrestrained and intent on instant gratification as we are doing now.

It is all like in that jazz standard song, *Anything Goes*, by Cole Porter which for its brilliant social commentary is worth quoting at length:

*Times have changed
And we've often rewound the clock
Since the Puritans got a shock
When they landed on Plymouth Rock.*

*In olden days a glimpse of stocking
Was looked on as something shocking
But now, God knows
Anything goes.*

*Good authors too who once knew better words
Now only use four letter words
Writing prose, anything goes.*

*The world has gone mad today
And good is bad today
And black is white today
And day is night today . . .*

Our standards are changed *piece by piece*, just as under some excuse such as the so called “war on terrorism”, our human rights can be taken away likewise piece by piece so stealthily we hardly notice it.

And then we could easily end up under the excuse of “our own protection” living in a society in which we are not allowed even to have free speech, and express what we really feel in our minds and hearts.

Of course, the truth is that this situation has only been created by the botch up of those in high places, who have failed to make friends and peace with other nations on our behalf.

We might ask, what has this got to do with learning to control our bad habits?

The answer is that *the personal is the political*.

What we are *individually* becomes what we are *collectively*, which in turn becomes what we are as a world.

For example, there is a sect of religiously inclined people who live together in certain parts of Britain called "*the Plymouth Brethren*" who don't watch TV or vote in elections, or otherwise participate in the "artificiality" of modern society, perhaps somewhat similar to the "*Amish*" in the US, who were "celebrated" in *Truman Show* director Peter Weir's movie, *Witness*, with Harrison Ford.

Do we think if the world was composed entirely of such people who reject all the values of the current society, and devote themselves to living a simple life according to the religious scriptures, we would be having this kind of national and international chaos?

There would be no teen pregnancies, no drug addiction, no gangsters and guns, no rape and murder, and likely no civil unrest and war between nations.

So is this to suggest we should all take our TV's to the rubbish skip and become like the Plymouth Brethren or Amish?

Well, there are far worse ideas being suggested by our current leaders, so for those who are so inclined, why not?

They have peace, they have a stable life, they have schools in which teachers are listened to with respect, and not spat at, assaulted and raped.

Many local people to these kinds of communities have tried desperately to get *their* children into the Plymouth Brethren's schools, but of course, understandably this is not permitted unless one signs up to "the whole package" of this community's way of life.

But of course we are made to mock or laugh at these seemingly "repressed" peoples, who don't enjoy the same freedom as the rest of us to do all these bad and generally self-destructive things.

We do not for example think the pop star *Madonna* is ever going to join the Brethren, and therefore as she leads millions of women and girls by her example of "freedom", they are not going to do so either.

What we see in society is the desperate search for *identity*.

In rock band *The Who's* classic song

Who Are You?

is posed this question of identity, which if we look at *The Who's* output generally, was a central theme of their songs, as clearly even their chosen band name suggests.

When asked the social question “what do you do?” we are taken to understand it is about *our occupation*.

Thus the fierce, competitive struggle for jobs, because we are treated as a human being based on *our job title*, which defines what group we belong to, and therefore what privileges and respect we are accorded by society.

On a recent UK chat show a TV presenter confessed that on his first day in the office he was told by one of the other famous already established presenters: “We don't like you, we don't want you here. Why don't you just *disappear?*”

For he was seen as a threat to this bully's status, his identity, his *job title*.

As soon as someone says I am the *manager*, the *director*, the *chairman*, the *anchorman* (or woman) we think *high*, whereas if someone says *cook*, *bus driver*, *clerk*, *assistant*, we think *low*.

That is, as Krishnamurti points out, we directly associate *function* with *status*, and in turn *status* with *net worth* as a human being.

And this association of *status* with *function* might be a fair system of assessing others in terms of their *type*, but *if and only if* jobs were always awarded on merit.

Due to *ambition* however – that is, *the desire to become what one is not* – we find in practice that a lot of people hold jobs which they are unfit *by nature* to do, and then the job titles do not necessarily mean what in theory they should.

For example, let us take the case of the *lawyer*.

Lawyers are generally respected and esteemed, because like a doctor, we feel they can have decisive power over our lives at times, and they are generally very well paid, some of them enormously so.

But what is it that most of them are really doing?

Let's list briefly the main types – *personal injury* or *negligence* lawyer, *property* lawyer, *criminal* lawyer, *family* lawyer, *commercial* lawyer.

If we look at them one by one, we see that they are all there to force people to behave and be fair – *as defined by the law* – when they won't or don't.

So that is, the vast majority of lawyers only exist because *we are behaving badly, and unjustly to one another.*

But the reality is even worse, because the law is often used as a weapon by the more powerful against the less. We say we have *a better lawyer* than the other person, meaning, *a bigger stick to beat them with than what they have to beat us.*

So this may be “the law”, but it clearly is not *justice.*

But these lawyers who therefore *bully* the weak on behalf of the strong, we *respect.*

We are not of course condemning those lawyers who truly act in the spirit of justice and decency, though we fear they are not the majority, but we respect them *all* it seems equally, just on the basis of *their job title.*

So how do we escape from the tyranny of being categorized and condemned by the jobs we have, or perhaps do not even have, suppose we are some place where work is hard to find, or we are a mother who has decided not to work in order to devote all her time and attention to her children?

We simply say *no*, we will not accept society's criterion of judging people on what they do or don't do.

For example, Einstein was at first a clerk in the Swiss patent office, and only became a professor in later life *because of what he was as a human being, because of his intrinsic worth.*

That is not of course remotely to indicate that everyone will eventually get a job title that matches their intrinsic worth, certainly not in the current society.

Thus we may be deceived in this society by the confusion of job titles with intrinsic worth, as the job titles do not necessarily mean what we imagine they do.

Someone calling himself a priest may be a wicked greedy person abusing his flock, whereas some lady who is a hairdresser may be almost a saint.

Likewise someone calling him or herself an accountant may be really ninety-percent a crook, whereas someone who faithfully cleans the school floor and windows may be of a noble, trustworthy and honourable character.

Nature or “God” has its own “royalty” and “hierarchy” which may be very different than what we see in the outer world.

So we must not be deceived by worldly status and position, and should in general be more inclined to trust those who have little, rather than those who have so much (but only if their "modesty" is out of choice).

Kundalini expert Gopi Krishna said that in ancient India, when a truly civilised society existed, the rulers and leaders of society were allowed to own *no personal property*.

They *might* live in a palace as a symbol of their status, but *it did not belong to them*, it was not their playground to hold wild parties and orgies in.

They were not busy inspecting their balance sheets and portfolios of share and property ownership, but were rather busy in improving themselves and the lot of their people.

Why do we not hear that regarding our current leaders?

Why do we not hear “the king” or “queen” or “prime minister” has decided to give up partying for a while and cancel the holiday on the yacht in order to go on a spiritual retreat to ponder if he or she is doing the best for the people?

On this retreat, they talk to the wise, those who care about world peace and social justice and harmony.

We are not saying that no leaders, kings, queens or even princes ever do such things, but as peace, love and freedom are not seen at the heart of our modern society and world, they are evidently not doing it half enough, or else are not putting into practice the ideals which they may nevertheless really hold and feel, some place buried deep inside themselves.

Many politicians and rulers and people – in fact those in all positions of responsibility – started out with high ideals, but they, just as we, get *compromised*.

We find that the culture we have joined is not what we imagined or expected.

We join the law thinking *Gregory Peck* in *To Kill a Mockingbird*, who bravely defends a black boy accused of raping a white girl in a deep South racially prejudiced American town.

Or we think *Perry Mason*, or even Daniel Benzali's brilliant portrayal of a modern justice seeking lawyer in the clever series, *Murder One*, in the mid 1990s.

But the truth is more like *LA Law*, or any other of these "gritty" series with their constant corruption, sexual intrigue, blackmail and greed.

It is these kind of corrupt, corrupting, ambitious, deceitful, ruthless and sexually overactive people, who currently get to the top in our society.

Those who are honest, kind, and gentle – note, we did not say *weak* - rarely get above the bottom rung in anything, except the nobler professions such as medicine and teaching.

Yet they are the *real* power of intelligence and strength who hold the world together, while their superiors are doing their very best to smash it apart with their stupid and visionless decisions and policies.

We fail to understand the difference between the person who has *strength* and the bully.

The bully is the person who is forever willing to *use* what strength they have got, often in a cunning and manipulative way, so we regard them as dangerous, whereas the good person only uses force or power when driven to an absolute extremity by circumstances.

As said in Sun Tzu's *Art of War*, the best general wins the war without ever fighting a battle.

If however, we were to upset a really strong person – mentally or physically or both – they would be a far deadlier enemy, but to upset a noble person who just appears kind, polite and honest isn't easy, fortunately for those who are currently in power.

But the strong and honest should be warned that the bully type people generally act *in groups*.

They pull strings of power, they are nothing on their own, but when they get power in some group, for example in the workplace, they start to use whatever influence they have gained to repress and bully others who in themselves are far stronger human beings.

The insecurity of the inwardly weak, ambitious bullying types, drives them to forever assert themselves, going round interfering in everything, rather than letting the truly competent people, who are usually beneath them in rank, to get on with their jobs.

But the *Harrison Ford* type “lone hero” who successfully fights against a corrupt system, or evil group of people, for example in the movie *Frantic*, in order to get his wife back from a criminal gang, is a very rare figure in real life.

So the good have currently got to be *very careful* in exerting and maintaining their rights for what they need in life.

For example, if we are bullied in our job, and no complaints to higher superiors are of any use, as is typical also, we should get another one somewhere else, because otherwise this bad culture where we work is feeding off the energy and power of the good people.

When no good people will work for them any more, the bullies will have to change their ways, because the good people are the only ones who see that anything ever gets done properly, and thus, should be the ones in authority, but mostly currently are not.

Thus if as a married woman you are being abused at work, the option is there to not work until you find a job where you are not abused, as long as your male partner is producing enough income, or you are able to simplify your life and reduced your expenses so you don't have to work.

Of course we should fight injustice *where we can*, but sometimes all we can do is *refuse to cooperate, refuse to play the game*.

For example, when all men begin to feel ashamed for using prostitutes - though we would argue this can only be part and parcel of a society that makes sure we all have a partner by a properly arranged social life - men will stop using them.

Then the procurers of women will go out of business because there won't be any demand.

But men will not feel shame, or will ignore it, whilst society is telling them that they should be getting *it* every day or they are *losers*, and made to feel humiliated if they aren't sexually experienced, even by other women they may know.

Likewise many women are lured into prostitution by amassing huge debts, with all the easy credit available to them – *live now, pay later* – that they get in the Western society.

Women must become *aware* that accepting credit and therefore debt, could end up ruining their whole lives and forcing them into some kind of prostitution, or even slavery in a job they are abused in and hate.

We have all got to learn to say *no*.

Teenage girls are taught by their magazines how to give oral sex to boys, but they are not taught how to say *no*.

They want to be “in the gang”, have “sexperiences” to swap with their girlfriends, and not feel like they are the only *naive* one who doesn't know “what it's like.”

But when they find out the boys are deriding them behind their backs or just as likely these days *openly* calling them “*bike*”, “*whore*”, “*tart*”, they might think twice about whether allowing their bodies to be used by boys at such an early age was such a good idea.

They might consider, that they are getting sex experience alright, but what they are not getting is *love* and *respect*.

But we see, we become *aware*, that society does not care if we are respected or not, that is *not* what is *on sale*.

The best thing a wise person can do is to watch carefully all that happens in society and in the lives of their friend and families around them and thereby *learn from the experiences and misfortunes of others*.

When for example we see some celebrity who has been an addict, read about – if you can find a good *honest* account, which may not be easy – what happened to them *in great detail*, how it damaged their life and relationships, and maybe long-term health.

The media likes to gloss over *the real truth* and just make a good “story” out of it, and turn the disaster into a success – as they say, put “some spin” or “gloss” on it.

They just say, person X, the famous pop star or fashion model, has successfully beaten addiction.

What was it like? they ask. *Was it tough?*

And the star says “*yeah, man, there were times when I was really low, you wouldn’t believe, etc., etc.*”

They make addiction sound *cool*, they make it sound like an experience everyone ought to have, which earns *respect*, but those who have been through it *for real* and *aren’t famous* don’t agree.

They just got their lives wrecked, without the celebrity’s millions to start over again after they “get cured” (*if they ever really do*).

We just don’t see *the full story* in the potted highlights the media shows.

So the question is, do we have to personally try everything ourselves, to know what it’s like?

Do we have to try cocaine to find out if it’s a good idea, or hallucinogenic drugs; or if we don’t try these things, we stay “naïve”, we are mocked as “inexperienced”?

Should we desperately run into as many sexual relationships as we can, to get “experienced” in this way also?

Or should we be a *despised* “goody two shoes” and say *no* to all these things.

Well, let us point something out.

“Goody two shoes”, whether male or female, is despised for one reason you may not have considered.

For “the rebels”, the so called “experienced”, have lost more than they have gained - like for example *self-respect*.

If a girl has sex outside of a stable relationship, thinking she is like some glamorous pop or movie star always flitting from one man to another, or a part played by an actress in a film she has seen, she may think she is doing something wildly romantic and wonderful.

But what she doesn't see is that pain is on its way.

She doesn't see that if she was easy, the sort of guy she got was easy too, and has the ambition to put more notches on his bedpost than “the fastest gun in the West” had upon his gun.

She doesn't see that every man who believes in being faithful to one person is never going to respect her as much as if she had stayed a virgin till she met him.

If she is his first sexual partner, but she has had other “lovers”, he is always going to feel uncomfortable that she has had someone before to compare him with, and will fear she liked the other person better, no matter how much she may try to reassure him otherwise.

And then, out of this twisted desire in his heart, he may feel compelled to do the same, he may say to himself *what's good for the goose is good for the gander*.

So when women play around, they cannot expect men to be faithful either.

Does that entitle men to play around?

Not with virgins, it doesn't, we should definitely say.

Because any person who has a sexual partner other than the one they intend to have as life partner, is putting a doubt and fear in the other person's mind, which may sooner or later wreck the relationship.

To both women and men we would say – if it is too late for you, if you have had a “misspent” youth, the best policy would be to start saying “no” starting now, until you establish a non-sexual relationship with someone you want to commit to long-term.

And to women in particular, we would say, if you don't say “no” to a man, you will never know if he is interested in you, or if he is just interested in sex.

There is a well known modern book by two people working in the office of the *Sex in the City* production, giving relationship advice for women, called *He's Just Not that Into You*.

May we briefly point out, that if you go to bed with a man on the first, second, or even twentieth date, you will *never* know whether he is interested in *you*, because you have already given him what he wanted sexually, and therefore he has no *need* to commit.

The *only* way to find out if that man is really interested in you, it to make him wait a year or two, and see if he wants to be with you as a friend, before you start making a sex addict out of him, as so many modern girls and women do.

In women's insecurity, they use sex as the bait, but sex is not enough to *keep* any man, because *there is so much more of it available elsewhere*.

So can the lady reader now see how stupid is the advice she has been getting on how to handle her relationships, from those who think the behaviour of the *Sex in the City* characters is OK?

Let us advise *Carrie Bradshaw* here and now on how to get her *Mr Big*.

Go on dates with him, but tell him from the very first night out, that you are not going to have sex with *any man* unless he is willing to commit to you.

If he doesn't accept that, you must simply *walk away* – no more dates for *him*, no matter how much he may beg and plead and lie, because he is desperate to get you into bed.

It's called *self-respect*, something the *Sex in the City* characters don't seem to know much about.

Because you have discovered not only is he Mr Big, he is *Mr Lecherous* also, who can only think of you in one way – *as an object of sexual desire and gratification*.

But if you are a fun, friendly, interesting, and kind *human being*, he should want to be with you just as a friend, just as he likes being with his male friends whom he hopefully has no desire to molest.

Don't fall for all the romantic garbage, like the hearts and flowers and expensive gifts. There is *only* one thing that is really romantic, and that is finding someone *who wants to be with you, wants to spend time with you*.

And if this policy means that fifty men walk away from you on fifty first dates, then you are either meeting the wrong kind of men – perhaps you should be looking in the church or library, instead of the bar or night club – *or there is something wrong with you*.

If you can be honest enough to suspect there is some truth in this, take a good look at yourself, however hard it may be sometimes, and work on being a kind, interesting, tolerant and considerate human being.

But if it's *sex* that they wanted, then you are just well rid of unfaithful rubbish, aren't you?

And the tough fact is for either men or women, the more intelligent and discriminating you are, the tougher finding a suitable partner is going to be.

And that is *especially* why you have not got to throw yourself away, by accepting and having sex with people who don't deserve you, and thereby throwing your life away, which is incidentally a message both to women *and men*.

Because the man or woman who is out there somewhere, and is really worth the trouble, but maybe you didn't notice yet - he or she *knows*.

He or she knows if you are gallivanting around, flitting from partner to partner, and the faithful type of man or woman wouldn't touch you with a bargepole after they've seen or sensed enough of that.

So you see, the men and women and boys and girls whose reputations are already smeared, they are secretly regretting it, because they know their chances of getting the person of their dreams are seriously damaged.

And thus, if you stayed "pure", they resent or even hate you, because you still have a value that they do not.

Mr or Miss *Wonderful* does not want *them*, but he or she wants *you*.

To those who due to this corrupted society have let themselves go, the best they can do is put a space of a few years of reformed behaviour behind them.

If we see a man or a woman who maybe made a mistake, but stays unattached for a few years, we respect that.

We respect they are at least *now* being discriminating, choosy, and therefore capable of loyalty to "one special person" – whom for them we all want to be.

So more generally, we see that our great mistake in life is on focussing on *wants* (mostly implanted by culture for commercial reasons, or malevolent people) rather than *needs*.

Look at the state of the average person who has lived a wild reckless life doing all the drugs, sex and so on that they wanted, i.e. *has given in to all their desires*.

They are mostly depleted wrecks of human beings - supposing they are even still alive - as the expression goes, like "a jaded rock star."

They didn't discover the power of *no*, in preserving their dignity, their mental balance and their lives.

We *need* someone to love. We don't need fifty lovers, though we might *want* them sometimes.

We don't need *fifty ways to leave a lover* but fifty *No's* to turn down fifty potential lovers, who would have just made our lives a misery, but we were wise enough to stop them in their tracks, before they ever started deceiving us and ruining our lives.

Because if we have fifty lovers, we wreck society for others also, not only ourselves.

We make relationships into second-hand books, tossed around in grubby piles, and sold and bought cheaply for a few dollars or pounds.

Nobody really *respects* those books. But a *first edition*, which is still in *mint condition*, people will pay *millions* for.

Why should we regard human beings as any different?

So if we want quality in both ourselves and others, we have to learn to say *no*, to all the things and people who would *degrade* us, drag us down.

If we are lost, fallen into habits and relationships far beneath what we believe is our true status, we have got to change our *habits*.

Person X says to us "are you coming down the club?" (the dark, dirty, smelly, noisy, badly-behaved club) and we say "no, not tonight. Sorry."

And if they complain, harangue and pester us, we say "sorry, I must let you go there alone, there is nothing there for me any more."

And then we lose those "friends", whom we may realise after a while weren't really such good friends at all, because *they never let us be ourselves - they made us be something else for them*.

But then we find we are *alone*.

And then we have to live with the pain of being alone.

If you want to be a hero or heroine, you have to suffer, you have to learn to take pain, not for its own sake, but because to become free from a state of bondage, imprisonment, it will be unavoidable *on the psychological level*.

It takes time to let bad habits die, to change a life, to look in places we never looked before.

The people in those new, more respectable places may not accept us until we have stayed away from the old places for quite a while.

They *know* us too, because a thousand little clues tell them where we've been – the way we dress or wear our hair.

Most people advertise *on their sleeve* who they are, or imagine themselves to be via their clothes, their hair, their shoes, their mannerisms, the way they walk.

But we put it to you that being *aware* of this game of posing, we are now in a position to break free of this game, to pose no more.

We can dress nicely, with a little style, but we are not slavishly following the rules and dress code of any particular group – unless of course it is wise to dress that way, to fit in the group we must – but even then we do it *with awareness*, we do not mistake the real person we are for the pose.

And if we still have some bad habit that is betraying us, we learn to fight it every day till we win.

We succeed one day, we fail another, but above all *we don't get upset*.

Because anger and frustration pull us back into the same old pattern as we shall shortly explain in the next chapter.

Then we find we “win” more days than we lose, and as time goes by our bad habit disappears. It might take weeks, months or years to change the habit, but we can do it as long as we don't give up.

One day we look back briefly at an old photograph, and we are amazed when we say *did I really do that? Was I really like that?*

But in conclusion, we should say, that the answer is not to make ourselves into something, build a picture of ourselves in our mind, but rather *to learn not to try to be anything*.

We can *do*, but let us not glorify *doing* into *being*.

That is, we may play the piano or a sport.

That is what we *do*.

But if we then say *I am a pianist*, or *I am a sportsman*, we are building an image, *an identity*. Then we are that thing only in someone's mind or even our own, at the expense of everything else we might be.

That is not to say, we should not say, if we are Chopin or some lesser light, that we are *not* a pianist, or if asked what we do, not say that we *are*; but that when we meet another human being or assess ourselves, the questions *what do you do?* and *what it is you are?* are not at all necessarily the same thing.

When we see this “putting on airs and graces” in others, building themselves an identity as some powerful and mysterious person, we should just quietly become aware of this flight into egotistical fantasy they are performing.

Likewise, when we see it in ourselves, we can only be the same, *be aware*.

For example, as Marlon says to Truman in *The Truman Show*

Come on – which one of us hasn't secretly wanted to be interviewed on “Seahaven Tonight”? (or Larry King Live, or Oprah or whoever else is currently the “chat show king or queen”)

So we see ourselves imagining being a famous person, interviewed by the famous chat show host, and the audience looking at us with awe and reverence that we likely don't deserve.

There's nothing we can *do* about it, we just see that we are building images in our minds. We don't say it's *good* or *bad*, or *right* or *wrong*, we just see what our mind is up to, building ideas *about itself*.

Because the reality is that ideas in one's mind don't do any harm, but if we follow those up with *actions*, and actually *do* the things we dream, this has *consequences*.

Have we really considered what it would be like to be a celebrity, not being able to scratch our nose or someplace, without it being national news?

Never having a “private life” again, and when we open the curtains in the morning in our dressing gown absent-mindedly, there is someone camped outside or watching from a building opposite taking pictures with a telephoto lens?

So really, the wise build no images of themselves, especially not even of being *wise*, because we are all wise some days, and very dumb on other ones, so thus that would be to try to build an image about ourselves which will soon or later be knocked down, as there will always be some person or situation which will be like a pin “bursting our bubble.”

That is, being *humble* is not something we can do, going round thinking “I am such a modest person” (in fact, I am *so proud of being so humble*).

Do we understand how the “ego”, the mind thinking up ideas about itself, is lost in a game of chasing its own tail?

So being *humble*, which implies being impervious to insult you see, can only come about when we don’t keep creating ideas in our own minds about being “Ms or Mr Wonderful” and *taking them seriously*.

The person who cannot laugh at themselves is familiar, and is obviously the same person who is very vain, continually building these images of themselves as someone “special” and a “VIP.”

We see it’s easy to laugh at *others*, but not so much fun to laugh at *ourselves*.

But learn to do that we must, and especially in *private*, though of course, that does not mean we should throw away our self-respect and dignity and become a laughing stock to others, which we see would be allowing them to build a negative image of us at our expense.

However, we can see that most of the mockery that is directed at us comes from the usually right perception that we think we are something wonderful, and are advertising that fact to others, we think we are special, we think we are something they are not, and therefore they don’t like us for that.

Of course, they may simply hate us because we really *are* something they are not, even though we haven’t “advertised it”, which would suggest that perhaps we are keeping the wrong company, perhaps because we enjoy “slumming it”, feeling safe only with those who we know ourselves to be superior to.

So then the abuse we get is our own fault, isn’t it?

Chapter Six – Hypnosis – the Modern Psychological Disease

The concept of *hypnosis* is a most remarkable one, because it is something which is extremely familiar to almost the entire population, but about which ironically the vast majority know so little.

Most people will also be familiar with the well known saying *a little knowledge is a dangerous thing*, and we would suggest that in the case of hypnosis, a truer word was never said.

Thus we need to make this concept *crystal clear*, and in its generality it is surprisingly simple.

By hypnosis is simply meant:

the power of one mind or will upon another

So when the evil hypnotist in the horror movie says “*you are under my power, your will is my will*”, this is *no fiction* - he really does mean what he says.

We may imagine we can safely go to a hypnotist who will help us with anxiety problems or a smoking cure, but unless one feels one hundred percent safe in his or her hands, we would suggest this is a risky step, and we should not be fooled even supposing the hypnotist is also part of a public health service into believing that is necessarily any guarantee that we will not be abused.

For let us be very simple about all this.

We are dealing with *the mind*. And our experience of the mind, is that quite frankly, it is not a terribly reliable instrument.

The computer can remember virtually flawlessly millions of pieces of data, but we struggle to recall even a phone number someone gave us a few seconds ago unless we have quickly written it down.

So when we say the mind is not really very reliable, what we mean is that *the memory is not terribly reliable*.

The mind is not good at processing lots of data simultaneously. It works best with one thing at a time.

What it *is* good at however is making sense of very complex matters *in an intuitive way*, which is still, and we would suggest always will be, beyond the capability of any computer ever possible to be built.

Those who play with ideas of “artificial intelligence” imagining they will one day be able to successfully simulate the intelligence of the human brain, fail to understand what *human intelligence* is really all about.

That is, it is certainly possible to build a robot which will successfully navigate any maze, or even play the piano from sheet music much more easily than any human ever could, but if we want it to produce for us an *original* Van Gogh painting or piece of Chopin piano music, when the artificial intelligence experts do not even know how Van Gogh or Chopin produced their works, surely there is going to be some difficulty with that vain hope?

That is, the human brain is *creative*, it produces works and discoveries which are “greater than the sum of the parts.”

It is “self-actuating”, it writes its own “programming”; whatever is at the root of our human intelligence cannot ever be stated in any number of lines of code, because the brain asks the question *why?* and sees *meaning* in reality, which no mere machine obviously can ever do.

We do however suspect that ultimately the intelligence of any particular brain is normally *limited*, and it will only be by progressive enhancements in the brain itself, which we believe are still happening via ongoing evolutionary processes, that its intelligence will actually increase.

Amazingly however, as we shall also later suggest, these processes are initiated inside the body itself, by a kind of immanent but ultimately super-physical force and intelligence known to yoga as *kundalini*.

But let us stick to our current theme.

We have said that hypnosis is the action of one mind or will upon another, and we will now explore the further implications of this point.

That is, as we have said, the brain and memory is not as reliable as the computer in terms of storing data and facts, so we have to be wary of its “inputs” and “outputs” to continue the computer analogy.

That is, if we allow ourselves to be put into a “hypnotic trance”, so that we are somewhat dazed like in sleep, if the hypnotist then puts ideas into our mind in such a dazed state, the first thing to observe is *we likely won't reliably remember what he or she put there.*

For example, we have what is known as “false memory syndrome”, in which it is suggested that psychologists could be implanting either deliberately or unwittingly memories of events that did not happen, for example in child abuse cases, so that some man (or even woman) may be accused of having carried out some abusive act when in fact they did not.

The other point is that anybody who has witnessed a person in a hypnotic trance answering questions, will be deeply suspicious of the source of the answers, especially in the case of someone whom we have known well.

Because most people have not had this experience of watching someone they know well personally under hypnosis, they tend to find what is said more believable.

But is it real, or is it fabrication, for example all these “past lives” that are supposed to be unearthed so easily in a hypnotic trance?

Is it what the subject believes the hypnotist wants to hear under the duress of “leading questions”, is it a “performance” intended to please, manufactured as easily as the fantasies we have in the dream state?

Or is it even “spirit possession” or some other kind of phenomenon of which we are not currently aware?

For example, recently on British TV, Princess Diana's ex-lover, James Hewitt, allowed himself to be questioned under hypnosis about his relationship with Diana, and produced different answers whilst in this state than the claims he had already made in his autobiography.

When he was returned to “normal consciousness” and confronted with a video recording of his hypnotised behaviour and utterances, he still insisted in sticking to the original story, and said he was “unable to explain” his hypnotised responses.

Was the mostly likeable and diplomatic Mr Hewitt using this as an opportunity to say what he was unable to in the “normal state”?

We cannot know for sure, as presumably only he, the now deceased Diana and a few others, such as those in the British secret service and perhaps some sectors of government, know the real truth.

But what we all *do* know, is that those who are hypnotised lose their sense of time, and frequently think only a few seconds or minutes have passed when they may have been in the trance state for an hour or more.

This tells us that their memory was not functioning normally whilst in this state.

So we are suggesting that those who either allow stage hypnotists or “hypnotherapists” to “put them under” are really taking a risk which is hard to quantify.

Let us explain a little further.

There is the well known experiment of *Pavlov's Dogs* which tells us how dangerous hypnosis can really be.

That is, the Russian scientist Pavlov began his experiment by ringing a bell before giving food to a number of dogs kept in cages.

He discovered that after a time, he could ring the bell, but give no food to the dogs, and the dogs would all salivate merely at the sound of the bell, at any time of day or night.

This is as we have said, an example of a *conditioning* process, or if we like, it is a *hypnotic process*.

The bell is an example of a *trigger*.

So the stage hypnotist can for example plant in our minds - given enough time to work on us - the idea that when the instant we put a certain pair of ordinary, cheap plastic “joke shop” glasses on, we will be able to see through a brick wall, so that putting on the glasses becomes the trigger or as they say in the trade, activates the “post hypnotic suggestion” even when someone is no longer in the hypnotic trance.

Under such a suggestion, the subject will actually believe they can see through the wall, and will if pressed start to describe what is on the other side of it, which generally will be a totally fabricated load of nonsense, *though they themselves will be unable to see that it is*.

This seriously suggests the ability of the mind to manufacture all kinds of imaginary data, but here is the crunch – *yet believe it to be real* – in order to “justify” some kind of fixed idea it has, *even if wholly untrue* such as the hypnotist’s deliberate fantasy suggestion.

So this is really a quite frightening ability of the mind, is it not?

That is, we are discovering *the mind can create its own illusory reality, based on fixed ideas it has implanted in it.*

So can we now imagine how a hypnotist could abuse his or her power in all kinds of ways?

For all we know the hypnotist could get us to reveal various hidden secrets that could be comprising for us, and rewarding to them – such as bank account numbers and passwords – and we might never remember we have given them this information.

Let us not however speculate too much on what else the professional hypnotist could do *if we let him or her*, but the obvious conclusion here, is that we should *never* let anyone hypnotise us for any reason whatsoever in such a deliberate formalized way.

Some say as in the movie *Conspiracy Theory* that there have been a number of people who have been hypnotised by government agencies at one time or another to kill a certain person on a certain command, which for example, might be given to them in some innocent looking item of mail that they receive, and they might not even register that they have had this "command" word or phrase given to them.

Apparently dogs can be trained to attack (and therefore possibly kill) on a verbal command, so this may not at all be as far-fetched as it might at first hearing seem.

We might argue that we have a human awareness that a dog does not, but then how can people go into the hypnotic trance and not remember what transpired during it, possibly even for hours?

In the striking 1960s movie, *The Boston Strangler*, we saw Tony Curtis giving a great performance as someone who seemed to carry out his murders in some kind of hypnotic trance, and could only gradually be made to realise that he had actually carried them out himself.

So when we are dealing with this *formalized* process of hypnosis, where we *voluntarily* agree for someone to spend a good deal of time “putting us under”, we are surely treading onto potentially very deadly ground, and the sooner the general public *wakes up* to this fact the better.

One last example of a girl who was hypnotised by a stage hypnotist may suffice to deter those who may still remain unconvinced.

The girl was whilst hypnotised and performing on stage for the public, given the suggestion by the hypnotist that she was having a five thousand volt shock.

She died the same night of a heart attack, and though we cannot definitely say it was as a direct result of this event, her mother certainly believed it to be the case, as this young lady had shown no signs whatsoever of heart disease or bad health prior to this incident of stage hypnotism only a few hours earlier.

But unfortunately, too many of the general public still cooperate with these often humiliating and potentially dangerous displays of stage hypnosis.

And in fact even more seriously, the public is not aware of the broader practice of what in actuality is really *hypnosis*, which is going on in all our everyday lives, virtually all the time.

For as we have said, the hypnotist gives *suggestions*, and our media and urban environment is absolutely choc-a-bloc with them.

In our exploration of this concept, let us first distinguish two concepts clearly – *ideas* and *facts*.

A *fact* is something we know to be real, it is clearly perceptible with our five senses, and preferably even measurable with scientific instruments.

For example, if someone said they saw a ghost, and some electrical or barometric test equipment was able to register significant atmospheric changes in the vicinity of what they believed they saw, there would be more assurance that it wasn't merely “all in the mind.”

Or sometimes we can be walking in the woods, and at a distance, we think we see a human figure, but as we get closer, we see it is only a tree stump.

Especially when we are afraid, or our mind is affected by drugs including alcohol, even “the morning after” when we are “withdrawing”, we are liable to actually *see things that aren't there*.

So evidently, we can *amazingly* create whole images in our brains, believing they are what we see with our eyes, and believe at least momentarily that they are real.

Some people may have also noticed that we can sometimes hear music in certain kinds of monotonous sound, such as the constant drone of engines, because somehow our brain is able to see or hear patterns in things which aren't there, due to its incredible ability to “fill in the gaps”, just as we can begin to imagine we see things whilst staring into the flames of a fire.

So clearly, we have to be very careful in assessing even the reality of what we think we hear and see.

But on the other hand, if we do not “believe” in our own minds, our own perceptions, then surely we are in big trouble also.

For we will then lose confidence in our ability to think clearly and *act with our own will*, and it is this field of “doubt” which the “common-or-garden” variety of hypnotist we encounter daily exploits.

Our senses are actually quite limiting.

We can see what is in our little room, or where the land is open, some vista, but we can only see clearly what is very close to us, and our knowledge of what is happening in the world is very much limited to things that are physically very close to us, and everything else that happens, which is therefore almost *everything* which happens in the world, unless we see film or photographs, we have to *take on trust*.

The TV or radio news reporter – who is always chosen we see as a very trust-inspiring, honest looking person – tells us of events happening all round the world, or new discoveries in science, and we are inclined to believe everything they tell us.

They “sit with us” in our living room each evening *on our TV screen*, and we begin to think of them at least somewhat as if they were trusted friends, which of course to almost all of us they can and never will be.

The essential point here is that *we trust them*.

We think that a nice person, such as national news presenters Trevor MacDonald or Katie Derham in England, or legends like Larry King or Walter Cronkite in America, could *never* lie to us.

And they probably would not do so *deliberately*.

But they have the same problem of only getting *their* information second-hand too.

So when we realise what a little bubble of *experience* we are trapped in, how limited our own powers of personally witnessing and verifying *anything* really are, it can become a bit scary.

We can start to go on paranoid conspiracy theory trips, and start questioning more or less obvious facts, such as whether the astronauts ever landed on the moon.

I mean, we believe that to be *a fact*, because we believe in nuclear missiles, and we think they are a lot harder to make than putting a man on the moon, in a rather dangerous space suit and craft, as one or two failed missions have proved, including the not too long ago Shuttle disasters.

It would be nice to imagine that nuclear weapons were only a “conspiracy theory” too, and didn’t exist, but we have this problem of all the people in Hiroshima and Nagasaki not agreeing with us, and this other worrying problem of that formula thought up by Einstein, $e = mc^2$, which suggests that they *can*, and *do* exist.

We have to become *aware* of what is *correlatable* – that is, what fits with *reasonable certainty* with pre-existing information we know to be reliable – and what is questionable.

For example, most of us have practically no data about genetic engineering with which to make decisions about the subject, and the governments - for commercial reasons most likely - simply reassure us, i.e. *hypnotically suggest to us* that this is all *safe*.

Whereas *the Maharishi* for example, tells us that genetically modifying life forms on our planet is potentially more dangerous than dealing with radioactive waste, because once *unleashed* these “artificially created” genetic mutations may possibly *never* again be eradicated, whereas even radioactive materials will in time decay and become harmless.

That is, once cross-fertilization occurs in the wild, it may be impossible to ever track all the altered seeds down and eliminate them from the “genetic pool” available to that class of animals or plants.

We may end up being in total fear about whatever we eat, if we are not one hundred percent sure of its source.

In fact, for those who want to “trust” the Maharishi’s viewpoint on this, he rather scarily assures us that anybody who eats a lot of this GM food isn’t going to be around for very long.

But we are not saying the Maharishi is right or wrong.

We are just saying, here we have two *suggestions*, two efforts at *hypnotism*, at *gaining control of our minds*.

We don’t have *the facts*, so we can’t make *a rational decision*. We can only decide in whom we will place our “trust.”

And as the Maharishi seems to be voting for “peace” and “love” and tranquillity, whereas the politicians seem to want to take us to war, thrive on conflict, and fail to solve most of our social problems, a lot of us are rather more inclined to trust the Maharishi, not seeing how he could gain from this situation if he is wrong.

On the other hand, he could just be deluded, couldn’t he, as could David Icke about some things, as could the present author himself?

So the point is, we can *place our bets* on what others say, but we must not go putting things people *say* - the truth of which we are in no position to assess - into either the “true” or “false” category of our minds.

The only logical place to put them is in the *undecided* category.

Yet we see that such blind acceptance of their *suggestions* as *truths* is exactly what the *manipulators* - the politicians, the advertisers, and others of ill or greedy intent - would have us do.

They want us to “buy” into their ideas hook, line and sinker, so we will *do* what they *will us* to do.

So as we have said, those who want to control us use our *feelings* against us, so the manipulators attempt to *bypass our reason altogether*, and appeal to *our emotions* in one way or another.

In terms of controlling men, *sex* is usually the key. With boys it is thrills and spills and toys.

Whatever *excites* us, or alternatively makes us afraid, can be used to control us.

Thus women are controlled by other means, which appeal to their greatest desires and fears.

As we have said, women’s *desire* to see the maximum spreading of *womens’ rights* for example has been used by the politicians to justify the Iraq war, and the general attack on the Muslim world, as well as our *fears* of the weapons of mass destruction.

But the politicians now have a problem, because before, we trusted them to tell us the truth, and now most of us don’t trust them any more.

So the issue here, is that we are given *suggestions*, we are told *ideas* as if they were *facts*, thus *bypassing our reason, our logical and legitimate objections*, just as we are told *without any justification* that GM food is “safe.”

This is *hypnosis*

They *say*, we *obey*, even if that just means being as dumb and mute as one of Pavlov’s Dogs in response to their suggestions, demands and commands.

Likewise, each day we turn on the TV we are presented with – apart from the genuine news items and film reports – an almost total fantasy from beginning to end.

The television set in every living room and bedroom of the Western world, is surely the greatest instrument of hypnosis ever invented.

In the middle of some program you are watching, we suggest you try a little experiment.

Try turning the TV off for a while.

You will feel an incredible *relief*, as whilst we leave it on, we are unaware that we are being *pounded* by suggestion after suggestion all the time we watch.

Each program that is shown is not merely the “entertainment” we may naively imagine.

Almost everything we see has *a message*, and if we are sensitive to this, if we are *aware*, we are almost astounded by the relentless efforts of those communicating their thoughts and ideas to us to get us to see the world and “reality” *their way*.

For example, the politicians’ speeches are always grand and high sounding, but if we get to the reality of what they *do*, we find that their actions are almost the exact opposite of what they say!

The UK government is currently saying how it is so concerned about our safety and security, yet is doing politically everything in its power in terms of foreign relations and jobs and trade to make us *insecure*.

For example, more rights are given to employers to hire and fire, and less rights for employees to job security, compensation or social security benefits.

Again, the British public has now been put in fear of its rights to an old age pension, and the implication seems to be that for those who have been too reckless or poor to invest in a *private or company pension scheme* – many of which have also collapsed without any hope of compensation or redress – we may either get no pension at all, or be forced to work until we die.

Readers around the world may also be astonished to learn that there are currently estimated to be over four hundred thousand homeless people in England, a problem which hardly existed in this “green and pleasant land” only twenty or thirty years ago.

Where is this security the government talks so many high ideals about?

They are either very great liars, perhaps so good they even believe their own lies, or else they are – as we believe in many cases – effectively blind, due to being hypnotised by the propaganda coming from their own party machine and already *conditioned, hypnotised* state in life.

So this talk of *security* is all *hypnosis*.

They give us *make believe*. They try to *make* us *believe* in what they *say*, when they do something else entirely different.

Abusive people in general behave in this way.

They continually *deny* all the bad things they do to us, they tell us “it is all in our mind”, they seem utterly shameless in the carrying out of their abusive plans.

They see *lies* as a totally legitimate means to get their own way.

Children from loveless, uncaring families learn these strategies from their parents at an early age. They see their parents continually lying to and cheating and abusing one another, and they think – *this is life, that is how things are meant to be*.

The point is, the liar feels *powerful*. The JR Ewing of *Dallas* always “dreams and schemes” *to get his own way*, just as does the Joan Collins *Dynasty* “bitch”, and both *usually* succeed.

When we see these devious characters in TV and movie dramas, such as the corrupting pre-revolutionary aristocrat played by Glenn Close in the historical period drama, *Dangerous Liaisons*, they make us feel *angry* and outraged, but they also *fascinate us*.

Many actors and actresses love playing the “baddy” part, they say “*the devil has all the best lines*.”

“Goodies” are mostly boring, unless they are really heroic warriors, such as *El Cid*, or *Kwai Chang Caine* out of *Kung Fu*.

But you see, why would we want to bathe our lives in *fantasy* anyway, especially of the typically formulaic and predictable TV kind?

But the sad truth is that we are satisfied over and over pretending *in our minds* to be a brave hero, and imagining that we too at the end of the movie, after gloriously disposing of or killing all our enemies, are going to win the heart and body of the pretty girl.

Or as a woman, we can imagine the hero is doing all these daring deeds just for us, and we can enjoy imagining we are the “femme fatale” or “belle of the ball”, whom all men fall helplessly at the feet of and declare to their undying love, like the Queen of Sheba or the Biblical *Delilah*, who conquered Samson with her womanly wiles, when the King and his whole army could not.

The true *history* of almost every Western nation is mostly the sordid tale of a bunch of unscrupulous, violent, deceitful, manipulating bullies and cowards all struggling *ambitiously* for supremacy, to be “cock of the dunghill.”

Those in the ruling families throughout history have lived in constant fear of assassination by their relatives or other ambitious upstarts, and we see this “intrigue” carries on into the present, for example with all the chicanery and scandal involving the British Royal family in the Princess Diana era.

No person in their right mind would have wished to be part of such a treacherous royal court, as it was clearly a threat even to their life, as in the constant executions of rivals and courtiers in the time for example of Henry VIII, who even had his own Lord Chancellor and lifelong “friend”, *Sir Thomas More*, beheaded, as depicted in the brilliant, multiple Oscar winning 1960s movie, *A Man for All Seasons*.

So as we see that so called “history” has been mostly the study of the tyranny and treachery of those who would seek to rule society, all cheating and murdering one another out of the seats of power or throne, why on earth would we suddenly imagine that our modern rulers – the politicians and dictators – would suddenly have become decent human beings, simply because the second world war was over by the nineteen-fifties and sixties of which the modern era is just the troubled child?

The brutality of which Saddam Hussein and others have been accused of by the West has in fact been carried out *or worse* by most Western nations at one time or another even during the last hundred years.

For example British national “hero”, Winston Churchill, who “defeated Hitler” gave orders to have the Afghan Kurds, whom he regarded as “a savage tribe”, gassed in 1919.

Likewise, in 1920, he created and ordered into Ireland, which was rebelling against the savage British domination of its country and people over centuries, the so called “black and tans”, who were a bunch of murderous and savage criminals let out of prison, given a non-regular “black and tan” army uniform, and allowed “carte blanche” to abuse the Irish people in whatever way they pleased.

At the time, Herbert Asquith, leader of the Liberal Party opposition in the house of commons at the time of the creation of *the black and tans* stated:

"There are things being done in Ireland which would disgrace the blackest annals of the lowest despotism in Europe."

And even though all but six counties of Ireland were finally made independent in 1922, we see that “the troubles” in *Northern* Ireland rumble on, even nearly one hundred years later, and British soldiers are still on the streets there, and thousands have died since the mid 1960s, when the modern phase of the unrest began in earnest once more.

And of course, Churchill described the Irish “freedom fighters” in 1919 as “terrorists.”

So this again is how *language* is used to *hypnotise* us, to *remodel our view of reality*.

As one of the “bosses” in the prison said to Paul Newman’s *Cool Hand Luke*:

“Luke, boy – you’ve gotta get *your mind* right.”

(and be a good little, well behaved *prisoner*).

Likewise those around us in everyday life – in our families, in the office or workplace, or in our relationships with friends and members of the opposite sex, are constantly attempting to revise for us *our view of reality*.

They want to take over our minds to control us, which you see – listen carefully – means *making us doubt our own ability to assess reality, finding ways to make us doubt the evidence of our eyes and ears and minds.*

For example an unfaithful husband or wife may say when confronted with allegations of infidelity: “*you are being ridiculous, it is all in your mind.*”

They say “that man/woman you saw me with is a work colleague, and that *kiss* was just a peck on the cheek as is customary now, imported from France.” (even though it looked passionate and on the lips to us).

And of course if we *are* paranoid, as we have explained, our mind *could* have manufactured an unreality we fear, out of some innocent events.

But the wicked and deceitful use this doubt in our minds against us, so how can we be sure that we can believe in what we imagine we sense and see?

The answer is, we have to realise that we do not see clearly when we are under the sway of *emotion*, that is of *desire or fear*.

That is why we have said in another book, that women *on average* are less suited to be in positions of high power than men *on average*, because women are generally more emotional than men.

If we are in the grip of powerful emotions like desire, fear, love or hate, we lose our objectivity.

We create monsters when we look at our fellow man and woman, just as Profess Morbius in the movie *Forbidden Planet* created monsters out of the power of his unconscious mind.

That does not of course mean that others may not be behaving monstrously towards us in reality, as such bad behaviour is now so common.

But the point is, whatever they are *really* like, and really up to, we can only see it reflected clearly in the mirror of a calm, objective and emotionally controlled mind.

Thus, we see that the powerful emotions or *passions* which the TV screen dramas, the romantic novels and even the pornographic materials would have us wallow in, are really not good for our clarity of mind, our objectivity and our mental health.

We are being *hypnotised* by emotion, they pull our “heartstrings” to gain possession of our minds, or maybe our strings in even less scrupulous places.

For example again, an insecure man who has married or is partner to an attractive woman or wife, can be driven crazy by her deliberate antics, flirting with other men when they are in public, and so on.

But it is a dangerous game she is playing, as he may end up killing her out of jealousy, like in Tom Jones’ powerful and somewhat scary song *Delilah*, or even the real life execution of some of his errant wives by Henry VIII.

Or again, a man may threaten or imply violence to dominate a woman, which is also not a fair or civilised way to behave.

Even in the context of business we surely have to reassess how products and services are sold, for this is perhaps the hugest area of hypnosis currently dominating our lives.

For it seems everything nowadays has ultimately the motive of *profit* at the back of it, as expressed in Pink Floyd’s classic 1970s rock song, *Money*, or even the quirky and somewhat cold-blooded earlier song of the same name, first sung by *The Flying Lizards*, with some very posh and selfish sounding girl who sang it like she was born wearing an evening dress, high heels and a string of pearls.

*The best things in life are free
But you can give them to the birds and bees
I want money*

*That’s what I want
That’s what I want
etc.*

*Your love brings me such a thrill
But your love won’t pay my bills
I want money*

*That’s what I want
That’s what I want
etc.*

This song would have been very funny indeed, if the lady singing it didn't sound so much like she really meant it, as did *Madonna* in her *Material Girl*, which expresses a similar heartless, materialism obsessed sentiment:

*They can beg and they can plead
But they can't see the light (that's right)
'Cause the boy with the cold hard cash
Is always Mister Right*

*'Cause we are
Living in a material world
And I am a material girl*

We are deliberately here quoting these song lyrics at length, because these are yet more instances of the constant *hypnosis* which is directed at us all, virtually all day long, especially by the TV, radio and other mass media.

The pop song – just like the advertising “jingle” – is again an example of how *our emotions* are used against us. We are fed some warm juicy sounds and *hypnotic* melodies to “suck upon” like a baby, while the *suggestions* of the words are fed into our minds.

We can hear those song lyrics being played in our minds at any time of day or night, long after our actual listening is over, so successful has this process of indoctrination, of *hypnosis*, been.

Or similarly a business person seeking to win a client will take them to a classy restaurant and wine and dine them, make them *feel good*.

Because when people *feel good*, they *buy*.

If the desired client is a man, and the seller a glamorous, sexy woman is wining and dining him, by her making him look like a successful man who will receive curious and envious looks in the public arena of the restaurant, he will usually feel *very good indeed*.

And it will be nearly impossible for him to say *no*, unless of course he is an equally manipulative scoundrel, and just using *her* for his advantage, but we don't sincerely believe that many businessmen are really that smart.

Or in terms of our relationships, if a man or woman wants to seduce us, they may invite us to dinner at their place, and after a drink, when we are *feeling good* we might then do something that we would not otherwise have considered was a good idea.

So then we *play now, regret later*.

For example, many a man could be “tricked” into having an affair or even getting pregnant a woman he would not otherwise ever have considered marrying by this means.

This is not a guide for women seducing men however, and we warn any woman who thinks that kind of technique of getting a man is a good idea, that she is only sowing the seeds of misery for herself and her children if she thinks that is OK.

But the broader issue is that as Krishnamurti points out, we conduct our human and business relationships not by *logic*, but by *persuasion*, and we would argue that this is *the wrong basis*.

We shouldn't buy from either a seductive woman or a pushy, bullying man unless the price is right, and we really need what is on offer.

But the advert on TV or elsewhere is constantly *suggesting* to us, that *if only we would buy we would feel* so much better.

If we buy that new conservatory, or that new sofa, or new dress, we will *feel* so much better about our life, about ourselves.

So because most of us don't feel so great most of the time, anything that promises to make us *feel better* surely has to be “given a whirl?”

But *the price* is frequently *our freedom*, the very lack of which and dispossessing from us, has made us feel insecure and miserable in the first place.

To own all these possessions we have to work like slaves, we have to put up with being bullied and humiliated by our bosses and colleagues and customers, and maybe we even have to neglect our children and other relationships to earn the money to pay for all these *luxuries*.

But we are constantly *hypnotised* by images from the media, that we *must* own these things or we are inferior, we are out of fashion.

For example, British TV constantly bombards us with obsessions regarding redecorating, extending or “trading up” our homes.

We are constantly shown images of those who have beautiful homes, whilst as we have earlier said, almost half a million British citizens don’t even have one, and if we look around and compare these “little (or not so little) palaces” to what *we* actually live in, it is inclined to make us feel ashamed.

Though as we have said, really we should be feeling more ashamed about the existence of so many *homeless* in what is a relatively rich Western country, when compared to the situation of those in the Third World.

And even in the past decade, in the UK, house prices have risen by as much as *three hundred percent*, so it has been made hard even for professional people to get on the first rung of “the property ladder.”

The TV and advertising industry makes us *compare ourselves* all the time with others who have “better things”, therefore making us constantly envious and insecure, and therefore *always willing to buy*.

And thus, we have made concrete and necessary the Flying Lizards’ sentiment in the *Money* song, and Madonna’s *Material Girl*.

The answer to all our human problems is always in the purse, wallet or bank account they imply, since if we are unhappy, surely all we need is a new car, holiday abroad or pair of fashionable shoes, and then we will be “cheered up” once more?

Which we usually are, *for a while*.

Soon however, like any other addict, we need another “fix” of shopping again, when the thrill of the last purchase has died down.

But we don’t stop and become *aware* that the only real happiness is in our human relationships – which we neglect – and above all *in the freedom of being in possession of our own unworried minds*.

We don’t stop to think, that by being forced to be workaholics to pay off our debt, because we can’t control our spending habits, we are depriving ourselves of the most precious rest and *sleep*, which as we have earlier explained, is essential to maintain our psychological balance, and therefore *happiness*.

In the innovative John Carpenter “cult movie”, *They Live*, as well as one of the most ridiculous (in an amusing way) and long fight scenes in cinema history, we are shown the idea of some special “glasses”, which upon wearing, we can see things and people as they really are.

The advertising billboards for example which showed glossy pictures, we see *when we have the glasses on*, only say in huge bold black-on-white letters - *CONSUME* and *BUY*.

We all need to have those “glasses” on *mentally*, everyday of our lives.

But “the glasses” are as we have explained, *the state of awareness*, the realisation that we are and have been *hypnotised*, bought into ideas, purchases and even *relationships* without properly having considered them calmly and objectively with our minds.

Yet we all get cheated, conned and deceived in all these *transactions* between humans every day. And when we wake up *briefly* we may see our image as a donkey’s head in the mirror, and we say “aw, I got cheated again.”

But now we have the option to *do* something, and break out of this deception we are imprisoned in, which as we have explained, is not to react angrily, but only *to become aware*.

Why not react angrily? you say.

Because as we have explained, *emotions control us*, they are used to *hypnotise us*, worst of all, therefore, we are *by our reactions*, in fact *hypnotised by ourselves*.

When we are caught up in emotion, we lose our objectivity, we make rash and hasty decisions, and usually the wrong ones we later regret.

So now that we see that *emotions* are more often our enemy that robs us of our freedom than our friend, that too is a new *awareness* in us, which “empowers” us in the true sense.

For we thought emotions were the most wonderful things. Well of course some classes of emotion are arguably the most wonderful things, and of course the expression of these *in certain situations*.

For example, if we express or feel *love* for someone who loves us in return that is a safe emotion to feel.

But if we express or feel love for a member of the opposite sex who doesn't love us back, that may be dangerous for us, we may waste our lives caring about someone whom we can never have a relationship with.

Thus as we are *aware* of that fact, we will not jump so quickly into new relationships, won't be ready to so easily "fall in love."

If we are sensible, we will make thorough enquiries and assessments to see if that person is really so keen on us, or otherwise we are going to likely get *burned*.

That is, of course, unless we are so big hearted we can love others without wanting to possess them, or expect anything in return.

But we must honestly say, that those who pursue a "hopeless love" are really just wasting their lives, and need to look much closer at themselves about why they are so desiring of something that can never be.

But no – don't end up on the therapist's couch, God forbid. We are saying only *become aware*.

We are saying, let us look at the rest of our life.

What is missing from us *as a human being* to think that happiness lies in the presence and affection of another, who doesn't want us for whatever reason, right or wrong?

Are we trying to unfairly punish that person, to compensate for an early feeling of rejection by a parent, by inflicting on them an obsessive and unwanted love?

If so, we must feel the pain, live through it, and come out the other side as a more independent, more self-sufficient *human being*.

We all want *someone* to recognise us, to make us feel that we matter as human beings.

But then everyone else is looking for *the same*.

So let us become aware of this unholy struggle for attention and affection that is going on amongst people, who are really mostly still children, emotionally speaking, and realise that it is the product of a world gone wrong.

A world in which children rarely grown into independent adults emotionally speaking.

We don't need to be smothered in love and kisses – we need to learn to stand on our own two feet, even if the whole world is against us – as it often seems to be – just like Truman in *The Truman Show* - as he bravely sailed away to freedom, with all the world against him and even trying to drown him in their efforts to stop him escape and break free.

For we see, when we do truly try to be our own person – but not in an angry, rebellious way – the world punishes us with such *isolation*, such *rejection* as happened to most of the “great” men and women throughout history, such as artistic “geniuses” like Van Gogh.

But then, if we can live through this typically long phase of rejection and isolation, live through our self-hate and self-pity, we can come out the other side as a whole and largely self-sufficient and independent *human being*.

And then *we see a miracle*. The miracle we discover, is that when we no longer need others so much, we find to our amazement, that rather others seek out and need *us*.

We can walk into a room, and they see our happiness, our self-sufficiency, and they are attracted to us without even knowing why.

For people are attracted to those who have *within them* happiness, peace and love, just as so many millions and billions throughout history have been attracted to great souls such as Mohammed, Buddha, Confucius and Christ for the very same reason.

Just as so many of society's accomplished and famous modern men and women also have been attracted to modern “sages” such as Krishnamurti and Gopi Krishna.

So in summary we are saying that by this process of awareness alone, which is really an antidote to the modern disease of hypnosis which surrounds us, we can progressively become the free and harmonious human beings which at heart we all surely want to be.

Chapter Seven – Heaven and Hell – Meditation and Kundalini

We have earlier made the bold assertion that meditation can be dangerous, and here we are going to tell you exactly why.

In offering this information, we wish to point out that just as with hypnosis, there are thousands of so called “experts” or even “gurus” who will claim the exact opposite of what we are saying, mostly because they have a vested interest in doing so, whereas we emphatically do not.

For our *certainty* that meditation can be dangerous is based on the experiences of a substantial number of meditators of whom we are personally aware, and even some who have never meditated in a formal way but have had trouble with their bodies and brains nevertheless, as well as the various writings or “scriptures” of spiritual writers and explorers throughout thousands of years of experience and experiment in these fields, of which modern science has been so far not in any position to investigate and is even sadly mostly wholly unaware.

Right away we will point out the case of modern yoga author, Gopi Krishna (1903-1984), who authored around fifteen books, including two autobiographies, the shorter of which was called *Kundalini, The Evolutionary Energy in Man*.

The point is, that Mr Krishna had firstly some amazing and blissful but later awful and tormenting experiences over a period of several decades, *due to deliberate intense meditation practices*, and those who would say meditation is always a “fun” and “safe” activity, need to explain his case before making such a glib claim.

They also need to look at the more recent transformation of David Icke, who is a self-confessed “kundalini awakened” case, who said he went through a period of confusion and delusion for at least a year after certain dramatic experiences happened to him, somewhat similar to those described by Gopi Krishna, though not quite as decisive and dramatic we would guess.

We do not yet wish to explain *kundalini* at this point, as we desire to not confuse the issue with the undeniable and incontestable consequences of meditative processes which we will first describe.

For as we have said, we know *personally* of a number of people who have got into serious difficulties with their bodies and minds following meditation processes, which may or may not be due to this “kundalini” phenomenon.

Almost certainly the largest class of regular meditators in the Western world are those who have learned the Maharishi’s TM, or *transcendental meditation*, which is estimated to be at least four million people worldwide, most of them probably in America, Western Europe and Canada.

Whilst we do not wish to give any “secrets” of the TM movement away which we may or may not have learned, we think it is only fair to point out that we are aware of a number of people who have used this supposedly “safe” technique of meditation, but got into serious trouble with it as a consequence.

Some people on the Internet for example even claim that the TM movement is corrupt, though we do not have any significant experience of this personally.

But what we are saying, is that meditation is not some irrelevant bit of “head in the clouds” nonsense, but something which dramatically can affect our body and minds *in a physiological way*.

Some who meditate at times go into tremors or even mild convulsions, it can make different people vomit at other times, and can also cause certain individuals to be very “wound up” and aggressive for short or long periods following their meditation sessions.

Our best guess as to why we have had these negative effects reported to us is that this kind of meditation functions as if we were purifying metal in a cauldron, so that the scum and the “slag” starts to rise up, and causes a lot of turbulence on the surface.

There is the saying *fire purifies*, and this appears to be how TM and other similar meditation techniques work on the brain and nervous system.

In purifying the nervous system and brain, TM stirs up all kinds of material long trapped in our past, and therefore somewhere in the structures of the brain, just as when the blood stream purifies itself of poisons, we may get spots or boils on our skin, via which the toxins will be accumulated and eventually expelled.

So the issue here is therefore *how fast the poisons come up* from our past, and output themselves as physical discomfort or powerful and sometimes poisonous emotions.

If the “dross” comes up too quickly, we will cause problems both to ourselves and others, and we suspect that the vast majority of problems meditators have had with this kind of meditation is that *they didn't follow the rules*.

That is, this kind of meditation should only be done for a short time – the Maharishi's usual recipe was twenty minutes, twice daily for adults, and for children an even shorter time depending on their age.

Our purpose here is not to either recommend or discourage anyone who would do a meditation technique such as TM, but we are warning those who carry out these techniques, that depending upon who they are, it could be dangerous for them without their knowledge, and also outside of the knowledge of the TM teacher who teaches them the technique.

We would suggest also that it is even more dangerous to use these kinds of techniques from books, without any other guidance or supervision at all, and by “these kinds”, we mean - *any deliberate attempt to focus the mind with closed eyes for any significant period of time*.

There are of course many other “schools” of meditation, who have different techniques, such as chanting mantras out loud, etc. but again, we do not either disbar or recommend any of them to anyone who is discerning enough to read this book.

That is, we do not deny the right of those to do their own “religious practices”, but we are trying to be scientific here, and in order to do this, we must now introduce the concept of *kundalini*, which will hopefully make matters clearer.

That is, Gopi Krishna explains that there is an energy centre in every human body, located at the base of the spine, called by ancient yoga texts *kundalini*, which has been known to those of all races over thousands of years, for instance even by the Pharaohs of Egypt who built the pyramids.

This energy is active to some slight degree in all of us, and it is responsible for the development of our bodies in general, but in particular our brains.

It becomes more active during the transition from childhood through adolescence, when we note that our brains and therefore minds undergo a dramatic growth in capacity and intelligence.

We thereby, with this fresh “spurt” of development of the brain, become *aware* of and capable of doing and understanding many things which we could not possibly have done and understood as a child.

For instance, we can see many ten or thirteen year olds who are brilliant at playing *mechanically* some musical instrument such as the violin or piano.

But what we almost never see, is a ten or thirteen year old who can compose a symphony like Beethoven, or create a song like Lennon and McCartney, or paint a picture like Salvador Dali.

It is not merely *accumulated information* which produces this creativity, because that could occur in many people much earlier; the mind flourishes fully to this mature “awakened period” of the brain only in most people in their late teens and early twenties.

For example, we see the young John Lennon or Bob Dylan at age sixteen or seventeen producing nothing of any quality or lasting value, but then suddenly – *Zok, Pow*, etc. as they say in *Batman* – they hit a period of incredible creativity, which is at least initially as shocking to themselves as anyone else.

Because, if this was merely an accumulation of data, then millions could do the same as them. What makes them unique is some “superfluidity” in their brain, which enables them to create so many remarkable things in a very short space of time.

But then we see this period rarely lasts more than a few years – especially in *modern* man – and therefore something has “burnt out.”

This extra special quality of their brain is no longer there, just as the athlete past a certain age can no longer break records any more.

In the latter case it is the deteriorated state of the muscles, but in the former case it is clearly the somewhat diminished functioning of the brain.

For it may only be a “hair’s breadth”, that separates the true “genius” from “the very talented”, just an extra stage in the “house of cards” that enables them to see *for a while* vistas which the rest of us cannot.

It may comfort the many “fallen geniuses” of society, whose “greatest hits” are far behind them, to know that *exactly the same* happens to even most of the “prophets” and the “saints.”

The well known state of “samadhi”, “nirvana” or “bliss consciousness” is usually a fleeting experience, as in the case of Dr R M Bucke, who wrote his famous *Cosmic Consciousness* in 1901, but experienced it only briefly in his whole lifetime.

But let us be clear – he got it *once*, and most of us get it *never at all*.

Certain saints however, like for example the famous nineteenth century Hindu saint *Ramakrishna*, have apparently stayed in this state of bliss and understanding for hours, days or longer.

According to Gopi Krishna, some very rare few – one in *billions* - have so far in our human history attained this state for years on end, which he said he did in his own case, but *only later in life*, after long periods of inner havoc and horror before the condition stabilized.

For once we have activated this *kundalini* force in a major way, most of us are going to get *heaven and hell*, and quite likely most of us are going to get mostly *the latter*.

And the reason for that is fortunately very simple.

Little do those who dangerously play around with meditation techniques and “chakras” realise, but in “the golden era” of yoga, that is *when there were some genuine twenty-four carat specimens of enlightenment walking around*, nobody under the supervision of a “guru” was ever *allowed* to do formalised meditation without undergoing a tough and lengthy preparatory training period.

This is demonstrated by Patanjali’s “*Eightfold Path of Yoga*”, which states that purification processes and training in self-control are the first, essential and pre-requisite stages to taking up the practice of meditation, which is in fact the last step in the *true* path, or in fact we should more accurately say *the penultimate stage* before experiencing *samadhi*, which arguably is not a stage, but a conclusion to the path.

In fact, even the extremely rare attainment of this “samadhi” is not the final stage in our development, as the experience will generally only be brief, whereas it should ideally be made a regular or continuous experience, as is arguably the case in so called “cosmic consciousness.”

So briefly, we will explain *why* meditation is the last step rather than the first, which is to say, because such powerful, deliberate meditation techniques can awaken this *kundalini* energy, which once roused, could be compared to being bitten by a poisonous snake *if our bodies and minds are not ready*.

That is, whether we like it or not, we are grossly mistaken if we think we can live an undisciplined, decadent lifestyle – overeating, too much sex, overworking, using certain drugs of a prescription or non-prescription variety – and then meditate in order to arouse this kundalini safely.

Our life will become a torture if we succeed, or we may flip into some awful state of mental illness.

It is our considered opinion and Gopi Krishna’s that many people who are currently or have been inmates or patients at the Western worlds’ mental hospitals, have somehow had a sudden awakening of this kundalini power, but without any knowledge of what has caused their condition, or how to cope with it, and thus they will typically get pummelled into oblivion by some powerful medication administered by the medical staff there, without which they could not otherwise cope.

So apparently the issue of whether kundalini will awaken or not in any particular person’s life is largely a *genetic* one. Like those who are born with the rare vocal chords of an opera singer, or the lightning quick brain of a chess grandmaster, most of us will have had this capacity either stamped on us or not from birth.

But the question as to *who* can awaken, and who cannot, is both unanswered and likely unanswerable.

Perhaps the more important question is, who could awaken *safely* and who could not?

For the most fantastic and fascinating revelation about this subject which has come in its clearest form to date from Gopi Krishna, though Vivekananda's 1893 work *Raja Yoga* is fairly clear also, is that what the kundalini is all about is sending the *sex energy* up to the brain along the spinal chord, to "energise" and evolve it.

Gopi Krishna describes this as an intensified "nerve current" of a fundamentally *electrical* nature, so thus, we are asking the question, whose neurones and "brain circuits" can we safely "turn up the current up on", and on the other hand, more worryingly, and gravely - *whose brains are going to "fry"?*

Again, we are aware of people personally whose brains have been somewhat "fried", in the sense of the subjective experience of pain, disorientation and sensation loss experienced by these unfortunate folk.

Many other horrors can accompany a kundalini awakening *gone wrong*, in someone whose body was unfit to handle so much "energy" for whatever reason, or whose *lifestyle* was not suited to this dramatic, potentially dangerous and delicate evolutionary process.

Though we cannot prove this all to the skeptic and the scientist in one brief chapter, or even several, we are just going to state quite boldly what we are talking about, which we hope that *with an open mind* they will as soon as possible do thorough scientific research upon, as was Gopi Krishna's lifelong wish and most cherished hope.

That is, we are saying, human evolution is not finished, and it is also not random. It is caused by this energy centre at the base of the spine, and this has over the millennia and centuries evolved the brain.

This evolution is slow and almost unnoticeable throughout most people's lifetime, we just say, "they mature", but *in some few*, the "genius type" such as Van Gogh, Dali, John Nash (of *A Beautiful Mind*), Leonardo Da Vinci, Einstein and many others, this can be very dramatic indeed.

We have "unbalanced" geniuses for the reasons we have mentioned – that is – an undisciplined lifestyle, immature genetics, and particularly lack of control over the sex desire.

The good news for the “one hit wonder” type geniuses, who wrote a brilliant song or novel or whatever but were unable to follow it up, is that they very well *might* get their “purple period” back, by exercising a lot more sexual restraint for some time.

For example, cutting sex to say twice a week or once a fortnight, rather than once a day or more as is common. By sex, of course we do not necessarily just mean *conjugal sex*, we mean *any kind of stimulation of the sex organs*, and in particular that which produces ejaculation or sexual fluids.

People lower down the evolutionary ladder may get away with “sexual excesses” far more so than the higher strata of intelligence, because their systems unlike our examples of say mathematician John Nash and artist Van Gogh are not so sensitive and in fact therefore “souped up.”

With the average “genius type”, what we have is a “prototype” experimental engine, which we are “test piloting” to see how fast it can fly, using a technology which is not yet properly developed and standardized.

So we find it flies around a bit wildly, jerks and splutters.

Then if it doesn’t actually blow up, it may suddenly have a *short flight* at incredible speed and astonish us, but likely when we find it, the wings are broken, the engine is blown, and we need to do a complete refit.

And sadly, this is what is happening to a lot of modern human beings of this genius or near genius class, round the world, who are “blowing a gasket” under the impetus of this kundalini energy, of which science is currently blissfully unaware, but “yoga” in many countries has been aware of apparently for several thousands of years.

We are saying once again, and once again with some knowledge of real life cases, that this energy generally activates in those in their mid to late thirties, and it is somewhat like a “rebirth”, in that we believe we have reactivated in a definite way exactly the same processes of rapid growth – but in this case, only of the finer structures of nerves, organs and brain – which were going on in the baby in the womb and developing young child.

Those who have this experience of *kundalini awakening*, feel *heat* at the base of the spine, just like in the yoga books; they get to feel hot and cold and light, *just like in the yoga books*; and they have a lot of strange things happen in their bodies and minds, *just like described in the yoga books*.

And there are other things, modern science has not yet dwelt upon, such as the fact that many male youths in their teens and beyond awaken from sleep in the morning with an erection, as do many older males.

This has been long explained away as the consequence of sexual dreams, fantasies, or even a need for the toilet, but this is not always the case, and can persist long after the person wakes and any fantasies are long gone.

The truth is that when kundalini is most active, and is sending up the sex energy to the brain, as a “side effect” the male sex organ becomes erect.

This apparently is the reason also why many ancient temples have what are believed to be “depraved images” on them, when in actual fact, they are depicting this “great secret” and phenomenon, and also explains the snake on the headdress of the Pharaohs of Egypt which again signifies this phenomenon, of which their subjects were wholly unaware.

This same phenomenon of the erection accompanying the flow of energy up the spine to the brain, and thereby enlivening and evolving it, is also believed to be the origin of the so called “Caduceus” which shows two snakes coiled around a rod, or “Staff of Hermes”, this symbol being the modern one used by the medical profession.

The two serpents are the left and right nerves on the spinal canal, which carry the “hot and cold” energy currents, and the central channel, called the “sushumna” in yoga literature is the rod.

Furthermore, Gopi Krishna said that if the sex energy was conserved rather more moderately than most men are doing now, this would generally have a rejuvenating effect on both *the body* and *mind*.

He did not advocate celibacy however in most cases, but as we have said *moderation*, the *middle way*, or avoidance of extremes, so we mention this to discourage anyone with an “overzealous” wish to use this information from trying out such a celibate practice which might culminate in them having a terrifying awakening of kundalini, which according to Gopi Krishna *for example*, could result in “instant insanity and death.”

Likewise, we would warn those who are considering “tantric sex” practices, that these may be safe for some, but the long term effects cannot be known, and thus they are best steered clear of, especially for those of a sensitive nature and constitution, and in no case “enlightening.”

So here, we wish to point out that the ignored and misunderstood scriptures of most religions, such as Christ’s New Testament and other moral treatises by leaders such as Mohammed, Buddha, and so on, actually were not just irrelevant “religious” works, but were giving us *psychological and physiological information*, regarding the safe use and development of our bodies and minds.

The treatises were there to say that, the evolving body and mind needs *balance, peace, harmony, tranquillity*.

The poisonous animalistic emotions of greed, too much lust for sex or power or ambition, spelt doom to you see, not merely “the soul”, but to *the nervous system, internal organs and brain* of the evolving future human being.

Any sensitive person will discover that an unchecked trip into rage, shouting and bawling at someone will leave them in a wrecked and unbalanced condition for *hours* afterwards, perhaps even days to properly get the effects of such a “thunderstorm” out of their system.

If we *habitually* go into such uncontrolled emotional states, we will sooner or later get unbalanced or *mentally ill*.

The doctors and scientists don’t generally yet know this.

They limit their analyses to what is going on in the organs, how “stress” and “worry” damages the heart, or hardens the arteries, and so on, but do not seem to pay much attention to what states of rage and so on are doing to *the brain*, and therefore to *the balance of our minds*.

So we see that meditating *in the formalized way*, which is going to energise our brains and make us more sensitive, is also going to *unbalance us* unless we are very careful, and that once our minds are somewhat cracked up, just like *Humpty Dumpty* – well you know – *all the kings horses and all the kings men may never be able to quite put us back together again.*

And we jest not.

The other point that Gopi Krishna explains on this topic of meditation, is that because of our increasingly mentally focussed society which is reading more, concentrating more on studies and so on, we are *already meditating, we are already unwittingly speeding the kundalini up.*

So we actually need not *more* meditation, but for us all to *slow down*, we need a less frantic and gentler life style, which is less demanding on our bodies and minds.

Thus, we are here saying, let us instead use this *awareness* technique we have expressed in this volume, rather than focusing the rays of “concentration” and likely scorching a hole in our minds and memories somewhere, which may leave us “out of our minds.”

Let us concentrate on *the preconditions* to enlightenment, which you see has been ninety-nine percent of what all the major prophets – Christ, Buddha, Mohammed, Confucius, Lao Tzu, etc. – talked about.

They said *we must become loving, kind, forgiving, tolerant, self-controlled, caring and sharing people.*

That is the real yoga.

We learn *that yoga*, not by escaping into mantras and chanting, but by *being aware of our wrong desires and rising above them.*

By becoming aware of our bad habits, and gradually transforming them *to something good.*

The real meditation is therefore the true life, full of dignity, harmony, selfless love, true humility, and with just moderate passion, pleasure, material possessions and a few luxuries thrown in.

We should be not like the proud peacock with its thousand brassy feathers, but like *the dove*, with its quiet, sweet nature, its lovely white plumage, soaring gently through the skies up to the heavens above.

Chapter Eight – Meditation and Authority – search for the guru inside yourself

As Krishnamurti points out, for example in his very easy to read book, *Life Ahead*, most of us are second hand people, whose whole lives are dedicated to serving and bowing down to the authority of others.

We all have this tendency to try to find someone to put our trust in, and look up to.

As Pink Floyd put it on *The Dark Side of the Moon* in *Time*

Ticking away the moments that make up a dull day
You fitter and waste the hours in an offhand way
Kicking around on a piece of ground in your home town
Waiting for someone or something to show you the way.

We are not “self-directed” beings, but this “conditioning” process which starts upon us from when we are knee high becomes the pattern of our life, so that we never become true individuals who set their own compass and steer their own ship, but afraid people, who are really desperately asking the question *will someone please tell me what I should do?*

But in itself, such a desire is we would suggest *a good sign*.

That is, the arrogant people who imagine they are masters of life, and spend their days asserting themselves ambitiously to get what they don't need and rule over others, don't ask for help, they are never going to read a book like this, because they – very foolishly we would say – imagine that they know it all.

Traditionally in the East, where some kind of spirituality has had a much stronger hold for millennia, far more so than in the largely secular West, to seek out and turn to a guru has been long considered the way to go.

This idea has been imported into the West gradually however over the last hundred years or so, and in particular since the explosion of interest in everything Indian and Eastern since the “hippy era” of the 1960s.

But the “guru” is not at all merely an Eastern figure – a guru is really anybody who starts talking and writing about “the meaning of life” or “how to live” in an authoritative way, and who therefore professes to have some kind of access to secret knowledge that we do not.

And then, if we think we find such a person, such a rare and privileged being, who is some kind of an “oracle”, or “fount of wisdom”, we can start to feel a reverence for them, which on closer inspection is generally found not to be very healthy either for them or us.

According to yoga theory, there are four states of consciousness – waking, dreaming, dreamless sleep and what is variously described as *samadhi*, *nirvana* or “the superconscious state.”

This is the state which Gopi Krishna has described in his autobiographies - an utterly staggering and *transforming* experience, in which his understanding of what the human being is, and what everything else is, is forever changed.

That is, in this elevated state, he saw himself as a mere “bubble of consciousness” in a huge ocean of *consciousness*.

His experience was that the universe was not *essentially* of matter, which physicists are now tending to express the dubious nature of, but of *consciousness*.

That is, the universe is not a heap of dead matter, in which we somehow have become conscious beings, and therefore some kind of aberrant freaks, but is at root, one of *consciousness, of intelligence*.

The universe is at heart a *consciousness*, not a pile of elemental rubble which accidentally strung itself together and created life forms and man.

There are of course millions, including many esteemed scientists like Professor Richard Dawkins, who say all is random, the universe is the construction only of a *blind watchmaker*.

But their problem, we see, is that *they have not experienced this higher state*.

There are however a few who *have* had brief glimpses or intimations of such a state, but who then also wrongly prematurely attribute too much importance and surety to it, and build a whole cult around themselves on such a flimsy basis of only brief and partial awareness.

But this is all very far from being a Gopi Krishna, a Christ, a Buddha or Ramakrishna who has bathed in this higher state for hours, days, weeks or years on end, and has gone through an enormous transformation which has bestowed on them great knowledge and understanding, which no relatively ordinary man or woman could possibly possess.

For we must appreciate that Gopi Krishna has given us a *biological* explanation of what is going on with a true “guru” or “prophet.”

The reason for example that taking drugs could never possibly produce enlightenment, is that the ability to experience and *maintain* this superconscious state, this *next stage of human evolution* – is based entirely on brain physiology, which like the transformation of the brain of an infant to that of an adult can only take place over a long period of time.

What is it that separates the genius, the psychic, or the prophet from the rest of us?

It is surely merely in the structure and physiology of their brains.

Scientists have been unable to locate the difference however between an idiot and an Einstein to date, because the brain is such a fabulously complicated organ, that it may prove in the final analysis even to be beyond human understanding in its entirety.

For example, it is said that the possible interconnections between the several *billion* brain cells of the average brain, is greater than the number of atoms in the known universe.

Which means, millions of years would pass before we could even partially count them all, let alone understand what they are all doing.

The brain for example seems to be at least partly *holographic* in its nature.

That is, if we cut or damage a part of it out, as happens to some people in operations and for other reasons, we may well find it reproduces the functioning of the lost part elsewhere, as can happen in the recovery phase after having a stroke.

But more generally we mean, that when we shatter a hologram we find that *the entire image* is present in each single shattered piece.

This is deeply disturbing to our everyday logic, but has been proven true by simple factual observation nevertheless.

That is, the brain, and the universe are not necessarily what we think.

If we imagine the universe as a field of *consciousness*, in a sense therefore *a field of dreams* of some kind of omnipresent and omnipotent intelligence which is *holographically* present at every point in the universe, we see that *in dreams* anything is possible, when we are freed from the limitations of our concepts about so called “matter”, “time” and three-dimensional “physical reality.”

Briefly, the scientists are no longer sure what a so called “atom” is any more, as when they have searched deeper inside it, they have found that there doesn't seem to be anything much there at all.

The concept of matter has in fact been mostly replaced by the idea of energy or force, and reality is felt to be more some kind of vast collection of waves, vibrations and “force fields”, rather than “solid” and made of indestructible atoms like “billiard balls.”

Furthermore, what is now thought to be happening with these wave-particle hybrids inside the atom, appears to be more like a *probability*, than a certainty, so that ultimately we will never likely be sure of what is happening inside any particular atom or why.

So the scientists are trying to contemplate what reality is, using these advanced scientific ideas, but yoga philosophy suggests they will never find the answers to “the meaning of existence” questions on that level, because they are still trapped within a model of the universe and themselves as “material”, whereas we are suggesting life and the universe is in essence an *intelligent consciousness*, not a physical thing at all in the sense we currently imagine it to be.

That is, from the point of view of those who have dwelled long in the higher state of consciousness, life and the universe becomes not something limited by physical laws of time and space, but more in fact like an enormous and perpetual dream which we are all living inside of.

But let us not forget that in our own dreams, we can feel joy, we can feel pain, we can suffer, we can have the most awful and terrifying nightmares, and thus *in our current state of awareness*, it is not practical for us to imagine that the world we see around us is *not* real.

So in this enormous gulf between us and whatever or whoever animates the universe, there is a huge doubt, and thus there are a never ending queue of people wishing to step in to resolve our doubts – whether they really know or they don't – and quite often money, celebrity or adulation is behind their desire to answer our doubts, fears and questions.

Thus *the guru* is born, to tell us what we are and what we should do.

Some say we create “God” only out of our imagination and need to believe, and certainly the same is often true of the guru.

The “guru” could be just as much *a scientist* like Dawkins, Stephen Hawking, Einstein or Charles Darwin, because they are claiming to tell us the nature of reality and life, and we are *believing in them*.

We tend to place a faith and credence in the famous and celebrities, as if they had all the answers to our problems, just because of their elevated status in society due to possessing one of these special talents, such as a great ability to write songs or poetry like Bob Dylan, or having made some outstanding scientific discovery, like Einstein.

But the truth is that most of these genius types themselves confess to not knowing the answers to our fundamental philosophical and social problems, though ironically many of the lesser lights will soak up the adulation and pretend that they do.

Such is also the case with the lower classes of “guru”, who likewise seek out wealth, fame, and the worship of the crowds, whereas the true guru – the Christ, Buddha or Gopi Krishna – is something very different.

And as we have said, the main difference is that the “true guru” is someone who is living more or less constantly in this higher state of “oneness” with Nature, or “cosmic consciousness”, has got his or her ego totally out of the way, and is not therefore motivated by the common persons' egotistical desires for worship, adulation, grandeur, dominion over others and sexual conquest.

For surely, the desire to be a guru and have others – even kings or queens – bow down to you, has got to be the most intoxicating desire that any person can ever have, and thus we should *beware*.

That is, a beggar on the street might become a guru, though such a person will never be able to become a ruler or king or get such enormous power and influence by any other means.

The great true gurus such as Krishnamurti, who denied even the validity of the term, and described himself merely as “someone who points things out”, are frequently courted by the rich, kings and emperors, who all in recognising their own inevitable decline and mortality wish to seek out whether there is any meaning to life before it is too late.

But if we are not of this calibre, to resist the temptations of flattery and offers of gifts put before us by the great of the world, we are liable to become prey to the greatest vanity, and in fact, thereby ensure that we never advance in the true sense spiritually, and worse - mislead others.

That is, let us recall that Christ was tempted by “the devil” in the desert, who “took him up to a high place” and told him the whole world could be his, if only he would acknowledge the devil and deny his loyalty to “the Holy Spirit.”

So we are surely seeing in those words, just this kind of temptation which he who could - because of this “coat of many colours” bestowed on him from “on high” - have kings begging for knowledge at his feet, must undergo and reject, if he or she is to become and remain a genuinely spiritual and therefore humble being.

For as we have said, by humble, we mean merely someone who is not accumulating flattering ideas and images about themselves, which would then motivate them to assert themselves and dominate others using their “spiritual power” and superior knowledge and understanding.

Such a person would not become a Christ or Buddha but a power hungry and manipulative despot, a devil in disguise.

And thus, we find that some very talented or “inspired” people throughout history have fallen to being one of these power hungry seducers of their followers, whom they may have performing tricks for them like circus animals and serving them as if they were emperors, kings or even *gods*.

So on one level, that is the kind of risk that following a “guru” can bring, and as we have said, this need not at all be an *Eastern* kind, but could just as well be someone wearing a business suit, who seems entirely rational and scientific in his outlook.

But we find in the final analysis that most so called modern “gurus” will inevitably be some kind of hypnotists who are seeking power over others, and to glorify themselves.

Equally, such a “guru” could be hiding inside a health service, or as a so called “therapist”, hiding behind some kind of a qualification such as a “Ph D”, but beware, because quite likely, at root all we have is another egotistical, power hungry and frequently sexually overactive human being.

Or else, we see, that many people – women more than men – will get a feeling of security from seeming to cater to the psychological needs of others, especially so called “healer” types, who actually may seek to control our lives like puppets on strings.

The phenomenon here is that we can gain a *false* sense of security, from spending our working hours in “a seat of authority”, as the average modern “psychologist” or “therapist” does, purporting to solve the problems of others, when in actual fact we cannot even many times sort out those problems we have ourselves.

In particular, we should watch out for any guru, “healer” or “therapist” who is *telling us we are special*.

For that is the greatest trick they can play, *appealing to our ego*, our awful desire for *recognition*, so that we will “believe in them”, *pay them*, and *do what they say*.

And even if they don’t ask for money, let us not imagine that means we are safe, for the mostly sad and lonely people who populate this globe have many other motives to gain control over us than merely money.

So for us to place faith in and put any ordinary person on a pedestal would be an error and a misjudgement.

If we *must* bow down to and put someone on a pedestal, it appears it is *safe* to do so only with those who are the *real* gurus, such as Krishnamurti and Gopi Krishna whom we have mentioned, both of whom incidentally did not wish anybody to do that in their own cases.

Thus, what we have been offering in this book, is not another path to worship any “personality”, but rather *a path to awareness*, a path to coping with life by rising above illusions and delusions in so far as that is possible for each one of us.

In particular this means *thinking for oneself*, and *not* attaching slavishly to *any* human personality.

We have got to grow beyond the immature stage of “belief in a person”, clinging to a person, and start to awaken “the guru inside.”

More accurately, by cleansing ourselves of prejudice and preconceptions, which we have gathered during our long years of *conditioning*, we will clear the fog from our mind, and thereby awaken our *intuition*.

That is, we will find our own inner compass to steer by, and then alone can we be our own captain on the ship of life, and thus be free.

So does this mean that we should throw away all concepts of having a guru of any kind as some imagined that Krishnamurti for example meant?

Not at all.

But it means we must assess what exactly it is we seek and mean by having a guru of some variety in our lives, and what our relationship is with that person.

And we would suggest above all, that it should not be *emotional*.

The goal is *understanding*, lighting our own light, not merely living always by the light of another, and basking in their reflected glory.

Millions of us seek out stars and celebrities, since we believe foolishly that if even we touch them, we have touched “greatness” and thereby some of it will rub off on us.

And this tendency becomes even worse, when allegedly we locate a being who seems to be wise, and appears to “have god on their side.”

But surely we should all stop this nonsense of attaching to those we perceive to be “the wise” *in a slavish doe-eyed way*, like some young girl screaming at the mere sight of a pop star?

Let us be respectful of the intelligence of those who seem to have more than we, and therefore may see something that we don't, but let us not grow to be “idolisers” of other human beings.

That is, if we idolise *any* other human being, whether a great artist, musician, celebrity or whomever, we make the psychological manoeuvre of validating *our fantasy* of them, and denying *ourselves*.

We try to lose ourselves in them.

We seek to merge with them, in a way that really we should only try to do in actuality perhaps with a marital partner, for the sake of living together and having children, when we know our feelings are returned.

For logically speaking, to lose ourselves in another person, is the denial, the extinction of ourselves.

And when we become *aware*, we see that the reason we seek to do that is that quite often we don't much like ourselves.

We decide *they* are wonderful, and *we* are nothing, and so we try to psychologically “meld” with them, but in that process we fail to grow as ourselves, we sell our minds into slavery, and fail to develop a valid existence as an independent human being.

We idolise for example John Lennon or Bob Dylan or some more modern pop star such as Madonna or Robbie Williams.

They can sing and in some cases write songs and play music on a level that almost none of us will ever be able to achieve.

So to try to be like them, is not the way to *our* individual “success.”

Rather we must learn to find our own *vocation* in life, even if that is to be someone who digs the streets, and makes the roads safe for us all to travel and walk upon.

It is not what a man or woman *does* for a living that counts so much, it is *what is in their heart*, whether they have learned the only *true* success, which is to become a genuine *human being*, of value to themselves and others.

Not however, that we should fail to try to do what is best for ourselves and society to do, within the limits of our powers.

But we must not think in terms of *grandeur* and fame, but of being like a little bird that carefully makes its own nest and feeds its chicks, and lives in peace with its neighbours on the fair meadow in which it happens to dwell.

The lives of the “great” and famous mean no more than our own, unless we *voluntarily* throw the meaning of our own lives away, and hand all our time, energy and thoughts over to them.

Likewise even with the *true* “gurus”, who just modestly consider themselves as our friends, brothers and sisters, and as Christ said, as humble as even the least of us.

So let us rather think of all the “gurus” of one kind or another as like modest and kind professors we are studying with.

We are – this is the spirit in which this book is written – attending the classes of a lecturer, who has learned from other teachers in turn a few things he wants to pass on, which he has found of benefit to himself - that is all.

Let us put our attention not upon the guru, but rather upon *ourselves*, rather than looking outward to “hero worship” someone else, as if this was some kind of solution to our problems when *it absolutely is not*.

The game of becoming whole, harmonious and sincere, by becoming *aware*, we would suggest is never about dwelling on the personal lives of others, it is always about learning to be true and clear in ourselves.

By the continuous exercise of the meditation technique described throughout this work, which is as we have seen, merely a “habit” of developing *awareness of our unawareness*, and thereby exercising our minds to discern the truth amidst the hypnotic suggestions of the false constantly placed before us, we may gradually unfold to this state of clarity and an increased sense of freedom, meaning and harmony in the thoughts, actions and experiences of our lives.