

March 1961

READING 5

SENIOR GROUPS

Monday Meeting – Colet Gardens – 27 February 1961

Dr. R. I expect you've noticed that last Monday I was suffering from a certain amount of unrest; and there *is* unrest and uncertainty in the air. On the one hand, those of us who feel that the Maharishi's presence offers very great possibilities which *we* mustn't miss and that some of us are moving too slowly and may be in danger of missing them; and on the other hand, there's unrest among those of us who were connected with Mr. Ouspensky and have been helping to build the continuation of his work, because we think that perhaps in their enthusiasm for the Maharishi and his method some may be, perhaps quite unwittingly, putting us in a certain danger of disruption. As you know very well, I *don't want* everybody to think alike. That would indeed end in our becoming frozen meat! On the other hand, with some quite momentous events in the near future, I do think it very important to state clearly something on which we *can* all agree – and *must* all agree – if we are to trust each other fully and allow everybody a free hand in playing the role of their choice. (Pause) You see, fundamentally somewhere, the doubt exists: are we to use this great opportunity in order to fulfil Mr. Ouspensky's aims and the continuation of the tradition of our work, or is our work considered now to have done its job and to be superseded?

Well now, this is quite a subtle thing in practice, not easy to understand. People keep falling out when they talk together. The fallings out are *not* important, but I feel that the main issue must be put very clearly, and so I want Mr. Allan to read a statement by Mr. Ouspensky upon which I think I can say that I *absolutely* take my stand, and if anybody is continuing with me they will also have to take their stand on this same point. If we do that, then *all* the minor things will become perfectly right.

(Reading) In 1935 Mr. Ouspensky stated his aim as follows:

If I can say: 'If I die tomorrow, work will continue,' it means a school is established. If it depends wholly on me, it means a school is not of sufficient strength.

And possibility of change of being is only with school work and school discipline... School means people. People must have preparation. Things went wrong with G. because at first he was very strict in choosing people, but later he took people without any preparation.

All this is obligatory today, on all who wish the Work to continue. Later, the following conversation took place, and it is from *The Fourth Way*, page 101:

What does development mean? It means working in the four rooms, only the order of the rooms in which a man works is different in different ways. In the Fourth Way, work is done in all the four rooms at once.

Q. Is this organisation a school?

A. This is an interesting question: can we call ourselves a school? To a certain extent we may, because we acquire a certain knowledge and at the same time we learn how to change our being. But I must say in relation to this, that in the beginning of our

work, in St. Petersburg in 1916, we were made to understand that a school, in the full sense of the term, must consist of two degrees, that is, it must have two levels in it: one level, where men 1, 2 and 3 learn to become No. 4 and the other level where men No. 4 learn to become No. 5. If a school has two levels, it has more possibilities, because a double organisation of this kind can give a larger variety of experience and make the work more quick and more sure. So, although in a certain sense we can call ourselves a school, it is better to use this term for a bigger organisation.

Q. Did I understand from what you said that this is not exactly a school?

A. For some people it may be a school, for others not. It is always like that. It cannot be definite and cannot be the same for everybody.

Q. If it is not yet ready to be called a school, what can make it so?

A. Only work of its members on their own being, understanding of the principles of school work and discipline of a certain very definite kind, If we want to create a school... we must take part in the building of the school. This is the method of the Fourth Way. In the religious ways, schools already exist, but here, if we want a school, we must take part in the building of it. But first you must learn. When you know enough, you will know what to do.

Dr. R. Well now, this is what many of us have been engaged on for a long time, taking part in the building of a School. Up till now, we haven't had much chance of finding a way towards a School on two levels, such as he describes there. I've never been satisfied with that state of affairs. I've always wanted that above everything, and a year ago I began to see really wonderful possibilities which many of you saw too. One feels that with all the help the Maharishi has already given us that he alone – of anybody with whom we have close contact – could enable us to achieve that objective of a School on two levels. We won't be given that help free. We have, as I have often said, to pay for it – to pay for it willingly, honestly and with a full heart; but since I believe he can give us that, I want very much that we don't let this opportunity slip.

So are we all really agreed about that? (Pause) Anybody not agreed about that, or do they feel that that is too local an objective, so to speak? Be brave and say. What we want is agreement. We don't want concealment. So if any of you feel that it's too parochial, do put up your hands or speak.

Q. There *is* a question I would like to ask in connection... If one takes somebody to the Albert Hall meeting, and he becomes interested, will one have any continuing responsibility for that person towards the Maharishi?

Dr. R. I believe that that would be so. I believe that all those questions will settle themselves *easily* and simply, provided the main question is agreed on and lived up to.

Q. I expect that some of the people we take will later want to know more, begin to turn in the direction of *this* organisation. That is not in any way taking people away from the Maharishi, is it?

Dr. R. He has often said to me that it isn't. On the other hand, I would like to continue to consult him about individual cases fairly and openly. He has, in fact, said that the

Meditation is a method which will help anybody, of whatever belief, to find their objective, and his interest is not sectarian. But if there is somebody who can be of great help to him, well I think we should play fair.

But the *main issue* is what I want to settle tonight. If, by your silence, you are with me on this, then I would like to say that it isn't only good *wishes*. One must be *able* to know that the consequences of one's actions, and words – even quite small – are in line with that aim to help in the building of a School on these two levels, and one must watch one's step, and take advice. (Pause) It's very, very easy in an enthusiastic moment *not* to see the full consequences of one's actions and words. There's a great art about this, and here we have got something very wonderful to help us.

There are very many parts of the System about which we are learning to have a 'new look' – a new understanding. There's a lot of dead wood which we have to get rid of – I welcome that – but there is one intrinsic part of the System, especially in Mr Ouspensky's own development of it, which we've never really been able to use much until now; and now I find that, if the Meditation is going well, or if by any other means one gets this awakening of the heart and mind, this particular part of the System suddenly blossoms into life. It is the teaching on the *six triads*, especially as exemplified by the *six activities of man*. (Pause) He said, at the time when I used to sit for hours in his room trying to think and get some daylight about this subject – and failing, I must admit – he said at the time that, when you understand this, a new world will be open to you; and later he said: 'You will find it possible to continue my work if you really understand the difference between activities.' This is a tremendous help just at the present moment, because I feel that, with most of us, when we disagree it's not a personal matter at all. It's because there's a feeling that one kind of action is masquerading as another kind; some conflict is set up. Do you see what I meant?

For instance, take this attempt to repay the Maharishi for all he has done for us in our taking over the organisation of this large meeting at the Albert Hall. (Pause) And also, looking after, *helping* to look after the people who come to him as a result of that. Now, as regards the organisation of this meeting, it's clear that *good, professional work* is one of the things which is needed – one kind of activity. We happen to be blessed with a number of people who can do that work extremely well, and I think you'll agree, as everything develops to the meeting, that it *is* being done properly this time. But these people, who are very efficient, have to realise that good, professional work and the organisation of labour which goes with it – all the printing and sending out of notices, arrangements with Press, BBC, Albert Hall, and so on and so forth – all this constitutes just two of the six activities; and that isn't organising just an ordinary kind of meeting, but they are working for something very exceptional indeed, for a man who has the capacity to use *another* activity, this *third kind* of activity which is so rare in ordinary human life.

I have often given you the description of a simple way of approach to the difference between activities. There is, for instance, labour, physical work; there is a certain inventiveness, training and experience which constitute professional work, labour-saving devices, and so on. But there is a *third kind* of activity very *rarely* met with and never in sufficient concentration in ordinary life. And I have often said that perhaps the story of the Good Samaritan – the man who had mercy on the Jew – depicts a *third kind* of activity.

Now I want to point out that, one of the keynotes of this story, is that the Good Samaritan was no respecter of persons. The Priest and the Levite, who ‘walked by on the other side’, were tied by a code which forbade them to help one sort of person but perhaps permitted them to help another sort of person. Now in working for someone like the Maharishi, *that is out*. The Maharishi, by his very status, his very mission in the world, *can be no respecter of persons*. He cannot say ‘no’ to anybody – tramp, criminal, anybody. And those who elect to help him – as long as they are helping him – must *not* make their own distinction between who they will help and who they will not help. The position is analogous to that between the general public and my own profession. *We* are absolutely forbidden, as doctors, to make any moral judgement upon our patients. A man may be the most frightful scallywag, suffering the most loathsome disease brought on entirely by his own stupidities, we give him the very *best* treatment that we possibly can. If we begin to form moral judgements it’s absolutely against the code of our profession.

This is important because there’s a certain amount of disagreement caused by some of our people adopting a too critical attitude, forming judgments, deciding who they will help and who they won’t help, in connection with the part they are playing in the Maharishi’s work. In *our* relation within a School, we *have* to form judgments. You remember Mr. Ouspensky said that exactly – in a School *sins can not be forgiven*. If sins were forgiven, nobody would learn better! But if we, as a School, are going to work with unprepared people, or people not under these same rules in the outside world (which is a splendid exercise for us at this stage), we must remember that this School Principle does *not* apply in ordinary life outside. Now, let’s discuss that a little bit.

Q. Most interesting thing is what you said about it being such a splendid exercise for us – to have to work in different ways – to be working in the two ways at the same time.

Dr. R. To be working in the two ways at the same time, yes.

Q. Then *that work* we do *this way* because this is Maharishi’s way, and *this work* we do in relation to our work as a School, because that is *its way* and we have to know which it is we’re doing?

Dr. R. Yes. Don’t you think it’s possible and very valuable?

Q. Yes. We’ll keep awfully wide awake!

Dr. R. And you agree that, although we *can* be tough with each other here, we *can’t* be tough outside, and it would be quite wrong if we tried.

Q. If we’re working for the Maharishi we have to do it the way we’ve seen him do it?

Dr. R. Yes, I think if we’re working for him we have to do it the way he *asks* us to do it.

Q. Yes.

Q. Do you remember Mr. Ouspensky said that the people who were useful to him were the people who were *responsible*, and he elaborated on what he meant by responsibility. I think that applies to both situations: one must be responsible as a member of the School and one must also be responsible as a member of that School in relation to the work for the Maharishi.

Dr. R. Well put; absolutely right.

Q. Responsible for both. It means really a big thing, responsibility.

Dr. R. Yes, and we can be pleased that many of us have shown this capacity, and that's why he is very fond of any of us that he's met. Also we must remember that this School of ours is judged by the way individual members of it go about things in the outside world. So it works both ways.

Now I don't know, Allan, if I have at all approached your question about wanting to understand the relation of the Maharishi's work to ours, and I'd like to hear any further questions anybody wants to ask on this important point.

Q. Yes, I have the whole time not been able to understand how we can make use of the Maharishi's presence? – How will it form itself for us? – To make more use of him, to appreciate his presence and what he can give us?

Dr. R. You see, it's a particular question for each of us. How does our capacity – our position in life – enable us to take some part in the work *he* wants to do, at the same time getting *his* help for this organisation of ours? As an organisation as a whole, I think I can say that we are playing a big part in converting his work in England from a rather frustrating semi-failure into what is probably going to be a dazzling success. There is a lot that we can do in the future, particularly if we remain a group of people acting *according* to School Principles and not a heterogeneous collection. But, as individuals, we have to ask ourselves: How can I take some part, if I want to, in the big scheme of bringing the Meditation to more people, more worthwhile people, and so on, more people who can help in a national or world programme? A specific question for each.

Q. If I understand rightly, you were saying that Maharishi's work was, as it were, the second level of our School?

Dr. R. Well now, may I just define that. I believe that, if the Maharishi's plans succeed completely, and he *does* extend his school in the Valley of Saints, in the Himalayas, to take in the most worthwhile people in the Western or Eastern world, to enlarge it, to increase the level of Being of these people and then send them out to help bring the method (and guide it) among many more than he can reach single-handed; if his plans come off, I believe then that we will be enabled to take advantage of this higher level of School. (Pause) I think maybe, we can go a lot towards that in the meanwhile by learning to work with him before that is all ready. Again, those of us who are well-situated for that and who want it.

Q. I was going to ask after that whether, in that case, we could take it that his tradition and our tradition were so similar that at least at the level of man No. 5 they would be merged?

Dr. R. I believe that that is so with regard to *being*. The presentation of the *knowledge* of his tradition is different from the presentation in our tradition, of knowledge. But I believe in relation to being, the two are so similar that we can obtain that objective. (Pause.)

My main point is simply that this is a testing time, which each of us can use, or not use, as they feel in their own conscience. They must *not* act as sheep, simply following the general run. Each person has to come to his own belief. But I believe also that, if we all have – really

have at our heart this objective of building a School, we can't go far wrong. We can take risks, we can try experiments, people can have a free hand – they needn't be held back on close reins all the time. But if there's a horrid doubt that some might forget this, then of course if anybody sets off galloping on his own I have to say, 'Well, he is doing it at his own risk.'

Q. Could we take it that the work that we do for the Maharishi would constitute the outer shell of the work and that our own School will remain hidden?

Q. Do you want me to repeat that?

Dr. R. Repeat it, yes.

Q. Do we take it that the Maharishi's work is the outer...

Dr. R. No, no. The work we do for the Maharishi...

Q. ... the work we do for the Maharishi is the outer shell and our own work is the inner core... and that our own work would remain hidden?

Dr. R. It wouldn't be the whole outer. You see – as has been pointed out – there *will* be people who will want to come to *us* afterwards. But, in working for the Maharishi, we are already learning more direct approaches to people – people whom we wouldn't ordinarily know how to reach, wouldn't ordinarily be able to talk to, people perhaps whose lives don't admit of their coming to meetings or forming part of a fairly full-time organisation. We are learning tremendously. This Work will benefit from it in many ways; at the same time we will be repaying him for what he has already given us, and keeping good relations for the future. We have many, many possibilities just now which, just over a year ago, we didn't have at all. And the end of your question – our work must be hidden from those who don't want it and would harm it; yet those who want it must be able to find it.

Q. If the Maharishi's level of being is higher than ours, what have we to offer that is superior to anything that the Maharishi hasn't already given?

Q. (repeated) If the Maharishi's level of being is higher than ours, what have we got to offer people that the Maharishi can't already give them?

Dr. R. That remains to be seen.

Q. Isn't it true that on a higher level we probably *would* agree? I mean, you said that, on certain levels of knowledge, perhaps we differ from the Maharishi's, but if we were to reach a higher level, we'd find probably that we don't disagree. Is that true?

If we were to reach a higher level, we would find there is not disagreement between us and anything the Maharishi was saying... in relation to knowledge, particularly in relation to knowledge?

Dr. R. I don't think there could be any disagreement, but I think there's a fundamental difference in the *System* of knowledge upon which his tradition is based from the *System* of knowledge which we have been taught. I think from him we can understand a great deal quite newly about our own System of knowledge. For some people, the System of knowledge based on the Vedas works. For other people, our System of knowledge works better. But our System of knowledge doesn't work properly unless we raise our level of Being.

Q. When you speak of the continuation of the idea, actuality of a School, do you include in that the continuing use of the psychological methods that have been used in the past?

Dr. R. (Pause) I heard what you said. I want to know just in what sense you mean that?

Q. Just very simply. We've used in the past many psychological methods which, now that we have this new method available, seem to be anyway partly superseded. When you say, we go on with School – which is a fine idea – do you mean that we go on with those psychological methods?

Dr. R. (Pause) I think that that *must* be a matter of choice, which need not involve us in any disputes or disharmony. I feel that our understanding of the psychological part of the System needs a great deal of revision, if only in the light of recent discoveries of the nervous system, and so on, a great deal of revision – and I believe that from conversations we've had with the Maharishi, that he *is* a master of the workings of the human mind, and that we can learn a very great deal from him in that way. I *don't* think that we can do without even the psychological part of our System, which contains many wonderful things you *never* find elsewhere – the distinction between the moving centre and the other centres, the different parts of centres, the relation of attention to parts of centres, the different working of the different centres in the four states of consciousness, the distinction of knowledge and being and the possibility of change of being – many of these things you *cannot* find anywhere else – also right descriptions of personality and essence. We're only just at the very beginning of understanding all these things.

I don't mind a bit what practical methods anybody uses if they go up there. I don't mind a bit!

Q. Apart from our change of being, is it possible to say now for what purpose this School of ours is being established?

Dr. R. Very many purposes. I don't think you can say just one purpose. I happen to think that one of its purposes is *just* this present one, at the present moment: to enable a man like that to make a success of a mission like that. That's one. But I don't feel at all it's the only one. (Pause) I feel that, with the Fourth Way School which is created for a definite purpose (unlike, for instance, Mount Athos which exists for centuries), this School must work in such a way as to be ready for any possible purpose which may turn up. I believe that there are other purposes ahead of us which we don't see now. We don't know what's going to happen in the West in the next few years. But certainly, why not let's just settle for the immediate purpose at our feet now, if only as very good practice. (Pause) Had you anything else in mind?

Q. I was wondering now if it's possible to see more clearly what purposes our Teacher foresaw?

Dr. R. I would like to say one purpose, and that is just the very fact of continuity. You know how brief the existence of things are – worthwhile things in the ordinary way – how they change, change direction. Well now, since 1920, when Mr Ouspensky first started up separately in London, we've managed to maintain very fair continuity – 31 years – no, more than that, 41 years – is fair going. Another 41 would be better still! And indeed, this idea of continuity played a very big part in his outlook. (Pause)

The other thing is this question of an accumulator, of valuable ideas which are in danger of being lost or superseded. And not only ideas – I dare say many of you can think of other purposes we fulfil just by being here, and by our connections with other countries – groups in other countries.

Q. Could you please say anything about what does it mean that in the Fourth Way it sometimes goes underground? I have never been able to think what that means.

Dr. R. Yes. There's a marvellous underground activity which we can *all* take part in... Did you say 'underground'? (Yes) Marvellous underground activity we can all take part in, and that is simply to be *kind* – just that, kind to just anybody, (pause) not to be negative ourselves and to help them out of some negative emotion; wonderful underground activity to be kind to just anybody. The way Mr. Ouspensky was kind, you remember. It's what's needed very, very much today. I had a very good idea of that going round in the car in Kenya – all these black people, and particularly little black babies and children and the rest of them – all they wanted was a smile, and with the help of my son and daughter-in-law they got it! And also a few words of Swahili were quite enough. All these primitive people, they just wanted a little kindness, a little understanding. If there were more of this about in the world, we'd be doing a very good job on the side! (Pause) Or is this something quite different from what you are meaning?

Q. No, it does answer in a way. I thought that when Mr. Ouspensky said that the Fourth Way sometimes goes underground, that it must mean that it doesn't somehow exist, and that it comes up again another time.

Dr. R. No. You remember he said that parts of the world very often became impossible for Schools, and then they would have to go underground. Certainly, Schools everywhere behind the Iron Curtain have to be very much underground, and it may be *our* turn to go underground at some point. I don't see it at the moment but...

Q. I thought that it continued when it went underground? I mean, as Mr. Ouspensky said, if Fourth Way had a certain purpose and when it finished it disappeared.

Dr. R. Well, having fulfilled its external purpose, it may be that the tradition has to continue, has to be preserved in times when any external organisation or building becomes impossible. We shall have to see about that. Who's best at going underground?! But at the moment we can stay aloft and there is plenty to do.

Q. Can you say something more about School on two levels... ?

Dr. R. Well, yes, I would like to continue to read from that same meeting report which happens to go further along that line:

Q. Would it be possible for everyone in a school to progress from No. 4 to No. 5, or only for a few?

A. There is no limitation in principle. But you must understand that there is an enormous difference between man No. 4 and man No. 5. Man No. 4 is a man who has acquired a permanent centre of gravity, but in everything else he is an ordinary man. Man No. 5 is very different.

He already has unity, a permanent 'I', the third state of consciousness. This means that he is awake, he can always remember himself when he needs it, and the higher emotional centre works in him which gives him many new powers.

...

Q. If schools are so important, why do they not have more influence in the world?

A. Schools can only act through people who are interested in them. They can do nothing if they are surrounded by people who are indifferent. The possibility of schools influencing life is conditioned by the general attitude to schools. In order to have influence, schools must have people who are interested and who would obey. But this must come from below, it cannot be produced by schools. Schools can throw B influences into the world, but if people are not interested in them, they can do nothing. They cannot use violence.

Dr. R. With regard to that last quotation, I feel that this refers to Schools on our level. It would be very wonderful to see if the product of a School from a higher level can, in fact, arouse an interest in masses of people who would otherwise never be interested. This is a work I would very much want not only just to observe, but to take part in, to see if it can be done.

But to return to your question, (pause) is that an answer to it – about the difference between people who *have* a permanent centre of gravity, that is, in all important things that refer to the Work, and someone having a quite different being, the Being of No. 5? Now, you must follow that very good question up by asking a further question: What additional things would be necessary in the School to create this entirely new Being? You may say that our set-up, as it's been for 40 years, may have been sufficient to make a number of people with Permanent Centre of Gravity. We see signs that it may have been adequate for that. But now, will this set-up, as it was, be enough to create people of quite new and different Being – people who have control of the Third State of Consciousness and of Higher Emotional centre, and all that? What will be necessary for all that?

This is connected with Dr. Allison's question about whether we're to go on with the old methods. This creation of new beings requires an expert. Any method which is as effective as that requires the help of an absolute expert and, moreover, a man who is himself of higher Being. (Pause) It's a moot point to me whether the methods suffice, whether we are expert enough in the methods we have previously tried, and whether these methods are the most effective that there are – still a moot point. But I think that if we have the help of an expert in another kind of method (pause) or, shall we say, if we're prepared to look unendingly for experts in additional or other kinds of methods, I am sure we'll get along quicker.

Q. Do you think it's possible that using the psychological knowledge we had to form *judgements*, whereas really they are only *categories*? We can't see what they mean unless we have more Being?

Dr. R. I feel that, in a number of ways, the psychological ideas we had were, at that time, the best possible in the existing knowledge, the best and most simple way of expressing those ideas which then found no expression in ordinary scientific literature, you see. But I don't think they were ever meant to be permanent in the light of advancing knowledge, and that it would be useless now, in 1961, just to go on repeating those parts which now look very

primitive indeed. But one of our functions, I think, could be that we make something of the advances of existing knowledge in the field of man's structure and functions, psychological functions. It's all very chaotic at the moment. I would like to be able to leave something fairly permanent in that way. You're right; the categories within which the System places the facts will last; but the contents of these categories are now very different.

Q. If we take our guidance from the Maharishi, are we still the Fourth Way? Can those two things go together?

Dr. R. Well, as I think we were saying, this may be different for different people. Some people may be in a School and some people may not, you see? Personally I'm convinced that the two can go together. I feel it's very, very important that if we take our guidance from the Maharishi, we remain the School we were created by the man who gave us everything; but at a higher level than when we started.

Q. Which, to me, means then that, if any of us should reach higher – get tremendous wisdom from following Maharishi – then we should feel that we only get this in order to bring it back to our own School, that everybody can profit from it?

Dr. R. Yes, I strongly agree, but I wouldn't make this absolutely obligatory for everybody.

Q. I understand.

Dr. R. I believe that individual conscience will tell a man or woman where *they*, in particular, have to go.

But I would like to say one final word. There were conversations in the past about the Lord's Prayer, and who is Our Father in Heaven. It was pointed out – these were very private conversations – and it was pointed out that the Lord's Prayer had its ordinary meanings – good, good, everything fine – but that there was another meaning altogether, as well; that the Lord's Prayer is a School prayer, the 'I' is never used, always 'we' and 'our', and 'Our Father in Heaven' means the Founder of that School.[†] And I was tremendously interested, when I had a talk with the Maharishi, who expressed exactly the same thing; and he said to me that the man who betrayed the Founder of his School, or his Teacher, would *never* find a place with any other School or with any other Teacher, and that this relation of pupils and founder is a very sacred and important thing. It was one of the things that won me over so much to the Maharishi – his never saying 'I', his never claiming that *he* was doing things, everything done in the name of his own Teacher, as you will have heard in listening to his 'Holy Tradition' recordings. So, I feel, there's a tremendous similarity *there* between our Tradition and his. I feel there is no conflict with him about this; we were perfectly open about it together, and he never asked me to desert my Master – the Founder of our School; he never demanded that at all – perfectly understood.

Q. Is the purpose of Maharishi's method, that it can be used for that union of heart and mind, as you just said, which could then bring us nearer the Leader of our Tradition?

Dr. R. Well, I think it has bigger connotations than that, and I wouldn't like to answer a question which began, 'Is the purpose of the Maharishi's method so and so', because I don't feel qualified to answer it. But I feel this, that to overcome the powerful centres in the lower

storey, the union of mind and emotion is a very powerful and successful combination. When I say 'to overcome' I mean to canalise it in proper – in profitable channels, and I do believe that the Meditation does just that if it's done rightly, and does a lot more as well. But also, *we* were taught methods and ways of working together which also had this effect, and those ways of working together and those methods can very well go on with profit now. And I have seen, even before this new star in the firmament, I have seen people change *wonderfully* in that way, over the years.

Q. Does it require for the Maharishi's method to reach man No.5 that the man is first truly No. 4, in our sense?

Dr. R. He might take it in his stride, who knows!

Q. You...

Dr. R. I am sorry – just a moment. But I believe, that this centre of gravity means that he has some fundamental belief which is stronger than anything else, or some fundamental realisation such as the one which we've read in this extract, that the most important thing is to take part in the building of a School, a real School, which has two levels. If *that* fundamental belief is the most important thing in this man's life, then he has a permanent centre of gravity. In that case, he should certainly go on and become No. 5.

Q. You spoke of us as being in a position now of being able to betray Our Father in Heaven, which is a really frightening thing to say, to me. How could anyone do this?

Dr. R. Loss of Memory and Valuation. Very easy because it's done by little steps quite unconsciously. It represents, really, the whole crux of the matter in a case such as this. (Pause) Is a man going to forget his own Teacher in the wonders of a new Teacher or, is he going to use all that he can get from the new to continue the work of his own Tradition and his own School? And this is just the thing which produces this unrest and doubt among us in relation to each other, you see. Now that I am being asked: 'Who is going to look after everybody who wants to do the meditation after the Albert Hall meeting, who and where are they going to do this?' – I would like to pick the people – if I have any say in the matter – of whom I was absolutely certain on this point. There generally seems to be a tendency for the people of whom I am *not* absolutely certain to be very active in this matter! But, it needn't be so; I may be very distrustful by nature.

Q. You spoke about sin in School. One has had the feeling that it's rather sinful to be genuinely puzzled by anomalies which have cropped up out of one's small understanding between our method, as we have learned it, and the Maharishi's method as he expounded it. If one could get rid of this feeling that it was a sin to find contradictions and that one could ask about them and find where the agreement was, I'm sure – certainly in my case – that this sense of anxiety and distrust would be dispelled. I have felt this very much.

Dr. R. Yes, and on what does it depend whether it is a sin or not?

Q. It depends largely on the climate of these meetings!

Dr. R. It depends largely on whether the person has this Centre of Gravity in which he

recognises and values our traditional teaching in the main – and wants to brighten and improve and correct this teaching or whether he wants to make a hybrid of it, whether he doesn't value it enough – whether he wants to mix it up with something else, do you see? So that the same person, I mean two people, doing the same thing, one of them may be committing a sin and the other may be doing something absolutely magnificent! This is the subtlety of the situation and why I find it so difficult to be clear. But all questions will be answered if one searches one's own heart, about what one really believes in. If we all stand on this one rock, then I would like to say: 'During the next three weeks, go *full* out and help the Maharishi in every way you can!'

Well, it's been a very interesting conversation to me, and the time has flown.

(Applause)

*

CONCLUSION

In times past (from the third century AD, when the three Traditional Ways crystallised into their rigid forms), the only way of becoming fit to absorb and transmit these subtle vibrations was withdrawal from the life of humanity to that of a Monk, or a recluse. But before all that the Fourth Way existed; in this Way the process of absorbing, reflecting and transmitting the Light is carried on within the confines of the Common life itself. We are now learning how this can be done by devoting a small part of the day to the quiet delight of absorbing subtle vibrations, so that in time we achieve the power to reflect and transmit them through the medium of the Special life in our activities of the rest of the day.

*

†NOTE from page 34

Already this description of the Lord's Prayer as a School prayer has been misunderstood. Someone has suggested that it means we should 'pray to Mr. Ouspensky'. Of course it means nothing so naive as to drag it down to the personal – to pray to some personality sitting on a cloud somewhere!

As a School prayer the Lord's Prayer is used in a particular way. It is not a personal petition but a *reminder* to the members of the School. We remind ourselves of the source of our System from Higher Mind; that is, from cosmic consciousness which is a *state* uninterrupted by death. We remind ourselves that cosmic consciousness remains unknown until it is manifested 'on earth as it is in Heaven'; and that daily inspiration from Higher Mind is the miraculous food upon which the life of a School depends. Then we remind ourselves that the work of the School consists in helping those who come to it to become free of negative emotions; but this depends on our allowing that miraculous influence to cleanse us of our own bad feelings. Finally, we remember the dangers of identification ('temptation') but particularly of the evil of self-congratulation, because all 'the glory for ever and ever' belongs to consciousness, the source of our System and the light of our tradition.

* * *