

21 August 1961

## ADDRESS TO 70

## IN CAMP AT OTAKI, NEW ZEALAND

I have been kept posted a little about what you have been discussing and I thought it might interest you if we started off by quoting from a conversation which I think I shall always remember. One evening after the Shankaracharya came to visit us; at the first informal conversation we had in the evening down by the banks of the Ganges with the great gold throne and carpets spread out in front, forty or fifty Indians on one side, all of us Europeans in front, and the ripples of the water coming a yard or two away in the dusk, he began to talk like this:

‘On the path to realization we are not required to do anything, *we begin to be what we are*. In order to be what we are we have to *come out of what we are not*. Those thoughts you are *not*, that intellect you are *not*, those feelings, those sensations *you are not*. You are *not* that restless separate ego. Through the meditation we give up all these things, and when we reach the transcendental state we begin to find out what we are, and then we realise what brought up this whispering “I am That”; the birds are singing “I am That”; the moon and stars are chorusing “I am That”. I am a note in the world’s symphony; so to begin to Be what we are we have not got to give up anything Real. All the unreal world is created by our own thoughts and ideas; give up those and we come back to the Real. And we do not have to do anything to give up; we simply come to pronouncing the mantra, and the mantra gives everything up for us.’

Then one of the party said, ‘Oh, but how can I give up my thoughts, they are there all the time?’ And he said, ‘They have to be there all the time but don’t stop to parley with them. There is a story that Jupiter and Venus often appear in the horoscope together and when they appear in the horoscope together this means marriage, and Jupiter and Venus get rather tired of this. They did not see why they could not meet without starting off all this marriage business; so they arranged not to meet, but in order to arrange not to meet they had to meet and so all the marriage business started up again. So do not stop to parley with thoughts, return, return, return to the repetition of the Word.’

Then there was a conversation about ‘not doing’ and he said that, when we use the word ‘doing’, we do not refer to natural actions, we refer to artificial things created on the path to spirituality – artificial codes of behaviour, artificial postures, people all becoming alike, meeting faces; all the artificial things that have cropped up in the world on this path to spirituality. In that Tradition they are careful never to cultivate those things. Of course, they are up against all the different sects and religions in India where the external codes of behaviour are the all important thing. For example, the traditional Hindus and Buddhists would be shocked to the core if you had your feet uncovered in the presence of the Shankaracharya. All these external things – you must when you meditate sit facing the particular direction (I have forgotten which it is) – all these external things are luckily in this Tradition regarded as quite unimportant. So that is the sense in which we use the word ‘doing’ and in which we try not ‘to do’.

So then comes the question: When a man has realized himself, how does he behave, what are his thoughts and actions, his speech, what are they like? They say, like no-one else in the world; just like himself; and he does not have to think how he is going to act, how he is going to talk

because, if he has realized himself, it flows out of him. He decides to walk across the room, he does not analyse how he is walking or decide how he is going to walk, he just walks across the room like himself. This our Group in London finds very difficult. When one comes new to a group one begins to look round to see how other people are walking, how they speak and how they behave, and over the years we get into stereotyped 'group' habits; and so our work for the Autumn is to begin to get out of these habits and begin to Be what we are.

I do not know if you have read the books of Aldous Huxley? (Mr. Howitt: I do not think many have.) There were some intellectuals collected round Aldous Huxley who were brought to Mr. Ouspensky in London. They were invited to the country house (Lyne Place) we had then, and they were brought in and introduced to us as we were all sitting around waiting for supper, about fifty of us; and they took one look and fled. And Mr. Ouspensky explained afterwards to us that, wherever people collect together for 'Work', they always manage to collect a sort of monasterial exterior. We were all sitting around looking as if we were moulded into a particular mould. Of course to individualists like Aldous Huxley the worst possible thing. Are there any remarks about that, anything you are not clear about? – I mean, as to how a man who realizes himself behaves.

Mr. Geary. Would it be a confusion caused by the idea of doing nothing unnecessary? And seeing habits one has and trying to avoid them?

Dr. Roles. Well, we used to think so and we had as our slogan 'Do nothing unnecessary', and so on; but I really think the meditation in time brings it all about quite naturally. If we are coming to this state of Self-consciousness again and again, then this by itself will eliminate unnecessary actions. They drop off one by one. It takes time of course and help. I think this is where a School is very necessary. But not active help, just simply by being together and working together, and meditating, unnecessary actions drop off. You don't have to try, because if you are *trying* it is your own self-will; whereas by coming to Oneself one connects with the Cosmic Will, and the Cosmic Will is doing everything for one.

But that brings me to another point, another conversation. The question arose, 'How can one tell whether the meditation is really being successful or not, both for oneself and for other people?' And there are two parts to this answer: One is that, during the half hour, one knows what has in the past been successful. One has had a taste of something one wants to get to, so one judges during the half hour of one's success by one's own experience. But the main thing to go by is not during the half hour, but a gradual change proceeding day by day, week by week, month by month. And the Shankaracharya gave us the following ten signs of successful meditation: *Firstly*, good physical health. If one's health is getting better, then one must be doing something right. *Secondly*, this sense of renunciation of useless, unnecessary things. Useless things seem to one useless, so one isn't interested. The *third* thing is a proper sense of proportion in life. For instance, things are done out of need only and not just out of excess energy. The *fourth* thing, the five senses of perception, and the five senses of action gain strength. That is, the meditation leads to using and strengthening all our faculties of experience; we are experiencing more vividly. 'If they are not getting strong,' he said, 'how can they keep to themselves?' Because all our faculties of experience tend to get mixed up, one experience blurs another experience; but

as they become more vivid and stronger, then each experience is an experience in itself. The *fifth* thing is that the mind tends not so easily to become excited. Curiously enough this leads to forgiveness of other people. If other people don't excite you one way or the other, then you have this feeling of forgiveness, kindness and compassion, which increase naturally into universal love. *Sixth*, the sense of 'this is mine' and 'that is yours' tends to disappear; this feeling of separateness between 'I' and 'you' tends to disappear. The feeling of possession, 'this is mine', goes naturally, and with that a lot of freedom from envy, and so on. *Seven*, freedom from greed. First of all 'you become less greedy, and then you become not greedy at all!' *Eight* is that you lose the feeling of fear; fearlessness increases. And with that, *nine*, self-confidence increases. You know that, if you are reaching – coming to the centre of your Being twice a day – you know that that is all you have to do, that you can then be confident, and lastly (*ten*) gloominess becomes less; general gloom disappears. The mind becomes more sparkling and less tired because most of our gloominess comes from a tired mind; everything seems much more difficult when our mind is tired. And the end of this particular conversation went like this: 'These are the symptoms of right meditation, and these are the very qualities that are most difficult to obtain otherwise. They come naturally as when you eat; hunger is naturally satisfied. You don't have to go into the question of eating; you simply eat, and the result is that your hunger is satisfied.' And these other ten results come about just like that.

Finally, someone asked, 'Will you define God?' And he said, 'Each man is made up of bodily sensations, feelings, intellect and soul. When he can see his body as the composite of all bodies, his feelings as the composite of all feelings, his mind as the composite of all minds, and his soul as the composite of all souls, and when he knows that the Universe is composed of the four elements, then this man is God. He is Cosmic, boundless.' That reminds one of St. Augustine who, you will remember, said:

Man is what he loves. If he loves a stone, he becomes a stone; if he loves a man, he becomes a man. If he loves God... I dare not say any more, or ye would stone me.

And that is a way of looking at it, at what you were speaking about, Mr. MacLaren, being less subjective, less personal.

I was going to have talked about the Parable of the Sower from the point of view of being less personal, but I find that Mr. MacLaren was speaking about it last night, but maybe the points that struck me don't overlap too much. Reading it in the last year or so, one can't help being struck by the fact that a Sower has gone out to sow this seed. As he sowed, some fell by the wayside, some fell on a rock, and some fell among thorns, and some fell upon the good ground. But you note that it isn't to the Sower's concern where the seed falls; neither the Sower, nor the people he appoints to sow the seed – it isn't their concern as to where it falls, and it isn't their business to tend it. The Maharishi's mission is to go all over the free world and give it to everybody without distinction. Anybody who wants it should be able to have it, and from the Cosmic figure point of view of someone who has realized himself and has Cosmic Consciousness, he cannot make distinctions. That is the business of the husbandman – the labourers in the field – to try to make this seed come up properly and look after it. Though I keep on saying to the Maharishi that results undoubtedly are better if there are husbandmen, if there is a School and an organisation with people who can look after this seed when it's grown –

results are overwhelmingly better, and though he accepts that, he says that's our business. His business is to go on sowing it wherever he can, quickly. I still don't see how it can be done successfully without a School. I think one can say – looking over the experience of the last two years – that, since he came away from India, in the ordinary world about a half-of-one-per cent really do the meditation properly and go on doing it. And the figures are something like ninety-something per cent of people that go on doing the meditation successfully in the thousand or eleven hundred people that we have given it to in connection with the School in London.

Further, when you do a lot of this work, you see how very true the parable is about the three kinds of difficulties that arise. The seed falling by the wayside, the devil coming and taking away the Word out of people's hearts; and then in other cases you see it falling on a rock and it takes no root, so when things get difficult, they stop. Then again, you find the seed falling among thorns, and the cares and riches and pleasures and anxieties and other desires choking it. All these three are all too common when the meditation is given in ordinary life. So the Maharishi comes to a big city and initiates people – three or four hundred people in two days – and goes away again; and then there are only one or two people left to try and look after everyone, and exactly these three things happen almost universally – one or another of them. And then it seems to me, that the seed falling on good ground is the seed that falls – and is tended by a School, and fruit is brought forth, thirty-fold, sixty-fold, a hundred-fold.

Finally, there is still another meaning of the Parable, when you wake up one fine morning and find that all these things are in yourself. Each day, from week to week, one recognises in oneself thoughts coming up and choking it; the devil coming and snatching it away (false ideas or some distorted thinking). On another day it takes root but doesn't penetrate; your heart is stony. And then finally one day, when everything goes absolutely perfectly, each half-hour gives thirty-fold, sixty-fold, a hundred-fold result. I don't know whether this is the way you treated the subject, Mr. MacLaren? (Mr. MacLaren: No, not quite.)

But how wonderful it is. And then one suddenly sees the connection with the Parable of the Tares just following it, which one perhaps had never seen before. So we don't have to become Hindus, we can find quite a lot in the Christian Gospels.

\*

Mr. Walker-Lehr. To what extent do we have to consider the demands of the society in which we live in connection with the Work? There is a tendency to grow away from society and the environment in which we live. It seems to be quite automatic, but that does not stop them making demands.

Dr. Roles. I think it is a pity to tend away from the society in which we live. I know that when one first comes to School and for some time afterwards, personality begins to weaken and one needs to lead a rather more secluded life till one is more certain of finding one's feet. But I do think that after a time it's very good, very important to try to keep up with our friends, to have a certain amount of social life, to keep one's roots in society. Is that not what you mean?

Mr. Walker-Lehr. Yes it is, but that would almost demand an insincerity in one, because I find that there is this falling off of unimportant things. There is a falling off of the liquor habit, of the dance and theatre habit, of the ordinary party habit. These are very strong things in

this particular society. Can you go back to those? To other people in this society these are very important and make up their everyday life, so that the drifting away is quite inevitable, I feel.

Dr. Roles. But not drifting away from the really worthwhile things in everyday life. It is easy to do that, but those things can't easily be recaptured.

Mr. Walker-Lehr. Yes, it narrows it down a bit.

Dr. Roles. Because with the meditation, and as work on Being progresses, so you see through the shallow people, but you suddenly see that there is something interesting in *this* person after all; and even something interesting in what they are doing. So that selection and discrimination is needed to decide how far you go back into all that. You couldn't have Canasta parties every evening of the week!

Mr. Walker-Lehr. I don't want to. I am quite happy to let it all go, but I feel that society is not very happy with me at times. I don't want to go along to the local Council meetings and other such organisations. They seem to have no value, and it's a waste of time rather. Time seems to be rather precious now.

Dr. Roles. It's quite tricky, but undoubtedly the manifestation of consciousness, the manifestation of School, lies in the surrounding life; and if you isolate yourself too much from it your manifestation is limited.

Mr. Walker-Lehr. Yes. It's not a conscious isolation, it's just a thing that happens. You don't listen to the commercial radio because you don't want to, not because you feel that it is wrong or harmful at all; you just don't want to listen to it.

Dr. Roles. No, but I must reiterate that it isn't a question of what you want to do, but it is a question of what ought to be done and what ought not, in order to enable all that the School has put into you to have the right kind of manifestation. You have to be the centre of attraction of people who have the Magnetic Centre and are looking for something. You should have the required standing in your town so that people come to you. You should have a substance, a weight, you see; very different from the ivory tower.

Mr. Walker-Lehr. Then it will come back; this is a necessary transition? Rather like the Zen – there were mountains and trees, and then no mountains and trees, and then mountains and trees again?

Dr. Roles. Yes, yes, it's like that. 'Trees are again trees, and mountains are again mountains'; but also you suffer so much by harbouring negative thoughts about ordinary simple people, which is merely a sign of false personality.

Mr. Walker-Lehr. Yes, there's another question I wanted to ask actually. I find it extremely difficult to feel this love and passion for humanity at large.

Dr. Roles. I admit that humanity at large is most unlovable. But individuals, ordinary simple people, are extraordinarily pleasant everywhere. The man who comes to read the gas-meter, the old car-park attendant, just simply anybody – there is a line of approach to that person and you can make a bond with him, a link with him, and see what it is that he wants. And

this is valuable for each of us. It means 'external considering', which is the core of Self-remembering. No, no, I didn't want you to fall in love with the masses.

Mrs. Roles. Might one add, too, that it's very important in relation to spreading a right form of feeling amongst people that, if one isolates oneself and only mixes with people in sympathy with one, then one loses contact with others; whereas one can do valuable work, unobtrusively, by having the right sort of relationship with every person one meets, and the Work can gain from that as well as oneself.

Dr. Roles. And also from the point of view of School, that the members of it have the right relationship with other people that they are in contact with in ordinary society. It's not a thing that one has to go on about, or study too much or anything, but after all, withdrawal with a rather hostile feeling...

Mr. Walker-Lehr. Oh, no.

Dr. Roles. It grows a little you know. What do you think is an important thing there to stress, Mr. MacLaren?

Mr. MacLaren. I should have thought that the thing would resolve itself gradually because one has to earn one's living and has to go about one's affairs. And as you said, you are meeting a lot of people – not only car-parking attendants, but people in business, councillors even – and it seems to me that people gradually discover how to have a proper relation with these people; and then it seems to spread after it's happened. I don't think one has to search out parties and things in order to do it; it arises quite naturally.

Dr. Roles. And if it doesn't arise naturally out of the meditation, it means that a very common thing is taking place in very successful 100% meditators, who are not assisted by School – this feeling of 'I am not as other men are'. It is an awful danger on the way to spiritual life, very difficult to prevent. We have been suffering from it lately in London. I think nearly every book that you read about some European who has gone out and attained success in an Ashram, or at the feet of some teacher, has been heavily imbued with that sort of aroma: 'If you have done all that I have my boy!'

Mrs. King. But on this question of other activities, I think it is sometimes very difficult to know what one should do and shouldn't. Because I find that I cling to some things quite tenaciously, and I don't get much time. I don't know why, because other people say there's plenty of time, but I've never discovered that; and yet I feel that the things I say I cling to are things that I don't think conflict with the School. It means that, although I did the exercise, I always did it with a slight grudge. Well, not always; I shouldn't say that. But at first I did it grudgingly, and well – never with love, or never completely...

Dr. Roles. Because it stopped you from other activities?

Mrs. King. Well no, it didn't really stop me from other activities, but I had that feeling always that the day was you know, almost too full. I think it is very difficult sometimes to know whether you should give up things. I felt perhaps that it was not right to give up everything but School as so many people find it easy to do.

Dr. Roles. But you know people don't give things up, one can't give up anything. Giving up is *doing* and, in fact, we think about it and worry about it; but does one really – can one really give up anything? Did you in actual fact give anything up? See what I mean? All the thought one spends, and the going on and the worry about whether to give up or not give up, but in actual fact what really comes of it? Doesn't one lead very much the same life? On the whole, doesn't one do things that one wants to do, but no longer wants to do certain other things! It's really more like that. But that is right and anything else we're not required to do; we are not required to give up anything Real. All we are required to do is to give up unreal things – our thoughts about things, our worries about things, identification with things. I think if you had really given up something, you would be the first person that I'd met who had!

Mr. Dingwall. Occasionally one meets a person one takes an instant dislike to. Now I've heard it said that the reason one does that is because one sees in the other person one's own thoughts. Would that be correct?

Dr. Roles. Not only features you dislike; features you like, too, are in yourself. Everybody you meet, if you recognise – feel something about them – it's because they have some reflection, or some facet, of your own character. And this is the great value to oneself of a wide circle of acquaintances. One sees so many different mirrors of oneself.

Mr. Dingwall. I can understand that quite well, provided one was able, gradually, by some means or other to overcome the dislike. Sometimes it doesn't work out that way.

Dr. Roles. You might of course try to frequent the society of people you dislike! It's no use being with a lot of people exactly like yourself, saying what a good fellow you are! Why do you dislike people?

Mr. Dingwall. Well, I don't know. I've just on two or three occasions (I'm quite sure it's not often... I'm quite sure I'm not singular in this) – one does meet a person that for some reason or other makes my hackles rise. I've never been able to understand why.

Dr. Roles. No. You know this strange sentence in the Lord's Prayer: 'Dismiss our debts as we dismiss the debts of others.' Until you have seen your dislike for somebody you can't get rid of your own debt in that respect. You see what I mean? Good. Somebody has shown up something in you, some negative emotion in you. You won't be able to go to heaven with that negative emotion still in you, even though it is not manifest.

\*

Now there's one totally different subject that might be interesting to explore for the future: You've heard of the Three Forces and the matter which conducts them. Matter conducting the Active force we call Carbon, matter conducting the Negative (Passive) force we call Oxygen, and matter conducting the force which is neither of those two – neither active nor negative – we call Nitrogen.

Now there is very interesting, illuminating instruction about the Three Forces in connection with the meditation. The forces in the body – they're rather more like the 'humours', you remember the four humours in Europe following the Platonic Tradition? But in the East there has always been this doctrine of the 'three humours'. And the humours were called *gunas*: *Rajas*

guna, that was active, corresponding to Carbon; *Tamas* was passive. Everything resisting endeavours to develop, everything resisting the meditation – heaviness, dullness of spirit, ignorance – all this is again Tamas. We all know what activity is, Rajas; we all know that sometimes there is just activity for activity's sake when we're stirred up; and we all know this opposite thing, dullness, heaviness, darkness; and we alternate very much between these two, all our lives we swing to and fro between them like a pendulum.

Only on rare occasions is there *something else* experienced, which is neither active nor passive. And then when we come to do the meditation, to our surprise we begin to experience again this something which is neither activity nor dullness nor inactivity, and it causes us to recognise the same thing we have felt before on rare occasions. This third humour is called *Sattva* guna – Nitrogen. Do you follow? Already you've had a taste of this during your meditation; twice a day one begins to accumulate more of this Sattva. It is said that it is derived from the conversion of Tamas (of this heaviness, dullness, ignorance) into Sattva. The Oxygen becomes converted into Nitrogen so that there is a higher proportion. All three are always present in everything, it's a matter of proportion. When the mixture in the carburettor becomes right, when the proportion is right, then one passes into the transcendental state.

Mr. Blight. The protoplasm of the body cell is a compound of those three elements, plus hydrogen.

Dr. Roles. Yes, all organic chemistry is based on carbon, oxygen, nitrogen and hydrogen, plus certain other elements which come in every now and again – phosphorus, fluorine and so on, but which are not essential to organic chemistry. Protoplasm is compounded of these four as everything else. One was not meaning this in the literal sense that we now attach to the word carbon, to the word oxygen and to the word nitrogen. I was meaning the matter which conducts the Active force, Passive force, Neutralising force in a given reaction. We were talking about the three forces in the body as a whole, the organism as a whole in relation to the meditation. If you discuss it in the terms of protoplasm you give these things a different meaning.

It is all very simple isn't it? The time will come when you will have difficulty with the meditation in that it is not going very well. You can ask yourself if this is due to over-activity in some department? Well, perhaps you may be able to correct that; or is it due just simply to useless turning thoughts, to useless things going on, the body being heavy? Then one has to go and have a dip in the sea. One must take an appropriate remedy so that the balance of the mixture is restored. You could read, Mr. MacLaren, that quotation (just after the one from Ramakrishna that was read tonight) about the Sattva guna. So now we have discussed different aspects. Is there anything that anyone would rather talk about?

Mr. Blight. If a person does a particular job of work or a particular exercise, if a fellow swims, he develops strong leg and arm muscles and a lumberjack has much stronger arms and a bigger diet than a person perhaps in a clerical position. The meditation, too, perhaps is an activity.

Dr. Roles. Which makes certain capacities stronger in you, is that what you mean?

Mr. Blight. Well, I would not know that, but it has a connection. Just a point of interest with what I mentioned before about the structure of the cell and body – it changes with different jobs.



Dr. Roles. It is all the time changing; the anatomy is not fixed and the meditation changes one's anatomy; it changes the function of one's organs. There is this change going on in one's organism all the time – some parts becoming more and more active and more developed; and other parts become less and less active and less developed all the time. Then there is this third aspect where the harmony of the whole lot is developed; where one thing is not developed at the expense of another thing. And this third element is increased by this system of meditation. Does that relate to your line of thought? Always if you are thinking in terms of duality you are developing one thing at the expense of another; if you recognise the threeness in everything you do not fall into those errors.

\*

Mr. Walker-Lehr. Could you tell us about the 'Sly Man' of Mr. Ouspensky's works?

Dr. Roles. I'll tell you a story of Sly Man which he was fond of telling:

There was a time when things were very bad for the devil, and one day the Sly Man was walking in the streets of Constantinople and he came across the devil looking very poorly indeed, and he tapped him on the shoulder and said, 'Well, you *are* looking bad, come and have a drink.' And he took the devil to a cafe and he ordered (not too expensive!) drink and food. He asked him, 'Now, why are things so hard for you?' And he said, 'It's a terrible time for us devils. We live on souls of human beings, and in the great old days, the grand old days, they had souls. They really were somebody. Nowadays, look at these people about, they've no souls at all – nothing at all. They're just materialistic; and we devils are starving.' And so the Sly Man ordered another drink. He said, 'Well, now what's this about making souls?' And the devil said, 'Oh, there is a very good way to make souls, a wonderful way to make souls.' And the Sly Man said, 'Well, look, can't we drive a bargain? Tell me how to make souls, and then when I've made them, you can have them.' And so they clinched the deal and they arranged to meet every day for a week, and the devil taught the Sly Man everything about Self-remembering – a way to make souls.'

I haven't heard whether he taught him the meditation!

This story was made up by the Group in which Mr. Ouspensky was and told to Gurdjieff. He laughed very much when he heard it. 'I'll tell you the end of the story now,' he said.

Time went on and Sly Man and the Group were very successful, and quite a number of the Group began to grow souls. And then tragedy overcame one of the Group and he died; so when he arrived at the Golden Gates of Heaven St. Peter said to him, 'Oh, you *are* a fine man! Now, *you* really are somebody. How did you manage to get like this?' And the man said, 'Self-remembering.' 'Ha, Ha!' said the devils and they snatched him down to hell. Done all this, been successful, got a soul, and here he is in hell. How has that come about? And the Sly Man said, 'Didn't I tell you not to talk outside your own group? Did you ever see St. Peter at your meetings?'

But that's Sly Man too, the idea that what the Yogi does in a day's mental exercise, what a Monk does in a week's fasting and prayer, what the Fakir does in a month's physical torture, the Sly Man succeeds in doing by making a little pill and swallowing it. And there were many questions about what the pill was, and how to make it. And none of these questions were

ever satisfactorily answered, because Gurdjieff had lost the pill. He didn't know what it was to make and swallow; but he pretended he did.

Student. It was the mantra.

Dr. Roles. Well, I'm beginning to think so. There must have been a direct method; there must have been a simple thing. If man is meant to remember himself, if everything depends on remembering himself, there must be a way to do it. Whether this is the real, the natural way or not, it is the nearest I've ever come to it. You see, a sound so small – it's not even a word; so small it can penetrate – become a vibration and penetrate; even a prayer can't do that. A prayer contains a certain amount of meaning, requires a certain amount of intellect, a certain amount of thought; a certain amount of many properties that prayer has – even the shortest prayer: – 'Lord Jesus Christ, have mercy on me' – even that has so much to it that it can't penetrate to the finer centres. It must have been something like this.

Mr. Walker-Lehr. But that wouldn't apply necessarily to all mantras? There are many of them, aren't there?

Dr. Roles. They are very, very short. Nearly all of them are one syllable. Just really one sound to them: Om – the mantra that makes you a recluse.

Mr. Walker-Lehr. There's the Tibetan 'Om Mani Padmi Hum'. There's another one in connection with that that I read with a German who is now up in the Himalayas – has been there for seven years – and he said that it was not complete without another sound, which came before it or after it.

Dr. Roles. I have heard that too but, yes, I don't know what that sound is.

Mr. Walker-Lehr. He did give a dissertation on it when he went to London recently.

Dr. Roles. I only know that an Indian said this to me: 'It's the particular way of intoning that counts.'

The idea of Sly Man has certain slightly unsavoury associations; it's connected with the conversation about insincerity. Gurdjieff used to say that there is clever sincerity and clever insincerity, and stupid sincerity and stupid insincerity. Out of that I prefer to think there shouldn't be any insincerity at all – insincerity clever or stupid. There is certainly clever sincerity and there is certainly stupid sincerity. One knows how very stupid it is to tell the whole truth quite unnecessarily. I mean a doctor knows perfectly well he can't do that. One knows how stupid just plain sincerity can be, but I don't believe there ought to be insincerity. Why be insincere? Didn't that strike you, Joan, – a slight unsavouriness – slyness – the *idea* even of insincerity?

Mrs. Roles. I quite agree. Insincerity seems to go against everything. One wants to try and *do*; it's awfully easy to be insincere, and I don't think it ever gets the right result.

Dr. Roles. One reason that Mr. Ouspensky had to leave Gurdjieff was this strain of insincerity. There used to be demonstrations of magic characterised by the three kinds of phenomena – 'tricks, half-tricks and real things'. A great deal of it was done by trick.

So there's no necessity in a School of the Fourth Way to be insincere or even sly in the sense of being crooked, but to be *clever*. The expression 'to be clever' was used in this way –

it means to remember yourself. One would ask Mr. Ouspensky what to do in certain circumstances. He would say, 'Be clever' – then one put first any method or anything one had discovered that would enable one to remember Oneself. That is the thing to go for instead of analyzing the actual problem ahead of you, which is never what you foresee. Some future situation will contain always what you didn't look for. But cleverness is different from slyness.

And now, what about it? How long do your talks go on?

\*

Student. Doctor, are there any signs of 'Mantraism' in the Bible?

Dr. Roles. Do you mean the repetition of a word?

Student. My own personal experience was rather strange, but the words 'I am' have that sort of taste to me and have come often and often to my mind unheeded.

Dr. Roles. It depends very much on the language, but this has a different connotation because it has a meaning, you see?

Student. Yes, well yes, I could see that here they are, not knowing the meaning of the mantra, because they have no idea about it at all.

Dr. Roles. You see, when you repeat the words 'I am', you are attaching meaning to it, building up a meaning; you are building it up with this expression. You go on repeating it for a very long time, and you go on forming an artificial shell around it with your thoughts, and this is something that may get you to the next stage of consciousness – Self-consciousness – but stops you getting to the fourth stage of Cosmic Consciousness, so your progress is restricted.

Student. Does that mean that people that use a mantra never know the meaning of the word until it is revealed?

Dr. Roles. You can't know the meaning of a mantra until it takes you to Higher Centres – to the Kingdom of Heaven itself – and then you know the meaning. Then you are there, so it is all right. What people call 'meditation' in the West (and nearly everybody knows something they call meditation!) is according to the Maharishi, simply exploring the surface of things by thinking. He calls it 'contemplation'. *This* meditation is not to stay on the surface, but to dive deep and find the hidden nature of things, you see. But every form of meditation that brings thought in, is staying on the surface, just skimming over the surface; but in this meditation you dive for half an hour, you come up, and the coming up is part of the dive; the coming up leads to the beginnings of Cosmic Consciousness. We dive to Self-consciousness, come up to the beginnings of Cosmic Consciousness, but it has in it the elements of both the succeeding stages.

Mr. van Hulzen. Is not the sound in the mantra the important thing?

Dr. Roles. You see, it isn't really the sound. It is its frequency, its tonality, the characteristics of its vibrations.

Mr. van Hulzen. I remember when you put the mantra in my ear it caused me a certain

[re]verberation. Every time I use the mantra, I get the same [re]verberation – say a hard, humming sound.

Dr. Roles. The thing is that one has to very, very quickly abandon the sound – not to hear it as a sound because this limits its travel; just as one ought not to see it as letters, so one ought not to hear it as a sound for more than just the beginning. So don't attend to the sound of it.

Mr. van Hulzen. It was strange to me because sound penetrates...

Dr. Roles. It isn't the sound. The sound stays in the ordinary areas of the cortex. You see, it is the other characteristics of it – vibration, it's frequency, chiefly it's timbre. I don't know how to describe it... and it should lose all characteristics which are dependent on physical senses in order to travel its own path.

Mr. Walker-Lehr. When Christ said, 'Not everyone who says, "God, God", shall enter the Kingdom of Heaven' – has this any connection with the mantra system?

Dr. Roles. None at all.

Mr. Walker-Lehr. I thought they used 'Jehovah' in the same way. Wasn't that a secret name that they did at some time use?

Dr. Roles. I don't know about repeating that. It was a kind of philosophical shorthand. But your argument is on the same line as saying: 'When you pray, use not frequent repetitions as the heathen do.' Do you remember that? This is used as an argument against continuous internal prayer, which is, as you know, the method of the Monk's Way. It really must be meditation. The remark about 'Lord, Lord', meant not to 'hang on his soul'. People who hang on the soul of a Teacher, saying 'Lord, Lord' but never doing anything that He says for themselves are wearisome!

Mrs. Walters. Could you tell me please the meaning in the Bible of 'In the beginning was the Word'?

Dr. Roles. There is no sort of proof about this, but I must say that I think it refers to a mantra or sacred word amongst other meanings. We don't know anything about the writers of the Gospels. We don't know anything at all about the School from which they emanated. It is very clear, I think, to anybody now reading the Gospels, that it was a written commentary accompanying an oral teaching. Very much of it cannot be explained unless there was a School with an oral teaching which was never written down. And as a result of the School certain things were put out; the Four Gospels were put out containing just those things that the general public should know about.

I think there was a School behind the Gospel teaching. Where did that School emanate? What were its connections and affiliations? People in London were doing research on the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Essenes, and so on. Though it turns out there isn't really any resemblance to these, I think there were many connections with other kinds of religions, and I certainly think there was connection with Buddhism. According to the Maharishi, Buddha Gautama lived much longer ago than is generally thought. He was usually put about 500 BC – a little later than Socrates. I am sure that a great deal of Gospel teaching can be traced to a number of different sources, one of which was Buddhism. The similes and

metaphors (e.g. the house built on a rock and the house built on the sand), the constant reference to three and seven. Think of the number of things containing the idea of *three* – the three-storeyed factory. The three temptations in the wilderness, the parable of the sower, the leaven which the woman hid in three measures of meal, the very structure of the Lord's Prayer and all that which is based on 'three kinds of food'.

There was a topic of conversation with Mr. Ouspensky which we had many, many evenings – the Lord's Prayer, divided into three parts if you include the doxology. In the first part, after the invocation, there are three: 'Hallowed be thy name,' 'Thy kingdom come,' 'Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven.' This on a very big scale – on the scale of the solar system; and then the middle part of the prayer on our scale, because we are mentioned in the first half – 'Give us today our supernatural bread,' but always *us* and never me. And he said it was a School prayer because of that. As a School prayer, the words 'Our Father in Heaven' have a special significance; so it's 'Give us today our supernatural bread.' This is bread – food, the three kinds of food – impressions, air, food. Supernatural food is Higher Impressions in the top storey.

And the middle phrase is a very difficult one to understand; it has to do with emotion. It has to do with emotional relations with people and with our Father. 'Dismiss our debts from us as we dismiss the debts of those who are indebted to us.' What on earth does that mean? It means that somebody is in our debt. For that person we are in a position to be able to dismiss their debts, but only in proportion to how much we ask and obtain forgiveness for our own. So it is a very intrinsic part of School work, and Mr. Ouspensky says you cannot think of that sentence unless you take in the idea of a repetition of lives, because these debts of ours now – negative emotions, identifications – they are there. Their causes lie away in the past; you cannot dismiss them now without removing the causes. Until just lately, I couldn't think of any way by which the causes could be removed, but now by this method, this method really does away with our identification. The root of our identification – the source of negative emotion – we can be fulfilling that very phrase and we can be helping those indebted to us to get rid of theirs too.

Well then, 'Lead us not into temptation.' To Mr. Ouspensky the operative word was 'but'. Why say 'but'? – 'Lead us not into temptation 'and' deliver us from evil' – that would be quite natural, but why say 'but'? He said temptation is identification – the opposite of Self-remembering. 'Help me to remember myself but let me not feel that I am doing it all.' Evil means particularly the evil of self-congratulation. 'For *Thine* is the Kingdom, the Power and the Glory' – not me at all. But he was puzzled for years and years about this word 'but'.

Mr. Walker-Lehr. At what stage was the doxology added?

Dr. Roles. I don't know whether it was added or there originally. The prayer should be said, I think, with the doxology added, as it brings you up again from our scale to the big scale. And it's '*Thine* is the Kingdom, the Power and the Glory'; the past, present and the future is out, it comes back to the Eternal 'Now'. '*Thine* is the Kingdom, the Power and the Glory', so the origins of Christianity must be pretty wonderful for they seem to contain the essence of a number of other roots.

But what would you say, what was the great thing, the great difference between

Christianity and all these other things – Hinduism, Vedanta philosophy, and these other things? There was a new note, wasn't there, sounded by Christianity which has never been sounded before, sounded by the Gospels? How would you put it? How do these other things seem to you, as compared to the Gospels?

Mrs. Vandenduuk. The other things seem more cerebral than coming from the heart. It seems more intellectual; I have often wondered about the cross and the meaning of it, and I think it is as though the Buddhist has to forgive himself and that is very difficult; and we have the cross as the sign of our forgiveness. I think that is one point where Christianity is up.

Dr. Roles. You see, there is a dilemma for mankind. You are either going to say there is a God, and then everyone takes it that God is far away... So then, how to combine the idea of Divinity with the idea of nearness – the God within a man? Christianity takes one line on that; the Vedanta Philosophy, for example, takes another line. There really isn't any difference other than language, and I wouldn't really say that this was the new thing that Christianity introduced. So I do agree with you that it has something to do with the heart, and I think it has a lot to do with the idea of *conscience*.

If you talk with the Vedantists they run down any idea of the conscience. They always think in terms of consciousness. They say conscience is this or that, too difficult to discuss. But in the Christian Gospels it is implicit all the way through about conscience, about the heart, about 'do as you would be done by', and the selfless love for somebody else and so on. Conscience is actually mentioned only once as far as I can find in the Gospels. It is only mentioned in connection with the woman taken in adultery. Jesus said, 'He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her', and then with one accord from the youngest to the oldest, they went out because their conscience accused them. That is the only mention I can find, but it is nevertheless implicit all the way through and in a way that no other religion or philosophy and other system has it, except this System where conscience is also greatly stressed. For consciousness is to knowing as conscience is to feeling – feeling everything altogether at once about a particular situation or person; and the System says that conscience is asleep in the ordinary way; it is present in all normal people but it sleeps and falls asleep very easily. For Mr. Ouspensky, the main function of the School was the *continual awakening of conscience*, of the individual conscience. He couldn't see how this could be done apart from a School. How can conscience be awake often enough at moments that are important without the existence of other people all also trying to awaken conscience? The System has a link with Christianity very much on that point.

Mr. Howitt. May I ask a question? We have heard a lot about Self-consciousness and Cosmic Consciousness. Could you tell us a little bit about how a man who has Self-consciousness and Cosmic Consciousness views objectively mankind as a whole?

Dr. Roles. What prompted you to ask that question? It is such a vast subject that even a man with .0001 per cent Cosmic Consciousness would look at this question, would look at mankind from so many angles...

Mr. Howitt. Well, perhaps the role of Schools in connection with the Ray of Creation.

Dr. Roles. Well, Organic Life is the means of transmission, isn't it, of vibrations from the Sun and Planets to the Earth and Moon? So that Organic Life is necessary to the growth of the Ray of Creation. And is not mankind the growing point of Organic Life? Therefore, if that Ray of Creation is to continue to develop fully, mankind must fulfil this function. If mankind fails in that, then Organic Life does not grow and then our particular Ray of Creation doesn't grow. I think that would be one answer to your question.

Then what for mankind is the growing point? School, the Inner Circle of humanity. Mankind is the growing point for Organic Life, Organic Life for the Ray, so that if Schools were to disappear, supposing everything became impossible for Schools to exist in the world, as for a time it became impossible within different countries (in Turkey, for instance, Dervish Schools had to go underground) – if Schools really disappear, and the three traditional Ways, you see, very easily disappear – they are very vulnerable, they have permanent and conspicuous houses; but the Fourth Way is never apparent, there is nothing permanent to show – the monastery of the Fourth Way, or something like that. As kingdoms come and go it comes to the surface at times, stays below the surface at other times.

Would anyone else like to tell us their thoughts about mankind? We do not think, do we, that we are the only persons in the Universe? I don't think that view is tenable nowadays. Although this is the only system of planets that we can sense the existence of in any way, because stars are so far separated that the nearest planets of another star are quite invisible, and not likely to be visible either; yet one cannot possibly regard life on our planet as a unique event in a Universe containing millions of stars and millions of galaxies; so even if we blow ourselves up, some other experiments are probably going on, but this is no consolation to me!

Student. Is it possible then for us to fail?

Dr. Roles. Quite possible. Left to us I think it would fail. We do all the wrong things in the most conspicuous way! But fortunately it is not left to us.

\*

Mrs. Tully. In the System is there anything about the role of woman? Is it any different to the role of man?

Dr. Roles. Oh, very different luckily. What would man do without women, and what would he do if women were like him? It would be a hopeless case!

Mrs. Tully. Are the potentials the same? Can a woman achieve divine consciousness?

Dr. Roles. Yes, there is no difference in the possibilities of development – none at all. It must be recognised that the development consists of a woman becoming a more womanly woman, and not a more manly one; and man must develop in the direction of becoming more manly man. Any mix-up in that respect simply puts a stop to the development, you see what I mean? But the chances of development are equal.

Mr. Walker-Lehr. What is the point of Christ's apparent celibacy?

Dr. Roles. I think it is a mistaken idea introduced perhaps at some later time. All through man's history enthusiasts have tried to interfere with, torture, cut off, maim every one of his

God-given functions. At one time or other hasn't some religious sect tried to make an antagonism against almost anything? Take the body, just think of the things the ascetics have done to the body! All the God-given possibilities and functions of man are assailed at some time or another by some religious sects. Do you think, then, they could lay off sex, the most God-given of all? Wouldn't that have been a certain target for someone?

Mr. Walker-Lehr. Then it gives a wrong picture of Christ?

Dr. Roles. Yes, a wrong picture made by the people who 'doctored' the Gospels! I had a conversation with Mr. Ouspensky on this same point. As you know, he is the author of *The New Model of the Universe* in which he stressed the great function that normal, proper sex should play in people's lives. Later, he said that in this Work there is only one point at which celibacy was required, and that is only for a very short time. That is in the actual crystallisation of Man No.5 from Man No.4. For a short period while that crystallisation is taking place, all the energy from sex has to go into that crystallisation, and certainly in this Tradition – the Fourth Way Tradition – that is the only time at which celibacy is demanded.

It is very particularly stressed that everybody is different in relation to sex, that one should never try to advise anybody else on the subject from one's own personal point of view. Everybody has different requirements; everybody has different beliefs, different standards and so on, and one must certainly not interfere with that from any theoretical point of view until one has full realization of Oneself and one's needs and possibilities. This conversation has taken a lot of very quick turns, hasn't it, with change of scale; it started with mankind.

Mrs. Geary. Dr. Roles, one more question about Christianity. Is it possible for us to know who Christ was, what he was? We are told that he was the only-begotten Son of God; what does that mean?

Dr. Roles. Have you ever found any objective evidence that Christ existed – any historical objective evidence? Well then, when you have found – if anybody can find such evidence, and come and tell me such evidence – then I will discuss (to my limited extent) the nature of Christ, but until you can give me such evidence it is beyond my ken.

Mrs. Geary. I thought it was an historical fact that a man called Jesus Christ did exist, did live.

Dr. Roles. There is a reference in Josephus to a man called Jesus. Jesus was not an uncommon name, but none of the events in the Gospels are corroborated in Josephus. And that is the sole reference that I know, but maybe better historians know more. Yet to me it doesn't matter whether or not it is to be taken literally or historically. What's important to me is that two thousand years ago something undoubtedly was born in humanity as a whole that never existed before; and that is the same 'something' which can be continually born in people, even today.

Mrs. Geary. Yes, I follow.

Dr. Roles. People ask if Christ is Man No. 7; Mr. Ouspensky said 8 or higher.

Mrs. Geary. He is not to be compared with Buddha Gautama?

Dr. Roles. There *was* a Prince Gautama, yet the historical man who became the Buddha is so



encrusted with myth – build-up – that it is virtually the same as if no such person existed, do you see?

Mr. Walker-Lehr. It shouldn't be important in either case to the central Teaching? Whether the individual existed or not should not in itself be important to the central Teaching?

Dr. Roles. No. Supposing this was an ideal figure, a counsel of perfection, wouldn't it be proof enough if there had existed at that time people of a level of Being high enough to be able to write the Gospels? Just think of people of a School of that calibre that could put out the Gospels – breathtakingly high, even if you don't speculate about the central figure. But undoubtedly, if we are talking of humanity, there was a tremendous turning-point for humanity at that time. This gave a tremendous shock in the octave of human development and they say in the East that another shock (and I am sure we all feel that one is necessary!) is going to come. Whether that is going to come in the form of a wise man from the East or elsewhere, or whether it is something that is to be born in the hearts of men as it was two thousand years ago, which is the most important?

Mr. Russell. Could you tell us a little more about the conjunction of the seven planets in February?

Dr. Roles. Not seven, it has grown! There are said to be five planets entering the sign of Aquarius. That means that they will be in a similar part of the heavens in February. I am not knowledgeable enough to know whether it actually means that the five planets are in fact in position to affect the earth more strongly because they happen to be entering the same part of the heavens at that time – I just don't know. We have got an astronomer in our Group in London who is librarian at the Royal Astronomical Society; he is doing everything in his power to find out all the facts about these five planets. I promise to let you know the result of his findings. The astronomers are not inclined to attach such significance from the point of view of the vibration effect on the earth as do the astrologers, that is all I know.

What do the signs of the Zodiac mean? They are a chart for tracing the sun's path in relation to the earth. What is the importance of that? It has to do with the angle with which the sun's rays strike the surface of the earth. At the solstices vertically, at the equinoxes at a very acute angle, and the effect of the vertical sun's rays are much more powerful. Is that not so? – is not the meaning of the Zodiac the question of charting the sun's passage in relation to the earth? By February next year the earth will have moved so that the Sun is entering the zone of fixed stars called Aquarius; and the five planets will be there also – a rare and possibly momentous occurrence!

\* \* \*

