

30 June 1975

READING 7

A COMMON LANGUAGE

During this term we have had some amusing and far-reaching discussions in the attempt to reawaken an understanding of the treasures of our Western System. But the introduction last week of a topic like Art (which has an infinite number of approaches, but about which everyone feels free to lay down the law) shows us that we must be reminded of yet another description in our Western System which we often neglect.

So now, at the end of term, we should return to ourSelves and that first question, 'Who am I?'. To answer that question a more exact description of man is necessary, not individual man, but man as a Self-creative being – all man, past, present, and to come. It is here that our Western System shows us a wonderful way out of the 'tower of babel' from which we do our talking; for we must have an agreed language in which to talk about man and his affairs.

The idea of *a new language* was first introduced to the West in a very powerful way, and I have tried to keep to the original words as closely as possible with small changes to bring them up-to-date:

For exact understanding exact language is necessary... The new language bases the construction of speech on one principle – the *principle of relativity*. The fundamental property of the new language is that *all* ideas in it are concentrated round one idea – the *idea of Evolution*; but not, of course, in the sense of mechanical evolution, which is an impossibility.

Everything in the world, from galaxies to man, and from man to ultimate particles, rises or descends, either evolves or degenerates, either develops or decays. But nothing evolves mechanically; only degeneration and destruction proceed mechanically. That which cannot evolve consciously must degenerate. Help from others is possible insofar as it is valued and accepted.

The language in which understanding becomes possible is constructed upon an indication of the place of anything on the evolutionary ladder. For this purpose many of our usual ideas must be reclassified according to the stages of this evolution.

(Adapted from *In Search of the Miraculous*, P.D.O. paperback edition. pp70–71)

Just as we started this term with the idea of 7 co-existent 'worlds', let us now take the idea of 'man', and define 7 categories of man which we will call 'Man No.1, No.2, No.3, No.4, No.5, No.6 and No.7'.

'*Man No.7*' means a man who has reached the full development possible for man and who possesses everything a man can possess, i.e., will, consciousness, permanent unity, and many other properties which in our blindness, we ascribe to ourselves.

'*Man No.6*' stands very close to him (so that from here we could not tell the difference). Though his Knowledge is complete, he differs only in the fact that some of his properties have not, as yet, become permanent.

'*Man No.5*' is the level we now see as that towards which we are all striving, and to which the Meditation and the true Knowledge now available can take us in this very life. This is a man who has reached unity, and for whom it would be unlikely that he

would ever lose what he has acquired. There are cases where such a man has been wrongly crystallised and then he has to be melted down.

'*Man No.4*' is an intermediate step which we can speak about later.

The outer circle of humanity is composed of *men No.1, 2 and 3* – the people who constitute mechanical humanity and remain on the same level on which they are born. '*Man No.1*.' means a man in whom the centre of gravity of all his psychological life lies in the instinctive moving centre. This is the man in whom the physical functions constantly outweigh reason and emotion. '*Man No.2*' means man on the same level, but in whom the emotional function outweighs all the others – a 'man of feeling'. '*Man No.3*' is man on the same level but in whom the thinking functions have the upper-hand over all the others – the man of reason who decides everything on theory.

Differentiation in levels in ordinary life are to be seen in the degree of development of other functions besides the main one – thus you can have one-centred, two-centred, or three-centred men.

(Adapted from *In Search of the Miraculous* p.71)

[Quite soon after we heard this from Mr. Ouspensky we were encouraged to do some research on the A – B – O blood groups in this connection; and, having done the test on all and sundry, we became convinced that there is very definite relationship. We reached the stage where we could often predict the blood group by certain physical and mental characteristics. The only difficulty here is that the blood groups refer to the *essence* which is often obscured by personality – social class, job, etc.]

In accordance with this, all the inner and outer manifestations of individuals must be classified in the same way. Take *thinking*. It is a good moment to quote what Mr. Ouspensky said about this to some of us just over forty years ago :

The Ray of Creation is a help and an instrument or method for *new thinking*. We know about dividing man into 7 categories – everything about him should also be divided in the same way. Ordinary thinking is divided into thinking No.1, 2 & 3. *Thinking No.1*. is just imitative and repetitive; *thinking No.2* is more emotional and based on likes and dislikes; *thinking No.3* is logical thinking which is quite good in its place, but being theoretical, when it is applied to things which are beyond its powers it becomes quite wrong. These are the kinds of thinking we meet with in ordinary life.

From the Ray of Creation (which is part of the Universal Symbol) begins '*thinking No.4*'; and this is a kind of thinking which little by little disposes of contradictions and disagreements. In '*thinking No.3*', whatever line one takes, one immediately finds some other theory which will contradict it. In '*thinking No.4*', one gradually comes to think *without contradictions*, to understand that apparent contradictions are really not contradictions at all.

(*A Further Record*, p.220)

Similarly, the other general functions and interests of man such as knowledge, art, religion, science or philosophy, must all be divided in the same way; and that is why we usually prefer not to discuss these inflammable subjects until the above classification has been explained.

Last week's arguments about 'art' were an excellent illustration. In the present context there is 'Art No.1.' which puts technique first; but which is also evident in crudely primitive and sensuous art, music and dancing among savage people; also in decadent art which has become merely imitative and second-hand. There is 'Art No.2' – sentimental art – sometimes seen in icons, or other religious paintings; and there is 'Art No.3' – intellectual or invented art – the outcome of some prevalent theory such as today's 'abstract art'.

Then, of course, there must be 'Art No.4, No.5', and so on; these are together called 'Objective Art' because they produce the same impression on all those who really see or hear them. Just now we can recognise this quality at first-hand chiefly in the music of the Mukabeleh or the 'Movements'.

CONCLUSION

The importance of all this is that Man No.1, 2, 3, or even 4, should stop laying down the law from their point of view about what Art is, because this merely introduces some limitation on the wide scope of Art so that others will certainly disagree with it. So the object of our Society must still be to keep walking up the Ladder of Self-realization instead of stopping to debate the contents of the subjective world. But it would be splendid if our people could produce works of Art as well!

* * *

