

1 June 1981

LARGE MONDAY MEETING

On the Platform. Dr. Roles, Lady Allan and Professor Guyatt

R.G. There are a few announcements. There will be a Mukabeleh for Visitors on Friday, June 5th at the usual time of 8 p.m. Next Tuesday, the 9th, there will be a Meditation Meeting at 7.15; and there is still time for the names of prospective meditators to be given in to the office before the Initiations which take place on the 14th, 17th and 21st June. On Sunday 14th June there will be a Work Out for turners from 3 p.m. onwards when there will be an opportunity to practise certain parts of the Mukabeleh and to understand more about it. The turners should bring something to eat in the evening.

Dr. R. Will you come along, Stuart, to that?

R.S. I don't know yet.

R.G. The next large Monday meeting will be on June 22. And finally Bill Anderson is reading some of his poetry on Friday evening this week at 8 p.m. at Richmond Adult College. Prof. Schaefer said he would be there and we hope there will be a good audience – there's a poster in the hall giving all the details.

Dr. R. Are you going to read any of *Haddow Sonata*?

W.A. Yes.

Dr. R. Good. I was terrifically impressed by that. So we hope that there will be a good company turning up to hear Bill and make his friend Schaefer see how popular he is as a literary gent! (laughter)

Many of you listened to Prof Schaefer's lecture at the AGM when it was replayed and I thought it might interest you to hear a little bit of Hoyle – Sir Fred Hoyle – having an argument on BBC radio to which Schaefer referred. It shows really what we're trying to save Prof Schaefer from because Hoyle has become a very controversial figure and he spends a lot of time and energy arguing against the establishment view – he doesn't like it. So listen if you can bear it... Sue, will you keep a watch on whether there is anything that infringes BBC copyright! We've got to be rather careful so make me shut up if I do.

(Passage from recorded interview with Sir Fred Hoyle)

Dr. R. You see, this is a very important point. We calculated some 30 years ago from ordinary data that the smallest living thing such as a virus or very small bacterium had a wavelength which lay in the ultraviolet and not in the infrared region, not longwave but shortwave, and point 7 of a micron (a question of tens of thousandths of a millimetre) is the size ordinarily given for the smallest living thing, a single strand of nuclear material DNA. Sand, silica, it would be a much longer wavelength and a much bigger particle and it would get burnt up by the earth's atmosphere. Whereas the very small life elements could enter our galaxy, our solar system with impunity. That's the point of that bit of the argument. But you see it's going to take a long time to get the establishment to accept this and so we want to spare our friend, Prof. Schaefer, from too much of that.

W.A. I think he wants to spare himself too! (laughter)

Dr. R. Yes, I'm sure and he may make use of us here to do that. And I was wondering if we'd offer Hoyle this as a forum at some point. But we had better let him get uncontroversial again before we do!

I won't play any more because it's rather technical but the other interview with Fred Hoyle was with a favourable interviewer and we would very much like, Sue, a recording, a tape of that in due course if you could. Prof. Guyatt will just read Maddox's concluding remarks in that interview and hand you (SC) the script.

R.G. (reading)

Interviewer John Maddox says, 'Well that's a rum conclusion, you'll say. Here is Fred Hoyle who spent the whole of his life looking for explanations of the way in which mechanistic processes can account for the way the world is. Now he is going to spend the rest of his life looking for the invisible hand that made it the way it is.'

Dr. R. So we'll watch him with interest. Well, any comments or anything further to discuss about this? It's far above all of our heads; it's got to be people who really can calculate mathematically in terms of current physics. We just try and improve our own being in this Society so as to be ready for whatever we're called on to do. So that's my line and I think it's the line of any of us here. We don't have to do the thinking. Any questions or remarks? What about you as a scriptwriter Haisman?

Mrs. Simpson. Isn't cosmology looked at differently by a Realized man? He comes to the knowledge differently.

Dr. R. That is far ahead of us to know what it would look like to a fully Realized man. But I can only say that even with us we have two hemispheres – one looking inwards and one in time and space which moves along. The one that looks inwards is perfectly capable of understanding that in a wholly emotional and highly new way. It's only this left hemisphere which does the talking and moves on in time that finds it so difficult and gets into arguments. So don't let's look too far ahead about the fully Realized man but examine ourselves to see how with a little extra Sattva we can look inwards instead of looking outwards at the material universe. Because we have to look at the subtle and Causal levels of this vast intelligence.

Haisman, it was you I was at. Any comments on...

M.H. I think it alters our view of the typecasting of scientists!

Dr. R. Yes, I see what you mean. I think it's going to alter our views on everything! Fifty years ago Mr. Ouspensky was saying, 'Why doesn't some scientist say this and produce the evidence for it? It's so obvious.' But the evidence wasn't there and hasn't been there until 5 years ago. Schaefer is right – it's the scientists who have to 'think things through to the very end', that are going to be listened to in due course. And anything which comes from any so-called esoteric source is not going down.

Lady A. Dr. Roles, and yet it seems that the transformation through individuals is in a sense... that seems the only way possible of transformation through individuals because to expect a

mass of people, as I said after the lecture, to have an altruistic attitude about aphids and their profit – it seems hopeless to look from that end up.

Dr. R. Yes, yes. The difficulty is to find a common language now – as it always has been – a way of expressing something which really everybody knows in the back of their mind.

Now, what else? (pause) We know that the fully Realized man is necessary to drag us out of the ditch. We've only got to listen to the broadcast last night in that dreadful series which poor Peter Fenwick got landed with, to realise what awful things get about from self-styled teachers who are less than fully realized. So we're lucky. We have somebody whom we have proved we can trust and I propose to let him pull me out of the ditch and anybody else who will come with me – out of the 'well of ignorance'. And for that purpose we need for certain times of the day to acquire the power to dip inwards wholeheartedly at moments when there is a change of direction of the mind... what His Holiness calls 'natural samadhi' which everybody experiences only they don't know it. They pass these moments by. But if we discover how to recognise these moments and if we, for a minute or two, detach ourselves wholly from the world around and can be absolutely still, we will then be able to make this inner hemisphere, inward looking hemisphere, work much more often and much more fully. So that is, I feel, my own job for the remainder of my life which may not be more than another month and those who are with me would probably like to listen to some more words of the Shankaracharya which you may not have heard in a long time. If there is anything you'd like to discuss before we get on to that, very good, do raise it.

Are you all baffled? What is it? (laughter) You're completely addled!

S. Wood. On the question of evolution, whatever the origin of life, there still seems to be a point where man was given consciousness which made him different from the animals. How did this happen? (laughter)

Dr. R. I wasn't there, you know, I wasn't there! (laughter) But consciousness must have been there from the beginning. There are two things that we need keep in mind – consciousness and matter. And for matter to take the forms that it does show now, there must have been consciousness from the very beginning. That's really all one can say with certainty as proven. So keep to that and from there lots of doors and windows will open.

W.A. Isn't this what has been described as the Anthropic Principle? Man, as principle, existed at the beginning and you see the creation of animals in a completely different way. They are manifestations of different experiments towards the manifestation of that principle on the earth.

Dr. R. The idea of a 'Self-liberating being' could have been there, but to produce *Homo sapiens* surely needed a long series of experiments in the great laboratory of nature. Also be careful of the words 'from the beginning'. You're jumping a little bit too far.

W.A. I know there is no beginning... (laughter)

Dr. R. But the anthropic principle is described as an intelligence. Now intelligence is the third thing linking consciousness and matter, but it is only one of three, do you see Bill? (Yes, yes) So although it's terribly useful that we're going to hear much more about the great

intelligence of the universe, remember that we've got to think in terms of three and not of two – duality. (Yes)

Stephen Wood, I interrupted you...

S.W. That helps, that discussion, but what comes to mind is the story of the Garden of Eden where it does seem to be hinted that there is a point where man is capable of making decisions for himself. He becomes aware of himself.

Dr. R. Before he ate the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge of good and evil; in other words, had an open mind, yes very likely. But different myths of human creation occur in various civilisations and there are many things that cannot be described in scientific language for which the language of mythology and stories is necessary even at the present time. Any more questions or remarks?

All this is useful – we're learning.

S. Harbord. Would you say that the phrase used in the *Gita* where Arjuna is told by Shri Krishna that he maintains the universe with only the tip of his finger (or whatever it was). This phrase came to my mind after I'd heard the recording of the Schaefer lecture and somehow I think there is a deep significance. What else is the Param-Atman up to? (laughter)

Dr. R. It's what, in moments of awakening, humanity has been wondering ever since Adam and Eve! But have found difficulty in expressing. What is important about this is that the physical – the finger – is tiny in relation to the subtle – the psychological – and that is tiny in relation to the Causal. Think about that. We must view the world on three levels. You may be able to guess a little bit what the Param-Atman is up to on the physical level only; but it's impossible to guess what He is up to on the subtle and Causal levels. You have to experience. Is that any use to you?

S. H. It's useful but it's certainly not clear! (laughter)

Dr. R. Anybody find their own approach, anywhere where somebody finds the curtain drawn aside for a moment, that's the way for him to follow up. There will be as many ways of approach as there are people.

Sue, have you anything you'd like to say!

S.C. I just wondered – you said that we've got to be ready to act; it's not up to us to think and I wondered if you could say anything more about that?

Dr. R. Nothing is manifested except on the physical level in the physical world. We can be thinking all sorts of things but nobody can know anything about that and our thoughts will make no difference at all. So what I really meant was that we have to learn how to *think rightly enough to be able to act rightly in the given circumstances and we don't know what the given circumstance is going to be*. Do you see what I mean? We've got to be ready for anything. We don't know what sort of role we will be called on to play either as individuals or as a collection of people. The one thing that I do know is that our old role of being an esoteric Society run on the lines of the old system is over. It just doesn't work. I've realised myself in being put through the hoop, as I am at the present moment, that what we used to call remembering oneSelf is in fact forgetting the Param-Atman. We misunderstood the old

system. It's not that there was... not that all of it was inherently wrong. But it was misunderstood. Mr. Ouspensky used to say, 'You have first of all to forget yourself completely.' This is what you were saying, Maurice (Pickering). You have first of all to forget yourself completely, all that you call I; and only then will the real consciousness come in. All the exercises we used to do – I mean when I first learnt the system somebody was put on to teach me and he said if you are going to shake hands with somebody, you have to stop and say, 'I am shaking hands,' and that will be Self-remembering. You agree, Bray? There was a great deal of self-deception about this. One lives one's ordinary life trying to do things the best one can from the point of view of what is right to do and what is not right, not do. If you have a little added truth and sweetness from the meditation and from the teaching, this will sweeten your ordinary life and you will just do things a bit better. You don't have to change your life, change the outward life. I'm getting as controversial as Fred Hoyle! (laughter)

Lady A. Schaefer indicated, when he was talking about the triviality of bending metal, and the point he kept coming back to was about the fact that if there was purity or sincerity or a genuine sympathy, then things were possible. But if there was any falseness, it wasn't possible. And this is what we need.

Dr. R. Purity of purpose shared by a big enough collection of people to make a difference. (Yes)

C. Geoffroy. (rpt) Claude was very interested in your reference to natural samadhi earlier this evening and he would very much like to know how to help this come more often.

Dr. R. Yes quite. This is a very apposite question. In the next paper, Reading 2, I am hoping you will read what was said about samadhi five or six years before we heard about 'natural samadhi'. It will shed a lot of light. I can't do it in just a single word. In the meanwhile I think we should read something about what we could be doing on the subtle level (which is where we begin) from an audience in 1972.

Lady A. (reading)

Attachment means to consider as ours what really belongs to God. (Dr. R. The word God here is used for the general public for what he has called with us Param-Atman.)

Our body, our house, our wealth, our son, etc. Give up this feeling and get rid of all troubles. Do not think that the world around you, i.e. your house, your money, your body, etc., are unsubstantial. Rather it is your feeling of attachment to them that is unsubstantial. Whatever is happening around you is right. But what is wrong about it is the view you are taking of it. If you could correct your viewpoint, you would be happy. The world is a great show which God is staging around you in the shape of the universe; but it is a mere show. Your birth is a show, your death is a show. Actually there is neither birth nor death. Know that and you would be happy. The common outlook is that the world is everything and that Param-Atman is nothing. It is a crime to hold this view and the punishment for it is to be imprisoned in this physical body. You cannot be happy while undergoing a term of imprisonment. Our mind has the property of thinking of something or other all the time. It cannot remain idle. If it doesn't remember the Param-Atman, it thinks of

the world. Remembering the Param-Atman leads to happiness and thinking of the world leads to unhappiness. It is true that people do not find it easy to hold the Param-Atman in mind and the reason for that is lack of practice. As long as the ability has not been acquired there will be difficulty. But the ability can certainly be acquired... You have a mind. You have a body. And you have intelligence. Let the mind be trained to remember the Param-Atman, let the body do service to Him; and let the intelligence discriminate.

(Record, 7 May 1971)

Dr. R. Let's just do five minutes, dropping off all thoughts.

MEDITATION

In order to become a body of people with purity of purpose, each of us has to learn to be consistent and to speak what we feel (that is try and tell the truth appropriately to the circumstances) and do what we say (keep our promises). And today we'd be a very exceptional body of people if we do those things.

Any last final words? It's twenty five past.

Wendy Wilks. In relation to this, do you think we need to learn to pray? One feels that alone it is not possible.

Dr. R. It's very individual. For some people, meditation *is* a prayer and takes the place of any other prayer. Others are different. Try it, try anything, anything and everything. See what helps. Sometimes prayer may help, sometimes it may not. (P.D.O. used to counter that question with, 'Depends *who* is praying.') Use anything to get out of this selfish well of ignorance.

Miss Skeaping. (rpt) Miss Skeaping refers to your comment about the thought of shaking hands and saying 'I am shaking hands,' she had felt that we were being taught to feel, be aware of what we were doing; and not put it into words.

Dr. R. Yes, that's certainly a step. But even to be silent, something in us, not what we call I, will direct us. It's to get the inner direction.

Dr. R. (contd.) By the way, Mary, I must congratulate you on your medal from the King of Sweden for services to Ballet.

Miss S. I haven't got it yet. (laughter)

P. Kindersley. Can one think of remembering the Param-Atman as being the same process as natural Samadhi? Dropping thoughts in the moment of natural Samadhi?

Dr. R. Yes, but don't *think* about it! (laughter) Do it and see. We don't realise how much our habitual thought processes interfere with what we really know perfectly well instinctively.

Well, let's see. Life is very exciting and from day to day my wife and I get through each day. We're very pleased with all the help we're getting but it's a close struggle. So I may or may not be here, I can't tell you. But I hope to make it to the Tuesday Meditation Meeting in eight days time.

* * *