

15 June 1981

**SMALL MONDAY MEETING**

On the platform. Lady Allan and Professor Guyatt

R.G. Well, alas, no Dr. Roles. Maureen has seen him today and has a message from him which will put you more in the picture.

Lady A. He said that the most important thing was that we should become as a united a body of people as possible, particularly this small meeting. And that there were people on the fringes, who for various reasons, pull in different directions and we musn't worry about them. We must – as many of us who understand – realise that the unity of the main body is the most important thing of all and we must withstand any of these odd pulls in different directions and find a way to become as united and as close as possible.

R.G. I wonder what that means to us?

Pen Scrutton. I was thinking that we all have to try to get as near to the centre as possible, as in that diagram with all the rays going towards the centre; and then we will be close together.

R.G. I believe he also said to find out what we as a group wanted?

Lady A. To find out what group takers want and how they want to carry on.

R.G. Which really connects with the main message. It's always a question designed to stop a meeting flat – if you say 'What do you want?' (laughter) – there's a marvellous silence straight away. It is a very difficult question and yet it is a question that we must face up to. Did your meetings lead in any particular direction?

J. Buscombe. At our meeting in Frensham there was much interest in natural Samadhi and many examples were given. How to try and understand and make use of these? They wanted more knowledge of how to make this practical in everyday life.

R.G. Was that connected at all with the point that Dr. Roles made, I think in the paper before last, about the main job that faced us now which is to increase Being?

J.B. I would say very much so. It seemed to us as being an important way of doing that.

R.G. Did that come up at any other meeting?

R. Barker. Yes, much the same at ours.

R.G. And also in the context of Being? (Yes) I don't know what people feel, but I think that's really the important thing that faces us now. And how does one do this? What does it mean?

A. Garten. What came up at our meeting was the feeling of very great valuation of the meditation.

A. Caiger-Smith. A person who quite recently joined our very small meeting said this which might be a reply to your question on the side. She said, 'The meetings take me, as it were, to the top of a high hill and from there I look around at what is happening, and at what I am, and I see it

all from a much wider, deeper point of view. Sometimes there is a feeling next day of sliding all the way down to the bottom (laughter) but at least I know that the high hill is there.' And that is one way, I would say for myself too, of describing what we want in our meetings.

(When Lady A repeated this, Alan said 'Not the sliding!')

R.G. I was going to ask! (laughter) How did you comfort her about the glissade? Were you able to comfort her? (No, no, it wasn't necessary... laughter)

R. Jacob. At our meeting, Mrs. Grazebrook reminded us of the poem that was read at Lord Allan's service, which begins. 'O my Lord, my whole Being is yourself..'

R.G. At the new group, I found myself in the position of having to try to define what Being was; and I didn't find it at all easy. Are we all quite sure that we know what we're talking about?

S. Harbord. Would one way of describing it be as ascension up the Ladder.

R.G. I think that would affect Being. What do other people think?

C. Geoffroy. I felt it was connected with this pendulum movement we used to hear about – how much time you spent on one side and how much on the other in relation to your state.

E. Guyatt. (repeat) Mrs. Guyatt says she realises she regards Being as belonging to somebody else. Everybody has a Being, but she doesn't know where hers is! (laughter)

C. Bullough. Well, she is somebody else to us! (laughter) And it just radiates from her.

R.G. We obviously can't develop Being from a frontal attack, can we? You can't sit down and say, 'I'm going to increase my Being'. Lizzie might, but I don't think anyone else could.

Bill Anderson. (repeat) Bill refers to the sort of feeling of not being in balance and this hits him sometimes when he realises he is not being consistent, or not being reliable.

P. Scrutton. Are we right in thinking that Being is not bad or good? Is it not just what *is* at that moment?

R.G. You think it's fluctuating?

P.S. Yes, I think it is fluctuating. Somebody mentioned the Ladder and one is going up and down all the time.

R.G. I'd like to hear what Dr. Connell has to say about this, because I haven't thought of it as fluctuating. I've thought of it as being a longer term thing, but I'm pretty hazy.

Dr. C. (repeat) Dr. Connell says that he thinks it is related to whether one is more or less mechanical, and one sometimes gets the feeling that something is missing; and to him this means that one has got rather a long way away from one's real Self. Is this not connected with Being?

P. Smith. Being seems to be from time to time a reduction of the personal, and closer to the universal. One seems to be better in that way at certain times and worse at others. This is connected probably with being more mechanical and more identified. Whereas when one is better and less personal, taking things less personally, one's idea of Being seems to be much

better. It's more creative in relationships and with one's work.

Lady A. I'd like to know whether... if you try to be more consistent and that sort of thing, are we not trying to prepare a better room for the Atman? Dr. Roles often speaks about the room in which the Atman will come to dwell. The Atman is perfect and needs no modification, but the *place*, the room, the vehicle for the Atman to dwell in, it can be either opaque and dusty, or polished and clean – and is this Being? I'd like to ask that.

R.G. It will be interesting to hear what Dr. Roles says. Also it would connect with what Philip Smith was saying, because the more personal you are, the less of a room you have to receive the Atman in, wouldn't you say? (Yes)

Lady A. Yes. And we've heard from many different sources – the Shankaracharya and Mr. Ouspensky and then Professor Schaefer – about being a vehicle. Professor Schaefer said it will flow through you. But any personal thing puts a block in the way.

R.G. Yes. (to P Smith) You were talking, in fact, about giving up weren't you?

P.S. When you are better, warmer, with more love in your heart, everything is more possible and I associate this with better Being.

K. Dunjohn. Has Being, in fact, got something to do with all the centres, as we used to call them, not just emotional centre, but the intellectual and instinctive centres as well? I jotted down quite a lot a long time ago something which Dr. Roles said: 'Consciousness can be measured by the degree of integration'. One senses Being is of the same order. Is it connected too with the message from Dr. Roles at the beginning – that is, the Being of the group as well as the individual?

J. Gould. I thought of Being as what 'I am' underneath all these layers of personality, false personality.

R.G. I rather agree. Would you agree Dr. Connell? (Yes) Yes, I think that's it. But it is a concept that is left out of ordinary thinking, isn't it? It's an extremely useful concept to have. It has nothing to do with an individual's brilliance or talents or attainments. It's quite different from that.

P. Grazebrook. (repeat) What do we mean by the word 'essence'? I thought of Being – growth of Being – more as increasing purity of purpose.

Lady A. Wasn't it given very simply as what you know and what you are? Your knowledge may far exceed your Being – you may not put your Knowledge into practice and so it's just words.

H. Wright. Like Mrs. Grazebrook, I was also thinking of it as not just Being, but *level* of Being that matters. What we're trying to do is increase the *level* of Being.

R.G. This really comes back to the meditation, doesn't it, which I'm sure is a way of feeding Being.

M.W.F. One aspect of the meditation referred to last Tuesday which seems to me to be very important at the moment is connected with what used to be called 'second conscious shock'. In reply to Dr. Fenwick's question, H.H. said there are three things which contribute to

progress in meditation and the second of these was the reality of the Tradition. In other words, how could one find closeness in oneself with the Shankaracharya and the Tradition; and look for help there in relation to this. I'd very much like to know what you think about this.

R.G. I'd like to know why you used the phrase 'second conscious shock' and not the 'first'?

M.W.F. Taking away the feeling of 'I' and giving up negative emotions – all this seems connected with the 'second conscious shock'.

Lady A. It almost sounds if it's more connected with *purifying* the Being, rather than raising the level. One feels that if one could be transparent and simple, then one's own talents would shine wherever they were meant to. One would manifest whatever was wanted and the personal wouldn't be there. The last Monday meeting I was here for and sitting next to Dr. Roles, it came to me (I think I said it to Mrs. Geoffroy) that I just wished I could be a clear pane of glass sitting next to him. I felt the sense of the necessity to be absolutely transparent and then it could go through one.

R.G. But I was interested in Mr. Fleming's coming to the 'second conscious shock' because in a way I've been beginning to feel that it's life, isn't it, that brings the negative and difficult situations to one? And we may be facing some now, and we've all faced them at some time; but it's how you meet those difficulties in the light of one's belief in this System and the Work, isn't it? This is how you can really cope with them. Is that the way you were thinking? (Yes)

P. Scrutton. Do you remember the story about the Guru who gave the little boy a leaf with the Mantra written on it in order to cross the river safely? The group was very interested in this and the fact that the weight of the Tradition was behind it which made the leaf important, not just the little boy's own Mantra. As we're in the middle of Initiations right now, it's good to remember this.

R.G. Yes, it's a marvellous support, isn't it?

Mrs. Simpson. Years ago I felt that Mr. Ouspensky meant that second conscious shock was Self-remembering in a time of great difficulty or of joy even. He gave an example of accepting and giving up suffering.

R.G. Yes, I remember that too. I think it might be useful to read that passage about natural Samadhi. For me, this was one of the high spots of our trip to India when the Shankaracharya spoke about there being such a thing as natural Samadhi.

Lady A. Richard Guyatt began by saying that he was rather confused by an answer that the Shankaracharya had given at the second audience about Samadhi being available between desires. He had always understood that Samadhi was an exceptional and definite state to which one aspired and which was available only after much work. And the Shankaracharya said:

Natural Samadhi is not designed by anyone. It is provided by nature itself. Common man experiences it every day, but he doesn't know that he is experiencing it; but it is the source through which he gets some sort of steadiness, energy and happiness. And that is automatic. But the wise have understood the importance of this Samadhi provided by nature which is available all the time and can also be put to further use. They try to increase the extent of this Samadhi. In this Samadhi the

idea is that after a desire has been fulfilled there is a little gap before the start of the next desire. Let us extend this time, which is natural free time. If we can extend it, nature will certainly provide the necessary further extra energy. Nature has made this automatic so that everybody is re-charged every time they complete a desire.

(Record, 30 August 1979)

Lady A. And that really ran into the earlier bit which gave the example of how you miss this; and he connected it with rest. And he said:

The sort of rest we are discussing is mental rest and for that one doesn't have to stop work. The moment something has been completed, we have to register that it has been completed and immediately extend that moment a little so that a clear demarcation in the mind is made and two activities are not intermingled. There are many different examples of how two different types of people behave. People who are efficient and who have learned to attend to their work with attention and consciousness, do their work much more quickly than others. They perform their tasks much more efficiently and they finish them in a shorter time. But those who are very much attached to their work cannot give this direct attention to it because they keep switching to their dreams, their attachments and their desires which linger so long that they don't find time to attend to the work, and some people, even during their sleep, keep on thinking about it and worrying, so they cut down their sleep and this, in effect, cuts down their energy for the next day.

Lady A. And then he gives a nice light example which we will all understand, I think:

One of my cooks is an example. He always tried to make a complete plan for the whole day so he could make sure that this was attended to first, then this, and so on, so that everything was done nicely and in the right order. But in effect he went on planning the work for such a long time that he never started any work on time and he never finished any work on time, and he was always organising things. (laughter)

(Record, 28 August 1979)

C. Bullough. So natural Samadhi is stillness between activities?

R.G. Yes. He says it's what gives us steadiness... it's a rather interesting list that he gives us.

Lady A. He says it is the source through which men get some sort of steadiness, energy and happiness, and that the wise, who understand the importance of this, which is available all the time, put it to further use and increase its extent.'

R.G. It's rather marvellous, isn't it, to think of it like that because there is a spring of this energy in each one of us. Speaking for myself, it's very easy to waste it with personal thoughts which don't bring steadiness and happiness in the long run. And yet it's like a source bubbling up within you the whole time.

Mrs. B Fleming. I find it very difficult when I'm aware of these moments not to find the Mantra there. It seems as if it's always like that.

Lady A. (having repeated the above) I'm sure you didn't mean it like that.

Mrs. F. No, not difficult. What I mean is that when you talk about it as a gap, it's really a fullness of the Mantra.



R.G. It's the difficulty of putting it into words isn't it?

J. Buscombe. We were rather surprised and pleased at Frensham to read in last week's paper something to the effect that if one could learn to use this Samadhi, it could lead on to full Self-Consciousness.

R.G. That's very reassuring, I think.

E. Guyatt. I feel I ought to have a plan of how to deal with this because it so often leads on to over-excitement and takes one off at a tangent.

R.G. Does anybody else find that?

C. Geoffroy. I'd like to ask what has happened to this thing called 'chief feature' – whether it has been abolished altogether officially; or whether we can still talk about it. (laughter) We used to be told that we couldn't find it ourselves; we had to be told about it by somebody else at the right time.

R.G. I think it's officially abolished for this evening! (laughter) It can be raised another time. But I can't think why you've got to know about it, Claude?

C.G. Because of the importance of it – because it seems to have a favourite hiding place.

R.G. Yes but it also seems to have a sort of *ancien regime* whiff about it. I think you really ought to talk to Dr. Roles if you want to understand more. What is so marvellous about the newer way of thinking is that we have got this spring of energy in us, if we can see it. It's all around us in everyone else and everything one sees. We're really part of an extraordinary wealth of energy, and if one can, for a few seconds, put aside personal thoughts, if one manages to step off the centre of the stage, then one can begin to see that everything around you, and you yourself, are a process. Everything is moving, everything is changing, quite unlike the way we normally see because our perceptions take everything separately and make things static. But in fact we are inhabiting a fluid situation where matters are constantly altering, where everything is being altered at different speeds. Everything is eating everything else. The whole thing is really very different from the picture that our senses present to us. But we have this extraordinary spring of pure energy in us that we don't encourage. We've been diverted to thinking about personal problems, personal day-to-day imaginary difficulties. It's an extraordinary picture. If one has a touch of the other to come back to, one's ordinary worries seem strange. Chief feature to me has a sort of worry about it. But still, I think you should ask Dr. Roles.

Lady A. I think you've given the most marvellous sense of this and also the Shankaracharya's approach is always to turn to the light. Every time you remember something like 'chief feature', turn away from it to the Atman.

R.G. I can't remember the words but he said that splendid thing about turning up the pots and receiving all this bliss which is raining down on us all the time. And I'm sure, with Philip Smith, that if one gets away from the personal, one is sensitive to this more and more.

P. Smith. I was feeling when you were saying that, that natural Samadhi isn't necessarily just in the gaps. It seems to be the background to one's whole being when one is in a quiet state of

activity and one is feeling free and everything is going smoothly and there is nothing personal in it. This seems to be a sort of natural Samadhi and the spring of energy you were talking about is there. It doesn't seem to be just in the gaps... perhaps there are infinitesimal gaps all the time.

R.G. I've always understood that gaps are where one starts from.

P.S. (repeat) There is a state of wellbeing that feels like a state of grace.

Mrs. Fleming. (repeat) Mrs. Fleming reminds us about the purity and wonder of Buddhi that can listen to these instructions.

Lady A. I thought what was interesting is that we're always asking about raising the level of Being, or what is practical, and he gives this absolutely practical thing about having a demarcation and not letting your days go in an endless slide of one thing after another. And he actually suggests making a mental demarcation which is a very practical thing to try.

Miss Bolton. I don't understand that. Can you say a bit more about it please?

Lady A. One can only re-read that little bit, I think. He says;-

The sort of rest we are discussing is *mental* rest and for that one doesn't have to stop work. The moment something has been completed, we have to register that it has been completed and immediately extend that moment a little so that a clear demarcation in the mind is made and two activities are not intermingled.

Then he says there are many examples of how the two different sorts of people behave: those who make a demarcation and those whose activities run one into the other:

People who are efficient and who have learned to attend to their work with attention and consciousness, do their work much more quickly than others. They perform their tasks much more efficiently and they finish them in a shorter time. But those who are very much attached to their work cannot give this direct attention to it because they keep switching to their dreams, their attachments and their desires which linger so long that they don't find time to attend to the work; and some people, even during their sleep, keep on thinking about it and worrying, so they cut down their sleep and this, in effect, cuts down their energy for the next day.

And then H.H. gives the example of one of his cooks who is always busy making a plan for the whole day so that everything will be done nicely and in the right order, but in effect, he goes on planning for such a long time that he never starts anything on time and he never finishes anything on time because he is always organising it.

H.W. Aren't these rather lovely descriptions of non-identification and identification as we know it.

R.G. I suppose they are, yes.

P. Scrutton. In relation to what you said at the beginning that this group must become closer and more unified, I think it is quite interesting that in trying to see the Param-Atman in everything, Mr. Costain said at our meeting that he found it much easier to see the Param-Atman in people than things; and it was not necessary to like them but to love them. I thought that was an interesting difference. In one's bad moments one thinks, 'Oh I don't

think I'll ever get on with Mrs. So-and-So; I'll never like her!' But it isn't necessary to like her; it's only necessary to reach a state where you understand the person. (When Lady Allan repeated this she inserted after Mrs. So-and-So, 'or Miss So-and-So, or Mr!; and Professor Guyatt said, 'or Professor'.) (laughter)

Lady A. I thought about this message that Dr. Roles sent and it struck me that some degree of unity comes from not trying to *take* all the time, but to give. But then I thought that was presumptuous because what has one got to give? It struck me that perhaps what one can give is one's humility; be more humble about what is available, rather than coming to take. Taking has the sort of feeling of drawing away from the centre, sucking out, and when he said there were people with their own ideas who pull in other directions, this gave me the feeling of taking. But if you give that up, you can give your humility – you can come to learn rather than to take.

M. Haisman. Following that thought, Dr. Roles then asked the question, 'What do group takers actually want?' And I wondered if it might be beneficial to reverse the question and say, 'What does the school require from us?'

R.G. It's a bit easy to say an increase of Being, isn't it? Although, obviously, whatever that means is tremendously important. We have to face up sometime to how this group is going to continue, and it won't continue, of course, at a low level of Being. It would just be fractious, quarrelling, self-opinionated. One knows all that well.

Dr. Connell. Don't you think that the original System idea that understanding is the result of Knowledge and Being has a tremendous content? It covers everything we've been talking about if you explore it in depth.

R.G. It really covers it all, doesn't it?

Dr. C. So it's growth of understanding that will involve growth of Being and growth of Knowledge...

R.G. They all interplay with each other. That's a good thought to end on. Just to finish, shall we have a few minutes of quiet?

#### MEDITATION

Well, let's call it a day. Thank you very much.

\* \* \*