

1 March 1982

**SMALL MONDAY MEETING**

On the platform: Dr. Roles, Lady Allan, Professor Guyatt

Dr. R. We're interested to know if there are any new meditators collecting and when it is projected that we will give Initiations.

Mr. Fleming. There are some next Sunday – I think about seven. And it looks as though we are going to have at least three more – probably the following Sunday, (14th) as well.

Dr. R. Is Prue here? Yes; your second daughter (Lucy) is coming, isn't she? (P. de L. Yes) And her friend, Melanie Spira?

Right, (to Prof. G. and Lady Allan) we want you to develop this paper of yours and get something started. We are getting continual surprises because we've been looking from the wrong way up for a long time. I'm keeping as mum as possible today. (Prof. G. Well, I hope not!) (laughter)

Prof. G. This paper that Maureen and I really concocted from the first audience we had; the centre of gravity of the audience was to do with meditation and right at the beginning Maureen struck the right note by saying that if the best way was to sit here and say nothing for two audiences and just learn how to be still, we would be forgiven in London, even if we took nothing more home, because we all want more of this stillness... deep peace too. He was clearly pleased with this and interested.

Dr. R. It changed the whole atmosphere that, didn't it?

Prof. G. Yes it did. Maureen went on to say that it was noticeable at large meetings when we meditated all together that a degree of physical stillness had been achieved, but we wanted more than that – we wanted inner stillness and he gave a really very interesting answer. Perhaps you could read that, Maureen?

Lady A. There's a small bit of this answer we are going to read now in the paper and it is the answer that brought in the idea of the frog which was used as an example and not as an end in itself. He said in answer to that:

The achievement of physical stillness is not an ordinary thing in itself. It is a very important achievement. There are three factors which come together as far as meditation is concerned. the body, the eyes and the mind.

Dr. Roles has added a note to the paper we prepared which is rather important – we might take that now. In the translation of the Sanskrit words, His Holiness used the word 'mind' as an example of the difficulty of translation, because English has just one word for many different functions. In this connection he used the word 'mind' in using the word 'Manas', and he actually said the English word 'mind' and Jaiswal used entirely 'mind' in translation, with H.H.'s approval. So I'll go back to that bit:

S. There are three factors which come together as far as meditation is concerned: the body, the eyes and the mind. When the body is totally still, the next movement is found in the eyes. They keep on flickering, however small this may be. When the

eyes are still, it is most probable that the mind will follow suit. Mind does move according to the movement of the body and there are other factors – but body first, eyes next, will be followed peacefully by the mind. Meditation as it has been given to you starts with the body, and the training of the body to become still is the first stage of entry into the spiritual world. His Holiness commends people that that has been achieved and he doesn't see much difficulty in achieving the stillness of the mind in due course.

There is a sage who wrote the *Mandukya Upanishad* – Mandukya is a word which really means frog – and this sage, who had evolved a system, says that with three jumps one can get into the deepest level of the Self, just as a frog who happens to be on dry land and is getting scorched by the sun and wants to be cool and peaceful, can jump into the water with three jumps where he can enjoy the cool and peace of the deepest water. Similarly, these are the three jumps we need and with these three jumps it should be possible to establish the stillness of the mind.

(Record, 9 February 1982)

Dr. R. Well, could we leave the frog until people start jumping instead of talking?

Lady A. Yes, Dr. Roles, we did check with Jaiswal there, and the *Mandukya Upanishad* – this sage had evolved a system which was not *our* system. That's why the word was changed... the Shankaracharya said that.

Prof. G. Apart from the frog – physical stillness and then leading to eyes, leading to mind. He spoke about that...

Dr. R. I must say that at the big meditation meeting, I do think people are sitting beautifully still. But I'm not sure how much they do that in their private withdrawing rooms or wherever they meditate.

Prof. G. But he patted us on the back for that, for being able to sit still (laughter) which was rather heartening.

Dr. R. Are there questions about that?

Mr. Ciappara. How aware is one of these eye movements? How conscious is one of them?

Dr. R. Well how conscious *is* one? Ciappara, how conscious are you of them? (Mr. C. I'm not at all) No quite!

Mr. C. Are they still going on, even if I'm not conscious of them?

Dr. R. Is *anybody* conscious of them?

Mrs. Gould. Not until it was mentioned! (laughter)

Mrs. Beckwith. I'm quite often conscious of a sudden strong desire for my eyes to cross. (laughter)

Dr. R. Well, do stop that! I don't like to think of a cross-eyed Sarah!

Mr. Wood. I'm quite often aware of tension in the eyes rather than movement. I find if I'm meditating properly the tension is further back and the eyes are relaxed. That's quite noticeable.

Dr. R. How does it strike you, Mrs. Dobrée?

Mrs. D. I have been conscious quite some time ago of the eye movement, but usually when one is drying out and finding it difficult to meditate.

Mr. Anderson. Would it be related to the appearance sometimes of quite bright mental images?

Dr. R. I believe it is, yes. I believe it's the images we notice and the activity of the mind rather than the flicker of the eyes – in my case anyway.

Mr. A. There is a stage that I sometimes go through of word thoughts dying down and then a nicer stage, a much calmer stage but still rather distracting because it's so nice, of rather beautiful mental images.

Dr. R. Ah. Well now let's make some more discoveries about this because I'm sure it's fairly crucial and a neglected point.

Prof. G. Are those images abstract or figurative?

Mr. A. They can be abstract, then they change into figurative. They're like hypnogogic images in a way but often very, very beautiful – sometimes very moving.

Dr. R. I'd like to hear some more views and experiences on this question.

Mrs. MacOwan. Since I began to think about them, I'm pretty certain that my eyes move a lot – blink.

Dr. R. Yes, same here.

Mr. Crampton. We were talking when I was last here, about the understanding that comes from stillness: it always seems that for me understanding comes in the form of symbolic images, not in the form of answers to questions. My questions tend to get answered by images rather than words.

Dr. R. Isn't this a stage in the meditation which is further on than the way we usually start, with conversations going on – habitual conversations in the mind? It's a stage where those have stopped and these images become very much more noticeable and apparent than we ordinarily notice. Would you say that?

Mr. C. Different sorts. Superficial rather dream-like images, which is one thing...

Dr. R. Is that your experience, Anderson?

Mr. A. Yes, but also as Sean says, suddenly there is something so much more beautiful and powerful. It's very hard to get back to the meditation.

Mrs. Koren. I've been finding that when one shuts one's eyes, just ordinarily shut, you have images and sometimes you get still; but sometimes your eyes, as it were, shut again under your shut eyelids – it's as if they drop down; and then I don't find any mental movement.

Dr. R. You see – different people's experiences vary quite a bit. What about Michael Fleming and the checking of meditators? Does this subject come up at all?

M.W.F. No, I don't think it comes up quite like that. I think it is obviously noticeable when

somebody is meditating, you can see their eyes flickering, but that's at a fairly coarse phase, isn't it? But I agree with what people are saying that there are many degrees – and for me, if an image comes at all, it comes with a lot of pleasure. There's a complete change in one's feeling. All one can really see in checking is just the flickering and doing something about that.

Lady A. Dr. Roles, perhaps Dick would confirm this, but the interesting thing that I felt particularly and he went on much later to talk about checking, was that we didn't have to worry about the flickering; as long as our mind was moving there was some sort of movement however slight and that other people who checked one or observed one would be able to notice this. The key to it was not the flickering but the fact that there was a way to still the mind and the story in the paper goes on to tell this; and for me it brought the pure simplicity of the meditation and how we hadn't dwelt long enough on the original instruction of doing just what we were told – it made it somehow absolutely the key.

Prof. G. Yes. (Lady A. It was quite a shock) But I think this evening we've been talking about the eyes the whole time, and have rather forgotten the first stage – which was the body. Because I've been very conscious since hearing him that my body does move in a subtle way which I wasn't aware of – especially tensions in my arms, which I think must be part of this. I've found that the first thing was to get the body really relaxed and still. Eyes came next, as it were. I have found it extraordinarily useful actually.

Dr. R. Yes, it's all part of what we used to call 'moving centre' and he calls Rajas which we have to transcend.

Any more views? More observations?

Miss Cassini. I've always noticed that at the beginning the eyes move but if you think about that, they are going to go on flickering and things like that – you've got to let the mantra take you to the stillness and you can't really concentrate on the eyes.

Dr. R. Yes – not attend to the flicker but attend to the mantra. Does anyone remember the obstacles to Self-realization that H.H. talks about? One obstacle is 'discursive mind' (Vikshepa) and that, he has often pointed out, is my own besetting sin! My mind rushes off from one thing to another and I know that when my mind is discursive eyeball movement must be going on.

In giving the meditation, giving the Initiations, you can see it happening in some people when they shut their eyes and begin. And you can relate the discursive mind to the flickering eyes. That's all we need to attend to about the flickering – it's the discursive mind that we must transcend by not attending to it.

Lady A. It means that we aren't meditating, yes? It seemed to me that the whole gist of it was that we had to be much more single-minded about wanting stillness and knowing that we've been told very simply how to get it, as Sue Cassini said. If we really are single-minded about it, it's the key to it all.

Prof. G. Yes, he really spoke about instructing the mind decisively. Telling it to keep the body still, then to keep the eyes still, and then to keep the thoughts from coming in. He said if you *really* give it orders, it will obey.

Mrs. Fleming. Could you add 'wholehearted' because that would help.

Mrs. Brunson. Lady Allan, there seems to be a very definite second stage in physical stillness. I've noticed that you may think you are sitting still but after a while a much deeper stillness comes which is very relaxed and very comfortable although quite poised. It's quite different from just a 'sitting still' kind of stillness, and this does seem to still the thoughts as well.

Dr. R. You see I think that the three jumps that the frog (which is being scorched in the heat of daytime life) has to take can be best observed in meditation. That in any half-hour we frogs can notice that there are stages in the meditation; we used to be taught by the Maharishi that we had to get over the ordinary thought stage and then we would find that there were dreams, and dreams of the past would come up, and we would have to go a further jump than that. And then one might reach complete stillness... one might even not know anything at all. Just not know, and it would be very difficult to tell the difference between that and being physically asleep; but we could tell because if you woke from sleep your mind was muzzy; if you 'come to' from this complete stillness, your mind is very clear, exceptionally clear. I think we need to get back to basics.

Lady A. Yes, H.H. also spoke of the difference between physical sleep during meditation and real stillness. He said that physical sleep meant you were meditating in Tamas, and he said that if people checking observed anybody falling asleep, they should very gently touch them on the shoulder in order that they could come back to meditating in Sattva. So he did differentiate between physical sleep and meditation. (Dr. R. So I hope our checkers are very gentle.)

Dr. R. Pickering, is this your experience with the Shankaracharya?

M.E.P. Yes, very much so.

Dr. R. I wondered whether one can ordinarily expect to be as still in ordinary life at home as one is in the audience chamber with the Shankaracharya?

M.E.P. Yes, I think so; it's a matter of practice and direction.

Dr. R. Yes, and not being content with the lowering of one's standards, which happens mechanically.

Mrs. Westwood. Could you say something about preparation? Sometimes here we have music and then there's meditation. Sometimes at home I read something. Is this considered beneficial?

Dr. R. What do you find about the music here at a meditation meeting; do you find it helps or not?

Mrs. W. Yes, I find it helps the first step of day-to-day thoughts. And the reading in particular I find helpful.

Dr. R. Well I'm not so sure about the reading. You see when I read my ordinary mind gets going and it's rather difficult to find something to read which doesn't set the exterior-looking mind more active.

Mrs. W. Yes, I was thinking about reading something from our papers or connected with them.

Dr. R. Well yes, but I don't think that even this is above reproach! Let's hear some more... I find this very interesting. If people could speak, not according to pattern, but strike out any how they like.

Mr. Geoffroy. I find the commentator is very difficult to silence.

Dr. R. Yes, this is where we really got a very sound answer, but it's in the paper and the paper is going to last two weeks and we don't want to use it up all in one!

Mr. Dunjohn. Dr. Roles, to illustrate what you were saying about emerging from sleep and from meditation: when you sent Bill Whiting and me to Italy on one occasion to meet the Maharishi, he arrived having had no sleep for five nights, having taken meetings in Sweden all the time. We took him to his hotel and he asked us to wait in the passage; he meditated for fifteen minutes and came out absolutely bright, shining and sharp. It was quite remarkable and Whiting and I still reflect on it.

Dr. R. Well, have you managed to do that?

K.D. Dr. Roles, are we in any way approaching a word which some people find not to their liking sometimes – the word 'trance'?

Dr. R. It's perfectly easy to avoid anything to do with trance by returning to the mantra. As long as you keep a hold of the mantra, you can't go into trance. We had one or two people in the School of Meditation who went into a trance and burnt their fingers on a cigarette, which they shouldn't have been smoking! But when told about hanging on to the mantra, they soon avoided such things.

Well, supposing now we – as good faithful frogs – shut our eyes and just take one jump after another.

## MEDITATION

Well, I think that's rather encouraging – a cursory glance and nobody seemed obviously asleep – nobody seemed to be moving – and I'm almost sure that my eyes were not flickering that time but I'm sure it was not free from tension as much as I would like it to be. Any views to be expressed? Some people are ominously silent... for instance the brilliant Reigate group – I'm sure the Barkers have something to say about all this – or Kent.

Mr. Brass. Dr. Roles, what actually is the value of knowing that the eyes move?

Dr. R. Merely that it tells you if your mind is suffering from dispersion for one thing and secondly it explains that though your body may *appear* to be still, *yet you are not in complete physical stillness*. But it's not a thing to dwell on. It's a thing to note in passing.

Mrs. Fleming. Could I just say that if you really give up – *really* give up when you are meditating – you can't think at all; so it's very encouraging, there's no need to worry.

Dr. R. Yes, very encouraging indeed.

On a new subject: about the little, dare we still talk about the frog making three jumps before the subject is banned! What do you find is a good stretch of time for frogs to aim for?

A lifetime is obviously far too long. In 24 hours I think we all of us at this stage could succeed in taking three jumps to the stillness and the coolness of the water. There are times when it would be mighty good to be able to take it in 3 seconds – one, two, three – if for instance one is going to have a difficult interview, if one is faced with a crisis or an important decision, it would be fine to be able to take those three jumps in three seconds. What do people – frogs – aim for?

Mr. Koren. I found the paper last week very helpful where it said the first stage was attentive action because it's simple enough to remember. Just try to attend, because one's day is full of actions.

Dr. R. I do think that what we call the 'mini-ladder' is the best way to go about the 24 hours' time scale. Do your own job with zest and as much enjoyment as you can and with as much pride as you can put into it, and from there one can, as step 2 on this mini-ladder, have good thoughts; and then (step 3) lessen the burden of the dismal thoughts we all suffer from in Britain at this time, and from there we reach step 4 when we get more Sattva which is what we all want; and then things are pretty easy for a short time... Frog's first jump.

And from there fresh problems arise. You have to stop dispersion of the mind and then you have to get away from identification and then you get on to the Causal level (jump 3) and life can become very sweet. But it all starts with the body, doesn't it? And for a turner in the Mukabeleh they haven't anything else to worry about.

Mrs. Koren. Would you say that between the leaps on all levels there is a no-man's-land like when you spoke last time of coming out of what we are not?

Dr. R. Yes, I agree quite definitely. I spend too much time in no-man's-land. One has got not to be content with no-man's-land.

Mrs. K. But could you say that one has to jump out of, say, identification with the past and the future, and then there's another stage – jump out of the creative dream stage that the others spoke of earlier; one has to have the courage to let go of those.

Dr. R. Yes, I see it that way too; but it's very individual, you see, and I want people to make their own discoveries about this – but as long as we keep each other moving forward, not backwards. (to Rupert Spira) I wonder whether Cornwall was any good for you in the way of being comparatively free from disturbances from outside?

R.S. Very helpful, yes.

Dr. R. So now you've got to tackle your return to busy life! (he nods)

Dr. Connell. These three steps tend to remind one of Mr. Ouspensky's teaching about six activities. Is this a profitable connection?

Dr. R. Oh yes, it helps me too, Arthur, to try to bring that in. I think that we shall find that this is very valuable for right understanding. Let's hear some more from other people. There's Jane Hassan hiding away there and she knows a lot about meditation and she's hiding more! (laughter) But is, from your point of view, what we've been talking about bunk or is there some sense in it?

Jane H. Yes, very much. I seem to go through several barriers. Sometimes I can't get through – and for me, it's definitely to do with the physical stillness.

Dr. R. I remember meditating with you, and your cat was a very good example to me!

Mrs. Guyatt. It seems enormously helpful doing it with other people. Perhaps one borrows Sattva from other people.

Dr. R. Yes, undoubtedly. If there is somebody at your group with a plentiful supply, it does the whole group good. It might be good if people practised more of this little ladder during the week and came to their group loaded instead of empty.

Lady A. It seemed very clear (Dick, wouldn't you agree?) that the Shankaracharya makes almost light of it in the sense that we seem to make a lot of problems about the stillness of mind, and he seemed to show that it was quite simple. He gave the feeling that it would come quite naturally if we just followed the instruction. Did you feel that?

Prof. G. Yes. He also said it was all quite easy if we were in love with it. That one did not watch the clock when one was with one's beloved. (Dr. R. The love of meditation) For me that was the real clue to it all.

Lady A. I rather think we love our problems, instead of loving meditation.

Dr. R. Well I'd like very much to hear at next Tuesday's Meditation Meeting something about this new advice he has been giving these two about making the mind, the Manas, the personal servant. We all have this Manas in us, and must make him do his job. It really is a life-saver I think.

Prof. G. Yes! (laughing) and it was quite clear that he used his own mind like that; he had a lot of servants that he put to different jobs.

Dr. R. Well it's now about half-past seven, so I think we might call it a day – but this paper has to do for a fortnight, and I hope something enjoyable will come up as a result.

\* \* \*