

15 March 1982

SMALL MONDAY MEETING

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

Prof. G. This will be the last week for Thursday meetings, as next week the Annual General Meeting will be on Thursday which is 25th March. There will be a small Monday meeting next week, 22nd, and then the last Monday meeting, a large one, on 29th March. The first one next term is on 17th May, a large meeting.

The office will be closed during the week after Easter, opening again on April 19th.

Most people will have heard that there will be no Meditation meeting in April, as the second Tuesday (13th) falls on the day after Easter Monday. Please tell your groups this, asking them to pass on the news to anyone who has not already heard – the date of the next Meditation meeting is May 11th.

Group takers probably realise that many reports of meetings are received each week, and not all questions in them can be dealt with on Mondays. However, if some vital question is not dealt with at the meeting, they could always ask it again during the meeting.

Were any more projector operators discovered? (Some groups had forgotten to ask before) Have any more come forward?

Dr. R. Is there anybody?

Dr. Cox. I used to do it in the army. (laughter)

Lady A. I don't know why we should laugh! (more laughter)

Dr. R. We may have to get the doctors in (laughter) if there's *nobody* else!

I would just like to say that I've heard very approving noises about the first paper these two (Prof. G. & M.A.) produced and I think this and the next one are going to be even better. So let's hear what they want to say.

Prof. G. Before we get to that, I wonder if there are any questions people want to ask?

Miss W. Snewin. Please could we have a definition of a cosmos?

Dr. R. Good question! To which there isn't an immediate answer. It all depends on what you understand by the expression 'zero to infinity'. There are many ways of thinking about the word 'infinity'. (to Lady A) Now your son Alexander at the Treasury says that he can't count personally up to more than...

Lady A. He said that he couldn't personally relate to a figure bigger than 10,000.

Dr. R. I don't think any of us, really, can count up further than 10,000 with the certainty of a clear picture.

Lady A. I think, being a mathematician, he can probably *count* further but he has no personal relation to more people. He says there are only 10,000 people in the world and all the rest are created by the media! (laughter)

Dr. R. I couldn't agree with him more! (laughter) Another thing that Alexander might be valuable over is in relation to *money* since he is at the Treasury.

This idea of zero to infinity is often illustrated in books on the calculus in relation to money. For instance, take the sum of £3 – 300 pence. This is (or used to be) quite a sizeable sum to an old age pensioner, for instance. But to a millionaire, it's negligible; it's infinitesimal. And it's a good way to think about what to you would be an infinitely large sum of money in your daily life. What is that for you, Peter (Eadie)?

P.E. 300p. (laughter)

Dr. R. Quite! It's much easier to think in tangible terms, something real, than having a sort of philosophical idea about it.

Prof. G. Yes, I absolutely agree.

Dr. R. So now on the basis of that, *what is a cosmos?* Each cosmos is said to be related to the next above as zero to infinity; and to the next below as infinity to zero. So that for a cell, 30,000 cells is an infinite number of cells and yet Sherrington reckoned that in the cortex of the brain alone there are 60,000 million cells! Just think how little 30,000 counts in relation to the number of trees in a forest; or the number of drops of water in a lake.

Miss Wright. If we are trying to think of it in a different way, how do you reckon cosmoses not in numbers or size, but in quality or some different way?

Dr. R. First of all, we have to relate them to the inner world of man, don't we? Not just to the outer world. And the way to relate them to the inner world is the difference between one centre and another. It's the same cosmic relationship, the intellectual centre being slowest, the moving centre a different cosmos – some 30,000 times faster in terms of frequency, and emotional centre working at its full speed, 30,000 times faster still. So now you answer your question from the point of view of emotional centre working at its full speed.

H.W. It's a question of perception then, speed of perception?

Dr. R. That's one criterion, yes... speed of perception and speed of action. When moving centre is moving at its right speed without being checked by the intellectual, it's quicker than thought. But now you are thinking perhaps of how to relate it to music – or not?

H.W. No, I wasn't.

Dr. R. That's lucky! (laughter)

Mrs. Cardew. How would you relate it to being?

Dr. R. I don't think I can quite, straight off. Intellectual knowledge and skills of movement belong to dominant hemisphere (left) and have to be learnt. Being is governed by emotional and instinctive (inborn) tendencies, governed by the autonomic system (right).

More simply, I regard the Shankaracharya as infinity to myself as zero, if that's what you want to know. I think that's quite a useful way of going about it. (yes, yes, thank you)

Mr. Buscombe. I always think of it, Dr. Roles, as something completely orderly in itself as distinct from chaos.

Dr. R. The cosmoses? (yes) Do you think, John, it's a matter of how the human mind is constructed? That in reality the whole universe is one whole, but that we are so made that we tend to see it on different scales, according to how our perception, as Helen said, is oriented? Is expanding? Would you say that? Or do you think that there is an actual division in the universe?

J.B. (rpt) No, John thinks the way you expressed it.

Dr. R. Well let's go on that way for the next month or so and see if we can think any original thoughts about the Teaching of Cosmoses from actual experience, because nothing original has come out of this idea since Mr. Ouspensky...

Prof. G. There are moments aren't there, Dr. Roles, when the ordinary visible world appears unreal? (yes) This is rather an interesting moment.

Dr. R. A very good approach. When the ordinary world seems like a dream, maybe we are in a different cosmos?

Lady A. Dr. Roles, can we think, as I asked you, in relation to what Mrs. Cardew was saying, and also when joking about Alexander's idea that you can't relate to a bigger number, that there is a part of us that does relate to ideas like eternity and things which must be one's spiritual life? Is this because it's another cosmos?

Dr. R. No, it's because you are speaking from the Causal level and not just from the ordinary way of looking at things which is the intellectual; to me it's more than one cosmos away. The intellectual always likes counting, can't count very far and is always disputing and arguing, but if you try to get three jumps and look at things from the Causal level, it will be utterly different.

Mr. Geoffroy. How can we begin to see the shape of a cosmos? It seems to be necessary to have a picture.

Dr. R. Well I have formed pictures. Why don't you? What picture have you got Claude? What picture does a sculptor have? He isn't counting all the time?

Mr. Crampton. He sees diagrams.

Dr. R. Symbols which connect a lot of things together; as H.H. said: 'In a nutshell'.

Mrs. Caiger-Smith. Isn't it significant that it's zero to infinity, not one to infinity? It seems to be a change of nature somehow.

Dr. R. Yes, I don't altogether like it; I don't feel quite happy. My ordinary way of thinking is to take 1 and the logarithm of 1 is 0; but I work in logs and that's a hint that our Manas works in ratios.

(to Prof. G.) Reverting to your idea that there are moments when all your ordinary life appears like a dream, I think that's a very good beginning for seeing things from another cosmos (bigger or smaller).

Prof. G. It is for me. Although it sounds a bit silly, it's also connected with a feeling I get occasionally that I don't exist. It's all transparent as it were.

Dr. R. That's also a very good idea.

Prof. G. It's connected in my mind, I suppose intellectually, that when studying drawing one quickly begins to see that perspective is an illusion, that everything is altering the whole time.

Dr. R. So you go 'abstract', do you?

Prof. G. No! No, no, no. No, very much not, because it's a sort of anchor – the way it looks is a sort of anchor to your life; but it's as if the visual scene is very fluid – things can alter their proportion very easily in different lights.

Dr. R. How do you take the Shankaracharya's remark that his tradition says that only the Absolute is Real – only the Atman, the Param-Atman, or some other aspect of the Absolute is Real? And that everything else is illusory in the sense that it's changing all the time.

Prof. G. Yes, changing, and just our view of it which is very partial which makes it...

Mr. Harbord. Dr. Roles, the *Gita* also says that the Param-Atman maintains the universe with only a very small part of Himself.

Dr. R. With His little finger.

Mr. H. Isn't this an astonishing remark – and what else is He up to? (laughter)

Dr. R. Yes, you see the point of that remark is that everything that is 4-dimensional (Einstein), everything that the scientists can measure or calculate, is infinitely small compared with something which only a person on the Causal (spiritual) level can appreciate. That's one way of putting it. But do you have another interpretation of that?

Mr. H. (rpt) Simon says that remark has hit him very powerfully of late and he is sure that it is the key to something.

Dr. R. I think if you could store up that remark and do your best to get more moments like the one you described (last quote in Reading 5), an emotional moment when emotional centre or higher intellectual centre is working in a higher state of consciousness in order to answer. Would you agree? (yes) He wants something more...

Mr. H. These are just thoughts that are coming, but the outward drama we are all going through (of atom bombs and so on) is terribly unimportant compared with the energy of the Param-Atman. Sorry, my train of thought has gone. Professor Schaefer put it better when he said there was more energy in a square millimetre of space than all that we use at the moment. Something on those lines.

Dr. R. Yes I agree, and I think that you can get it much more definitely from someone like him; or you can think of the fact that in organic life or even in one single species, physical bodies are infinitely small and of no importance whatsoever. Bodies seem to be very destructible in the world as we see it today without altering matters at large, such as earthquakes and volcanic eruptions.

Now I'm longing to hear something from H.H.!

Prof. G. In this week's Reading (again it was prepared by Maureen and myself from answers His Holiness gave us), there is a longish quote right at the beginning of the paper which I think is very apropos to our conversation this evening:

S. If individuals have to communicate with each other and live in different places, in villages people use their feet – they walk around; if they have to go a bit further they use other means – cycles or horses. For longer journeys you can use a car, or for still longer distances a train. If you want to go still further – 8 or 10,000 miles, you take an aeroplane. Science has now provided us with another concept of travel – by rocket, so one can go from one planet to another as well. The verified results of their landing on the moon, and visits to other planets, are already available, and there is no doubt science can achieve all these things.

But there is another world to which you cannot go by horse, by bike, car, train, plane or even by rocket, and that world is *within the human mind itself*. How do you find the real communication in the mind? What are the ways and means you use? That inner world is very extensive indeed, and if communications within are not correct people can go mad, and there is no scientific solution to it. There is only the spiritual solution, the philosophy and the logic, the reason.

Unless you come to these things you will not be able to find proper communication. *The world which in truth is very little as far as physical things are concerned, is in fact very enormous.* The spiritual world is in fact one – *it is not in each single head* – but *one whole head* which is the universe.

(Record, 10 February 1982)

Dr. R. What about that?

Mr. Eadie. I have wondered what part of the mind one could possibly use to understand long before science knew it that the moon was heating up and was an embryo?

Dr. R. Science hasn't got there yet! About the moon becoming like the earth.

P.E. They know it is warming up and this seems to verify a truth that we were privileged to hear some time ago.

Dr. R. There are many things, you see, about a world which science cannot approach through mental calculation based on physical measurements, as H.H. points out in this extract which has just been read. We ought to spend more time exploring that world, the world that you can't travel to on a bus, or by bike or rocket.

P.E. Does it know all the Truth (Lady A. This spiritual realm?) Does it know objective Truth?

Dr. R. Does what know?

Lady A. The inner world.

Dr. R. Whose inner world? Nobody knows the whole truth, Eadie, but each of us knows a tiny part which he calls 'the world' and is different for everybody. It's the only part which he has actually experienced. Your remark is relative to a given individual; it can't be taken in general. There is no such thing as 'the inner world'; there is Peter Eadie's inner world or my inner world.

P.E. Is it not all there and we're just not in contact with it?

Dr. R. The Param-Atman is by definition the consciousness of the whole universe, and nothing short of that knows – no individual knows.

Now, Dr. Peter Fenwick has arrived and I much want to tell him and get his opinion about something which has been happening to me since I was let off the administrative hook and given this beautiful material which they have brought back from India. I find, just as that Upanishad – the *Mandukya*, the ‘frog’ Upanishad, says – that if I really do the two half-hours, in the morning half-hour (if I do it soon enough after waking) I’m still in a state of Samadhi where there is no movement of the mind at all. There is no difficulty of stopping thoughts, looking at my watch, or anything like that. And that stillness looks after the day to some extent. Having felt that for a few moments during the morning meditation, the day is different. Then I came to the evening meditation that is meant to look after the night when the inward looking hemisphere, (the inner world) takes over. And the night will be different. But I can do nothing about it. I’m supposed to be sleeping at night. But if I do those two half-hours just a little better than I ordinarily do, I get this Samadhi. I wake with it as if after a lovely bath. But *during it*, I know absolutely nothing.

The Shankaracharya’s tradition says that in the state of deep and dreamless sleep we have nothing between us and the Absolute or the Atman. But to *know* something about it is to be conscious instead of deeply unconscious as in deep sleep or during Samadhi and *that* must be an act of Grace from above. The Atman Himself will come in and help us, and unless that ‘luminous splendour’ lights us up, we remain in the dark.

On a bigger time scale of life and death, this is what, by all accounts, happens during the hour of death. Though many people are reported to have experienced it, after recovery from clinical death, very few people remember it; or in very few people does it make any noticeable difference to their next life or whatever. I wanted to ask whether you think that this Upanishad (written four to six thousand years ago, or rather passed down by word of mouth before writing was invented) which says that there are these three stages in human life every 24 hours, of which the lowest is the ordinary daytime state, the next is the world of dreams which with a little bit more consciousness, a little bit of elimination of self, is a creative world where poets write their poetry and painters paint, and the Causal world which ordinarily we know nothing about in deep sleep is the spiritual or emotional world? Whether there could be any maintenance of this conception that what we ordinarily think of as the three states of Consciousness is upside down? How would you deal with that, Dr. Peter?

Dr. Fenwick. I think I could accept that. We know that a lot of restorative functions go on during sleep and we also know that sleep isn’t a passive process at all – it’s a highly active one. More than that, we know that it’s impossible for any length of time to exist without sleep. So sleep is essential.

Dr. R. You can go for a few weeks without food. How long can you go without sleep?

Dr. F. To maintain your proper functioning, you can’t even go without a night’s sleep.

Dr. R. So that’s part of the basis on which you feel this position could be maintained – that we ordinarily see the states of consciousness upside down in importance or potential. The Shankaracharya says that each state is part of the magical state of the Atman and each has its

own function and its own importance. One is not more important than another but it's *differently* important.

Lady A. I was going to ask: the Shankaracharya seems to differentiate between the union or unity with the Absolute in sleep, which he calls in ignorance (Tamas), and the unity in meditation which he refers to as being in Sattva.

Dr. R. From my own experience now, I absolutely agree, and I think this can be maintained by psycho-physiology in that the three parts of the autonomic vary with the gunas; the predominance of Sattva is in the sympathetic division, the predominance of Tamas is in the cranial autonomic, and obviously the source of rage (the dominance of Rajas) is from sex centre, from the pelvis. Could not a case be made for bringing the autonomic into the picture more than it is?

Dr. F. Yes, very much so, particularly during sleep. There is now evidence that autonomic dysfunctioning in sleep leads to a lot of problems that one has. For example, duodenal ulcers occur during sleep, coronary thrombosis also occurs in sleep.

Dr. R. I think that the way to this is better meditation... one's own experience. (to Prof. G.) Do you feel like a little meditation? (yes)

MEDITATION

I think that many more of us in this room have experienced enough to make them want more, same as I have, and even more people at the big meetings, particularly the meditation meetings. So I would like them to hear what H.H. said. I can be forgiven, I think, for wanting to stay at home and experience more of this marvellous Samadhi which is destroyed by talking and thinking – almost instantaneously – so I'm applying for some leave.

Lady A. This was in our first audience. The Shankaracharya was talking about his connection with us in relation to guidance:

S. As far as guidance is concerned, there are two types of guidance. One is the manifest, physical guidance which is being conducted here and now and which has been given previously. But there is another level of guidance and care – that is the mental and spiritual care. That, he assures you, will always be available, has always been available. As far as physical contact is concerned, His Holiness has now retired from the institution which he was leading. He believes that his end is also nigh and he has to prepare himself, just as Dr. Roles is preparing himself, for the next stage of the journey. This being so, it is reasonable that he should devote as much time on inner work himself, so that the next journey is easy and right. There will be certain limitations on the time available because he wants seclusion from the world as much as possible. Nevertheless, if his health allows and if he is here and if he has free time, certainly whenever you need help he will be available. The doors are not closed at all. There may be longer intervals and shorter visits.

(Record, 9 February 1982)

Dr. R. Well, speaking as zero to infinity, that's what I want to do so as to be in the best position to help all of us be liberated.

I hope you all enjoy Cecil Collins' film. I'm certainly coming to enjoy it myself. Have you seen it, Bill?

Mr. A. Yes, it's lovely.

Dr. R. You seem to think it's worth coming to! (yes)

* * *