

22 March 1982

SMALL MONDAY MEETING

On the platform: Professor. Guyatt, Lady Allan

Prof. G. Well alas, no Dr. Roles this evening, so we'll all have to do the best we can without him. He's started what he calls his sabbatical – I'm told he's enjoying himself very much, so that's rather nice, and what's better still there's a rumour that he will be here next Monday.

Lady A. Hope so, yes.

Prof. G. So that's really good news as far as I'm concerned.

Lady A. Well he's coming on Thursday to the AGM.

Prof. G. Yes, but selfishly I'm delighted he's coming next week. So perhaps the best we can do this Monday is to formulate some questions on the material we read last week to help him for next Monday.

So, to start the ball rolling I've got some questions that John Hersey sent to Maureen which I'll read out and we might try to discuss them. These are based on last week's material. He says: 'What does it mean, the physical world is very little. If it is little, is it not sufficiently extensive for its purpose? What is its purpose? Is it a world of desire, of communication, of action? Who created it? What is it limited by, or what does it limit? I've seen a physical world become transparent, full of joy and instruction. Where is its littleness then?' So that's quite a lot of questions really. (laughter) I feel the answer must lie somewhere in the significance of this world, the physical world which we know can't be as great as the world that caused it. The Shankaracharya told us, did He not, that the subtle world was created by the Causal world, and the physical world was created by the subtle, so it is a chain of manifestation with the physical world as the end product.

Lady A. And he also said that the Spiritual or Causal world was not in each single head, but one whole Head, which is the universe; so perhaps in answer to John's question it isn't that the physical world is very little, but it's very little compared to the Causal world, because presumably in the same way the Causal level is not in each galaxy, but all galaxies, all cosmoses. So it's the sphere of influence and size of the Causal world relative to the physical world – it gives an enormous stretch.

Prof. G. Yes, I agree. Do people agree with that?

M. Skillman. We had a question at our meeting last week. Somebody asked how they might think about the subtle level of the universe in relation to the first or second of the quotations which drew an analogy between the physical, subtle and the Causal of the individual, also of the universe. We didn't get an answer of course! (laughter)

Lady A. Well, we got a sort of an answer which is rather intriguing, and gives one some scope for thought.

S. If you want to compare the universal world with such things as Manas, Buddhi, Chitta and Ahankar (which is really what you're asking which is the division on the subtle level of the Causal Antahkarana) which you find in each individual. In India the concept of gods has been evolved in such a way that they represent all these facets which one sees in the individual.

And then he gives some examples which I don't think are necessarily useful here, e.g. the god Chandra representing Manas. And then he says:

S. So all these concepts of gods are the embodiment of the Causal world exactly as you find in the individual and physical world.

(Record, 10 February 1982)

Lady A. I don't know if that helps. It's obviously a difficult concept. And in India they've found a way out, haven't they?

Prof. G. Well yes.

S. Cassini. I was wondering whether the subtle level of the universe has something to do with ESP and all the things which are very much in vogue at the moment? People seem to stop there, rather than realising that there is something beyond.

Prof. G. It may be. For myself I think of it as the world of ideas because there always seems to be an idea behind any manifestation in our actions or the way we live. In that sense I think the world we're talking about gives a form to the physical. What Maureen has just been reading about the gods connects with something I happened to read recently in the *Bhagavad Gita*. This was an interesting passage in which it spoke about how necessary we were to the gods and the gods were to us. It was a two-way situation. And it made me think and feel about the interaction between cosmoses. The idea of the relation between cosmoses being zero to infinity has always been a bit of a stopper to me – it's brought me up against a brick wall, but there must be an interaction which during the last week has been rather interesting for me because I've felt that not only am I rather necessary to my cells, but they are rather necessary to me. It's so strange the way we don't consider our situation even in this physical world. We don't remember that we're surrounded by air which is a food without which we couldn't live. We're all controlled by laws yet we take it for granted that we don't float about, and it would surprise you if I floated off this platform!

Again, one can't begin to conceive of a human being as a 'one-off'. His very essence is that he is mass produced; that he is a multiple and not a single thing. We're kept rigid by all these laws – we're kept upright by them – and we have all these influences raining down on us continually. We are, as part of humanity, in some sort of womb. It's quite clear even to a logical mind that we are kept alive for some reason and that we're supported and encouraged to live, yet this is a situation that we don't take much cognisance of. We take it all for granted and we're much more interested in our own individuality.

Mrs. Fleming. Would you say that the two-way purpose you mentioned is a question of consciousness that has to be manifested on the physical level? Isn't that rather the way?

Prof. G. Yes I would agree and I think that John Hersey's letter to Maureen ends up in the reason.

He says, 'I've seen the physical world become transparent and full of joy and instruction'. I think this is what it should be doing. It should start an upward movement.

J. Buscombe. At our meeting in thinking of this word 'instruction' we thought of guidance and instruction as coming from universal Conscience.

Prof. G. Yes, how is Conscience defined? It was feeling everything at once, wasn't it, as opposed to Consciousness – knowing all at once?

Lady A. Alice Bolton, who is here I think, asked me a question on Friday when she caught me in the hall. She asked about the Causal level of each of her cells. While I couldn't possibly answer that, it did strike me that you couldn't talk about, in relation to yourself, the Causal level of each cell, but you could talk about the Causal level of all cells or the cellular world. In relation to an individual it struck me that this must be what H.H. refers to as the spiritual world not being in each single head, but in one whole head.

A.B. I thought more in connection with the little bit of control in each cell and felt that if there was a happy atmosphere for my cells inside in relation to me that there would more likely be a happy atmosphere between me and other people, individuals, and I thought this represented, if not three cosmoses, at least three layers.

Prof. G. I'd love to know what Dr. Roles would say to that. I feel it's a good way to start, do you? It's a good approach to it.

A.B. But – does each cell have physical, subtle and Causal of its own?

Lady A. I don't know. I'd like to hear what Dr. Roles says. I feel that this is my trouble, that I want to think that I've got my own *individual* Causal level in the sense that I want it for myself and that the Shankaracharya has given one a hint in the phrase 'the Self that lives in the hearts of all'. I love that phrase but I realise that I nevertheless don't really merge into this universal Self. One still clings very much to the individual which is a sense of duality because the end of duality is when one gives up the desire for the individual and is ready to merge with the Universal – I think.

A.B. I first had the realisation that I was composed of elements of the earth and that they came into me and went through and went out of me and it was the same on the subtle level so there was no physical Alice Bolton, I was part of the earth. And I realised that I fed on other people's ideas and ideas streamed in and out of me, so there really wasn't a subtle Alice Bolton – so I am beginning to think there isn't a Causal Alice Bolton! (laughter)

Lady A. (to A.B.) Then why are you so keen that each cell should be so separate? (laughter)

R. Amis. There seems a very strong sense sometimes that the moment of bliss itself touches every cell at the same time, instantaneously.

Prof. G. That's jolly interesting because you've experienced that.

Dr. Connell. That suggests that cells have their own consciousness, wouldn't you say, and yet they have no individual existence by themselves.

Woman. Nor do we!

Lady A. They do seem to have joy.

Prof. G. Yes, and they all feel comfortable inside Alice Bolton! (laughter)

Lady A. Do you think we're in danger of getting tied to the physical level?

Prof. G. We are, aren't we, yes.

Mrs. Simpson. In those moments of joy, there is no duality. In some sort of way you are one.

Prof. G. Absolutely, yes. And of course this is the great aim, isn't it? I came on a terribly nice quote from Boethius the other day saying. 'He who is content to get to Heaven alone will never get there' which I think just about sums it up. Because of course my ego only thinks of getting to Heaven alone. (laughter)

J. Buscombe. We had a question which may be connected with that, asking why we were told to think of three cosmoses at the same time.

Prof. G. Could you answer it? (laughter) (J.B. No!) This may be wrong but I've tried to think of it in connection with the combination of forces. But this may be a complete red herring. What do you think?

J.B. I thought we were told originally that we could only see one above and one below, and yourself presumably.

Prof. G. And yet there is action that must come in there, mustn't it? I just don't know. I don't know what Dr. Roles would say to that.

Lady A. Following on from what John Buscombe said, I felt that with this idea if you could understand or feel, comprehend the relationship of these three, you would understand the whole. And I think in relation to the idea of physical, subtle and Causal, this might be borne out because there seem to be hints in this new material from the Shankaracharya that if you take the idea of physical, subtle and Causal, it can apply to the individual and the same idea can apply to the universal. So you can comprehend the universal through comprehending the individual.

J.B. I wonder about that because I thought that the physical, subtle and Causal comprised more than just three cosmoses.

Prof. G. I think they are. I did ask Dr. Roles last week whether one could think of the Causal, subtle and physical as cosmoses and he, I thought, said yes, rather surprised that I should ask it even. But I don't know.

Miss Scrutton. Is it a question of relativity of this idea of nought to infinity, because it's difficult to think of nought to infinity without thinking of the cosmos each side?

Prof. G. It may be, yes.

Lady A. He did speak a little bit about the elements in the individual and the universal which links a bit with various questions that have been asked:

S. The difference between the individual and the universe is only one of magnitude. Otherwise materially there is no difference. The individual is the expression of the

universal. Now we know that the individual is made of the three bodies – physical, subtle and Causal. Similarly the whole universal Being is also made of the same three bodies. And the expression of these three bodies has been given some time ago as the nine elements of this creation. We find from the make-up of all these same elements which are experienced in the world – earth, water, fire, air, space – we are all a conglomeration and arrangement of these elements and so is the universe also made out of all these things...

(and then he gives a word we haven't had before)

From Tanmatra arise all these elements. Tanmatra is the subtler state of the physical form, so from the subtle comes the physical and from the Causal comes the subtle.

(*ibid*)

And then he went on to give the example of the Manas, Buddhi, Chitta and Ahankar on the individual level as the different gods on the universal level. I don't know if that helps.

J.B. Taking the idea of the three levels, I thought we were supposed to think of the one below and the one above, so I felt I should think of the one below as cells.

Mrs. Fleming. It all sounds rather slow. It would all be realised much quicker, wouldn't it? And then one could apprehend three cosmoses or seven, it would be much quicker, more instantaneous?

Lady A. We have before, in considering three cosmoses, thought of cells but this is taking it from a physical aspect. And this time Dr. Roles asked us not to take cosmoses that way but to look for them *within*. And I felt this was a different approach and didn't involve dwelling on cells.

Mrs. Brunson. It seems to be a feel more of energies, of different speeds and energies, and therefore of penetration of energies.

Prof. G. I think you could look at it like that, yes. I've not got much sensibility for cells. I'm not really aware of them or conscious of them in any way. Rather than cells, and to come back to your idea of energy, I find it extremely interesting to think of the whole physical world as opposed to the mental world that lies behind it. This, to me, becomes fascinating. I suppose I talk almost professionally because one of the enjoyments of being a designer is manifesting an idea. This one does a lot, and of course we all do in a variety of ways. You don't have to be a designer to do that. But one sees very clearly when one has an idea, one actually manifests it, in my case on paper. And having done it on paper this makes an enormous number of lorries to shoot around, all sorts of men have to spend hours doing things in factories. It's an extraordinary process that one idea has started off. This is certainly, by analogy, the same as subtle to physical anyway. Somehow this is what we're part of – of this extraordinary process that starts at the Causal level and ends up in this room.

Lady A. I think that's a marvellous example because your one idea has set the whole Wedgwood factory zooming. But by analogy this is what we are not doing. We haven't enough confidence that one dip in the Causal level can set the whole subtle world zooming in the *right* direction. If we had the same confidence that a dip there would have this tremendous broad effect, life would be very different.

Mr. Koren. Isn't this just what Mr. Amis was describing when he feels the joy permeating all his cells, he is feeling a different cosmos.

Prof. G. Yes. And this is the direction Dr. Roles is urging us to take, isn't it.

Lady A. I think it relates right back to the beginning of John Hersey's question. He is asking about the limitations of the physical world but that isn't the point. We do see the physical world as vast. I saw a picture in a scientific magazine yesterday about 2 inches square, and it looked like one galaxy or something, but the title underneath said, 'This contains thousands of galaxies'. It's inconceivable, but seeing an enormous physical world should give us the confidence that the Causal world is even greater and we are permitted through meditation to take a dip in that twice a day and manifest it. It should be a fantastic idea.

Prof. G. Yes, it should. And H.H. was anxious to emphasise – he mentioned it several times – that if one did dip successfully, one created a steadiness in oneself, which he said scientists lacked for one thing! (But so do we.) (to Mrs. G.) Liz, you were saying something about manifestation being the end of a process.

Mrs. G. Yes, manifestation I find an extraordinary idea because we can only manifest on the physical level. You were saying you thought it was part of a cycle and suddenly it seemed quite clear that the Causal level was really animating everything and that manifestation is one of the results which in its turn must find the way and return to the Causal, so that there would be a cycle and that's why the human race has a special role. They have to develop possibilities to take the manifestation back to the Causal level.

Mr. Geoffroy. In the material you gave last week, there was a very strong hint that we should look for *Whose* intelligence. We're very apt not to look behind things today. One sees intelligence but doesn't look for the source of the intelligence – *Whose* intelligence? It's rather wonderful – we're always asked to look further, stretch beyond the manifestation of intelligence and look for *Whose* intelligence is manifesting.

Prof. G. Not only intelligence, was it? It was love as well as intelligence. Which is rather comforting I think.

Lady A. And he said, speaking of scientists, they had yet to find what it is that *uses* the intelligence. I liked that too. And what it is that expresses everything through love. That which loves and that which is intelligent has to be found.

Mrs. Fleming. Does this relate to the Fourth Room where we've been told higher intelligence and higher emotions come from? Scientists wouldn't know about that, would they?

Prof. G. I shouldn't think so (laughter) but I'm sure you're right. In the old work it was like that, wasn't it.

Mrs. Cardew. The new advance of some scientists seem to take account of the intelligence and the love, don't they?

Prof. G. It was apropos of this when we were talking to H.H. about the scientists that He actually said this. He was saying that although they might be aware of intelligence and love

permeating the universe, we should lead them to Who was intelligent and Who was expressing love. Can you find that?

Lady A. Yes.

S. Although scientists have come to the conclusion that intelligence and love are behind this creation, they have yet to find what it is that uses the intelligence and what it is that expresses everything through love. That which loves and that which is intelligent has to be found. These gentlemen should be led to it.

(ibid)

He said that with rather a twinkle!

S. Cassini. Has this got something to do with Mrs. Guyatt's question? We have been told that we have somehow to manifest what we are doing here in the world and this would bring other people to discover the Causal and that's what completes the cycle? Through experience they would then be led to experience the Causal.

Prof. G. Yes this is the way I think I see it myself. And it's the beginning of the ladder isn't it.

Mrs. Brunsdon. Don't we all experience the Causal all the time, but just don't know it?

Prof. G. Do you mean in deep sleep?

A.B. The whole of one's life.

Prof. G. I feel not, myself. I think we are refreshed in deep sleep by reaching there in a state of unknowing; but in this state there are too many clouds about, aren't there?

A.B. I wouldn't have thought we would be alive otherwise.

Lady A. I think there's a slight difference in words here. Doesn't Mrs. Brunsdon mean we're animated by it but we don't know it?

Prof. G. Animated by it, oh yes indeed, but in a sleepy way so we don't experience it at all.

R. Amis. Although we don't know it or experience it, don't we in fact perceive through it?

Prof. G. Yes, in spite of ourselves we're animated by it, and such as our perceptions are, indeed yes... but they aren't all that hot!

S. Harbord. Professor Guyatt, when the artist wakes up in us in dreams perhaps sometimes and creates the most magnificent things, isn't that the Causal?

Prof. G. Well I think it must be if it creates magnificent things. I mean you've answered your question yourself really.

S.H. Who is behind that?

Prof. G. The Causal level must be. But artists don't always create magnificent things, do they?
(laughter)

S.H. I said the artist in oneself.

S. Cassini. That reminded me of something Mr. Resuhi said when we went to see him once: that the form of the Mukabeleh was very important because people watching it who knew nothing of why we did it might perceive through the form what lay behind it.

Prof. G. Yes. Did you see that marvellous dancer on *Omnibus* last night? She was terrific, just what you're saying. She even talked about dance being a way of getting people on to a different level of consciousness.

Mrs. Simpson. Isn't it true that some modern physicists are seeking reality in the same way that the great mystics and Realized men of the East have done – they've come to the idea of a wholeness, instead of studying the parts.

Prof. G. It seems that way, doesn't it.

Mrs. S. It's a good trend.

Prof. G. It is a good trend. And how is this Society to fan it, as it were? That's one of the problems lying ahead of us, I believe. Dr. Roles sent us two questions asked by you, Bill (Anderson), I'll read them shall I? I don't know if you'd like to extend them at all?

You said that here is a thought attributed to St Anthony of Egypt. 'When a man prays, if he is still aware he is praying, his prayer is not perfect.' This seems to me to express something of the new attitude you were asking us to discover.

It also seems the same as when the Shankaracharya spoke of the meditation, the meditator and the object of meditation forming one.

W.A. That quote has also given me a lot of pleasure because over the years I've found it very hard to give up the idea of my own shut-in individuality; and it was lovely to find something in our Western tradition that expresses true unity without any dualism.

Prof. G. Yes. Your other question was: 'With the same object in mind, can we please hear soon the new material from India about how to deal with tensions in meditation? What we have learned recently about stillness has been a marvellous help, but it has also revealed what a coil of knots and cables I am most of the time.'

W.A. I've nothing to add to that! (laughter)

Prof. G. Well nor have I really, except that even spotting them in myself has been a great help. Haven't you found that, or do you remain a knotted coil? (laughter)

W.A. I just seem to find more and more and more! It isn't so much the movement but awareness of it – just so much tension that is stopping me concentrating.

Lady A. This was what was such a revelation when Dick Guyatt in India said that – that he had not realised that tension was movement and that increasing stillness led to dropping all the tensions you saw. That was such a help to me when you first said that.

Prof. G. It was to me too, but I'm sorry to hear they're increasing for you!

W.A. I suppose it's a wrong attitude to the meditation over the years. One hoped one's mind would go away. (laughter) But it wasn't being given its job to do.

Lady A. I think that's a wonderful way of putting it!

Prof. G. Well perhaps this would be a good moment to try keeping still for a few moments.

MEDITATION

Just to finish off, I'll ask Maureen to read a quotation from the Shankaracharya from our first audience.

Lady A. It comes back to the benefit of a brief dip:

S. In one of the diamond mines thousands of tons of stone are cut 300 feet below ground. It is brought up, broken up into small pieces, processed, washed, then spread out to dry. Then thousands of people are engaged in picking over these small stones and looking at them. All this process goes on and outwardly they may find about a hundred grams of diamonds.

This also happens in meditation. So you will have to give half-an-hour simply to get just a few moments of contact with the Self. And it is worthwhile because you do get a diamond, the Real force, the most valuable precious material of anybody's life.

(Record, 9 February 1982)

Prof. G. Thank you very much. Next week Dr. Roles should be here.

* * *

