

2 February 1982

### SMALL MONDAY MEETING

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

Prof. G. Well, there are no announcements this week, but Dr. Roles has asked me to say that there's been a very good feedback by the end of last week from the material from the groups and he found that the two meetings for the new groups were so on the ball he's given quite a lot of the record of those two meetings in the paper that you picked up today. Also there have been very good reports in from most of the other groups and there's a very wide consensus of opinion that the subject that people want to study is Cosmose – Cosmose studied from the inner point of view rather than from outside – so that's the direction we will be taking.

Dr. R. Then you two, as announced last week, are going to India so perhaps you'll give us the latest news on that.

Lady A. Yes. Dr. Roles suggested that we mention that Richard Guyatt and I met Mr. Jaiswal last Tuesday, and it was really rather extraordinary, almost sort of magical, because when we just happened to mention, we were talking about music and things, and Dickie Guyatt said 'Well this of course also refers to the problems of language', and Mr. Jaiswal then expressed exactly what Dr. Roles had said about the difficulties of translation and that he had been trying for all these years – that the Shankaracharya had asked him to try this, and Dr. Roles had been pressing; and he said 'I have tried very hard but I have come to the conclusion that it is impossible' and then he gave the reasons, which were just what you have mentioned here. And he was in absolute agreement with using stories and examples of H.H. to illustrate an important English word that we might choose to use, and that this would apply to *this* Group because we would have been given this example by H.H., and it might be different in another group; and he also says that after some time it would be wise to always go back to the source of the story that we've taken to check that we were still using the word rightly, didn't he? And this would make life very much easier on the visit. So we go with accord on translation.

Dr. R. Yes, so we are going to move, I hope, quite a big step forward as regards understanding what the Shankaracharya is meaning, on the one hand, and on the other we're going, of course, to see our Teacher, the now retired Shankaracharya, who remains our teacher forever. We don't have to change to the new Shankaracharya. Although he's an old friend of ours. That may be for future generations. So we're just going to resume that sort of contact... two reasons for going, and we look forward to your return with great hopes.

(Dr) Peter Fenwick, I rang you up yesterday partly to say how very thrilled I was with the talk you joined in at the Hove conference – a record of which you kindly sent me. I was going to put it in the Library but the editors of *The Bridge* want to have a word with you about it. I learned so much from reading that again and again – your very clear method of expressing the problem which is felt all round and particularly your analogy of the chalk and the paper.

The question before us is what your groups will do with this Reading (2). I think the greatest possible freedom as to how each group feels they would like to use the wealth of remarks and questions in it. Some may like to study the really excellent questions that the newer people (who have not all got to thinking alike) are interested in, and you can practise people in answering some key questions in such a way that you lead the questioner to the next step forward. As regards the Cosmozes, an outline was given at the big Monday meeting last week so I won't repeat it now.

And now we want the senior groups to have an airing. So there are a number of very good things said or asked by the old hands during the last two weeks. For the important thing is, I think, for each person to try and ask the right question – the most important question for each of them – and to wait in silence to give their own Atman a chance of showing them the answer. He's there all the time ready to answer. We are so quick to take the words out of his mouth that we never listen to our own answer. And one of the questions is voiced by Alan Caiger-Smith. 'The elephant story seems to force on each of us the question "If I was suddenly left entirely on my own, what do I know and understand for sure?" And the next question is "What of all I've heard has meant the most? What difference does it make?" How to formulate it so it can be communicated if need be.' What questions do you want that follow from those?

Lady A. Dr. Roles, if you are trying to see the Cosmozes in relation to the Subtle and Causal rather than the physical level, where do you put us as we are? Where do we begin in that scale?

Dr. R. Well, we really begin by coming out of the illusions that ordinary psychology has established over the centuries as what is considered to be the normal daytime state, which is in fact illusory... a question of habit. I'll start it like this quote (1972 Record): 'Meditation, meditator, and the object of meditation, these three always go together. There would be no meditation if either the meditator or the object of meditation were not there. The object of meditation is Param-Atman, the ultimate Truth, the Absolute Truth, and the one and only Truth that has real existence. That is the Self, the Consciousness of the whole Universe. There is no such thing as the world that we see and perceive from the point of view of dual existence. Yet we see a world around us. This seeing is like seeing a mirage. Unreal though a mirage is, we cannot dispel it by any physical means, that is we cannot dig it out with a spade or blow it away with artillery. As it is due to certain conditions limiting the light with which we see, it goes away only when those conditions have gone. Similarly, the mirage of the 'world' is due to certain conditions of ignorance and it goes away only when that ignorance is gone; and this is what a number of great painters have tried to do since the Impressionist period and specially what Cecil Collins (who is going to talk to us at our AGM) is trying to do every week at his art class – to get people to see the world around in a different and new way.

Prof. G. This seeing Cosmozes within one, Dr. Roles, is this really what it sounds like, namely observing different levels of Consciousness... is that the way *in* to this question?

Dr. R. *One* way, yes; but those are the big changes determined by the 'Alerting System'

discovered during the last decade. What happens when we wake up in the morning, having known nothing during sleep and suddenly (perhaps after a cup of coffee) the daytime world appears again. And then what happens when we emerge from that common rather stale world of everyday, into a magical world which we sometimes experience when the two hemispheres come together – the third state of Self-Consciousness. And what happens still further when Cosmic Consciousness is experienced? Those are the big changes.

But I mean smaller changes which you can observe several times during any given day. Mr. Ouspensky observed that the different centres, the instinctive moving centre, the emotional centre, the intellectual centre, were separated by the same Cosmic ratio or difference of time-space between one Cosmos and the next, and he advised us to observe the difference which we can easily verify of speed of different centres. Run downstairs, but if you try to get the intellectual centre to count the steps you may ‘fall and break your crown’ like Jack and Jill; because the moving instinctive centre is so much faster than the ordinary thought processes. And when the emotional centre is working in its pure state, it’ll lead you into another Cosmos (or even two Cosmoses) further away still. So, there’s plenty to observe in the course of a given day through observing the different speeds of the different psychological functions.

Prof. G. But I suppose (though we never really talk about it here) that sex must be something to do with Cosmoses.

Dr. R. Yes, and of course all these things cannot be thought about, they have to be experienced; and only if you have the experience can you compare notes with another person who has an equal experience. Sex uses the most powerful energy; it is the kind of creative force in everybody which is so quick and powerful as to be almost ungovernable and therefore people are afraid of it and do everything they can to reason themselves out of it. If you read the end chapter of *New Model* you’ll see that most of what we call sex is infra-sex, according to Mr. Ouspensky, and that above all there is nothing to be ashamed about. Luckily a lot of that shame has disappeared since my day.

But it’s not just a question of physical reproduction (continuing to fill Nature’s perambulators); not even just a question of the intimate relation of man and woman, between two people, which is their secret. On the subtle level it’s what keeps the breed high, for always when a civilisation is deteriorating there is a big increase in all the manifestations of infra-sex. And then on the causal level it is the energy which can unite you with the Divine.

Prof. G. Why I mentioned it was that it suddenly struck me as being a very clear example of entering another world, quite distinct from the ordinary one that we know.

Dr. R. You can’t expect an old man of 80 to know anything about that. (laughter) It’s for the younger generations to describe that, not for me! But as a doctor in whom many people confide, I believe that Mr. Ouspensky was right in fervently believing what you are saying.

Lady A. But Dr. Roles, a great love of one’s life such as, if one may be forgiven for saying so, such as one saw with you and Mrs. Roles, is so patently not ordinary that this must be connected with something on quite a different time scale.

Dr. R. Well, that’s a matter of luck, you know (Lady A. Yes, but nevertheless...) – the right man meeting the right woman!

Lady A. Yes, but the time scale seems very different.

Dr. R. Well I don't know – it's rather out of my depth. I'd rather somebody very young told me about it!

Gerald Beckwith. In the old system there used to be an idea that sex energy could be transformed into something else in the cause of Self-realisation. Is this idea still valid?

Dr. R. It's part of waking up but you can't work directly on it. I mean you can't say 'I'm going to transform my sex energy'. (laughter) Well, anyway, I do think that sex is not a good thing to discuss, because it's the *old intellect talking about something it understands nothing whatsoever about*. So I'd rather it wasn't the main subject of conversation of our groups! As I said at a lecture in New York, you can't wear your love life or your religion on your sleeve. Both flourish in secret.

Sue Cassini. Dr. Roles, is it terribly important about negative emotions because if we give in to those, it's bringing down the great speed of pure emotion.

Dr. R. Now, this is very important, Sue. We don't realise at all, even among ourselves here, how a single critical thought can bring you down from the peace of the Causal level. A single critical train of thought. Or it can block you when you are just on the way to experiencing that stillness on the Causal level because it slows all the emotion down. It allows the ego to get in the way and promotes wrong work of the different centres. So let us adopt Mr. Ouspensky's advice that because negative emotions are so quick that we can't block or stop or change the emotions themselves, but we *can stop their expression*, we can stop looking or speaking negatively. And when asked by somebody when we first met the Shankaracharya – 'Are there any rules and regulations in your set-up?', he said: Just simple things like 'Do to others what you would like them to do to you', and other simple things like 'Thou shalt not steal' – whether it be other people's reputations or books from our library (and I would like those books returned forthwith). Quite simple rules and regulations, especially in relation to meditation which should be utterly free and for everyone. That's why we want to remove it from the hoary hierarchy of Colet to neutral ground.

W. Anderson. It's interesting if you think of the relation of the Lord's Prayer to the Doctrine of the Cosmoes that the last petition was 'Deliver us from evil' which in the original I believe has the meaning of slander, and that every time we are negative we are slandering the Great World.

Dr. R. Yes, and when that is personified, as Mr. Ouspensky explained, you get, 'Deliver us from the slanderer' meaning the devil outside, not 'me'... But there's really a bigger meaning in those final two sentences of the Lord's Prayer for it really comes from the Socratic prayer, 'Give us those things that are good for us, even when we don't ask for them, but – and Mr. O. commented on 'why *but?*' – deliver us from evil even though we beg you for it'. So I think you must take those last sentences 'Lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil' as part of an ancient prayer which has been truncated. More questions... these are very exciting for me.

How can we blow away this mirage which is a certain attitude that we have built in, about ourselves and other people. We don't have to change anything outward. Our lives, our

structure, everything, are a miracle really. And so is the human body a miracle, but what is wrong with us is the view we are taking of it, of all these things.

M. Cullinan. Do we just have to remember we are holding the hand of the king?

Dr. R. Well, *just* have to remember! Yes we do. If we had the Param-Atman, and we can do that, have the Param-Atman in mind all the time, we can be leading our normal lives. Next step, holding his hand and everything would be different! So if that means a lot to you, hang on to that.

Mrs. Reid. Dr. Roles, when you remember that, is that the same thing as switching on the light, and is that the same thing as first conscious shock?

Dr. R. Don't take it that I know what any of those things mean! I realise now that I have been talking about them for years. *You* answer those questions – what those things mean. But actually it's putting yourself in the way of being able to switch on a light, or to *allow the light to switch itself on*, it's something more than remembering Param-Atman. The light has to switch on and love of Param-Atman is what will do it. The light comes from the Deuterocosmos, the Cosmos of the sun – we're just like a planet reflecting it.

Mr. Bullough. Dr. Roles, the idea of Love is very strong in Christianity, 'Love your enemy and your neighbour as yourself' – and if we did this then I suppose we'd be incapable of slandering anybody.

Dr. R. Oh yes, I mean it's put in the answer to the lawyer's question as a whole way of inheriting eternal life, isn't it, and he leads Christ to tell the story of the Good Samaritan. But what I would like to say is that we were taught by the Shankaracharya that there is an inner core of every great religion and there's no need to change our religion... because Christianity has this within it, this inner core which is the religion of the Atman – Sanatan Dharma. When asked what H.H.'s religion was, he said 'Sanatan Dharma' which is the religion of the Atman, expressed for him, in the Hindu religion. But Christianity, he pointed out, has its own Sanatan Dharma and if you read the Gospels in a certain frame of mind and with a certain amount of emotional energy and stillness, you will determine what is the true inner core of Christianity and what has been imposed on it by successive scribes and by customary thought. So, if that means a lot to you, Clifford, you go ahead on that and consult our friends at Mount Athos, though it's not necessary to live the life of a monk in order to experience Christianity, although the Holy Mountain has been a great Accumulator of Energy for the Christian world for centuries.

Mr. B. I can't take the 'miserable sinner' side of Christianity.

Dr. R. No, no! I don't like that either. It's much easier really to prove that there is an original innate goodness in every human being than there is a principle of sin in every human being. There is a goodness in every human being originally.

Mr. Eadie. Dr. Roles, there was a very interesting five minute talk given on the radio recently which said that 'sin' meant man being off-target, and I thought, in terms of evolution, this was really what sin was, and that all the rest of it was misunderstood.

Dr. R. Talking to your wife, Peter, one person in the new group says that it's possible for people to have different points of view – for instance you take the history of Ireland as written by the Irish and compare it with the history of Ireland as written by the English... and it comes out very differently! But there is only one set of facts. So it's again a matter of opinion, you see.

Mr. E. Yes, and when you are aiming for something, when you are not doing it rightly, your ego is in the way and then you are off-target.

Dr. R. Yes, I see what you mean.

Mr. E. That is the sin, not miserable sinner, but that meaning of the words.

Dr. R. And H.H. refers to the fact that love is what makes the world go round but if love is frustrated, prevented, it turns into hate. It's a rather similar sort of thing. You want to love but if your love is not permitted or returned it turns to hatred. You are off-target. Anyway, everybody's got some marvellous thoughts. What do we do here which can allow Satsang – good company – to permit exchange of thoughts which you don't ordinarily have a chance to do? And this is what I want to try and explore. And you come back from India and give us some help!

Mrs. Koren. You said Christianity had a word which I can't remember (Sanatan Dharma) as the inner core of it, and for H.H. his tradition had that same thing, could you say in a Fourth Way School that life has the same inner core, and that if we could get the 'T'-ishness out of our attitudes we would relate directly to that.

Dr. R. Yes I would, and that the fact that people belong to a different outer religion doesn't mean that they can't communicate, because they really have a core – the religion of the Atman... and if they're both looking and aiming at the Atman, they will have the same aim, whatever their religion, and you probably met in Mexico a nearness of outlook which wasn't vitiated by the rather different attitude to religion that you found out there. Would you say? You seemed to communicate beautifully with them out there.

Mrs. K. Yes, I think what you say is very true. Especially with somebody like Gilberto with his experience directly with his life and his land and which he communicated VERY clearly – from his Being really.

Dr. R. Yes, for he's the one that Irene Nicholson and Armando handed over to and he's kept the Spanish-speaking Mexicans together ever since; which is a marvellous job on his part, in spite of terrible heart operations which have given him great suffering. But he's still going strong, you found?

Mrs. K. Very much so.

Lady A. When you spoke of that common core in religions, I was very much reminded of Mr. Resuhi when he was here and staying with us at the farm, and some people probably here, we all went to the village church on Sunday and he came with us – and to see him standing in the aisle and giving a big Dervish bow to the altar was one of the most profound feelings. It was not an outward, it was an inner act and it was a very marvellous experience.

Claude G. I think he said Allah! (laughter)

Lady A. Yes Claude was there and said that he bowed deeply and said Allah... but, of course, in the Lebanon all the Christians say Allah (Dr. R. Why fight each other in the Lebanon?) I know... because the Lord's Prayer begins with Allah there.

Dr. R. Anyway what about coming out of our mirage and really getting to this change of attitude about ourselves which can be done on the subtle level in three weeks if you go at it fairly intensively? Mr. Ouspensky proved over and over again to us that you can't change your nature because everything is so closely intermeshed, but we can change our *attitude* in three weeks. We've been at it an awful long time. H.H. says that, again, our bodies are so intermeshed and their structure and function so established by evolution over the centuries that we can't do very much changing the physical life, but (quote) 'there is no difficulty whatsoever in changing our subtle level... changing our psychology'. I was a bit peeved when I heard him say that there was no difficulty whatsoever, but I've since discovered that there really isn't.

Pam Varley. Dr. Roles, is that the reason why you said it was just a matter of giving up the small habit, *small* habit, of putting 'I' into everything, because I find this rather a large habit.

Dr. R. It isn't. We magnify it you know. We try to do too much all at once and if you take it coolly and remember that during the daytime we're supposed to be doing our jobs not thinking of ourselves. Supposing a Doctor is thinking of himself and how awful he feels all the time, he doesn't do his patients much good! In the same way, we don't do ourselves much good by permitting this silly little habit that we've got into, of intruding, usually negatively; in Britain today we have a poor opinion of ourselves.

Claude G. It does seem that if something big gets inside us there's no room for all this nonsense. We can't force this. We can't bring it about.

Dr. R. No. Of course you're lucky, you go to Provence! And in spite of the Mistral you have a marvellous time – your postcard showed it, Adeline. And it's undoubtedly a fact that going to a new place suddenly jerks you into a new world, but how to get into this new world when you *can't* go to a new place? I like very much, Peter Fenwick, the way you spoke about Florence because my wife and I had exactly the same idea, and the same experience of feeling that Florence (and Venice) are so rich in Renaissance experience as compared to India, that India seems like a desert – and really, that's one reason why I want to use the Western tradition and not switch over to some Eastern tradition to which I don't belong.

Lady A. That was very interesting – Professor Guyatt will probably confirm this – what Mr. Jaiswal said too. He said that India has H.H. and a few like that, but on the ordinary householders' level there was absolutely nothing to meet it or make use of it, no structure or gatherings or groups of people like there are here, and how wonderful it was that so many people could be helped here because we had this.

Dr. R. Well, we've got a marvellous opportunity just now; we may be going to go through some difficult times but I think everything is being made available for the West, for the free world, and that we here at Colet want to have a role to play in this.

Sue C. Dr. Roles, can you say more about changing your attitude in three weeks?

Dr. R. No Sue, I can't *say* anything more about it! I just like doing it and seeing *you* do it!

Ron Miles. You've used the word 'allow' on a number of occasions tonight. That seems to point the way.

Dr. R. Yes. We keep on teaching the Creator his business, whereas if you allow the Creator to do the creating, things happen and that's what is meant by keeping Param-Atman in your heart; loving Param-Atman and keeping him in your mind and heart and letting him get on with it for you. And this comes from *stillness* and if you first of all still the ordinary noisy psychology which is going on in one's mind all the time, you get the stillness on the subtle level where Nature provides moments in between desires and the thought processes come to an end. Then if you can just take it a step further and when you snap out of all those psychological processes which are silly little habits and when you are lucky enough to feel complete satisfaction with what *is*, then you get the peace on the Causal level and it amounts to (quote) 'total surrender to or complete faith in the Will of the Absolute' and you will find that you 'accept what comes without reflection or opposition'. This is really what 'giving up' means – giving up your own feeling that you are the doer, your own ambition, your own opinions and allowing nature to do it.

So let's just for a moment 'allow' a little peace and quiet. We've got five minutes.

#### MEDITATION

Well I'm afraid five minutes is up – so I only ask one thing. That you don't read anything that's in print already about Cosmoes so that we make a fresh start; and you may find in Reading 2 some hints. (To Lady A. and Prof. G.) I wish you both a nice easy journey and safe return, and I'm sure you'll get something unexpected, unpredictable, (Lady A. I expect so!) because *anything Conscious is unpredictable. It's only mechanical things that can be predictable.*

\* \* \*