

## VALUES

Each individual member of our group must value its existence, not only for personal reasons but because it is the only group that studies the knowledge that Mr Ouspensky left us. We are steered through that System of knowledge by Dr Roles's papers, especially those he wrote after he first met the Shankaracharya. Though he was convinced that the teaching HH practised was the origin of our System, yet the two are far from identical—for instance, Western formulations of specific areas of knowledge such as Cosmoses and Hydrogens do not appear in H.H.'s teaching. We are fortunate in having Mr Ouspensky's and Dr Roles's paper which cover these areas; it falls to us as a group to see that their content is passed on to others.

Our Western System is based on an intellectual presentation of the knowledge while H.H.'s is emotional, so that between them we have a fine spread to which to turn for the increase of our understanding, as the following two examples show. The first from the first audience in October 1977 and the second from the opening paragraphs of Mr Ouspensky's *First Cosmological Lecture*.

H.H. The body is the product of the Sanskara (nature) and the Prarabdha . . .

[*Note on Prarabdha*. We first heard this word when it was introduced in answer to this question from a correspondent in Malaysia: "Regarding the three worlds we live in, I have often wondered about the difference between the physical and subtle worlds. The other day I tried out a recipe, but found that at every step in making the dish, it was not going as it was meant to. Could I take it that the recipe was in the subtle world and the act of cooking was in the physical world? It struck me at that time how easy it was mentally and how different it was physically."

H.H. (reply) " . . . The making of the dish was not going as it was meant to because Reason (Buddhi) was not helping enough. Apart from Buddhi, the factor of Prarabdha also comes in with regard to success in doing something. If Buddhi and Prarabdha both support a physical act, things go as desired and success is inevitable."

*On application to the interpreter (R.L.Dixit.) for light on this meaning of Prarabdha, we had this reply:*

"I could not find an exactly equivalent English word. Prarabdha belongs to the concept of re-birth and as such it makes no sense to those who do not believe in any such phenomenon. Out of the countless good and bad acts done by an individual in all his past lives, Prarabdha is that parcel of them for escaping the consequences of which his present life is intended . . . Prarabdha is inescapable, and it would search us out wherever we might be, just as a calf can search out its mother from among a hundred cows. It manifests itself in what we ascribe to 'luck' or 'chance' of destiny' . . . Though it can be helpful or unhelpful in our worldly efforts, yet it would not stand in the way of our spiritual progress; just as the recitation of a mantra would be useful even if the back is not straight." (Record 1972 pp. 30, 31, 32, 92)]

. . . and however the body has been designed according to the ingredients of these two, it is very difficult to tailor it according to one's desires, because it is materialised and finalised. It will go by the laws which it is designed, or forced, to follow. But as far as the subtle level is concerned, that can certainly be controlled, there is no difficulty in controlling the subtle level at all—that is within the realm of the human endeavour through special means. The means to do that is to go into the Causal level. The third level is described as the Prashanta (deep peace), and H.H. says that, the simile which is given to the Causal level of peace is the ocean. The ocean embodies all the three levels; the surface is always in turmoil, there are short waves always going on; the middle of the ocean has very little movement, but the deepest levels of the ocean never have turmoil of any sort - they are always at great peace.

It is only through the meditation that one can enter into the Causal peace which is very deep peace. The system of meditation has been described and one can go into this without any difficulty, and it would seem that this region of the causal level appears to be experienced very briefly as far as the time factor is concerned, but its potency is great. Its effect goes on for a much longer period, for a longer stretch,

just as, for example, when you have a meal lasting for ten or fifteen minutes, then this ten or fifteen minutes of taking food will keep one going and working for hours and hours on end, and if one gets tired or hungry again, then one returns for more food again.

In exactly the same way, this meditation which takes you to the deepest levels of peace, is good enough to give you enough strength and energy and sustained peace for sufficient time for you to keep your subtle level trimmed to your desire. You cannot trim your body to your desire, but although you may be a puppet on the physical level, you are not a puppet on the subtle level at all - you are a man.

\*

And this is the opening of Mr Ouspensky's *First Cosmological Lecture*:

Every system of philosophy and every serious student at a certain stage of their work or development must come to the conclusion that it is impossible to study man without the study of the universe, exactly as it is impossible to study the universe without the study of man. Man is an image of the world. He was created by the same laws which created the whole of the world. By knowing and understanding himself, he will know and understand the whole world, all the laws that create and govern the world. And at the same time, by studying the world and the laws that govern the world, he will learn and understand the laws that govern him. In this connection some laws are understood and assimilated more easily by studying the objective world, while man can only understand other laws by studying himself. The study of the world and the study of man must therefore run parallel, one helping the other.

In relation to the term 'world' it is necessary to understand from the very outset that there are many worlds, and that we live not in one, but in several worlds. This is not readily understood because in ordinary language the term 'world' is generally used in the singular and if the plural 'worlds' is used, it is used merely to emphasise, as it were, the same idea, or to express the idea of various worlds existing parallel to one another.

Our language does not have the idea of worlds contained one within the other. And yet the idea that we live in different worlds precisely implies worlds contained one within another to which we stand in different relations.

If we desire an answer to the question 'what is the world or worlds in which we live?' we must first of all ask ourselves what it is that we may call world in the nearest and most immediate relation to us.

To this we must answer certainly that we give the name of world to the world of man, to humanity, of which we form a part. But humanity forms an inseparable part of organic life on the earth, therefore it would be right to say that the world nearest to us is organic life on the earth, the world of man, animals and plants.

\* \* \*