

52. Ouspensky's Fourth Way (4)

1. G. Beckwith continues with esoteric psychology in ch4 of Part 2.

First he divides the human structure into the usual three storeys or zones calling them Head, Heart and Hand [=head, chest, abdomen]. The intellectual centre and Higher Intellect are on the upper storey. The ordinary intellect is said to be the driver and the Higher Intellect (with Higher Emotion) is the "Home of Real I". The ordinary emotional/feeling centre is in the middle storey and the Higher Emotion (with Higher Intellect) is, as said, "Home of the Real I". The moving or doing centre is in the lower storey and so are sex and instinctive centres. The ordinary emotion is termed "The Horse" and the entire lower storey "The Carriage". (P217-218.)

2. Three observations are necessary here. First, this is somewhat confused since, just before, GB said that the "reins are the mind (the lower parts of the mind including the basal ganglia) which conveys decisions and intentions and the driver is the discriminating intellect" (217). The so-called "lower parts of the mind" are not shown in the "schematic picture": there is no lower mind and "discriminating intellect" but only "Intellectual /Thinking Centre: The Driver"!

Second, O does not give such a picture and arrangement anywhere.

Third, the Real I or Master cannot be in any of the three storeys: this would make it a function and so put limits to what is unlimited and not a function.

GB here is thinking both of the old system and some new information from Śāṅkarācārya but does not quite succeed in uniting the two. The Vedāntic approach is rather different – without all these "centres".

3. On p229 GB does give the diagram of an upturned cone or spindle with the Absolute at the very top and Paramātmā just under – Paramātmā being the Super [or universal] consciousness. Then the Ātmā is below in the Causal body as a circular platter, followed by Subtle body as a larger platter and below this an even larger platter as the Physical body. Here there are no centres and the four levels correspond to the four bodies of the old system; but the terms are Vedāntic and the schematic picture is nowhere to be found in O. What is more, the Ātmā, being the true Self and of the same substance as the Paramātmā, cannot be a manifestation like the causal body!

This presentation in GB follows from a brief examination of energies which arise from the metabolism of the three foods we take – solid stuff and water, then air and then impressions. This is illustrated in two diagrams (p223, 225) which come from G's exposition and the diagrams on pages 182-190, *In Search of the Miraculous*.

So in these areas too we find nothing new: we have only reproductions of G's "fragments". Anything new comes from Vedānta and F. Roles, not from O.

4. In chapter 3, GB deals with the Laws of Three and of Seven, the Octave and the Ray of Creation with its number of Laws for different cosmoses. Here again there is nothing much that is an innovation from what we find in the formulations and diagrams earlier, in O's *In Search...*

The lateral or parallel subordinate octaves are the same. So is The Diagram of the All-living or "Step Diagram" (GB p211, O *In Search...* p323). Of course, O, on G's suggestions, did develop the idea of time duration in different Cosmoses or magnitudes from the electron to Protocosmos (*In Search...* pp 329-341). G refused to discuss all this as too theoretical.

A serious question arose in my mind when I first saw this Diagram (and others like it) and must arise in every enquiring mind: How could the Protocosmos or Absolute (p 200 in GB), be limited (even by a huge or a very small number)? It could be so limited, only if it were taken as a lower and measurable entity, as G had said. But then it could not be the Absolute Absolute.

5. Finally, the Enneagram has been developed to a great extent but it was done by Dr. Roles and I find it all very complex and theoretical.

The food-octave (p225 in GB) and the food-digestion on the Enneagram (p272) still use hydrogens (768,384 etc.). If Dr. Roles and his successors had looked into the Āyurvedic aspect of the Vedic Tradition (which is the Indic Medicare), they would have found an Octave reaching the sensory impressions (not between Sol and La, as is presented on their Diagram, p272 in GB but) at the interval Si-Do when the substance of "marrow" can go either toward semen or toward ojas "mindstuff". And God knows how far back goes this Vedic knowledge of *āyurveda*.

Frankly, the "Ouspensky Fourth Way" is no more than a myth: O proved too conservative and, in fact, retained G's Fourth Way.

53. Leon MacLaren's death

1. According to the evidence of thousands of years of human history every birth ends in death. Many traditions, especially of the East, teach that death is followed by (re-)birth. But this has no absolute proof. The dead do not come back to our life to tell us what happens after death. Moreover, the propounders of reincarnation say that some people can reach such a high level of Being that they are not born again. So rebirth is not so absolutely inevitable and universal as dying.

And so even wise gurus and divine incarnations pass away. Often their disciples relate miraculous events associated not only with their life but also their death – as obviously with Jesus.

2. Ouspensky's last few weeks or months are of great interest. But before we look at his case, I'll examine Leon MacLaren's last few days as I myself had a close connection with him and his biographers.

Mrs. Dorine Tolley, nee Van Oyen, whose parents looked after the School in Amsterdam under the general guidance first of Dr. Roles and then of LM (=Mr. L. MacLaren), looked after LM from 1972 until his death in 1994.

In 2008 she published (privately) her Memoir of LM's life and work in a book with the title *The Power Within*. There are some minor errors but they don't affect the main strand of LM's course. E.g. on p193, the three verses in LM's handwriting are not from the translation of the Hymn of Creation as is said but of the *Hymn of Puruṣa* (Primordial Man), both from Book 10 of the Ṛgveda.

3. Anyone interested in LM's course of life and the story of the SES which still remains alive and strong with LM's successor, can read Mrs. Tolley's book. Here, I shall focus only on LM's last days, described in the penultimate chapter "Final Destination".

LM's physical collapse started several months before the actual end. He began, contrary to his previous habit, to neglect his physical appearance and the clothes he wore (p309) and his temper was "unbearable" (310).

He was also full of contradictions. He told Miss van Oyen off for looking after a group of ladies and not himself, but then he explained that he was putting her to test (p 311). He also repudiated the ancient Hermetic writings which she and Clem Salaman had translated into English and one of the pieces *The Poimandres* was read at a gathering of all School-leaders. (I should say here that I dismissed that piece as valueless when I heard it, was very surprised that others took it seriously and much later wrote an academic paper showing its deep flaws.)

4. LM's health deteriorated very rapidly once they arrived in South Africa in the summer of 1994, at the beginning of the annual world tour.

“He ate very little and kept asking for the end of his life. He started to become confused wanting to [go] to a Chinese restaurant while he could not even stand up.” (p316)

Later LM became “quite disorientated asking [Mrs. Tolley] to phone his brother who had died some years previously and asking to see photographs which she had never seen. The doctor had said this was to be expected because of dehydration” (318-319)

5. LM’s state of confusion continued throughout the return journey to England and to Mrs. Tolley’s demonstrations of love and care in the plane he said “You must give me my clothes when I get there, I must see them all”.

On arrival, LM was driven quickly to a hospital. Although he emerged “reborn” after the nightmare in the plane, “he seemed not to notice us... [and] he just looked at us as if we were strangers... for the next ten days until he died” at 6.20pm on the 24th June, 1994.

Mrs Tolley was subsequently told that at the time “the heavens opened and all the elements made their presence felt, thunder, lightning, wind and rain”.

But of course, even in June a storm would not be surprising in England.

54. Leon MacLaren's death (2)

1. G. Beckwith in his Ouspensky's Fourth Way (2015) refers to Mrs. D. Tolley's *The Power Within: Leon MacLaren, a Memoir of his Life and Work* (2008) but not to Brian Hodgkinson's *In Search of Truth* which is "The Story of the School of Economic Science" (2010, Shephard-Walwyn, London) covering not only Leon MacLaren's life and work but in greater detail the different aspects of study and work of other individuals and groups within the School. The book covers also the 15 years after MacLaren's death under the leadership of Donald Lambie.

2. In a way this book reminds me of the effort of Eusebius of Caesarea to narrate the history of the Church and Christianity until the time of Emperor Constantine in the early 4th cent. CE *Historia Ecclesiastica 'History of the Church'* and its unfinished continuation *Vita Constantini 'The Life of Constantine'*, and thus vindicate the Emperor who had executed his son Crispus and his wife Fausta (326 CE) not mentioned in his writing.

There is an important difference. There were no Gnostics, Arians and other "heretics" regarding the School and the teaching in London as with Christianity at Constantine's time. At all times it was LM's teaching transformed and inspired since 1965 by the ancient Advaita teaching (= unity, non-duality) of the Śaṅkarācārya of Jyotir Math, Śrī Śāntānanda Sarasvatī in the Vedic Tradition.

It was the same with LM's teaching of Economics which had been based on Henry George's vision of every man's right to have free access to land for place of habitation and working, as to air and sunshine; also the imposition of a Single Tax on land-values (i.e. Land Value Taxation) omitting all the other usual taxes which discourage development, investment and work generally.

Nobody ever challenged the Philosophy teaching or that of Economics in all the history of the School, although several people wrote and rewrote (some of) the lectures.

3. There is a brief chapter on Ouspensky's teaching (ch 4: pp 34-41). But in fact, eventually LM did away completely with the Ouspensky "system". Whatever ideas were retained, they were reformulated and totally subordinated to his own comprehension and presentation of Śaṅkarācārya's Advaita teaching.

LM much better and more fully than Dr. Roles fused together the old with the new - the Gurdjieff-Ouspensky tradition with the Advaita of Śaṅkarācārya.

And Mrs. Tolley corroborates my view when she writes (p55, *The Power Within*) that Prof. R. Guyatt of the Study Society acknowledged with admiration LM's achievement in this respect when she showed him some of LM's lectures.

G. Beckwith expresses a very different view because perhaps either he never saw LM's lectures or he is too attached to his own Ouspensky-Roles tradition.

4. Hodgkinson's book is very well written and almost tediously factual and comprehensive, due to the author's honest scholarship.

However, some points remain in darkness as he glides over them without further investigation, information, or explanation.

According to one student, MacLaren had said "that everything in the New Testament is true". I doubt this – unless it was said at an old period when LM had not read very carefully the NT. I showed clearly in the early Es4 and Es5 that there are enormous discrepancies and contradictions in the Four Canonical Gospels not to mention the *Acts*, the *Epistles* and the hideous *Apocalypse*. Besides, LM used the Gnostic *Gospel of Thomas* (cited on p69 of Hodgkinson's book but has no place in the Index) which is vastly different from the FCG. The forgery *The Gospel of Peace...* is cited on p109 and LM was unfortunately taken in by its absurdities, perhaps because initially he felt its general run accorded well with his own puritanical tendency in some areas but soon later abandoned it.

5. The more important point, perhaps, is L MacLaren's Will and Testament, not mentioned by Hodgkinson but discussed by Mrs. Tolley in her book (331ff) and reproduced on pp333-4. Hodgkinson mentions (p323) "a difficult copyright dispute with Dorine van Oyen [=Mrs Tolley]" thus covering up the real issue and leaving unconnected and unexplained the reasons why some Schools broke away from London (pp235, 311).

In December 1993 LM designated Donald Lambie as his successor. Later, in May 1994, he had his Last Will drawn up and duly signed leaving **all his estate**, "oral and personal" and "all manuscripts and papers and correspondence" to Miss Doreen van Oyen who, however, should make all this available to Mr. Donald Lambie whenever he needed them.

After LM's death Miss van Oyen left and went to Amsterdam to look after her very old mother and help her brother run the School there – which was one of the oldest, established by their parents. Mr. Lambie called on lawyers who decided that LM was a servant of the School's Executive Committee (although he appointed and dismissed them as he pleased!) and therefore the copyright of his works (lectures, music, books etc) belonged to the Executive!

It is extraordinary that these two people, closest to LM in the last period of his life, and the members of senior groups and the Executive should in their own separate ways ignore their Master's last wishes!

I contacted B. Hodgkinson on these matters and he told me that he "had to use discretion"!

Perhaps a future edition of *The Search for Truth* will clarify these issues.

55. Publicity

1. I can understand why Plato wrote his *Dialogues*. His main tenets were needed and they were and still are good literature. He did say though that some ideas in his teaching are not expressed in the Dialogues.

I can understand why Gurdjieff produced his own writings mixing so wondrously reality and fantasy - always true to character.

Ouspensky obviously wanted with his early publications (*Tertium Organum, Fourth Dimension* etc.) to leave his mark on philosophical thought.

I can understand (and am grateful) why Krishnamurti wrote down in 1961 his experiences for about 6 months. These notes were first published in 1976 and are magnificent descriptions of visions from a higher level of consciousness.

I can understand why Leon MacLaren wrote the *Nature of Society and Essays in Economics* thus formulating clearly the Natural Laws in Economics.

2. I can also understand why so many people wrote books about Gurdjieff and Ouspensky and some published O's notes and lecture materials.

I gather that the successors of Dr. Roles in the Study Society allowed the publication of his *Conversations with the Śāṅkarācārya* and their dissemination.

Soon afterwards several people, outside the Study Society somehow bought copies. It seemed a most unhappy situation and some thought the copies should be returned! But this last was impossible, of course, as there were new copies and photocopies in a wild proliferation.

In any case, for some time now all of Dr. Role's lectures (several thousands of pages) are now available on line on the Internet!

And now we have books on MacLaren and on his School. D Lambie undoubtedly approved of Hodgkinson's *In Search of Truth* and may even have suggested it himself.

But I feel sure that neither Roles nor MacLaren would have allowed all these publications. I certainly would not.

3. I suspect numbers of students coming in these organisations have dropped and are dropping out. Such publications may be thought to attract people - except Mrs. Tolley's which seems to have an altogether different motive.

Obviously vanity is another important motive on the part of numerous authors. Also the desire for financial gain. These are hidden below the more ostensible and "ethically correct" motive of passing information and helping others to understand.

Surely there are many decorous forms of advertising. It is not necessary to bring out to public view your dirty underwear.

Nor of course to cast esoteric pearls before swine.

The drop in intakes must be due to other forces, not lack of publicity. Publicity was much poorer in the middle of the 20th century or the beginning of the 21st but the numbers were not at all small then.

4. It is strange that all these occultists who taught one or other version of this wonderful teaching did not find more fitting successors. Dr. Roles as a successor of Ouspensky has been a remarkable exception; but his own successors have proved inadequate.

It seems to me that the intellectual aspect (= information) increasingly takes over and the emotional (= being) is subtly disregarded. Greater effort and longer time is required for spiritual development despite the great aid of meditation.

What we sow that do we reap: the inexorable Law of Nature.

But it must be also the relentless descent into the Kali Yuga (or Iron Age) where virtue and strength, knowledge and love diminish according, again, to the Law of Nature.

56. Ouspensky's last days

1. G. Beckwith does not refer to B. Hodgkinson's history of the School of Economic Science. He may have read it and found nothing worth reporting in his own *Ouspensky's Fourth Way*. At least he has consulted and does refer to Mrs. D. Tolley's biography of Leon MacLaren, which is not in the bookshop of SES, probably because she kept open the matter of L. MacLaren's Will and Testament. (N. Kazanas also broke his contact with the SES. He published a very scholarly study of the Economics taught in the SES as found in texts of the Vedic Tradition, *Economic Principles in the Vedic Tradition* in Delhi, 2010, dedicating it to MacLaren acknowledging him as his guru. This book too is not for sale there. But I am sure the search for Truth continues).

2. Beckwith (GB hereafter) refers to an unpublished typescript *Last Remembrances of a Magician* (=LRM hereafter) which is held by people of the Study Society but is now available on some sites of the Internet. It exists in several versions, it seems. But all these in the general circulation are incomplete: chapters 9-13 and part of 14 are missing. The missing chapters are "classified" and only if you are fortunate enough to obtain a copy and read them you realise why they are kept under lock and key! Yes, I do have some of these and will use them hereafter.

This was written, it is generally said, by Dr. Roles and Rodney Collin Smith, both of whom were with Ouspensky at Lyne Place from 23rd January 1947 when he returned from America to England until 2nd October 1947 when he died.

Some passages seem to be by R (=Dr. Roles) but by and large the style of writing suggests CS (=R. Collin Smith). I doubt Dr Roles wrote any of it.

3. GB introduces LRM on p16 after a reference to esoteric schools in O's *New Model of the Universe*. He cites a passage about schools perhaps existing, as O thought at times, "on another plane" and ascribes it to the Preface whereas it occurs on p7 of the Introduction.

The point is that he then quotes from LRM (pp50-51, ch7) that "sometime between 1942 and 1943 some very deep change seemed to take place in O" and then, on 1/9/1947, O said:

"I found school. Did not expect to find school, but found school. Five years. People are working there still."

Later: *"Took long, long time. Still, I understood certain things." And again: "Then, I said many fantastic things. Now I know less".*

GB implies that in 1942-3 O may have found a school "**on another plane**" in the USA and revealed this suddenly in 1947 in England. Stranger miraculous things have happened, of course. But since O mentions 5 years, why not take it that he referred to the five years he studied with G in Moscow starting in April 1915 up to Constantinople in 1920, when their ways parted and O went to London and G to Berlin?... This would be more understandable.

Another point is that O dismissed the notion of Schools on a different plane in his *In Search of the Miraculous*: he wanted a School on the ordinary spatiotemporal plane.

In the next paper we shall begin to explore more diligently the LRM.

57. Ouspensky's last days (2)

1. The unpublished text LRM (= *Last Remembrances of a Magician*) is very strange. No wonder it was left unpublished and chapters 9-13 and part of ch. 14 were kept apart as "classified" for the few select. However, after Dr. Roles' death in 1982, someone or some people in the Study Society decided that all the knowledge collected there should be publicised and so publications began to appear and items began to circulate on the Internet.

The LRM, still unpublished as a book, starts as a historical narrative and continues as such giving an abbreviated biography of O in chapter 1; then ch.2 opens with O's arrival in England from America on 23/1/1947. The subsequent chapters deal with the months that followed and particularly from chapter 8 onward with September until O's death on 2/10/1947.

Very soon, however, the reader becomes aware of a change in the intention of the author(s). There is an agonised effort to prove something.

2. Three aims appear very clearly. First, everything that happens is full of significance to everyone present, i.e. all those who were with O closely to the last. Second, O is made into a kind of superman orchestrating events, guiding actions and helping to transform individuals. Three, all action unfolds as in a drama, a predetermined theatrical performance.

Often ordinary or unreasonable acts are presented, or interpreted, as expression of a higher will imposing itself upon a recalcitrant reality. If an opposite action took place, it would, you feel, be presented in the same way. This too happens.

Often illogical utterances of O (mainly) are interpreted as expressions of higher mind connected with previous or subsequent utterances. Nothing said is taken at its value, as inane or absurd due to a state of confusion.

Occasionally it is admitted that there is a muddle. In chapter 6, for example, on p 46: "All was such a muddle that nothing worse could come". But soon after an explanation is given to dispel the "muddle".

3. In chapter 2 of LRM, O returns from USA in Jan 1947. He is a frail old man who walked with difficulty and "spoke-to those who thought in terms of the exact language he had previously used - incomprehensibly". (Note the implication that those who thought somehow otherwise could comprehend!)

"He seemed to say that there was no teaching, no method, no discipline; he had never heard of a system or a school". (Note the "seemed" whereas he actually did say so!)

From the second year in America, O's approach began to change. His answers "become less and less explanatory, more and more enigmatic". In subsequent years, 1944-6, students from England visiting America noted the change in the "communication or this higher man and his followers". (Note the "higher").

During the spring of 1946 (no exact date given, p14), O's "health began to deteriorate rapidly, and to an extent that could hardly have been anticipated".

No details at all are given about this health deterioration, the nature of illness or medical examinations. Only in December "he began a series of very heavy nose bleeds. These attacks left him very weak. He had great difficulty with the stairs, and began to find it too exhausting even to shave." Yet he was constantly asking about sailing!

4. Once, "perhaps in September, he told Miss Quinn about a dream he had had. He was a baby again, but he knew everything, remembering everything. As he lay in his cot, his father playfully spoke to him. He was about to answer when he remembered that as a baby he must not speak, **that above all he must tell them nothing.**" (This is strange, since babies cannot yet talk!)

CS (=Rodney Collin Smith) was constantly with O all that period and when he returned to England at Easter 1947, as O had told him, his first impression at the meeting he attended was "of the incredible honesty of O's answers".

The following extract (p17) illustrates CS's view:

"He (=O) pretended nothing, he claimed nothing, he recalled nothing: -

Question: We have been trying to follow out the teaching you gave us years ago.

Answer: I gave no teaching.

Q: You told us certain things to help us.

A: You misunderstood.

Q: Where can we begin to work now?

A: I'll see what you want to know and where you want to begin and then we will see the first step."

The last answer is typical of O. He will resort to this repeatedly. But the other replies are not honest. Of course he gave a teaching and help to people. Later O disclaims that he told people they are machines and that if he spoke it would be mechanical. O added that he "would be quite satisfied to become worse [but] didn't know how to do this"!

This is not "honesty" but hogwash on the writers' part.

58. Ouspensky's last days (3)

1. CS, as Rodney Collin (Smith) is designated in the *Last Remembrances of a Magician*, appears to be the most important character in the story of O's final years, not just days. Born in 1909 he was in his early 40's when by chance he accompanied O on the steamship to America, stayed with him for most of those six years and rejoined him at Easter in 1947 at Lyne Place until O's death (Oct. 2nd).

He is supposed to be writing LRM together with Dr. Roles but most of the writing must have been done by him (in my view, all of it). Any information contained in the document referring to O's stay in USA could come only from CS since Dr. Roles was in England throughout that period.

Unfortunately CS says very little about O's illness and his conduct in America, especially the early period when Marie Seton was there and so we could cross check their accounts: the one by a devout follower, the other by a sympathetic but rather irreverent young woman.

2. CS is never at a loss to indulge in his own subjective appreciation of events and interpretation of O's words and deeds.

Thus in the summer and winter of 1946 even as "they" (who?) sat with O in the study eating zakouska and drinking Traminer, with O's large cat Ripples lying before the fire, "they" had the impression "of O moving farther and farther away on the other side of a great gulf... so that communication grew more difficult".

O could say for instance "Cat watches" or "Open the bottles" and these were symbols "of some deeper truth". The second is then explained as referring "to try everything, leave nothing undone, taste all experience... unlock all secrets." But the "Cat watches" is not elucidated! Are we to understand that the cat symbolises the Higher One-Self who is always observing without being affected?

All this "accorded with his (CS's) own long growing feeling that one must come to one's own truth independently of - almost in spite of - the extraordinary explanations of every phase of life they intellectually possessed" (p19)!!!

3. One November evening when CS was alone with O, "in a very gentle and open mood", then Mrs. CS joined them too. They drank but hardly spoke and CS "almost never" had felt "such complete trust, respect and certainty".

This is totally subjective. And as the narrative proceeds, especially in the "classified" chapters (e.g. 12,13) CS changes in mood more frequently and easily than his underwear. It is difficult to place much credence in CS.

In the previous paper we saw that CS thought of O's "incredible honesty" in denying that he ever gave a teaching and help to people or that he said people were machines (things which

O did for 20 years!). It was so unusual an honesty that it appeared as "a trait of superman" and "half the hearers were left baffled"!

It was a way, continues bravely CS, whereby O "tore away the illusion of common aim which lies at the back of many hypocrisies" (p17). The writer constantly seems so conceited!!!

4. After his return, O started his second meeting by announcing that he had had an interesting meeting in New York in which had come "many people that he knew before... people that [he had] met in Petersburg." And after some unrelated question from the audience O continued: "I met many people I didn't expect. Several quite unexpectedly without knowing one another, and they met. Most of them I met in Petersburg. All sorts. Or two or three. Well, I wanted to begin in that way".

Nobody remembered such a meeting in New York. Nor did CS. But he did later remember that O had once said back in America that "all his old friends came to see him, sat around the table, people from all periods of his life, from Petersburg, from Moscow and talked to him".

This sounds to me like advanced senility recalling with nostalgia its past when it was perhaps much happier than at present. But our writer, who never, it seems, appreciated the fantastic vagaries of discursive mind, sees here "some definite exercise in preparation for recurrence" (p19) - that is next life.

How reminiscing with imaginings is an exercise for recurrence is beyond both my limited emotional and intellectual comprehension.

59. Ouspensky's last days (4)

1. By this time, summer 1947, O was physically a frail old man who, in addition, had acquired new unhealthy habits. His walking had become very difficult, he often had little or no appetite and more often stayed awake and active at night and slept in the day. But he did walk persistently albeit with difficulty...

His close companions saw his peculiar antics and "expressed it to themselves that he was 'experimenting with death'" (p23). This was in April.

Later that evening "they were convinced that he expected the end". Another subjective judgment on their part. And when the next day O emerged lively and in good spirits, "he had, it seemed, deliberately turned his back on death." The writer(s) don't want to realise that there is very little objectivity in their views.

Apart from such perceptions they also thought that, whenever he talked about the past in Russia or looked at pictures, O was reconstructing recurrence. And to CS it seemed that O was achieving something positive from these "experiments" (ch5, p39).

2. O had to a large degree turned the night into a day having lunch, for instance at midnight. He would also have them drive him around searching for a specific but elusive place during the night. Naturally, as a consequence, he would sleep very little and often during the day.

His speech was incoherent. After an abortive attempt to return to America, described at length, he again talked of going there - but not before the end of October. Then he began to talk about his friend Plavin in Sydney and a trip to Australia. (The writers take it all as allegories to an unknown destination - of the spirit?)

He would ask for "a piece of string" or perhaps "a thing" - a yard and a half long - to be bought at a shop near Charing Cross. But he laughed and dismissed the matter when asked to give more details. (CS thought that the "apparent forgetfulness and misuse of words was deliberate".) Or O would cry out "Get it" in the middle of a meal. Or he would ask "Who are you?" But he would not be satisfied with their responses and he would ask each to get cigarettes, wine, a handkerchief etc; yet not these things! Surprisingly the devotees see neither senility here nor confusion.

3. The writers display throughout astonishing dishonesty. Behaviour, symptoms, utterances and acts that would in any ordinary conditions and with any ordinary reasonable people (even saints and mystics) would pass as signs of dementia or inconsiderateness of others in this case are presented as highly spiritual, esoteric, if mysterious, manifestations.

And chapter 8 opens with this extraordinary vapid statement: "The period after September 17th - 18th becomes more and more difficult to describe in an objective way. Because at this point it became necessary for those who were in close touch with O to admit the existence of miracles."

This is shameless writing. Very little in the seven preceding chapters can objectively (=impartially) be said to be objective (=impartial).

4. Is it really miraculous for O to sit in the car and not budge in the early hours before dawn or to get out after pressure and then rush back inside? Yes, it may have been an "experiment" and a test for his devotees, but was it "miraculous" for the taxi-driver who did not know what to do and for the car-proprietor who would come to rescue his employee? (Ch5, p35, 37; Ch6, p41.) No consideration for the outsiders?...

I shall not examine the laborious preparations for the journey to America and the drive to Southampton to embark on the ship. All the luggage and even Miss Q. got on the ship but O was unable to walk up the gangway. And so they all returned to Lyne Place. (The writers again make this a test and find among O's incoherent remarks one or two that "indicated" he did not really intend to go!)

The first chapter which is more biographical-historical has also gaps that tend to cover up unsavoury events. O's first meeting with his future wife is mentioned but nothing is said of his passionate affair with Anna Butkovski before 1915. Then, they write about intensive work at Essentuki in the summer, 1917, but not that O had "separated" the system from G and was preparing to abscond. Nor do they mention that during one of G's lectures in London (1922), G accused openly O that he had neither permission nor the capacity to expound G's teaching. And on p10 they don't say that Mme Ouspensky preferred Gurdjief, was staying as a student at the Institute and only at about 1928 was sent to England from France by G himself!

All this can hardly be designated as objective history. And O can be excused as senile and very ill, but what of the writers?

60. Ouspensky's last days (5): the illness

1. We learn that O underwent a change between 1942-3, No 56, §3, and had deterioration with nose bleeds in 1946, No 57, §3. But no writer bothers to expand on these events. O was very ill but instead of giving details of his illness, they prefer to interpret most events as "miracles" and O's attempts to plan recurrence.

We saw in No 17 that in August 1916 in Finland Gurdjieff induced telepathic communication in and with O. And, sure enough, after 30 years of non-manifestation, such powers emerge this time in and by O sometime in August 1947. And, sure enough, it is CS who gains a "first inkling of something of this sort" (ch8, p57): clairvoyance, thought transference and knowing the future "which would seem to be" miracles for ordinary men, [but] were the normal function of man no 5. So, although the writers had no idea really of what man no 5 was like, they imply that O was such.

2. The writers ignore blatantly the obvious physical debilitation of O and his erratic behaviour and incoherent speech.

Undoubtedly O forced himself at times to move and walk despite difficulties but this hardly conveys, except to those who wish to so see it, "an extraordinary impression of will, will as a force by which a man can make his body do the impossible" (p40). Patients of open heart operation are soon after made to walk up a staircase of 18-20 steps and then longer. And I know of an ordinary mortal, a pathologist, specialist in fasting therapy who on occasions abstains from all food and drink for 5 whole days.

They ignore his long spells of temper, his loss of appetite (but not of drinking) and his inverted sleeping-waking periods. This last they interpret again as the manifestation of a new spiritual power: have lunch at midnight, rise at 9-10am, have another lunch at 2.00pm, then supper at 6.30 and then retire. This inversion they ascribe to one "whose instinctive time – sense was so preternaturally acute"! They forget that he used to stay up all night carousing and conversing or lecturing until morning.

3. Let me give some more examples of incoherent speech, which the writers find symbolic or allegorical.

Returning one evening after a sojourn in to the countryside, O got out of the car but then, having taken off hat and coat, went back, and sat in the car. "This is not the right Lyne", he said!

On another day, having "said several enigmatic things", O wanted "all the people" assembled but nobody could be found other than these 4-5 close to him.

O: Well we must decide. CS: About the house?

O: About the house, of course... everything depends on that. What is this place?

Miss P: Lyne Place. O: What is it connected with?

Miss P: It is connected with everything. O: That's it –exactly.

And a little later he said “Yesterday I visited Madame – she was ill.” Madame was at that time in America! (P39-40.)

4. The “Dutch” version of the *Last Remembrances of a Magician* (held by Mrs. D. Van Oyen and inherited by her daughter Dorine, now Mrs. Tolley) which is on the Internet has a Forward. In this Mrs. Tolley says that she consulted “one of the world’s leading kidney experts, who is also familiar with Ouspensky and his work.”

As I often repeated O had been ill for quite a time and certainly suffered severely when he returned to England (Jan 1947). He was then treated for kidney failure and liver dysfunctioning by three physicians including Dr. Roles. But knowledge of such diseases and of their treatment was then very limited.

The expert opined that O suffered from hepato-renal failure which is a combination of liver and kidney failure – fitting with O’s heavy drinking. He gave all the symptoms that have been mentioned: difficulty with sleep-wake pattern, confusion, lethargy and personality changes.

The doctor added that there was lapse into a coma but O’s spiritual gifts may have spared him this.

I certainly prefer this explanation.

61. Ouspensky's last days (6): the Fantastic!

1. As September moved to its end the atmosphere became more intense and "strange things began to happen, miracles became as much a part of the day as eating or sleep". Thus one morning Miss R perceived the individual people present "as in some way representing planets... as they are set about the enneagram and how their influences are necessary for a certain work in progress".

Ouspensky was Jupiter, CS Mercury, Miss P Venus. CS added that she (=Miss R) was Moon and Dr R Mars... Then she saw that the empty space was Miss Q, who was absent and that the three points of the internal triangle [i.e. numbers 3, 6, 9] were the three cats of the house.

But that night she felt the air "to be full of suggestions of black magic and... great struggle and fear, as of battle with evil forces". So she was given a soporific injection and put to bed. And the next day, "when bending down to pick up an eiderdown," she was filled with "a sense of indescribable horror and revulsion" as she knew that the eiderdown covered a dead body!!!

O then told her that in a previous lifetime of hers she was wrongly accused of an actual murder! (All this fantastic/miraculous, much extended in ch8.)

2. In April 1947 there were several talks at Lyne on what they had in common now that the old system was in abeyance. Some were bewildered; others fumbled for a new "language"; still others thought of finding their own aim/desire, independent of others' opinion.

"But what was really interesting about these meetings was that, without meaning to, each character played his own inevitable role – the same role that must have been played so many times in history in similar circumstances" (p20).

But surely we all play our own inevitable role in all circumstances willy-nilly, from an absolute point of view - and so, yes, the roles were played many times in the past.

"And in the various remarks", continues the text, "could be seen the seeds of the whole history of the Early Church – creeds, schisms, heresies, apostolic succession and the rest. It was clear that minds on any ordinary level *must by law* produce such effects from a legacy of higher knowledge" (ibid).

The writer here betrays presumptuousness and megalomania. For nothing of the sort followed: no creeds, schisms etc. The succession passed quite smoothly to Dr. Roles and the "system" was transformed fully by the teaching of Śankarācārya.

3. The following incident is from "classified" ch12 of LRM.

CS (=Rodney Collin Smith) had the extraordinary sense that O had effected "transfer of consciousness", i.e. O's own consciousness into CS after some experiments!

CS now had an extraordinary sense of having become a different person. This was so strong that it seemed quite clear to him that his old life had come to an end, disappeared. "So he asked O what had happened to his own life and O replied "I don't know about that"!

"Without any artificiality or pretense, the figure of CS had now become 'he' in his [=CS's] mind, another person".

He then went into his room and told his wife her husband "was dead, make ready to marry again"! All this, of course, is highly delusory and artificial, revealed by the last sentence. But more follows.

"And when he made love to her, it was as if to a woman he had never known before". This now confirms the sheer delusion and pretense. For he now proceeds to justify this with utterly unreasonable explanations.

"Again he had the most intense feeling that his sexual act was necessary to the creative experiment which had been conducted upon him". An embryo of a new body was being attached to CS's body (between the brows and at the heart) and had now to be attached to his sex-centre!!!

4. Afterwards CS went into O's room and on saying that he would go to Mme Ouspensky in USA, O started hitting him on the face. Then, when O asked "what happened?" (and I do believe O did not know), CS replied "A man was killed".

"Then quite calmly CS... at an indication from O walked across and with all his force dealt Dr. R a blow on the cheek, which broke his eardrum". (Dr. R was deafened, in fact.) He [=CS] then sat down beside O again and suddenly overwhelmed with an extraordinary tide of love and gratitude, put his arm round O's shoulders and they smiled at each other".

"Miss R and Miss P were kneeling on the floor, weeping uncontrollably. O turned to them and said quietly 'I cannot be accused'. After a pause he added 'Is it wrong?' Still weeping, Miss R answered 'Nothing is wrong'. Later, he said aside... 'He knew that he was good for nothing! ... they stayed there, tears pouring from them.'" (ch12.)

5. Such were, alas, the "miracles". Feelings running high, imaginings, blows, "transfer of consciousness", weeping, corpses under eiderdowns, murders in previous lifetimes, people embodying planetary forces, historical roles.

In other, plain words – delusions if not temporary dementia.

62. Ouspensky's last days (7): Recurrence

1. After his own self-importance the most intense obsession Ouspensky had was the notion of recurrence, "eternal recurrence" as he termed the repetition of life in the selfsame space-time frame. This means in practice that one is reborn in the same period, the same environment with the same parents and the same life.

O turned this possibility into a universal almost law – which may appear most feasible on paper and logical and correct with diagrams of waves becoming circles that revolve on the same spot about their own immovable centre.

But it is only one of four possibilities. However, O passed it onto his close students so that in that final period of his life in the LRM the writer(s) interpret most of O's behavior as preparation for recurrence!

2. The writer(s) of LRM thought that O's return to England in 1947 was connected to recurrence. It might well be: "to renew memories or to prepare for work to begin there earlier than in this life" (p16). O himself is not shown to make any clear statements about this. Before leaving America he had written to Lyne that he was coming to see certain people "whom he would choose" (p21).

Another obsession passed onto the closest students was "to have an aim". This is clearly and strongly expressed on p15 in O's words "Ask yourself always what you want" or on p25 in "the true formulation of one's aim". It was CS (p25, too) that suddenly saw in his mind "the exact formulation of his own aim". It would be too tedious to go through all the instances when, according to the writers, O was "reconstructing his own early life in Russia and accumulating all the factual knowledge... to orientate himself with it next time", always according to the writers – pp 19,22,26 etc.

3. I do not have chapters 9, 10 and 11, have not read them and therefore do not know their contents. But in chapter 12 (p4) we are told that O, having lost all ability to look after and support himself, had been reduced to helplessness and to infantile speech: it was as though "he was intentionally acting the part of a baby, learning how to live as the baby he soon expected to be... In a sense, *recurrence had already begun for him*".

I think infantile and preposterous is this interpretation of O's senility and helplessness. The writers' reason must have gone on a very long and distant journey.

They are so arrogant to think they know how recurrence manifests and that O was in his terrible collapse acting as if in recurrence! How could anyone of them know anything about this phenomenon?

4. Recurrence is, of course, quite possible possibly for a very large number of people. But it must be only one possibility out of four. Even reincarnation is only a theory held by the ancient Celts, Platonists, Pythagoreans and Orphics and in Buddhism and the Vedic Tradition.

The soul, or whatever element of man reincarnates, may repeat a cycle of life in very similar but not exactly the same circumstances, depending on changes in the wider environment. Man's desires, actions and knowledge is only one factor. The environment is a second factor and it may undergo changes – in the community, the nations round it, the earth and its condition, the planets and other celestial bodies. There may be a war, a destructive earthquake, the birth or death of a sun nearby. Surely such events would influence conditions in rebirth.

But there is also the Will of the Absolute as the final arbiter and this may decide to send the soul forward or backward in linear time according to its deeds and real knowledge.

5. So what O labored to achieve would not count for much – if indeed he was preparing for recurrence.

He travelled round in the country side of South England where he had lived or visited in the 1920's and 1930's. All this would hardly influence his earlier life for he was by 1923 45 years old!

He looked at pictures of Moscow and Petersburg and the countries he visited in the East and all this was mixed with dim and confused reminiscences, imaginings and fantasies involving his grandmother and people from the time of Peter the Great!

As for acting the baby, as the writers think, surely all babies behave alike guided by Nature itself expressing the Will of the Absolute and having no need to prepare before death in the previous life.

The writers are again lost in the realm of the fantastic.

63. Ouspensky's last days (8): System, again

1. It is said that O abandoned the System. In the LRM, chapter 2 (p 17), as I remarked previously, Rodney Collin Smith thought it "incredible honesty", as he heard O denying (quite falsely) that he had given to the questioning students any "system" before and called it the Fourth Way, as many still call it today.

This illuminates another aspect. O claimed repeatedly that he left Gurdjieff in order to preserve the system, as he (=O) thought G had gone mad (ch 7, p. 49). To Marie Seton he said that he took over the leadership, again, to preserve the system even though he had not had adequate training and control of his mind and so went in the wrong direction, No 46 § 2-3. He also went to America late in 1940, after the war broke out for the same reason, to save the system.

2. All this sounds very peculiar.

G had not gone mad at all, judging by numerous publications. His temperament was very different from O but he taught in France, in Britain and in America the very same system as O, who had been taught by G and took G's system!

Then, to leave your students in England and seek the safety of America is not very fitting for an esoteric teacher – particularly as G never left Paris despite its occupation by the Nazis.

Now, suddenly, O repudiates this system!

3. In chapter 3, O is presented as saying (p 24) that the system had been tried in America and found not to work: "really there is no method" (p 25).

Later on, in chapter 6 he is made to say: "Before I spoke of big, now I speak of small" (p 46). And when they remind him that he gave them the system he said "System is only language to hang a cat on"!

Then he spoke of himself: "I did nothing. I was not strong enough. I only spoiled everything".

This last remark accords well with Marie Seton's following report of O's reference to his students in America: "They are such fools...I took over the leadership to save the System. But I took it over before I had gained enough control over myself". And when she says she had learned something, he replies: "Then you are the only one... The others are deluding themselves. They have never gained anything".

And when she suggests that O stops lecturing until he gains control of himself, he replies: "The System has become a profession with me".

4. I suppose it is very much possible that O discovered that his own method of teaching the system was not very productive. How could it be?

If we exclude the residential in Lyne Place and the intensive physical work there (a reflection of the practices at G's Prieuré), his other methods could not be very fruitful. Gathering 200 (LRM, p 11) or 100 or even 50 people in one meeting and lecturing them or answering their questions and thus expounding the system is a haphazard and ineffective way of guiding people in esoteric discipline and practice. This at least is the picture given in LRM and other books like the *Records of Meetings*.

What is needed is a structure of groups of 12, 15, 18 people at most, with a tutor well-grounded in the theory and well-proven in the practice of the system, in progressive grades.

Then, the system itself has limitations. There is hardly anything useful on measured living; then, most important is the absence of consideration of the observer, its nature and function.

5. Frankly, I think Miss Marie Seton's Memoir with its rather pedestrian remarks and evaluation of O is far more accurate than the highly reverential but subjective and fantasy-ridden narrative of the LRM, or subsequent tales and descriptions of the "system" by devoted followers.

I may be wrong, but I feel O is a rather tragic case.

64. Ouspensky's last days (9): Rodney Collin (Smith)

1. Born in 1909 in England, Rodney Collin Smith (=CS, hereafter) was with Ouspensky almost constantly from 1940 until O's death, Oct 1947.

I remember him with much gratitude for his *Theory of Celestial Influence* (1947? And mid-1950's) and his *Theory of Eternal Life* (1949). Like O's books, they influenced greatly my mind and the direction to which it should turn in the bewilderment of those raw student years.

He is said to have done much good work in Mexico after O's death and to have maintained collaboration with Dr Roles in London.

An article by Norwegian Terje Tonne on the Internet is full of admiration and praise and quite informative. Tonne seems to have had access to some version, probably the common one of the LRM: there are some citations carefully selected. But not wishing to be smudging his hero's image, he does not reveal much: he sees "a more immediate sense of intensity and depth [of O's death]". Let us see then.

2. I have often referred to the "writer(s)" of LRM but I must say again that I think CS wrote the whole of it. We saw in previous papers several aspects of CS's involvement. If I were to make propaganda for O and his tradition, I too would focus on various incidents and CS's interpretations with exclamatory or other emotional cries of approval. But I suspected that there was delusion on a large scale even though the people involved thought they were being sincere and perceptive of subtler truths.

CS writes at the end of *The Theory of Eternal Life*, after references to Milarepa of Tibet and our Christ, who both, after dying, showed themselves to their disciples, that O did the same thing:

Lying in bed in Surrey, [O] possessed with his own mind a young man flying over the Atlantic, whom he had already rid of an illusion. That morning, dead he walked with a traveler – crossing London Bridge; and to another at the wheel of a car showed the nature of the universe. // Yet these tales are hard to believe... Let him who can understand understand. For so it is.

The young man over the Atlantic was CS himself on an abortive effort to fetch to England Mme O. The traveler is unknown but we have no corroboration of this apparition. The driver also is unknown and, again, we have no corroboration nor information about "the nature of the universe". These are important events and I am not content with CS's pontifical statement "so it is".

3. In ch 1 of LRM already are several facts from O's life that are suppressed or misrepresented deliberately, as shown in No 59, § 4 end.

In ch 3, p 21, CS "was more than ever impressed by a certain indefinable but very definite power" in O. On p 25, O "seemed to hold up a mirror to people in which their desires could

be seen reflected whether true or false". And CS himself saw that "the true formulation of one's aim is in fact the magic 'Sesame' by which alone a certain door can open". In ch 4, p 25 all O's stuttering, inconsistencies and incoherence in speech are interpreted as deliberate, intentional acts. I could add several more instances of such delusory interpretations from the first 8 untampered chapters. But the magnitude of CS's misconceptions appears in the "classified" chs 12,13 (possibly 9, 10, 11, which I have not seen).

4. CS writes several times about "miracles" and sees "experiments" and O's "magical and deliberate interventions" almost everywhere.

In ch 12, at one point he imitates (after "telepathic suggestion") O's movements and rocking from side to side and suddenly O leaps upon him, shouts and rains blows on him. CS responds in like manner - beating and kicking each other until O and CS "crashed their foreheads together with great force". *It happened several times*. And here, *it seemed* later to CS that this "stimulated certain inner organs"!

But later, feeling certain he had died to his old self and having had sex with his wife, he rushed onto Dr Roles and struck him so hard that he broke the man's eardrum. What miracle or spiritual aspect here!

In ch 13, travelling over the Atlantic, he felt O's mind overwhelming his own, but despite its superior knowledge it did not tell him that the trip was futile and Mme O would not budge. Instead he was inundated with thoughts about women and pleasures. And when he returned to Lyne he wanted to have sex with Miss P, who also wanted it but did not give in!

Surely spiritual development and transfer of consciousness from a "higher man" is not of this kind!

65. Ouspensky's last days (10): Drama

1. Rodney Collin Smith, CS for short, claims in his *The Theory of Eternal Life* that Ouspensky's last weeks were a play, modeled on the drama of Christ's death. "Of my own teacher I can only say that he also produced among his friends a play, of which they unwittingly but perfectly played their parts, and whose plot was his own death".

This notion is not very surprising since O had an obsession with the New Testament as a conscious work of art, discussed in No 4-5, and regarded Jesus' life and particularly the last days, as presented in the *NT*, as a Holy Drama the roles of which were fixed in Eternal Recurrence but with different persons taking on different roles and the chief disciples aiming to play Jesus' central role.

In the intense and unbalanced emotional conditions prevailing in Lyne Place in late September (1947) it is rather natural that highly strung CS and others should see the situation as a repeat of "holy drama".

2. That all life is a dramatic performance, a theatrical play, is a very old notion found, among others, in Shakespeare's plays, in Epictetus' essays etc. We human beings are but actors in a play written by an unknown author.

Here, according to the writer(s) of *Last Remembrances of a Magician*, the writer and director is O who is preparing for "recurrence". Thus O's decision to go to America and then, just before embarking, not to go signalled the opening of the final play, or final act of a play.

"A test, both of decision and understanding was created for every individual concerned. As a result... the stage was automatically set and the characters arranged for what he proposed [= O] to do" (ch 4, p 30).

O then said "I never intended to go to America – not for a minute". But back at Lyne the following morning, he sent a telegram to Miss Q who was travelling on the "Queen Mary" to America saying he intended to go to America but "under his own conditions" – a phrase often used by O. And a few days later he re-affirmed his decision of going, saying to CS that arrangements should be made immediately.

3. Thereafter, all arrangements in Lyne, whether for meals in the house or for trips in the countryside, were laid out "as if in a stage set waiting for actors who had missed their cue"! This is a dialogue specimen:

Miss P: You said cats have astral bodies.

O: Yes

Miss P: Are they born with them?

O: No, kittens don't have

Miss P: Only grown cats.

O: Yes.

Miss P: No dogs have astral bodies?

O: Some dogs but all cats.

“Every phrase seemed also to refer... to them and to the possibility of creating a new body, the greatest mystery of all”.

But the play is not merely a play but a drama in the Gospel style. For when a murder is mentioned the word ‘murder’ seemed to connect “with the killing of a man’s old personality: *but this they did not know at the time*”. (ch 6, p 43, my italics highlighting an echo from Gospels).

4. Phrases echoing the Gospels appear again in the same chapter 6.

O sat in the car resting between Dr R and CS. “And he spoke to them in such a way that each heard what was addressed to him, and nothing of what was said to the rest” (p 46).

And the chapter closes with this statement: “So they all went away to rest, and to remember everything that had been done”.

But the exchanges of the actors are muddled, or pedestrian, or pretensions. Thus O speaks (seemingly of “reconstruction”) pointing to a picture of Moscow on the wall and saying he and his grandmother were there and Mme O and the mysterious Evremov who might be of the period of 1916 or of Peter the Great!

Then O says: “Madame’s people different way. My way theosophical way. I was at many places in India and Ceylon. No religious words, but still the same”.

5. “They began to understand things”, in chapter 8, “which [O] wished to convey to them *without being told*, or in single sentences and phrases they would see some extremely subtle and illuminating significance, which they knew very well they could never have invented for themselves. Moreover, they began to feel every gesture and situation as meaningful just as they are in a play, where nothing is introduced which does not relate directly to the plot... And in the whole situation... *O was doing in some normally inconceivable way* - moving, arranging, combining and experimenting with human material without any visible or audible direction” (ch 8, p 57).

At the end of the “classified” part of ch 14 we have again theatre as CS feels he had “*known these words before. They were the words of a part*. He said, *speaking his own part*: ‘Traitor and disbeliever get out of this room!’ He was addressing Dr Roles, friend and fellow-disciple!

Then in ch 15, after he has shut himself in a room for a week and after O has died and been buried in ch 14, CS emerges from his isolation and on Oct 4th, two days after O’s death, he goes “to O’s bedroom. It was empty”. And this, of course, reminds of the women going to Jesus’ tomb and finding it empty after the resurrection!

So much effort for a fantasy.

66. More on Gurdjieff

1. Some time ago an old acquaintance informed me that he had joined a Gurdjieff group in London and was doing movements, exercises and had been given specific individual practices.

When I wrote that I was doing this probe into G and O he replied that O did not understand “the majestic scope of G’s message”. And when I asked what was this “majestic scope of G’s message”, he wrote that it was not words but practice.

Fair enough. Yes, G was undoubtedly practical in contrast with O who was theoretical. But even G indulged his writer’s talent and produced some volumes, lengthy and difficult to read, in which he formulated his teaching. Others, however, like O, Walker, Nicoll, Nott, did a more lucid and comprehensible job.

2. Apart from self-remembering, G laid emphasis on breathing and physical exercises - movements, postures and dancing.

People who knew him well write of the elasticity (or suppleness) of his movements. So O: “there was an astonishing assurance and precision in all his movements” (261, *In Search...*). And G explained that he did the movements “in a special way with muscles relaxed” (p262).

Exercises with movements are mentioned again as part of the regime in *Essentuki* (p351) and, of course, at the *Prieuré* (p387).

These exercises had multiple effects – on breathing, on the function of the heart, on thinking etc.

3. In *Views from the Real World* there is a talk given at *Prieuré*, May 1923, entitled “The three powers - economy”. In this G describes man’s three powers as physical, psychic and moral. The first depends “on the structure and tissues” of the body. The second “on the thinking centre and the material it contains”, while “will” is one of its functions. The third “depends on education and heredity” (p159).

Here G points out that we spend too much energy in our movements or even in sitting and doing no movement: too much tension. We need to economise on the expenditure of energy by doing appropriate movements and by doing them properly (p160).

The “First Talk in Berlin”, Nov 1921 (p167) and a “Talk at *Prieuré*, Feb 1923 (p174) are also about movements, postures, tensions and expending and economising energy.

4. Most Yoga organisations today deal with this almost universal problem of tension. Some employ the various āsana of Haṭha-yoga, others simpler exercises and music to help people relax. Relaxation is the thing everywhere.

G’s exercises, described in his own and others’ publications are not really all that different and have the same aim.

Undoubtedly relaxation of tensions and preservation of energy or correct movements and the use of appropriate amount of energy in movements and postures, are very useful. But they can hardly be called “esoteric” or important in involution and in raising the level of being and consciousness.

The *Yogasūtra*, Patañjali’s Eightfold Yoga, has nothing on postures and movements and related exercises. Only 2.46 says *sthira-sukham-āsanam* ‘the posture [is, or, should be] firm and comfortable’. The next one says that this is achieved through relaxation of effort and immersion (*samā-patti* ‘entering, completion’) in the Infinite (*ananta*). The first means is the usual approach with physical exercises, the second uses mental and deeper (causal) energy to achieve relaxation and economy.

5. In the mid 1920’s, after the serious car accident and the closing down of the Institute at Prieuré, G composed many pieces for piano that are now well-known and often played. He had composed music in the 1910’s for his Ballet, *Struggle of the Magicians*.

His view of music is given by O (p297, In Search): “Objective music is all based on ‘inner octaves’ ... There can be such music as would freeze waters... as would kill a man instantaneously... [T]he destruction of the walls of Jericho... is precisely a legend of objective music... [N]ot only can [music] destroy but it can also build up... Orpheus used to impart knowledge by music... [In a long, drawn out] single note ‘inner octaves’ are going on all the time... inaudible to the ears but felt by the emotional centre”. These can control snakes but also people!

6. I have no reason to doubt that there could be such music.

However, I have not found in all the considerable literature about G and O any instances of miraculous effects either from music or from the movements and postures.

I have personally listened many times to several pieces of G’s music and felt deeply moved but no more than by many pieces of Mozart or Vivaldi.

Helpful though all these are, they cannot of themselves raise the being or consciousness. They only give a short-lived emotional uplift, indicative of a higher state.

67. Gratitude

1. After this survey of the character, life and teaching of Gurdjieff and Ouspensky, I must express my deep sense of gratitude for their teaching and the lines of development that followed.

All interested parties should feel gratitude to both men and their successors who brought the new ideas to a wide public and those who wanted took the opportunity to benefit. I would include both Dr. Francis Roles and Leon MacLaren, who, in fact, in my estimation, with the help and guidance of the Shankaracharya Shri Shantananda Sarasvati, transformed the teaching into a much more amenable and meaningful method for inner, spiritual or psychological development.

2. The feeling of gratitude should not preclude caution and circumspection in approaching G's and O's formulations. As I indicated, O's reformulation of G's ideas into a new system is in fact more of a notion in the mentation of some of Ouspensky's followers than a solid reality.

The ideas of the Octaves as a system (whether in the creation of the cosmoses or in the food and digestion) is not helpful in the long run and the nomenclature is imprecise. But of great importance is Man's place and function in the universe. The triads too are not helpful in the long run. The psychological centres and their functions are very helpful in explaining human psychology and behavior and can form a good and useful starting point but must give place to a different approach.

All these subjects and their practical human aspects can be studied just as well and, in some respects, better in other known philosophical teachings that combine theory and practice. Here I have in mind especially Vedānta.

3. Gurdjieff is undoubtedly the man who brought to the West these "fragments of an unknown teaching". Some of his students (e.g. Mme De Salzmann, J. Pentland) and Ouspensky (especially) did much to promote these worldwide in the same or different formulations.

By all accounts Leon MacLaren effected probably the best rearrangement and the widest promotion through his schools.

The most important point to realise is that there are no shortcuts and no bodily exercises, postures or dances, no music, that can bring about permanently higher states of being and consciousness. The aspirant must find a teaching and this must insist on the practice of the traditional ethics that are much neglected. These are the first two aspects of the Patañjali's Yoga and of Vedānta, the 5 yamas and niyamas, encapsulated in the discrimination between the true and false, eternal and transient, and the full emotional realization of the former which is the immutable, indescribable Observer or Witness, the One Self, personal and universal.