

## *Saturday 24 January*

### *Fifth Talk*

*R. You said to me yesterday: “But emotion has to go hand in hand with discourses and Knowledge of Truth, when Bhawana (Pure emotion) and Viveka (Pure intellect) are brought together”.*

*Do you mean that the discourses with Realised Man will correct the mistaken ideas which have taken root in our Buddhi?*

*How does this over action or separate action of intellect show itself chiefly in me? Distortion of ideas? Wandering off the subject? Or making a cloud which prevents me from taking in what the Jagad Guru says?*

H.H. The end of the Way is the same—Self-realisation. As we have been told there are two lights, the emotional light (or Bhawana) and the intellectual light (or Viveka); it is possible that people might traverse to the end by either Way. But it is very possible that there will be certain desires for further enquiry left hidden in the being, about the other Way. To satisfy such enquiries it is essential that the disciple must work on both of these lines, the line of Viveka, and the line of Bhawana. Particularly for a person who is destined to be the leader of a group, it is very essential; because there will be a hundred and one cases of different types which he will have to tackle in order to give them a lead. So for a leader it is very essential that he should have both ways running together.

*R. What blocks the Way of Love, the Way of emotion? Because I could do with ten times as much!*

H.H. Would you like to put a specific question based on this?

*R. We still do not understand just where Bhawana fits into the scheme of things. Is it on the causal level alongside of Antahkarana, or with Chitta felt in the heart (part of subtle level)? My need is really to understand the relation of Bhawana to Antahkarana.*

H.H. Yesterday we were told about the two centres, the heart and the head; in the heart appear the Chitta and the Manas, and Bhawana springs from these two. All the desires or the doubts are raised by the Manas. The first glimpse of the desire is first glimpsed by the Manas. It comes in collaboration with the Chitta, Chitta being the store (Memory) of all the knowledge and everything a man can call his capital. But this relation to Bhawana is not a constant and smooth process. Sometimes it is abundant and all in one direction, and sometimes it is very scanty; just as one sees the ocean, there are waves small and big. But this is how the nature of Chitta works.

**Note:** The most important part of our long term Memory mechanism is the power to recall previous experiences of Consciousness—the special province of Chitta.

The Buddhi works for discrimination, the discrimination as to what is right and what is wrong; or between what is useful to the Self and what is not useful to the Self. Once Buddhi has performed this activity of Viveka and a decision has evolved out of the discussion and thinking process, then it leaves no ground for any doubt. The lack of doubts stabilises the flow of emotion as well, so there are no outbursts in one direction or the other. This is brought about through the support of the Buddhi and its Viveka.

**Note:** Bhawana and Viveka seem to us to be the equivalent of the two Higher Centres of our Western System.

*R. I am asking not for myself alone but because in Western cities, like London and New York, the cry from among*

*our more experienced people is always for more Sattva. They know very well by now that if they had abundant Sattva things would become right. How to answer this cry? Does it involve a way of living, reading Scriptures, helping each other, thinking of Realised Man?*

H.H. The Sattva is described mostly as Light—a light which is a steady light. So one of the major manifestations of the presence of Sattva is this illumination in any type of work one takes on. If one finds one is afraid to tackle a new situation or one has doubts on certain types of subject, they instantly mean lack of Sattva.

What can one do to change the situation so that there is abundance of Sattva in one's being? The collection of certain good qualities is very essential. The good qualities are these:

1) One should always love to speak the Truth: so there is no disparity between what one thinks and what one says; or between what one says and what one does. (see 1961). There should be complete correspondence of ideas with activities.

2) Cultivate the love of people, encouraging them in turn to express their love through certain types of activity.

3) Be magnanimous in dealing with those around you, and the other things which come within the influence of a Realised Man.

With increase of these good qualities one would see that the Sattva is increased.

After a pause, he continues:

One of the major factors is that Manas, Buddhi and Chitta must all come together and stand simultaneously; there should be no division between these three; that one should run on one line of action and the other should run on another line of action. So there must be complete unity of heart and mind and activity. It is only through these means that it is possible to increase Sattva. And then one could see that whatever the situation, howsoever new they might seem to be, one would handle them with great patience and love, without putting a foot on any wrong lines at all.

*R. That's fine—thank you.*

*A previously prepared question: One time we came (1965) Your Holiness said; "In each individual and within each Antahkaran the knowledge of all 'names and forms' with their possibilities is present in seed form. The individual doesn't know that he knows."*

**Note:** "He who knows, and knows not that he knows is asleep; wake him! He who knows, and knows that he knows, is wise; follow him!"

*My question: When an individual becomes a medium for 'inspiration' and expression of creativity, what is happening in his Antahkaran? Are those seeds maturing into plants via the subtle level? Has one somehow to tune in or draw near to Atman with abundance of Sattva, in order to get those results?*

H.H. It is true to say that of all the knowledge, and all the Love, and all expressions which one can think and do to express the happening with the Antahkarana, the latter means artistic activity; all these are present in seed form. But as far as any given individual is concerned, those expressions are governed by time, space and matter. The possibility of complete realisation of this abundance of all knowledge, or all love, or all activities, is impossible to attain. What does really happen is that a particular person with a supply of just enough Knowledge and Love, feels satisfied and complete within himself. Through this he might be in tune with the Absolute. But it would not be right to say that any single person can make use of all the knowledge, or all the love, which the Brahman Himself controls.

He then gave an example of the river Ganges: The river is flowing with curative and auspicious waters. All the time people are going there and taking part of the Ganges to their home, or dipping in the Ganges; and even if millions and millions of people have baths there and take away some water with them (a pint or two), the Ganges will remain the Ganges. It will not dry up.

And so all this eternal Knowledge, and Love, and creativity is available to individuals according to the Laws of time and space and matter.

Even Brahma, Vishnu, Shankara and all these great figures who have happened to be the proceeding deities of Creation; they also have their Antahkarana. But their Antahkarana does not contain the whole of everything that the Brahman holds.

*R. There is a Cosmic Antahkarana. Does the individual Antahkarana sometimes draw from the Cosmic Antahkarana?*

*J. Yes, H.H. did say that the Antahkarana of Brahma imparts influences to the individuals from Himself. So the individuals derive all these from Brahma. As they advance, the association of coming closer to the Atman becomes possible. He said: "Coming closer to the Atman or having abundance of Sattva is practically the same thing. Without Sattva one couldn't get near the Atman; and if one didn't work to get near the Atman, one wouldn't get more Sattva. So this happens simultaneously and reciprocally."*

*D.C. During meditation, repetition of the Mantra sometimes brings a wish, a desire to meditate upon the Atman, the Good within. Can H.H. give any advice about this?*

H.H. He says whatever one meditates on he becomes. So if one were to meditate on the God which one has within oneself, one would see that the qualities (attributes) of that God will take appearance in oneSelf.

But there are thousands of ideas and pictures of Gods; so one must make sure as to which and what type of God, is really the God. One has to make sure, before 'meditating on God', that one has got the real concept of the Absolute, and not as explained by people here or there.

Since meditation is the Sattvic activity, it achieves whatever one aims at. One can meditate upon God, or Atman, or individual, or anything whatsoever, and one will experience the dawning of those qualities within oneself, if the meditation is right. In fact however, we have not been introduced to the concept of meditating upon anyone, because in the meditation, even if only for a short time, all cognition is removed; and then we are giving up even the subtlest activity which could go on.

*J. (to us): I am not very clear about this—shall I ask some more?*

*D.C. Yes, but could I add a rider—One has this feeling in the heart of wanting to reach out towards the Creator; but perhaps, from what he has said, it is not profitable to make more concrete or actualise this view?*

H.H. The purpose of meditation is to bring the individual to the great stability. Stability (equilibrium) is the quality of the Sattva. Once the individual has achieved this complete equilibrium, and has done away with all ideas, even of meditation, meditator, and Mantra, so that he has achieved equality or unity; only then, if one does take to this feeling and meditates on that, could it be useful. He says the meditation is only to achieve stability, but if some one feels like meditating upon God, he is free to do so, but it will always be within the limitation of whatever idea of the God one holds.

The meditation is a discipline designed to produce the Sattva and the stability which comes with Sattva. Once you have got some Sattva out of meditation you have to use it. You have to choose the way you wish to use it either by loving people, or by helping people, or doing some other activity pleasing to God. You will see that whatever you do, you will do it with more efficiency and goodness within it. And so the activity of medi-

tation is not for the sake of meditation itself, otherwise it will become void. It produces Sattva, and the Sattva has to be used for the type of activity which one chooses to take on in the worship of God or any other activity for the spiritual advancement of the individual.

**Note:** ‘Stability’ in the sense of a firm foundation for any type of building one wishes to construct. A seesaw or chemical balance is also an analogy—the fulcrum is stable;—up and down go the arms, Rajas and Tamas.

*D.C. I am a person who needs stirring up sometimes. I gather the original Shankara stirred people up. We would like to hear something of the first Shri Shankara—some stories?*

H.H. He gives an episode of Shankara’s life. He was supposed to be an incarnation of Shiva, one of the Hindu Trinity.

At home when he was about four years old, his father had gone away somewhere and his mother was sick. Since the worship of the deity in the house had to be done, and he was the only one left, he had to do this.

He had seen his father performing the ritual or ceremony of worship, so he did everything practically as he had observed his parents doing. He gave a bath to the deity; then dressed her with all her ornaments and flowers arranged as it used to be done. The last act of the ritual was to offer the deity, Saraswati the Goddess of Wisdom, a cup of milk. After putting the milk in front of her the curtains were drawn, so the Goddess could drink the milk in privacy.

After waiting ten minutes he drew back the curtains and found the milk unchanged, and it clearly hadn’t been accepted by the Goddess! So he examined the milk to see if any impurity had got into it, but he found nothing at all wrong with it. When he repeated the ritual of the milk with the same result (it was untouched), he got frightened that his worship had not been truthful, so he started weeping. He did not understand that the offering of milk was simply a show! But all the same because his heart and mind were united in the worship of the Goddess, the Goddess though made of stone, became conscious and drew this milk close to drink. She drank all the milk so there was nothing left.

As there was no milk left, whereas previously the glass was left full, he then became worried that the Goddess was angry. So he prayed to her and asked her why she had done such an extraordinary thing.

So the Goddess drew him to her breast and fed him with her own milk. After this Divine drink, this boy of four was able to recite from memory any of the verses of the Vedas and Upanishads.

With that capacity he travelled all over India discoursing with people and convincing them that the correct way to Realisation is the way of the Vedanta; and worship is just one of the means that anyone can take, provided what you do and think is the same. It is quite possible to experience the Absolute anywhere, because the Absolute lives everywhere. He is available at any time.

So one has somehow to work this out within oneself to get this unity of thinking, acting and feeling all synchronised as one type of activity.

*R. At what age did Shri Shankara leave home and where did he go?*

H.H. There is a book called ‘Shankara Dignijaya’—The conquest of the world by Shankara. (This being the intellectual conquest). There you can get the details of the life of Shankara. He gave a synopsis.

Shankara left home by the age of eight. From eight to eleven years he studied the Scriptures under his Guru Govinda.

*R. Whose name we repeat in the Initiation.*

H.H. Then he went to Uttarkashi in the Himalayas, staying there for some time, during which he had discussions with Veda Vyasa. Veda Vyasa is a person who, at the change of a Yuga, collects all the Vedic treasures and passes them on to the people. He discoursed about the existence of the Brahman and the Atman, with him, and he learnt everything.

Veda Vyasa wanted a commentary on the Brahmasutra. But since Shankara was only destined to live 16 years, he said, “My work is practically complete and I may not be able to do the commentary for you.”

Because his father who became old didn’t have any son; he was a worshipper of the God Shiva. Shiva one day offered him the choice of having a boy with wisdom and short span of life, or a boy with a longer life but less wisdom. He chose a boy with wisdom and a short life, so Shankara was destined to live only sixteen years.

In these sixteen years he had travelled right round India convincing people about the validity of the Vedanta and untruth of other philosophies.

So Veda Vyasa said: “Never mind, you do my commentary and I will give you an extra sixteen years.” Being a Realised Man he had this miraculous power of putting such a promise into effect. So within those thirty-two years Shankara wrote a commentary on the Prasthan Trayi. They are three books, the Brahma Sutra, The Upanishads and the Bhagavad Gita. Anyone who wanted to propound a philosophy had to explain those three books. And his ideas of how these work in the creation. He wrote commentaries and quite a number of poems which were sung in the praise of different Gods. Through these he realised the presence of these different Gods as well.

By his travels around India he established the teachings of the Vedanta. He also established a system of worship of God—serving the God, pleasing the God; God will then grant the bonus.

## *Sunday 25 January*

### *Discourse at Magh Mela Camp*

H.H. As the purpose of the Magh Mela is to prove a month’s Satsangha to visitors—so that the dirt which has been settling on the mind due to worldly activities during the year may be removed to some extent at least. The definition and effects of Satsangha (which had been going on for the last two days) is being continued for the present.

In reality, a ‘Being’ (the Jiva) is nothing but a part of the Absolute. As such, whatever is present in the Absolute is also present in Jiva, or the ‘Being’. But the Jiva is under the influence of Maya, while the Absolute is not. The Absolute is the commander and the master of Maya, while the Jiva is the slave of Maya. At His own free will, the Absolute can make Maya give him a shape, though He is shapeless, and can equally well give up that shape and merge into His natural state of shapelessness again when His purpose of having a shape is fulfilled. But the Jiva, being a slave of Maya, has helplessly to revolve in the never-ending cycle of birth death, pleasure, pain, etc. until it is free from the bonds of Maya.

As a Jiva, he is subject to three feelings; viz: (1) fear of death, (2) desire to know, (3) desire for happiness.

Dealing with the fear of death first, it can be said that it is most unnatural. This is why Nature itself has arranged things in such a way that before death actually sets in, complete insensibility is produced and one



cannot feel death taking place. Nor, by the way can any creature feel being born. This fear of death, however, is so strong that, generally speaking, one wants to avoid death at any cost, although his living may seem worse than death itself.

A man 95 years old had children, grandchildren, lots of wealth, many servants, and a palatial house to live in. But age had made him so useless and unlikeable that nobody took any interest in him. He was even served his meals last of all—and one day even this had been forgotten, though it was as late as 4 o'clock in the evening. There he sat on a chair outside shedding tears. Then a Mahatma happened to pass that way and he asked him why he looked so sad. On knowing his story, the Mahatma offered to take him to his Ashram and to provide him with all comforts there if he only undertook to recite the Name of God all the time. The old man agreed.

But some children playing there had heard this talk, and they run into the house to tell everybody that a Mahatma was taking the old man away with him. His son's wife came out and asked him not to leave the house and little children kissed him saying, "Oh! grandfather—don't go, please!" Then Maya, the false love for the grandchildren, so over-whelmed the old man that he decided to stay on in the house, even as a neglected person. So he refused to accept the comforts which the Mahatma offered.

Similarly, in refusing to give up Maya, we invite all sorts of troubles.

As the Jiva is a part of the Brahman (the Absolute), it is fundamentally Eternal. It is fundamentally all knowledge; it is fundamentally all Joy. But look at Eternity fearing death! Look at knowledge missing all Knowledge! Look at joy missing all Joy!

It is the business of Maya to make things look just the opposite of what they are—and to deceive the Jiva—so that it can be kept in bondage as long as possible. But surrendering oneself to God removes the delusion of Maya. Then there is a dawn of true Knowledge, and we realise that there is no death for us, that no knowledge is hidden from us, and that the fullest Joy is always with us. Someone asked me what happens when true Knowledge dawns? I replied that there would be nothing to happen then. All the happenings happen before true Knowledge comes, and none thereafter.

A hunter plays a tune on his flute, to which the animals in the jungle love to listen. Therefore they do not run away, and are killed by the hunter. An insect loves the smell of a flower, and it sits on its petals. The petals close up, and the insect dies. A moth likes a light, so it rushed into a flame and dies. This is how blind desires created by Maya ruin us, and we do not realise it until it is too late.

We often do not realise the powers which we can command or acquire through purity of purpose. For example: although cutting of a human body is a serious crime ordinarily, yet surgeons do it daily in their hospitals because of the purity of their purpose. Similarly, soldiers even kill human beings on the battlefield without becoming (legally) guilty of murder.

Guru Ram Das once tested his disciples in this respect by pretending to be ill, and telling them that the only medicine which could cure him was the milk of a lioness. While others hesitated, Shivaji went forth to bring it. He went straight into a den where a lioness was feeding her cubs. She gave a loud roar and was about to pounce upon him, when Shivaji looked straight into her face and said resolutely, 'I am no hunter, and I mean no harm to you. I only want a little of your milk for my Guru who is ailing. It would cure him.' The lioness was, so to say, hypnotised by the power radiating from Shivaji due to sheer purity of purpose. She lay down, and Shivaji took her milk and came back with it alive. We may call this a miracle if we like, but it was purity of purpose.

A good deal of unhappiness is caused by aspiring beyond our capacity, and trying to do the work of others instead of that assigned to us. Doing our own work and taking pleasure in it is much better, from the point of

view of happiness, than trying our hand at other people's work for greed of more money or power. A soldier would get happiness only by being a good soldier, a scholar by being a good scholar, and a businessman by being a good businessman.

There is no factory in the world for producing poverty. Still, some people are poor. The proper remedy against poverty is hard and honest labour only. The point worth remembering is that taking any short-cuts to more money through dishonest means would only lead to unhappiness and discontent. Money thus acquired would, therefore, ultimately be found not worth acquiring at all. One would be much better without it.

## *Monday 26 January*

### *Sixth Talk*

*R. Yesterday we felt all sense of separateness melting away. We were proud and happy to be with all these wonderful people experiencing the Light from the Jagad Guru every afternoon. Also we were surprised to find anywhere on the earth today so many hundreds of people on the spiritual quest during the month of the Mela. The influence of the Inner Circle on suffering humanity still seems very much alive today.*

*In his recent letters H.H. has distinguished between True Ahankara and the false Ahankara. Could he tell us how this arises and how to check it immediately it starts?*

H.H. True Ahankara is the feeling of 'I' when it is related to the Atman. The most that can come out of this feeling is service to humanity. When all these are related then it is pure Ahankara. If the feeling of 'I' is connected with the body, the senses, or the mind—or anything with which one seems to have been associated such as one's particular name, association with any type of thing, or position, or profession, or knowledge—all these things when associated with 'I' are false Ahankara.

With the true Ahankara one experiences the unity with everything. With false Ahankara this unity is broken. Once the unity is broken limitations immediately take over. Where there are limitations there is falsehood. He gave an example:

The Ganges starts from its source Gangotri. It flows right down to the ocean having just one name, the Ganges. The river is worshipped all over India for the clarity and purity of the water; also its auspicious qualities. But suppose the same water, by chance, takes on a limited form by flowing into a ditch mixed with other things. Then it will not be respected as the water of the Ganges where people would go to have holy baths. In addition the germs would multiply in that limited water which is subject to other influences. The main river of the Ganges is never polluted, for it is directly connected to the source.

A true Ahankara is always connected with the Atman and from it emanate all ideas, feelings and actions related to the Atman. False Ahankara forgets the existence of the Atman and takes to the existence of everything else other than the Atman, such as physical body and one of the other things.

*R. The same could be true of Love. At a previous visit we were glad to hear the story of Ram Das and the boil in the context of Prem and Moha—selfless and selfish love.*

H.H. I agree with that.

*D.C. The sense of true Ahankara, as well as one of its facets being the memory of the Atman, also at times is associated with increased awareness of everybody in the building and around one. Awareness of the needs of other people. Is this the right way of looking at it?*

H.H. Yes, it should be right as you have said. In support he gives the example:

After having experienced manhood or being a doctor one may be engaged in multifarious activities of attending to this or that or whatever; one never forgets being a doctor or has to remind oneself of being a man. This is developed in due course by constant association and practice.

If by virtue of the Satsang (company of Truth or a group of seekers after Truth) and the Realised Man—if this feeling of true Ahankara or ‘I am the Atman’ is fully established in an individual, then there will never be any separation. Whatever situation presents itself one would deal with everything and anyone with the same centre. The centre would always be the Atman.

*R. You have advised us to read the Scriptures. Yesterday I opened the Shrimad Bhagavatam at this page (English Edition, p.128): “One day the divine sage Narada approached them and said: ‘O Haryasvas, do you know the end of the field? Without knowing the end of the field all disciplines are fruitless.’”*

Before Jaiswal could go on with the quotation, H.H. began to laugh and to talk and laugh with his followers around him. His answer contains many smiles and laughter. Towards the end he tells the joke and laughs with his followers. This lightens the atmosphere.

H.H. Here we have the classical example of mis-translations. I myself couldn’t understand the riddle as translated when compared with what Narada had intended it to be! The idea is quite different from what was expressed in English. I would like to explain it to you. The word which has been translated as ‘field’ is Kshetra. Kshetra, although in one sense it means a field, here it has not that meaning. The idea is taken from one reference in the Bhagavad Gita, where Lord Krishna speaks of the Kshetra and the Kshetrajna. [See Chapter XIII of *Bhagavad Gita*, “The body as the play-ground of the Self.”]

Kshetra is the field and Kshetrajna is the possessor of the field. Here it is taken in the Cosmic way: Kshetrajna being the Atman and Kshetra being the body and everything within the body, or the cosmos as one single body itself. The Kshetrajna of the whole cosmos being the Creator (Brahma).

So to know the Kshetra is not very important if one does not know the Kshetrajna, the Owner, the Master of the Universe. So here Narada is saying that if you have known the Kshetrajna, the Owner of the field, then all this knowledge of the world, knowledge of the ‘field’, becomes unnecessary. If you are learning the knowledge of the field, your aim should be the Kshetrajna, the ‘end of the field’, the Absolute or the Atman. In this case he is simply stating that discipline by itself is useless. Although without discipline nothing can be achieved (for then you cannot know the Kshetrajna), yet you should not believe that discipline by itself is the end of everything.

As far as translations go, he quotes another joke:

In the Bhagavad Gita at one place (Chapter 1, v. 40– 43) it is mentioned that if the great warriors of the land are killed, then the inferior or second-rate ones would become the chiefs. Because they are second-rate they would not be able to fulfil all the dharma in its true course. Then the practice of the undisciplined would gain the ascendancy. If undiscipline prevails then the people would forget even their Gotra (Gotra means a family line or family tree)—Gotra—in the name of which certain rites are performed. In these rites balls of rice are made to offer during the ritual. Now the translator without explaining the whole ritual simply put that if the warriors are killed, and the inferior warriors become chiefs, the ultimate result would be that your dead forefathers would not be able to get balls of rice! (Much laughter all round)

This illustrates the real problem in translation.



*R. (Puts further parts of Narada's riddle): The second verse was read: "There is a kingdom where reigns the one and only king. There is a well whence there is no return. There is a woman who assumes many forms. There is one who is the husband of the woman."*

H.H. It is important to have rather a full knowledge of the Scriptures otherwise it is difficult to get the central point out of such stories. There are styles of literature in India which are developed along different lines, just as you have in the West. You have the Bible which contains parables, stories which are clothed in such a way as to contain spiritual knowledge in their fabric. So in India also there are certain types of tales which have been clothed in a great variety of language. Your sample comes from just one style where the questions are presented as riddles.

The questions which Narada puts are, 'Do you know the Kingdom where there is only One?' And so on. The answer to all these is the same. There is only one Purush (Absolute). This Purush is the King of All. The Purush has a wife who is Maya. Maya is the woman who assumes multifarious forms. The well which he describes is ignorance, falling into which there is no getting out, unless you are graced with the presence of a Realised Man (Siddhapurusha). Narada mentions the nine doors and other things.

*R. When H.H. quoted stories from Shrimad Bhagavatam, Dattatreya and the arrow-maker and others, many people bought an English translation of his book. Does he recommend that people read only the ones he quotes?*

H.H. The study of such stories from the scriptures is part of the process of knowledge—Knowledge of the Truth. It is one of the recognised proofs of true Knowledge. If individuals study such stories and find they help, then there is nothing to worry about.

The story of Dattatreya is that he had twenty-four such teachers from whom he gathered some kind of knowledge. But the use of the word 'teacher' in this context has a different connotation. A Guru is different from a teacher in the ordinary sense. A teacher in the usual sense is a person in an ordinary school, where you take lessons with 7 or 8 periods in the day. So you may have 7 or 8 different teachers in a day and some of these may be transferred after a term or so. The correct view of a Guru is a person who guides an individual not only on the physical level, but also on the mental and spiritual levels also. He leads him to the Light and freedom. Even if the liberation is achieved the relationship of disciple and Teacher is not dissolved, which is the usual case. When one passes out of an ordinary school one forgets all those teachers and pupils for ever. In fact, none of Dattatreya's so-called 'teachers' initiated him into knowledge from their consciousness. But as they happened to be the main agency in a situation where he could gather the Knowledge through his own volition, he gave those instruments of knowledge the credit for being his 'teachers'. So there were twenty-four situations out of which he named twenty four 'teachers'. But a Guru is only one, one for all time.

*R. About translating, we must be much more careful than we are. We have the same trouble over the Christian Gospels, that what people didn't understand when they were translating they changed.*

*For instance, Christ says "Except a man be born from above ...." He speaks of the subtle and causal, but being translated as "born again" it at once leads to the absurd question, "Can a man enter his mother's womb a second time and be born?"*

*We have all sorts of examples also.*

H.H. He says "Yes", and he also holds the view that all the religious books, the Bible, the Koran, or any of the Hindu scriptures, they all speak of the same truth. But the interpreters, because they have not achieved that level and because the subject has not been related to their own way of living, interpret it on their level and there arises the difficulty. In fact for us, as far as the truth is concerned there is no difficulty, no disparity, no difference anywhere.

He quotes one of the Sutras from the Vedas: Ekam Sad Vipra Badhuda Vadanti—“Truth is one but the wise express it in many ways”. Only the rare and special people who are wise speak in their own language the same truth. But those who do not understand the truth and yet try to interpret, put it wrongly.

*D.C. He spoke about faith (which he also mentioned previously)—the faith on the part of the disciple in relation to the teachings of the Master. This has a strong appeal to those back in London, but our difficulty is that the word “Faith” is understood in several different ways. Does faith imply acting upon your belief? Could he explain his views on this?*

H.H. Faith<sup>1</sup>, he explains, has two levels. The first level is that after hearing the discourse of a teacher or a wise man, somebody may feel interested and attracted. This would be the first level of faith. But if this is not pursued and knowledge is not gathered, this will die down sooner or later. The second level comes if the advice is taken firmly and put into action, then slowly and slowly this will deepen and a stage may arrive when it would become deep and full. Then there would be no doubt as to what is coming through the Teacher. [*Guru*].

The word Guru is made up of two components. The first being G and U, the latter being R and U. The first part symbolises the disciple who is engulfed in ignorance and is pressing towards the Teacher. The other component symbolises the light and the Teacher who is ready to bring him into the light and liberty and freedom. This certainly is possible. The concept of the Guru is one who takes the disciple from ignorance and brings him into the open light of Knowledge.<sup>2</sup> This is possible only if the disciple’s faith is established in the Guru. So establishing the faith in the Guru is absolutely essential.

*R. He used the word “mercy of the Guru”. Can you tell us the Sanskrit word for “mercy”?<sup>3</sup> Is it like the mercy a judge might show to a prisoner?*

H.H. Mercy is neither demanded nor given.<sup>4</sup> It simply happens just as water always flows to the lower level by its nature. The nature of mercy is that when the faith of the disciple is established in the Teacher the flow of mercy is spontaneous; it happens; it’s neither done by the Guru nor expected by the disciple.

*R. It’s late—could we ask a small personal question privately? Merely asking permission to stay on an extra three days?*

## Notes

<sup>1</sup>Bhagavad Gita, Ch. XVII.

1. Arjuna said: Those who setting aside the ordinance of the Shastra perform sacrifice with faith (Shraddha) what is their condition, O Krishna? Is it of Sattva, Rajas or Tamas?

2. The Blessed Lord said: Threefold is the Shraddha of the embodied which is inherent in their nature—the Sattvic, Rajasic and Tamasic. Hear it now.

3. The faith of each is according to his essence (Samskar). The man consists of his belief; he in truth is whatever his belief is.”

The passage continues by showing these three in (1) forms of worship, (2) austerities, (3) the foods which they like, (4) the Yajna or offerings and sacrifices they perform, (5) their manner of life, (6) speech, (7) state of mind, (8) austerities, (9) gifts.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Ouspensky used to teach that the story of the Good Samaritan who showed ‘Mercy’ on the ‘man who fell among thieves’ is a parable (in physical terms) of the relation of the Teacher or Guru to the disciple (on the Spiritual Way).

<sup>3</sup> There are two chief words for ‘Mercy’ in Hindi. The word Kripa would be used in such situations as a prisoner in court pleading for mercy. A higher form such as might be used in the story of the Good Samaritan or in the above passage is Anukampa.

<sup>4</sup> The Quality of Mercy is not strained,  
It droppeth as the gentle dew from Heaven  
Upon the earth beneath. It is twice blessed;  
It blesseth him that takes and him that gives.  
(Portia in *The Merchant of Venice*)