

AUDIENCES

ALLAHABAD

March 1970

Mr. & Mrs. Allan

Translator S.M. Jaiswal

Saturday 7 March

First Talk

R.A. We bring warm greetings from Dr. Roles and Dr. Connell and all in London who benefit from H.H.'s help and guidance. Dr. Roles has written and sent warm regards and thanks to H.H. He says that for him and Dr. Connell life is a struggle to try and practise H.H.'s wonderful instructions during this last visit because this Ahankar is always interfering and composing addresses to other people!

Mr. & Mrs. Allan were sorry that they could not be here with the Doctors and are most grateful that H.H. should have agreed to receive them during this short visit of four days. They both feel the joy of being in H.H.'s physical presence though they feel that they have never been far from him during the last year.

H.H. In reply to what Dr. Roles has written, about his struggles to try to practise what H.H. has given, and his query about Ahankar interfering with the material. H.H. says that all the material which has been given ought to be presented as it is without any alteration by individuals. If it is not taken and understood properly then certainly it is essential and necessary that it should be interpreted according to the country and conditions. The explanation is very important when the differences of place and conditions are very great.

Secondly, your mention of being in the physical presence, and the experience of joy, he said that coming together brings happiness. This coming together applies to any type of activity either physical, emotional or related to reason. Wherever there is unity in coming together there is this inflow of joy and this applies to all the levels, so H.H. also feels the happiness.

R.A. Could H.H. say something about Anand? Is it something that comes as a result of development on the Way, or is it a state which one can induce?

H.H. Anand is the natural state of the Atman when all other things and obstacles are removed, then the Atman exists in the Anand; no-one in the Creation can exist without some Anand. One might feel that as one develops on the Way and makes progress, so one feels that Anand is also improving or developing, but this is only illusory. The real state is that Anand is always with the Atman and so unchanging. It is only our view of it which has changed.

So it is very much like what we have always been given about the Absolute as Sat-Chit-Anand: that Sat is that which is always there, which remains always the same and which is Truth. Then he defined the Chit which is Consciousness or Knowledge, none of these three ever change.

Men as they are born are not given any particular knowledge, but all the knowledge resides in the Atman, so in all individuals. This has got to be aroused by somebody who seems to be giving the knowledge, but in fact nobody gives any knowledge to anyone. One becomes an instrument to arouse the knowledge which is in everyone. When these two come together, Sat and Chit, then the outflow of Anand takes place immediately with the Truth and Consciousness, the Anand flows in. One would not say that there is any improvement or any excess availability of Anand because one is going on the Way, but it is clearing of all unnecessary obstacles which allows the Anand to flow into the life of individuals.

The nature of water is liquid and cool, but if other sources are applied to make it hot, the nature which is cool is no longer available with the water, so—this natural state of the Atman which is Anand can change into some other thing, just as we can experience with water.

In that relation he also says that when people attach themselves by seeking pleasure rather than Anand from worldly things, then certainly they are not experiencing Atman in its natural state.

Just as when one goes to sleep, and the sleep is good and profound, when one wakes up then one knows that the sleep was good and one experienced a happy state of sleep. The same applies to all other activities, that unless you take the food you would not be able to experience the happiness or joy of eating it.

Similarly, unless you meet the person you would not be able to derive the happiness, so this experience of happiness is possible only when some activity has been performed. It is only by coming together that Anand is possible.

R.A. Sometimes one feels that people would get on better if they felt happy. Sometimes they apparently feel very miserable. If one could encourage them to feel happy, perhaps they would get on better. Is this right?

H.H. When any activity is taken up it must have its effect, and there are two possible effects—the effect may be favourable or unfavourable. If it is favourable it results in happiness. If it is not favourable then it leads to displeasure or pain. All those people who seem to be miserable and are in need of some sort of inducement to Anand, this also is a result of something which has happened previously in their life, in this life or some other. They might have been unsuccessful in some of their desires or some other incidents might have come in their life which has resulted in some sort of misery and they keep on or hang on to this state. With such people if it is possible for an individual to give some happiness from their own side, and stimulate them with a little happiness, then they will take up the work. Once they have taken up the right work the result will be happiness, so they will have some happiness of their own and keep on with the work.

M.A. As one gets glimpses of a truer state, dissatisfaction grows with the usual state. Though one feels this should lead to further efforts, it seems to prevent a feeling of happiness, and dissatisfaction prevails. Could H.H. advise how to see this and yet be happy?

H.H. Of course whenever anyone experiences the truer state, then it is natural that there will be some dissatisfaction with the usual state which is mostly Rajasic state, filled with Rajas. The truer state is the state with abundance of Sattva and certainly it has more peace which one could experience in such a state. So the natural effect is that one likes to get away from this Rajasic state of the world. If this prevails in the mind then the dissatisfaction will kill everything which has been earned. But if one adopted a devotional attitude, then the situation changes, for with a devotional attitude one would not take any activity even of the world as a responsibility which one must perform, or a duty which one must undergo. One should take it as a sort of drama and only play one's part without any attachment to any of the activities one takes on. Once you have established yourself in a state in which you simply act as well as you can, then just as in the dramatic performance the actor enjoys acting, and the onlookers enjoy seeing the play, so then you will find that whatever you undertake will have this colour that you will also enjoy doing whatever work comes before you, and everybody else surrounding, or connected with you will also enjoy that the work is being done nicely. Before one starts any activity one should prepare oneself with devotion and apply it to whatever work presents itself to one.

M.A. Can you create a devotional attitude by remembering Atman within you and this tradition, or is there some particular way to cultivate such attitude

H.H. Devotion is only possible by remembering or looking at somebody who happens to be superior in all three aspects* or in the knowledge which one is heading for. So in that case remembering the Tradition would be logical. In fact the whole thing is in the attitude, establishing the attitude that whatever one does in the world is only a rôle which one has to perform.

*Word used was Shakti. This implies development of all three aspects of being—emotional, intellectual and physical.

For instance, he gives the example of Ramleela the play of the life of Rama where fights are arranged, and many other things happen, and the actors who perform these Sattvic deeds or the Rajasic deeds, or these Tamasic deeds—might have to fight, to weep and to laugh, all know they are simply doing their job. In fact when they are weeping there is no pain, when they are laughing there is no change of any sort; or even if they pretend to be dead, in fact nothing really happens; in all these situations all of them know that they are acting, so no-one gets attached and they do not feel any pleasure or pain related to the work.

When once the same attitude is established and developed, one would find that whatever one takes up is accomplished without any attachment, and as long as there is no attachment there will be no feeling of success or failure, or pleasure or pain and one can easily get along with any work.

The source of all energy and happiness and consciousness is embodied in each individual, so one can if one likes remember one's own Self. It is from there that all the energies can be had. Or one can remember any great man or Realised Man in whom one can put one's faith, and by remembering it is possible that such a state would come easily and one can with that particular attitude which has been described, proceed with the work easily.

R.A. When my wife and I were in Bombay we were taken by an Indian friend to see Swami Swaroopananda at Pavas. We were with the Swami for about ten minutes, and though we asked no questions we were greatly refreshed by being in his presence. We wonder if this visit was made with your knowledge, and if not we hope that there was nothing wrong in making it? Is it profitable to maintain a contact of this kind? I was going to mention this later, but mention it now as I believe Swami Swaroopananda went by the Devotional Way.

H.H. On the way to Self-realisation one may reach a certain station and find some welcome scenes. They might seem attractive and if one gets involved in it then the rest of the journey is forgotten.

Any good thing which is useful can be had from any source. Of course one has to see what is useful to oneself, and in that respect there are different types of Ways which have been given to us, and are known to all of us. He mentions some of them by name—one Way is the Way of Activity or Ritualistic Way—discipline of all activities and actions—which has been propounded by Vashishtha and others; and then there is another Way which is the Way of Ascetics which takes one out of the world and leads one towards Self-realisation, propounded by Sukadeva and others, and then there is the (middle) Way taken by Sooradasa and Tulsidas and also by Shankaracharya. The last named propounded the theories suitable for those who still like to be in the world and work for Self-realisation. To decide what is useful relates to what has been so far useful. If one is on the Way according to certain principles and certain disciplines then one has to keep on with the disciplines. If there is some other source which might seem to be useful by its appearance, then one would have to enquire whether what seems to be useful is really useful or not and that means that one must come in direct contact and personal discourse. Only then would one be able to know what is going to follow.

It has been seen according to H.H.'s experience, that people take to other holy men who seem to be more useful to them, and then later on they find that whatever system or disciplines they have been undergoing for so long are discarded and a new system is given to them. Now this immediately puts limitations on the individual because going by different disciplines is not easily possible. In that case H.H. would certainly leave it to individuals to decide what is useful to them, but the way to decide what is useful is by personal contact and association, but there is a danger one will not find one's way back to the way which one has always been following so far. Once you are given a new discipline it is very difficult to get back out of it.

R.A. We are disciples of the Shankaracharya's and of course stay in his discipline, there is no question about that!

I notice that in his recent talks with Dr. Roles, H.H. discussed Shuddha Ahankar and Ashuddha Ahankar. In earlier talks he has told us of the difference between Aham and Idam. Is Shuddha Ahankar the same as Aham, and Ashuddha Ahankar the same as Idam?

H.H. They are related. The Shuddha Ahankar is related to Aham and Ashuddha Ahankar is related to Idam, but not completely because Ahankar is a state where Atman always plays a part. When the Shuddha Ahankar is active then all the faculties—the senses and the mind—and Buddhi, all of them are working properly, and they see things as they are, and out of this when Shuddha Ahankar is experienced everything is pure and true. That is the Shuddha Ahankar. Whenever the mind is distorted, or Buddhi is distorted, then whatever knowledge is experienced would be tangled with the Idam—that is the world. So anything which is entangled with the Idam would certainly have some Ashuddha Ahankar, but if it is based on pure reason and related to the Atman, and anything which results in goodness or happiness or bliss, that would certainly be called Shuddha Ahankar.

Sunday 8 March

Second Talk

M.A. We have quite a lot of questions, but is there a particular line of enquiry which H.H. would suggest we should pursue to make best use of this short visit?

H.H. The line of enquiry should always be related to one's own enquiry in connection with the work on the spiritual line so once you go through that, that will cover every other person's enquiry as well.

M.A. Mr. Ouspensky used to say it was important to pass on ideas in a certain order—does this apply to what H.H. gives us, and if so could he give an outline of such an order? Is this connected with the “three years” mentioned to Dr. Roles and Dr. Connell?

H.H. In relation to the period of three years, the general prescription of three years is given with a view that according to the human nature it would take about three years for a discipline to become part of one's nature, provided this discipline is carried on for three years with sincerity and continuity. Although it is possible to impart knowledge of any ways to people to take and understand within one single week or forty days, or three months, or a year, but if people take and understand the discipline in this small period, it is quite possible for them that later on they may either forget or may not hold it as sincerely as they thought they would be able to, so there may be diversions or weakening of the effect and ultimately losing the whole thing, and this usually happens because of the individual's incapacity for holding, or by the effect of other wrong influences such as bad company which will also undo the good effect of the discipline taken by the individual. So, this is a general rule that three years is just enough for any individual to come to a stage where he can be self-sufficient and make this discipline and a method part of his life, and only then he can impart it to others and work with others.

R.A. Can this period of three years be connected with the Ladder of Self-realisation, is it for instance point 3 on the Ladder?

H.H. The general notion of three years is only to bring the individual to a point where the discipline and the method becomes a part of his life so much so that even if he is sick he will not leave the discipline or the meditation, and at the usual time at which he meditates he will settle down to meditation and carry on the practice. This is possible when it has become natural. There are so many examples here of people who have been carrying on the discipline for twenty years and yet they haven't transcended even one step. So it is quite possible that people may carry on the discipline and yet not do it with sincerity and love (which H.H. mentions precisely). So it is only up to the individual that he does the work with sincerity and love—then he will be able to come

to the third step where the effort will be natural. There are students who stick to their classes for many years and cannot pass them, and there are students who even at the first go get a first class and pass easily.

M.A. Could H.H. tell us more about the cultivation of pure Reason? There seem to be two types of analysing of ideas—the usual one is an active thinking about ideas which leads away from, or replaces ‘practice’. One would like to ensure that when we meet in our groups the discussion leads towards Self-realisation. The same thing happens when ideas of Truth come to one alone—without right use of reason one seems to be carried away from the ‘present moment’.

H.H. The discipline of Pure Reason is that one should first of all get the information (system), and then relate it to one’s own experiences which might present certain doubts (questions) regarding the propositions put before one—if you work in this way the function of pure reason is possible. Otherwise if somebody takes the discipline without reasoning, which means without putting up any personal experiences and questions arising out of them, that would be taken as a Kashaya (veil). This is one of the three coverings Mala—Vikshepa—Kashaya, a sort of cover which you put over yourself and block out reason. [See full description 1968]. That is not really very useful or good, so every discipline which is given must be reasoned, and the way to reason is to relate to experiences and the questions and doubts arising out of them. The other way which leads towards futile discussion is when the reason or the logic is not related to experience or diverts from the subject itself. So if the subject is kept in mind, and if the experience is reflected, only then is pure reason possible.

H.H. continues: About the three types of coverings which we have—because of these coverings communication is hampered and is not possible between the disciple and the Teacher. One of them is usually predominant in each individual. The first one is Mala (literally translated as the ‘dirt’) the opaque dirt which prevents all penetration into the Antahkaran of the individual, so that he doesn’t understand anything of what is being preached, or the way being shown to him. The second is the Vikshepa (distraction) which is when the discourse is taking place and someone is giving the teaching, the attention of the individual goes somewhere else just after catching the first sentence, so he cannot listen to what is being said. And the third one is Kashaya (veil) which is the sort of covering out of which there is practically no impression gained by the individual, and this Kashaya is due to sticking to certain ideas which have been taken without any reason—(sort of blind belief). These are the three ways due to which communication of pure reasoning is not possible. One has to get rid of these before reason can prevail.

M.A. This bringing together of the idea, the knowledge and the experience, is this the right linking of head and heart that he spoke of to Dr. Roles?

H.H. Yes, that is certainly so—the union or the unity of head and heart is essential. When this unity takes place it is the Sattvic Antahkaran—the individual is full of Sattva and it is only under Sattva that something good can prevail. Those who cannot bring their head and heart together, if they are not aligned, then the distortions take place and no discipline is actually fruitful nor are discussions understood by them.

There are two types of people—those who work predominantly with head, and those predominantly with heart. Those who work with head are usually prone to too much discussion, and those who work with heart accept the discipline or the discourse without any reasoning and like to get along with the work. But neither of them are really complete because the rational man, or the one who simply keeps on discussing and does not practise the discipline which is being given would not attain any level further, so he would not be able to reason in a better way and about subtler levels. The person who takes to the discipline just on trust—if he faces a person from the other side he would not be able to match up to him, and then if he cannot match up he will have some inward doubt in his own heart about the discipline and it is quite possible that under the stress of the opposing ideas he might give it up. Here is a story to illustrate this:

Two people were going to bathe in the Ganges, and while they were walking towards the Ganges the man with the head said to the other: “Look at this Creator—he must be a fool because he never knew what he was doing.” While they were going along they passed two types of trees—one was pumpkin growing on the sandy soil above the river with many big pumpkins and six feet away was a mango tree. So the man with the head said: “This is such a small plant and the Creator put such big fruits on it, and if you look at the mango tree, which is such a big tree it has such small fruits. So he must be a nut to have done such a thing.”

The other man, belonging to the line of heart, couldn't reply and couldn't say that, after all, the Absolute was not so foolish in doing this, but anyway he kept quiet and felt sorry for himself.

When they were returning after the bathe, on their way home they were tired and they thought they would have a little rest under a tree, and they happened to sit under the mango tree, and while they were dozing one of the ripe mangoes fell on the nose of the man who was the intellectual. It hit him hard and he felt a lot of pain, but the moment he got this he exclaimed to the other chap that now he understood why the Absolute made such small fruit on big trees. “If he had acted according to me, I would have been nowhere!”

The moral is that both ways are insufficient. The real way is to bring these two together, and in unison the life is better and purposeful.

R.A. H.H. said it requires sincerity and love to get anywhere. One can be sincere through the practice of disciplining oneself, one can get knowledge through attention, but how can one get love?

H.H. Whenever one takes to any discipline with a view to do by one's own efforts and achieve these ends which one has in view, then this is impregnated with some sort of egoistic, individualistic approach, and as long as this approach is there in undertaking any work, even spiritual work the result will be such that it will not be with love, for the success and failure will affect further effort. When you have some sort of love the effect is that you bring enthusiasm into the work to keep it continuous. To bring about this situation he says that if we think and try to impress upon ourselves that all the work which we are undertaking for any result is only in the service of the Absolute so that whatever we do we offer as our service, then the individualistic approach, or the egotistic approach would not intervene in the work. Whenever there is individualistic approach the effect of the work falls on the body and mind also, for people get tired physically and mentally—both, and if they get tired physically and mentally they would not be able to continue the work. The other way, when you serve the cause of the Absolute, because there is no egoistic approach the body and the mind is never tired, and if it is not tired, one would be able to continue with the work and to do as much as is necessary. That is the true way and one should see that one serves the Absolute, and does not think to achieve things by one's own deeds.

M.A. We need a few pumpkins on our 'active' London heads to shorten the number of years necessary to fix the discipline!

H.H. H.H. does not prescribe pumpkins for anyone except those present! The possibility of any improvement is on the level of the Self. If anyone wants to improve he has to listen and put that thing into practice. Unless it is put into practice there will be no further advancement. If one thinks that these things can be give to others as we can give presents to individuals, then that is a mistake.

In the ordinary life when we are pleased with somebody we usually give them a present, but these material presents are of such a nature that they will somehow in due course be either destroyed or they will be consumed by the elements so there will be some sort of deterioration according to the laws of Nature, and the present will be lost.

In the life of a disciple who is on the spiritual line, there aren't such presents which can be given to anyone—the only thing one has is to listen to the discourse and immediately try to put it into practice. It is only by putting the whole discipline into practice that one would be able to see further.

If you give a 100 rupee note to a two-year old child you will see that he does not recognise the value of the paper at all, and the most he would do is to tear and play with it and destroy it. The same may happen with people that they may be given valuable material but they just play with it and make no use of it at all. When the child reaches say thirteen or fourteen years, and he has learnt to appreciate the value of money with which he can buy so many other things then if he is given a note he takes a lot of care of it because he knows that this piece of paper is far more valuable than other pieces of paper.

So the clue is for us, in fact the pumpkin has fallen on our nose! We ought to take the advice and put it into practice—only through that is it possible to give some proper and purposeful effects to others.

In India it is quite possible to get a copy of the Bhagavad Gita, which holds the philosophy of liberation, for a few pence, but the essence and the Truth and the knowledge which is enclosed in the Bhagavad Gita is not possible to buy even for a million rupees.

That truth or the knowledge of the Bhagavad Gita is available only if one takes to three-fold work. The three-fold work is as follows—the first is the trust, faith. With faith one should prepare oneself and take to the work, as H.H. previously said, in the service of the Absolute. The second is the sincerity with which one attends to the work or the knowledge which is being given and one tries to understand and put the whole thing into practice again and again. The third thing is the discipline to gain control over the senses and the mind. Control over the senses and the mind is very essential otherwise the disciplines are lost in due course. So it is a three-fold way—one must have control over the senses and the mind, and be sincere in the work and approach, and must have some trust and faith so that the work is nothing but the 'play', only then would one be able to improve on the way.

Note. We had hoped to finish with the following question which had been prepared and typed but our time was up and so it was not asked, but the answer which follows came immediately after a slight pause from the above.

R.A. Ever more detailed knowledge seems necessary to confirm and make permanent experiences gained on the advance to Self-realisation. Is it right to think however, that at a certain stage the knowledge required can be simplified and condensed? I have in mind a saying of Jesus that all the religious laws and all the teaching of the prophets can be summed up in two principles. First: Love the Lord thy God with all thy mind, and with all thy strength, and with all thy heart. Second: Love thy neighbour as thyself. Are we yet at a stage when we could understand such a simplification? If so, would H.H. give us one?

H.H. Gives a quotation from the life of the first Shankaracharya who after full experience and discourse gave the whole system in just one sentence:

“Only Brahman is the Truth and everything else is illusory; there is no difference between Brahman and the Self which is in the individual.”

This one simple sentence is the culmination of all the experience and all the knowledge which were available to him. One has to go through this knowledge and experience—only then do these sentences, or this knowledge have any meaning, otherwise they are nothing. So one has to experience and put everything into practice.

Jaiswal then read the quotation Allan had intended to give in his question with which H.H. was obviously delighted.