

Saturday 19 January

Fourth Audience

R. To get the peace on subtle and causal levels it is clearly necessary to give up. Suddenly last night I woke up with His Holiness's words of personal advice ringing in my ears:

"Giving up can be done emotionally and intellectually at all times and in all conditions. Practise 'giving up' all the time, by regarding the body, the mind and the heart as belonging to Param-Atman and so offering all these back to Him."

Even a little of this is found to be more effective than anything else. How can I make myself do more of it?

H.H. This observation is in keeping with the spirit of the first Upanishad—the Ishavasya. The first two verses of this carve out the central core of what can be said to be the essence of Indian philosophy. The complete Gita which we know, is almost an explanation of these two verses from this Upanishad.

The same thing given in these two verses is also given in the Bhagavad Gita. Here Krishna says, "Whosoever sees the world in Me, and sees Me in the world, he alone knows Me, and he alone will transcend, and be relieved of the turmoil of this universe. He will be in bliss and he will have everlasting life."

The essence of the first two verses of Ishavasya Upanishad is that all this Universe is filled with the Absolute. If one takes anything in the world, and looks into its construction, one will ultimately reach the state where one will find the Absolute in everything. For example:

You can take cloth: Cloth is made of thread, thread is made of the cotton, and the cottonball comes from the earth, and the earth is made of water, water comes from fire, fire from air, air from space ('ether'), and this comes from Mahat-tattva, Mahat-tattva comes from Apra-Prakriti: this in turn comes from Para-Prakriti, and Avyakta, the Unmanifested, is in the Absolute.

So, if you keep on looking into anything, you will ultimately come to the Absolute, that which prevails in everything. This is the process through which all things come to be manifested. In fact, the Absolute is not just within matter, but it is everywhere. It is not only the 'efficient cause', but the 'material cause' also. It is the efficient cause and the material cause—both are the Absolute; so the Absolute is within and without and the Absolute is everything.

The Ishavasya Upanishad says that the Universe is permeated by the Absolute. Whatever one sees in creation, whatever moves—one should use it fully and enjoy this Absolute everywhere, but one should enjoy it with renunciation. One should not try to hold it or covet it. Just because the Absolute is always everywhere, one need not try to hold it, enjoy it—and give it up. So, 'giving up' is the most simple philosophy which promises complete fulfilment of the individual's life, also Liberation after having enjoyed it. This is the meaning of that first verse.

The next verse says that, if one could live like this by enjoying the Absolute and giving up, one would desire to live a hundred years and, having lived it this way, none of the Karma—none of the actions through which the individual has to go during these hundred years—will bind him at all. They are no bondage for, in fact, he is already liberated; he lives in Liberation; and, when the body is finished with he goes forth with Liberation. Indeed, nothing will bind him, so this observation which you have given is the central philosophy. If one could practise it all the day, all the time, one would experience liberation within, and the real liberation when liberation from the body comes.

We were given the following story some time ago, but the situation demands that it should be told again:

It relates to Prajapiti, who is the teacher of the Gods, the priest of the Gods. His son, Kach, having gone through the proper education in the Vedic and Upanishadic texts, and having acquired all the knowledge that was to be acquired, came back to his father. His father asked him what he was intending to do. He said, “The essence of all I have learnt is that renunciation is the best medium for life, so I would like to go the way of renunciation.” So he would not take up the activities of the priesthood, and he would not help in the household activities either; he just stayed in the house.

After some time, the father asked him whether he had really renounced everything? As far as the father could see, his son had renounced all work, but he still keeps on moving, eating, and using the amenities of the house. ‘So what about that?’ The son said, “All right, I will renounce the house,” so he left the house and went into the jungle and stayed there.

Then, after another interval, the father visited him there, and asked him what the situation was? The boy said, “I can’t say I have acquired complete peace, so it seems I have not yet renounced everything.” The father said, “Yes, of course, it seems so—your renunciation is not complete, otherwise peace would descend on you.” So he renounced the cloth which he wore, the food he ate, and all activity, yet he could not get the real peace of mind.

“Now,” he said, “the only thing left to renounce is my body, so I must renounce the body,” and he prepared a funeral pyre intending to jump into it. His father suddenly appeared and asked him to be sure that this would be the final renunciation. The son asked, “But once I have given up the body, what else will remain to bind me to worldly things?”

The father replied: “Your subtle body is not going to die with your physical body, and the activities of the subtle body (which has desires) will make it keep on wandering, and will not subside after the body is burnt. You will get another body when you are dead because there will be some desire in your subtle body, so burning the body is not the final answer—you are not going to get rid of this creation.”

So the son said: “Well, what should I do if I cannot renounce, what else should I do?”

The father then said: “At last you have asked me a question, so now it is possible for you to learn something! Give up all your learning, and the final giving up—the final renunciation—will be the giving up of the very idea of renunciation. You are not giving up anything, everything is given up. By the idea of renunciation you are holding something in preference to other things—in fact, you are not renouncing; you are holding on very tightly to something lesser.”

The creation is such that everything is there by its own right—everything has a purpose and must fulfil its function; so it must keep on rotating, it must be used. Use everything, and give up the idea that you are renouncing. Don’t hold on to anything in this creation, and that can only be done by this *final renunciation of giving up the idea that you have anything*. In fact, you have nothing. Everything is of the Absolute, everything is permeated by the Absolute; you use whatever you need, and the rest simply belongs to Him. This we must keep in our minds when we think of renunciation.

From the Ishavasya Upanishad

In the Invocation: That is full; this is full. When this fulness merges in that fulness, only fulness remains. Peace! Peace! Peace!

Verse 1. Whatever lives is full of the Lord. Claim nothing, enjoy, do not covet His property.

Verse 2. Then hope for a hundred years of life doing your duty in His name. No other way will prevent contamination with the effects of your deeds—proud as you are of your human nature.

Verse 3. A life not illuminated by Self-knowledge condemns itself.

R. *On that subject could you read two of the questions I brought from London, because His Holiness has now answered them, I think.*

J.S. *(First question from London) It appears that one's individuality is only part of the 'delegated adaptability' of Param-Atman, so are we just to be good receiving stations and transmitters according to our level of understanding?*

H.H. One's concept of 'I' is of two types: the Real 'I' is the Atman, but the Atman by itself does not receive anything, and does not transmit anything. It is there, and it is everywhere, just like the Absolute, so it does form something more, and that 'something more' is a part of this Universe, and we call that Ahankar, the Ego. This Ego is part of the Antahkarana, which includes several things—the Chitta, the Manas, the Buddhi, the body, and everything. Atman uses this machinery to experience the Knowledge, the Being, and the Bliss. So this 'I' is now made into two—the inner one which is the Atman, and the outer one which is the Ahankar.

To appreciate oneself as just 'the receiving station and transmitter' is the best understanding one could have, because it is only the Absolute which has manifested itself as the creation, which is passing through and being manifested or expressed by Himself, which is the Atman.

When people don't understand, and think that this Ahankar alone is themselves—that Ahankar alone is the 'I' and there is nothing beyond it—then they start creating boundaries, and these boundaries are made of the limitations of this understanding, their knowledge, or the ideas which they have. It is not just the single body which creates the boundary, but everything to which the individual relates himself—the concept of family etc.

This act immediately puts obstacles to the natural and full flow of energy from the Atman, and man lives by the little flow which he naturally cannot stop. Some boundaries are small, some are large but, in fact, all this which is within the boundary, or which creates a boundary is not the real Self. The real Self is the Atman: it has nothing to do with this universe, and yet the whole design of this universe is there for its enjoyment. So, when you separate these two, it is only then you come into difficulties.

But, if you keep both together, and feel that you are the receiving station, and transmitting it as a necessary part of the universe, then you would be able to enjoy the universe—you would be able to do what you are designed to do. If one wanted to find out the definition of Real 'I', then whatever you cannot give up is Real 'I', and whatever can be given up is the other 'I', which is the Universe.

R. *This (next) is a question of several senior people who demand only direct contact with His Holiness, and not through anyone else:*

M.E.P. *(Second question from London) Questions must be a sign of the work proceeding—unless one is making some effort, there are no questions. But of whom should the questions be asked? Surely (after some years) it is to ourselves that the question is asked, and from the Self only that the answers can come?*

Yet again, if a man by this logic were to say, "I know all the answers, and so need no help," would he not stand in great danger from ego? Would His Holiness please show us how to resolve this everlasting paradox?

H.H. The answer is very simple. The Atman never questions because He has no reason to question, so whenever a question arises, it never arises from the Atman. It always arises from the Ahankar because Ahankar is not fully realised; it is not the Atman, it is not the Absolute; so it wants to know, and it is necessary that there should be questions because the full Realisation has not taken place. As long as full Realisation has not taken place, the questions must arise. But if one allows the Ahankar to *answer* the questions, then one will be in trouble.

Should one put the questions to the Atman? That could be a proposition. If the Atman has no questions, certainly He must know everything; and he must also know the question of the individual, so should one question the Atman who knows the question already?

No, one cannot question the Atman—one cannot ask questions of the Atman. But one can pray to Him. Be

humble, and put up a prayer to the Atman to resolve the question—that is a way to appeal to the Atman, and then the proper answer will be available.

R. So they are quite right to want the words of His Holiness, because we could not have answered the question in that way!

H.H. In the Isa Upanishad there is something again very close to this question (His Holiness quotes verses 15 & 16):

One of them says that this Self is hidden by a golden sheath of this Universal Being, Universal Body: so the body, the senses, the mind, Buddhi, Chitta—all these form the golden body within which the Self is hidden, and then a prayer is put to this hidden Self.

Translated, this prayer reads:

“That which gives food to everyone, that which is the supporter of the Universe, and the One who gives like no-one else—that is the One who gives most, who resolves and keeps on regulating this whole Universe; who is brilliant like the Sun, who looks after all His children in this Universe and with all these glorious things—

O Self, who is in everything, please now remove this golden sheath so that the Truth, the real Understanding, and the full Realisation of the Self can take place.”

So one does not question the Self; one only prays to the Self to resolve the problem.

R.A. Is it right to feel that nothing belongs to me, even the Ahankar that is called Allan; that Ahankar is really only the instrument for the use of the Absolute?

H.H. The machine is certainly the individual, but there is some other element which runs the machine—which supplies the force to run the machine. This force is coming only through the Real Self, the Atman, who is called Allan, Lord Allan!

The body, the senses, and the inner instruments, they are also part of the name which we call Allan. As long as the force which governs this machine is kept without any hindrance—as long as one does not claim it to be done by one’s own mind or body; if one recognises that all commands are coming from the Self within, and then are interpreted without any boundaries—without any further interpretation—then one will see that the Atman is acting through the individual.

One cannot separate the two, because it is in the design that the Atman will have to work through the Ahankar. But no boundaries should be created, and none of what is called ‘Allan’ can be removed from the real Allan.

M.A. At the beginning of the answer to J.S.’s question, Mr. Jaiswal used the two words Antahkarana and Ahankar. It may only be a question of translation, in which case I would not want to waste His Holiness’s time, but I wanted to ask what the relationship between these two words in this answer was?

J. It was my slip of the tongue saying Antahkarana first, when Ahankar was meant; but we will ask His Holiness about the two words.

H.H. Ahankar is one of the parts belonging to the Antahkaran. Antahkarana is the internal machinery—internal body—and it has got these four parts—Ahankar, Chitta, Buddhi and Manas—which are just like the four gears in a car, and you use one gear for a particular type of speed. When you use one of these you get a different function; this is the difference between Ahankar and Antahkarana.

These four have four types of function: Ahankar gives the feeling of ‘I’; in Chitta you have all the knowledge and the memories (smriti); Buddhi makes the decisions and discriminates; and Manas collects all the ideas which come to the individual—this and that, without selection.

R. *It is 10.45 and tomorrow is Sunday; do we ask to see His Holiness again on Monday?*

H.H. As we have no audience on the 23rd, we may come tomorrow Sunday.

R. *(cont.): But Sunday is a whole holiday for His Holiness we understand?*

H.H. It is my holiday to talk to you.

On the 22nd we will have the Rasleela, and on the 24th we will have the audience followed by lunch at the Ashram.

Sunday 20 January

Fifth Audience

R. *In a talk here this time last year we are told that His Holiness said; “One of the benefits of Holy company is that we learn from it that the deepest possible relationship that can exist between two things is that which exists between Ahankar and Param-Atman.” So no wonder we could not define it in words! Only experience in the presence of a Realised Man could reveal it?*

H.H. In the realm of Bhakti—devotion—this relationship exists very closely between the Param-Atman and the Ahankar, and is used in the most positive manner. The individual in this realm looks at the Param-Atman in its manifest form and makes it the object of his worship. He sings the praise of this Lord (whom he wishes to worship) by proclaiming all the glories which are enshrined in this God and, because he tries to become One with Him through his emotion, he subdues or merges his Ahankar into the Being of the Absolute—the God. Then it seems that, because of this Unity, the qualities and the glories of the God are shared by the devotee himself.

Take Tulsi Das who, in one of his couplets, says that whenever you try to unite with any particular being (it could be a God or anything else), and you devote yourself entirely to the service of that particular being, then all the peculiarities of that particular being will be shared by you.

When a devotee merges his Ahankar into God, then he starts sharing the qualities of God.

When you, for instance, take to the ideal of being a Man, then immediately all the qualities associated with Manhood are separated from those of all other beings and one feels shy and ashamed of not being able to measure up to those qualities associated with being a Man, so one refrains from being like an animal. One always keeps that standard before oneself, because this manifestation of the Absolute as a Man—‘The Ideal Man’—stays very close to the Ahankar of the individual, and then he behaves as a Man should.

This is how one can see that through the Ahankar, when it is Sattvic, then the qualities of the Gods descend on the man. When it is Rajasic, then he takes it as his own body—his own doing, and does not get the finer qualities of the Absolute. When he takes over the Tamasic aspects in his Ahankar, then he acts in a very cruel and rigid way and, in fact, he becomes less than a Man should be. If the Ahankar is Sattvic then the relationship with the gods will also be Sattvic.

R. *That attitude is expressed, surely, by Sri Shankara’s Dakshina-murti with the thumb, the Param-Atman, the Ahankar the first finger, and the other three fingers the Gunas?*

H.H. This position of the hand is known as the ‘posture of Knowledge’—Jnanamudra. When the original Shankara was discoursing with his disciples, he told them that in one Shloka he would give them the gist of all the Advaita (non-dualistic) philosophy, and in that Shloka it is said that:

Brahma Satyam—Jaganmithya,
Brahman is Truth—the world is illusion,

Brahma Jivaiva—Naporah.
Brahman and Jiva—are not different.

(He shows the hand-sign); these three fingers (middle, ring and little finger) depict the three aspects which are the Sattva, Rajas and Tamas (or waking, dreaming, and sleep states). All the three aspects of the creation (which is involved with the Prakriti) are illusion, so are separated from the first finger which acts as the Jiva—the person, the thumb being the Absolute. The state of Unity is shown by the position of the first finger linked to the thumb; the Jiva is the Atman, it is with the Absolute and is just the same. So Jiva himself is the Brahman, and all this Prakriti (which is governed by the other three) is illusion and, therefore, is outside the realm of the Absolute (which is not involved, separate). This is the Knowledge symbol—the Jnana mudra of Knowledge (knowledge hand sign) which is given in the Dakshina-murti (‘of wisdom the image’) or ‘hand sign of Liberation.’

M.A. I feel rather impertinent asking this question, as I don't imply that I know much about this realm.

His Holiness has described the deep dive—the state of full meditation. Does this mean that we pass through the state of Samadhi to reach this, and is it the Mantra which leads us through, or has the Mantra been transcended before Samadhi?

H.H. What has been described to us as this profound, deep dive is the state of Turiya, which is beyond Samadhi. In Samadhi there is a state of equilibrium, but Mantra is still present there. When you go to the profound depth, then you pass through this state of Samadhi.

In Turiya, the Mantra is also transcended because, at this stage the three factors—the act of meditation, the Mantra, and the one who is meditating—all these things are lost into one Unity; there is no differentiation or any attempt to do anything, or any knowing of any particular thing; neither is there the movement of the Mantra itself. So that state is the real state of the profound deep dive.

There are three parts of the Mantra we have been given. [*Here His Holiness repeated our Mantra twice in a long, slow resonant way.*] This also relates to another Mantra—AUM. You heard the way our Mantra was pronounced; there are three measures in it. You start with the short ‘R’; then comes the long ‘AAA’, and then the closing sound of ‘M’ is lengthened, protracted. This is how this Mantra should be said (not aloud, but within one’s mind) so all these measures come together; and the last measure takes one to the state of equilibrium, and to complete peace or silence where everything comes to an end, as you have heard.

R. But couldn't one bring the state of Samadhi out into the world after transcending in meditation?

H.H. The state of Samadhi is a transitional state leading to Turiya.

The state of Turiya is like going to have a bathe in the Ganges. When you come out of the river, then you are a bit wet; you do not bring the whole Ganges with you, but you bring the effect of the Ganges and you feel fresh, and you take to any activity in a far better way than if you were tired, and unclean.

When you come out of this Turiya (which is the profound peace experienced by the Self), you take something of this great stream of Ganges with you—the great stream of the Absolute. You acquire some strength from it, and with that strength you deal with all the situations which are presented to you in the world.

Some time ago we were given the Seven Steps of Knowledge, and the sixth state was described as Padartha-bhawani or Pure Bliss. In this state there is absence of all things, and this is equated with Samadhi; but, after transcending this state, you come into Turiya where there is Unity with the Absolute—Unity with the Universal stream. When you come out of that then you are better disposed to face the world and handle all situations.

R. After hearing all this, we long to get back to improving our own meditation, making it better and better.

May I now lead up to two more of the questions from London: Mr. Whiting asked me to say that he gave the first talk he had here with His Holiness to the School of Meditation; he also gave it to me, and some of our people heard a recording of that first talk. It has created a profound effect on everybody. One of these questions arises from it:

Mrs. N.D.-H. His Holiness, commenting on the story told to Mr. Whiting of the 'King crow and the young Swan,' said that 'victory goes only to the natural man.' We know this is true, and yet one longs to experience it on the subtle level of Being: is there a short-cut?

H.H. It is not really necessary to look at the Work only on the subtle level, because the subtle level cannot be removed from the physical. There are two ways of looking at a thing, or finding the Truth about a thing: one way is Anvaya and the other is Vyatireka. In Anvaya is the addition of things, in Vyatireka is the subtraction of things. Through Anvaya we find that there is this Absolute which brings out the Avyakta, and from the Avyakta you have Prakriti, which is threefold, then Mahat-tattva, and further:

Akasha	Vayu	Agni	Jala and	Prithvi
Space (Æther)	Air	Fire	Water	Earth

then everything which you see in different forms. This is how the stages of beings are being explained by the way of Anvaya. In these stages, *the forces of the Absolute are descending and taking their place in this universe*, so they are held in their place and their time only by the power of the Absolute.

There is another way of looking at this problem: you take a thing and try to find the Absolute within it. You say that the form which is presented before you hides something within it, so the flower hides the Prithvi within it. The Prithvi hides Jala within it, and Jala hides Agni, and then Vayu, and then Akasha, Mahat-tattva, then Prakriti, then Avyakta, and then the ultimately hidden substance is of the Absolute. So you *separate the fine from the coarse*, (Vyatireka), and keep on finding subtler things. These are the two ways.

When you look at the manifest world, then this is the Anvaya, and looking the other way, you draw out the forces which are hidden in them; and with that experience and the Knowledge gathered from the physical world, you substantiate your subtle body. Having substantiated your subtle body to conform with the Knowledge and the Bliss derived from the physical world, you use that force of the subtle body to perform more efficiently the activities of the physical body. So these two ways must always be kept supporting each other.

If one thinks that it is possible to live in the realm of the subtle world alone, then what is the use after all of coming into this creation—into the coarse world—when one could stay in the subtle world? Then the Manifest world would become useless, without purpose; and we cannot say that, because it certainly has a purpose in this creation and it must fulfil that purpose in full. In fulfilling the purpose of this physical world we can be united with the Absolute and, if we do not do that, we would not—in reality—have unity with the Absolute.

This also applies the other way round; one cannot just forget the subtle world and only enjoy the realm of the physical world, because that world will not be enjoyed by you—the greater and better part of this Absolute will be left without being enjoyed and known. So they must go together, simultaneously.

When one goes into the activity of the world one gets tired; and when one is tired one must draw energy from the peace and so one goes into sleep, only to recharge oneself.

Similarly, these two worlds of physical and subtle help each other, and we must learn to keep on working through both so that we may enjoy better and deeper realms of these two levels.

R. Is it part of this that one experiences in meditation—of ascending to the stillness and then descending, up and down the spine?

H.H. Yes, the description of this ascent and descent can be easily related to this Anvaya and Vyatireka. By giving up spending energy, when we proceed into the meditation we certainly go down into the lowest part of the spine which is the Muladhara. Having come to the state of profound peace, then the potent energy rises on this ladder and works through all these stages of Swadhishtana, Manipuraka, and so on, coming into the Brahmarandhra [*the fontanelle at the top of the skull*]. This is where you are charged with fresh energy and, having come out of the deep meditation, you use this energy for any efficient work. The simile is right. Here is a very ordinary example:

In the morning a shopkeeper gets up and goes to the shop after having a bath and breakfast and washing up. Then he opens the door of the shop, cleans the shop, and re-arranges everything in the shop in its proper place, and starts selling his goods. He sells for eight hours, and after that he puts back all the goods which he has put on display outside, makes up his accounts, and then closes the shop and goes home to sleep after his meal.

This creation is also like a shop where you come to display your goods and get the proceeds from the sale so that you can live an easy and a good and prosperous life.

So, this is the big shop of the Absolute, and it is in the pattern of our nature that we also must take part in the business—we also must keep on working on the physical level, and deriving substances of the subtle nature from this physical world to substantiate our being for the next encounter in this world. This is how life must be kept on. One should not try to resign, or overdo anything on one of the levels.

Second part of Fifth Audience (re-written)

The conversation then changed, as some personal questions were put which concerned the attitude one should take up when someone very close to one has died. Unfortunately these questions reached His Holiness through the interpreter in the form of the longing of the bereaved person to communicate with the dead one; so much of His Holiness' reply was irrelevant. However, if one cuts that part out, there was a valuable message delivered to anyone in such a situation:

Mrs. B.C. (About the recent death of her mother, who was a keen meditator though only initiated in old age):

When someone dies with whom one is closely linked in life and love, although one immediately accepts the death of the body, there is a much longer time during which the relationship has to be relinquished on the psychological level. During this time there are many happy memories and many regrets for debts unpaid. I would be glad if His Holiness could comment on how to use this period so that it becomes positive—perhaps on both sides? Is communication between a dead and a living person valid for a time, or something to be got over as quickly as possible?

(Mrs. B.C. was thinking of how, perhaps, to help her mother but the question reached His Holiness as concerned with pity for herself!)

H.H. The direct communication on the subtle level between the living and dead is certainly unnecessary and uncalled for. And it is also unnecessary and unnatural to blot out or erase the memory in the hope that one

would be free; or that perhaps both would be free. This memory of the dead is only one-sided and, (since it is due to having lost the former association with that particular person, while one has not yet established other relationships), the memory of that person will be very much alive. But it will not last for ever; in time this will subside and be superseded by other memories which will come out of new and fresh associations. So one should neither try to erase it, nor try to enliven it. In any case both are impossible.

R. So, you seem to say that such feelings are all one-sided and all this subtle activity, these memories, do not help the dead one at all?

H.H. When an individual dies then he stays in the astral, ethereal realm, till he gets a new body. As long as he has not yet received a new body, it is quite possible that the memories about him will attract his or her attention. I can't say how long that is possible, but it is certainly only possible until he takes another body.

Then followed a rather gruesome story from the old epic Mahabharata designed to show how lightly Krishna regarded the death of the physical body!

This, continued His Holiness, is a very sad story, but the moral is that this creation is filled with many changing situations which are competing for the attention of the individual all the time, but this is just the passing world. There is, of course, something which is constant—the memory of the Absolute. That will never subside whatever happens, so if anyone tries to relate oneself to the Absolute and be filled with the memory of the Absolute then memory of this transitory world and the passing show of this creation will not torment anyone any more.

R. This answer will greatly help our own family. His Holiness remembers that our daughter and her baby died in a car accident some years ago. Last month, her son now seventeen, died in three days of a rare and malignant fever for which nothing can be done. We keep asking ourselves why it is that in this branch of the family there is only one survivor, whereas in our son's family everything prospers—three children—success, etc. How to think about this?

The atmosphere must have been highly charged emotionally, for we noticed tears running down the cheeks of the High Court Lawyer who came to our meetings. But His Holiness spoke in a calm and detached—almost a light-hearted-way.

H.H. There is a positive side to this episode, in that when one comes into this world then one comes from some other world. Having lived one's life in this world, one must return to that other world; so from the Samashti (the universal realm) one comes at birth into the Vyashti (the individual realm). When a person dies, that person is going back to the Father, and it is a moment of rejoicing rather than of sorrow, because he is attaining the ultimate state. And in relation to that there is a story:

In East Africa there lived quite a number of Indians, and once an Indian died, so the relatives took in procession that dead body for cremation, and some of the relatives were crying and weeping and wailing. On the way to the cremation ground, another Indian was negotiating a loan from an African. When the African heard all the wailing, he asked the Indian who was asking for the loan, what all those people were wailing about, since they seemed to be from his part of the world.

The Indian replied that somebody must have died, and perhaps they were going to the cremation and were expressing their sorrow. The African asked, "What happens when someone is born in an Indian family—do they also wail and cry at that time?"

“Oh, no!” replied the Indian, “that is a time of rejoicing; when somebody is born we rejoice because we are united with that being, and we wail when someone dies because of separation—we are separated from the being we love.”

The African replied that if this is the tradition of his country, he could not lend him any money. The Indian asked what the loan of money had to do with their wailing or rejoicing. The African said: “It seems that when you get something you rejoice, but when you have to give it back you are very sorry. So I don’t intend to subject you to such grief. I want to save you from future grief, so I won’t lend you the money.”

One should not, then, feel grief at all when someone passes away, because he is going back to the real Father, though leaving the temporary and physical father and mother. We ought to console ourselves and keep our attention directed to the real Father of all, whose family is spread throughout the world. When somebody is called back, we should happily allow that person to go; and if we keep on remembering him, we would be hurting that being because he will feel some attachment, some attraction because of the grief we show.

R. We have a saying that ‘those whom the gods love die young.’

H.H. Young or old we should feel happy that one of His children has gone back to his real home. This universe is the travel ground—we have to come here only for a little while.

Monday 21 January

Sixth Audience

R. Would His Holiness say anything about the subject of his talk at the Mela yesterday?

H.H. At the Mela, as all over India through the ages, there are two streams of discourses going on all the time, so we have the same two streams of discourses taking place in the Mela ground.

One is the stream of Devotion—Bhakti—which covers the cycle of incarnations through which the god descends, and those people who are prone to the devotional set-up in their being can only respond to these Gods who are said to incarnate in physical form.

The other cycle—the other stream—is the Adhyatma, the Atmaveda, which preaches the unity of everything; insisting that the Ultimate Being is the Atman or the Absolute, which *is* and is activating everything. This stream is the stream of Knowledge and is certainly a little harder to appreciate. Those who are strong enough and well-informed—who have appreciation of this True Knowledge and have acquired some understanding, they alone can see the Unity within, which expresses itself through all the manifestations. So they do not run about—they do not take to much activity, and are not bothered by doubts about the inner and the outer. In knowledge they are satisfied and, with this satisfaction, peace, and understanding they keep to such activity as is necessary—the needful activity—and they don’t move around in confusion unnecessarily.

The others who belong to the devotional stream with its cult of incarnations, have different types of Gods (with their saints or heroes); they try to worship them and listen to the exploits of these gods and relish them. They hear different names, different forms and types of activity related to these Gods, and they like to dwell on these—enjoying them, remembering them, hearing about them, or even worshipping these Gods in different ways. Our Vyasa at the Magh Mela belongs to that stream and he certainly appeals strongly to the common man; so the large gatherings which we see are attracted and held by this Vyasa because he appeals to the devotional; and he describes the physical form and activities of the God, how he moves around and performs all his activities.

Yet there are some people in that crowd who are not much moved by this, because they want to understand the Self, and there are many people who discourse on this mysterious unity of the Self. So many also come to listen to those who speak on these subjects. Thus there are these two different types of activity going on.

People wonder whether or not there could be a synthesis of these two. Is it possible to bring both these two factors together and enjoy them simultaneously? Yes, it is possible, because whatever is the Absolute (which we call the unified Being within), the same is manifesting Itself in everything in this creation which we see—in words, in forms, and through the activities. So by whatever name we call the Absolute within, we also can partake of this Absolute in everyday life in every form, through every name, and through all sorts of activities which all beings perform. This creates a completeness of the Being within and without; and this also is the sort of thing which goes on there.

We forget that we are the master, we are the Absolute; but by discoursing about True Knowledge we come to know it again, just as we come to recognise individuals.

Someone's friend may go to act a part in the drama, so he puts on different clothes, different head-gear and makes up beyond recognition. But the moment he speaks, the sound reveals his identity.

Here, the True Knowledge is the sound through which one recognises the True Self manifesting through all these different forms. One has to understand and find out this synthesis—that the Being within is also manifesting and taking part outside; and one has to find out the Unity; to hate no-one, and start working through Love. That will bring peace and Liberation.

R. This leads on to the question I want to raise about the synthesis which we felt very much at the last Magh Mela when we were with His Holiness:

We heard then a very amusing recitation from the Ramayana about the adventures of Prakriti and Purush. It was said that, "When the Purush puts constraint on Prakriti (who only wants to please the Purush), then trouble ensues." Surely here, under the influence of Rajas and Tamas, the nature of common man shows the two sides which often come into conflict—the masculine or dominant mind turned outwards, and the feminine or passive part of the mind turned inwards? There is much evidence now in scientific circles for the existence of these two sides of a man's brain. Since it is interesting everybody, I now ask:

From the point of view of Self-realisation, can the conflict be resolved if, under the influence of Sattva, the Param-Atman becomes the Purusha, and becomes the Supreme King above both parties? Then the situation explained by Tulsi Das to Mira comes about where Purush is the Lord of Creation and Prakriti is His Creation—the Nature of this Universe?

H.H. This creation is a magnificent creation; it is perfect, beautiful and blissful. There isn't any scope for anything wrong or inferior in this creation. So the forms—the masculine and feminine—which we do see so predominant in our life are, in fact, equal; neither of them is superior, nor deserves any right to be either dominant or passive. But this whole creation (which is a perfect Drama) is played in different ways. If there was only one way, there would not be any drama; there must be many, and they must take their rôle and do whatever their rôle demands.

The usual concept which one comes across is that there should be a master, and this master should be served in many ways so that the glory of this great Creator may manifest through all these servants. The real Master is the Absolute, which this Prakriti is serving in manifold forms. But when one takes oneself to be the master, then one falls into some sort of error because we are all governed by the Prakriti which is threefold. Whether male or female, everybody is Prakriti—and everybody has this part of the Absolute (Atman)—through which the individual is known, though Atman is always the same for everybody. Therefore, a man and a woman are no different from each other. [*Somehow the interpreter had conveyed the idea that R. was speaking about sex differences!*]

If, by our ego or Ahankar, we suppose that we are the master, then immediately the Prakriti (which is good, beautiful and pure) will start mixing things together, and adulteration takes place which is called Vikriti. Corruption takes place, and it is because of this corruption in our mind that we try to become dominant and to rule everything—try to govern everybody else, because we think that everybody is inferior and there to serve one. All our troubles and tribulations come from this corruption, adulteration, or Vikriti, which is only in the Ahankar.

Take the example from the Ramayana in which Rama represents the Absolute and Sita, Prakriti. But there is no sense of superiority or inferiority between either of them.

When we come across the battle of Rama against Ravana, Rama has never wanted to punish Ravana as such. Ravana, in his previous life, was one of the attendants on Rama (as Vishnu); but because he somehow developed Ahankar and thought that he was the great servant of Rama, he had to descend in this creation and correct his Ahankar, and get liberated.

So this attendant of Vishnu came here as Ravana symbolising the Ahankar, though actually he was a devotee of Rama. Rama never hated him because Rama can never hate anyone, for everybody is a part of Himself. It is the same Absolute in everyone, so he cannot hate even if he has to kill. He killed Ravana with love and affection, and when Ravana was killed he was instantly liberated. People ask: If he was to be liberated, why was he killed? Actually, Ravana was never killed at all; it was the Ahankar of Ravana that was killed—Ravana was liberated from the Ahankar.

In this Drama of the Absolute one has to come to understand that there is no difference between the masculine and feminine; everyone is to be the Master, and everyone must also be the servant and help each other.

R. But Hanuman gave his ugly servant a good smack on the head and knocked him unconscious; that was for his good?

H.H. Yes.

Hanuman did try to wake Ravana up, but Ravana was determined to speed up the process of Liberation. There were occasions when some of Ravana's ministers tried to tell him that he should return Sita and not become the object of the fury of Rama, which would lead to his destruction.

To this Ravana used to say: "I know who Sita is and who Rama is. I am keeping Sita knowingly because I want to get liberated; I must keep her. If I give away Sita then there won't be war and so no liberation; I must keep Sita in order to be killed by Rama and insure my Liberation. I am not going to budge an inch from this decision, and I will play this part as well as I can."

So he did, and he got liberated.

When Sita was captured by Ravana she was put into a garden and given one personal lady attendant. Sita used to collect all the flowers in the garden, and with them she used to write 'RAMA' on the ground; then meditate and contemplate on that. After meditating and contemplating for a long time, she used to feel like Rama herself.

The same thing was happening to Rama in Pampapura, on the other side. He also used to think about Sita, and on many occasions he used to forget himself. Then he used to say to Lakshman, Jambawanta and others, "Who am I?"

This went on for some time. One day, Sita said to her lady attendant, "It seems that I am so absorbed in the thought of Rama, that it is quite possible I might turn into Rama. If that did happen, would not the conjugal life of husband and wife be disturbed?"

The lady attendant replied, “That’s only half the story, because from the other side Rama is also remembering you in exactly the same way. By the time you turn into Rama, Rama will have turned into Sita, so conjugal life will be restored, and you will not be missing anything of this creation at all.”

So this Prakriti and Purusha are working within each other in unison. Male and female makes no difference. When we come to understand this, we simply fulfil the rôle which we have to perform, and enjoy this creation.

We should see this story, therefore, as an allegory of the tripartite nature of each one of us.

R.A. Two days ago His Holiness mentioned praying to the Atman. Yesterday he recommended taking a manifest form of the Param-Atman as the object of worship. Can the disciple choose the Realised Teacher as the channel through which he prays to the Atman?

H.H. The first Sri Shankara (in the course of one of his poems describing Dakshina-murti) says that the Absolute, the Guru, and the Atman are all the same. It is the same Unity which seems to be experienced in the world in these three different forms.

Those who resort to the Way of Knowledge (having acquired the Knowledge through the teacher), they always like to look within to the Self. Having acquired the Knowledge, the Self becomes the Guru. They do not see it as different; they see it as the Atman or the Absolute—not Absolute as a God, but Absolute as Atman. So, for them, there is no difference, and they like to think and talk only about the Atman.

But for those who are on the devotional side, the God is of the Saguna (having a name and form); and the Teacher, who leads him towards this, seems to be very important, and they are seen to be working through the Teacher to the God.

R.A. Would His Holiness say more about the inspiration by which the Teacher can help the disciple?

H.H. When the relationship between a disciple and the Teacher is established, it has to be mutual. Having established this relationship the Teacher (through its invisible aspect) keeps on inspiring the disciple. Apart from the physical inspiration (the words which he speaks, and the ‘disciplines’ which he prescribes), there is this other medium which touches the mind and heart of the man under the discipline. This is how the inspiration works.

If the aspirant keeps on responding to the inspiration which is given and does not create any block, then that stream will always be working. If, however, the disciple ascribes the results to himself—establishing his Ahankar as the doer—then it is possible that hindrances will be created, and the flow of the stream will be interrupted.

So, it lies entirely with the disciple to respond to the inspiration by practice, and then to keep this channel open so the stream is always alive. If this is allowed to happen, then the disciple will see that he does get inspiration; and this inspiration is of such a nature that the disciple himself will feel that it is not of his own making—it is not the product of his own knowledge—and so this will keep on working for his development.

As we have been told, there are these two types of people—the one who works through Knowledge, the mind; and the other through the heart; and it has been observed that it is a rare thing to find that both these sides of human nature could be working simultaneously with equal force; there is always predominance of one or the other in any individual. With the predominance of mind, at best they use the heart to enliven the mind, to recharge the Buddhi and the reasoning power, so that Manas and Buddhi work in harmony. Those who come from the devotional side, on the other hand, use their Buddhi to establish the predominance of the heart over the mind. This varying relationship goes through all these two different types of people; yet one need not bother about the differences, for in fact both extremes are working for the same end. So the heart of the disciple

will be open, and it will remain open if he both follows the initial inspiration and the impulses which are later given to him to enable more and more new inspirations to keep coming.

R.A. I have, at times, felt completely at One with the Shankaracharya. A friend in London who meditates and works in Dr. Roles' group told me that she, in meditation, had also felt totally at One with, and as it were, part of the Shankaracharya, even though she had never seen him in person.

It seemed to me, at the time, and from what the Shankaracharya has said this morning that this is quite possible; but I would just like him to confirm it.

H.H. Both the experiences are good and valid. This is how it should be.

One can see from the ordinary experiences of the supply of electricity, that there is a place where the electricity is being generated. It has to be used by different people in different forms; but it cannot be directly given by the generating board. It will have to come through some other medium. So, in each house, in each factory, a meter is installed so that the electricity from the generating powerhouse can be made available for the individual to use for different purposes.

The teacher is very much like this meter. If one gets connected to the teacher, 'the electricity supply' will be available; then it can be used in lighting systems, or in fans or coolers or heaters—or whatever one wants.

One should remember that, in fact, the power supply which one gets from the teacher is not the monopoly of the teacher himself; he is only the bridge (wire)—the connecting link between the Absolute and the individual. In his own way he is there to connect himself; to the Absolute. When the disciple is connected with the teacher, he is connected with the Absolute, and the force* of the Absolute passes through the medium of the teacher to the disciple.

*See ref. to Shakti in 3rd Audience and refs. to Chetan-Shakti in 1970 Record.

The disciple, in turn, should also think that all this creative capacity (or the energy which is being made available), is not just for his own enjoyment, but for the use of everybody around him. Whosoever wants it should be able to avail himself of this energy, and this is how this flow of real inspiration (which takes its origin from the Absolute) should be kept going, manifesting, and developing through all the forms of this creation.

M.A. This explains why, when you get a little impulse in London to do something 'beautifully' and you manage to follow it, you find yourself giving thanks for the help which seems then to be a fact.

H.H. The thanks are due only to the Param-Atman; as far as His Holiness is concerned, he is only a medium.