

AUDIENCES

ALLAHABAD

December 1979 – January 1980

Mr. & Mrs. Howitt

Mr. & Mrs. Harris

Translator Sri Narayan Swaroop

Friday 21 December

His Holiness inquired about our comfort at the Hotel and the trip to India, after which we began with a short meditation.

N.G.H. Your Holiness, my wife and I are so pleased and privileged to be here with you again. Since our last visit the group in New Zealand has continually persevered in trying to put your words into practice. Many of the questions we ask stem directly from this practice.

We would like to introduce to you Mr. Michael Harris, a lawyer who has been a member of our group since 1961, being initiated into the meditation by Maharishi Mahesh Yogi. In 1971 he and his wife went to London where for five years they helped Dr. Roles in many capacities related to the introduction of meditation to new people. On his return to New Zealand, Michael and his wife now look after the whole administration of the meditation in Wellington.

M.J.H. Could you convey to H.H. how grateful I am to Him and Mr. Howitt for being able to come to H.H. The guidance of H.H. and the meditation have been the most important influence on both my wife and myself during the whole of our adult lives. H.H. has said so much over many years that most questions can be answered, but if H.H. can help in allowing deeper experience in meditation I would be most grateful.

N.G.H. We have a number of questions from Dr. Roles in London and people in New Zealand which we would like to put later this visit. First I should like to relay a message from Dr. Roles.

R. I would like to convey the solidarity as a School with the many different groups around the world of those who meditate and live by the Shankaracharya's instructions. I would like you to realise that anything you give to one of us, it gets around to all the different groups. For instance, this term all these people have been receiving the material from your last audiences with Lady Allan's group and have been sending interesting observations about these natural possibilities of Samadhi every day, of which they had no idea before. The people are all very much alike and belong to three categories which Mr. Howitt wrote to me about. I have asked Mr. Howitt to describe the three categories to you.

N.G.H. The following is the essence of Mr. Howitt's letter to Dr. Roles:

"I have found with the people here in New Zealand that in practising to find the point of rest between desires they fall into three categories: the first are those who never seem to find the point of rest, in fact they even forget to look. The second category of people always seem to 'wake up' in the middle of an action, so for such people life seems to be nothing but desires, action. They easily despair of ever finding the point of rest.

"The third category is of those who actually find the point of rest. Some, when they find it, start thinking of how they can intensify and prolong the experience and so lose the point; others observe from this quiet point that action is going on around and is actually the interplay of the Gunas. They observe how the appropriate energy is exactly measured to each action. Others see everything as a great play going on which is not real. Behind the play they speak of a unity whose qualities of Bliss permeate everything but yet are not touched by the Play. There is the knowledge that the unity of Atman and Param-Atman is the Truth, the Real meaning of life."

I wrote this to Dr. Roles and he said it was in keeping with his own findings. Could H.H. comment on these three categories of people in relation to the natural Samadhi?

H.H. In the world there are only three types of persons—mankind can be divided into three categories which he describes as sattvic, rajasic and tamasic. But he clarifies that the three categories are not mutually exclusive. One has got predominance of tamas—but sattva and rajas are there also. Similarly in the case of rajas, tamas and

sattva are also there. In tamas there is no desire for getting into sattva so people don't even desire the higher plane. In the case of rajas, people also have a desire but because of the predominance of rajas, they do not get success in achieving it. In sattva they desire and also achieve success.

Now the question arises how to get more sattva than either of the other qualities? By associating themselves with people of sattva, with atmosphere where sattva is prevailing, with literature which is full of sattva, they can increase their sattva, higher qualities, and control the other two qualities.

So it is by associating yourself with that type of person, place, and literature, that you can improve.

In translating the above question to H.H., it appears the word 'Shanti' was used for the whole phrase 'point of rest between desires' and when the question was reiterated (after Sri Narayan was asked to put one question at a time to H.H. for his answer—not to read the whole list of prepared questions at once)—the question was asked in terms of people of Sattvic, Rajasic and Tamasic tendency—could H.H. say something about these?

N.G.H. Though some of the people are meditating and they are hearing knowledge of the Shankaracharya and regularly come along to hear the good words, there are still people who, even though they do all this, still do not find that natural samadhi or that point of rest. Is there anything extra that we can do to help these people?

H.H. For people who regularly come and attend your meetings and try to hear the good words which have already been given and yet do not find the point of rest, the main reason for that is because of their inborn tendencies (samskar). They have still got in them a certain disturbed element, and due to that they are not able to make their own all that is told to them, and when they go back, they again get engulfed in their previous samskar. They should continue to meditate and reflect again and again about what they have heard so that in due course of time their previous associations will be wiped away and there will be room for taking in the new things which they have been told.

To illustrate this:

There were two ants, one was living on a mountain of salt, the other was living on a mountain of sugar candy. It so happened once that the two ants met and began talking about themselves.

The ant who was living on the sugar candy was given a piece of salt by the other ant. When she tasted it, she said, 'Oh, this is horrible! How can they possibly live on this?' and so she invited the other to her home. So this other ant went to the sugar candy mountain with all her sisters and all her other ant relations, and thinking there wouldn't be enough for them to eat they all took a small piece of salt in their mouths. When they arrived, they were all given a small piece of candy, but since they already had their own piece of salt in their mouths they could not taste the candy—the two tastes got mixed up. So they said, 'You praise your own place so much, but it is really almost the same as ours.' Then the first ant said, 'Well, go and wash out your mouths and come again.' They did so and again tasted the pieces of candy and found that it was really sweet. So then they never went back to their mountain of bitter salt.

Similarly, the previous associations are so deep in these people that the element of disturbance is there. It has to be washed off and the only way to do that is by constantly bringing to mind the knowledge they have heard and by doing so they will gradually be able to take it in.

N.G.H. There is another type of person who finds a point of rest, but at the same time, having found it—I think it would be the Buddhi—will then come in and say, 'Oh, this is good—I've found this point of rest, now how can I intensify it, how can I make it longer?' and this seems to take them away from the point of rest. I was wondering if H.H. could help us with these people, because they seem to be in a different category.

H.H. Such people should not try to prolong this period of the point of rest too much or too suddenly—it should be done gradually. Effort should be made not so much to increase it, as to digest it. His Holiness gives an illustration:

In the same way as when you eat something it takes a time for it to digest, and if you keep on putting more and more food in, expecting your system to digest that as well, you will only upset your stomach and instead of digesting it, nature will revolt. So the effort should not be so much towards increasing the period of the point of rest as to making the point of rest natural and then of course it will gradually increase of its own accord.

H.H. gives another illustration:

There are certain medicines which lose their efficacy by passage of time, but there are others which increase their efficacy with age. In Ayurvedic medicine, in our Indian system of medicine there are some medicines made out of herbs which cannot be kept for long, but there are others which are chemically prepared which, the longer they are kept, the more effective they become.

So with Sadhana, the older it becomes, the more power it gathers. He stresses the same point again, that instead of trying to do it for a longer period and then exhausting yourself and reverting to the previous position, the position of disturbance, it is better to do it slowly, slowly and in the course of time your power of endurance will be increased and you will be able to get that point of rest for a longer period.

N.G.H. On a different line, I would like to ask about the practice of bhakti yoga. (This was the introduction of a question, but was put to H.H. at this point.)

H.H. You don't have to prepare a very long scheme for practising bhakti yoga. Whatever you are doing, you can continue doing the same thing; you have only to change your attitude. Now when you are doing anything with a view to gain something personally, then the attitude should be, 'I am doing this not for any gain, but as a service to God, what I am eating, I am not eating just for my own satisfaction, but as an offering (prasada)—it has been given to me by the Lord to enable me to serve Him', so that whatever you do, you connect that with the Lord—that will become bhakti—you don't have to change your course of action—action will be the same, but the object will be different.

N.G.H. Concerning desire, often when the mind is at rest, there is the strong desire that all men everywhere should experience Friendliness, Compassion, Happiness. These seem to be the natural expression of Man's nature, Man's power seems unlimited when desire relates to the expression of his true Nature? Could H.H. say something on this? In this state it seems that Nature (Prakriti) employs the least possible energy to achieve the desire of Param-Atman.

N.S. I'm not very clear as to what—how I should put it to him?

N.G.H. It's more that the divine friendliness, compassion, happiness seem to be the natural qualities of man's nature—when all else falls away this seems to be what arises—is this the natural state of Man?

H.H. Yes, it is true that this is natural but the power, though unlimited, is obstructed by virtue of the previous tendencies.

Just as sunlight is pervading the earth, a small cloud appears and obstructs that light.

Similarly, if the previous actions are good, they help in Man's natural Friendliness, Compassion and Happiness—if they are not good, then there is an obstruction. If his previous associations are good and present ones are not, then there will be obstruction; but if previous are not good and present associations are good, then probably this will overcome these previous associations. If these previous associations were good and the present also good, then this will be helpful to further advancement.

N.G.H. Whenever the thought of H.H. or Dr. Roles comes to mind, I receive no particular image, but instead a great love arises for they remind me that the Param-Atman is in everyone. There comes a strong feeling that everything is the expression of the Param-Atman. At such times, there is no difference between 'I' and 'That', there are not two identities. At such times, the ordinary sense of 'I' does not exist. Only the Self exists. Do I need to persist in bringing in an image?

H.H. There shouldn't be the need to bring in an image because if an image comes, then there will be two. What our philosophy says is that there is only One. We have to wipe off the two and if you try to bring in an image, then instead of wiping off that dualism, you'll be creating a dualism. You are on the right path, so you needn't bother about the image. If there is no image then you will reach the goal quicker, otherwise this dualism will bother you more.

N.G.H. Where does that image arise in man? Into which part of the mind (Antahkaran)?

H.H. You come to know each other by the medium of the image, but once you know, the image has finished its work. We have to move towards realising that we are all one, unity, to move towards unity. If this bodily existence, or the image, continues, then that unity will not be possible. We cannot go to the unity except through the medium of the image, so the image is the cause of unity as well as the cause of the creation of separateness. We have to leave this medium to go forwards towards that unity. Actually, your question was in what part does this image arise. He explains that there are four subdivisions in Antahkarana—Ahankar, Chitta, Manas and Buddhi—so this image arises in your Antahkarana and passes through these four divisions. An example:

People living in London can come to India and meet people here, and people living in India can go to London and meet people there, but India and London cannot meet. People living there can come here and people living here can go there and meet.

So similarly the Atmans can meet, although the Atman is there and here also. But the bodies cannot become one. The souls, which are inside the bodies can become one, but the two bodies cannot be welded together for they have got their separate existence.

N.G.H. So the Param-Atman relates to the unity or the Real whereas the image relates to the Play or the Maya?

H.H. Yes, it is all Maya except Param-Atman. There are five elements with Akasha the atmosphere—that unity is one and the same, but as you go towards more solid things like water, fire, these are what we call elements (JA DA), they move towards increasing solidity, from ethereal element we go to more solid element. Akasha is ether and we move towards earth which is more solid, so unity is possible amongst ethereal elements, but not amongst solid elements.

N.G.H. Since my last visit to H.H., I have noticed a change in the experience of Ahankar. Often the Ahankar identification with the body mind aspect has fallen away. The realisation and memory that the Param-Atman has become everything knocks out the usual Ahankar sense.

H.H. There are two types of Ahankar. One is pure Ahankar, the other impure Ahankar. Now pure Ahankar relates to Atman and impure relates to the body, so the purer your Ahankar is, the more it is associated with the Param-Atman. If it is impure, it is related to the body. It is desirable to eliminate the impure Ahankar. The idea that 'I am Atman' cultivates pure Ahankar. Your realisation that you are Atman is also Ahankar, in this case it is pure Ahankar.

N.G.H. What you said before about Bhakti—that attitude—I have found that since my last visit that attitude of mind has been developing and growing and this seems to have this strong effect on the Ahankar and it gets more and more related to Atman and this is what has brought up this question.

H.H. The key word is Aham, which means “sense of individuality”. If this Ego is connected with the body, then it becomes Ahankar—Kar is ‘vehicle’. So if the bodily vehicle is attached to Aham, then it is Ahankar (it is impure), but if it is attached to your Soul (Param-Atman) then it is pure Aham.

N.G.H. At times it seems to do away with ordinary feeling of there being an inner and outer. With the lessening of identification with the ordinary picture of myself, the mind comes to rest. There is an emptiness. Confidence grows in the truth of the statement that the Self has become everything. At such times, everything is seen as an expression of that Self. It is a joy and light-heartedness to enter into play of everything. I have become everything.

H.H. There are two divisions or aspects of Sadhana, practice; one aspect is that ‘I am everything’—that is Bhakti; and the other is that ‘everything else is in me’—that is Jnana; ‘affection for everyone’ is Bhakti, and ‘there is nothing else except Atman’ is Jnana. (This is made of metal (pointing to tape recorder), that is made of metal (to window frame), so many things are made of metal, this is one aspect, this is Bhakti. The other is, there is nothing except iron—one is all things are made of iron, there is nothing but iron.)

Manifestation—there are two ways, manifestation of Lord in everyone—cause and effect—those who see the cause, that’s Jnana—those who see the effect, that’s Bhakti—there’s nothing but God that is cause—that is Knowledge—Jnana. By looking at man, one knows that this is the creation of God, God is the creator—that’s knowledge, Jnana, but when we say that He is Himself present here, that is Bhakti.

N.G.H. What would be the effect of the purified Ahankar in the Antahkarana—what effect does the purification of the Ahankar have on the Antahkarana?

H.H. Antahkarana is lighted by Atman so the Shuddha Ahankar throws a lot of light on the Antahkaran, so that the purification of Ahankar elevates Antahkaran.

N.G.H. And how would a Realised man—how would the purified Ahankar affect the actions of a Realised man? Everything he does would be the expression of the Self?

H.H. The only difference would be that when Antahkaran is not there, then the light will exist—Atman will exist. The sun is lighting this house—when the house is no longer there, the light will still be there—but when the sun shines on the other hemisphere, then there will be no light—the house will be dark.

Similarly, when there is purified Ahankar, then there is enlightenment in the Antahkaran. When the Antahkaran is in the body—when the body is not there—the Atman still will be. (*N.S. I can’t conceive of the Atman going to another hemisphere!*)

The difficulty arises by our feeling that Atman is inside the Antahkaran—this is the general concept—while the fact is that the Antahkarana is inside the Atman.

There is light in this room, but this light is not of the room, it is coming from outside, it is from the sun. So it would be wrong to say the room has light—the source of light is outside the room.

So the Atman is outside. Antahkaran is in the Atman, not Atman in the Antahkaran.

N.G.H. What is the best way to weaken the identification of the Ahankar with the body-mind machine?

H.H. If you identify yourself with the Atman and not with the body, that is the best way.

Friday 28 December

N.S. I showed the map to H.H. and he understood the position of New Zealand vis-à-vis other countries. Then I expressed my regrets to him that I did not bring it to his notice earlier—my mistake—about the permission for Mr. Michael Harris to initiate. He said that there is no difficulty—he has his blessings. Then I told H.H. about the Sanskrit that you have (Initiation Ceremony) and he says he will do as you wish. Now, today's programme .

N.G.H. Yesterday, H.H. said there are two aspects of Sadhana; the Bhakti aspect, 'I am everything', would seem to be the easiest and best Sadhana for the Householder. Is this so?

H.H. He confirms that the Bhakti aspect of Sadhana is the easiest and best for the Householder. He re-emphasises that by thinking that 'everyone else is my own Self' there is a feeling of oneness with them and that is responsible for creating a sort of affection. When, 'I am present in everyone', then I love myself so my love is spread out to everyone of them and that is Bhakti.

N.G.H. I was wondering how much knowledge is needed in the way of the Householder, because a householder must have a certain knowledge as well.

H.H. Knowledge is also a kind of Bhakti—devotion. Because without knowledge there can't be any devotion. You have to have some knowledge to have devotion. So the two—devotion and knowledge—are inter-related. Knowledge will be there if there is devotion. It will automatically come. So let a householder start with Bhakti and the necessary knowledge will come automatically.

N.G.H. So if one sees the Self in everyone that is knowledge also, isn't it?

H.H. Knowing is Jnana (knowledge) and accepting something is Bhakti. If you know and then accept then that is perfect. If you accept something without knowing, then there is room for doubt and there is a likelihood of getting muddled. But if you know and then accept, that is perfect.

N.G.H. That of course is necessary for the householder.

N.S. Yes, excuse me, why only for the householder? Why not necessary for everybody?

N.G.H. Yes, of course. Yesterday H.H. also said that the way to weaken identification of the Ahankar with the body was to identify myself with the Atman. This identification with the Atman seems to have two aspects—one related to knowledge and one related to action. First, I need to know I am Atman. I need to know that I was not born, I need to know that everything is going on within me. This is the knowledge aspect; and second, I need to act in relation to my occupation in the market-place. How does one act while remembering the Param-Atman?

H.H. Disassociating yourself from the body will remove your false Ahankar both in respect of knowledge and in respect of action. Because, when you do something and you consider it is being done not by you as the doer, but because it is your duty, it being a service, then you are doing it because somebody else has desired you to do it. Therefore you are not the doer of it, you are only carrying it out at the behest of someone else.

N.G.H. Is this the idea of Dharma?

N.S. H.H. used the word 'seva', 'sevabhav', instead; 'karta', kartabhav', means 'doer' and seva means service. So you do it as part of your duty as a service and not with an ego that 'I am doing it'. So that when you disassociate yourself with the body, that will kill your Ahankar of action also. So when you are not the doer, then you will not be responsible to reap the consequences of that doing (action). Someone else will be responsible for the consequences of it, and you will get liberation.

The bondage comes when you consider yourself to be the doer. When you are not the doer, then the effect of the consequences will be reaped only by the person who is doing. If you are not doing, then you will not get the consequences of that action. You will get liberation.

N.G.H. The following question is from Ross Mitchell, who accompanied us on our previous visit:

Sometime ago, as the result of carrying out an exercise to ‘remember the Param-Atman at all times,’ I had the following experience when walking one morning: Suddenly, for a brief moment, creation as we usually know it disappeared. It simply was not there. There was instead only One. Unknowable by the normal mind but familiar. Dark but not empty, potent, joyful, real, eternal. It was recognisably the same as one has experienced in meditation. After a moment this passed. I realised that I had seen things as they really are. They are always like that—just a sense of pure consciousness and existence. It was just as simple to attach the sense of ‘I’ to that pure consciousness as to the mind-body machine as I habitually do.

I realise that this experience has enabled me to pass on the teaching to others with a degree of understanding previously not possible. Because it has given me an understanding of the fundamental Vedantic Teaching: Brahman is Real, the universe is not Real, Brahman and Atman are One.

I would be grateful if H.H. could explain what the Shankaracharya Tradition teaches about the states of consciousness experienced with the above experience.

H.H. The Shankaracharya Tradition is that Brahman and Atman are One. This is correct. As far as your experience is concerned, the consciousness of ‘I’ you speak of is only a situation; this is the sort of position which is different from the person who is seeing it. The person who is conscious is separate from what he is seeing around him. He saw that everything had vanished. Who sees it? Who sees that everything has vanished? That person who sees that everything has vanished is separate. There are two individualities—one who says that everything has vanished, he is separate from the things that have vanished. So that is why it is only a situation.

But this situation is also sattvic, it is good. One should feel happy that such situations do arise—it is sattvic.

N.G.H. I wonder if you could ask H.H. if there is some exercise that Mr. Mitchell could practise—he finds it very useful to have something to carry in mind. Is there something we could take back for him to practise?

N.S. Practise to do what? He is getting those sorts of experiences?

N.G.H. To help him in his endeavours.

H.H. It is not necessary to have many practices—many ways of practise. He gives a very good illustration:

You pass a law degree and then you start practising. Now when you practise you gain experience. A person with one year’s practice will have less experience than someone with fifteen years’ practice. But you don’t have to pass Law finals again and again. You have passed it already and by your practising in the courts you get certain experiences.

Similarly in meditation also, once you have learnt the theory and method of meditation, you practise it. You don’t have to go on practising something else as well. As it goes deeper and deeper, your experience will be increased. So you don’t have to change practices or acquire new practices. Whatever practice is being done it is to be continued and given greater time.

In India, in the beginning under the British Raj, there was a rule that no-one could ride in a carriage with four horses without Government permission. Once upon a time there was a person engaged in the business of building carriages. He built one and harnessed four horses and then went around to try it out and see if it was all right. When he reached a crossing, the traffic police stopped him in the street and asked him whether he had permission. He said he had not, so they arrested him.

Later on he was produced before a court and let off on bail. He went around to the lawyers one after another and they all said, ‘The rule is you can’t ride in a carriage with four horses without permission, so naturally, there is no escape for you.’

Ultimately, he went to a lawyer who was very old and who had learned the same law as others, but he had lots of years of practice to his credit. So he said when the carriage-builder approached him: ‘I will need to see the carriage and horses before I can give you any advice.’ The carriage and horses were brought. He inspected them and then asked for a fabulous fee. ‘If you pay me this fabulous fee, I will be able to get you off.’ In order to save his own skin, the man paid the money. The lawyer said, ‘Appear on the fixed date along with carriage and horses.’ The carriage-builder objected: ‘I was arrested for only going out once on a trial run—if I go out in the carriage a second time, which will be to the court, I do not know what will happen to me!’ The lawyer said, ‘Don’t worry, I will be responsible for whatever happens.’

So the carriage-builder went to the court, the lawyer appeared and said: ‘My lord, you can inspect the horses, the alleged horses, and you will see there is only one horse and three mares—(laughter)—so he has not committed any offence.’

The knowledge of law was the same as it was for the others, but it was the older lawyer’s power of observation which he had developed by virtue of his long practice. That made the difference.

So H.H. says that by continual practice, he will get that aptitude which will be helpful in getting him what he wants—not by changing the method of practice.

N.S. (To M.J.H.—who is a lawyer) It appears H.H. is conscious of your presence!

B.R.H. At times, when for a moment the habitual identification with the moving mind (manas) weakens, I am aware of a continuous ‘underground’ current of desires like an engine left to run all the time. This seems to determine the limits of one’s ordinary level of consciousness. Occasionally, when a briefspace occurs between these desires, a quite different dimension is experienced. It is completely different from the ordinary state. This ordinary state seems, by contrast, to be very limiting and confined, instead of being ‘weakened’ by such an experience, i.e. opened out.

(N.S. sought some clarification re ‘engine left running,’ ‘ordinary level of consciousness’ ‘different dimension of consciousness’ but then said:)

N.S. It appears that H.H. understood your question much better than I do!

H.H. He says that there are two types of desires, one is natural desire, for example, one feels hungry and eats. Now this is a normal or natural desire—it keeps on coming and being satisfied and then naturally, if it is not satisfied, after a time it rises again. The same desire comes up again, for a while you feel you are satisfied, but after a while that desire comes again. So there is a desire that comes up, gets satisfied, lies low, comes up again, gets satisfied, lies low, this sort of thing—you don’t have to bother about that. But when you get something which you like and you are feeling attached to it, then there is a very keen desire to hold onto that particular thing. When there is that keen desire then you have to control it. In the other case, you don’t have to control that desire, for it will just come and go. But when there is a very keen desire to hold on to anything, then you have to control that desire, rather than let it be fulfilled. Then there will be no puzzle as you feel, within the gap of the fulfilment and unfulfilment. Because if it is fulfilled there will be happiness and if it is not fulfilled then there will be unhappiness. Therefore, the best thing in such cases is to control the desire rather than allow it to be fulfilled and in the other case, let it be unfulfilled.

B.R.H. Could H.H. say more about the control of that desire? It’s one thing to force it away, but quite another to control it.

H.H. The best way to control is to have contentment—the feeling that God alone is the best judge of what is best for me, what He has given me is best for me. And if you have that sort of contentment, then you will be able to control that keen desire and you will feel happy in whatever circumstances you are placed.

A certain sage said that when your desire has not been fulfilled, you should feel happy that the desire of God (Param-Atman) has been fulfilled, because nothing happens without His desire, and whatever has happened, that is His desire that has been fulfilled in preference to your desire and so, since you claim to be affectionately attached to the Lord, Param-Atman, you should feel that His desire has been fulfilled. ‘The desire of my Beloved has been fulfilled instead of my own desire.’ This is the way to live a happy life.

A person who can bear with adversities will always remain happy. It’s a sort of ‘meal for Atman’ to remain happy always, because we are part and parcel of Sat-Chit-Ananda. Ananda is the quality of God and we are part and parcel of God, therefore we like to be happy and if we are happy then that is a sort of food for Atman.

B.R.H. This underlying current of activity seems to be powered by ideas of ‘me’ and ‘mine’ and ideas of achievement, but is usually beyond my ordinary awareness. The only thing I have found to be of real help is the idea of surrendering the activity itself and any results to a higher Intelligence—to That which lives within the hearts of all. Is this a form of Bhakti ?

H.H. Surrendering the activity is really Bhakti, there’s no doubt about that. But the results of one’s actions are controlled by that Higher Intelligence (Param-Atman) because if they are not controlled by that Higher Intelligence (Param-Atman) then we will accept the result of our good actions, but will not like to accept the result of our bad actions. So someone else has got to get control—that’s why a person who is a devotee will consider that whatever is happening although the result of his own actions, it is being controlled by someone else.

B.R.H. What is the word used for Higher Intelligence in this context ?

N.S. I understood by what he said, the Creator, Lord, the Param-Atman.

M.J.H. I woke this morning with great joy to be here and be in Satsang with H.H. and the story of the merry Mahatma came to mind who sat under the tamarind tree. I long to be like him. He was so overjoyed at getting the message he did from the Lord, that the Lord came down and embraced him then and there. Can H.H. talk further about the ‘direct route’, perhaps further illustrations?

N.S. There are a number of persons living abroad, not all of whom come here. They don’t get this possibility of Satsang, of being with H.H.. Well, you are indeed—I don’t know whether I should use the word ‘lucky’—you are indeed favoured, in the sense, by the Lord that you got this possibility. So this itself shows that you have been accepted and you are embraced by the Lord. The experience which you had this morning was only a reflection of that situation.

M.J.H. H.H. recently (in August) gave Lady Allan’s party knowledge which had enormous significance for many, including myself.

I refer to what H.H. explained about the moment of Samadhi, which is provided by nature between the cessation of one desire (vasana) and the arising of the next. If we can register and extend the gap between one desire and the next, we can be recharged with energy by nature. If a person fails to register and benefit from these moments of natural Samadhi, will this not limit the person’s ability to experience Dhyana during his practice of meditation?

H.H. He says there is very little difference between Samadhi and Dhyana (deep meditation) because in either of them, the effort is to be without any desire (sankalpa) (vasana). When a desire (vasana) arises, between the

fulfilment of it and the arising of another desire, there is a gap. Now in meditation also we try to be without any vasana, without any sankalpa, to be without any vasana we try to create a kind of vacuum—mental vacuum—and that is a sort of samadhi. So there's not much difference from Samadhi—of course with Samadhi there are different types also; but meditation itself is a sort of Samadhi so the question of limiting doesn't arise. The longer the period of this gap, the greater will be the charging of energy for doing your every-day work. Even when you are awake you can experience this gap, and if you can increase this gap even then you will get energy. He says that everything is related in the Cosmos; Vyashti and Samashti, individual and cosmos; now if you remember that connection, that relationship, then you receive power, but if you forget that relationship, the source of power is disconnected. He illustrates this:

It is like a tank which you can fill or empty. This is like there being the arising of desire (that is painful)—if it has got some spring inside—in the bed of the tank—then if you let it be for some time it will get filled up automatically.

If you are connected to Samashti, if you remember your connection with the Samashti then you will get power, then you are still. When there is no desire coming up. During that period, it will work like a spring inside the bed of the tank, and you will get charged.

He says something more about this charging of the battery. You get power while you are still, but being still doesn't mean that you don't do any work, you can do work and yet be still, that means that you know the work is being done by the body, but in the manas, in your mind, there is no desire coming up or going down. If there is a vacuum of desire in your mind, even though you may be doing some work by hand you know that this work is being done by the hand or the body, not by the mind (manas). Then there is a stillness there and that will be responsible for charging your battery, your power.

M.J.H. H.H. has really anticipated the next question, but it might be just worth putting it in case he adds anything. During Mr. and Mrs. Howitt's last visit, H.H. described how Samashti can recharge Vyashti through Dhyana. Is a similar thing taking place when a person is recharged with energy during the natural Samadhi between one desire and the next?

H.H. He gives an illustration:

A battery, when it is discharged, has to be connected to a charging apparatus, but when it is charged, it is put on and connected to the car. While the car is running, the battery gets discharged and charged, both functions go on simultaneously. The use of the battery by the various mechanisms means that the battery is discharged, the functioning of the battery causes loss in its energy, but at the same time, the dynamo is charging it also.

The same thing happens in natural Samadhi. Both things go on simultaneously, discharging and charging with the rise of your vasana and its being fulfilled and the gap between. A person who is very ill needs a long rest, but a person who is healthy takes his rest as he works, the two things go on simultaneously.

M.J.H. During Lady Allan's party's recent audiences, the description of the Samadhi naturally available between desires (vasana) led on to a description of how a man can learn to act without attachment to the fulfilment of desire. I have noticed that an underlying desire to get my work finished consumes an enormous amount of energy. Does not the attachment to the fulfilment of desire rob a man of the energy which he gains through Dhyana or by connecting with the natural Samadhi between desires.

H.H. When you make a determination that you will finish this work, then there is a sort of burden which causes this enormous loss of energy. If you do not have that determination, by just letting things be done, let it

start, let it finish, but do not be attached to that determination that ‘I will finish it’, ‘I will get up only when I have finished it’, then that loss of energy will not occur. It will be a natural thing for the work to come up and to get finished and that loss of energy will not follow. Work should be done as a part of duty. No work will ever get finished.

In big factories, as the bell rings, the work is left there where it is, and when there’s a break for lunch or time is up, then work wherever it is, is left there and then. And then restarted from there again—there’s no determination that ‘I will not go home until I finish.

The second illustration uses a court of law:

As soon as the clock strikes four, the court rises. The case is adjourned and left where it is. It will be taken up again at the next hearing from that place onward. So if you do not have that ego sort of thing—‘I will not get up until I have finished it’—‘then only will I get up’—then there will be no burden and the extra loss of energy which you are experiencing will be avoided.

M.J.H. Perhaps I could just add that the approach which H.H. has just been describing is one of the most noticeable differences between our way of life in the West and here in India. It is also one of the chief obstacles to our people experiencing deep meditation because in the West we try to cram so much in so short a period of time through desire.

H.H. What H.H. has been recommending does not mean laziness or lethargy. In life everything has got its place and every work should get equal importance. When we try cramming things in a small space that only means we are robbing some other work of its due importance by trying to finish it at the cost of some other thing that is waiting. One has to give equal importance to all the aspects of work, and that can only be achieved when you think you are doing it for the sake of your duty. This will not mean any laxity or lethargy.