



Direct Realisation

talks on the 9th chapter
of the Bhagavad Gita

Swami Venkatesananda



Series of talks on Chapter 9 of the Bhagavad Gita
October, 1982

Published by the Chiltern Yoga Trust
in the Divine memory of Shri Ramawadh Ramsahaye Maraz

Sivananda Yoga Ashram
Rose-Hill Mauritius

I

The eighth chapter dealt with the death of the ego. And now we are given the vision of reality.

Idam tu te guhyatamam Pravaksyamy anasuyave Jnanam Vijnanasahitam yaj jntitva moksyase subhat (IX-1).

"I shall now declare to thee who does not cavil, the greatest secret, the knowledge combined with direct self-realisation. Having known this thou shalt be free from evil."

And once again: Rajavidya rajaguhyam paviram idam uttamam Pratyaksaragamam dharmyam susukham kartum avyayam (IX-2).

"This is the kingly science, the kingly secret, the supreme purifier, realisable by direct intuitional knowledge, according to righteousness, very easy to perform and imperishable."

What is the meaning of this secret? Two hundred million copies of the Bhagavad Gita have been distributed all over the world. Can this be a secret? What is a secret? And when someone says, "I am telling you a secret?", the first thing you want to do is to tell it to someone else. If you did not say it was secret, nobody would bother to transmit it to others.

So the first significance of the idea of the secrecy of the teaching is that you should share it with everybody else. But what is proclaimed? The words. The concepts. The concepts that are enshrined in this chapter may be shared with others, but with the caution, "This is a secret". What is the significance here? The significance is - 'please do not take the word for the truth'. The reality indicated by these words is a secret, secret in the sense that it is not obvious. We bear this in mind, that though the expression is openly declared, the meaning is still secret. "Secret" may not really be in the sense that if this is transmitted to all and sundry, there will be chaos. That is another way of looking at it; we will come to that also. Like the tantric teachings, if you give them to immature people, you might be misleading them. That was the reason why some teachings were kept secret.

Another reason is the idea, "I am giving it only to you". Then there is greater application, greater receptivity, there is a value put upon it, but I do not know if that is what is implied here.

Why is meditation considered a great secret? Because if you think that what you are doing is meditation, already you have lost the key to real meditation. So, when it is said that it is a great secret, that it has to be learnt from a guru,

in your consciousness it not only grows in value - but you are alert and receptive and you are seeking all the time.

The greatest secret, the kingly secret, the supreme among secrets. I am going to tell you this, but I repeat that this teaching comes after the previous teaching that you must be completely dead - the ego and all the rest of it. Then this teaching can make sense, otherwise it will convey some literal meaning which you will grasp intellectually only.

Understanding something intellectually can be self-destructive. Why? Not in the sense that you are suddenly going to disintegrate, but in the sense that you waste your time and pretend that you have got there, that you have realised the truth, that you have realised God.

Arjuna has given the title that every true disciple endeavours to earn, and that is freedom from jealousy, and that is the only way. Where there is jealousy, or its similar evil qualities, the truth cannot become clear. For the truth to become absolutely clear in substance, in essence, the heart must be free from all these things - jealousy, hatred, ill will, attachment, otherwise the truth is not clear. The words are clear, but the truth is not clear.

What is going to be declared in this chapter is not knowledge in the sense of book knowledge. It is intellectual knowledge plus something that is super-logical. But how will I know that I have grasped the truth if it is secret?

"If you know this you are free from all evil, all impurities drop away ." Here is a double-edged sword. You must be free from impurities in order to understand it, and when you realise it, all impurities drop away. The meaning is that you must be qualified, you must be pure enough to receive this knowledge. At this point it is possible that even if you have cut the plant of the ego right down to the ground, the seeds are still there. And it will come up again; give it a little bit of rain and a bit of sunshine, the seeds will come up. So here we are told, first make your heart pure enough to receive this knowledge, and when you have actually experienced this truth, all evil will drop away from your heart.

If total deliverance from evil does not happen, please remember that knowledge has not been experienced or rightly understood. The knowledge may not only be of no use to you; it may be partly destructive.

Rajavaidya rajaguhvam pavitram idam uttamam

Pratyaksavagamam dharmyam susukham kartum avyayam

It is a kingly science, because in olden days it was the kings who used to practice yoga. "Rajavidya". Only kings can learn this secret, or you can say rajavidya in the sense that it is the direct road, the royal road, straight forward without any deviation and the fastest road possible.

One other important factor mentioned in this second verse is that you can directly experience this truth. It is not something which is based on some sort of faith, though you may have to believe in something to begin with. It is something which you can directly realise. It is also easy to practice. When yoga or the spiritual life is mentioned we often suffer from a deluded idea that it must be something difficult. If it is not difficult, then everybody can do it; so what is the good in it ? It is easily done and therefore do not try some sort of psychic power or tantric tricks here, but try to inhale this truth as you inhale a perfume. A flower wafts its perfume in secret, that is the secret. It becomes part of you. Let this truth also become part of you similarly, by gently inhaling it. Inhaling the perfume is a very simple and easy thing, but it is also difficult because you make it complicated. Something which can be done very simply is done in a complicated way, because you make it complicated.

So, approach this in a very simple way and you will inhale the secret. It is very easy. "Avayam". It is inexhaustible. It is given here in order that you may share it with others. Go on sharing it. As you go on sharing it, you will find that this knowledge becomes deeper and deeper, and more and more profound, and more and more experiential.

II

Asraddadhanah purusa dharmasya 'sya paramtapa aprapya mam nivartante
mrtyusamsaravartmani (IX-3)

"Those who have no faith in this Dharma (Knowledge of the Self), O Arjuna, return to the path of this world of death without attaining Me".

This is the next verse. One who does not have faith in this supremely secret teaching, goes round and round in this samsara. Samsara is a sort of merry-go-round where you think you are doing a lot, you think a lot is happening, but nothing is happening. You get down exactly where you got up. Why is this so? Because some secret has not been understood, "aprapya mam nivartante ... "

What is this "mam" here? "Mam" means "me". "Without attaining Me". "Not having reached me". Does it mean that we should go find where Krishna is and get into his coat pocket? That may be one view. If you ask the Hare Krishna people, they will tell you that eventually you must become one with Krishna, or go to where Krishna dwells. Or it can be interpreted quite simply to mean "not having reached me". Please examine what this "me" is.

About one hundred per cent of our problems, if not a little more, arises from an incorrect understanding of what the "me" is. Why it is so ? This is a secret! Why is it a secret? Because you have never looked into it. You may never have examined this thing called "me" that is driving you to do this, to experience that. It is the "me" that determines all that we think, all that we do, in fact the entire life.

What is this "me" that is hankering for experience, that thinks it is doing or not doing? Can the self be investigated, understood, unveiled? Then what happens? Krishna has already hinted at it : jnatva moksyase subhat - having known this thou shalt be free from evil.

I am going to tell you a great secret. If you know that, you will be instantly freed from all "asubhat", inauspiciousness. non-good. In other words there is only one way of overcoming lust, anger, greed, hatred - and that is to track them to their own source, which is the self or the "me".

Can all unwholesome thought, word and deed come to an end here and now? Yes. How? If you reach me it comes to an end. What does "me" mean here? Krishna. If you are a devotee of Krishna, please do not change your view. Find him. They will tell you that Krishna dwells in your heart playing the flute. Good. very good. Find him there.

If you examine this idea you will find that they are saying exactly the same thing. From where do all these evil thoughts come? From your heart, so examine it. When you find where Krishna is, you will find quite possibly that is where all your thoughts come from, that is where all your emotions are, that is where all your hatred breeds, and all the inauspicious thoughts lie hidden. And if you are sincere, when you reach that 'me' and discover "My God, this is what I am", a change happens. That change is profound and instantaneous.

"Aprapya mam nivartante mrtyusamadravartmani".

"The path of this world of death", or "this world which is tainted by death". It is one of the most chastening thoughts. All that you do, all that you are, it comes to an end just like that, and it is finished. If you still cling to the idea that somehow the "me" is important - 'I must do this, I must achieve that', if the breath stops, what does all that matter to me? Nothing, absolutely nothing. So if there any residue of a craving or a selfish motivation left, this thought, this truth, that all this will come to an end, will make us more sincere.

Now the first word used in this verse is "asraddadhanah". If you have no "sraddah" in this truth, you will go round and round. Can the word sraddah be translated as faith? If so, what does faith mean?

Now I have a difficulty and the difficulty is that the book itself very clearly says that if you have faith you will reach me, you will be totally free from all impurity. Therefore it seems to me that if, having professed faith in the doctrine, you find that your life has not improved at all, then there is no faith.

All that has been said so far is that your impurity will go. When all impurity dies, there is moksha; and that which brings about the cessation of impurity is called sraddah. Sraddah does not mean mere lip service or saying "I believe", for in lip service there is something in you which is not being touched.

The previous verse reminded us that this great secret that is going to be revealed is very easy, and you will see the effect immediately. If you have faith in this doctrine, then your attempt at self-purification will be very easy. But have you ever found any self-purification exercises easy? Even fasting is difficult. When a craving arises, to stop it is worse than death sometimes - and yet here he says that it is very easy.

Someone comes and tells you that if your heart is pure, you will see God. I believe in this. But then why is it that I do not see God? Because you have no faith. What is that faith? Can I buy it? No. Nobody can help you in this. One who has faith will be pure, will know how to get rid of all impurities that arise in the heart. One who has faith understands life. His life is quite easy.

Whatever has to be done is done, quite easily, and there is no difficulty, there is no complication in such a life. If these factors are not there, that means that there is no faith.

III

If you say that you have faith, then the fruit must be the abandonment of all impurities. Otherwise you go round and round the merry-go-round. If you have seen an old fashioned merry-go-round, you see that all the people are being whirled around, but a person in the center keeps rotating the wheels; that is what makes it go round. Whereas all these people are being madly whirled around, the person who stands at the center is very steady, unconfused, undisturbed. The trick somehow is to jump off and get into the center; then you are not whirled around, you are the controller, the mover of the merry-go-round. So as long as you are ignorant of this, as long as you do not have the right type of faith, the right type of understanding, this business of dreaming life after life will go on.

"Aprapya mam nivartante".

"Not having reached me".

The "me" may not specifically refer to Krishna, may or may not even specifically refer to God. Realise this me, or that which is the essence of this me, the self; having reached that you are no longer confused because you realize that the thing that experienced sorrow, joy, happiness, unhappiness, success, failure, honour, dishonour, in itself does not undergo any change; is not being whirled around. It depends entirely on your experience - whether you call it Krishna, Rama, Jesus Christ or Buddha, or just "me" or "self". That is not so important. The very center of your being is where there is no confusion, where there is no churning around. This steady center seems to be unchanging; and that is what has been there all the time as the experiencer of these diverse experiences. It is because it is there that all these experiences are possible. So instead of being pushed around by these experiences, why not seek the center where the experiencer 'is' realized, or the experience is realized, not in a divided way - I am happy or unhappy, but "I am", that is sufficient. As long as you are separated from this "I am", hanging on to the periphery, you cannot help being turned round and round - happy one minute, unhappy the next.

Once again, this "mam" can be translated as either God or Krishna or just "me" or "self"; they mean exactly the same thing. Somebody calls it Krishna and somebody else calls it God, but it is what you refer as "myself" when you think of yourself. If you investigate that deeply enough, you will come to what they are talking about, God or Buddha, Krishna or Jesus Christ. You will reach the same point by persistent investigation - so we won't worry what to call it, we will say God.

"Maya tatam idam sarvam jagad avyaktamurtina."

The entire universe is pervaded by God.

What does this mean, "pervaded by God"? It makes no sense to us at all, and that is why Krishna said it is "rajavidya rajaguhyam", a supreme secret.

Why is this all-pervading God such a secret? Because you are included in that secret. The moment you rise there, you have already disturbed the truth. Of course, you cannot destroy truth, you cannot destroy God; but so far, as you are concerned, the truth is no longer the reality. The moment "I" arises, the truth is gone, and since all the time you are dependent upon the ego, on the mind, to understand anything, including spiritual truth, that spiritual truth is condemned to remain forever a great secret. There is only one way in which this truth can be realized, and that is by your self-elimination; since this self-elimination is not possible, not so easy at least - rajavidya - you have to be as strong, as powerful, as determined, as heroic as a king in order to unravel this secret. That is why it is secret. It is not secret because someone has hidden it away, but because it needs a certain instrument of understanding of which you are capable, but which you are unwilling to employ.

The entire universe is pervaded by me. How am I going to realize this? Ah! that is the whole trouble. Drop that. Can I understand it verbally, intellectually? No. As long as you are using your intellect, as long as it is the ego that is trying to understand, it will remain a secret. It is possible to understand it only if you can use the truth itself as the instrument, which means surrender or abandon your own instrument. So these two together are necessary: one, there must be faith in the existence of this truth, or otherwise you would not even begin to investigate it, and two, there must be the abandonment of that which entertains this faith.

You can say, "I will realize God" - that sounds egoistic. So we will not realize God, we will eat, drink and be merry! Ah! no, in that process you are creating another danger. You see how you are caught. You have to have faith, you have to have firm determination to achieve this self-realisation. Having raised this firm determination and having that faith, you must abandon the whole thing, knowing that this is not the instrument with which the omnipresent being can be realized, that the omnipresent being cannot be realized by a finite entity, and that when the finite being is dropped the omnipresent being realizes itself.

"The entire universe is pervaded by me". One example, though no example, is adequate, is water and a block of ice. A block of ice is nothing but water, but it looks to be something solid; but water is not solid. That thing has somehow become this, an omnipresent being which dwells in all.

"Matsthani sarvabhutani na ca ham tesv avasthitah"

All beings are in me.

In other words, there is nothing outside of this God. It is not as if this all-pervading God is somehow confined to each one of you. We are all in him. But in the first half of the next verse it says:

"Na ca matsthani bhutani"

No, we are not all in him!

The example given here is the mirror. Hold a big mirror in front of us, you will see all of us in the mirror. We did not get into it at all, yet all of us appear to be in the mirror. Now you are stuck. You cannot say that we are not in the mirror, nor that we are in the mirror. The reality is the mirror, but you can never see it, you have never seen one. You stand in front of it and you see only your face and the background. We have been taught by our school masters that what we see in the mirror is a reflection. Maybe it is something else. The mirror's reflection is one of the supreme examples to meditate upon in order to understand some mystery.

The world seems to exist and this whole world exists in God, says Krishna here, but not in God in that form, in that sense, just as the block of ice is water and yet not water, since it is a block of ice. Vaguely, in a similar way, the entire universe is one, indivisibly one. Again the mind or intellect brings up a concept of indivisibility which is very different from the truth. As long as the "I" remains as the point of reference, you cannot get at this truth. It will always create a diversity; and yet the ego cannot create anything, it can only think it creates. So any action based on the ego, any sadhana or spiritual practice is only the thinking that there is a sadhana, there is yoga, there is meditation.

Some funny man said, 'La verite blesse', - truth hurts. That is totally untrue. The moment you see the truth, you are free. The truth does not hurt at all; on the contrary, it frees you from all hurt or hurtability. The ego has no power to create the reality, the truth. The reality already exists. All that the ego thinks is what in oriental philosophy is called illusion or unreality. Since the ego cannot create anything, the unreality is not created, and therefore it does not exist. All this is maya. If you enquire into it, the maya does not exist. Suddenly you realize 'my God, in a non-existent thing I imagined a ghost'. The moment it was investigated into, the ghost disappears. The reality, as it is, always exists. That is a great secret. This secret cannot be grasped by the intellect, the mind or the ego. When the ego tries to work this out, at some kind of a philosophical, metaphysical or mathematical proposition, it creates a

diversity. So Krishna says, "na ca matsthani, bhutani" - all this diversity does not exist in me, but "matsthani sarvabhutani" - as a totality they exist in me.

That is a beautiful thought - in their totality they exist. That block of ice does not hold several hundred thousands individual drops of water; the block of ice contains the totality of those hundred thousand droplets of water. So, is it possible for us to view the entire universe as a totality. Do we have an instrument by which it is possible for us to become immediately aware of the totality? Yes and no. If you refer to the mind, the intellect or the ego, it is no. When these are sacrificed, disposed of, dispensed with, something arises that is instantly aware of this totality - and that is called intuition.

IV

We have looked into the reason why the chapter starts with the flourishing statement: "This is a great secret". Now we come to the secret itself.

"Maya tatam idam sarvam jagad avyaktamurtina."

All this world is pervaded by me in my unmanifest aspect."

The word "tatam" cannot be translated. The entire universe is (to use the usual expression) pervaded by God. This expression can be read the other way round: that which pervades the entire universe is God.

A doubt may arise here. If God is all-pervading, why do I not see it? It is seen only by someone who is endowed with an extremely subtle intelligence or intellect. "All pervading" has by definition to be extremely subtle, and this extremely subtle truth cannot be grasped or understood by that which is gross.

What is it that I see? Avyaktamurtina. It is God who pervades everything in this universe, but in a non-obvious way. That is what the Veda also implies:

"Whatever is seen or heard is also God". But not in the way you take this expression to mean. The Yoga Vasistha is most inspiringly blunt: what do you mean "You do not see God?" Do you not hear sound, do you not taste something, do you not smell something? That's it. It is only because of the Grace of that God that you are able to do all of this. Still not clear? That which is clear is not God!

Avyaktamurtina. My unmanifest aspect. Why is this enigmatic "avyaktamurtina" introduced here? Why is there a dismissal of the manifest reality? It is very important to grasp this noble truth - that God, who is all-pervading, is yet not the obvious thing. Otherwise it leads to all sorts of gross and terrible perversions. Is this God? Yes, but not that which appears to be in front of me.

What is it that appears in front of me? Jagad Avyaktamurtina. The same God, but not what is obvious. What is non-obvious is God. Then he says, "Stop and find out why a non-obvious thing has become obvious." When something obvious is seen or experienced, Krishna says a very pertinent and simple thing: examine what is meant by "This is obvious". It is obvious to you, not to others. What is obvious to others is not obvious to you. This is the crux of the whole problem of understanding and misunderstanding amongst us. When this truth soaks through your entire personality, it is then that real

understanding may arise. There is however no guarantee that this will happen because the intellect is so constituted that it craves for something obvious.

Beauty is in the eye of the beholder. That is it: what is obvious is in the eye - the I - of the beholder. The definition "This is so-and-so" arises in the beholder, in the experiencer, in the I. So, while looking outside at this, we are also looking within and saying, "This is the obvious thing". But God is not obvious, he is the non-obvious reality in what is obvious.

Now, how can I know what is non-obvious? By trying to trace what is obvious to the source of who has made it obvious. "To me this is obvious", so who the "me" is has also to be understood while simultaneously experiencing or seeing this object. Then an extremely simple magic or miracle takes place. While the vision is focused outside, it is also able to look within. How can that be? If the vision is outside and inside simultaneously, what is the meaning of the words "outside" and "inside"? There you are, got it! At the moment nothing is obvious. Why? Because even this fundamental thing is not obvious! How can there be a dual vision, how can I be aware of both the outside and the inside It is not obvious. That is where an intuitive understanding of what God may be arises.

Immediately we will dispose of one important question - what is the use of all this? The use of something unimaginably great, that is - you are able to live an enlightened life. Enlightened in the sense that you are not taken in by obvious. Instead, you are looking at that factor within yourself - which I might loosely call prejudice, and which characterizes every object as this or that, and makes it obvious. When that is discovered, then there is no longer a delusion. You are able to say with Arjuna, "The delusion is gone, doubts are set at rest." There is no more misunderstanding because the understander himself has disintegrated. There is no anxiety to understand, knowing that what is obvious is not true.

Every great man doubts. What you see is false, what you hear is false. The knowledge that arises after a deep and thorough investigation, that alone is true. In that state of inner silence the delusion is gone.

We are looking for an intuitive understanding which will dissolve something that is plaguing our lives, namely delusion, and out of this delusion all the others arise - craving, fear, hatred, and the delusion is 'I understand what this is. I understand that she loves me, I understand that he hates me.' How do you know? I do not know! Then there is an inward understanding which is not entirely a selfish action. I am not worried about merely understanding myself. I understand myself only in relation to you. But when the gap between the outside and the inside is bridged, a peculiar insight arises, peculiar in the

sense that the light begins to shine, and in that light delusion goes away. When delusion is gone there is enlightenment.

"I pervade everything," says Krishna, "all things rest in me"; and then he says, "matsthani bhutaninaca" - they do not exist in me! What is this contradiction? You cannot possibly intellectualize it. "All these things exist in me, in the infinite, but not as all things". Do not go any further. The mind can only grasp that or this; it cannot grasp that "this" and "me" together. And therefore what is important here is to remember that "that which we call God is all-pervading", which means the me is included. If the me is also included, then who is the seer of all this? Do not ask any more, shut up until this vision arises. It is not a vision that is generated by me. It is not that I see God. Perhaps God sees himself. But do not assert that God sees himself. How do you know? When that stage is reached, the seeker becomes highly enlightened and the only thing that can be said is that he is not deluded any more.

The one thing that should go is delusion, that is the most important thing. When that is gone you can live in this world as you have to. Who determines what you have to do? Do not ask me. Again, you are looking at specifics, you are looking at the other as the other and you as yourself, and you are looking for that which is obvious. Here he says, "No, that is a foolish quest altogether."

Here is a secret and it is a secret because it is advaitam, because it is non-obvious, so the intelligence that constantly seeks this non-obvious discovers that the non-obvious can only be intuitively grasped.

It is the inner light that enables you to see the outer one, it is the inner light that enables you at the same time to be intensely aware of the entire universe. So what is obvious is obvious to the inner light, to me; but I am not aware of the me, and therefore there is darkness inside, and this darkness pretends to see the light outside. Is this possible?

"I do not care who I am but I understand you", is the most absurd statement that anyone has ever made. It is like saying that I am blind but I can see the cinema. If you are blind you will not see the cinema! The light outside depends entirely upon your sight. If you are blind, the blazing sun is all darkness. If you want to see God in all, the inside must be absolutely clear, without any shadow whatsoever. It is this inner light that enables you to see what is thought of as the light outside.

You cannot understand yourself unless you come into contact with something else. It is the something else that provokes something in you. It is also a funny thing - first you define something as beautiful, and then pursue it - you define something as painful and avoid it; and the more you avoid it, the more painful

it becomes, the more you pursue something thinking it is pleasure the more pleasure it seems to give you. All the time you are like a blind man who proclaims he is able to see colors. It is not possible. There must be the inner light or the insight, and that insight must be quite clear in that clear light.

Must I go and sit in a corner of the room and try to figure out what the me is? You cannot do that because, if you are isolating yourself and trying to figure out what me is, there is no input, there is no stimulus to arouse this me so that it can be observed. So while coming into contact with external stimulus, can I simultaneously look within? This vision of the totality is what is regarded as a fundamental sadhana , for this yoga. "Rajavidya rajamukyam" is the supreme direct path, supreme kingly science, kingly secret, and you will shine as a raja yogi if you are able at the same time to remain inwardly aware of external phenomena. Then it is possible intuitively to understand that this omnipresence does not require the destruction of diversity, any outward change, but a complete and total understanding.

We spent some time over the one single expression "avyaktamurtina". Maya tatam idam sarvam jagad avyaktamurtina. The divine is the non-obvious truth. The mind is so constructed that it swings from one extreme to the other because it wants to hang on to something. So it demands a concept. A concept is a perversion of the truth which serves as a coat-hanger. Without that the mind is unable to function. So since God is the non-obvious, all that is obvious is not God.

A mantra in the Katho Upanishad brings out the same point: "That which cannot be thought of but by which thinking happens is Brahman, not what you are worshipping here." This is one of the famous formulas which the anti-idolaters use. You should not worship this. Why not? Because the Upanishad says that Brahman is not something which you can think of. But that is only half of it; what about the other half? "That which enables you to think is the absolute, is the reality, is God." God pervades the entire universe, that is a fact but 'avyaktamurtina' not in an obvious sense. If God is the non-obvious in all this, what is the obvious reality? Unless you grasp that very clearly you cannot really examine what is obvious. This world, does it exist? Does it not exist? If it exists, what is its relation to humanity, to God? Does God create the world as a potter creates a pot? This is a well-known example. Just as the existence of a pot enables you to understand the existence of a potter, even so the existence of the world makes you realize that there must be a creator.

But at once we get caught. This is the danger in all analogies. This danger must be fully faced; and yet an example is given because without an example the mind cannot understand an unseen truth. So Krishna gives here an example of the movement of the air in space. Krishna tells us in contradictory terms that there is an indescribable relationship between God and the world. "Everything exists in God," he says; but nothing exists in God.

What is this verbal jugglery? It means: shut-up! Do not try to use your brain here. Why? Now comes the answer. "Sarvablutani kaunteva prakstim yanti kamikam kalpaksave punas tani kalpadau visrjami aham". God sits somewhere and according to his own clock some sort of kalpa is determined. One kalpa is 100.000 years. At the beginning of this kalpa, God lets all these things flow from him. At the end of the kalpa, according to his own clock again, he takes it all back again. It may be true; but if we have followed the previous arguments concerning the non-obviousness of God, non-obviousness of truth, then a new light arises - and that is, if God is all-pervading, and that God is non-obvious, then what is this obvious reality?

The obvious answer to that obvious question is a non-obvious question again: to whom is it obvious First figure out to whom this thing that is obvious is

obvious; then your question will be answered or you will find an answer to your question. You cannot escape this simple understanding that this is obvious to me. In that all-pervading consciousness there is something that is obvious, but that obviousness is obvious only to me. Now, therefore, the whole attention is turned upon yourself and you come face to face with the mind that conjures up an obvious reality in what is non-obvious. Non-obvious is quite simple. How do we know that this is a human person? May be it is a wax model. So what is the guarantee that it is obvious? Or is it as obvious as I think it is? To me she is the divine mother, but not to somebody else. What is obvious to me is again subject to interpretation. What makes a thing obvious is something which clings to this concept that there is something obvious. Because the mind cannot work on something which is non-obvious.

And so you create a concept called infinity. This is rubbish again. The thing called infinity is obvious to you, not to me. How can the mind conceive of infinity and yet not be outside of it? Unless you are outside of the thing you are thinking of, you cannot think. These are the problems that arise when you start from something which is non-obvious. Krishna says, "Look at what is obvious and go on from there. "What is obvious is considered to be obvious by something which demands an obvious reality, and therefore coats the non-obvious with something which seems to be obvious and that something is within you - it is the mind.

What is mind? Nobody has seen the mind either. But you have experienced within yourself these two psychological states, certain movements of thought within yourself, and those movements together are called the mind - "Sankalpa Vikalpapa kram namahah." "Sankalpa" is thought, "vikalpa" is imagination, or right thinking or wrong thinking; that is not terribly important for our discussion now, but I want that word "kalpa". Why not look at it this way. Krishna says at the beginning of every kalpa the entire creation emerges and at the end of the kalpa the entire creation is withdrawn - into me, into God, into consciousness. So why not take this simple view that thinking makes the world, thinking makes the non-obvious obvious, and therefore we are caught, because all our lives are based on mere thought. That which is the truth is perverted into something which is non-truth. Why? The non-truth seems to be obvious and we resist all inspiration to examine what is obvious and reach the non-obvious. Otherwise there is no sense in somebody saying what is obvious is not the truth.

We are exposed to this teaching that God is the non-obvious truth. So, I am not aware of the non-obvious reality, but I am aware of something which is obvious. I do not blindly reject the obvious as being non-truth, but I want to find out why the non-obvious reality has somehow become obvious. And I realize that this apparent appearance of an object is based upon me, memory, mind - and so I come back to something which is again a mixture of the

obvious and the non-obvious. I have not seen the mind. I do not know what consciousness means. I do not know what awareness means, but I realise that I experience within myself the arising and the setting of thought. And this is dramatically experienced at the moment of awakening and at the moment of falling asleep.

Observe how the world arises when you wake up in the morning and observe how the world's whole creation is withdrawn into you when you fall asleep. If you learn to observe this, you will also know how to enter into that state of consciousness which is neither waking nor sleeping, but which is the substratum for the whole lot. That is the reality, that is consciousness, that is awareness, we are all that; but when the thought arises with that thought which is the "I" thought, the entire universe is created. Are we just wasting our time, speculating how God creates the world, or how I create the world, or how you create the world? No, it is of immediate relevance to us. You are, there is no doubt about that; the whole world is, there is no doubt about that; and in that "I-ness", in that existence, there is no problem.

The problem arises when you enter into a relationship with somebody and that relationship is based on your thought. You think that so-and-so is so-and-so and you characterize so-and-so as good, as bad, as beautiful, as ugly and all that - all these are your own thoughts. When the relationship is based on this thought process, you have created your own little world in which you are imprisoned, you are trapped. When that world comes to an end, there is peace, there is bliss, there is great joy. How do you know? Because I experience this every day in sleep. When my own private world comes to an end in sleep, there is great joy, great peace, great rejuvenation, and in the morning when I create my own private little world all these things are gone, peace is gone, happiness is gone, energy is wasted. I go to sleep and it is quite possible that the world, the earth that I am living on is sunk. This does not matter at all, nothing matters. I am asleep and it is quite possible that someone whom I love intensely and who sleeps in the same room or the next room might have died. I do not weep, I am not miserable at all. Why? Because my private world has come to an end for the time being. Before I wake up and re-create this world in the next kalpa, next morning, I am not aware of anything and therefore there is no unhappiness, there is no sorrow.

Is it possible, asks Krishna, to live such a life without sleeping?" Why not? The moment you directly perceive the mischief that thought creates, that mischief comes to an end and there is no more problem. This is the great secret. Why is it the great secret? Because you have never bothered to look at it.

VI

The non-obvious is the truth or God; but then there is also something which is obvious. Does it mean that there is something other than God in existence? This is the next question. What is obvious is considered to be creation. If there is a real creation, and if it is obvious, it is not God. "Maya tatam idam sarvam". "All this world is pervaded by Me", is immediately negated; the statement that the whole universe is pervaded inside and out by God is instantly canceled when you say that God is non-obvious, and there is something which is obvious and that obvious is the creation. If these three statements are put together, instantly you are challenging the very statement given in the beginning: "Maya tatam iidam sarvam" - "I pervade the entire universe, inside and out". How do you reconcile this? Hence, it is called paradox.

Paradox means not merely a puzzling statement. It also means something which cannot be taught, but which can be caught if you contemplate rather deeply into it. The universe or creation comes into being at the beginning of a kalpa, and exists for the duration of that kalpa, and concludes at the end of that kalpa. What is kalpa? Kalpana and kalpa are very close together. Sankalpa, Vikalpa, Kalpana - all seem to have the same flavour. Sankalpa is a notion or thought, Vikalpa is imagination. What is the difference between a thought and an imagination? The difference is only semantic, arbitrary. You think that a thought is something that you think of, and you think that imagination is a thought that does not have a corresponding reality. That is, in the one case you accept that the thought has a valid basis, and in the other case you accept that the thought has not got a valid basis. That's all. If you try to examine your own thought, you find that it has no basis either; but for the purpose of some kind of discussion we have to talk of sub-conscious mind, super-conscious mind, or levels of consciousness.

The universe comes into being at the beginning of a kalpa. What kalpa is it? Sankalpa, maybe - Sankalpa meaning a thought or idea. An idea arises in the mind and the universe comes into being. Someone might instantly come up with an argument: but you did not create this. All these are my creations; but something is there. Water has been created, but not by me. That it is drinking water, that it is pure water, that it is unpolluted water, that it is good water, that it is polluted water, that it is poisonous water - all these are my creations, mine only. The poisonous quality of that water is born when I regard it as poisonous; but I did not create water. So, independent of what is called my sankalpa, there is something in the universe whose nature I do not know but concerning which a sankalpa arises in me. There is something here looking at that. I do not know if you see it already. The thing that sees that, the thing that sees those two beautiful eyes also has eyes. So, the sankalpa that arises here is somehow related to that. This expression occurs quite often in the

Bhagavad Gita: "Purnagunesh bhakta rata". It looks as though the world is seeing itself - if you know what I mean. It is not that "I" am seeing the world, the world is seeing itself, one pair of eyes looks at another pair of eyes.

One body relates itself to another body. Some sort of moisture, something in the taste buds in the tongue tastes this. Am I not there? Yes, you are there also. It is the existence of a thing called "me" that produces this sankalpa, and thus brings about another creation in this creation. The moment you realize that, then the whole thing becomes clear.

So the thing called friendship is a sankalpa which arises. Where? In the mind. And what is the nature of the mind? The nature of the mind is thought. And what is that thought? What does that thought consist of? What is the material of which the thought is made? Consciousness, not mind. This is a very funny thing. Thought is mine and this mind belongs to God. If you reduce it like that, then you come to the same understanding that all this is indeed God. I am, but I am not mine. I am, but I belong to this God. The body is. Nobody need to deny that the body exists. But the body is not mine, it belongs to the supreme being himself. So there is obviously a thing which is called creation - but that obvious creation is not God. That obvious creation manifests itself in what is un-obvious, but which is the total reality.

If this is not my creation, do we accept a creation created by a Creator which instantly brings about a division? This gives rise to another problem: why did this funny God create this stupid world, and then create all this endless argument: is the world good or is the world miserable - it doesn't end anywhere? Yesterday we heard a sermon that "God created the world and it was good." Then why is it so bad? Are you prepared to admit that the world as it is with all its violence, viciousness etc, is a good world? In that case we will join the vicious ones. Why should I suffer? So, once you accept the creation as the product of a Creator, you get into endless trouble in understanding.

Krishna comes up with a lovely verse: "Prakritim svam avastabhya visrjami punah-punah bhatagramam imam krtsnam avasam prakrter vasat. It is like a dream creation, like the dream of God. Why does dream arise? "Prakritim svam avastabhya". The world as it is, is natural; the world as it is with all its beastliness is an expression of divine nature. Do not try to call it beastliness, but do you deny that there is violence and viciousness and wickedness in this world? So, can we determine whether the world, as it is, is good or bad. Whether it needs some kind of amending exercise. Or, if you say that all this is good, shall we join the hooligans? First find God - as Ramakrishna would say; then these problems will be correctly understood. The entire universe is God's nature manifest - "Prakritim svam avastabhya".

In the Upanishads there is a very long discussion. Why did God create the world? There is an extraordinary argument advanced by one religious group - it seems to make sense to them, it doesn't to me. They believe that God created the whole world out of nothing, just once. That is unlike the Bhagavatam viewpoint that this thing has been going on in cyclic repetition. One kalpa begins and it goes on and it ends, and at the end of it there are some billions of souls which are not liberated and for their sake God creates another world. Even that argument does not satisfy one question. Why did it all start in the first place? So, the other cult has a beautiful argument. Why did God create the world? In order that you may obtain liberation. Is that such a nice argument? I am asking you, "Why did God create me at all? He could have kept quiet. If he had not created me, I would not have been so mischievous and he need not have created mosquitoes and scorpions to keep me in my place. It is what is known as begging the question. It is not a proper answer. Is there an answer? No answer.

God's nature manifests as the entire universe. God does not have to have a motivation, an intention, an unfulfilled desire to be fulfilled by creating something. To one who is infinite, is there a desire to be fulfilled? Is there a need to show that you are infinite? This is another famous argument. It is a lovely story but it is not satisfying. God wanted to experience his own omnipotence and created all of this. God wanted to express his own infinite nature so he created infinite beings. All these are lovely arguments, but they cannot satisfy a sincere inquiry into the nature of truth. So, after having listed all these arguments one ends up saying "Devasa sobhamohim". This is God's own nature, not even an expression of God's nature - "expression" still means that you can push it out. This is just God's nature. Learn to look at it like that, and then your own attitude will change towards life. It may not, but you will at least learn to drop your viewpoint; and when you have dropped your viewpoint, the world may remain as it is with a little less viciousness in it. Fantastic, isn't it? That is the maximum contribution you can make to the peace of the world, to the happiness of the world, to the welfare of the world.

If this is God's nature, must he manifest it? What do you mean, manifest it? It is not even an expression or manifestation of God's nature. You are asking the sun, why the hell do you shine? The light hurts my eyes. It has no intention of hurting your eyes, it has no intention of doing anything at all, but the very nature of the sun is shining luminosity. Does a mirror have the intention of reflecting your ugly face? Does it want to insult you? When something is placed in front of the mirror, it reflects without intending to do so. So, if God created the world as it is, he had no intention of doing something or not doing something. God's creation of the world is totally un-intentional, totally free of all desires, totally free of any accomplishment. And the funniest part of it is, we are all part of that cosmic being or that cosmic nature.

Then, why do I desire something? Movement in consciousness is inevitable and that movement in consciousness is called thought. So, sankalpa is inevitable, do not try to suppress it. That sankalpa might suggest anything. Allow its own natural manifestation and there will be no desire which does not arise in God. For instance, hunger. Here is a living organism, and this body is living not because I want to live. It is living, not because of a personal or private wish, but because that sankalpa arises in this cosmic consciousness called God. Why does this arise? It arises. It is natural. There is no question, there is no argument there. The sankalpa called hunger or thirst arises naturally and therefore it is not desire. But do we not have desire? We have millions of desires! Why do they arise? Merely because thoughts can arise, millions of thoughts can arise in consciousness.

You have a crooked idea that this is the right use and this is the wrong use and it must be done this way. What would you do if you were God? God is not responsible for all that. So, to come back to your desires, every morning before breakfast you entertain at least 15,000 ideas or desires per minute. If God were to fulfill them all, quite likely he would have to destroy the entire creation before lunch and recreate the whole world to suit your desires and prayers. Try this experiment. Just for one day, note down and tick off the desires that have been fulfilled and you will be shocked to see that in 100 years' time not more than three of those prayers or desires have been fulfilled. What happened to the other 14,993 desires? They merely fertilized your mind. No desire that does not arise in that which you call God will ever be fulfilled; so do not pray for what you want.

We go on praying: "Sarva bhavantu sukhi nah; sarve santu niramayah, sarve bhadrani pasyantu". Right now at least 1 million pandits are offering this prayer, "May there be no famine, may everybody be happy, may everybody be healthy", and right now at this moment people are dying, next to us. What is this? What am I praying for? You are merely praying in order to prevent the mind cooking up other thoughts, that's all. If you understand that, you have understood everything. Why am I praying at all? I am not praying because I wish that what I pray for will immediately be answered by God, but so that this mind that has been fertilized by millions, and millions, and millions of unholy desires may learn to do without those desires. It is not that your good desires are going to be fulfilled in preference to your bad desires, none of your desires is going to be fulfilled because you desired it. Some of your desires may accidentally be fulfilled, not because you desired them, but because God desired them. When this is clearly grasped, then you may still pray, why not? "Sarvesam svasti bhavatu", right now when we are sitting here saying this, somebody is killing somebody else in some country. Some other pandit might say, "Your prayer is not full of faith; you need that mustard seed of faith." Why am I praying? I am praying not because I expect God to fulfill all my

prayers but since the mind is still active, and since there is this movement in consciousness called the mind thought. Let those thoughts be harmless.

Let these two principles be simultaneously understood: first - that even a wicked thought is but a movement in consciousness; second: that neither consciousness nor the energy that causes the movement is mine, I myself being but a wave in that cosmic being. It would be nice if I could cease thinking that I have an independent personality, independent from the totality. Since that is not the case now, let there be non-harmful thoughts, thoughts which may be totally irrelevant - but thoughts that do not disturb the mental equilibrium or social tranquility or peace. Is that possible? Then you have saved the world from one mischief maker. That is great, tremendous.

The structure of existence is that there is this God or cosmic consciousness, and in that cosmic consciousness there is movement which is kalpa , sankalpa, time, and all the rest of it. That movement which is sankalpa, thought, motion, concept, will continue to arise regardless of your "me" and that movement will go on in its own natural way, that it is also capable of flowing in perverted directions without ever becoming effective. This is something I do not believe. That somebody, however powerful he may be, can be projecting a vicious thought, disturb the atmosphere or peace, I do not believe this. You can pick up a big rock and throw it at me, but if it is not my time, I will not die, do what you like. Let that arise as a consciousness, not as a thought but as a realization.

"Na ca mam tani karmani nibadhnanti dhanamjaya Udasinavad asinam asaktam tesu karmasu."

This is the difference between let us call it 'thought of God that gave rise to this world', and the 'thought that arises in you towards someone'. You love someone, you hate someone and all that. Here you are caught because you think the thought is yours, not that it is natural to you. Is it going to change the world? No, your thoughts are not going to change the world, but you think they are going to. You think your relationship with somebody is based upon this thought, therefore it has value. So, to you, your thoughts have value, and therefore you will be hurt. In the case of God, this problem is not there. He has not created the world at all. If there is no intention at all, why should he create it? A mirror does not create your image, the mirror is a mirror. The mirror does not even reflect your face, because it has no intention of doing anything. So, in the case of God, there is no such problem, because there is no intention to create, and therefore there is no creation. And if one can understand the way in which the mirror lives and acts, if one can use such an expression, if it is possible for you to live and act as a mirror lives and acts, then you are also free.

God is free, God is not tainted, God is not affected by anything that goes on here, because there is no intention in Him to create anything; this is all his nature. But the individual, assuming an independence of the totality, owns a thought, thinks that he thinks the thought, thinks that he entertains this desire. I entertain this desire, I entertain this wish, I offer this prayer. It is this foolishness that returns as bondage, as karma and its results.

VII

We have looked into the way in which the world was created, not only mythologically or prehistorically, assuming that the world was started a few million billion years ago, because that is unprovable number one and number two, it leads to an absurd impasse. You cannot answer the next question: if the universe has only been here for 3 or 30 billion years, what was there before and for how long? If there was nothing, how long was there nothing? It does not seem to satisfy everybody. In terms of cosmic time, if there is a cosmic time, 3 billion years is nothing. So, the mind does not want to accept as fact a doctrine that says that everything has been here for only 3 billion years, and that before that there was nothing. All these things are unprovable. Was the world ever created? I do not know. Is it a cyclic creation? Maybe. And so we look at these creations from another point of view.

Creation comes into being, in our case, every day. And the Yoga Vasistha's philosophy states "Dristhi srishthi vada". That is, a thing comes into being when you become aware of it. Or to put it the other way around, the world comes into being when the beings in the world become aware of it, or the world comes into being when some being becomes aware of it. You cannot disprove this. Why not? Because if nobody is aware of the world, would there be a world? And therefore you must admit that someone has to be aware of the universe in order for the universe to arise. And therefore what is called 'my world' comes into being when I wake up or when I become aware of it in the morning. This is how with every thought it is created, with every imagination a new world is created. Whatever God's world may be or whoever God may be, in that world you have your own private world. What God's world is, you have no idea, but in that world you have your own private world. If you can become aware of where that world arises, or where that world is created, you can become aware of the entire thing. And this omnipresence of God's world as well as the roots of your own world are non-obvious, and that being so, you are investigating into the arising of the world.

You begin to understand that, when a thought arises, when a concept arises, when a feeling arises, when a notion arises, when awareness arises, the world arises. Is it some kind of a dream philosophy? Does it have any relevance to my daily life? Krishna says yes. How does this world arise? "Avasam prakrter vasat." This world is created involuntarily depending upon God's nature. "Bhuta gramam imam krt nam avasam prakrter vasat". This is a very beautiful expression, and this also has to be very carefully understood. This whole universe is the manifestation of the nature of the cosmic being, and such manifestation being involuntary and therefore unmotivated, spontaneous, without any intention; so this itself is God's own nature, manifestation is natural to God. In that manifestation changes may be there and that is also

natural to God - "avasam prakrter vasat" - "God is not doing anything voluntarily", says Krishna, because if something is done voluntarily by anybody, obviously it is done with some motive in order to gain something.

,

God being full and infinite, there is no need to be satisfied, but "prakrter vasat" means something which is impossible to translate, "because it is natural to me." Why do I manifest this Universe? Because it is natural to me, do not ask why. Can we ask ourselves the same question every morning? Why does my world come into being? Why do I behave in the way that I have been behaving? I do what I do without any intention whatsoever. Can you say that? Then you are free, you are liberated immediately when you cease doing anything with a motive deliberately, intentionally, "prakrter vastit", because that is your nature or has become your nature (never mind, we will come to that in a moment) then and only then does something else become clear. What is meant by the word "prakrter vasat?"

Can we include in that our cravings, our wants, our prejudices, our hatreds, our jealousies and so on ? No. Can it also be said that these are natural to me ? Here is a question which cannot be answered, logically, philosophically. Is jealousy built into you? Is it also part of your nature? If it is not, how does it arise? That question has to be faced each one by himself or herself. Is hatred built into me ? Then our friend comes along and says there is a lot of aggression even amongst beasts and birds. If you have seen a tiger or a lion about to pounce on its prey, you see that there is no hatred, no anger, nothing. On the contrary, there is an expression of royal pleasure, exactly the same delight that may adorn your face if you see a luscious mango sitting in front of you. So a lion does not kill an animal out of hatred, and therefore a lion does not kill at all, it is merely eating. When you look at these birds and dogs and so on, and conclude that they are also subject to aggression, to anger, to hate, you are superimposing on them something which you think exists in you naturally. So instead of looking within, which is painful or which you are unwilling to do, you look at all these outside and think that these are all part of nature, and therefore my viciousness is sanctioned by nature. If however you drop all motivation right then and there, "I am not doing this because I want to do it, but maybe it is my nature ", in that maybe is the prod. Maybe it is my nature to be vicious. If it is so, look, and in that observation itself there is enough power, enough energy to dissipate that jealousy, that hatred, that aggressiveness, that violence - if it is there within you.

You may then be able to realize that your behaviour is not going to alter the nature of the universe. The universe not being your creation cannot be affected by what you do or do not do. But the world of your own creation can be affected by what you do, and since the world of your creation is within you,

only you will be affected by what you do. It is as simple as that. So you realize that you are acting involuntarily. As long as you are acting involuntarily, you are facing yourself; because, as a craving, as a motivation arises, you are facing that. "I want to do this." Why? Because I want to get something out of this, some pleasure, some profit - and therefore this is not natural to me.

What is natural to me must be natural to me for 24 hours of the day. So if you are short-tempered by nature, then you must be short-tempered 24 hours of the day towards all; but you are not. You shout at somebody and smile at somebody. Why? That means that your actions are motivated, whereas the divine actions are not motivated. When actions cease to be motivated they become divine - it is as simple as that.

"na ca mam tani karmani nibadhnanti dhanamjaya udasinavad asinam asaktam tesu kavemasu", Those actions do not taint me, bind me. Why? Because "udasinavad asinam", "I rest in these actions totally unconcerned", that is, these actions proceed from me without motivation, without craving, without desire. Is that possible? It must be possible. Why? You sleep without any motivation and you perform so many actions without motivation, and if you observe the natural urges that arise in you, you have no motivation at all.

I am taking a vitamin B injection because I want to be really strong for the next 10 years. There is a motivation there, it is a deliberate action done with a motive; therefore, if I have another heart attack tomorrow morning I am going to be terribly disappointed. On the other hand, even if I am going to die tonight, I will feel hungry in about one hour's time. That hunger is a natural urge and therefore it is not conditioned by the fact that the body is going to stop breathing. Natural things will happen naturally, whether or not you want them. That is the nature of a natural action. So there are such things as non-motivated actions, but we do not pay attention to them and therefore we are unaware of their existence. Hunger and thirst do not create problems at all - but craving does. When you open your eyes and see, that does not create any problem, but the thought that goes with it, "I want to see only this, I do not want to see that", that creates a problem.

Can you allow the eyes to function without any motivation? Can you allow the ears to function without any motivation? They do function, this is the beauty. The senses function naturally and they do not need any motivation whatsoever. When this is realized, you begin to wonder where these motivations arise.

Where do these cravings arise? Where does aggression, violence arise? So we allow life to go on, to flow, and when you begin to allow life to flow without pushing it, it is then that you have energy, the opportunity to look within and see - is this natural to me? And that insight dispels anything that may be

unnatural. That introspection, that introversion has got that much energy to cancel the perverse thoughts and notions that arise in the mind and pollute it. Only the mind can be polluted, not the awareness. Does the arising of these polluted thoughts or feelings have the power to alter the world? God's world - flowers, animals, etc - cannot be interfered with by your good thoughts or bad thoughts. That is what Jesus Christ said when he said, "not even a sparrow will fall unless it is the will of the Father. "

Even a dry leaf cannot be wafted except it be God's will. Nothing but God's will, will eventually take place in the world, but because of your own personal, private desires and aversions you get hurt. What is bound to happen will happen. Your private cravings and aversions are not going to interfere with the world that God has created, but it will certainly interfere with your own world which is unrelated to God's world. Your own world is yourself, and therefore it will destroy your peace of mind and your happiness, "Udasinavad asinam asaktam tesu karmasu" Why do all these things happen? It is natural and therefore what is natural must happen and what is natural will happen. One who understands this is asking himself this question all the time. "Is it natural?" If it is natural let it happen. The question itself eliminates all unnatural cravings, thoughts, desires, notions, ideas and so on. If this truth is clearly grasped, then one is not bound, one is not tainted. You must observe this. In that observation itself there is enough intelligence to enable nature to function naturally without perversion arising in the mind.

VIII

We have been discussing the existence of something which is real, call it God, call it Atman, call it Brahman, Christ, Buddha, something that exists and is therefore real - but which is not obvious, and therefore for all practical purposes, unreal. When that which is real is sought to be made obvious, you create the world. You see that abundantly in relationships. I do not even know the name of this child, but I love him. His mother says, Swami, please, would you care to become his Godfather?" Then the trouble starts. The non-obvious thing called affection is now made obvious. That means I must send him some birthday presents and he must kiss me whenever he looks at me. As long as it was non-obvious, it was beautiful. Reality is un-obvious, and by making it obvious you have destroyed it. You have created a world and it is called samsara.

The un-obvious is not only the existential reality, but it is also where actions happen. So what makes speech possible, what makes seeing possible, what makes living possible, what makes action possible, what makes behaviour possible, what makes activity possible - is un-obvious. Make it obvious and you are in trouble. Because it is thought that has to interfere in this whole process and create a notion, a thought, an ego - and make that ego declare that "I" am speaking, "I" am hearing and "I" am listening. So the "I" becomes important to itself and then your "I" becomes important to this "I". You see the complication.

The moment there is thought interference while I am speaking, if everybody is like this girl, then I feel miserable, then I think that these egos are not pleased. For though she may be deeply listening, there is no feed-back. So what is un-obvious is made beautiful and brilliant if while the speaker is speaking or while the listener is listening there is also at the same time a searching for the source of these activities. Then you suddenly come face to face with this un-obvious thing, and leave it alone there. It is not possible to know this. If you are facing that way towards God, if the intelligence, the intellect, the mind, if all these are turned toward this indwelling omnipresence which is God, then the actions do not taint.

In the Yoga Sutras there is a specific Sutra which says that in the case of the yogi there are no virtuous and vicious actions, whereas in the case of others their karma is threefold - some are good karma, some are bad karma, and some are mixed karmas. In the case of the yogi it does not exist. Why not? Because it is not the ego that is functioning. In his case, the ego itself, the total mind and intellect, is focused upon the source of action which is not obvious - *maya tatam idam sarvam jagad avyaktamurtina*". So, when you are tempted to say that it is God's will or God is doing this, be very careful. If it has become so obvious then it is the devil! If you are quite certain that it is God who is

making you do that, then it indefinitely objectionable. Only the inspection or introspection can be real. What you discover within cannot be so obvious.

It is when this inquiring spirit stands not only bewildered, but in a way desperate, that it has reached the end of its inquiry and found that the truth is not obvious - and it is incapable of taking one step further. At that point the reality reveals itself. What on earth do you mean by that? The reality exists and you are absorbed into it. You go there and you stand there frozen, completely frozen. It is not possible to take one step forward, and it is not possible to retrace your steps. There is only a big question: what is this? You are facing that, whatever it is, and within you is burning this question: what is this? I have a very funny way of explaining this, if you are interested. When there is this question, how come there is no answer? According to logic, a question is not a question if it does not have an answer. You are not a woman if there is no man in the world, the sun is not shining if there is no darkness somewhere, it is the contrast that makes something something, it is the existence of an answer that gives validity to the question as a question, it is the child that makes the man, it does not mean anything more mischievous than that. It is the child that makes a man the father; if the child is not there, he is still a man but he is not a father. You call him your father because there is a child, you call this a question because there is an answer. Now how do we reconcile that? We realize that the answer is non-obvious and therefore there is no answer. "There is no answer" cannot be the answer. But I have a funny way of putting it that may make it clear: the answer arises but the questioner is gone. The seeker goes on seeking. By the time the thing sought appears, the seeker is gone. So, when the answer arises, you are also absorbed into that answer.

This is the reason why the karma of a yogi does not stick to him - because there is no him, there is no personality that does this action, and therefore the personality has no desire at all, no motivation at all. "I am doing this in order to get that in this birth or in another birth", "I am doing this in order to reap some kind of a benefit", none of these things prevail. He is merely examining the source of the action and he is not in any ordinary terminology responsible for his actions. "Maya' dhyaksena prakrtih suyate sacaracaram hetuna' nena kaunteya jagad viparivartate", Then how do these actions take place? Merely by the very presence of the supreme intelligence. The intelligence does not bring about this action directly, but it happens in its presence. The example given is of a magnet and iron filings. The magnet has no business to attract the iron filings to itself; it is the very nature of this magnetic force to attract iron filings to itself. If one iron needle does not want to jump up, the magnet is not disappointed.

Now if you can reach that spot where there is no individuality and therefore no individual egoistic notions of "I am doing this" and "I will not do that",

then there is no sin and there is no sorrow. Suddenly there is a quantum leap. But unless you follow the line we have taken so far, it is rather difficult to integrate the next verse into the whole sequence "A vajananti miim mudha miinusim tanum dsritam param bhavam ajiinanto mama bhutamahesvaram". "People do not understand me because I am clothed in human garb, because they do not know my supreme nature." "Me" here is God. The devotees of Krishna very justifiably say that this "me" here refers to Lord Krishna. Because Krishna was clothed in a human body people did not recognize him as Lord Almighty in this context. Why is this thought suddenly brought in here? We were discussing something else. Unless the whole thing is read as applicable only to Krishna, only Krishna's actions are beyond sin, only Krishna's actions are beyond ego. Why are you telling me all of this? The line of approach that we have followed is that this creation and this "I" in the action, all these are relevant to our own daily lives and if that line of approach is followed. "Avajananti mam mudha" becomes tremendously interesting - then we can interpret this verse to mean that all these beings here are the manifestations of the same God, and because you see them clothed in some kind of a human body, you do not recognize their divinity - "Param bhavam ajananto". You do not even have vedantically to deny the existence of the body and of form, the existence of the immortal spirit which dwells in all beings. Even the body itself has its divine base. What you call the physical body is itself not a physical body merely made of gross substances. If you examine those gross substances, they suddenly abandon their grossness and in those very gross substances you find something extremely subtle and intriguing. The grossness of the gross substance is attributable to grossness of the vision and the inquiring instrument.

We are merely assuming now that this thing dressed like this is a woman. Why not investigate a little further and see that, even though this thing looks like a woman, looks like flesh and blood and bone and all the rest of it, it is made of cells, it is made of energy, it is made of God consciousness, cosmic consciousness? "Avajananti mam mudha manusim tanum asritam ". Why is it you are able to see this as a human body? Because you have got human eyes, you are looking with gross instruments and gross instruments are only capable of viewing things in their own light, in their own limited fashion. But it is "Avajtimanti mam mudha", not "Awolookti mam mudha". The eyes, whatever you do, will only see human forms. Whatever you do, the eyes can only look at forms, they cannot see thoughts. The eyes cannot see sounds, that is how they are made. So, there is no harm in the eyes seeing this as a child, this as a man, this as a woman, there is no problem. But as the thought that this is Mr. V., that does not arise in your eyes. It arises somewhere else. The eyes can only see the form. But the instrument that gives them a definition, that instrument can be re-educated in a different way, to function in a different light, to function in a different dimension.

That is where the other "jananti"-knowledge arises, cognition arises, that is not where the perception is, that is not where the sensory input is, but that is where cognition arises. That cognition has been trained otherwise it would not know that this is Mr. X. Definition depends upon cognition - the definition that he is a man, that he is an Indian, he is President of the Yoga Society and all the rest of it. They have been programmed, they have been conditioned; and if these conditions are dropped or another set of conditions are introduced into this consciousness or the instrument of cognition, then the world looks very different. Ramana Maharishi's famous quotation was: "Dristi nianayme pasyaut Bramanijagad". Although you have fleshy eyes, human eyes with which you see forms, if the inner vision is made of the Divine, then it is possible to see the Divine in all beings.

"Moghasa moghakarmano moghajana vicetasah

Raksasim asurim cai'va prakrtim mohinim sritah"

If this vision does not arise - "Moghasa", all your desires are vain, sinful, stupid, useless, futile. You have your own desires and those desires are not fulfilled. Occasionally when they are in conformity with nature they seem to be fulfilled but that is not because you desired it. "Moghasa". If you are not in tune with this truth, then your desires become a nuisance, not merely a bondage but a great nuisance. "Frustration". "Moghakara mano". Your actions become stupid, futile. "Wrong" is only a very tame word. Wrong action here is not really a problem; but because of your actions, you suffer throughout your lives. If the knowledge is wrong, there is no awareness. It is not your fault; but watch very carefully, without judgment. It is not your fault; but you have slipped into the diabolical stream, and therefore your mind is perverted, your heart is polluted, your soul is dull and your actions are stupid.

What else? You could have slipped into the other stream, the Divine stream, "Mahatmanas tu mam partha daivim prakrtim asritah". They are flowing along the Divine stream (we'll come back to that in a moment) and therefore "Bhajanty ananyamanaso jnatva bhutadim avyayam" - and therefore they constantly think of God, constantly remember of God, constantly reabsorb themselves in God, God in the sense of the innermost reality. This makes all the difference. The stupid people are going away from reality and the divine ones are seeking this reality. It is not that they have known the reality, not that the reality is their monopoly. They are still seeking because, once they reach the end of their seeking, they are absorbed by the reality. They are the seekers, relentless seekers of the divine. So, what is important is to be able to remain constantly aware, aware that that is the right direction, aware that that is where you want to go, and aware that you are going in that direction. So in your life there is light, constantly. In other words you do nothing blindly, nothing at all, even good things. You sit there and do your puja, your

meditation, it's all brilliant. But when it is done blindly, even a good thing becomes bad. "Bhajanty ananyamanaso".

Constantly you are seeking this thing within, this reality within, which is "avyaktam", which is not seen - "jagad avyaktamurtina". Something that is unseen, un-obvious, pervades everything. That is what we must seek, discover, and find in the words of Swami Sivananda "Satatam kirtayanto mam yatantas ca drdhavratah namasyantas ca mam bhaktya nityayukta upasate".

This is the nature of the holy man. He greets God in all, he remembers God, he speaks about God. I am sure you realize that by God I do not mean something holy or religious but "constantly looking for the truth in all situations, the reality in all situations." If one does that, then one is wide awake and it will eventually lead us to enlightenment or it may itself be enlightenment.

Om Tat Sat