

PATHWAY TO LIFE

(ENGLISH VERSION OF JEEWANPATH)



Manav Seva Sangh, Vrindavan

Pathway to Life

(English version of Jeevan-Path)

by :

Late Prof. Padmakar Jha

Ex-President

Manav Seva Sangh, Chapra-Branch

Chapra (Dist. Saran)



Publishers

MANAV SEVA SANGH PRAKASHAN

VRINDABAN (Mathura), U.P., India

PREFACE

“Path Way to Life”

The present book is an English translation of Swami Sharnanand ji Maharaj's Hindi book “Jeewan Path”. It has been rendered into English language by Late Proff. Sri Padmakar Jha —the Shakha Subhapati (Head) of Chhapra Branch of Manav Sewa Sangh.

Late Sri Jha Ji was a Professor and Head of the Deptt. of English in Chhapra College, Chhapra (Bihar). He had long been associated with Manav Sewa Sangh and its founder Brahmaleen P.P. Swami Sharnanand ji Maharaj. He was deeply impressed with the revolutionary and epoch-making teachings of Swami Sharnanand ji Maharaj. An erudite person Sri Jha ji was well versed in the sacred tone of Indian as well as Western Philosophy.

Late Sri Jha ji had to his credit another translation of Param Poojye Swami Ji Maharaj's book “Sadhan Triveni”-English name being “Ascent Transfluent”, which was published in 2012. On one occasion. Prof. Jha ji had expressed his wish to translate some more books of Param Poojya Swami ji Maharaj into English. But Alas! in the meantime he was called back by the Almighty Lord to his heavenly abode.

In publishing this book we the Sadhaks of Manav Sewa Sangh, are paying our adorable and loving regards to the departed soul, May he rest in everlasting Peace and Bliss.

“Om Shanti”

Manav Sewa Sangh (Ashram)
Vrindavan (Mathura) 281121
Gita Jayanti, 2 Dec. 2014

In humble submission
Swami Advait Chaitannya

Homage to the Translator

In the heart-touching memory of my teacher and translator, Late Prof. Padmakar Jha, I have to submit very humbly that the book in your hand is the last work and as an offering to Manav Seva Sangh which has been declared the 'holy body' of Sadguru Swami Sharananand ji Maharaj, who is now invisible but visible in his Immortal words. Late Prof. Jha is not in flesh and blood between us but will always be present in his writings. I pay homage to him with unfathomable reverence. Hari Sharnam!

Janardan Prasad Suman

A Sadhak of

Manav Seva Sangh

Chapra-Branch

Date

25.3.2013

Foreword

Homage to the Translator

Have you ever felt any weakness or incompleteness in your life ? Have you been exhausted and tired ? What is conflict? Have you felt slavery any time or have you ever been grieved with the necessity to go into the origin of individual or social problems. If yes, then this Pathway to Life is your own.

You might have felt that your whole needs or necessities are not contained in any philosophy. A particular philosophy gives you a vision to some extents on your path and leaves you to see further with your own eyes. Determined path guides you for some distance and compels you to proceed further on your own feet. Then usually you become tragic figure being possessionless and friendless or being in nothingness. But in the light of self discrimination awaken in this nothingness lies the consequence of philosophy and building of life. On this very spot the pathway to real life is revealed.

In this context, to achieve an inner vision of real life and to discriminate the thought due to self-study which is quite original. Patna branch of Manav Seva Sangh organized a weeklong satsang from 23rd December, 1959 to 29th December 1959. Whatever evolutionary, enlightened and ambrosial words were poured upon by the saint having revolutionary vision has been treasured in this book **Pathway to Life**.

Under blissful affection,

Ranchi College

30.12.1959

K. Kumar

Prayer I

My Lord Almighty,
By your immanent grace-
Ambrosial, omnipotent, spontaneous
And sanctifying,
Grant the indomitable spirit of surrender to
The miserable,
And eager verve of service to
The joyous
So that they may be released from
The bondage of joy and suffering,
And become saturated
By relishing your immaculate love.

Om Anand !

Om Anand !

Om Anand !

Prayer II

My Lord Almighty,
By your immanent grace-
Ambrosial, omnipotent, spontaneous
And sanctifying,
Grant dedicated reverence to
All mankind for
Their intrinsic light of wisdom
As well as the capacity to
Transmute force of energy to good use.
And O ocean of compassion !
Demolish forthwith the structure of
Attraction and repulsion
By your unbounded compassion
Let the life of all be replete with
Fulfilment through service surrender love

Om Anand !

Om Anand !

Om Anand !

Introduction

We all are passers by. Since we started feeling, we have found ourselves moving on. There come hardships in life, unfavourable situations or circumstances grieve us, Death frightens, frustration and weariness bore us, then we feel and experience, what we followed is not the true path to destination.

We cannot stop because life lies in motion. Outerly every thing in space is continuously moving whether visible or invisible. We cannot cease movement and do not want to walk on wrong path, the way to death, the way to frustration and weariness, the way to slavery or dependence is also not our requirement. We demand immortality, strength and eternal happiness. What shall we do ? What path should we follow ?

Pathway to Life is the transcription of '*Jeevan Path*'. On reading this book attentively, you will feel yourself amazed that there needn't go anywhere else to find the answer to the above questions. It is collection of fourteen discourses by *Swamiji*. There is no distance of time and space from destination. The real life is not beyond our reach. There is effort and weariness while walking on the path of Death but not in the way of Life. Slavery lies in acceptance of the false reputation of this seeming world as true life, not in the real life.

The book in your hand is a special gift to convince you that there is certainly a pathway of Life and it is greatly expected that the very life is possible being effortless and tireless.

Pathway to Life gives you quite original viewpoints. Its originality lies in the fact that:

- (a) Those demands of life have been highlighted which are fundamental demands of mankind such as peace, independence or freedom and love.
- (b) The essential demands of mankind must be fulfilled.
- (c) Fulfilment of our own real demand is life.
- (d) Man is quite independent to have peace, freedom and love, because there is no effort at all in it. This life has no expectation of the dependence of bodies, individuals, states and circumstances.

Having been tortured with experienced slavery in the attempt for worldly achievement if a man seeks the path of his welfare and again here if he is led to catch the laborious means and shelter of limited personalities, he might be puzzled, the barrier of slavery might be stronger. Being melted on this miserable condition of human being Pathway to Life has been presented as a consolatory blessing in which great emphasis has been given on the fact that a *sadhaka* must renunciate the dependence of earthly possessions, individuals, states and circumstances. The real life is already obtained. Every individual has been given enough materials to be free from efforts, slavery and unhappiness because there is nothing to achieve for real life. Desirelessness, non-attachment and ownness are the means by which a *sadhaka* can be free from labour and efforts, from slavery and from unhappiness or frustration. Then he or she must have rest, freedom and love, that is real life. Hence there is no slavery to be inseparable with Life. In this Pathway to Life the solutions of different problems due to different view points of different kinds of *sadhakas* have been discussed.

You do know 'Jeewan Path' the Hindi version is the collection of fourteen immortal ambrosial discourses of the saint having revolutionary vision to advance the *sadhakas'* soul towards sublime and supreme destination in very simple and lucid language. These discourses in English version, that is, in Pathway to Life are based on the natural communicative interaction in spoken language. Three things were put for discussion on the eve of the Weeklong *Satsang*-Rest, freedom and Love because these three things are fundamental demands of mankind in the eyes of *Manav Seva Sangh*. This is the real picture of Life.

In the morning meeting these rest, freedom and love were interpreted one by one and in the next meeting of evening different kinds of questions were raised by different *sadhakas* and they were explained satisfactorily based on self-experienced facts. This was the aim of the weeklong *Satsang* that the participants who had been wandering for the achievement of Life for long, they would obtain the required pathway to life before the end of the celebration. It was the chief goal to solve the complicated problems of life of individuals. Man must have the inner vision to solve all the problems according to one's own interest, capability and circumstance. This was the main aim of the celebration. It was not the intention to publish these discourses in the book-form.

Therefore you might not get a sequence to inculcate the above things in these discourses, nor can you have the proper philosophical analysis, but what you receive, it will be vital for your life. You can find proper solution of read problems of mankind by which you may feel blessed following the path indicated by the solution. So in these discourses, communicative language style based on the events of day to day life has been followed so that you may know clearly that Life-philosophy is not merely the topic for intellectual exercise, but that is to follow in one's own life, it is the pole of light for the pathway.

While reading these discourses sometimes a stranger reader may feel that the topic of the explanation was started and some aspects of the topic were so much expanded that the analysis of the main topic remained incomplete. There are some spots in the discourses and it is so because in answering different questions of individuals it is not possible to analyse the topic completely and thus questions have been given their answers during discourses and sometimes continuity is broken. But if all discourses are studied attentively, the lackness is never felt. The reader will get complete analysis on every aspects of rest, freedom and love.

Pathway to Life is not literary creation, it is the collection of discourses that lead to reality from unreality, to truth from untruth. Our eyes are opened while reading some pictures of our present condition at some places. Our demands are manifested to us and we become aspirant to obtain them. That is why we do not hide our temptation to publish this collection of discourses in the book-form.

Observing the miserable condition of individual and social life, our heart is about to break. This book is nothing but the expression of silent grief of that heart. These discourses are the symbol of the silent grief of that heart. Addressing of the saint with the passion of deep ownness automatically draws our attention. The sense of ownness is a main feature of several specialties of Pathway to Life. While reading these discourses you will feel that our all sorrows have become its own and being melt pathetically it is leading our path. Receive it warmly and following this indication be blessed we all !

With humble submission

Shivratri,
25.2.60

Prof. Devaki
Women's College, Ranchi
Ranchi (Jharkhand)

Pathway to Life

Discourse-1

23 December, 1959.

Morning.

My own Self-identity of the present exalted, magnanimous, eminence as well as Brothers and Sisters !

The origin of volitional will is shrouded by acceptance of one's own individuality. What is the world ? What are we ? What is the Lord ? The world has not question about what it is. God never calls into question the kind, class or nature of His identity. The entity that spins out such questions is named the Ego, we Let not any brother misunderstand that I oppose here the vogue word ego in the sense of scriptual 'Atman' or 'jiva'. Some averred it as 'Atman', someone else as 'Brahman'. You might have heard only two coinages from scriptures or commentaries or them; you might not have heard of any third formulation. *Shanakar's Advait* philosophy affirmed it as Brahman; Vaishnava, Jain etc. averred it as the *Atman*. But do we raise any such questions by being one with *Atman* ? Do we put up any such questions being one with the human and as the one described in the scriptures. Let us ponder over the issue. You are unable to raise question in case you believe yourself to be the body because it is indivisible from The world. the body will always remain inseparable from the world because it is veritably and organic part of the world. For example, if someone wants to separate wave from water, it will mean to separate water from water. So that just as water is never separable from water, accordingly, the body is never separable from the world. That is to say, in no form is the gross body separated from the gross world, the subtle body separated from the subtle world, nor is the caused body separated from the causal world. The gross, subtle and causal bodies of humans then are so identical with their world equivalents as no space remains to allow such questions. But then who is that 'duty' that claims the body to be his own, who complains of being distraught by doubt and who asserts that he feels the need of God for his own sake. That deity can't be identified in the body,

nor is it comparable to the Atman, nor can you call it the *Brahman*. But as I submitted to you at the outset that there is some belief, a certain kind of acceptance as true, in the life of all of us, and that stretches beyond the discreet scrutiny of those who accept or believe in it. It is because we have only heard of it, we have not known it on our own. Hearing without alternatives appears real as knowledge.

A topic was adopted for discourse this morning with a view to promoting *Satsang*, not in order to encourage learning or to make one understand. The genuine, honest matter in this regard is that I don't speak with a view to make one understand, or instill understanding into others. It is absolutely a worship to me. I don't speak with the assumption that I understand; you don't understand. I speak with the belief that my beloved Lord in the likeness of your soul-identity and being aroused spontaneously by his uncaused grace purges me of my passionate liking to speak. Take it to be true that it is our own volition and desire which brings about our degeneration. You know that my name is *Sharananand*; I am surrendered to the Lord. Nevertheless I am not even in the slightest a propagator of the idea of theism. Why do I abnegate propagandizing for the supreme Being? It feels like hurling insult on, or a scornful disrespect of the Lord, if I ask you to trust and have faith in Him. Let us think a bit over the matter. Has our Lord lost so much of his worth and glory to require our advocacy of faith in Him? This is not my opinion. Although people might be holding the view that this is a holy person, a saint, and probably an apologist, a propagandist for God. If anyone whoever in friendly intimacy and closeness appears to you as your own, excuse me, let God remain for me alone. In case you can live alone without a fellow-friend, you are allowed to remain in the space of spiritual blessedness. God will meet you in the form and likeness of we and you.

It is the nature of God to incarnate Himself in the form of the world for the sake of the materialist to offer him love for the world, to bless him with peace and honour. There is no doubt in it; and the climactic point is that He blesses such a man with release from all suffering. Don't open that God is such as he eradicates the suffering of only those with faith in him and doesn't destroy the suffering of those who don't trust in him. Such is not God and even if He is so, He might be someone's

'personal' God. Trust or distrust Him, know Him or remain unaware of Him but He trusts and knows you. I have no doubt about it. So that when we cherish a wish, a desire, of our own volition, our own mental resolve, our own intention deprives us of self-identity with anyone else. Let us ponder over it with earnest intent. Desire hinders self-identity, soulful oneness, with anyone and you will realize that love never arises in life in the absence of this identity of inward oneness. Ecstasy of bliss does not manifest itself in life so long as love is not awakened. Has any brother experienced the ecstasy of bliss without the awakening of love? Is there any in a state of boredom and yet rid of the pang, of desire and lust? Can anyone bear witness to the otherwise?

You know that at a certain time there was a widespread feeling of love for the country in us. How extensive and intensive were the feelings of patriotic love in the years 1907, 1914 and 1921? People used to suffer under duress, in forests and solitude, anguished in fantasizing if there would ever dawn the day when mother India would be liberated from the foreigners. They had no longing to become a minister or a dictator. They knew it well and truly that the British rule could not be eliminated by killing of a single Englishman. But young men relinquished their youth in order to awaken the love of that liberty. It is well-known to me that the grandmother of Ramprasad Bismil used to beg for money in courts. Can't we break up our preference of individual will in order to accomplish fusion of soulful identity with God with the theistic point of view? Can't we bring about the disintegration of individual wish and desire in order to melt into all as oneself from the spiritual point of view? Can't we achieve the break-up of the structure of self-interest and lust in order to become one with the whole world as single family of kith and kin or say the entire world as singular oneness? All this has been said in view of the reality of our sacrifice of personal pleasures of youth, breaking up individual wishes and dreams for the sake of identifying with the cause of liberty of the nation. All these are momentous matters. Let us think of smaller perspectives matters regarding human relationship between husband and wife, between two friends, between father and son. Could any wife sustain a soulful relation of identity towards her husband while nourishing a separative self-willed purpose of her own? Could any husband

keep up conjugal harmony of identity while cherishing his self-willing resolve ? Could any father maintain a relation of soulful harmony towards his son keeping at the same time a self-centred wish in his mind ? Think over, consider how enormous a hindrance your own volitive will and desire is to you ! It does not allow you to be the friend to your friend, son to your father, devotee to God, experiential awareness of Truth to the inquisitive. Which is the impediment that your desire did not engender and to which it did not expose you ?

I will be the first man to pronounce that our own desire by itself is life if it were your experiential truth that your wish has allowed you oneness with anyone. Is there any room or scope for such a thing in life that doesn't allow space to be one with anyone whoever, neither with the world nor with its Master, neither with the inmost Being nor allows oneness and trust to be established in mutuality of human relationship ? Let us not get confounded under the existing condition nor become hopeless in panic. Don't get immobilized in the fear about how we can be free of the volition that breeds desire pressing on us to make choice ? Let me tell you the truth in this regard : He alone will be rid of volitive will, wish or desire who has been nurturing it; he alone who has owned it will be rid of it. Well, brother, tell me if the dependent under subjection be free or the freed will be free ? Consider if the miserable will be clear of anguish of despair or he who is not miserable at all ? We and you have nurtured certain desires, wishes and choices through an exercise of volitive will. Let me point out to you a serious sickness getting entrenched in the ethos of the day—the ailment of hammering out opinion about others. People queried me if I would convene satsang at the house of a particular individual! Why, isn't he a human being ? And people surely point out to him slandering how he was mired in such an ailment ! That is to say, people don't visualize that the unrevealed humanity of a man can awake to awareness at any time !

Can you happen to reside remote from Truth ? You can never manage to do so. Or can Truth ever be distant from you ? It can never be at distance or vanish into non existence. But people live entrenched in the opinion fabricated by their conditioning. They look at things, beings and happenings in an incomplete,

fragmentary way. Do you know what a fragmented observation means? It takes into account only the sensory viewpoint, it does not apply the integrating view point of intelligence, what to speak of holistic light of discrimination which makes use of a complete, synthetic approach to life. People judge on the shifting ground of the sensory view of things where as they need to consider seriously on the truth of life that your own desire bursting from the volitive will never allow you to be one with anyone whoever. Fulfilment of all desires is unfeasible with all your might and let not god grant such an exhaustive all out satiation to anyone and it is beyond your capability to realize life after fulfilment of desires, wishes.

Consider the point of view seriously, what is desire in succinctness? Some one may make oneself useful to me. Some one will fantasize: Life would be probably a turn about in attainment, if I could get a beautiful woman. Someone else might opine: Life would become a gratifying fulfilment, if I could get that cherished post. There is nothing wrong in it. It is not that none ever had a beautiful wife. I'm not opposed to such a wish. I go by observing the way of the world. We get resolved to materialize the wish already realized by someone else. The point of concern is only about why it was not fulfilled in my case? It's not that none ever had a beautiful wife nor is it that no wife ever had a beautiful husband. Nor is it that no father ever had a worthy son. It's not ever that none ever had a real friend or a high post. The question that stands out is whether he whose intention was fulfilled could be released from desire? Could he be free of subjection to the other? He could neither get rid of desire nor evolve into spiritual freedom. Whoever be the author of creation, of whatever kind, if truth be told, I have a feeling for his being so equitably honest that despite numerous distinctions in life, that is to say, despite distinction of condition and circumstances, there is unity in reality. We opine that we could not receive the kind of honour which is showered upon the Prime Minister of a country, but when they look at themselves on their own, with their own view-point, they find they are unable, unsuccessful and realize incapability. We fantasize how

delighted and great we would become, we don't know, when coming upon the honoured post given to him ! It's only a figment of mind, an idle curiosity, my brother !

It is just a curiosity, a prank of the mind, to think that I will become someone, by dint of special circumstances, which I am not today. Gentleman, you will remain where you are. The only difference will be that instead of writing three by four, you will write seventy-five by hundred. This much will be the difference. And if the fire of being lowly will dwindle a bit, the fire of pride will get inflamed. It is likely that the fire of being lowly might get extinguished easily because the poor or the lowly attract compassion from the people. But is it possible to be saved from getting burnt to the ground in the fire of pride ? It is not possible; he must be burnt to the ground. Let it not be misconstrued that I don't call that as the need which people opine to be their need. But I define the need of the human being in the sense of singular number; I don't interpret it in the sense of plural 'needs'. It is my individual point of view. If the name 'need' is to be bandied about at all, your lone need is to awaken to the need of someone. It is an ornamental adornment in human life to become dependable need for someone. But in what form or way should you smarten up to become someone's need ? It should be with your sense of discrimination and capability. Otherwise, we are so much subjected to the habit of asking for something that when we go before God we use it even then to hope that he should fulfil our desire. When we go to the *Guru* we hope that he will respond to our wish. This our disease is an abominable condemnation of human life. It is hurling horrible insult at human life to go to the *Guru* with the thought that the August *Guru* would fulfil our desire; to go before god thinking He would carry out our wish; and bow to the spirit of the world for making our resolve come true.

This pathogenic subjection to selfwilled desire will survive so long as ego-sense remains entrenched in elemental inertness. Because identity with, and vanity of, the body alone epitomizes desire; and satisfaction or frustration of desire is the breeding source of attraction and anger which is the root of annihilation.

And just as you resolve : O beloved! Let your will be done. Then will follow on its own demolition of the vanity of the body and oneness with the life of consciousness. You should instead have the goodwill to wish for the fulfilment of the mind's desire of the neighbour, the friend and your nearest and dearest ones. When the *sadhaka* gives up his intentional desire, he gets rid of slavery and is whered to an awakening awareness of *yoga*. The previous speaker has called it 'rest', which is an imperturbable stillness of inner mind. When the yogi does not tend to indulge in this inward peace, he is ushered to the awareness of the inmost being which the previous speaker has defined as spiritual freedom. When the *sadhaka* does not get satisfied with this freedom of the sprit love for god is awakened in him. The previous speaker has described these three rest (peace), freedom and love-as demand of the soul of man. These are our genuine seeking. Didn't I ask to know first the essential identity of life ? Your genuine demand, the seeking of your soul is the essential identity of your life. Your life inheres in 'peace', 'freedom, and 'love'. Love is the epitome of your life, the peak of your quintessence, your humanity. You may either focalize love on the *Atman*, self or the inmost being from the spiritualistic point of view, or focalize on the world-Being from the materialistic point of view or focalize on the Divine Being from the theistic point of view. But your life is built in love. It is not that love inheres in you, love by itself is your life.

It is not that I have in me today a passionate allurement to enjoy myself; tomorrow will I have the ecstasy of love in me. The lure of the passion to enjoy will abandon you, love will be yours faithfully, yours truly. 'Your' will be demolished as soon as passionate allurements in you for pleasure disappears. 'You' linger in passionate attraction 'You' don't exist in love. 'You' are under subjection to the other, 'you' are not in spiritual freedom. 'You' exist in the churning of labour; 'you' don't remain in the calm repose of rest. Here 'you' means a deluded apprehension of individuality. What is that which the *sadhaka* feels like his individual identity, What is that 'I', 'we' ? It is a dustered aggregate of subjection, labour and attachment. But despite being these what potentially do they point out to ? What is attachment ? It is demand of the soul for love. What is slavery

of subjection ? It is aspiration of the human soul for unbounded freedom of the spirit. What is the grind of labour ? It is demand of the inward being of man for repose of rest. Therefore your on going life is nothing but demand of peace, freedom and love whereas you view it bounded by walls of circumstances we think of fulfilling the demand only by dependence on a certain individual, circumstances or condition and think more on unobtainable circumstances than on existing ones. Instead of wasting time this way the existing circumstances should be put to use with a sense of worship, a sense of *sadhana* or a sense of duty. What is the meaning of the sense of worship ? If eating chapati is not the meaning of worship of god, then excuse me, counting leads of rosary also is no worship and if turning rosary is worship of God, defecation too, is worship. You might be opining that turning rosary for three hours is worship indeed, then what will you do for remaining twenty-one hours ? If there is worship in the true sense of the word every inclination of the mind to do is worship. If there is *sadhana* in the true sense of the word every tendency of the mind is *sadhana*. Otherwise, so long as any particular inclination of the mind is *sadhana* and any other inclination to do is *asadhan*, all remains *asadhan* till then. But I am not entitled to call all as *asadhan* because there never remains *asadhan* in all respects. Therefore it is not worth while to make this statement. But *sadhana* which is really life remains unachieved so long as there is partial *asadhan* mixed up into it.

Our own desire is the root of all *asadhan*-and therefore it is untruth. Why is it untruth ? First because it is not fulfilled and as such it is untruth. So that retaining one's desire is intimacy of association with untruth already known to oneself. And I am entrenched in the belief-even if it may be untruth to all taking it as my individual assumption of truth but, brother, one is bound to share one's own belief through a lecture-that any *sadhana* done with deliberate force of self-will, while persisting in known untruth, may well be fruitful in times to come but it is not in immediacy of the present. Therefore if today it appears convincing to us and you, not from my viewpoint, if only it is transparent to you in the light of your own sense of

discrimination that it is absolutely meaningless to cherish any desire of one's own, there is no room for it in human life. It is blot on human life because one's own self-willed wish converts one into slave, lets others rule over one and one's own will misleads one to rule over others. Such becomes the tendency of our want or desire. Assuming to be a father we assert that the son should behave in a specified way. Did you become the father to love the son or to rule over him ? Becoming a husband you prescribe the demeanour and the mode of doing of your life. Doesn't she have her own mind and its inclination ? Is she so devoid of desire as to blend her mind into yours ? you assume to be a man, a male person and are unable to blend your mind into the mind of the female person. What for are you a male person ? She is a woman, you are servant of the woman. Consider the point : You undertake to be friend and you are unable to merge your mind into the mind of the friend ! If you can't fuse your mind into the mind of your friend you are accordingly unable to blend your mind by melting into the mind of God.

What in reality is the world ? It is a training to meet God. Here in this world we arrange or happen to come into the presence or company of God. The world and living in it is indeed to make acquaintance of God. He who lives on properly, genuinely in the world can meet God as a matter of course. I would rather prefer to assert that even if he for gets, God himself comes over to him and meets. If you can put the circumstances to right use in the spirit of worship, you won't have to remember God; God will remember you. If you put your circumstances to proper use in the spirit of *Sadhana*, you won't have to invoke fulfilment; realization or accomplishment will invoke you. If you use up your circumstances in the right sense of duty, religion will incarnate in you, you won't have to make effort to be religious. But when will all this happen ? Only when you are free of your desire. Now think over the point : Do you like to live in complete alienation from religion by a passionate hangin onto desire ? Do you want to remain distant from realization ? Do you want to live in isolation from God ? Do you like to retain disunion with your affectionate and dear ones ? If you think your desire is so valued that you can hold to it despite causing perpetual

dissension among nearest and dearest ones, remain alienated from the world, God, deprived of freedom of the spirit, rest and love, you can hang onto so costly a desire, wish or a mental fixation. But how long can you retain that too ? Are you capable of retaining it during deep sleep ? Are you capable of persisting with it while dreaming or staying awake ? That is to say, you cannot hold to your wish at any cost. Pore over the underlying point : Umpteen are his modes of teaching or counselling !

That is to say, he gave no brother, not even a sister, the space of freedom to retain his or her desire every time. O Hark! Brother ! Who is called mad ? He who is bogged or lingers in desire; he, indeed, is mad. It is why, he is prescribed electric 'shock'. Why ? So that he might be released from the obsessional grip of desire, his mind may get well. Consider the issue of desire, egocentric wish and our preoccupation with it from the materialistic, theistic and from the viewpoint of every problem of life.

When do you relish the maximum savour while taking meal ? Of course hunger is taken away by feeding on meal bought by payment of price but you don't get the appetizing piquancy of its savour. Experience in your own life and relish the flavour of the meal when your hunger arouses in someone the exciting intensity of longing to feed on you. Hark! What to speak of you, even the Incarnation of God like Raghunathji could not forget the plums as the most immortal, appetizing eatables by *Shabari*. Installed in *Shabari's* sanctum of her devotional heart were the infallible words of *sadguru Matang* that the Lord would come over here one day. It crystallized as solemn vow of an intense longing to feed on her own Lord with her own hand. What infact is love ? It is to sacrifice one's own passionate attachment and fondness. I tell you the truth : Hang me if there remains any defilement in you after you fall in love with someone. First fall in love with someone; and when will it come off ? When you opt to choose that someone's heart may become your heart; that is to say, the heart that belongs to someone else is my own heart. Someone else's heart may not merge in my heart, but could I blend my heart in some one else's! You should at least

discrimination that it is absolutely meaningless to cherish any desire of one's own, there is no room for it in human life. It is blot on human life because one's own self-willed wish converts one into slave, lets others rule over one and one's own will misleads one to rule over others. Such becomes the tendency of our want or desire. Assuming to be a father we assert that the son should behave in a specified way. Did you become the father to love the son or to rule over him ? Becoming a husband you prescribe the demeanour and the mode of doing of your life. Doesn't she have her own mind and its inclination ? Is she so devoid of desire as to blend her mind into yours ? you assume to be a man, a male person and are unable to blend your mind into the mind of the female person. What for are you a male person ? She is a woman, you are servant of the woman. Consider the point : You undertake to be friend and you are unable to merge your mind into the mind of the friend ! If you can't fuse your mind into the mind of your friend you are accordingly unable to blend your mind by melting into the mind of God.

What in reality is the world ? It is a training to meet God. Here in this world we arrange or happen to come into the presence or company of God. The world and living in it is indeed to make acquaintance of God. He who lives on properly, genuinely in the world can meet God as a matter of course. I would rather prefer to assert that even if he for gets, God himself comes over to him and meets. If you can put the circumstances to right use in the spirit of worship, you won't have to remember God; God will remember you. If you put your circumstances to proper use in the spirit of *Sadhana*, you won't have to invoke fulfilment; realization or accomplishment will invoke you. If you use up your circumstances in the right sense of duty, religion will incarnate in you, you won't have to make effort to be religious. But when will all this happen ? Only when you are free of your desire. Now think over the point : Do you like to live in complete alienation from religion by a passionate hangin onto desire ? Do you want to remain distant from realization ? Do you want to live in isolation from God ? Do you like to retain disunion with your affectionate and dear ones ? If you think your desire is so valued that you can hold to it despite causing perpetual

dissension among nearest and dearest ones, remain alienated from the world, God, deprived of freedom of the spirit, rest and love, you can hang onto so costly a desire, wish or a mental fixation. But how long can you retain that too? Are you capable of retaining it during deep sleep? Are you capable of persisting with it while dreaming or staying awake? That is to say, you cannot hold to your wish at any cost. Pore over the underlying point : Umpteen are his modes of teaching or counselling !

That is to say, he gave no brother, not even a sister, the space of freedom to retain his or her desire every time. O Hark! Brother ! Who is called mad ? He who is bogged or lingers in desire; he, indeed, is mad. It is why, he is prescribed electric 'shock'. Why ? So that he might be released from the obsessional grip of desire, his mind may get well. Consider the issue of desire, egocentric wish and our preoccupation with it from the materialistic, theistic and from the viewpoint of every problem of life.

When do you relish the maximum savour while taking meal ? Of course hunger is taken away by feeding on meal bought by payment of price but you don't get the appetizing piquancy of its savour. Experience in your own life and relish the flavour of the meal when your hunger arouses in someone the exciting intensity of longing to feed on you. Hark! What to speak of you, even the Incarnation of God like Raghunathji could not forget the plums as the most immortal, appetizing eatables by *Shabari*. Installed in *Shabari's* sanctum of her devotional heart were the infallible words of *sadguru Matang* that the Lord would come over here one day. It crystallized as solemn vow of an intense longing to feed on her own Lord with her own hand. What infact is love ? It is to sacrifice one's own passionate attachment and fondness. I tell you the truth : Hang me if there remains any defilement in you after you fall in love with someone. First fall in love with someone; and when will it come off ? When you opt to choose that someone's heart may become your heart; that is to say, the heart that belongs to someone else is my own heart. Someone else's heart may not merge in my heart, but could I blend my heart in some one else's! You should at least

get prepared to be harmonized with the mind of someone else. In case you don't get such a fellow-traveller in the world, let your mind be blended with the mind of God you have heard of. And if you come across him here, let the mind merge into his mind here. But as soon as you blend your mind with someone else's mind, the chitta, the mind-stuff, will immediately merge in consciousness and consciousness will merge in the Infinite.

'Hari Om!'

Discourse-2

23 December, 1959.

Evening

My own Self-identity of the present exalted, magnanimous, eminence as well as Brothers and Sisters !

Love inheres in the kinship of being one's own and love alone is the nectar, the elixir of life, the ecstasy of devotion. The flavour of ecstatic devotion is so unequalled that both the Lord and his devotee cherish the demand for it. Matters like power and emancipation are evolved versions of individual entelechy of the human being and man's flowering as devotee or his devotion to God is for the sake of the Lord. Now think how unequalled, invaluable is the life which is so extremely useful and worthwhile to god himself ! It is not describable in any language whatsoever. Now, we have to consider what actually goes into the making or rather realizing one's own kinship with God. The first constituent of the relation of kinship, of belonging to him, is 'faith' which is strong conviction not based on proof but originating from spiritual intuition. It is only a brief, succinct utterance : "The Lord is". Faith is epitomized in these words. I don't know how and where He is ! It is absolutely unnecessary to know this. It is adequate to know that "God is". Thereafter, as soon as there emerges the strength of firmness in the initial founding of faith, reverence awakes on its own. Consider the point with sufficient seriousness. We have to repose trust, lay the foundation of faith; veneration is not to be worked out. There is a spontaneous awakening of reverence and veneration on this path to life. Faith as awakening in the soul is unfolded when reverential emotion for the trusted "God is" wells up in the heart. This is the touchstone of the feeling of reverence epitomizing sterling excellence of trust. That which is the focus of veneration becomes the convergence zone of faith, and when faith of sterling excellence comes of it, the souled identity of kinship is accomplished in Him. That's that. The perfection of this path is completed with the realization of identity of kinship with God. Once you acknowledged this soulful identity of kinship with the supreme being, you should be kind to you self to abnegate your tendency to look for its impact in the body, the sense organs, the mind and intellect. Why ? In case you look at its influence over these faculties the soulful identity with the

supreme being will be degraded into sense of 'me' and 'mine' with body-mind. Therefore, whatever be the mode of the body, the vital breath, the mind, they pertain to beloved Lord, not your not even from any philosophical point of view. So that anything which is not my own belongs to God from the theistic point of view, is only *maya*, illusion or appearance of the phenomenal world from the spiritualistic viewpoint, and it belongs to the world from the materialistic point of view. Which is the thing that appertains to you? You can rest only on the feeling for God alone as the one who belongs to you. Many impurities, defilements, are observable in the body, mind and intellect despite. His ubiquitous presence, you may rue, but brother, that is overtly observed in the inner and outer instruments because you regard them as belonging to you.

Very well you know the truth that the body, the sense organs and the mind are not ours; There is no doubt in it. Had they belonged to us? We could have held up old age, prevented sickness, protected joy and would not have allowed misery to befall us. Every brother, every sister has experience to this effect. It is well-known to them that they are incapable of working out the assignment they want to do and can do. Look! The problem before you is not to do that which you are incapable of doing. The plight, indeed, is that we can work out the mission and don't fulfil it. This plight makes the *sadhaka* aware of, familiar with, his incapacity. It is a profound truth to realize that in the lucid awareness of one's own incapacity is inherent the trust in someone who is Almighty. And if faith in the Almighty does not emerge on its own, familiarity with incapacity is not genuine and complete. If unable to grow to maturity of being aware of your incapacity, you should put your capability to right, prudent or good use. This is also a path to the expression of *Sadhana* in life and a path independent of the awareness of incapability. Both the paths putting capability to good use or the pang of incapability-lead to entry into the same ideal life of fulfilment. But, brother, the situation is such that you suffer sometime the pang of inability to do the right and sometime enjoy yourself in accomplishing what you should have done. Wobbling about perplexed under this dual movement won't do. You get entrenched in a single attitude of inward mind; be instead established in unwavering rest of mind with regard to choice of pathway to life. Our Lord has the magnanimity to overlook your

past, to condone it, if you can put your capability to good use here and now; and he is forgiving enough to adopt you even if you don't ask and seek his spontaneous compassion. To think that God will adopt only when you want and seek his kindness amounts to insulting Him. According to mode and intensity of my faith. He adopts first the unbelieving agnostic, and responds to those with faith in Him only afterwards. It is one of the modes of His spontaneous, magnanimous grace. What is the rationale of this nature of the working of divine compassion or grace ? That is so because the atheist, the agnostic, unbelieving in the supreme Lord, believes in the existence of objects, ability and circumstances. And as such when God finds His beloved man, the most invaluable focus of His kinship, affection and fondness, under the subjection of objects, He gets sharply stirred up to assimilate the being who is truly unbelieving, a genuine atheist. We generally commit the fault to falter between sometime believing in God and sometime believing in the world. This wavering is a very serious blunder.

I appeal to you not to get frightened of the dilemma of belief and disbelief. Try your utmost that God might not come close to you somehow or other. Don't make effort to let any relation of kinship become established between Him and you. Try to oust or throw Him out from inside your life. Take it to be the truth that as you try to oust the Lord from your psyche, so will he go on piercing into you. You may interject uttering how I affirm a matter like this ! Look a bit into the matter underlying the idea of God's Hand reaching out to man ! Can you identify or specify the moment in your life when you did not accept the power and the might of one stronger than yourself ? Could you ever escape the glory, grandeur, majesty or opulence of divinity ? So, which was the moment in your life when you did not acknowledge the authority of God ? Thus, you have constantly been invoking the glory and majesty of divine invincibility. You have always been invoking the mellifluous melody and ecstasy of Love. But you are substituting them with alternatives in the form of individuals, objects and circumstances. You have hope from invincible divinity, you hope for mellifluent sweetness; if not, let me know if there is any beloved son of a mother who was not attracted to the unconquerable, inviolable divinity in life ? If grandeur of supremacy has enthralled you, how do you assert that you have deserted God ? Consider seriously if you have the

capability to abandon God ? And does God have the capability to forsake you ? Therefore it is another matter altogether if you invoke him to come in the form of a beautiful woman; look dear, come to me in the form of a bungalow, come in the form of a post of placement to me !

Your condition is such that you would go on invoking the supreme Being as the Beloved to be realized in the settled psyche beyond desire, in the form of equability of mind, in the form of detachment or in the form of dedication to duty. Does any moment in your life pass without such invocation or call or begging ? This invocation, on going supplication, is a cry for none but God. The only point is that your cry for the Supreme Being is tinged with your nature with inbuilt vanity of the body. If you have to be genuinely surrendered to God, it would do you good to forget Him. It would be much better if you could forget and refuse to have faith in Him. I tell you the truth that as soon as you make effort to forget the Lord, an unl continuous remembrance of Him will be awakened in you. But what do you do instead ? You make effort, strive and struggle, to remember God ! What does it mean ? Is it known to you that you drift, glide and move in a stream of thought on the world when you labour and exert to remember God ? On the other hand you never have to suffer the stress of worldly thoughts while discharging duties of the world. Remembrance of the world comes about during worship because you admitted distance from, difference with and disregardful oblivion of God. Think seriously, that is why you think of God while you accept Him remote and different from yourself with forget fulness of Him but thinking of the world happens on its own at the time. And what else did you do? You accepted the existence of the thinking of the world happening on its own. Think seriously, you want to enter into meditation on God after lending reality of existence to thoughts of the world which is absolutely impossible.

Be kind to yourself, give up the attempt to meditate, then meditation will ensue on its own. Don't misunderstand taking it otherwise. Give up waiting on, concentrating on objects, individuals, states and circumstances to which you are attached with sense of me and mine, self-interest, selfishness. Look! when does the question of meditation come up ? It arises when your attention comes up against something that is not the object of your love. Ah! Brother, why do you hang on to the world if

meditation on God eludes you ? You may interpose that you don't do, it happens on its own. Well and good ! Why do you indulge in the stream of thought you have not created yourself ? Oh! You are wise, are n't you ? These are wise people who sit in meditation. They spread out *asanas* to sit on, recite *mantras* from the *Vedas*, read out *kalmās* from the *Koran*, don't know what else ! Therefore I pointed out that you were exerting yourself to alongate attention on that to which your meditation is focused on its own. So, what does your meditation converge on ? You say it comes together from different directions on that which you don't want. Then, brother, why do you get entangled in the snare of the unwanted and suffer from it ? Why do you support or oppose the stream that flows on its own ? If you don't want volition and indecision, desire and option, why do you support the current that flows on its own and derive pleasure from it ? Why do you invoke absolute release from desire and option, from all resolves and choices ? Give up all this mire of delusion and your indulgence in it.

I told you in the morning and assert even now that I won't make an effort for conversion to theism. Why ? I would have converted to theism in case you appeared to me an atheist, or if you seemed distant from or alien to theism. I do have the belief and knowledge also that you are not distinct from God, nor have you the potential to be separate from him nor will you ever be alien to Him. Therefore, brother, you act in concert with that which happens without your wanting it, that is to say, you join forces with desires, wishes, resolves and proliferating options. How do you act in concert with this compelling whirl of futile thought? You sometimes resist, oppose, sometimes support or identify with the whirl of thoughts and sometimes you invoke thoughtless, absolute optionlessness. All these are your modes of the mind to co-operate with, join forces with the current stream of futile thought. Think seriously, does the immutable consciousness admitting no option nor alternatives, no wavering, no hesitation ever get demolished ? Think, think even with very gross intelligence, you might have seen demolition of born, self-willed wishes, desires and resolves, or of their alternative options. Well, brother, can anyone prove, demonstrate or authenticate the extirpation of the immutable consciousness beyond wavering and hesitation ? Look, I will tell you the grand secret of secrets ! Can you destroy the indestructible ? Can you

destroy stillness of rest or repose ? Can you destroy the unbounded space and infinite extent of freedom ? Can you end the existence of Love ? You can never do it, it exists forever, it is but what do you do instead ? You keep the option open in this regard that he does not exist or He is negated, nullified or annulled. Say goodbye to matters subject to option.

Accept once and for all with theistic intelligence and sensibility that 'He is', that God is immanence, complete, absolute entirety of existence, immanent in things and beings. Poke fun at Him that I saw in your mind volitional will, desires, wishes and their alternative options, helpless disability in my intellect and that I viewed sickening malady in the body given to me. Why did I observe it that way ? That is so because I am aware of the fact that these things or instruments don't belong to me. I don't own this body and mind and these are not meant for me; this intellect is not mine. And I have cherished faith in the truth that God belongs to me, He is mine, but I don't know him. This question of belief without knowledge may, or often does, arise at this juncture. But here is an answer to man's ageless question by the great Swami's catechetical question itself. His characteristic catechesis is : 'I ask you where comes up the question of belief or faith in something already known ? Brothers, think and consider seriously, there is absolutely no question of cherishing faith in something which is already known. Why? You get rid of untruth if you are aware of it as untruth. You realize truth in case you know truth as truth. The question of faith, belief, or trust arises in regard of the being that you know nothing absolutely about. And who is that you know nothing absolutely about ? We are bound to aver that the Lord alone is such a Being. People these days misunderstand that listening attentively to a knowledgeable person speak on the topic of this nature is equivalent to knowing on one's own. Do we genuinely know or realize or do we only believe in what we hear ? That which is only heard is not really known to or realized by us, whether heard from the Koran, the Puran, the Bible or the *Vedas*. Anything at all that is heard is not known or realized. And whatever is known, realized, is not believed in. Let us consider what actually is known to us ? Every state, every object is changeable forever, at all times, or say that it is devoid of stability, permanence. Can you prove stability or immutability of the perceivable ? Can you establish the endurance, the

permanence of the perceived or the apprehended that which you know? You can't prove nor establish its validity, sir! On the other hand, you can't eliminate the endurance, the permanency of the faith you have reposed on the bosom of the unknown being unperceived by the senses. That is to say, you can't eliminate the endurance, the permanency of the reposed without your denial of it. Let me illustrate the point by citing some overt instances. You are aware that conflict with the Chinese would have ended altogether had they believed they were not Chinese. Had Americans accepted the idea that they were not Americans the quarrel with them would have ended? Had the Indians believed they were not Indians the conflicts they faced would have ended altogether? That is to say, you can't eradicate the object of your faith without making disavowal of it.

You cannot authenticate at all the stability, the permanency, the independent existence of the perceivable nor can you obliterate the repository of your faith. So momentous an ascendancy of energy is commanded by reliant trust, ardent reverence and unwavering faith that you don't have in you the courage to summon the capability to exterminate the repository of faith. And you don't have the capacity to retain or maintain in steady, unwavering condition the perceivable through the senses. Let any brother cite example to the effect that he has retained steadily the sensory perception in his case. Even if he is the greatest among great philosophers or scientists! Let the issue be posed before the greatest scientist so that he may kindly prove the stability of the known. Let the question of everlasting nature of faith be put to the greatest logician to erase even a bit of the trusted, believed. Therefore the repository of faith remains indestructible, everlasting and, friends, the known, the perceivable is not stable and enduring at all. There is no room for concern or anxiety, then. If the believed were subjected to obliteration a problem would really have arisen. In case the known were stable or enduring a problem would have really emerged. The known is not steady, it is not enduring; and as such don't regard it as your own, that is to say, renounce your sense of belonging to it. And the being you have heard of cannot be nullified nor annihilated and as such acknowledge your soulful belonging to the Lord. When will this sense of belonging to the Lord, in the identity of oneness, liven up to animation? One of the conditions that one should have nothing as one's own

at one's disposal'. And the second, only the second commandment, is that 'whatever be the nature or mode of His Being, he is one's own; but I don't want anything from Him.' Don't entertain here the cynical notion that it is difficult for the Lord to grant freedom, enlightenment, force or energy.

The only seeking you can manage to express is that O my Loves ! You are the core of my soulful own, I want nothing else from you ! Why not any other seeking whatever ? I would certainly have asked for something else if it were superior to soulful identity of kinship with you. There inheres unfathomed extent of quintessential love in soulful kinship of belonging. In no other way is the ambrosial relish available to the beloved Lord except through this quintessential love proffered by the loving devotee. Therefore I don't want nor seek after any gift distinct from this inward kinship of belonging so that your blissful grace of kinship may remain intact and unbounded. There never was really anything in the past which I owned myself, nor do I have anything now. Non-attached impersonality, disillusioned detachment, came on its own when I realized through percipience that there is nothing of my own in myself. And my soulful kinship of oneness with the beloved Lord livened up to animation, when I ceased to want anything from Him. In the inviolable kinship of oneness, in soulful kinship of belonging alone inheres unfathomed unbounded Infinite, ever-fresh love in its quintessence, which in truth is admittedly life.

'Hari Om !'

Discourse-3

24 December, 1959

Morning.

My own Self-identity of the present exalted, magnanimous, eminence as well as Brothers and Sisters !

No *sadhaka* whoever requires any unavailable object, capability and competence but to make resolve not to misuse the available ones is required of all who tread the pathway to life. Let us transform it into a solemn belief, a commitment of our own that we shan't misuse that which has been granted to us and won't ask for that which has not been given to us because he who is the giver knows more of us than we do ourselves. This does not signify that I talk matters only in regard of those with faith in theism. It does no harm to believe in theism, atheism, materialism or spiritualism. Because one truth is common with regard to all believers. Which truth or truths ? That which is granted is given by someone, it is not our own. The second truth is that it is not meant for one. Whatever is given to you is neither yours nor meant for you. It is given by someone and meant for someone. The world is the name of someone for whom it is meant and the being who has given it is called the Lord Infinite in the language of the theist. So, whatever is granted to whoever brother or sister is given by the Lord and it is meant for use to the world. Then, what is meant to be my own ? Brother! God alone is for my own sake. What will I receive from God ? It is not much valuable to pore over what God will give you. God instead will receive from you and me loving regard of self-same identity, quintessential love, dependable trust and absolute faith. All these are oblatory offerings to the highest realizable, from the *sadhaka* to the supreme Being. Are these virtues privately owned by the *sadhaka* ? No, no, not at all; these are given to him by the Realizable, entrusted to him to be transformed into offerings to Him. The lord instills into the spiritual aspirant the luminous understanding of assurance that he would regard Himself fulfilled in the return of these virtues of soulful identity, love, trust and faith. The *sadhya*, the Realizable alone knows why such an idea struck or occurred to Him as a flash. I can't fathom the mystery, the secret, of this dispensation. But the matter of this esoteric, overarching relation of God to man is literally true as I looked at it with my point of view.

How much obligation remains now to be fulfilled by the *sadhaka* ? In case you return the given or received gifts or faculties regarding them as your own, you will receive lots of these in lieu but if you make these offerings regarding them as god's He himself will meet you in lieu of your devotional oblation. This is the substance of the matter regarding the loving relation of the Lord to the *sadhaka*. The faculties, the gifts-of trust, faith and love are certainly given. But who is the giver ? One whose existence, identity, you have acknowledged. It is gift of the world if you accept its identity; it is a gift of God if you admit his existence or identity.

Thus you won't misuse gift, faculty, talent because they are given to you. Does it appear impossible to you ? If the determination not to misuse the given is not impossible, the firm resolve to make up one's mind to this effect is not to be abandoned to future. There is no need to take resort to someone else in order to resolve against misuse of the given powers and faculties. I have to muster myself the will power in me to resolve firmly against the misuse of whatever has been given to me. However, it is most urgent to be overcome with anguish of remorse regarding oneself incapable in case one slips into perpetrating misuse of the given despite the firm resolve not to do so. The incapability that obtains in the life of the *sadhaka* is not in the sense that he cannot do what he ought to have done. It is indeed in the sense that he did not do what he should have done. There is incapability of the kind the blind person has; the hopeless fellow cannot see at all. Not this, no incapability of the kind comes up in the life of the *sadhaka*. The incapability that comes up against the *sadhaka* is that he did not do what he was and is capable of doing. Truly speaking, he alone is the *sadhaka* eligible to tread the path of self surrender to God. He has the right and qualification to adopt the pathway to absolute surrender. But people with ability to speak these days enthuse and excite *sadhakas* to adopt the path of surrender by singing hymns to the glory of God. Just as someone would lure lustful man to woman saying that her nose is very nice, eyes very attractive, ears very charming and her speech juicy or succulent. Why ? So that the desire of the lustful man for the woman may wax to intense excitement. This has become customary these days. But this in reality amounts to an insult to our own beloved. Consider the point, consider it with adequate seriousness!

Can self-surrender to the divine Being be accomplished in reality except through intensely anguished awareness of one's own incapability? Can genuine detachment from things, beings and situations be attained except through right use of capability? Will faithfulness to duty originate in you unless misuse of the given faculties is kept under control? Never. In no case. Even if you want it or not allegiance to duty will come on its own once you make up your mind not to misuse the given. Another distinct merit will also emerge from allegiance to duty ensuing from turning off misuse. What more as distinct merit? It is that you won't be puffed up with conceit for faith in duty which comes on its own from keeping misuse of talent under control. You may argue why I ask to desist from misusing power instead of putting it to right use. In case you opine that you will put the given power to right use your limited ego-ego-trip will remain alive with the sense of your being dutiful. Ego-trip, egomania is detrimental to spiritual well-being. Therefore, don't think of speaking truth, think instead not to tell a lie. Don't think of serving someone, make up your mind not to harm anyone. Don't think of offering honour to someone; be resolved instead not to disrespect anyone. Don't think you will do good to someone; think instead that you won't be evildoing to anyone. Why? That is so because no negative resolve or determination demands capability and as such no conceit issues from it, no beautification of the ego is brought about; it pulls down instead the structure of ego. Therefore, if you want rest, ease or relaxation, either as pathway to life or life itself as goal, it will be attainable only when you have eschewed misuse of the given talent and power. Such a spiritual aspirant will certainly get rest. He will attain it if he wants, or attain even if he does not want it.

Consider the matter in all its ramifications. When you make up your mind not to misuse the given, two situations will emerge before you either your power will be put to right use or you will get rest. When your powers, faculties get mobilized on their own to be put to right use, remain alert not to regard yourself as doer of the work done. Why? Because you have not decided to put the faculties to right use, you have only made up your mind not to misuse them. So that it won't be proper to be puffed up with conceit when the powers get to right use on their own. What benefit will come out of it? Who asks for the fruit of doing? He who does something. What fruit will you ask for when you have

not done anything at all ? Won't desirelessness emerge from it ? Won't attachment to the fruit of doing be eraged by it ? Consider the point. You ask for wages; payment or fruit when you claim to have done some assigned work. But what right have you to ask for fruit when you have done no assignment, nothing at all. Look! A situation wherein no conceit of doership looms up, at tachment to the fruit of doing also does not appear, nor is there any hope for nor even thought of the fruit. And when there is pride of doing, thought hovering over the fruit and attachment to it also obtain. So that if remembrance of discharging whatever present duty comes to the memory lane at the end of the work, or evokes the fruit of it. or if there is anticipation of future work, without relaxing into rest, it is a clear, definite indication of pride in making the right use of powers. If someone prides himself on always speaking the truth, he must lie through his teeth, even if he is a Yudhishtir sometime-someday.

Please think, what idea of a joke flashed into the mind of *Bhagwan Shyamsunder*! You might not have heard from anyone till today-at least I have not heard so from any story-teller whoever that *Yudhishtir* told a lie I heard unstead that *Krishna* was very naughty, he managed *Yudhishtir* to tell a lie. This is what all people say, don't they ? None says that *Yudhishtir* told a lie. Think a little, look at the naughtiness of that impish Being ! Could the *Pandawas* deny that there was desire for victory in them, when asked to make a clean breast of it ? Could they confess they had no desire for victory ? I ask you if someone with the muddle of bewildering desire in him can follow or speak the truth ? Look at this magnificent grandeur and dignity of Beloved *Shyamsunder* ! Alas, He lets himself in for slander, and graces others with the crown of victory! Ponder and consider, could you get such a friend in the world who lets Himself in for slander and would fulfil the desire you cherish, you couldn't ? Such is the mode of pouring grace by my Beloved Lord! And you had nothing at all at your disposal, your majesty, when you were born. It was gifted, only given to you to be put to right use and you were granted the ordinance, the light of discrimination, to make a prudent use of it. You had the ordinance, the capability, and the freedom to utilize the given made available to you and yet you take pride in doing the good or the right. If a judge in the crime case stoops so low as to pride on sentencing to death, there will be no judge exempt from death by hanging. If the judge

writes that he sentenced someone to death by hanging, won't he be punished to death by hanging in lieu of it? If a magistrate writes that he awarded punishment, should he not be punished in place of it? But every magistrate is aware that power is derived from the government, law and rule of order belong to the government, it is not my creation, it is not mine. He discharges duty by the power and statutes legislated by the government and as such he is exempted from crime.

Likewise you and I are given object, ability, capability, a divinity legislated ordinance in the likeness of light of discrimination and the Lord has granted us total power to utilize them. So that if we resolve firmly against misuse of the given, it will be nothing but the truth that faith in obedience to duty will be incarnated in our life. And is it known to you what this faith in obedience, loyalty, to duty stands for? It is the *Sadhana*, the pathway to life, in the material world. The twin fruitions of faith in devotion to duty are release from involved attachment to doing and building up of beautiful society. So that when loyalty to duty awakes and becomes manifest in the human heart, the need for convening of a nation remains no more. This is the identity, the distinction, of a beautiful society. And the society that requires a nation or a country, artificially convened, should be regarded as one that is far away from faith in devotion to duty, even if it has made nice roads, given food to all, and provided objects for consumption and comfort. Nevertheless, it is inordinately remote from genuine commitment to duty. Do you know what consequences will follow from that dereliction of duty? It results in conflict between two individuals, two groups and two countries. There is no possibility of establishment of peace by the country.

Therefore, life is intrinsically inherent in rest: Rest is life itself. Both the formulations are true. Rest is attainable, at hand, if we memorize and assimilate the lesson that "Life inheres in rest, rest is life itself". None is dependent on the other for rest. Why? Didn't rest exist before whatever you did, and at the end of it? Wasn't there rest before speaking and in no-speech, at the end of it? Isn't there rest at the end of speech? Therefore, inherent rest is not unattainable, brother. Inherent, intrinsic rest is ever obtainable. Now, how much useful and worthy is your derivation from this inherent rest depends on the extent of your trust in and reverence for it; it depends on the extent of your

soulful identity with and your faith in it. From this point of view, it is compulsory and extremely urgent for all of us to resolve against misuse of rest inherently available to us. Just as object, ability, capability or faculty talent and power are given to be utilized with the light of divine discrimination and never to be misused at all, so is the determination not to misuse rest available by its divine inherence, urgent and compulsory.

Now think further in the line of motion ahead on the pathway. With emerging right or good use of powers in work or rest, after cessation of all misuse, one is absolutely forbidden to pride oneself on having lone it. This abnegation will lead to demolition of attachment to the fruit of and thinking on the work done on its own. A brief rest will come about where attachment to the fruit of and thought on the work done are demolished. And then again will come up the schedule of work preordained by the legislation of the Infinite and there will follow a turning inward after its fulfilment. In this way, rest will be available at the origin and end of every work. The materialist will obtain energy or capability out of that rest, the spiritualist will gain in most freedom and enlightenment, and the sadhaka with faith in the infinite will attain to devotion to God. That is to say, that rest will be the originating wellspring for the awakeing of capability, non-attachment and the state of pang of separation, estrangement from the Lord. Love for the Lord springs from the awakening of the feeling of estrangement from him. Non-attachment is the mother, the wellspring, of spiritual freedom, and capability is the epitome of duty. From this point of view life will be furnished with dedication to duty, non-attachment and surrender to god. In this way, it is undebatably true that life for all of us can be transformed into identity of oneness with bliss of yoga, self-bliss and ecstasy of Love.

'Hari Om !'

Discourse-4

24 December 1959.

Evening

My own Self-identity of the present exalted, magnanimous, eminence as well as Brothers and Sisters !

It is indeed a truism that I have not come to bring to light any such new idea, ideology or vision that is unknown to you. I have to be at your service in order to submit themes and ideas already known to you. The first point in priority order is to consider the fundamental basis we have adopted to evaluate our life. What is our yardstick to measure the worth or importance of our life ? This is the first point in order of priority. What does the importance or significance of your life seem to you to depend on? Let us analyze and consider the issue. If our evaluation depends on possession of a certain special object, the value in fact belongs to the object and does not remain ascribable to our own life. Accordingly, if evaluation of life depends on special circumstances or some particular state of the body-mind, the importance belongs to circumstances and the state and not to our innermost being as such. So that the most grievous error we committed has been that we became disregardfully forgetful of the value of our own life. Let me illustrate the point. When our country was subjected to alien rule, we thought, fantasized on how beautiful we would become after the exit of the foreign empire ! Such was my own made of fantasy. And I do know some of the friends sitting here about who also probably fantasized likewise. But the circumstances changed and there was no entrance into the kingdom of beauty. Is this fact of life concealed from us today ? You can find it illustrated in small doings or activities of life. Some people opine that the value of our life will emerge and get established by meeting a special individual, or by acquiring a particular object or that we will reform or correct ourselves when placed on a specific post.

Thus speculating, pondering on change of circumstances we are misled into brooding on an unavailable individual, circumstances and state never considering what worth is the value which is not my own ? It is an absolutely worthless sense of value. Let us consider the fact of deep sleep in which all of us are estranged from our circumstances and you cannot say you are in an unhappy state at that time. Not only so much, you

cannot even do without deep sleep. you desert greatest circumstances, the most beloved persons, individuals, for the sake of deep sleep which is marred by the negative of inertia and unconsciousness.

It will surely be your characteristic value if you come upon sleep untainted by unconsciousness and free of resort to object, individual, space, time, situation or state. So the first matter of discriminative concern in order of importance before the individual of any country or class should be to ascertain if genuine life exists or not when we are dissociated from objects of consumption and deserted by fellow beings. In case your own investigation, discernment and decision point out that there would be life beyond objects and fellow beings, perennial life can certainly be realized, and in case your own decision points out that life is not realizable without consumable items and fellowship of likable persons, life in the unbounded dimension remains absolutely unrealizable. There is no brother, no sister who has not experienced the truth that even the best of beloved friend has not seen a friend forever and that even the most beloved item of an objects has been my own forever. Who doesn't know this truth ? Isn't it a self-evident truth to all human beings ? Look, people might have been caught up in an illusion about Manav Seva Sangh as an epidemic that has taken off. What is the meaning of Manav Seva Sangh ? It is an epitome of the human being's own organization. What is the message of Manav Seva Sangh ? It is a message emerging from the human being's own experience, a holy communion with the self.

I have all along been affirming to people that those who don't assimilate and adopt the philosophy of Manav Seva Sangh disregard their own inner light, their own experience, the guidance of the innate *guru*. Consider think with a cool mind the point that if there is no life of your own without fellow beings and material items of consumption, there is absolutely no life at all. And this is neither a figment of imagination nor vapid sentimentality, but a stark reality. You can experience it just now, in the immediacy of now, by renouncing attachment to objects and beings provided for you. This does not mean you should flush the given down the *Ganga*. Nor does it mean that you should not harness the given materials and beings to positive use. The attention should be anchored on abnegation of

attachment to them as our own. Why ? Why should we disown them ?

Think yourself, for example, that we have been allotted this hall for convening a *satsang*. But are we entitled to regard it as our own because we have been permitted to hold *satsang* on the venue ? Whereas there shall be no objection to its use as site for *satsang* we shall be expelled forth with if we claim its ownership. Why ? Won't you accept this truth of the matter coming out of your own experience ? Would you postpone it for future-to do it slowly ? Think of it, take it into consideration. It is not something to be done slowly. It is not a matter to be dealt with in future. This sense of ownership of things, beings, estate or their possessive attachment cannot be done away with by proxy. You will have to eradicate this delusory attachment to things, beings, estate or property on your own, alone, unaided and it can be done only in the immediacy of now. And do you know what an adversity, sorry plight, it would turn out to be in case you fail to do away with limited, possessive ego ? What is the syndromic nature, the psychopathology of failure to eliminate the greedy, delusive, limited ego ? It proliferates in compulsive thinking on unavailable circumstances, objects and individual beings which erupts in adversity of a sorry plight. This persistence of stressful, futile, thought of insistent dementia cannot be held back by our modern science, our high rank at job, nor by study of literary writings, nor by bank accounts, nor even the calibre of university degress can hold back the clamour of futile thought. And you are already aware that those who indulge in pondering on the unavailable circumstances cannot welcome the present situation. The son born to me is an unlikeable bully, a feel good one is not available, the female-fellow available is not likable, a feel-good one is not available. The allotted building is not a feel-good one and a nice house is not available. Ability granted to me is not agreeable, it is not improvable.

Think of life putting it into proper perspective. I have studied life as it is, in its proper perspective, not books of learning and ponderous knowledge. Let us define precisely the most grievous blunder we lapsed into ? We let go, missed, our own distinction, value or worth. And are we aware of the second serious blunder we committed ? We neither welcomed the existing situation nor put it to good use. It is not an ordinary mistake. Great statesmen of the world today would like to see

India well of like America, powerful like Russia and accomplishment of statesmanship as achieved by London.

I ask if there is no central Intelligence, Law Court, organized Army, rebellion and uprising against established governments in other countries, in America ? What specific matter is there in America which we don't have here in Hindustan ? You may say here are not good buildings, no profusion of objects of consumption, no good hospitals. Right, are the inhabitants insane or intelligent ? Please, don't resent or take it with ill feeling. I don't call the American mad, nor the inhabitant of any country. If the citizens are wise, intelligent who are those to be protected by weaponry and ornaments ? Will the machines of war be instrumental for devastation or development ? Let us probe the question seriously. Moreover can anyone strong win over the force which is stronger ? Absolutely not will it win over the opponent with equal strength ? No, never. It can vanquish only the enemy that is weaker. So that can the country threatening the weaker one with its mightier weaponry be called legitimately developed ? Manav Seva Sangh seriously protests against such a profane, unconscious in human development.

Manav Seva Sangh maintains that a developed human being, an evolved society is one which neither rules over any other nor is ruled by it. The class that rules over any other, the individual who rules over the other, or the individual being ruled over by the other, that class, that individual or country is not developed. They live an incomplete, immature life. Then you may argue if it is feasible that we may remain absolutely free of any ruler whoever ? The answer is that it is always feasible. It is always possible that I don't become anyone's ruler. That is to say, it is not impossible to eradicate even the tendency to rule over anyone. When ? Look, how simple a matter it is, if only we refuse to misuse the given. The hurdle is not that we don't have this and that. Gentleman, I hear from the educated that we must have rights, we must get this and that. But irony of the situation is that we fell short of utilizing what we could get, if you get more, you will annihilate it. Don't misuse nor pervert the given, you cannot be ruled by anyone. Don't be irreverent to the being you have heard of, you cannot be ruled by anyone. Don't disregard that you have known through your experience, you won't be ruled. Abusing the given, disregarding the known, persisting in irreverence for the divine being you have heard of, you will

always be tethered to slavery. And do you know what you will do when bound to slavery ? Those bound to slavery are exerting to make slave. The country desirous of overpowering the other is itself bound to the slavery of some other. The class desiring to enslave some other class is already enslaved to some class. And no other individual can erase the slavery to which we are bound. The truth is that for from obliterating your slavery the other cannot even point it out to you.

Therefore, my brothers, consider once with cool-headed sensibility and define precisely your characteristic significance as a human being. You are not unacquainted with importance of things, objects, individuals, post, standing, rank, knowledge, science and arts. You are unaware only of your own importance. Do you know what is distinguishable about the human being ? It is a matter of complete honesty that you can be absolutely useful to the world. Your importance consists in being useful to that boundless Infinite. This importance does not derive from any circumstances, condition, things, objects any speciality of class or system of *sadhana*. It is your characteristic importance as a human being. You are so beautiful! You may argue, how ? It is a straight concept based on factual experience of daily life. Answer me about the two distinct human facets usually noticed in the world scenario you look at. You identify the one facet as that of a happy being another that of an unhappy, miserable one, a sad being. Have you noticed any third distinct facet of a man or woman ? I ask you to point it now, just now. I won't hear if you postpone. Have you or anyone also noticed any other thing in the world except the happy and the unhappy ? You don't respond to my question. This means you either don't want to answer or have accepted the fact of the human situation as I point out. Tell me with truth and honesty if someone you notice is happy and you are glad to look at him, won't he feel your need and welcome you company? Or else, if someone notices you are happy and becomes glad, doesn't he become a feel-good company, a dear, likeable beloved ? Relax to feel and experience it. Likewise, you chance to notice someone afflicted and your heart gets stirred up by surge of comparison. Won't the afflicted one feel the need of your empathetic presence? People indulge in pleasure and enjoy themselves in the name of service. Let us not get misled into blunder.

Rajendra Babu along with some friends had a conversation with me at the constitution House in Delhi when the country became free. Addressing him 'Babuji', I affirmed that service should culminate in self-denial, not in climbing up to ministry. The counterpoint he made was : 'Where would such men or women come from ?' I rejoined, saying, 'volunteer yourself as one such, become a renunciant.' He laughed it away, I also laughed off. Think, you vouch for service and mark your name with post, designation. Can one become a servant regarding the vital forces as his own ? He cannot be during any of the triadic times. I may be forgiven : He whose vital powers belong to him, whose mind is his own is not the servant in the true sense of the term. He who feels himself to be the owner of his skill and ability, what to speak of outer objects and adjunctive qualities, cannot offer genuine service. Then, who is really worthy of being an attendant or a servant ? He who has nothing whatever as his own. What is innate in him to enable him to attend to and serve ? He who has the saintly, empathetic disposition to be awakened to compassion at the sight of the distressed and enkindled to joy at the sight of the happy.

I ask you if someone like me is dependent on any other for offering such a service ? No honest individual can object to offering service on the excuse of being dependent. People opine to offer service when they get wealth. O! Hark ! You already have the wealth of the body at your disposal, but never do you utilize it for the sake of service. Do you know what many fantasized on giving service ? That they would offer service when they become the government in power after climbing the ladder of society. O! Hark! You did not serve the wife at home nor the son after becoming a father nor the brother after becoming a brother. You fantasize to serve your country after rising to peak of power in government ? You will indulge in privileged plethora of perquisites and power and enjoy yourself. Indulgence in pleasures of self and perquisites will entangle you into disease of the body mind and depressive remorse, compunction of bad conscience. You cannot avoid the compulsive pathology of indulgence in excitement through pleasure. My dear friend, you can't even die peacefully! Therefore, brother, if you are dedicated to service as pathway to eternal, unruffled, unbounded life, look at the afflicted beings and let your heart be filled with

compassion. Do you realize what emerges at the palpable fruition of this empathy ? There will remain no trace of inclination to enjoy yourself, to indulge in pleasure in your life. And what does one do when devoid of the inclination to indulge in pleasure ? He does not misuse, abuse, the given faculties and powers and modes of energy. When abuse of the given was discontinued, disposition to enjoy oneself was obliterated so that won't there emerge a workable unity of purpose between two individuals, two classes of society between two countries, between the happy and the unhappy, the strong and the weak by dint of emergence of the power to put to good use the faculties, abilities and circumstances ? If we are honest, we will have to accept an ambience of unity between individual, social and polarities would come out. Will weaponry and ornaments of war be required even after the emergence of unity between existing polarities ? Will courts be required to come out in operation in the perspective of such unity ? Consider it, consider the point serious mindedly.

The society that feels the need of a nation state is not at least a human society. Therefore, brother, it is a blemish on human society that it is ruled over by some power or that we should rule over someone. It will have to be obliterated and every brother or sister can eliminate it with freedom. A speaker affirmed that the idea, ideology or wisdom realized in one's life spreads out everywhere tending to become all pervading. Don't wait for a megalomaniac to come and reconstruct society. Many cherish the delusion that someone unprecedented will come about to work out the wonderful regeneration. But you did not attend to your own unique unprecedance, your own significance. Therefore, brother, every sister, every brother has to accomplish this work as one's own, with interest and inclination to get unflinching arousal to compassion at the sight of the unhappy and to respond with sure joy at the sight of the happy. In case you argue that you have no compassion nor joy in your life you have no right to look at either of them. If you cannot serve the world faithfully you have no right to look at it. Then you may have a verical go a head beyond the sensory and intellectual view of the world. That, too, is sadhana. Manav Seva Sangh does not usurp anyone's freedom.

In case you cannot be awakened to sympathy of compassion viewing the distressed, and pleased to look at the happy, you may have an acceleration down the runway or take off beyond all viewpoints for everlasting home in the unbounded Infinite. What will happen, then ? Then also, there will be no selfish attachment to the given nor proclivity to misuse them. So you may either look at the world or take no notice of it at all; but in case you look at it and come short of awakening into compassion and joy, it measures up to inhumanity. Therefore, every brother, every sister, of every country has to discontinue this inhumanity just now.

Yes, what should be the support, the substratum, the anchorage of this awakening of compassion and joy ? The supporting ground can only be our own philosophy of life, our own viewpoint on life. If the world has an existent truth of its own in your viewpoint, you will do well to be compassionate or happy for the sake of the world, in the name of the world. Because the world-scenario is sensorily, veritably real to you. If your philosophy is spiritualistic, distinct from the materialistic, get inspired into compassion in the name of oneness of the *Atman* or into joy for the sake of the same *Atman*. Then will you surely reach to enlightenment. In case your philosophy is theistic get compassionate or pleased in relation with the Lord. You will experience love of the Lord. What will you get ? Love, you will realize love.

Let it be known to you that love has a distinctive singularity of its own. It may originate from anywhere, from the world, the spirit or god, but it becomes, all-pervading. This is the first, uncommon feature of love and the second remarkable attribute is that one cannot retire from it nor is there any decay, wasting away or withering in it nor is there ever a stage of completion in its accomplishment. Why ? There is retirement from the spell of desire and lust, fulfilment of inquisitive questioning for knowledge and wisdom and realization of love alone. Exempt from completion of entirety, decay, decline or retirement, quintessential love is an epitome of unfathomable, infinite succulence. Quality or flavour of life does not consist in any of its circumstances, objects or individuals. Enjoyment of

flavour emanates from loveableness, loveableness ensure from intimacy of identity of self kinship which inheres in avowal of reverent faith. So that there is nothing objectionable in your belief in the world, there is no objection to your faith in your own self, there is no objection to your faith in the Lord, you will receive and realize the love of the being in which you reposed your faith. But when will you receive that love ? When every kinesis of desire, or outward movement of will and energy-not of any single inclination of the mind-happens regardless of relationship with the Being in whom your faith is placed. When it is regardfully directed to him, for his sake alone, not in any hope for one's own sake. Why ? Had there been anything superior to love? I would have been the first man to ask you to do anything in the hope for something other than love.

So we are now aware that the succulence attainable in the quintessence of love divine exists nowhere else. We are also aware that the entelechy of love is not realizable by asking for anything whatever in lies of doing something nor is one freed of attachment to doing. In case attachment to doing continues, the body that is born is required for doing anything whatever; grown, acquired abilities, objects and individuals are to be called far. Therefore so long as attachment to doing is insistent, subjection to object state circumstances remains, and so long as it is so, there is no awareness of one's own value, own importance. There is total extirpation in the state of oblivion of one's own importace, unawareness of one's own significance. Therefore, brother ! There is dire need for us today to become and grow aware of the importance of human life, and circumstances to good use. Let not anyone misinterpret it to mean that I want a saddening situation. But let me submit to you that if we and you can't welcome the given situation, cannot respectfully put it to right use, cannot withdraw our awareness of life from it, cannot shun brooding on unattained object, then take it in the true sense of the term, there will neither be material development, nor emancipation, nor attainment of divine love. And if you and we can welcome with reverence the available circumstances, renouncing our sense of life, in it, ceasing to abuse it, then take it

to be true that the same situation, which you dislike, can blend you into oneness with quintessence of love, can provide you everlasting rest and can lend you spiritual freedom.

Therefore, brother, two matters of useful guidance emerge in this regard—don't disregard yourself unfortunate and don't cherish the vanity of being fortunate either. You and we are human beings, we are one in this regard, we are one despite difference in circumstances and condition in states of becoming and being. Once we accept this fact, the labour will have the same self-esteem as the mill-owner a peon will have the same self-respect as the President. I affirm to the extent that the patient will have the same self-esteem as the doctor because the latter cannot survive without the patient. It is likely the disease may get well in the process of natural law but it is always possible that the doctor might die hungry without the patient. Therefore all of us are bestowed with auspicious circumstances, indomitable and spiritual but no situation as such is life. This sums up the matter. This is called spiritualism. No situation itself is life, no object, no individual is life. Offer your services to the individual, make the best use of the object. Don't place in it the belief as if it were life itself. Your own inner significance as human entity will be manifest as a result of service to the individual and putting available objects to right use. With emergence of your unique importance as human entity your usefulness to the world, to the Lord of the world and to your own inner being will be proved, authenticated. For this transformation you have to be crystallized in the viewpoint that as a human entity you are always entitled to be useful to the world, but the world has not to be useful to you. Your life is useful to the world. Your life is useful to yourself, your own being. You ought to develop unflinching, reverent faith in the above mentioned guidelines and let them be rooted in peace for a while before sleep and after waking. When you become still and peaceful the impressions and impact of what you have done already will make the mind upset with overturning agitation. This should not cause fluster and perturbation. And if it happens or persists, it should be viewed as excrement which is discharged as viewed with detachment. Don't get stirred into panic, nor be identified with it nor co operate nor oppose it. That suppressed impact, influence, will come out to break down and disapper.

You will then attain the supreme Beloved, everlasting, unbounded life and realize the peak of fulfilment in divine love, perennial rest and impaccable freedom of the spirit. It is an indisputable truth. I have not pointed out to you any idea of a guideline which is not your own nor any light on the path which you cannot assimiate and adopt. Therefore, brother, awaken to awareness and value of life, welcome the circumstances regardfully. This will do-the raft, the floating boat, of your life will cross the ocean of existence.

'Hari Om !'

Discourse-5

25 December, 1959,

Morning.

My own Self-identity of the present exalted, magnanimous, eminence as well as Brothers and Sisters !

There is an aversion to rest, a shying away from stillness, and an amnesiac oblivion of it, whereas it is neither farflung, inaccessible, nor is there any wise no unattainableness of it. Labour follows from volitional will which originates in one's own individuality. So long as the *Sadhaka* beautifies, embellishes, or manoeuvres to maintain his individuality in a specific model of his choice, he remains turned away from the tranquility of rest. Some of us opine that the mind absolutely free of alternatives in a situation is a still mind in rest. Proceeding or evolving to a higher stage some others think that rest, repose or composure inheres within equanimity. Proceeding further some *sadhakas* opine that rest exists in non-attachment. For some advancing onward still, or climbing upwards futher, rest, repose, calm stillness is enshrined in surrender to the Supreme Being. Absolute freedom of the mind from alternatives, equanimity to opposed polarities, non-attachment to objects, beings and surrender of ego to the Lord these appear as four noticeable pillars of rest to us.

These are the four gateways of entrance into the kingdom of rest; therefore these are regarded respectfully and worthy of adherence. But let us not linger over the entrance deluded that we are already at one with repose of rest. Nor is it appropriate to postpone the pilgrimage to empire of peace under the misconception that rest would not come out unless the mind is emancipated from overwhelming alternatives, nor unless intelligence is equanimous beyond opposed inconsistencies of life, nor unless one is detached nor pulled off alone beyond the three bodies nor that there would be no rest without surrender to the Supreme Being. Let us not get clogged up by such inhibiting barriers. why ? Because these entry gates to the peace of rest are individual, separate, designed for use by a single person. Individual, distinct *sadhana*, even though bringing about individual accomplishment cannot be generalised into collective *sadhana*. But it appears honestly to every successful *sadhaka*

through any of the entry gates that the door that brought him success was a collective one meant for all. Therefore those who assert that rest cannot be attained without absolute release of the mind from alternatives, or without equanimity under polar opposites in life or without non-attachment or without surrender to the Lord are not in the wrong when they say it; they speak with utter honesty and speak the right because they have realized rest and peace. But the *Sadhaka* will have to look for himself the easiest door to him, the most innate and natural to him. If it is there, it will be a nice choice of the door to rest, leading to the kingdom of peace. Let us imagine the case of an individual *sadhaka* unworthy like me for whom all the four entry gates have become impossible to get into, what should he do? He should first consider what he wants for himself! What he hopes from the world and what can he do to himself on his own! There are only three alternatives, isn't it? You will either have to derive something from the world or you have to take something from the Lord or you will say you have to do this to yourself. I will do this to myself, this will offer something to me, the world will give something to me, I will have something from the Lord. So long as these hopes and desires endure in life, there remains no rest available to the *sadhaka*. Why? The world has already given us unasked that which is benevolent to us. So that hope for getting something again from the world amounts to doubting its honesty and making a deep chasm between us and the world. Therefore, we should never think of what we will get from the world. Let us look at this issue in the perspective of a more practical life. The family with which you reside, those with whom you live, thinking you will get something you like from them we will get some likeable from the son, we will get this from wife, we will receive this from the neighbour cherishing such day dreams itself is turning ourselves away from rest. Then what should we think of or about? Let us think of persons and about what items to be given to whom from among those already given to us, and the modes of giving these back. The focus of thought should be on the idea of giving away, giving back, distributing the given. We don't have to think now of getting hold of, gaining anyway, because you did not experience fulfilment nor satisfaction through the given. Had you been satisfied fulfilled, with the given asking for something earnestly and humbly, begging for anything, would have stopped. And

now that it did not lead to cessation of begging, we should be all for absolute cessation of importunities.

This alone is the gist of our inadvertent omission. We produced children, we were not satisfied with them, nevertheless we don't give up hope from them. We married; there was no satisfaction with the wife, nevertheless we don't renounce demand for a woman. We entered to pierce the society, offered services and whatever we were given in lieu of it was not satisfactory, nevertheless we did not stop to go begging. It is our own negligence, it is our own inadvertent omission that the given in place of the services did not satisfy us, nevertheless we did not stop to solicit. We shall remain exhausted with hard labour, so long as we don't stop begging things and privileges. We may either be tired by the toil of meditation or contemplation or involvement in activity. Maintenance of activity, thinking and stability involves and entails labour. The temptation that the on going activity, thought and steadiness should remain safe guarded in life-that temptation itself is the origin of labour. Both you and we are aware that activity shall not always remain safeguarded. There will be a time when the faculty of speech won't work. So that can't we renounce the attachment to speaking after speaking the right prior to that predestined time. There will be a time when these ears won't be able to hear. So that can't we hear the right before the predestined time and get devoid of attachment to hearing. Likewise we shall not be able to do the work we are doing today, at a time to come. That time is bound to come about. Then shall we be compelled to think of what we should do? Instead of thinking out late then; we should develop unflinching faith; before that critical time, in the spiritual dispensation that life in its unbounded essence exists even in non-hearing, non-seeing, non-thinking! But can one get at non-seeing through seeing the wrong? No, never at the three times at all. One can get at non-seeing only through right seeing. This is called dutifulness.

Dutifulness makes one devoid of attachment to doing, swallows up the doer, and builds up a beautiful society. Dutifulness eliminates infatuation of individuality in the doer and it does not harm the society at all. If it appears to us today that peace will not be established so long as people do not believe in our ism or our religion. I have to say in this connection that the ism or religion may well be true but we are subjected to

deceit. That ism of ours is far away from us and that religion of ours is not translated in our life. If it seems that all people will get all things from our religion and that no freedom, no liberation will be obtained so long as all don't recite 'La Ilah Illillah'. It is a right commandment but that 'La Ilah Illillah' we could not recite ourselves is a continuous, unbroken truth. If we affirm that there will be no deliverance so long as we are not surrendered to God. This is true, but friend, we have not surrendered to the Supreme Being. If we assert that there will be no spiritual freedom so long as we are not detached from the three bodies. The guideline is immaculate and true, but we have not accomplished detachment from the three bodies. From this point of view every *Sadhana* is perfect in itself, I have no white of doubt in this regard. But the *Sadhana* is perfect, nevertheless, the vanity of *Sadhana* is absolutely incongruous, immature, imperfect.

Life of the *Sadhaka* is enshrined in the intensity of his love for *Sadhana*; life for the *Sadhaka* consists of his sense of importance of *sadhana*. But vanity of *Sadhana*, attachment to it and indulgence in joy issuing from it measures up to horrible negation of *Sadhana*. Therefore, whatever you know or repose your faith in, from the guru or *Shastras* or your own sense of discrimination, your lifestyle should become compatible with it without any vanity or arrogance in that regard. Not only that we have to follow our own belief or wisdom while according respect to the validity of others' beliefs and mode of following, then only can our ism or religion become worthy of respect. In common parlance these days people call scriptural, bookish knowledge, which is faith, as wisdom of the inner being. In common parlance, again, the commanding guideline of the *Guru*, which works through faith summoned by the disciple, is called knowledge. I have no objection to such a situation where a certain *Sadhaka* regards faith as knowledge because each is a given of spiritual accomplishment. But I am of the view that wisdom and faith are two distinct, independent pathways to enlightenment. But whether heard from the *Guru*, or whether read from the book, or whether illumined by the sense of one's own discrimination, that should be one's intimate and identical with life. There should be no difference between the two. There is no need of proof for that. There should neither be opposition to dismay nor should there be any enhancement to the effect of

embellishment, because truth is one. Truth is no one's heritage, no one's inheritance. The individual item is one's faith, one's *shraddha*, which is one's own, and in the form of one's *sadhana* that knowledge of yours, that faith of yours, should be so natural to you, should be so easy to you, so much on your own, that you may not have to think of it, that you may not have to labour under it at all, that you may not have to look at it at all. So that you may not be able to localize that your knowledge is your own knowledge, and it is in you, it has become so easy, so natural to you. Then alone your *sadhana* can give you rest.

Manav Seva Sangh pointed out a subtle, beautiful idea, that *sadhaka* and *sadhana* do not belong to two classes, they are not isolated. The same *sadhaka*, in his quintessential spirit becomes pure, immaculate like a gem. But it is traced only when there is no known *Asadhan* in the *Sadhaka*. When does one's own known *Asadhan* does not remain? When we break free from the known blunders of life, they cease to remain so. This *Asadhan* becoming like blunder, this has grown, proliferated, because of attachment to the untrue. There is no other reason for its growth and proliferation. I am not ready to agree that even if you place your individual arguments on the level of logic, your own view point is imposed upon with greed and fear on the others. For example, once I regarded it feasible that in the steady intellect there wakes up a knowledge of *Shruti Shri Bhagwati* that is to say, a knowledge of the manifestation of the *vedas*, on the basis of inspiration of the *Sadguru*. There is no need of any special, esoteric language in this regard. Some gentlemen of eminence said at this that those illiterate in the *Vedas* condemn them in their discourses. Well, can anyone without the study of the *Vedas* acquire the knowledge of it. I have no objection to why the gentleman of eminence should regard it individually as such. But I am no supporter of the idea that the ever-effulgent wisdom of the Infinite is confined to any book and any specific language. When all human beings have the same aspiration and even two persons don't have identical abilities, to say that all will realize the reality with the same viewpoint, in the same perspective, is opposed to the sense of discrimination.

If some gentleman of eminence puts forward a viewpoint regarding the origin of creation in the light of his faith, I have no objection to it in this regard. But by self-abnegation of known untruth there will be no generic and genetic elimination of

karmic impressions, and there will not be oneness of *Sadhaka Sadhan Jattwa*, that is to say, there will not be demolition of *Asadhan* and expression of *Sadhana* is not acceptable to me in any way. That the *Sadhaka* is dependent upon anyone for *Sadhana* is not beneficial to any *Sadhaka*.

Let us imagine how the process of recreation starts again after the phenomenon of dissolution. Different kinds of answers may be given according to differences in one's viewpoints or way of thinking. But to keep a bias of his own in this regard may well be an individual opinion but it is not an even handed solution. If someone who answers the question affirms that the residual karmic impressions of *jivas* are responsible for repetition of creation. If question is asked again about what karmic impressions were responsible for *jiva's karmas* when initially there were no *karmas* at all. Consider the point ; are the creator and the *jiva* different from creation ? In case, they are different, where did he exist, what did he do, when, however, these three are non-different, by what logic do the *karma* of *jiva* are proved. No one could give an undebatable answer to this question; because the question of creation, *jiva* and his *karma* arises only after creation comes into being. Maintaining the existence of creation, all answers given regarding its cause, are provable by faith, not by logic.

The creation that appears to give you angst, anguish, exists neither from theistic point of view, nor from the spiritualist's point of view and not, truly speaking, even from the point of view of the materialist. The creation appearing to give misery and stress is of one's own making born of attachment to the untrue. from the materialist's point of view the creation is a developed, the widest or the most evolved form of cosmic manifestation of the individual being and the same creation, from the theistic point of view, is a unique *lila* of the Infinite. That is to say, creation is a space of activity, of doing, or by renouncing one's right and safeguarding other's privileges, there is an expression of rest and peace in the individual; because renouncing one's right and protecting other's privilege may become a cause of bringing up unattachment in him. Freedom from attachment ensures freedom of relief from misery which brings about the peace and calm of rest. Thus, the materialist viewpoint brings about peace and stillness. To spiritualist's viewpoint is perceived the many as transcendent to the likeness

of a self-effulgent reality; it gleams and glitters so in the form of creation. Thus, there is a continuous, uninterrupted, unbroken juiciness, of succulence, out of the many into oneness. The theistic *Sadhaka* visualizing the creation in his quintessence envisages it in his unequalled *lila*, dotes, fondles and caresses Him, becoming His lover and beloved. From this point of view, the creation that is not made out on one's own, is bound to be juicy or succulent.

The juicy flavour of the *ras* that is calm and still is incombustible and immortal; continuous, unbroken, uninterrupted '*ras*' is incombustible and immortal; and never-ending, infinite '*ras*' is also non-flammable and immortal. Now, in the capacity of being just a *Sadhaka*, not in the capacity of a *jiva*, nor in the capacity of a human body, nor in the capacity of *Brahman*, just in the capacity of the *sadhaka* do we visualize our need, we feel clearly we cannot live without soft juiciness, succulence, without '*ras*'. Presently, however, the emancipation from misery is so important that it seems it can satisfy your hunger for it. There is nothing to worry about. Let it be gained for the time being. But when the emancipation from miseries will be gained, you will get stupefied and hesitate, and become restless for the gain of spiritual freedom. As soon as you gain spiritual freedom you will become restless. It is not that with the gain of love for God, there is any demolition in love for spiritual freedom, it is not so at all. Similarly, there is no demolition of spiritual freedom in the '*ras*' of calm stillness, that is not so at all. The '*ras*' of calm stillness, of spiritual freedom, as well as of Divine Love the three '*rasas*' are one-in-three and three-in-one. You may look for yourself, when there is meeting of the Lover beloved, isn't there rest at first. But the next moment : "O beloved! Would you go away ?" Doesn't it give the stress of restlessness ? Doesn't pang of separation merge in the oneness of meeting ? This is from the point of view of one's angle of hunger. If emancipation from misery gives you satisfaction, don't bother for your '*ras*' being of a very low kind! And neither cherish the vanity that all are foolish and you know much more than others.

There is no room in life for the forlorn and the vain. There is no room in life for the unsuccessful and the worthless. There is no room for those admitting no hope in life. Ever new hope, ever-new ardour, ever-new longing, ever-new love, ever-new life

is life in the true sense of the term and that is your life. So that the rest we are talking about, that rest is the blessedness, the rapture of *yoga*. The spirituality we are talking about, the delight of the being we are discussing, that self-bliss of the being which is the glory of rest, of *vishram*, is also its majesty, its dignity. You will see that if there is no *yoga* with *karma*, is it then *karma* at all? If there is no *gyan* with *yoga*, is it then *gyan* at all? If there is no *Bhakti* with *yoga*, is it then *Bhakti* at all? *Yoga* is the Earth, and Brother, and whatever is on the Earth, and whatever non-flammable immortal is a tree on the ground, call it *gyan* and there is a fruit on it, with no husk, neither *Guthali* nor *Guda*, there is only 'ras', only succulence, and that is only Love. The Earth cannot be divided from the tree. We can express the matter in a different form also. We can describe dutifulness as the earthly ground; whereas *yoga* is the tree; the quintessence of the tree is the fruit of wisdom; or wisdom is the fruit of the tree, and the 'ras' is Love itself.

What is the beautiful form of dutifulness? We have nothing whatever, whenever, to do anything in any circumstances for ourselves. He who has nothing whatever to do for himself, every outgoing of his energy is *Dharma*, duty and *karm yoga*, because he has nothing to do for himself. What shall we have to do, when we have to do something for ourselves? When notice is taken of the miserable, there will have to be service without entertaining vanity of it. We know how people get beneficent these days; how do they manage to be benevolent? People bring in first the vanity of nobleness in them opining there might be loss of aristocracy in them. Don't beg apology, don't do anything for protection against bad name. You have no pang of pain at the sight of the hungry. you go in for nice breakfast just for fame. This is for one's own sake. When your heart gets restless at the sight of the hungry, adopting whom your food appeared to be his, which appeared as rather his; then will dutifulness be proved. There is no sin more heinous than the giving of an object regarding, or contemplating, it as one's own. It is no service, it is lustful carnality. It does not let you rise beyond the libido.

When will service get going, sir? When does duty commence? When you have nothing to possess as your own. Speech delivered with your own libidinous instinct is sensuous,

passionate or carnal; where as speech delivered in the language of the audience is religions. There is no sense in me of my own belongingness to language, this is spirituality. Speech belongs to god, it is worship of God. There is nothing in me, brother, that really belongs to me. I have therefore, nothing to do for my own sake. So long as you do not accept this, duty will not blend with rest. Let us consider the point with utter seriousness. Can you get detached from the mind with the strength of intelligence ? Sir, can you get unattached or non-attached from intelligence ? You cannot be can intelligence help in getting unattached ? It cannot help : When you enter the kingdom of rest the first step, that is the time you get unattached from the causal body. Let the gross and subtle bodies go away. The equanimity of mind attained in the unattached state is the first unbroken *Samadhi*. The *samta*, of equality of intelligence, attained by virtue of mind without alternatives, is just a shadow of *Samadhi*, not *Samadhi* in the true sense of the term. For example, there remaining no file of a suit, the Megistrate ordered the court to be closed. But hasn't he to come again tomorrow ? Did the court close when he has to come again tomorrow ? It is only for some time. Likewise the equality of the mind without the alternatives is the temporary break in the Megistrals schedule, it is like the contemplatives reflection or rumination. Whereas the unbroken equanimity of the mind and heart after getting lost into the ecstasy of rapture is outstanding. This is not by rejection, cancellation but by getting lost in radiant ecstasy.

From this point of view, there is all round development in rest, this is truth beyond all debates. We have a genuine belongingness to it, we have not gone away from it, we have a certain aversion to rest, a shying away from it, an amnesiac oblivion of it. And that remembrance, that aid-memoire, which prompts love, awareness, and attainment and then is it reminiscent or evocative of rest. If reason is not so, it is mere fondness or attachment. If remembrance is no cause to the awakening of awareness, if remembrance is no cause to love, it is no reminiscence. That remembrance is not done deliberately, it awakes on its own, in the kingdom of rest. Rest is life for all of us in this way, there is no doubt in it. Rest is the ground of all *sadhana*; it is also the fruit of all *sadhana*, there is also no doubt in it. Therefore, we have to decide if the outgoing of our energy is

meant for us. Definitely not. It is not meant for us. If the withdrawal of our energy is meant for us. Definitely not withdrawal of our energy is also not meant for us. Withdrawal of energy is the bed of the Beloved and outgoing energy is offering for *Lila* of the Beloved. From this point of view neither outgoing nor inward energy is meant for us. This is the form of real meditation.

‘Hari om!’

Discourse-6

25 December, 1959,

Evening.

My own Self-identity of the present exalted, magnanimous, eminence as well as Brothers and Sisters !

If the stuff of consciousness becomes still, gathered up, without basis to stand upon, and the view point focalized without focus, every *Sadhaka* would regard the idea with love. There is no doubt about it. But the *Sadhaka* is afraid of adopting measures to attain them. Consider yourself on your own, can there be any *karma* or contemplation on it which might become unbroken or continuous ? Can we turn it into any permanent basis of continuity ? And that which cannot be turned into a basis for unbroken continuity, isn't non-cooperation (not support, opposition or identification with it) compulsory ? Any activity which is double is that of which the doing is compulsory. But when the activity ends, the doer instead of becoming someone's love, gets entangled in its consequences or enjoys the pride of its delight. These are two items, which don't exist before us today, nevertheless we chew the cud of it.

I found it out when I heard some sadhus speak of going here, going there, speaking out they had been to *Gangottari* on many occasions. Nostalgia for having been to *Gangottari* was not disposable, it proved to be parapsychic nostalgia. It did not allow me to be singled out of the spectacular scenery. Or the worthy work I did for the brother like a brother or for the friend like a friend, or like an individual to a society, excuse me a bit, and think seriously, or like jiva to Lord God, indulged in the pleasure of its vanity. For example, if someone says, "I have accepted self-surrender to the Lord." O Brother! If you have accepted it already, why do you sustain your ego with it ? Self-surrender is meant to dissolve your ego in it. But the *Sadhaka* wants to enliven his ego on the basis of sustaining it and hopes that the Lord himself should say that you have surrendered to me and the society should say, "He is a greatly surrendered devotee."

This is the condition of our faith in the existence of God. We neither abnegate being proud of doing what should be done nor do we remain unattached to the result of what is double. The consequence is that the duty gets out, the fruit also gets out and the cloer becomes forlorn. To safeguard you against the anguish

of the unfit to be performed it has been submitted to you take care not to do the unfit and the improper. Proper discharge of duty happens on one's own. Indulging pride for doing the right distorts the righteous discharge of duty into the unrighteous one. Materials and devices for doing proper duty are given to man, these are not personal. The effort of the *Sadhaka* should consist in rejecting and renouncing its misuse. To return the given object to someone and put its obligation on him that have given you the object is it honesty of intention ? The material for accomplishment of duty is not personal. It is the heritage of those for whom the duty is discharged. and those for whom the duty is offered, they too are not wholly only of some one in particular.

Consider the matter a little, Brother ! Those with whom there is question of duty, in case you regard them as belonging only to you, you are deceiving yourself: She who is your wife is also someone's sister, she is also someone's mother, she is also someone else's daughter. Her relationship is placed in different ways in many names. No thinker, no social scientist can prove that any object or individual belongs to any one in particular. It is therefore no honesty to impose cent-per-cent right on any object pertaining to an assembly of people. Therefore, brother, love your wife honestly, not in lieu of a valued quality. Even the prostitute receives love in lieu of valued qualities and beauty, from the libidinous and the lustful, not from the husband. If you are the husband, give her love as you are related maritally to her whether the wife be beautiful or ugly, whether epitome of good behaviour or centre of unrighteous doings. In case you are unable to do so become a divorced person altogether for all time to come. This is going alone in life, remaining unattached to persons, free of me-mine and egoism. Take it as truism that love of wife will give joy only to those of harsh temper and ugly features and he alone will be free of egoism and me-mine. Beautiful, epitome of service, emotive if the wife is, it will not yield the juice of love of the wife, it will instead yield the enjoyment of the pleasures of the wife. It will promote instead the vanity of being a husband and be supportive of egoism and the feeling of me-mine. This means that we should live alone, without friend and fellow-beings, this means that we should have faith in duty and should not expect joy from others. Under which condition, our loving Lord, or the law of nature, or legislation of society has given us the role, or the norm, which,

indeed, is the acceptable principle meaning that contains hope of joy as its sense? Every norm upholds duty alone as the epitome of meaning. Is there any mention of discharge of duty as bringer of happiness from the wife to the husband? You have never seen it that way. Nor have you seen it written anywhere that the husband should be deriving pleasure from the wife. Wherever it is written it is the wife's duty to respect the husband, serve him and the husband's concern is to respect the wife, love and serve her. This is the law of life in regard of every relation. You read all literature of life. There is no mention in any literature of the idea that an ideal being is one who expects happiness from others. I talk of literature on life. Nowhere is it accepted that now that you have become a husband, you ought to get a beautiful wife. Nowhere is it written that now that you have become a wife, you should get a husband who earns a lot of money, handsome and capable husband. If you are a father like *Ram's*, you ought to get a son like *Ram*. *Kans* too was the son of someone. Favourable companions may be desirable, they cannot be legislated. There is no scope of me-mine, selfishness, and temptation for pleasure or even for the fragrance it, you go on singing the hymn of duty. The meaning of what I told you was that eschewal of freedom from fear born of the sense of me-mine, is effectuated by adopting those individuals with love. Then look out if the sense of me-mine remains or goes out, And you are burdened with sense of me-mine because you have not learnt the art of giving and so long as you have not learnt this art you cannot demolish it. And another matter is that who are your friends and objects during deep sleep? Life exists even in deep sleep, *Samadhi* and non-attachment, but we don't except objects and companions during such periods. If out going energy is juicy during duty, isn't there a juiciness in the states of equality and spiritual freedom? Both the states of in going and out going energy are spaces of *Sadhana* and nothing else.

That indeed is not out going energy which has bound us with egoistic possessiveness, out going energy is that which offers us compassion on looking at the miserable and offers happiness on looking at the joyous. In going energy is not the one, sir, in which you are seated, as if in a certain cavern in the *Himalayas*, with your vital energy under suspensory holding. When the view gets stable without scenery and the stuff of consciousness still without basis, then the *pranas* too become

equal without holding. Thus the *pranas* becoming equalized without holding them, and the view getting stable without scenery and *chitta* without base, that inward equanimity is the bed for the Beloved. That bed will have to be spread out to the Beloved and then the ego will have to be melted away, and will have to remain undifferentiated with Love. And then the Beloved would grow and evolve and that Beloved would come as lover in an outstanding intimacy of soul. He will sing the hymn of your glory, He will adopt you and a veritable, immeasurable, infinite, evernew fountain of ecstasy will gush out of its juiciness. Therefore, brother, it is that you are love in the inwardness of energy and service in the outwardness of energy. And therefore, has it been said that if you have to tread, to walk on the righteous path to life, to arouse your humanity, decide it beforehand that our objects and appliances are not ours, nor for our sake. This is the meaning of being without objects and appliances. Our fellow-beings take their own objects, language from us and say that you have given these to us. Thing a bit. You take your own object and say that 'You have shown and tell me that you have pointed out a very beautiful matter to me? We know already that the lecture belongs to the audience in all respects, nothing of it belongs to the speaker, then in that case if the speaker shows the vanity of delivering the lecture and obliged the audience, can there be any dishonesty superior to that? Is it service in the least if those served are pressed and burdened by this load of lecturing?

The essential nature of service is such that even the least of its burden is not to be transferred to those that are served. Then are we, from this point of view, friendly to those who are likeable persons? Do we utilize the given objects with this feeling? If you don't do so, you have no right to be trustee of those objects and to call someone a likeable friend. Therefore, brother, it is a path for the miserable. It is renunciation not to keep objects or materials at one's disposal. It is *Sadhana* for the unhappy. It is no *Sadhana* for the happy I wan't regard anyone as friendly and likeable. Why? Because I have no power to give love. I have no ability to offer service. I have no power to give up the sense of me-mine.

Therefore, I will live without friends and materials. Why? I could not serve the likeables, I could not make the right use of objects and materials. Don't think that I regard certain

circumstances as special requirement for the vision of a life that is real. I don't opine that truth will be available in a *Himalayan* cavern and the vision of it cannot be had in the market at *Patna*. I don't think that truth will be attained by some unattained ability and that it will not be available with attained ability. I don't think it will not be available in the present, it will be obtained in future. He who is always yours, and yourself always His, He will be realizable wherever you are.

Don't get upset about it. When will He meet ? Well, brother! Will two persons ever meet before the third ? Is there a union of the two before the third person ? What is the meaning of meeting, of union ? Of the two becoming one. And what is the meaning of love ? It means the one becoming two. If the one does not become two, it is not love. If the two does not become one, it is no wisdom, no knowledge. O hark ! Do you meet without knowing ? What is knowledge ? It is the first gate of meet, of union or blending. Therefore, brother, the covering, the protection of materials, the delusion of me-mine and pride of egoism will have to be given up. But the companions will not be eliminated, or given up in their identity, the materials and appliances will not have to be thrown away, these will not be misused or abused; and above all, these will not have to be regarded as one's own. A theft was committed in the Ashram. A brother wrote that a loss of almost ₹ 700/- was suffered. I wrote that in case you detect some lapse in carefulness; it is needful to be sorry for it. But no theft has really been committed; whoever had given the money has taken it without asking. Why are you upset about it ? You will be surprised to learn that exactly almost ₹ 750/- was recovered at a moment's notice. I wrote them a letter again saying, "Look! he took the money without asking it, and returned it forthwith even without asking for it."

The meaning of what I have to say is not to be afraid of what you are unable to do on this pathway to life. Don't be afraid that you will not be able to live without contemplation and meditation. The doable, that which is worthy of doing, will be done on its own; contemplation and meditation will happen spontaneously, on their own. But then, how can you remain smugly self-satisfied in complacency with mere meditation whose only love you have to become ! Consider ! You are self satisfied with love thinking on the being whose sole love you have to become ! To become satisfied merely with the cleaning

of the room of one whose sole Love one has to remain. What is duty? Cleaning the room to provide sitting accomodation for the Beloved. What is thinking on the Lord God? It is awaiting, looking out for God. What is meditation? It is the density of above-mentioned biding one's time for Him. That is to say, we should not retain only the temptation to enjoy just the pleasure of remembrance born of God on these bases alone! It is a blot in the name of love of God. Whatever the intensity or depth of our anguish, but as it is the awaited juiciness of the Supreme Love, our thinking on God should not diminish into mere feeding, doable duties should not degenerate into just catering and *Samadhi* should not break down to mouldering. Spiritual freedom should not become just eating, rest or stillness should not be just a provision. Then in that case shall we become undifferentiated from the quintessence of Love. Do you know what quintessence of Love is? It is the axial nature, the real core of the Divine Being. The lover has not even a quantum bit of love in his computer. I had heard people say in our childhood: "Supreme love is awakened in the pit of the heart of the beloved and is voiced from there." That is to say, Love awakes in the abode of the Beloved.

Love awakes and thrives onward in the Beloved. They have given the example that when the lamp or candle gets luminous the moth gets burnt. Therefore, brother, we shall become indistinguishable from the love of the self-same infinite. Therefore, that which is the nature of Infinite is the life of the lover of God. It has been called *Sadhan Tattwa* in the literature of *Manav Seva Sangh* and the different kinds of *Sadhanas* are called *Sadhana*. Where the whole commingle into oneness, the contentment of spiritual freedom blend with and dissolve into oneness with the essence of Divine Love.

The light of equanimity should continue to stay with us; it should continue in the same place or condition; not depart or change. That is to say, no unfulfilled desire is sorrow of life nor fulfilment of desire is joy of life. Neither inwardness of rest is life nor spiritual freedom born of unattachment is life. Where is life, then? It inheres in the manifestation of Supreme Love. But two things in this regard—rest and freedom—are immeasurable and immortal. Our Supreme beloved has kept these two immune and invulnerable, safe and as gifts for you. He thinks that if our darling is satisfied with release from suffering, I am delighted. If

he is happy and contented with rest and comfort, with *yoganand*, God himself will be delighted with it. If he is contented with self bliss, God is delighted with it. At that time the question arises that the god who granted you, through his inimitable magnanimity, Self-bliss and bliss of *yoga*, what, indeed, did you do for His sake ? At that time the question is to let self-bliss remain on its own, but I have not to convert it into provisions of nourishment; let *yoganand* remain on its own, but I will not get contented in its complacency. Then does the Lord grant us his own quintessential nature, which is Love, to us and that, I opine, is our genuine life.

'Hari om !'

Discourse-7

26 December, 1959,

Morning.

My own Self-identity of the present exalted, magnanimous, eminence as well as Brothers and Sisters !

Pluralistic faith, numberless relations, and variety of thoughts, opinions are probably visible in the life of the individual. Had there been no mode of thought of any kind whatever, no relation with anyone whoever, then there would not have probably been any question of recollectedness in the space of pristine memory ? This question of awakening of recollectedness has come up when there are numberless thoughts and emotions, even without our wanting them. Sometimes we enjoy ourselves in them and sometimes we are trepidant about them. This proves that all our spiritual cravings and aspirations, needs or demands, had their recollectedness been in animation, all our thoughts would have been erased, attachment to relations would have disappeared, and all our umpteen faiths and beliefs melted down unfrozen. Let us find what happens when recollectedness is unawakened ? When emptied of doing anything whatever, your thoughts remain stirred whether you want them or not. Thoughts, emotions have sedimented in the field where experiences of enjoying pleasure or suffering pain have made their dent whereas it should have been the space for the recollectedness of pristine, unspoilt, spotless memory. Now it happens even without your wanting it because they are on way to getting obliterated forever and recollectedness should arise in the immaculate space. What do you do instead ? Arrogantly you assume you are very intelligent; you either oppose the stirred thoughts, feelings and emotions, support or identify with them. With what ? With thoughts, which happen on their own even without your wanting it. Your thoughts hinge on some born object, individual or you have vision or visualization of space-time. We cannot affirm that we don't have thoughts nor thinking in our life. Thinking indeed there is, but whose thinking it is ? Which existed already in the past, which no longer obtains, that which might occur again.

No matter or thought which is not yours, nor pertain to you, is stated in the philosophy of *Sharananand*. What are the thoughts which happen to you without your wanting them ?

These are those that happened earlier, but don't exist now; or they are those that don't exist now, but will happen in future. Does any brother or sister register any doubt in the matter ? There is no doubt regarding the matter. Therefore, brother, it is thinking on 'not', on 'nihility', on 'non-existence' or 'nothingness'.

First think of this. Do you want safe-guarding against, immunity from, non-existence of 'not', if so, you will have to raise or nourish faith in the positiveness of 'Is'. What will be the way out of thinking on the nothingness of 'not' ? It will be faith in the 'isness' of existence. What will follow from faith in the 'isness' of existence ? Faith in existence gives rise to reverence for life, veneration for it. Faith in the 'isness' of existence generates and offers trust in life. Trust in or reliance on life awakens self-alliance, belongingness to self. Thus faith in existence, reverence for life, trust and firm reliance on life, self-alliance, belongingness to self, this sums up all that we have to do, after which no question remains to be done. My own experience in this regard, and there is nothing objectionable if I affirm it to you, is that the *Sadhaka* who has gained intimate kinship to self or at least has accepted his cognateness to It, has yet to do more additionally is *Sadhana*, is something that I don't believe. So that we have to see to it where our self-alliance or self-interest gets its incentive or inducement, awakening or encouragement. Is it towards 'nihility' of 'non-existence' or faith in the 'isness' of life, or 'existence' ? If there remains attachment to the past and future, as me-mine, it will proliferate or multiply into many a greed, lust and fear looming into shapes of perversity. What is the difference between attachment to 'me-mine' and cognateness of relation to the self, to what may be called self-alliance ? Attachment to me-mine, or selfishness is meant for egocentric pleasure and happens with many, it does not happen with anyone in particular. The vanity of the body or bodies originates in the body and that happens with object and individual etc. that are born. Sense of me-mine, of egoism, initiates attachment originating proliferation of greed, delusion and many perversities. And it binds us to servitude of attraction for meeting the object of pleasure and fear from the object of suffering. On the other hand, cognate, intimate kinship of everlasting relationship happens only with the sequence of faith, reverence and trust in the Being of our Beloved Lord and that

awakens immeasurable, boundless, ever-new endearment of ecstatic love.

So that, brother, the subject matter to be thought out is merely this; whether there is in your life thought born of self-centred, egoistic me-mine or if there is endearment of love born of intimacy with the being who is all love. We think of him who manages to live without us, who lived earlier and exists no more, who is no more and will come up again. Let us think out. Issues emerging from the past are thought about, circumstances from the past are thought about, object unavailable or circumstances unavailable are thought about. Thoughts get centred round 'not', 'nihility' or 'non-existence', that is to say, that which has no independent existence of its own. You use available object, individual; you make use of whether in the form of the object or the individual you are making use of the available object, the available individual. But your thought gets centred round the unavailable. Think out clearly, whether working, active relation exists with available object individual etc. or with unavailable ones. Would you think of non-existent object individual or instead of doing that utilize the obtaining object and serve the existing individual? Righteous use of available objects and service to the existent individuals is no hindrance in the awakening of meaningful thought nor does it give rise to futile thinking. The origin of futile thoughts is contained in the tendency to indulge in pleasure through objects and individuals. So long as this tendency or disposition persists, futile thought would persist even if you don't want it, and if futile thought continues, forced meaningful thinking is not really effectual in the present. For this reason, meaningful thought arises in truth only after the demolition of futile thought, which is realizable only through alliance with the Being, through belongingness to the self, not through practice of any given exercise.

If you argue that in case you don't think over the closest, likeable, fellow beings they won't be pleased with you. Think discreetly if someone is thirsty, would he be satisfied with letting him drink water or by thought? Dear brother! The world needs service through fulfilment of requirements and desires, not thought. Even you, sirs, cherish hope of service from the world, fulfilment of your desire, intention and purpose. From this point of view, between you and the world, service alone is the object of

give and take, not thought. If someone maintains that there is no continuous flow of outgoing inclination in service without required thought, it only means that he has no goal in life to attain in relation to whom he might offer his service either to the world, to the self, or the Lord whose nature is Love.

Look Brother ! The straight plain truth is that the thought you want to demolish, thought that recurs even without your wanting it, non-co operate it with discrimination, don't get afraid of them, don't support or oppose them nor get identified with them. Then these thoughts will die away on their own. As soon as that happens, unbroken, continuous recollectedness of belongingness to the supreme being will awaken.

The heart of the matter to be percipient about is that the very thought of objects, which lets us turn away our face from that who is our intimate kindred and whose immeasurable love is the desired goal, what titanic loss any gain of such an object or individual might not inflict ! Once I myself told someone in the whim of humour : Brother ! When your very remembrance turned me away from God, What havoc of meeting you might not perpetrate ! Consider the point. What are the thoughts passing through your mind ? Those that don't concern obtaining matters. And the thoughts to have turned the mind away from that which "is" that is to say, which is Ever present. Do you want to retain thought of non-existence, of 'nihility' ? If you want to retain it, recollectedness of memory will not awaken. And if you don't want to retain it, recollectedness will surely awaken. If you say that you have decided not to retain thought of 'non-existence', but what can I do, it happens on its own. All right, in case it comes on its own, then think how much happiness you have derived from the man whose memory comes on its own. If you have derived happiness from him then you will have to suffer pain. And if you have not derived joy, how much from what he has given to you is his due. If what he has given is still his due, his thought will haunt you. Therefore, brother, if someone's thought haunts you, gift him something.

A certain gentleman came to me. He told his wife was no more, the son survives, and when he sits down to remember God, the memory of his son comes over to him. I asked where his son lived. He replied he lived with his maternal grandmother. I replied that the day you remember the boy send him a Money order for ₹ 50/-. What will follow from that ? I told that would

stop the remembrance coming over to you. He asked the 'how' of it? I said, "Do it and see what happens?" "You regard the son as yours, and make your mother-in-law serve him. What to speak of you, not even your father can eschew his thought." Therefore, brother, whose thoughts do you register? First look at the man or the woman whose thought comes to you? Don't relinquish the matter making a fuss over it nor take leave of it by disignating it with words like *Maya* or mere untruth. The theist these days brings more shame and discredit on God I tell you the truth than the atheist does. On the other hand, the theist admires God so much, sings His glory so much that people may become infatated with him and may convert them to theism. This is not the desirable mode of awakening the remembrance of God.

Therefore, brother! If you really want to awaken the pristine remembrance of God, resolve firmly not to think of non-existence or nihility and whatever be the mode of Being of the Lord, you ought to regard Him as your own. Then his remembrance is bound to arise. Those who become theists hearing the resplendent majesty and beauty of the Lord are lustful, greedy, not lovers of the Lord. Who is attracted to beauty? He who wants to enjoy himself in pleasure. He indulges in selfish pleasure and is not a lover of the divine Lord. Recollectedness of the innate memory of the Lord arises in the lover of the Lord, not in those who enjoy themselves in selfish pleasure. If a useless God is lovable to you, even if He is cruel, callous, good for nothing, without liking for you, even then if you could call Him with appellation of "your own", his remembrance will awaken in you. Do you know the situation today? A certain gentleman fell ill. His wife heard somewhere that God protects all. There was profusion of worship, then and the husband got well. There was copious worship again when the husband fell ill the second time, but he could not be protected from the urgency of the situation this time. The lady of the house then discarded and threw off "*Thakurji*" from the sanctum. If you and I sit down to consider the matter in the context, let us first think if an object would be available by mere reflection. You have been caught in the syndrome of letting the Lord hear His glory and remaining deprived ourselves of his continuous, unbroken gathering up of His pristine 'intimations'.

Consider, brother! The glory of the Lord was meant for laying the firm foundation of our own faith, not for propaganda

or persuasive speech. Firm ground for faith is laid in the process of anguished struggle for it, and not by persuasive speeches for it. But does the propagandist for those believing in God today have as much fondness for becoming a guru as to become a devotee of God himself? If it is so, theism itself would have become pervasive everywhere by implication and manifestation. How many are the guru-preachers pained by restlessness and impurities of the mind of their disciples in their loneliness? Did they ever become pained and restless for the sake of their amelioration? Or did they go on a life-long preaching spree? How many are the leaders pained by the anguish of the society? Or are they happy with the joy of their leadership? A true leader's heart is always filled up with miseries of the people and a true *guru* is he whose life sheds light on the path of the *sadhakas*. It is not by mere discussion of principles that the calibre of a guru is really acquired. If you and I sit down to reflect on the matter we should first think if objects are acquired by mere thoughts on them? Can we get individuals by mere thoughts on or about them? Can circumstances be availed by merely thinking upon it? Can states of mind be availed by mere thoughts upon them? In no time past, present or future can it be availed. Objects are gained by putting them to right use. Circumstances are gained by putting them to right use. Objects are not gained by thoughts alone, individuals are not available by thoughts alone. Don't think of that which is not available at all through thought. If thought on it comes nevertheless, don't think that I am very bad, I am engaged in futile thought. Don't think this. Think that thoughts sedimented or entrenched in your life, my sole Beloved has stirred them up and has manifested them with his uncaused grace in order to demolish them and awaken His recollectedness. Think seriously over this point of thought.

The matter of fidgetiness, restlessness or unease of the mind is generally stated in the system of *Sadhana* these days. Brother, I don't believe in this concept of the restlessness of the mind, let me first point it out to you. When are you aware of this restlessness of the mind? When you want to be quiet and stable. Is there any appearance of the restlessness of the mind during engagement? That is to say, when there is the beginning of quietude, right then are we introduced to restlessness, sir! Therefore, that which you understand as restlessness is the ground where stability is being founded. And you say that the

not to allow a let-go. Therefore, if futile thought is not the ideal and to be thoughtless is also not the goal. But to be thoughtless is to get into repose of rest on its own, that is to say, *Yoganand* manifests itself, but unless one gets rid of the pleasure of "I am a yogi" there is no entry into the kingdom of Self-Delight. But brother, for the sake of real, immeasurable, infinit, ever-new bliss of Divine Love, there should be *yoga* without self-indulgence in it, there should be freedom, but no smugness of self-satisfaction. Then does that self recollectedness arise which is really quintessential love that can provide bliss of love to God himself. *Yoganand* and self-bliss are also immortal quintessences but these are not elixirs that can quench thirst of lovers of God. The *sadhak* satisfied with spiritual freedom, satisfied with release from suffering, satisfied with peace, in him arise not the kind of recollectedness that can provide bliss of love to the infinite, because there is stink of the ego even in getting satisfied with self-delight.

Therefore brother ! That in which you just had the faith by only hearing of Him, without knowing His whereabouts, self-identification of kinship with whom alone is his last attempt for the *sadhak* with faith alone as his light and succour. Nothing else has he to do in this regard. It is compulsory to safe guard values of desirelessness and effortlessness in order to prevent undesirables to happen. Let not any brother or sister misunderstand that recollectedness is the sole inheritance of the mere theists. Recollectedness is an ideal for all kinds of *sadhakas*. The only difference is that this recollectedness alone is manifest in the modes of awareness, attainment and endearment. The inquisitive get satisfied with firm awareness, not the lovers of God. This much is the difference between the man of faith and the man who reflects or meditates.

It does not, however, matter if brother-sister don't cherish firm reverence, faith and kinship of endearing self-identity with this Abode of Love. Not to have faith in such being does not deserve blame. It is neither reprehensible and certainly not criminal. Not to have faith is no fault, but "we won't have faith" any predilection of this kind is a fault of inadvertence or inattention. My endeared one will be attained by you in the very form in which you repose your faith. You repose your faith in yourself, or the world, or any entity whatever, but be attentive to the issue of keeping kinship of self identity with it, never seeking

any fulfilment of desire from it, then there will awaken on its own in you that faith and recollectedness in you which happens in any lover whoever.

Consider the point seriously, has anyone of whom he is born, ever known his progenitor through the sense organs or intelligence of the mind? Never. Every action merges into its cause, it can't turn it into its subject. People like you are born of the being you know not but believe in He who is the light of all and the resort to all; you can have faith in Him, but you can't turn it into a food for your thought.

Once a boy-student came to me and began saying-point out where your God is ? Those were days when I was God intoxicated and even the boy was intoxicated with his power of logic. I talked with him with many pieces of arguments and asked him at the end where does your mind or intelligence take the last resort when you have nothing else to do. Experience it not in deep sleep but in waking state. of the mind. The boy was extremely honest. He said, "I don't know where my mind or intelligence resides during the period of rest" I asked him again, but it does live somewhere ? It does live somewhere, doesn't it ? He said, 'yes'. You do believe in the matter that it lives somewhere. There, my God is ! You name Him as God or you may substitute it with any other which might be your ideal.

There is no birth without resort and all births originate from that alone which is unborn, self-established, irrespective of birth and death, which alone is theos of theists and quintessence. of quintessentials. There is release from suffering and unbounded rest in it. There is sweet recollectedness for his sake in that Abode of Love and release from all suffering, everlasting rest and spiritual freedom are meant for one's own sake. Quintessential love is ecstatic bliss only to those whose ideal is to proffer elixir to Him. This abode of love has given all to all and has concealed Himself. Look brother, how extraordinary is his mode of giving ! Whatever He gives to others looks and appears to be his own as it were. Should we misuse His extraordinary generosity in saying that we will not cherish faith in the heard Lord ? The known world could not do for you, nor could you have faith in the heard Lord, nor could you remain contented alone, within yourself. Is the perilous plight of man under the fall concealed from anyone in the situation ? Be useful to the world with objects given to you by it; and remaining unattached

all objects, states of mind, and circumstances, be contented in yourself. Even then if some thirst lingers, in that cruel Being, who concealed Himself and identified assimilated all, repose a firm, unwavering faith in Him.

Very well should you be aware that which is rid of birth, death and distance of space time is not attainable through any kind of labour. That which is work-related or related to natural legislation cannot be attained through reflective thought. Many desires may be fulfilled but some do remain to be fulfilled. Considering all these matters it is undebatably proved that futile thoughts will pass away compulsorily followed by coming up of meaningful thought and thoughtlessness which again will be followed by entry into the kingdom of spiritual freedom gained through unattachment. But lovers of God who seek to be useful to Him, who knows us but we don't know Him, they will have to have faith in Him and then many faiths will blend into one faith, many relations will blend into one relation and many a thought will melt into one thought and sweet recollectedness will awaken on its own which is strong enough to offer to the *sadhaka* awareness, attainment and endearment

'Hari Om !'

Discourse-8

26 December, 1959,

Evening.

My own Self-identity of the Present exalted, magnanimous, eminence as well as Brothers and Sisters !

There are a great many philosophical viewpoints, but life is one. Every philosophical viewpoint denotes part of a collective whole and is partly pervasive and fragmented partitively to an extent. What is the reason behind it ? The reason is that when there is completeness of union with truth, there is existence of the philosophy, not of the philosopher. The philosophy of the time when the philosopher is non existent is not contained in the discourse. The philosophical discourse by the existing philosopher alone is contained in his discourse and some part of it is ubiquitous, acceptable to all, beneficial to all. And part of it is meant to be in the form of *Sadhana* to that philosopher himself part of it in the form reverential reading to others. From this point of view every brother and sister should reverentially and regardfully follow his faith, philosophy and viewpoint and respect other's philosophy with honesty. Why ? If we fail to do so, because of numerous differences among us, unity of love will not emerge among us. My own faith is that without this unity of love among all of us complete evolution of the *sadhaka* is not possible.

Sometimes people ask me about how to evolve toward Divine Love. I feel then to reply with saying that if you can help and love the collapsed, the crashed down, the fallen, you will have love for God. You consider yourself, the fallen who receives the light of the sun, water that quenches his thirst, the wind that lets him breathe, the sky that gives him space to live in, the earth that gives him to resort to abide, can't you give him love to live ? Therefore, brother ! There should be a ubiquitous unity of love despite many a discrimination in life. When will that happen ? It will happen when there is unattachment in our life to that which has subjugated us to the other. What is that enslavement to the other ? This you should try to know yourself. Every brother,

every sister can know the cause of his dependence on the other, or his subjugation to the other. One has to get detached from it. To be unattached is not to hate someone. The meaning of unattachment is not to consider the man concerned to be a bad guy nor to oppose him. Then, what is it ? It is that he who has given me subjugation in that form, in which form ? In the form in which I happen to be subjugated, I won't have any relation whatever ? Let us take an illustration we are sitting somewhere here, and none can say that the venue belongs to us. Ask *Bhagwat Babu* and he will affirm that it belongs to the government. Ask us, and we will say it belong to *Bhagwat Babu*. Then point out if you did not become unattached to it. Then, did you condemn the bungalow ? Did you consider it a bad bungalow ? Did you hate it ? You neither hated it; nor condemned it nor considered it a bad one. You knew it that, brother, it is not mine. Proceed further, and you will say it will not be yours after sometime. A man of thought will say that it does not belong to him, it is not for him for all time. Why ? What is the meaning of 'we' ? Our demand, our aspirations ? 'We' does not mean 'I', it is not the '*Atman*', it is not the body! 'We' means, our demands, what our demands are.

So, what is our demand, what is our aspiration ? There should be no subjugation, no subjection, no dependence in our your life-this is our demand. So that there should be no such a subjection, or dependence in our, your life, this is our demand. Then, brother ! When the condition is that there should be no such a demand in life, which object would you call your own ? It is another matter that, for example, the Hindu wife serves the husband via his relation, the mother-in-law and be blessed through it. Accordingly, you serve the world with the given objects regarding the world's relation to you, or in regard of the Lord's to you, or in regard of the *Atman's* relation and then would you receive love of the world, of the Lord or of the *Atman*. There is no doubt about it. Utilize the same objects, my Master of Grace, regarding personal joys as goals, what do you get, then ? Would you get attachment or love ? Subjection or freedom ? Inertia or freedom ? Want or perfection ? From whom have we to

get detached ? When we think upon the point, it is obvious that we have to be unattached to temptation for joy. Which temptation ? Temptation in which we enjoy ourselves. I ask you if believing the world to be true, do you want to be indulging or a *yogi* ? Do you want to be indulgent in pleasure or a *yogi* ? If you want to be *yogi*, did you become unattached to indulgence in pleasure ? Consider it. That it is not necessary to regard unattachment unnecessary believing the world to be true, or if one regards the world as false, unattachment will be unnecessary does not also appear to be correct. Why ? What is the meaning of false ? That which does not exist. Would you get unattached or attached to it ? Even unattachment to that which is not will be nourishing and supportive.

Believe it to be false or true, in either case, you have to observe a clinical detachment from the world. Why ? Look at what our situation is today ? In case you say you are God believing because you have faith in God. Right; the God you believe in, think honestly on it, do you want something from him or not ? We do want something. Then do you want him or the fulfilment of your desire from Him ? Consider it. If you believe in what you want, you don't believe in God; if you believe in God, you will have to be desireless. When it is compulsory to be desireless, how can you be desireless without unattachment ? You can't be. Well brother, if someone asserts that he has accepted the entity of his own being. But can you remain desiring, or with desire, even after accepting the entity of your own being ? In case you can remain with desire, you have accepted the vanity of the body. This proves that you will have to be desireless even after accepting the entity of the *Atman*. If someone say, I have neither accepted the existence of the *Paramatman*, nor that of the *Atman*, I have accepted instead the existence of the well known world. Then all the good and beautiful a matter. Now that you have accepted the existence of the world, would you be of use to the world or would you expect pleasures of the world ? Expecting pleasures of the world, if you accept them as your own pleasures, did you realise them as

entity of your personal joy or the entity of the world ? You consider the point. So that even if there be many a philosophy, numberless be the viewpoints, there are, brothers, neither discriminations in real life nor differences in *sadhana*s, that are wider in implications. Those hoping for joy from the world ceased to accept the existence of the world and accepted the entity of their own joy. Therefore, he, too will have to be unattached to his personal pleasure whose entity he has accepted. The spiritualists as well as those with faith in God will have to be unattached to it. I don't believe there can be any incompatibility in life because of philosophical difference, I don't have such a faith nor any experience to this effect, Therefore, brother, what is the nature and the kind of being of the world ? Just as it appears to you. What is the nature of the world ? As you regard or contemplate it. The world is as you wish or believe it to be, but you will have to remain unattached to indulgence in personal pleasure. Now, what will be our measure, approach or procedure to attain unattachment ? Let us think out carefully. The measure, the methodology, the procedure, it seems to me, is to locate first the man in whom the temptation to seek pleasure wakes up by taking resort to someone else in order to accept his existence. You may ask, how? Consider the point. I ask someone who you are ? He will then say he is a certain individual. But, how can I believe that you are that individual ? Brother ! You look at my hand, I am an individual. What is its meaning ? Its meaning is that you have accepted your existence on the basis of a born object as part of your existence. As a man of more awareness, he might say, he is an Indian. How do you know that the country is named Hindustan ? What, brother ? Is there a separation between the sky of this and that of another country ? No, that's not so. So that your saying that you are a Hindustani; is it an imagination or reality ? It is reality. What mode of reality ? There are differences in our language, modes of living and culture. Therefore, we are Indian. Then, brother, look at the languages of your feet and eyes and find out if these are one and the same ? No, that is not so. Are your physiognomies the same ? They said, these were not

the same. So that, why don't you regard the eyes existing in isolation ? And why don't you regard the existence of your feet in separation ? How can we do that, sir ? They belong to the single body. So that, if I say that India too belongs to a singular world how do you regard it in separation or alienation ? They said then that from that point of view, we are not Indians, but beings of this world. Well, brother, as beings of this world do you experience yourself that world in deep sleep ? Then he will have to say that he does not. Which world do you belong to then, in deep sleep ? Of what kind of a world are you, then ? I don't know the world I belong to, at that time. Whatever you knew of deep sleep, was it true or untrue ? They said that was rather untrue. This means that, or what it proves is that we are not of the known world. Consider the point.

Someone might affirm that he may not be of the waking state of the mind nor of the state of dreaming but he does belong to the world of deep sleep. Then tell me if there is or is not the existence of deep sleep in superconsciousness ? Then did he affirm that he does belong to *samadhi* or superconsciousness. If we don't indulge in the bliss of superconsciousness does there remain still any relation to it ? Then he said, there does not remain any relation at all. The question of unattachment arises not only to the untrue or the false, but also to the blissful joy of *Samadhi*, to the joy of contemplation and doing. What do we seek this detachment from ? Certainly, it would be a detachment from enjoying ourselves through the others. Should we then condemn that from which we have to be detached ? Condemnation will ensure the continuity of the relation. Should we eulogize it ? Even eulogizing it will keep the bondage alive. Should we oppose it ? Even opposing it will perpetuate the relation. What, then to do of it ? Don't identify with it, don't support it, don't oppose it. Whose ? Of that which is known to you. He wanted to know if some harm will befall him by non-cooperation with it. There will be absolutely no harm. What will be the benefit ? Non-cooperation will bring about the strength of self-abnegation. What shall we gain by eschewing the sense of identification ? If you accept the proposition from before, the gain of attainment

will be delayed. Why ? Had there been any distance between breaking of identity and meeting Him the description would have been correct proper.

There is no gap of time between the breaking of identification and the time to meet with Him. He is to be gained, attained, or realized and not to be merely described. It was in that state of ecstatic elation that the world seemed non-existent. People in that ecstasy of elation affirmed the world to be one's own quintessential self. People in that ecstasy of elation realized the world to be a lila this is the last whisper of ecstasy of elation. It is not a concept or a principle; it is not a goal-it is a *sadhana*. Therefore, my brother, unattachment is compulsory. Now, a question crops up here, when I have to be unattached to my own happiness, why should I brother about the anguish and miseries of someone else ? This question cropped up. Once one of my friends said that we should renounce our right, why do I require to safeguard the right of others. The need arises because you can't do without doing. You have a self-motivation, an attraction for doing, so that you are urged naturally to protect the right of others. If you cannot be compassionate for the miseries of others, you won't be unattached to your own joys. I sometimes feel such a pang of misery that our own Supreme beloved himself appears to us in the form of misery in order to detach us from our joys. So that if you want to look for your Beloved you may look to Him. Why does he incarnate in the shape and form of stark misery ? It is because he wants us to be emancipated from the subjugation of joy. It is in order to liberate us from slavery of happiness that the Lord compelled to servitude of miserableness, becomes miserable and incarnates himself as such.

Didn't you hear that *Narsinha Bhagwan* took *Prahladji* in his lap, lost patience and began talking-Brother *Prahlad*! I was delayed, you were put to a big harrassment. He begs to be forgiven, fondles him, apologizes confessing His lapse and speaks to him at the end: Brother ! Let me give you something. This is the nature of the Infinite! Where as *Prahlad* drowned in

indulgence of qualities, excited, afloat and drowned in the pride of trust in God counters, saying, "I don't want anything." He went to the extent of averring : "Do you regard me a broker ?" "I don't want anything." Again God, losing His patience, opines that His fond devotee is drowned still in the pride of *Sadhana*. "Brother Prahlad! You ask for something," He urged again. Prahlad again says in the same vein of pride of *Sadhana*, well then, I want that I should have no desire. God says, well, it will happen so, you become desireless. You think upon the situation. Then, *Prahlad* asked God a question. What was the question he asked ? Who was your enemy-my father or his pride ? Then God said, 'His pride'. So, did you kill my father or his pride ? 'The Lord admitted his crime; But he made *Prahlad* aware that whoever is with the sense of me-mine in anyone cannot be void of desire for him. The whole character of *Prahladji* is meant to show that his trust in the Lord is unswerving, firm and unwavering.

Therefore, brother mine! When you and I meditate upon the need for the extent and the limit to which unattachment is required it seems that it is in unattachment alone that the feeling of self-identity with the Lord becomes live. This time during the *Satsang* week only three Subject-matters for discourses were selected for detailed treatment-abiding rest rising from desirelessness, spiritual freedom attained through unattachment and ever new endearment awakened through self-identity. This is demand of life, this can be fulfilled, and this can be fulfilled in the present. It can be fulfilled through every philosophical point of view, through every system. But brother ! The demand of rest, freedom and love should increase forever, we should have an eagerness for it, with ever new enthusiasm for it, and we should have such a trust in it that it should seem impossible that we should not get rest, freedom and love. Every brother, every sister can attain rest, freedom and love. This is possible. It is mere inattention and carelessness to become hopeless for the possible. Likewise is it inattention and carelessness to hope for the

impossible. Therefore, we are interacting among us, through mutual discussion and getting exchange of views, in order to get rid of inattention and want of alertness. It is neither commandment, nor preaching, nor any message. All of us are *sadhakas* and as such engaged in the mutual undertaking of exchange of views. With this view that, who knows, the Lord might let us hear some such unique a speech by virtue of which we may have faith in the attainable which is life, our demand for it may be fulfilled. The message unattachment has been stated that, brother, because there is no entrance in the kingdom of freedom without unattachment. There is consciousness where there is freedom, there is perfection of wholeness where there is consciousness. Where there is wholeness, there is self-identity, where there is self identity, there is immeasurable, infinite, ever new, ecstasy of bliss, there is no trace of doubt in it.

'Hari Om !'

Discourse-9

27 December, 1959,

Morning

My own self-identity of the present axalted, magnanimous, eminence as well as Brothers and Sisters !

Undoubtedly, human life is a life of distinguished significance. The Lord Himself has organized it for his own ever-new ecstasy of bliss. If man could revere the known or say that be not irreverent to the known, could not misuse the given, could not distrust the heard, he could very easily prove himself of immense use to himself, to the world and to the Master of the world. The most serious blunder we commit is that we try to make others understand with what we know. So long as this sickness persists misunderstandings and misapprehensions will augment and multiply gradually. When we understand ourselves and realize by our own knowing, then I believe all misunderstanding will disappear not only from ourselves but also from the world as a whole. The only reason for problems of life looming difficult today is that the wisdom that makes one understand oneself is used for others and the love meant to identify with others is being used on oneself. Look! justice which is founded on the imagination of a nation, if we start doing it to our own selves, then I believe, there would be no need for nation, states to the human society. That which you call love, it is another name for religion itself, or love is another name for religion, or justice itself is the name of the nation. Great place of importance is allocated to justice and love in raising life to higher level. But that which we should do to others, we do to ourselves; and that which we should do to ourselves, we do to the others. Justice is not hatred, it is not punishment, it is not to bring anguish to anyone but to keep intact and immaculate one's innocence. This is justice. So that we do justice to ourselves if we don't repeat known errors of the past and keep intact and inviolate the present. But remembrances of the past errors will appear to be demolished and disappear. When it manifests itself we should not allow our faith to be shaken and remain unyielding in the commitment to the idea of our present innocence. On the other hand, you should not cooperate with the manifested remembrance, you should not be scared of it, nor be pleased with it nor remain identified with it. The consequence

love and that humanity is present, in the form of seed and seedling, in every class, country, opinion, sect and is present in the current of opinion of brother-sister everywhere. In order to develop and evolve humanity in the present all our brothers and sisters should before going to bed and just after getting up, make themselves understand it not to become a *guru*, not to become a leader, not to become the master of the house the light of discrimination received in order to make oneself understand it oneself living in that light alone one should bring this plan of *Satsang* into the reality of their inward character. This week's *Satsang* prays to brother and sister of every class that we'd not go to bed—for minimum time at least without studying our present state of being or obligatory prerequisite. And He with whom we have accepted intimacy of self-identity, we shall sleep with his sweet recollectedness in the mind or serve all regardful of God or live in waking sleep in the state of *Samadhi*. We have no right to look at the afflicted, distressed, harassed unless without compassion. We have no right at the happy unless without cheerfulness. From this point of view your life is service to God or to the world. From the point of view of spiritualism it is your innate essence and from the point of theism your life is the love of Infinity. From this point of view, we become service in outward movement of the mind, and become love in inwardness. Thus shall we live eternally in the life of which we have heard from the quintessential knowers, from radiant books of Truth, from knowers of Wisdom from devotees of God and from those liberated in life. There is no trace of doubt in it.

'Hari Om !'

Discourse-10

27 December, 1959

Evening

My own Self-identity of the present exalted, magnanimous, eminence as well as Brothers and Sisters !

There can be no birth like one at the root of which there is no some unborn element, there can be no such an appearance without light to illuminate it, there can be no vision without some light to irradiate it. Therefore, we have to posit faith in that which exists prior to the birth of individuality in us. The world is innately one with individuality. For example, the individual and society are innately one and so are the building and the room essentially one. Likewise the individuality and the world are innately one. Whereas it appears to us that individuality is genetic, so does it appear to us that the world too is subject to birth. So that when every birth has at its root some unborn, fundamental element, isn't it compulsory to have faith in it ? Birth appears to us through that which is born, taking, as you like, the grossbody, the subtle body or the causal body, or taken in appearance, as you like, the gross, the subtle or the causal worlds. There is no appearance of birth through the unborn. Because of this there has been no manifestation of that till today—we have to cherish and evolve faith in that from the point of view of senses and intelligence. How will it happen ? The path to it is easy and natural. What ? You accept that you already have faith in the Lord. Suppose you opine : I am deceived by intelligence, that is to say, that becomes hindrance on the path to cultivating faith in the Lord. How can I have faith in Him ? If you know, if you are aware of that you are distinct from intelligence and have faith in the Lord on your own, no intelligence can govern you without your cooperation. It is only when you accept the servitude of intelligence, it governs and rules over you. Therefore, intelligence cannot be any hindrance to faith in the Lord. When you accept that you have faith in God, the divine energy in you will also accept it after sometime.

When the question of being a *Sadhu* cropped up in my life and I had to be a *Sadhu* because I couldn't live without the happiness devoid of all anguish and misery. And you know one has to approach *Sadhus* in order to be one. Subsequently I had to approach *Sadhus*. And *Sadhus* have the spontaneous nature to ask

everyone to go for *bhajan*. So that they asked me to do likewise. They directed me to remain engaged in *bhajan*. I replied forthwith saying what *bhajan* was ? What *bhajan* is ? What is called *bhajan* ? He said, "you go on with *Ram-Ram*. This is the tradition-isn't it ? You may see it. Again, I said forthwith, "I don't have faith in *Ram-Naam*." But that saint did not become angry; he became calm and serious instead and asked me instantaneously, "Don't you have faith in the existence of God ? Don't you believe that there is God ?" Then, I said, "I don't believe that there is no God." Then, that saint was highly pleased and asked, 'Do you believe in God ?' I said, 'yes sir.' Then, there is nothing to bother about my dear friend! Surrender to Him. He neither asked me to circulate the rosary nor did he ask me to make recitation nor did he ask me to do this or that. His guidance was only to surrender to him. I don't understand the magic embodied in that one-sentence of the unique guidance, his superb initiation from this great *sadguru*. I did not think of God with His cartoon as aid, Nor did I contemplate God regarding Him as formless. Why ? Because he who deserves to be called by many a description, no one of alert mind can accept any single exposition of his infinite mode of Being. I speak of those with alert mind. I was firmly persuaded not to allow you any linear or partial or fragmented view of that. Consider that if you accept ideas of one side, these appear likable to us because they belong to our side, and we have doubts regarding the veracity of the other side. He who takes any of the two sides cannot be alert and impartial to the views. Just as I don't regard anyone opposed to any side as neither neutral nor impersonal, nor alert, similarly, I don't regard supporter of the other side wanting in alertness and impersonality. Only the brain of those remain alert and impersonal who are neither honestly opposed to nor supportive of any side.

Had I been asked to meditate upon any particular kind of God, I would probably have argued about his mode or form. I was not directed to think of any specific form of God. Instead of that I was asked to surrender to God in the mode of my faith in Him. How much nice had it been if the compassionate *sadguru* had made the solemn observation forthwith : "Already, of course, you are surrendered to Him." Then "I would have caught hold of and adhered to the *Guru-Parampara* with such a force that I could not have eschewed it." But the *Guru* is not one who comes

in the garb of someone more than himself, He comes like a friend, someone with transparency, without assumption and comes like one's own. He alone is one's real *Guru*. So that he affirmed, Brother ! Secure your surrender to him. Walking or in movement, sitting or getting-up, thoughts on the *Sadguru* will rise on their own, not in any form nor in any shape. At that time, when someone questioned why don't you take God's name, do you know what reply did I give ? The Divine name is recited by those, who consider Him distant from his own self-identity. Excuse me. I don't oppose the Divine name. Let not the devotees of Divine name feel any hurt or anguish. I am making only an introduction to a prologue to the structure of self-identity with God's name. I am not opposed to His name. My faith in Divine name is as much as yours. You may regard it even a bit more than yours. In case someone asks for meditation, I reply that let meditation be the course for those who regard themselves in remote abstraction from Him.

Now, what remained to be done by us ? Love. How to accomplish it ? One day a lady was speaking to her brother's wife, Look *Vishan* (*Vishan Devi* was the name of her brother's wife) your husband is that guy, standing there. This I heard with my own ears.

Now my heart was in absolute anguish; they are aware of the secret of love making. Many a guy are standing here : But among so many guys *Vishan's* brother alone, of all of them, is visible to her. Ah, Ah, for me! But he to whom I am surrendered, is not visible to me anywhere! Once upon a time, another lady came to my notice. I asked her of her well-being; tell me, how do you do ? She told me what might I tell you ? Things look up in complete black-out. There was again a hurt, an anguish of streees in my heart. The lady, I thought within myself, sup a black-out even in day light and I am unable to see darkness even in separation from my Beloved. They alone know how to love. She had come back from her first Departure to her husband's house. It is an episode that had really occurred. So that *Swamiji* records its actuality of occurrence and says, "they really know how to be a genuine lover." And adds, "I was sleepless". There was no rest. It was the time of night. I was not asked to undergo discipline, undergo austerity of *tapas* this way, follow rules of *Sanyas* that way. Farmers were keeping farms, keeping up during the night. They were safe guarding fields against the pests and the other

enemies of the fields. Thoughts in regard of my own lethargy arose in me at the time, suddenly; they will wake up the whole night for the sake of some meagre crops whereas I want to remain asleep delaying undiminishing ecstasy of bliss keeping before us postponed ! This way every event used to help me in the waking up of His pristine layers of memory. Now can I say that many a numberlessly unknown are His modes of teaching, countless unknown are his intriguing devices to ingratiate us with His favour to keep us involved in His grace. But brother ! The condition is that your seeking should be only one, in singular number.

The king of *Gurus* averred, 'be surrendered', and no negative issued from my mouth. As for me, I think that he it was who said and he it was who also accepted it. He alone is called the *Guru*. *Guru* is not he who forces one into *Sadhana*, into labour. Excuse me, he is not the *Guru*. He is called the *Guru*, who does the *Sadhana* himself, and the success in the *Sadhana* crowns the disciple. But lest the secret gets unravelled, the *Guru* keeps it under a curtain as it were. I have complete faith in the reality that the seeking of love on the part of the beloved is so enormous that, compared to it, the collected demand of all the lovers of the world is equal to nothing. Therefore brother, just as you are, not with preparation, with easiness of feeling, accepting it with simplicity acknowledge it that now we are not without Master, that now we are not without Manager of all matters. How can this empire of the emperor run without its Master, when no empire of the world can do without it ? Consider it. The only difference is that we don't know him, but does He also not know us? He does know us. Does he not believe in us even if we don't have faith in Him ? Will he believe in us when we shall have faith in Him ? No, He does have faith in us. Will he believe in us, when we regard him as our own ? Will He know us when we know Him as our own ? If we regard Him as our own, He also regards us as His own. If we know Him as our own, He also knows us as our own. Even if we don't know or regard Him as our own, He regards as well as knows us as His own. Let us accept God with this faith in Him that "God is our own." Why is He ours ? This is because "He is ; the Lord is." Brother! Who is called 'the Lord' ? Is He called so because He is the Master only of a specific class ? Is He called so because He is Master of a

certain specific *Loka* or country or is it that who is the Master of all ? So that He who is the Master of all is also our own Master.

The mother of *Madhav Bhaiya* was very *Sattwik*, *Satyugi* mother. Whatever of love and affection he has in him—how much he may be proud of it—it is a gift inherited from his mother. He wrote me a letter once, saying *Maharaj ji*, I became deprived of the Master; my mother is no more. I wrote back, Brother, how can you be Masterless, *Vishwanath* himself remaining in existence all the while you cannot be without the Master. It is another matter that while it is true that the affectionate, child like blessing you have received so long from your mother will no longer be available now. However, you are certainly not deprived of the grace of *Vishwanath* because *Vishwanath* is present forever. The Masterlessness that the human being experiences in himself that experience of Godlessness in him is a stark blunder and a grim want of eerie alertness. No one is Masterless in reality. All are with the Master and they are always with the Master. Do you know why the idea of masterlessness harasses the human heart ? This experience of Masterlessness affects us in life, when there is something with us which we own or possess as our own. He who has something of his own as possession, always experiences himself Masterless.

Imagine, if this sick body were not with me, can this poverty of spirit ever occur to me ? If this healthy body were not with you, can pride ever come to you in your life ? Can division of kind be ever created without pride generated by health of the body ? It cannot ever be generated. So that the Masterlessness and incapacity that you experience in yourself means that the object you have received has been regarded by you as your own or you have identified yourself with mother's affection so much that you feel intensely the want of your mother. Then you can neither be protected from the poverty of spirit nor from the pride of owning it. Therefore, Brother ! If you have to contemplate, contemplate not on how does he Divine do or where he is!

Think instead on the matter that the body which is actually near you, does it really belong to you ? Are you really that ? And do you know how this thought will be figured out ? It will not happen through intelligence ? So long as you will look into the question whether the body is yours, maintaining inner and outer silence, whether you are the body, so that the inward light which made things visible to you as they are that inward light, of

intelligence and the senses itself will give you the awareness that neither does the body belong to you nor are you the body itself. The decision that the body does not belong to you nor are you the body itself is not the decision taken by the power of the brain. I have a faith to the extent that there is no taint of labour, nor of laborious exercise, in the beyondness of awakening and faith. Both of these are void of labour and exercise. We are so much attached to attraction for and repulsion against doing and vice-versa that we want to achieve everything by doing. We want to attain to wisdom and unbounded awareness only through mere intelligence. You cannot be, nor can you be a philosopher in the pristine sense. Therefore, brother ! When your body is not yours, think seriously and ponder over the matter, idea, isn't there some being with unbounded mastery over it? But when you, yourself, become the master over it, how can you have faith in that sole master of it? So long as the mind is yours, it won't be peaceful, stable and pure. So long as the intelligence is yours, it will neither be equable nor discriminating, it is certain like truth. Therefore, brother ! When no object, nothing is yours, is it without a Master or a shelter ? It is neither without a Master nor without a shelter. We regard the object as ours, subject ourselves to it or demolish it or subject it to hindrances on the path of its development.

Remove the sense of me-mine from the mind if you want to develop it and be a cause to its evolution. Remove the sense of me-mine from intelligence if you intend to develop it and be a cause to its evolution. Give up the sense of me-mine to the body, to the family if you want to develop and be a cause to its evolution. And if you want development and evolution of the whole of the world remove your sense of me-mine from it. When the *Sadhaka* gives up the stony weight of the sense of me-mine and releases the world, the body, the sense organs, the mind, the *pranas* and the intelligence free of this weight altogether, instantly do they melt back to which they belong, or belonged or will belong. It is our sense of me-mine that has brought these down to the miserable plight. When we shall withdraw our delusive sense of me-mine from them, then all these glories of God will dissolve into their respective causes which in their turn will melt into their cosmic causes, mega-centric shelters and all born elements will go back to their Unborn sources, will merge into their mega-causes. Then shall we have faith in the Root of all

causes which is the Lord Himself. This faith will instantaneously give rise to reverence for him which in its turn burgeons into trust in Him and that will flower into the feeling of self-identity with the Lord. What is the meaning of Self-identity with the Lord? It means that he is our own, our intimate own. Self-identity does not mean he is very beautiful, not that He is with form or formless. Excuse me. Tell Him with form, He remains incomplete; Describe Him formless He remains incomplete, fragmented. Mix up the two; the description will not be complete. How can the description of truth or the Lord be completed? It cannot be organized into wholeness.

Therefore, brother, let him be as he wishes, let Him be where He is, let Him do the thing He wants to do—give Him all the three modes of freedom—saying, grandsire, do as you like, be as you are, wheresoever you are, but you alone are our own. As sole, lone beloved, you are profoundly endearing. The thing that is our own gives rise to and awakens love; and love is the epitome of ambrosial juiciness. And juiciness, do you know what it is called? Love or juiciness that is yielded from Love does not satiate; there is neither withdrawal nor retraction, nor fulfilment in love. Juiciness of love inheres in its quintessential endearment, endearment inheres in self-identity which inheres in faith, faith inheres in reverence and reverence inheres in trust. With this point of view all of us, according to our ability and disposition of circumstances, should cherish faith in someone but it should be only one. Faith in one becomes faith in the endless, which is faith in the Lord of universe.

'Hari Om !'

Discourse-11

28 December, 1959,

Morning.

My own Self-identity of the present exalted, magnanimous, eminence as well as Brothers and Sisters !

Attainable neither by spiritual exercises nor feasible through meditative thought, perfection of life consists in immeasurable, unbounded, ever-fresh love alone which is awakened by the feeling of self-identity. To safeguard this feeling of immaculate self-identity we shall have to ponder seriously over the truth of life that whatever we have received is neither ours nor for us. Whenever this feeling of self-identity gets blurred, we find that we forget the matter and being to think that we can gain something through health of the body, that we can get something through collected wealth, that we can get something through attained abilities and we think we can gain something through some post. These matters will surely come up. And as soon as the idea that whatever I have had is for me, is mine, then there will be neither self-identity with the world, nor with the Lord, nor with the self. And let other relations go away, there will be no relation between mother and son, the wife and the husband, no relationship of self-identity between the husband and the wife, no self-identity of relationship between friend and friend. When ? When you accept that whatever something you have received is meant for you and yours. Therefore, Brother ! The only guideline to be safe guarded between us is to keep intact our relationship of self-identity so that nothing that is given to us is either ours or meant for us. This relation of self-identity has to be maintained among three *Atman*, and in the *Parmatman* who is heard of.

When even that which has been given to you is neither yours nor for you, then why should there be any expectation from anyone in regard of one's field of duty ? Let us consider this point. It can nicely and cogently be said that when we discharge our duty we have certain expectations from concerned persons. Why do we have expectation ? We expect because the things we require for discharging duty, whether it be the body, the wealth, the abilities, knowledge, the sciences, the arts and technology; we regard these as our own as well as for us and, therefore, we expect from others. If we can uproot this inclination, brother, in the form of things, knowledge, sciences and arts, that is neither

ours nor for us. Then in that case who is ours ? This is to be decided within, on one's own, who is our own ? But whatever we have received is neither ours nor meant for us. When you affirm that the Lord is ours and well! He is meant for us. Here, self-identity will take two modes of expression. So long as the *Sadhaka* believes the Lord is meant for us, no self-identity is gained in the mode of the gopis. It is only when they believe that they are meant for the Lord, then only can the self-identity of the kind the gopis had, be gained.

Look! Even if you regard the Divine as your own and if you do it so for yourself, the desire for your personal right will be triggered up on its own. That is why, *Shri Rukminiji* could not muster courage to apply dust-of-the-feet to the Head of Beloved *Shyam Sunder*. There is ache in the Head of endearing *Shyam Sundar*; He is pained, anguished by it and he says let someone of my beloved apply the dust-of-his-feet to heal me. *Rukminiji* has her feet intact, dust-of-the-feet at the holy place and she has also the feeling of self-identity towards *Shyam Sundar*. But she opines that he is her husband and if she applies dust-of-the feet to His Head, she will have to go to Hell. So that she made Him her husband for her own sake, isn't it ? But when this problem went up to *vrajgopis*, they had a different response altogether. Beloved *Shyam Sundar* has headache. Is there not someone to give Him medicine ? Saying this they lost their patience and became restless. Had *Shyam Sundar* been here, His mother would have given Him the medicine. Is there none to give Him the medicine in *Dwarkapuri* ? *Narad Baba* spoke in the meanwhile addressing the *Gopis*, "He is Himself to administer the medicine but the medicine itself is not available. The gopis were surprised." "Which is the medicine like this", they asked ? It is the dust of the feet of lovers of the Lord Himself. The gopis spoke—go fast, hurry up, take as much dust-of-the feet as you please. *Narad Baba* observed addressing the *gopis*, "Aren't you aware that he is the Absolute *Brahman Sachchidanandghan*; you will have to undergo the torture of Hell ?" Gopi spoke, "Baba, we know very well about tortures in Hell. Not only for a single birth, but also for many a birth can we undergo the excruciating incarceration of Hell-fire but can't bear the anguish of the Beloved".

When does Self-identity come up to the condition of burning intensity? So that when we accept someone's entity, it should not be for the sake of our own self-interest, that this gentleman would be of some use to me. Look! What is the

meaning of regarding someone as one's own ? Give him love, regard and respect, give him all that you have and don't take anything from him. You may say, will it be intelligent to do so ? This is sheer madness. Then, brother ! What a great amount of juiciness is contained in this madness ? There is no entry of any man of intelligence here. So that if you want to retain your self-identity intact with anyone, then look brother ! You leave aside the world, leave me and even the *Parmatman* aside, regard anyone whoever as your own with condition that you believe him to be your own because everything under your possession is his, I myself am his and I don't want anything from him. Let your behaviour be identically so with anyone whoever—I don't ask you to do so with God. Whoever the being with whom you behave that way will get hidden and that limitless, that unbounded will reveal Itself. Why ? Because there is no individual to enjoy himself in that juiciness of bliss; no individual can indulge in it. That limitless, that unbounded alone is the enjoyer of the juicy bliss. And who is the giver of this bliss ? Do you know ? No Deities, Man, Man alone ! How glorious is your elevation that you belong to ? This juiciness of bliss that I don't have to take anything from you can be given to God by man alone.

You might have heard of *Bhagwan Raghavendra*—you might have read about it as sojourner at Chitrakoot. He had an occasion to meet there three categories of *Sadhakas* who came over to meet him. The deities came in, began saying that they have been much harassed by the *Asuras*. He replied, well Brother ! I will annihilate that *Asuras*. Many great thinkers, *Sages* and *Munis* followed them. They spoke, "We had a great waiting, your glorious vision has been granted by your grace and realized." Maharaj averred : Go forthwith to *saketa* and reside therein. Thus did He take leave of the thinkers, *Sages* and *Munis*. But some of the seekers were such that their coming was of a unique order altogether. The uniqueness of their motivation was not at all in the tall claim of serving the Lord : What or how to serve him; not to inflict pain on them would be a great thing ! And whatever was easily available to them—roots of holy plants, fruits and their pristine subterranean recollectedness of the Lord was awakened forever. In fact, they came up with this pristine recollectedness already attained and kept the '*Dona*' made up of dry leaves in a state of outstanding ecstasy of bliss. They have no awareness of time, space; neither of the season, neither of

individual nor of the world. They have the sole recollectedness of the Lord Beloved melting into blissful, outstanding ecstasy. Only they came and went in silence of blissful oblivion, lipping in supernal delight of Being, and doing frequent 'johar'. They neither spoke nor heard a word. This ecstasy of silence in supramental love, when doing and being become one, is a veritable jewel of life, devotion, love. This is self-identity in the third category; this alone is the real self-identity.

Those who indulge in pleasure and those who seek liberation cannot strike the relationship of self-identity with the Lord. For indulgence in pleasures and the seeking of liberation are eligible only those that can spurn both sensory pleasures and delight of emancipation by reducing it into mere recreation through football. It is both costly and cheap in the sense that even if the *Sadhaka* utters these words only once, spontaneously, on a spur-of-the moment, and keeps mum forthwith, Lord! Undoubtedly, Thou art always mine, Thou art always mine! Look! This is juiciness of myness, of mineness. On the other hand, "I am yours" is profoundly distinguished from that. Who is it that says, "I am yours." He who expects something from the Lord, hopes an expectation. Why ? With relation to someone great we shall have motor car to sit in. "You are mine" can only be the utterance of the *Sadhaka* who, when he says someone his own, does not expect from him. So that the feeling of self-identity can be enlivened, and to awaken endearment through the feeling of self-identity it is compulsory to be void of all desires.

If someone opines and questions the possibility or viability of life in desirelessness the answer would be that there is no life at all to the living being with desire. Why ? Life is that which is neither illumined by nor dependant upon the other. And the life of those with desire cannot be such that it might be without dependance. So that it is compulsory to be desireless in order to awaken endearment through the feeling of self-identity. It is in order to uphold the idea feasibly in our life in different modes, it has been proposed to us that rest arising from desirelessness, and spiritual freedom attained through unattachment is useful to oneself and endearment awakened from the feeling of self-identity is useful to the Lord. The brothers and sisters who cherish intense longing to offer juiciness of loving ecstasy to the Beloved Lord, they alone can keep alive the feeling of self-identity and safe guard it, endearment awakens in them alone. To accept self-identity is the only attempt for arousal of

endearment to God. No rule of law of any kind is applicable to the Divine Beloved regarding his mode of and manner of granting love to any lover devotee.

I have to speak nothing new to you in the matter in this regard. You yourself ought to think over it seriously. If someone confides to be your friend and then asks for motor car, what will you think about him ? If he had to ask for the motor car, he would have done it forthwith, instead of beating about the bush. You won't have any pleasure of obliging him. If someone, instead, asks for it in simplicity saying, "Would you please lend me your motor car ?" You won't have any perturbation, you either decline or accept. Then, Brother you point it out yourself if anyone who seeks anything, does he appear at all to be your own ? Can you trust in or rely upon him in all respects ? Can you become his own in all regards ? Never—therefore Brother ! Faith, indeed, is the *sine qua non*, for making it live like burning coal, but it is also compulsory to be desireless. Indeed, desirelessness is the *Mahamantra* for this. Whatever we have received is not ours, nor for us. Let us make up our mind on any single matter. When the given itself is not ours, then why should we hanker after the unavailable ? When what we have already received is not ours, what is the sense in begging for more ? If we make up our mind and retain these ideas in ourselves as our own, I will have the faith in me that whatever your grade of degeneration or incapability, this degeneration and wretchedness can damage not a whit of us. And this will undoubtedly come to pass if only we adopt that whatever we have received is not ours, nor for us.

Give them to whomsoever you want, Sir ! I tell people : Give your wife, give your son; but don't keep anyone or anything as your own with yourself. Do you know ? When we give, we burden them with so many things and expect-one doesn't know what-a-multitude of things in return! Then brother ! So long as this sickness persists with us that we want to keep things with us as our own and that these are useful to us, till then do I believe that from no legislative point of view whatever, can self-identity be made into a living reality. And when self-identity itself is not live, love or endearment exists neither in spiritual exercise nor in any philosophy whatever. Endearment is expressed in self-identity, juiciness of love is expressed through endearment. It is my faith that completeness of life inheres alone in endearment of love awakened by self-identity.

'Hari Om !'

Discourse-12

28 December, 1959,

Evening.

My own Self-identity of the present exalted, magnanimous, eminence as well as Brothers and Sisters !

Human life is the life of a *sadhaka*. Call him either a man or a *sadhaka*, it is the same thing. The body is not named the *sadhaka*, the *Atman* is not called the *sadhaka* and the *Brahman* too is not an appellation of the *sadhaka*. This indicates that a *sadhaka* is neither the body, nor the *Atman* nor the *Brahman*. Then, who is the *sadhaka* ? One who has given acceptance to the sense of me-mine, but nevertheless who cherishes inquisitiveness to know the Truth as ultimate reality and loving endearment for God. Had inquisitiveness for Truth been fulfilled retaining still the sense of me-mine, and loving endearment to the Lord would have gone on, no question of realization of truth and love would have cropped up. These questions come up in life because neither inquisitiveness for knowledge of truth nor longing for Divine love is awakened while retaining the sense of me-mine. From this point of view, the remaining responsibility with every brother and sister is only that he should not regard the given as his own. Thereafter, his inquisitiveness for knowledge will automatically be fulfilled. With destruction of the sense of me-mine, equanimity is automatically expressed. You don't have to make separate effort for the expression of equanimity. Your whole effort should be directed only to the demolition of the sense of me-mine. We have only to resolve that even while we demolish the sense of me-mine we don't have to demolish the objects themselves, nor do we have to misuse them; we have only to understand clearly that the language we speak with is not ours, and the ears we hear with are also not ours. You think yourself, haven't we received even this freedom ? If we have been given this freedom, then demolition of the sense of me-mine and expression of equanimity are simultaneous. But we have not to luxuriate even in that achieved equanimity. Then there is an unconditional, spontaneous entrance into the space of Divine life and then again, there is a spontaneous torrential flow of loving endearment either from the side of Divine lover or from the side of lover. That loving endearment is self-evident, proven on its own.

The only matter that remains to be done now is that if you are capable of renouncing the sense of me-mine, do it forth with, and if some brother or sister experiences that even so much is not possible to me, he must at least experience the need for self abnegation of the sense of me-mine. When the *sadhaka* experiences the need that no sense of me-mine should remain in my life, then does come on one's own, unasked, the capacity to demolish the sense of me-mine or the sense of me-mine is eliminated automatically. But there is a special juiciness in the elimination of the sense of me-mine of which we should beware because it incarnates itself in the form of immaculate purity of inwardness, which invites luxuriance but which is not our inner demand. Then comes spiritual freedom in life. Even spiritual freedom is not our inmost demand. However, this immaculate purity and spiritual freedom are indestructible, we are unable to renounce them. If we disregard them the feeling of self-identity is awakened on its own. This feeling of self-identity contains the immediacy of ecstatic juiciness.

You might have heard of one day Mother *Kaushalya* speaking to *Sumitra*, My dear friend, let someone make me understand : I want to know if the ceremonial Departure of *Ram* to the forest is true or false; I fail to under it; because *Ram*, *Lakhan* and *Sita* are ever present to me before my eyes, all the time; but the anguish in my heart is not erased. I have heard this, and this is my experience that there is no pang of misery even by looking at him, and *pranas* too don't remain in existence without his vision. But my dear friend, the *pranas* are intact in existence; the pang of misery is also there. Therefore, let someone make me understand if *Ram's* Departure to the forest is true or false ?

You might have noticed it, you always see it happen in life that the current of time of meeting and separation, of birth and death pass simultaneously, but our inward attention doesn't note it. We don't notice that the time for silence is to arrive since the time for speech commenced. Just as the time of meeting commenced, the time of separation has also commenced; commencement has taken place; the end is also about to follow; in fact, the end, too has 'begun'. The fact that our inner attention does not stay at this illusion, does not stay on the circumstances, because we keep up retaining hope of meeting even during separation. But, contrary to this situation, when the feeling of self-identity is awakened in the *Sadhaka*, there remains the feeling

of separation in meeting and as also the feeling of meeting in separation. It is not there is no separation in meeting and no meeting in separation. Now, you think yourself, on this uniqueness of meeting and separation : Where there is feeling of separation in the state of union, will the ecstatic bliss of it yield satisfaction or fulfilment ? And where there is feeling of union in the state of separation, will there the juiciness of ecstasy allow any subjection to negativity of want ? This alone is the *rasa*, the juiciness, where there is neither satisfaction in union nor subjection to want of negativity. Every brother, every sister can attain it now, in the present. But when ? It is indeed a small matter not to regard any object on which we have no right as our own. It is not within our right to go on speaking, it is not within our right to go on hearing. That you have accepted identity with speaking and hearing and that you have converted it into a food for your own mind is an act of your own sense of me-mine.

When we consider the matter with impact from the known that if there is life in speaking, what is there in non-speaking ? If there is life in hearing, what is there in non-hearing ? And what is there beyond hearing and non-hearing ? Three matters-what is there in speech ? What is there in no-speech ? And what is there beyond speech and no-speech ? Then, it seems as if bondages of births-other-or-alternate-births, bondages of births of beginningless times were broken. Only with the little matter if life consists in speech or no-speech or beyond speech or no-speech as soon as your inward attention goes to the transcendent, believe and regard it as truth, that the boundless, immeasurable love will embrace you, and then will you be unable to find out if it is union or separation, separation or union. Whether it is love or abode of Love, abode of Love or love, you will be unable to get even a trace of either of the two. But Brother ! If you experience life in speaking, no speech will become compulsory, if you feel life in no speech, then speech will become compulsory and if you take pleasure of no-speech, speech will become compulsory. Therefore life consists neither in no-speech nor in speech but it is beyond both speaking or non-speaking.

With restless hope, and unquiet, uneasy waiting, as it were, your supreme beloved is coming to you, in accelerated speed but our attention, dispersed and diffused, is engaged at times in speaking or non-speaking, doing or non-doing. So that, brother !

Be somewhat turned away sometime from speed and stability. As soon as your face is turned away from these diversions, none different from your Beloved will be visible to you at all. It is my faith that the Home of Love does not meet the Beloved with frills of decorated greatness about Him, instead, He meets the knowers of Truth becoming indistinguishable from him; He meets the lover with little importance or significance, with tremulous impatience, restlessly, becoming his own. It appears as if he were one does not know how restless He had been without us.

Therefore Brother! This little is your responsibility. You do convert the doing into non-doing. That this doing is not converted into non-doing is not the experience of any brother or sister. Neither be subjected to doing nor to non-doing; do the right, the correct, the proper and staying a while in non-doing, let your face or inward attention be turned a bit to the transcendent unknown. Then can your inward demand for juicy ecstasy, for raptive of bliss be fulfilled. Look brother! Who will be fulfilled and who will replenish ? Let us think and ponder over the matter. He alone who is anguished and afflicted will be fulfilled and replenished, none else will get fulfilment. And who will build up and satisfy ? He who is his own. He alone who is neither distant, nor in remote abstraction from us nor in alienation from us is our own. The intense yearning for fulfilment has been made sluggish because of cyclic syndrome of doing and non-doing, stasis and speed. Today, in the wake of this weeklong *satsang*, we ought to consider the relevance and viability of the guidance that while worship is inherent in doing and dedicated, intense waiting for him is inherent in non-doing. Intense, restless waiting for His Presence is always capable of making a perfect call on Him.

'Hari Om !'

Discourse-13

29 December, 1959,

Morning

My own Self-identity of the present exalted, magnanimous, eminence as well as Brothers and Sisters !

That whose happening is held with resolute faith, His "isness" becomes easy and natural. If we accept that there is neither incapability nor any trace of dependence on the other in accepting self-identity, then it can be attained very easily and an immeasurable, unbounded, ever-fresh endearment can be awakened through it. There can be no argument, no logic of the kind which turns us away from self-identity, or deprives us of it. Because we don't have to rely upon someone for support in order to regard the other as our own. We may well be dependent upon the other for some work, to serve our purpose; but are we dependent upon anyone in order to regard him as our own ? Are we incapable in this regard ? Whatever want of freedom is perceptible in this regard is primarily owing to obstruction caused by temptation for fulfilment of desire. There is no propriety of relevance at all in order to accept self-identity in the sense that we regard you as our own because you might be useful to me in a certain situation. Then, you can say that accepting self-identity is not possible to me. But that we should be useful to you, you can use us as you like, you should appear endearing to us, are we dependent upon the other even for this ? We are not dependent for this. Yes, if someone says he doesn't like that anyone should be loving and endearing to him. Then, brother, there is no question of accepting self-identity. But if you want that someone should be endearing to us or we should be endearing to someone this is not essential; but that someone should be the most loving and endearing to us, then for this self identity is the most infallible measure.

Some people opine that endearment is awakened because of a certain importance. He will appear loveable, because of some speciality about him. This matter of speciality arises in case of those who have considerations for personal joy in order to love someone. Those who are attracted for certain specific importance indulge in personal pleasure. But the lover is drawn to the Lord, or is attracted to Him, not for any of His importance. The lover's sole attraction for Him is the singular feeling of

self-identity. He is dear to us because He is our own. It is not that he is dear to us because He is *Brahman*, He is unbounded. This feeling of self identity is not cultivated because of His High, outstanding eminence, not because He is *Paramatma*, He is all powerful, so he is to be regarded as our own. The feeling of self-identity is not cultivated for this merit.

Everyone is agreed to accept the purifier of the fallen as His own, the kind to the poor as His own, the all-powerful as His own. There is no matter of speciality about it. But we want to regard Him as our own so that He might appear endearing to us. Brother ! Why do you want that He should appear endearing to you ? Because there is no other way to offer Him bliss of exciting love. Consider the point : Someone of lesser strength can be vanquished by the stranger than oneself, someone less qualified than you can be vanquished by one of greater qualification, we can attract one of lesser beauty by virtue of our greater beauty. But no special attribute can prove adequate to give juiciness of exciting love to the one with limitless beauty, unbounded invincibility and unbounded sweetness. The only required attribute is that he should appear loving, endearing to us. And no other measure except this that one ought to regard Him as our own is required.

If you consider and look at the issue with this viewpoint, self-identity is cultivated in order to give juiciness of exciting bliss to the abode of love, not for one's own welfare, not for one's own emancipation, nor for the greed that I will get something out of it. Why ? Whatever is useful to us, has already been given to every brother and sister without asking. What, indeed is useful to us ? There are two matters-we can put to genuine use that which has been given to us and attain high place in the world, and by adopting discriminating renunciation we attain spiritual freedom and self-bliss.

These two matters-spiritual freedom and self-bliss-it seems to me, are meant for our own use. But the endearment awakened by self-identity gives juiciness of love to the Divine Beloved. Although endearment awakened in anyone is enriched with juiciness for all; it is not cold, nonchalant, because loving endearment is juicy for everyone by its very nature. But the juiciness of love is available to the abode of love alone and only he is the rightful owner of this love. Ask your neighbouring endearing people, you seem to be very endearing to us indeed,

but I cannot part from the object for you. Immediately, you will get the answer that 'let your love for me go to Hell!' Those cherishing ponderous pride on his wife's feeling of self-identity, let him tell his wife : Look ! I have no clothes, no meals to cater to you, no speech of sweetness and grace, I love and regard you as my own, Darling, be pleased ! I don't require such as inept husband! God, the Lord alone, is strong enough to get cheered up and enchanted by mere Love.

Let us consider and look ourselves at the point. Look for any friendly fellow all over the world, not even a single such-a-one would you find who gets contented merely with the notional form that you love him and you must be satisfied with this much. They will say instead that you love me so that your bungalow is mine, your motor car is my motor car.

Many people come to me; they look at me from a distance identifying persons—men and women—who are in contact with me. Again, they think: Now that *B.P. Sinha* has become President of the *Manav-Seva-Sangh*, let us pray to *Swamiji* to recommend our names for judgeship of the Honorable High Court. They come to me for the reason that a certain officer comes and goes to *Swamiji*, so that I may be recommended for confirmation. Now think. There was a time when people come to saints for blessings. Now they come to saints for recommendation for confirmation to posts. You may search all over the world : You will get not a single man who might say that he regards you as your own, get contented only with this much. You will not get even a single such. Who ever you think to be such, you may test him to verify yourself. This self-identity is meant for one's own liberation. This self identity is meant for giving exciting bliss to the Abode of Love. How fortunate would be those from whom the Abode of Love gets exciting bliss!

Would it that the sole yearning of our life were to make it useful to him! The light of wisdom granted by Him became useful to us, the object given by him became useful to us and the world but how, after all, can we be useful to Him ? For that self identity with Him is the most intimate, warm and unflinching measure. Don't worry that where do we, the ordinary, petty, human animals get the right from to call the unbounded Infinite as our own ? Brother ! Think, discriminate and judge! He who doesn't identify with the Lord and is unable to apprehend his belongingness to the Divine Being, who else is there whom he

can call Him his own ? He alone has the power, the capacity, the Might that everyone can call Him his own. Everyone in the world cannot be called your own. The Infinite, the Absolutely unbounded alone has the Power, the Capacity that he belongs to all, and belongs to all forever. Therefore never hesitate to regard Him your own, don't be scared, don't retain the alternative that we cannot call Him as our own. Why not speak of Him as our own ? Point out, then who else shall we call our own ?

Point out anyone else who may be called our own. Who ever will you proceed on to speak of your own will be the collectivity of so many, one doesn't know how many senses of me-mine. You will find no room empty for its own owner already self-appointed. There will be no individual without stigma of attachment to the me-mine of many a man and woman. He alone is the Being with belongingness to all. Therefore there is absolutely no matter of fear in that we have had no previous preparation, we have no capacity whatever, we have no ability, we have no purity, there is nothing to be scared about it. Whatever our ability and capacity he has given us the freedom to call anyone our own, or not our own.

When you decided and resolved firmly that you would regard the Lord as your own, even the Lord has no capacity to decline or negate it. Why ? This freedom has been granted and given to every man without exception. You can speak of anyone as your own you like to, and every brother and sister can break the relation of me-mine whenever they want to do so. It is another matter that when unbounded in self-identity, your sense of me-mine is broken, and when the relation of me-mine is broken, the relation of self-identity comes about automatically.

Now, if you argue that you want to break the attachment of me-mine, but are incapable of doing it. Nothing to worry about in the matter; this much you know and believe that you want to break the sense of me-mine and become one with self-identity. If you really believe in the proposition and say with anguish in the heart that, "O my dear One! We want to have faith in You as our own, but are unable to do so, we want to break attachment to the sense of me-mine but we are unable to do so". Say so with anguished heart and appeal to Him in silence. And you will be unable to trace how the attachment to me-mine was broken, disappeared, and how self-identity came about on a firm foundation. Why ? That which you want to do, but are unable to

do, the very wanting is doing itself, nothing else is doing. Wanting to do becomes identical with doing itself. Look! Who, indeed, is incapable of doing? He who is capable of doing; but fails to do. So that who is careless? He who is inadvertent wanting in attention, either because of carelessness inadvertence or incapability we fail to break the sense of me-mine and are unable to become one in self-identity, there is nothing to worry about; but the point that you want to break the sense of me-mine, and become one with self-identity, this want of ours should be intact, protected and strengthened.

When does our any of the wants remain protected? When or so long as it is not fulfilled and there remains no other want along with it. When one and any one want remains in life, then will it remain intact and protected? Till which time? So long as it is not fulfilled. If we want to break the sense of me-mine and become one with self-identity, let this sense of want remain safe-guarded. That we could not break it is no cause for anxiety, that we could not unite it to self-identity is also no cause for anxiety. But this yearning to break the sense of me-mine and make it one with self-identity, this inclination to keep it intact, should be stable. There is only one measure to do it to keep the desire single and not to allow any other desire to step in. Why? Because the piece of land in which many kinds of seeds are sown does not lead to strong germination of plants. On the other hand if there is a single kind of seed in the piece of land how much strong will be the plant? Likewise our individuality too is like a piece of land.

If there is a single, lone yearning in my or own life that this sense of me-mine were broken, and self-identity with God established, then believe it as truth, that when a singular yearning remains in life it is fulfilled on its own. When this yearning gets fulfilled, then we are not even aware that we had, truly speaking, broken attachment to the sense of me-mine or had become one in union with self-identity.

It is mere egoism that we get or find out the trace of breaking the sense of me-mine or becoming one with self-identity. They are supremely fortunate who don't have any awareness of having broken the sense of me-mine; they, indeed, have the feeling that they did not break it at all; I don't know how it was broken? I did not get united to self-identity; I don't know, however, it happened on its own. When there is neither

any awareness of release from vices nor of expression of virtues, then there should be understood that union with innocence has transpired. So long as it seems to the *Sadhaka* that I have abnegated this vice and adopted this virtue till then is it neither adoption of virtue nor abnegation of vice.

Therefore, the experience of incapability is a vast space and ground for development; not the thought of incapability, but experience of incapability is urgently required. A feeling of anguish underlies incapability; there is no suffering in the thought of incapability, nor sorrow in retaining thoughts of incapability. To think that we are incapable is not significant at all. We say that we have experience of incapability or retain it or just maintain it or just indulging in the pleasure of its experience. Those that have the experience of such an incapability become anguished by it; Don't know why 'that callous' has this nature? He cannot see anyone anguished even continuously for twenty-four hours.

If I tell you of my own faith in the matter, my own faith is that only anguish does not stay even for a little while, it does not remain lingering at all. This misery or anguish that looms over life, there remains along with it some kind of a lurking indulgence in pleasure. But when there remains no trace of pleasure in life at all, and there looms stark anguish alone, then do I opine that just as there is no intervening imagination of time between sun-rise and release from darkness, similarly sheer, absolute anguish and development or evolution in sadhana go simultaneously.

Now, think yourself; aren't we the rightful man to have even the anguish of our failure to get into the relation of self-identity with God? Aren't we the rightful man to have the anguish of being incapable of breaking the sense of me-mine? If you are unable to have even this anguish, where will you existence itself be proved? You consider the point. If you and we accept any of our existence, there ought to be something or the other in it. The painful absence of that which we want makes it indistinguishable from that which is our demand. This proves that in the anguish of the present is contained all development. From this point of view, if we cannot have relation of self-identity with God independently, let the anguish of being without it, continue. As supremely beautiful and Almighty. He cannot see anyone in the anguish of suffering.

People might argue that hundreds are suffering. How does he see us suffer ? The reason is that in your misery and affliction is contained indulgence in and temptation for pleasure. Suffering exists in life in order to demolish that temptation. When there will be no temptation for pleasure, no enjoying oneself, that very time, that misery which you regard as suffering or experience as such, will not be there but the redeemer of suffering will be there. He will say you are mine. You will say-no, you are mine. He will say you are endearing to me. You will say no, you are endearing to me. This alone is immeasurable, Infinite juiciness of love.

'Hari Om !'

Discourse-14

29 December, 1959,

Evening.

My own Self-identity of the present exalted, magnanimous, eminence as well as Brothers and Sisters !

The aim of *Manav Seva Sangh* is to realize self-welfare as well as to organize a beautiful society. The ethics and the meaning of *Manav Seva Sangh* are contained in twin matters - man or woman is that who has some demand and who has a certain responsibility. It's not called a demand if it cannot be fulfilled nor can that be called a responsibility which cannot be worked out. From this point of view, in this human life, no space at all can be traced for failure, hopelessness nor to pine away with a defeatist mentality. Now we have to appraise deeply what the demand of all of us is ? It is clearly known, after due deliberation on the issue, that there is no such brother, no such sister whose demand is not rest, not freedom and not love. All of us need these three glories of the Divine Spirit. These are : Sublime rest, spiritual freedom and supreme Love. But what responsibility develops upon us for the complete working out of it. And the responsibility is only one not three. To renounce in one's life the known not heard, nor believed to renounce the known untruth. This is the responsibility.

What is the meaning of renunciation of untruth ? Let us consider the point a bit. The mistake we have made, or the mistake that we know is a mistake, now, I shall not commit it. That's all the meaning of renunciation of untruth. Take it to be the truth that whether he or she is a man or woman of Hindustan, whether he or she belongs to any religion or sect, one thing is naturally true for all that the present time is innocent in case of all of us. Ask any brother or sister of the mistake that he committed, he would not speak of having made it in the present he would have made the mistake sometime before. If it is seen from this point of view, I cannot say that any brother can say honestly that I have always been honest. Some or other mistake has been made. But no brother and no sister can say that there are only mistakes in their life. None is subject to mistakes in all respects, none has committed mistakes in the present. Whatever mistakes have been made, these have been made in the past. We

will not repeat the mistakes already committed this is called renunciation of the known untruth.

What mistake has been made ? Basically, I would affirm that three mistakes have been made by us. One mistake has been that we misuse the given strength. This has been a serious lapse. The second blunder has been that we disregard that which is already known to us. The third error has been that which has only been heard, not known, we betray our faith in him. These three mistakes have been usually committed by us. If we resolve today not to misuse the given strength, whether the strength of wealth, or of post or position in society, or of ability, or of knowledge and sciences, and arts, whatever be the strength, we shall not misuse them. Then what will happen on its own ? With the stopping of misuse of strength there will follow either the right use of it or we shall remain in rest for sometime, remain in non-doing neither in idleness, nor in escape from work-or will follow the right use of that strength or will remain in rest. You know what will result from this? Right use of it will result in the making of beautiful society. What kind of beautiful society ? Will everybody receive beautiful bungalow ? Will everybody receive profuse materials? Will everyone have necessary materials ? Brother ! This is like buying fruits of the garden and getting shade of trees on its own. Such a beautiful society will be built up, my brother ! Which will require neither a king born of a queen nor minister born of womb of the people.

What is the identity of a beautiful society ? That is a society where there is no misuse or abuse of power and strength. I ask you of a society where there is no misuse or abuse of power, can there be any usurpation of anybody's rights ? It cannot be possible at any of the time in the past, present or future. When there is no usurpation of the rights of anyone, will there be any need for an organized nation state ? Do you know why any nation-state becomes a necessity ? It becomes a necessity in order to encounter strength by means of strength, power and might. Do you know why religion and ethics become a necessity ? These in their turn are required to abnegate the untruth already known to us. What is our condition today ? Look at the situation in any country whatever, however beautifully organized. What is the condition ? Is there no need for an organized nation state in that country, applying the label of their respective religion, has it been possible to them to renounce untruth from their own life ? If you

will not repeat the mistakes already committed this is called renunciation of the known untruth.

What mistake has been made ? Basically, I would affirm that three mistakes have been made by us. One mistake has been that we misuse the given strength. This has been a serious lapse. The second blunder has been that we disregard that which is already known to us. The third error has been that which has only been heard, not known, we betray our faith in him. These three mistakes have been usually committed by us. If we resolve today not to misuse the given strength, whether the strength of wealth, or of post or position in society, or of ability, or of knowledge and sciences, and arts, whatever be the strength, we shall not misuse them. Then what will happen on its own ? With the stopping of misuse of strength there will follow either the right use of it or we shall remain in rest for sometime, remain in non-doing neither in idleness, nor in escape from work-or will follow the right use of that strength or will remain in rest. You know what will result from this? Right use of it will result in the making of beautiful society. What kind of beautiful society ? Will everybody receive beautiful bungalow ? Will everybody receive profuse materials? Will everyone have necessary materials ? Brother ! This is like buying fruits of the garden and getting shade of trees on its own. Such a beautiful society will be built up, my brother ! Which will require neither a king born of a queen nor minister born of womb of the people.

What is the identity of a beautiful society ? That is a society where there is no misuse or abuse of power and strength. I ask you of a society where there is no misuse or abuse of power, can there be any usurpation of anybody's rights ? It cannot be possible at any of the time in the past, present or future. When there is no usurpation of the rights of anyone, will there be any need for an organized nation state ? Do you know why any nation-state becomes a necessity ? It becomes a necessity in order to encounter strength by means of strength, power and might. Do you know why religion and ethics become a necessity ? These in their turn are required to abnegate the untruth already known to us. What is our condition today ? Look at the situation in any country whatever, however beautifully organized. What is the condition ? Is there no need for an organized nation state in that country, applying the label of their respective religion, has it been possible to them to renounce untruth from their own life ? If you

have accomplished it, then, undoubtedly your life will be useful to yourself and the world. But, brother ! When we look at the present situation, it appears that where as on the one hand the nation state goes on imposing tax after tax, on the other hand the expert lawyer goes on imparting lessons on legal theft. The nation state has gone down to this predicament. The nation-states could not erase the inclination to abuse strength and power from your and our existence and memory.

Therefore, today, under this horrible circumstances, the question before every brother and sister is about how to organize a beautiful society ? No beautiful society was built up ever by the country as nation state in the past, nor will it ever happen in the future, nor can it ever happen. When will it happen, when we and you, brother and sister of every class of society resolve from this moment that we shall not misuse the strength given to us. A beautiful society will automatically come into being. Intelligent human being argue here : Has it ever happened so far like this till today ? I ask you whether that which has happened till today, has it ever remained in existence ? Sir, could it happen like this till today, there would have been no need for the *Manav Seva Sangh*. You may argue- you alone have been the man who says that it will happen like that now ? We ask you, don't you require a beautiful society ? Do you want a deceitful friend, do you want a dishonest friend ? You will honestly say, you don't want him. The need of today is the achievement for the future. Therefore, brother mine ! Undoubtedly, I have the unwavering faith that if we don't misuse the given strength, the beautiful society will surely be organized. This beautiful society cannot be built up by some legislation, nor can it be organized by anyone else than yourself. The society from which the individual keeps his eyes on it that we will build up beautiful society, his work of organizing it surely succeeds.

Manav Seva Sangh has made up a *Satsang* Project for this. It has several forms. The first form is that we should, before going to bed and after waking as an individual being, look at our life in the light of discrimination and give up our mistakes what appears to us. Then comes satsang in the form of family get together as *satsang*. Meeting with members of the family in an ambience of affection and keeping safeguard of mutual respect and love, we should discuss matters in the light of truth of life. And from our own side we should be a miable and

apologetically concerned for pains caused to other members of the family with readiness to accept one's faults and offensiveness, if any. This family get-together for *Satsang* is called familial *Satsang*. Then there is Collective *Satsang*, once a week or twice a week or once a month and again big collective *Satsang* as the loving public here have organized twice daily for a week. These get-togethers for *Satsang*, previously scheduled and organized, will complete both the plans of the nation-state and do the needful for the religion. From our own point of view, we can get rid of our faults, lapses, mistakes known to us. But the mistakes or blunders pointed out to us by others, may possibly get translated or remain untranslated in our life, we may or may not accept it, but when we look at our own faults known to us, we can get rid of them.

With feeling to translate the project for *Satsang* into reality the weeklong *Satsang* was celebrated here. Those who participated in it will realize themselves how necessary a part of life it is! If your aim is to realize the goal of individual welfare and building up beautiful society, this *satsang* project should be worked out, taking up the same need, with which you sit down for meals or take sleep. You know that the body will not remain even as you take meal after meal and taking sleep after sleep. But by virtue of *Satsang* all of us will get rest and inner stillness, get spiritual freedom and love will awaken. That which is rest, stillness or relaxation is an epitome of strength, capacity or energy. That which is spiritual freedom is an epitome of immortality and freedom of unbounded consciousness and that which is an epitome of immeasurable infinite ever fresh, ever-new, juiciness of bliss is love. Can't we adopt such a *Satsang*? We can certainly adopt it.

Therefore gentlemen! Let us be ready to translate the *Satsang* Project in life. You might say that if we don't misuse strength, what shall we get out of rest? Think, As you speak the truth, mutual trust gets promoted; no-speech will lead the energy of sense organs to get dissolved in the mind on its own, the energy of the mind will dissolve in the intellect on its own and the intellect will become equanimous. That is named yoga. Do you know what is the substance of that *yoga*? There is strength, power and energy in it. What kind of energy is there in it? If you are seeker of wisdom, discriminating wisdom will automatically rise from you, the spirit of inquiry in you will be quenched. If

you are a materialist, a unique power and capacity will emerge in you from that very *yoga* and you will be dedicated to duty, and if you are a devotee of God and have faith in him, from that very *yoga* a pang of separation from God will awake in you giving attainment of love. From this point of view it is undebatably true that by abnegating undutifulness will come dedication to *Sadhana*; and there will be, with demolition of passionate attachment, an emergence of supreme love.

You resolved not to misuse strength; and there was right use of strength on its own. Don't take pride when truthful use of strength begins to happen, nor should you keep temptation for joy in view of it. Don't think that you make the truthful use of strength, and you will get joy for it in exchange nor should you take pride of it that you make the right use of strength. Why? By taking pride virtue and vice are generated and limited ego-sense comes into the being. And where separative ego comes into play many a mistakes are generated on its own. This is one thing. Another matter is that we get subjected to delusion of individuality, in order to aggrandize the delusion of individuality, that we should get established, get honour and fame with this feeling and in this regard, we should not work. If you are a materialist you ought to keep regard of the world; if you are a spiritualist, you should keep the Atman in view while working; if you have faith in God, you should work with feeling of worship for God. It is a law of life that the cosmic entity in regard of which a work happens or is done, the doer becomes at the end of the work the focus of its love. This becomes a beautiful accomplishment. Consider the point. It is said that letting one drink a glass of water brings one attainment of love. When? If it is not done in regard for the body, then; if it is not done in regard of temptation for personal pleasure, then. If you let the water drink with a view to serve the interest of the world, you will attain love for the world; if you let someone drink a glass of water with love for the *Atman*, you will get love for the *Atman* and you will attain Divine Love for making someone drink it for the sake of God. You will get only love. You know that, when love awakens in someone, it is in the form and spirit of ecstatic bliss to those in whom it rises and it is also in the form and spirit of ecstatic bliss to those for whom it rises. From this point of view when love will awaken in the heart, there will only be

ever-fresh ecstatic bliss. This alone is one's own welfare and well-being.

Therefore, brother mine! One responsibility that devolves upon us is that we shall surely abnegate untruth and for this we should get ready to do with the whole of our energy. One other matter is that, imagine that you decided to relinquish the untruth known to you and could not do it for some reasons. It is not that you cannot do it. Let me point it out to you here that from the viewpoint of principle or law of life every brother and sister can relinquish untruth. Despite this inculcate law of life, imagine that you could not do it, if you have the anguish of not having done it, then take it be the truth, the capacity to relinquish that will come to you. Thus, two matters remain with us—renounce it, or remain anguished for not having done it.

Therefore brother! I had got it written sometime somewhere in my book that only two conditions in our life are positively meaningful either the fire of restlessness should keep burning or the *Ganga* of ecstatic bliss should keep flowing in waves and wavelets. The basic question of human life today, before you and us, is that we shall not misuse the given strength. You have to think one more thing in this regard. What is proper about the use of strength in human life? You cannot use strength against the stronger, nor can you use it against the one equal in strength to you. Consider and look at the matter. If someone stranger than you brings harm to you, you cannot call him valiant for that. Use of strength in itself is against the weak, whether it be against two countries or two classes, or between two individuals. If you use the strength, it will be enforced against the weak. I want to ask you what do we expect from the strong destruction or protection? Think of it. No brother or sister will ever entertain the option in his or her heart that someone stronger than him or her should harm or destroy. This also proved that strength is the inheritance of the weak. When strength is the inheritance of the weak, then we should take a vow not to misuse our strength. All our blunder will automatically be demolished.

The second point I wanted to submit to you is that you should not be irrelevant to what you know already. In no case should you disrespect the known. Who is the brother who does not know, who is the sister who does not know that the object which is available to me today, will not remain next time, and

that which existed earlier, does not exist today. The whole kingdom of the waking is gone in the dream state, the whole kingdom of the dream state does not exist in deep sleep, the inertia of deep sleep does not exist in the state of *Samadhi*, the ecstatic bliss of *Samadhi* does not abide in non-attachment; and the supreme awakening of Love does not exist in the Spiritual freedom of Non-attachment. Who is unknown to the peak of Love supreme! Therefore Brother! This which is known to us not be irreverent to It, this Supreme Ecstatic Bliss of Peak of Love. In that very way in the heard or known Lord, I don't say that you should have reverence for him, I don't ask you to believe in him, you don't believe in him, you don't have faith in him, then will he have to live like our own, great, greatest, Supreme ecstasy! But I tell you with certainty not to have irreverence for the Lord. I assure you if you don't have irreverence for the Lord, your faith in the Lord will surely awaken, the wisdom in you will awaken; if you don't misuse or abuse the given, dutifulness will arise in you. Dutifulness, non-attachment with blazing light of self-identity, life will fulfil itself in completeness.

Hari Om !