

Lights on Advaita: Selected Teachings of V. Subrahmanya Iyer

- CHAPTER 1: BEYOND YOGA
- CHAPTER 2: FALLACIES OF RELIGIONS
- CHAPTER 3: THE MEANING OF RELIGION
- CHAPTER 4: THE MEANING OF MYSTICISM.
- CHAPTER 5: THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY
- CHAPTER 6: LOGIC SCIENCE & PHILOSOPHIC REASON
- CHAPTER 7: CHARACTERISTICS OF PHILOSOPHICAL DISCIPLINE
- CHAPTER 8: THE NEED OF SEMANTICS.
- CHAPTER 9: RELATIVITY AND THE TWO STANDPOINTS.
- CHAPTER 10: PHILOSOPHY OF SENSATION & PERCEPTION
- CHAPTER 11: ILLUSIONS OF SPACE, TIME, EXTERNALITY
- CHAPTER 12: DOCTRINE OF MENTALISM.
- CHAPTER 13: THE ILLUSION OF WORLD EXPERIENCE
- CHAPTER 14: THE ILLUSION OF EGO EXPERIENCE.
- CHAPTER 15: AVASTATRAYA
- CHAPTER 16. THE ULTIMATE AS TRUTH.
- CHAPTER 17: PRACTICAL PHILOSOPHY
- CHAPTER 18: ETHICS
- CHAPTER 19: KARMA
- CHAPTER 20: POLITICS
- CHAPTER 21: DOCTRINE OF NON-CAUSALITY.
- CHAPTER 22. PANCHADESI
- CHAPTER 23. SRIMAD BHAGAVATAM
- CHAPTER 24: LAST MESSAGE OF KRISHNA
- CHAPTER 25: BUDDHISM
- CHAPTER 26: A U M
- CHAPTER 27: SELECT WORKS OF SRI SANKARACHARYA.
- CHAPTER 28: APAROKSHANUBHUTI: 'DIRECT REALIZATION'
- CHAPTER 29: SWATMANIRUPANA: or Definition of One's own Self.
- CHAPTER 30: SRI SANKARA
- CHAPTER 31: BRAHMA SUTRAS
- CHAPTER 32: VIVECKACHUDAMANI SUPPLIMENT
- CHAPTER 33: SWAMI VIVEKANANDA & SRI RAMAKRISHNA
- CHAPTER 34: V.S.I. PERSONAL
- CHAPTER 35: COUNSEL: GENERAL
- CHAPTER 36: LITERARY COUNSEL
- CHAPTER 37: KANT
- CHAPTER 38: ANCIENT EUROPEANS
- CHAPTER 39: MODERN WESTERN PHILOSOPHERS
- CHAPTER 40: MANDUKYA UPANISHAD
- CHAPTER 41: VIVEKACHUDAMANI OF SANKARACHARYA
- CHAPTER 42: DRG DRSYA VIVIKA

CHAPTER 43: ASHTAVAKRA SAMHITA
CHAPTER 44: UPANISHADS
CHAPTER 45: BHAGAVAD GITA
CHAPTER 46: ART
CHAPTER 47: SAGEHOOD AS AN IDEAL
CHAPTER 48: THE MIND
CHAPTER 49: THE ULTIMATE AS REALITY
CHAPTER 50: THE NEED OF ULTRA-MYSTICISM

CHAPTER 1: BEYOND YOGA

(1.1) On Light: How do you see various objects, scenes and persons during your dreams? If the dream world were covered with darkness you can never see it. Therefore there must be a light in the dream world. This light is similar to the light (joti) seen by the yogis in samadhi.

(1.2) The gross world is merged into the mental world in the sense that when it is analyzed, it is found to exist inseparably in and as the mind alone. All "spiritual" planes are really mental.

(1.3) Is impossible to prove the existence of God by any reasoning: you can only say "I believe." The most rational position is that of the agnostic, "I do not know."

(1.4) Mystics see visions of gods and goddesses and adepts according to their own vasanas (impressions remaining unconsciously in the mind from past karma).

(1.5) Authoritarianism merely assumes as true what another says, but what has yet to be proved.

(1.6) You may believe in a position, but you are required to prove the truth of your belief. A belief is a feeling, truth is knowledge.

(1.7) Disappointments in religion or mysticism or even science imply error or ignorance. Create the question. "Am I in the right?" Where is the certainty that I am proceeding on right lines?" Thus doubts arise and the inquiring spirit comes and impels to search elsewhere for truth where it will not be possible even to have doubt. The test is therefore in experience. And only in non-duality, where there are no two to argue about views or to have difference of opinion can such doubtlessness be possible.

(1.8) There is a controversy as to the meaning of Maya. One Advaitic School says it is a shakti¹ of Brahman whereby both illusion and creation are brought about. I reply: How do you know that it is the truth? If you base it on the sayings of Rishis and saints I say, granting that they honestly believed in their experiences, there is still the query how do they know that these experiences were the truth? For even lunatics believe in what they

¹ Cosmic creative power

see and feel and yet their experiences are often quite untrue. What then is it in us which ascertains the truth of these experiences? If you say it is anubhava², mystic experience, then my experience differs from yours: Such disagreement does not settle the matter. Thus these are the two common sources--authority and samadhi--but both are shown untenable. Some object that the differences of samadhi or anubhava experience are like different parts seen of same single elephant. I reply, how can you prove that it is the same elephant and how know that each man is seeing the same part? Others say that mystic experience always gives the same result in peace and bliss. I reply: You can only assume thus: it is impossible to know whether the taste of sugar in one man's mouth is the same as its taste in another's. For to know you would have to use his tongue and his mouth which is impossible: you can only assume.

(1.9) Unless you give up the ideas of heaven and hell, philosophy is impossible. Truth must be proved here and now, on this earth. If that cannot be done, we cannot consider any such idea, as existence of heaven and hell, as true.

(1.10) Religion is "My Truth"; Philosophy is "Truth for All." This means religionist takes his feeling of truth whereas the philosopher takes his reasoned judgment, which will be the same under test everywhere in the world.

(1.11) My position is this: I have not seen God. I do not know his capacities, what He can do, and what he cannot do. Therefore any statement I might make about God would only be a lie. I do not wish to tell a lie. Therefore I do not accept your God nor deny Him; I simply refuse to make any statement about Him.

(1.12) God is only a settled fact for believers, but for others His existence is problematic.

(1.13) When Francis Bacon said that a little philosophy leads to atheism, he was right but profounder thought leads to agnosticism. He who says, "I know there is no God," is foolish.

(1.14) How do the mystics know they have experienced the whole? Where is the proof they have seen it? When they say "I know from experience" they merely mean "I think so." If mystics experience joy, they cannot be egoless, for who is having the joy? And if they retain the ego they cannot know the Universal Brahman, the whole.

(1.15) How do you know asks Sankara³, that God who tells about himself in meditation or mysticism is truthful! He may tell you a lie! His statements must therefore be tested. Supposing a mystic has a vision, which experience is true, but he must prove that it is really what it purports to be, and that he is not deluded.

² anubhava – actual experience

³ Sankara, the Great Hindu Philosopher, founder of the Advaita school

(1.16) Appearances and quotations have nothing to do with Philosophy. Why does not Krishna say in the Gita that it is found in the Veda? How many times has Buddha quoted the scriptures? Never. So also Gaudapada⁴ and Sankara.

(1.17) Suggestions may come to you from a book or person read or seen some years ago, and thinking of them a number of times; then when you meet and sit before a yogic guru for first time, the suggestion comes up from the past or subconscious and gives you vision or mystic experience. The whole thing is a super-imposition. So the mind is led by constant dwelling on a thought, to the manufacture of it as a projected experience. Similarly with worshippers in church who fall into tears. The complex overcomes them.

(1.18) Two ways of religious cheating have always existed and are always successful (1) Say what happens after death-- nobody can deny it (2) Say you have seen God by intuition--who can disprove it?

(1.19) No mystic experience ever reveals truth. The feat of a guru, touching people and thus putting them into mystic states is purely a physical or at best a psychological one; based on the power of suggestions it has nothing to do with epistemology, with the question of truth. It is just a higher variation of the effect produced by patting a friend on the shoulder to encourage him.

(1.20) Scriptural tenets may be quoted in philosophy as authoritative only after you have shown the reality and proved the truth, for then you can point out that the texts teach the same thing. If you quote them before having demonstrated truth, then it is scholasticism.

(1.21) Doubts come to man when he meets with suffering and disappointment. The latter are absolutely necessary to make men inquire. Thus when man gets an internal pain he begins to question whether he has eaten something bad. Philosophy is the getting rid of all doubts.

(1.22) When we say philosophy begins with doubt, we mean doubting yourself, your own beliefs.

(1.23) How is truth to be attained? Not by intuition but by reason, which is superior to it. Not even a combination of intellect and intuition will find truth.

(1.24) Proof is the first thing in Indian Philosophy, "How do I know that you are God" they would ask Him, if He appeared.

(1.25) If yogis practice Yoga up to the limit and extent of getting a strong and concentrative mind, and to be able to think of particular subjects, it is good; beyond that if they begin to weaken their mind and accept what they imagine as real, they begin to go insane.

⁴ Famous commentator on the key text The Mandukya Upanishad

(1.26) Yoga belief is a self-mesmeric condition out of which it is extremely difficult to escape.

(1.27) Reason is the common ground for all humanity in modern times, whereas the appeal to scriptural relations reaches only groups. The great Sages of Advaita, knew that one day the world would throw up scriptures, hence they provided for the appeal to reason and met the objections of skeptics in their literature, no less than those of religious believers.

(1.28) Vedantic position is: first prove your standpoint true before we can accept the criticism or objection made from it.

(1.29) Intuitions exist, yes. But nevertheless although they flash into the mind without any process of thought to mark the intervening stages, still they are ideas, mental phenomena in their full nature. They must project themselves into the mind as ideas.

(1.30) Yogic and mystic experiences are imaginations projected outwards as the dreamer projects his dream visions.

(1.31) If God answers prayers it means He interferes and thus changes; hence he can't be relied on as the unchanging eternal one: he may even die, if he can change. It also implies that He could free us from our own troubles but won't, hence he is cruel. If you blame Karma why did he make with the certain possibility of all creatures falling into error and consequent pain, as we see everywhere, which possibility he must have foreseen as He is Omniscient? No, the theory cannot hold. And if God is unchanging and does not alter his mind, what is the use of praying to him?

(1.32) Do not be carried away by the confusion of issues and say "He is such a good man, such lofty character, that what he says must be true." A man may be sincere, enthusiastic, high charactered, but withal a shallow thinker.

(1.33) The whole of life has to be resolutely weighed, and accurately, observed in philosophy. We must ask: What is this world, What Am I? Hence Science is a necessary foundation. Hence too, the Yogi who looks only inside and ignores the world throws away part of the materials needed to find truth.

(1.34) Without knowing the nature of the world, it is impossible to know truth. What is the use of trying to find your inner self before you understand the world. The very opening words of the first and second slokas of the Mandukya refers to "all this" meaning "this world which confronts you as being AUM."

(1.35) Look at everything in nature because in every thing there is Brahman. Do not avoid them, do not shut your eyes to Nature; do not shut yourself away from the world which is as much Brahman, as anywhere else. But those who are brainless or of dulled mind tell you to be non-observant and to withdraw: keen powers of observation are desirable and will help, not hinder your pursuit of truth. Take experiences as they come to

you, do not run away from the world in ascetic fear or shyness of them. To say they are Maya without first examining them, and inquiring into them thoroughly is to delude yourself. This world is common to all of us, therefore we must begin our inquiry with it and not flee. It is only after you have inquired into the nature of the objective world, that you should inquire into who is the knower. If, however you inquire into the knower before the inquiry into the universe, then it is mere mysticism. What is the world? must precede Who am I? in philosophy.

(1.36) Yoga will give steadiness of mind, education of mind, but never Truth because it ignores the external world.

(1.37) Our chief argument against yoga is that it shuts its eyes against the world and then has the temerity to declare that it knows the world to be Brahman! Because it has not inquired into it, it knows nothing.

(1.38) Yoga's secret from Vedantic viewpoint is this: it helps the yogi by giving him the feeling that the world is not worth bothering about, it detaches him from world; it makes him treat the world as a dream, i.e. an idea. It does the same to his ego to some extent because he becomes indifferent to what happens to him. But the great secret is that this is only feeling, he feels these things only but does not know that the world is an idea. Such knowledge can come only after philosophic inquiry and in no other way. That is why yogi cannot be gnani. It is the difference between feeling and knowledge. Feeling of the yogi that the world is unreal may change tomorrow because all emotions are liable to change; and the fact is that yogis do change, as when going after women they lose their sense of world unreality though previously they felt it. A permanent view of world as unreal can come only after intellectual inquiry; such knowledge cannot change. Were the yogi of sufficiently sharp intellect he could discover the ideality of world by reasoning alone and then it would not be necessary for him to have gone through yoga practice at all; that is why we say yoga is for dull or middling intellects.

(1.39) Man is primarily interested in himself. Hence, to get him started on a higher quest we advise him to go to the root of his own self, i.e. to ask "Who Am I?" This is a mystic formula. When as a later consequence of this mystic practice he gets more impersonal we teach him to go to the root of all existence, i.e. to ask "What is the Meaning of the World?"

(1.40) In the old times Vedanta was taught, not by putting a pupil in a cave and telling him to sit quiet, but by taking him to a peepul tree and by breaking a seed off, and showing it to the pupil and breaking it into smaller and smaller fragments and pointing out to him the wonder of a great living tree growing out of the seed. Thus the chela⁵ was shown the objective world first, and taught to question about it.

(1.41) All is self. We cannot get away from body or thoughts. They are part of us, so is the world of our life. Hence need to understand world, if we want ultimate truth.

⁵ beginning student

(1.42) All other yogas lead finally to Gnan which transcends and fulfils them. The highest form of yoga is Gnana Yoga, according to which the individual soul realizes through knowledge its identity with the universal soul.

(1.43) Yoga cannot remove ignorance. It is only a step. It removes obstructions.

(1.44) It is not possible by mental control alone, by yoga, to achieve Brahman, but at best one falls into a sleep. It is like eating fire or leading an elephant by a thread or draining an ocean drop by drop, to try the yogic way. When the yogi shuts his eyes and does not see the world he is like the cat in the Indian proverb who shuts its eyes when drinking forbidden milk although other people are there, and it imagines it is unobserved because it cannot see them. He does not examine the phenomenal world and hence cannot see Brahman for he takes that world as real but runs away from it.

(1.45) Gnana cannot come if anything is left out. The whole universe must be included. For only when all is known can all be known to be but ideation. Hence yogis blotting all out in samadhi cannot lead to Gnan. The I-thought, the ego, belongs to the drsyam⁶ as does the universe thought. The yogi may get the knowledge that the drg⁷ is separate from drsyam, but he will never know Brahman without inquiring into the world, because he is giving up the world, and hence cannot discover his unity with the world. The Gnani regards everything in the world as Brahman; the yogi rejects the world. Thus there is a fundamental difference.

(1.46) There is a theory that in primitive antiquity before the Aryans came to India, and perhaps before the Dravidians arose either, the first inhabitants of India were extremely few in number; food was plentiful (Nature giving fruit trees etc), climate lethargic. So these inhabitants had no struggle for existence: so they sat quietly and practiced meditation, quiet contemplation, sitting still, mentally and physically. Thus they originated Yoga. The invaders, Aryans and Dravidians learnt yoga from them and adopted it into their own religion. It was never intended to yield truth, only the bliss of inactivity.

(1.47) Of the symptoms of incipient and advanced insanity described in Hart's psychology of insanity you will find in many yogis and mystics of Ashrams in India.

(1.48) In non-duality, contemplation has no meaning.

(1.49) It is not possible to stop thought for more than a half-second whilst in the waking state. If one succeeds in controlling thought and then banishes it, one passes into nirvikalpa samadhi, which is identical with deep sleep. The only difference between ordinary deep sleep and samadhi, therefore is that the ordinary man falls asleep involuntarily whereas the yogi has the satisfaction of knowing that he has passed into sleep by his own effort of will in banishing thoughts. And where Patanjali warns against sleep as a hindrance to yoga, he means when it occurs in the early stages of the practice

⁶ Phenomenal world, objective experience, other

⁷ Seer, self, knower

before one has obtained the power of control and consequently to banish thought. This fact that Samadhi is deep sleep is kept secret because people would not be tempted to take up yoga. Then what is the value of it? Why, to sharpen the mind, to enable it to keep away all extraneous thoughts when one gets out to reason in the practice of the next higher stage, i.e. gnana. Yoga is thus simply a sharpening-stone for the mind to enable it to take up Gnana. But you say that some holy man or teacher lives without thoughts. Impossible. How can he walk from one spot to another without thought? He does not know the gnanic truth if he says thoughtlessness is the perfect stage of self.

(1.50) What happens when thoughts are stilled? It is not the Self that is found. Rubbish. It is only mind. Patanjali has not reached Gnana and therefore does not know highest truth. His yoga is good to give peace and concentration, but only in order to start reasoning, i.e. thinking again to find truth.

(1.51) Mystics who promise a Garden of Eden, a joyous outlook on life, do not see that this must be a drsyam, an object which is seen and must inevitably vanish. How long can it last? We Vedantins regard peace as higher, because it is apart from joy or sorrow, ecstasy or pain, and because it belongs to the drg and is therefore unbroken, permanent.

(1.52) In dream you know that the dream figures are also mind, not different from it; similarly when you know that everything is Brahman, there is no need for yogic control of mind. Control presupposes second, a duality. Hence yoga is in the sphere of duality and is unnecessary to one who knows non-duality.

(1.53) Vedanta requires the mind to be active in order to examine the world and discriminate. Hence Vedantic Nirvikalpa samadhi means knowing that there are no ideas different from myself, as the dream mountain is not different from Mind, knowing which they automatically come under control. This is different from Patanjali Yogic Nirvikalpa samadhi, which is only deep sleep.

(1.54) There is nothing to drive out. Even the yogi's ecstasies may be retained, provided you do not let yourself be deceived about them and accept them like everything else, as part of Brahman.

(1.55) The mystic who sees God in vision has seen Him during the waking state: but as Reality is not in a state, therefore he is in the world of drsyam.

(1.56) The Yogi wants to do something, some action, even that of sitting still, to control this or concentrate that. This means he is still attached to body. He wants his body to be quiet. He is still thinking of illusory body. He does not start with Vedanta idea that the body is but an idea. On the contrary, he takes it for a reality.

(1.57) To be desireless means to feel that you have everything in you; that there is nothing outside you; therefore, what have you to desire? The populace misunderstand and think desirelessness means asceticism. The gnani has nothing to give up, when all is Brahman.

(1.58) If a man gets Moksha after undergoing any discipline, his moksha is only temporary: it will go again. Atman cannot be got because it is already there. Drg has never been in bondage because it is always apart from, untouched by drsyam, idea or object. This argument cannot be turned against Advaitins by yogis and religionists, because they regard ignorance as an integral part of the soul to be got rid of by their practices, whereas we say Drg is ever pure, ever free from ignorance, being Knowledge itself, and that even all Gnana-yoga practice is within the realm of drsyam, never Drg.

(1.59) The final state is that God is Everything, the All, there is nothing but God, whereas to say "God is in me" is mysticism.

(1.60) Mystics claim that their ego disappears in the mystic experience: we say it is not so. It is the ego that sees and enjoys the experience, otherwise they would not say afterwards "I had this great ecstasy, I felt such peace."

(1.61) Pantheism is a step higher than theism.

(1.62) Truth cannot be got in fragments or parts. How could you know they are different parts of the same thing? Only by imagining it. There is no proof. Similarly those who say the various yoga-paths lead to the same realization, cannot prove it; they only imagine it is so.

(1.63) Mystics who imagine they can unite with reality, are attempting the impossible because they imagine reality as apart from themselves; then there will be two, hence duality.

(1.64) There are two kinds of Peace (1) Where you withdraw from the world, actually or mentally or where you practice samadhi, thus avoiding troubles. (2) Where everything is faced and known, its true nature understood as Atman and henceforth you are always undisturbed by wants. The first is lower, delusive, mystic; the second is higher, genuine and gnanic.

(1.65) Both real and unreal, seen and unseen, trance and activity are Brahman, whereas mystics wrongly divorce one from the other. It is absurd to think that anything can be left out of Brahman.

(1.66) How can anything be rejected? How can the world be renounced? Only those who delude themselves think so. Everything is Brahman, and remains so.

(1.67) No name, no form can be given to the Brahman. Any Yogi who says he "sees" something within as Brahman is no sage.

(1.68) When you think you are a reflection, a ray of Brahman, you thereby separate yourself from Brahman and imagine an individual soul. Give up all these imaginations and you will find yourself to be what you are.

(1.69) The whole universe that you see is Brahman. Unless the world is there in your realization, there is no Brahman.

(1.70) It is not enough to see a mere blank, Nirvikalpa⁸. You have to see you are the universal self. You are free from ignorance not when you see nothing at all, as in Yoga but only when you see all this universe is yourself. Hence you must ask the question “What is this universe?” The attention must be drawn to the outer world. Thus Gnana will make you feel for the universal welfare. This is the highest aim and test.

(1.71) It is no use seeing God everywhere. You must see Atman, the same soul, the same self, everywhere, and then you will treat all people alike, with equal beneficence.

(1.72) Every man needs money. Vedanta says: “Do not beg. Earn your livelihood, and then give to poor.” But so long as Sanyasins are disciplining themselves, so long as they are learning or teaching, and are students, let them wear the yellow robe. But the most valuable service is to remain in the worldly life and set an example to others, of what can be done to live spiritually amid worldly difficulties. This will encourage others to live like you and yet get on with the inner quest.

(1.73) The chief purpose of analyzing the external world is to discover that it is part of the ultimate reality and thus to enable us to carry on with activity from the highest possible viewpoint; where people fail to make this analysis, as with so many religious-minded seekers, they fail to do anything worthwhile in the material world. To effect this discrimination, we need an intelligence much sharper than the average, whereas too much religion and not a little mysticism drugs this intelligence. The highest state is to be the “All”--not to shut your eyes to the world and to go off into the deep sleep of trance.

(1.74) Vedanta does not teach aversion to existence, as do the ascetics and yogis; on the contrary we teach that you should go on living in the world, acting, working, etc. that you should accept life.

(1.75) Philosophy does not tell you to give up anything, but to know all.

(1.76) There are two stages: 1st - detachment of the Drg, the seer, as unaffected. 2nd – that everything is Brahman. The yogi may stop at the first stage, which is incomplete and leads to selfish indifference to others. The Gnani must pass through both for the 2nd stage leads him to serve mankind and seek the well being of the whole.

(1.77) Only pretenders give blessings; what has been the worth of all the blessings which have been given to poor India for centuries? The real sage neither blesses nor curses.

(1.78) The greatest mistake is to think that a gnani sees nothing. This blind reverence for samadhi is as valuable as revering a man who has taken a dose of chloroform.

⁸ Pure Consciousness, Void

(1.79) The Gnani sees the essential universal unity and the multiplicity of objects simultaneously. The person in deep sleep or samadhi leaves out the objects and sees the essence; hence he has not full gnana. That is why the yogis have done nothing to uplift, strengthen or protect India; they have refused to see the nation inside the essence, merely obliterated sight of it.

(1.80) You know of dream that the dream-figures are also mind, not different from it; similarly when you know that everything is Brahman, there is no need for yogic control of mind; control presupposes a second thing, duality. Hence yoga is in sphere of duality and is unnecessary to one who knows non-duality.

(1.81) "What is experience as a Whole?" is the formula to be asked after "What is the world?" as latter is not enough.

(1.82) In spiritualistic phenomena or occult performances the mind of audience or sitters is paralyzed during that period and all sorts of fraudulent tricks can be performed. It is really mass mesmerism. If however, a counter-suggestion is present in the mind, then it may be difficult or impossible to mesmerize the person. The mind weakens itself by accepting the slightest suggestion that the feats are possible; the next step of being mesmerized follows.

(1.83) Only yogis who have not studied philosophy would make such nonsensical statements as that the soul, i.e. mind is situated in the heart, or in the chakras of the spine or in the pineal gland. For how can mind, be spatially located?

(1.84) Give up all imaginations; then alone can you know truth. That which knows them to be such is the Real.

(1.85) The first step is of knowing "your Self." The second is to know your self as Brahman, the "All." Then alone you know Satyam and Gnanam, i.e. the whole truth. Your Self is the key that opens the door of Brahman. This yoga referred to here is certainly necessary at the first stage, when the mind is wandering. At the end of this yoga the mind gets stilled and knows the self--individual self. Then it is free and fit to know Brahman, the All.

(1.86) When I say it is the stronger mind that alone can telepathically influence another, I mean by 'strong' one which has reasoning power well developed. Thought-transference is a fact but only under this condition.

(1.87) Why did Krishna show Arjuna the vision of the Universal form and not stop there, if it was the highest goal? Why did not the Gita end there? Instead he went on to teach Gnana. This shows that he regarded yogic vision as not the ultimate.

(1.88) Yoga is intended to remove the hindrance to enquiry such as sexual desire, worries, anxieties, desire for money etc. Also to enable the mind to keep out irrelevant

thoughts whilst making enquiry. All this has to be done before enquiry can begin. Therefore yoga has only a negative value and is a preparatory stage. It is quite unnecessary for enquiry itself. If you say that yoga and vichara⁹ must be equal partners what is it that tells you that the removal of these hindrances is necessary? Is it not vichara reasoning? Therefore vichara must be the ruler and yoga only a subordinate.

(1.89) The question "Who am I" is a religious, not a philosophical question. It is a most selfish one. It is on a par with "What shall I be after death?" and "What shall I get if I offer these coconuts to God?" It is purely ego-centered: it is an appeal to the interest in selfishness only. Only the philosophically-minded can lift their thoughts above ego and ask "What is the world.?"

(1.90) What is the first thing that a man sees? It is the world. The mystic and religionist disregard this in order to think of self.

(1.91) If you don't see objects, it does not mean you have Gnana. Whoever looks at objects alone, at the external world, he is wholly ignorant. But he who looks at both the outside and inside, inquires; he is led towards knowledge.

(1.92) Those mystics who ask "Who am I?" may succeed in finding the common factor in all 'I's, the I-ness but they have to come back afterwards to the world. Their task is incomplete. They do not know the world is Brahman.

(1.93) It is a defect to make "What Am I?" a philosophic interrogation. It is not. The stages are: scientific: What is the world? Mystic: What am I? philosophic: What is the whole. For philosophy puts both the world and the 'I' together after having examined each separately; it is interested in the whole of life, not a part. The world is only a part just as the 'I' is a part.

(1.94) The "Who am I? formula is useful as a first stage to show the illusoriness of ego and thus help seeker to get rid of it. This prepares him to consider the higher question: What is the world, the truth about which cannot be learnt by those attached to their ego, with its prejudices against idealism, etc.

(1.95) If you ask why there are so many different animals and natural objects in the world you may regard them as teachers, there are lessons to be learnt from them by using Buddhi¹⁰. Why did Brahman produce all these varied forms? It is so that the ignorant man may study them and get Gnan. We have to study the whole world.

(1.96) There are two things you have to consider: 1. My duty to the world to remove others sufferings, 2. My duty to myself to remove all my doubts.

(1.97) We do not deny the existence of intuition; only it must be tested if it be true; it must be verified. Everyone has intuition, for it comes spontaneously.

⁹ philosophic inquiry

¹⁰ Buddhi – The highest faculty of the mind, Reason.

(1.98) Imagination is allowable in philosophy provided it is tested. Then, if it passes the test, it becomes a fact. We cannot kill any of the faculties of man. The same applies to intuition. In addition to both these faculties there must be reason.

(1.99) The first thing we are aware of after waking, just as the first thing in an infant's experience, is the world outside. Therefore the first thing we ought to study is the world, not the self; to that of which we are aware, not that which is aware.

(1.100) Vedanta is not anthropocentric like mysticism for the simple reason that it takes away the 'I' and eradicates the ego.

(1.101) Since the ultimate truth is the truth of this world which we see, how can it possibly be got by refusing to look at it, as yogis do?

(1.102) Mystic Ananda¹¹ is a drsyam, for even if it did last all day, it disappears nightly in sleep.

CHAPTER 2: FALLACIES OF RELIGIONS

(2.1) With the Greeks philosophy began with wonder, with moderns it begins with doubts.

(2.2) Quotation from others should come only after you have shown your arguments, convinced by use of reason based on facts, and then only may you introduce quotations in order to show that others have reached the same conclusion. But when a man quotes very extensively it is because of his inferiority complex.

(2.3) "How do you know that what you have seen by the intuition which you praise as the highest faculty, is true?" I asked Bergson¹² in Paris. He confessed that that was a difficult question and he begged me to remain in Europe and go into the point with him.

(2.4) Everyone says "This is a fact. I know. This is my experience." None stops to doubt or to understand, or to inquire as to what is a fact, or what is the definition of experience. The fool takes the simplest path, that of the uninquiring mind, because the other way, the search for truth, is hard and difficult and laborious. Such questions do not worry the religionist, the mystic or the ordinary men.

(2.5) Vedanta: Pursue this quest until your questions will be answered, until your problems will disappear and your doubts will be solved.

(2.6) How do you know that you are related to God? Have you seen God? That He created the world, that he has manifested himself is merely supposed. It may be, but how do you know? How do you know that Veda, Bible, Koran are true? The Rishis might

¹¹ The Bliss of the Higher Self

¹² Henri Bergson, French philosopher

have been mistaken. To accept these scriptures without reasoning is to possess the slave mentality.

(2.7) Mayavadin¹³ does not start with idea of God. We do not know whether there is God or not. There is no proof. If you mention God you must prove his existence.

(2.8) We need not doubt that mystics saw Shiva, Jesus, etc. That they saw visions may be an undeniable fact. But the question is "Was what they saw the Truth?" In insane asylums you find patients who make similar claims. They no doubt had such vision but they never stopped to inquire if their visions be true. Vedantins take all the facts, science, religion, art etc. and then ask of them, which is the truth? We collect as much evidence as possible, even contradictory, and then proceed to examine all of it. We are not opposed to anything, but say, "Analyze, how far is it true?"

(2.9) What is the value of mystic experience, what is the value of the words of great men? In philosophy we examine and evaluate them all in order to find truth.

(2.10) Why did God create pain? Why does he torture men with new diseases? Has God no better business to do? It is useless to say that he is teaching people lessons through these sufferings. What lesson can God teach the little child destroyed by fire the other day? How can we believe that God is all-merciful when he constantly displeases all humanity?

(2.11) Suppose you say you have got faith in a religion or teaching. Suppose I say I have no faith in them. Thus there is contradiction. What are you going to do about it? Nothing can be done. In the real truth there can be no contradiction, nor any possibility of it. In real truth even a man who does not know that two plus two equals four cannot contradict it any more than the educated man.

(2.12) Mind splitting i.e. one part of the mind is perfectly sane, in regard to worldly duties, but in the other part generally dealing with religious beliefs they are insane. This is the condition of many yogis.

(2.13) How am I to know that what I believe is true? That question must prick the seeker.

(2.14) You cannot know the mind of a man in front of you. So how can you know the mind of a Being who is invisible—God? You will only know your imagination of a God. You have no more reason to say God is all-merciful than to say He is all-merciless.

(2.15) The purified intellect (Buddhi) is the Reason.

(2.16) Logic is misunderstood. People cannot distinguish between reasoning and intellect as Vedanta does. Buddhi applied only to waking state is called logic, intellect. Vedanta learns not only such reason but also reasoning based on waking sleep and dream. To say rise above logic, is generally confused with saying "Rise above Reason." It is wrong to

¹³ Mayavadin – The world is thought, ideation, illusion

give up reason. Life does not consist only of waking state. We must take all three (Waking, dream and deep sleep).

(2.17) The scholastics like all religionists have to start with an assumption that there is some unseen Being or Power or World, and then they start to interpret this assumption. Whereas the first Karika of Mandukya starts with the world, going up from the objective world to truth by inquiry. No assumption, no faith, is needed by Vedanta, which demands thinking. People do not want to think: it is too troublesome. Why worry about philosophy, they say. This is their excuse, an alibi for being too lazy or incompetent to think. They do not want to be bothered to inquire.

(2.18) Yogic trance is no better than hypnotic trance as there is no duality in the deepest stages of both, because they are both deep sleep. The intermediate stages of dream are paralleled by hypnotic and yogic and mental experiences and visions. The only differences between all these three lies in the manner in which the state is induced and whether it is involuntary or voluntary.

(2.19) Vedanta is the philosophy of verification.

(2.20) Patanjali takes for granted that there is an Iswara--God, gives it to you for concentration purposes, and then you naturally find God in your meditations. But it is only your imagined God. Mystics see what they are looking for or that whose existence they presuppose. Therefore Patanjali Yoga belongs to religion, not Philosophy.

(2.21) Who has proved that there is a God? Who has proved that the individual is God or Brahman? Personal experience which is not universally valid is no proof, neither is ecstatic feeling.

(2.22) An advaitin prefers not to state his case but for opponents to do it first and let him cross examine them and expose their fallacies. By showing that all other doctrines are erroneous, he reveals that Advaita is left as the only alternative.

(2.23) If you have a belief, it is because somebody else believes it; or the majority believes it--or it is your own experience. Is it religious authority, or religious sanction or is it based upon a feeling of certainty? Do you believe it merely because it works well or is it true. If you ask the question of Truth, it becomes a question of philosophy. Does your belief rest upon Reason?

(2.24) The very mystical critics who denounce science should be asked, How do you write, What pen do you use, How do you get news from Europe, How do you know there is a war, Where do you get paper from, How are your ideas published? The answer to all these is—Science! So they are convicted by their own lives.

(2.25) Newton's keen eye saw a fact, then his imagination worked on it. Thus he formulated his law. This is good scientific procedure. But note that it begins with facts;

imagination enters later. Similarly in philosophy you must start with facts--the facts of this world.

(2.26) Wonder possesses implicit doubt, not explicit doubt, and in this sense is the beginning of philosophy. When you are so impressed by anything as to wonder at it then to some extent, however little, you begin to reflect upon it. This leads to realization that there is something about it which you do not understand or know, hence to doubt your grasp of it. This again leads to further inquiry, i.e. philosophy.

(2.27) There is no agreement among the views of mystics. Eckhart's experiences are not the same as those of the Sufis or of the Hindu mystics. Therefore we say that mysticism does differ and is not fundamentally the same everywhere as is claimed. But more important than this is the epistemological question which we ask of the mystics. That they have had experiences is true, but that what they experienced is true is another matter. How do they know that it is the Ultimate or the Almighty or the Reality that they have come in contact with through their ecstasies?

(2.28) You should have as few theories, use as few words and formulate as few doctrines as possible, according to "Occam's Razor" which is a leading principle of science. Thus the danger of opening the door to errors and false views, imaginations, fancies, is greatly lessened. Simplicity in explanation is safer than profusion.

(2.29) A sane level-headed mind is always willing to examine facts and judge them calmly whereas the partly unbalanced minds (who have insanity to a small degree although outwardly normal) will be immune to all facts and hold hard to their delusions. Such people do not want truth but only what pleases them. This is because the aham in them is so strong. "What pleases me is true, what I dislike is false" is their attitude.

(2.30) The mystic is convinced by the feeling of immediacy in his intuitions, and therefore he takes them as true. In plain language, this simply means that he is swept away by the strength of his emotion and regards its irresistibility as the evidence of its truth. His attitude is fundamentally wrong. The warmer his feelings, the stronger the enthusiasm, the more certain his intuition, the more he should suspect and doubt them, the more he should try to make his mind cool and calm again, and then only examine this idea.

(2.31) Sastras are simply books which are held in reverence and deemed to be infallible; they may have nothing to do with truth. For philosophers they have no value. Yet common people worship them.

(2.32) If you stick to the old formal logic, you cannot get at truth. People seeing this insufficiency of logic, therefore wrongly say "Give up logic and go to intuition." Their error is "What is it that told them that logic was not enough?" It was Reason itself; not intuition. Thus there is a confusion between logic and reason.

(2.33) How do I get this knowledge? What is meant by knowledge? Which kind of knowledge is true? Those are the questions which epistemology asks.

(2.34) I repeat a thousand times Faraday's quotation: "A philosopher is one who is no respecter of persons, but of facts."

(2.35) Authoritarianism as a source of knowledge means slavery. People who compile philosophical books on a basis of quoting from others as authorities are compiling useless rubbish, from epistemological and philosophical standpoint. But in practical life, for empirical purposes authorities are acceptable, because they are experts in such specialized knowledge.

(2.36) Eating, drinking and sleeping are instincts which you share with all animals. Sex desires are also instinct, but you as a human being bring it under control by thinking. Thus reason must be brought in to check instincts. Such instinctive thoughts strike you of their own accord. In the same manner, intuitive thoughts dealing with loftier matters than mere animalism also come to you without your effort, but they must similarly be controlled by your thinking power.

(2.37) We do not deny that it is possible to get some knowledge through intuition, as we do through various other sources, as the senses, etc. but the question will still arise, "Is this true knowledge?" Even sense observation must be checked for truth e.f. snake/rope, how much more non-sensual intuition.

(2.38) Inquiry implies doubt, proof, evidence, so that even if God were to come and say that He is God, one would inquire into the truth of the statement. People are overawed by doctrines enunciated upon authority of some famous man or institution or scripture. The one answer must be: How does he or it know? Truth must be tested. If it is true, it will survive the test and will bear proof, but everything else must inevitably find the props of pontifical authority to support it. How am I to know that this is Truth? The first test is--is it universally applicable, which means--will it be true in every other part of the globe, will it be true in two million years' time? Will it be true for all people who pursue inquiry to the utmost extent? An idea often appears to be a reality when it is not properly inquired into. Even if forty million people declare that this world is the ultimate reality, their assertion is of less value than the assertions of a Jeans or Eddington who have inquired into the nature and reality of the world and found it to be an idea.

(2.39) The religious way says: Believe! and you will be saved. The Vedantic way says: Doubt! and you will be saved.

(2.40) The desire to know is everywhere but the capacity to understand is limited. The result is that people resolve the conflict by jumping to the first and simplest and easiest conclusion as the correct one, and smugly but unjustifiably thinking "I know": Thus they commit the fallacy of primitivity.

(2.41) Why do we appeal to reason, and not to intuition, belief, authority etc? Because of its universality, because all over the world and in all times there is only a single rational truth, because reason is the only way to obtain worldwide agreement amongst all peoples, nations, groups etc. Faith, intuition etc. varies tremendously in its imagined doctrines, scripture is interpreted by every man as he likes, but reason cannot vary in its truth.

(2.42) Once truth is known it can never be given up: you will never change your outlook again; whereas religion, being a matter of taste, or temperament or like, is changed by its devotees occasionally or they even become converted.

(2.43) What is wanted in Advaita is thinking it out for yourself all the 24 hours, and not merely reading books or hearing words.

(2.44) Katha Upanishad says, beyond mind is Buddhi, beyond the buddhi is the Atman. Therefore it is Buddhi, reason alone which is the door directly opening on to Atman.

(2.45) The intellect which you use for everyday waking life, cannot grasp the Atman. The Buddhi which can grasp it, is the sharp intelligence which can perceive that waking itself is but a mental state.

(2.46) Buddhi (Reason) is the higher mind. It is simply that in you which says “This is true; this is not true.” It is that which evaluates thought. As thoughts come and go and are therefore evanescent, it may be said that “Buddhi” is comparatively the permanent part of the mind, whereas Intellect is the lower faculty of mind which builds up the logical chains. Buddhi is the Judge. Intellect is the advocate arguing his case.

(2.47) It would be better to use the word intellect in terms of waking experience only and Reason in terms of the totality of the three states (waking, dream, deep sleep states.)

(2.48) Intuition is the stage between animal instinct and developed human reason. It is unripe reason but ripened instinct.

(2.49) Intuition is a lower faculty of mind than reason, not a higher one. As the mind develops reason becomes explicit and supplants or complements intuition and instinct. The superior man will have all these--reason, intuition and instinct--functioning in his mind, but he will always keep reason on top because he knows that intuition is sometimes unreliable.

(2.50) When people say God is merciful they attribute to him a quality which they find in good human beings --there is no proof that God is merciful and it is just as anthropomorphic as to make Him the creator.

(2.51) Most commentaries on the ancient books are merely the work of imagination. Every commentator goes on imagining as he likes.

(2.52) Life is too short to waste 25 years at a Sanskrit College to learn the mere interpretations of words. It is far better to devote the few years we have, to truth rather than to the punditry of interpretations of texts.

(2.53) Dull minds take the world to be real, miracles to have occurred, and scripture to be truth; they are content to have judged without enquiry. Hence the dull are also the deluded.

(2.54) We have no quarrel whatsoever with religionists and dualist philosophers. It is only when they claim to have the highest truth that we must interrupt and ask, "What is Truth?"

(2.55) Where there is no ego, there can be no religion. When ego goes, then only philosophy comes in. What is it that attaches you to this body? It is the I.

(2.56) Our criticism of religionists is "Show us your God and we shall believe," but they cannot.

(2.57) Where is the proof that your belief is true? This is what we say to those whose attitude is based on belief, whether in God or scriptures. Our principle is truth. Truth means proof.

(2.58) Religion means imagination. You imagine what you like, and what pleases you. Its cure is science.

(2.59) Nobody will go to hell, but everybody will go to the heaven that he imagines. But remember that all imaginations are drsyam, they come and vanish.

(2.60) How do we know that all the Gods ever known to history are merely imaginary? Reply: Because they are all thoughts, ideas, hence drsyams, i.e. all ideas have to go, you can not catch hold of them.

(2.61) People give a name and form to Atman as God creating according to what they are most familiar with. Thus some give a man's face and figure, others worship snakes, others revere spirits, others female deities, other universal forces, others Agni, the fire-deity, Kala, the deity of time and death, others abstract infinite duration, etc. All, whether anthropomorphic or abstract are merely imaginary--nothing more. There is no proof.

(2.62) Scriptures may be quoted for the common people who are unable to think well, but for educated persons the final appeal should be to reason.

(2.63) There can be no proved answer to the question "How do you know there is God?" other than "I feel it" or "I believe it," etc.

(2.64) The omniscience and omnipresence of God are mere assumptions. How is it possible for anyone to test or prove these assertions: how can he discover whether God is

in the sun as well as here, whether He knows what is going to happen a hundred years hence?

(2.65) The fundamental thing is to get a knowledge of truth by your own experience and reason; to say that Sankara writes the truth implies that you already know the truth, and hence can certify Sankara's work. Until then you have no right to say whether his work is true.

(2.66) Those dualists who say God is unchanging but his environment (the world) is changing, and that the world is in or part of God, are inconsistent. For how can a part change if the whole is changeless?

(2.67) People talk that God is immortal, but how can they know that he will not change tomorrow? To say anything about the future is merely to imagine it. It is impossible for a second thing to be immortal, because it will always change. To change is to be mortal.

(2.68) Re: God's omnipresence at the same time. Unless you yourself became God and are everywhere present with him simultaneously you have no possible means of verifying the truth of this doctrine. Therefore we say "Atman is God, and God is Atman."

(2.69) Men who have made similar inquiries, i.e. the Rishis have found the same Vedantic truth but must inquire independently and verify it for yourself. The sages and scriptures may teach the same thing but you must prove it yourself by facts.

(2.70) My opponents accuse me of also using quotations. That is true. But it would only be a fallacy if I depended on them to prove my case, which I do not. I first prove my case by reason and quote afterwards.

(2.71) Advaita goes to the very root where there is nothing more to doubt, nothing more to question.

(2.72) A man may be truthful and yet what he says may not be truth. He who mistakes the stump of a tree for a bear will be personally truthful in saying he sees a bear but the content of his statement will yet be false. Or he may say he sees God and yet it is not God. Hence we can not accept authority.

(2.73) We are not to take any doctrine to be truth merely because it is very old or because it is very new.

(2.74) The reason why I advance the argument against religionists and mystics who make assertions of God's plans and wishes, that they cannot look into God's mind for they cannot look into their neighbor's mind, is not to deny telepathy and thought-reading--on the contrary I accept them as scientific facts but it is because they (1) treat God as a separate person, set Him up as apart from themselves (2) because it implies that they have seen God and (3) because it implies there is more than one mind. From the practical standpoint thought-reading and thought-transference are genuine enough but from the

philosophical they must be untrue because they imply the existence of two communicating minds, i.e. duality.

CHAPTER 3: THE MEANING OF RELIGION

(3.1) If a man must pray to God, let him pray only to Buddhi.

(3.2) Our position is not agnosticism nor atheism. It transcends both.

(3.3) The great majority of men are like children, not sufficiently educated. Hence they need religion to keep them in check. But when they grow up they become adikaris¹⁴, fit for reception of philosophical truth.

(3.4) The only prayer you ought to make is that for Truth. Do not pray to God to give you this or that, it will be useless and wrong. Ask only for truth and you will be put on the path towards it.

(3.5) If a man is purely religious, he lives an ethical life, does not injure others, and does not attempt to convert others by force. This sort of religion benefits society and is therefore to be praised.

(3.6) The various religious ceremonies and customs which have been laid down in Hinduism have a tremendous psychological value from the practical standpoint, even though from the philosophical standpoint they might be irrational, unsound and worthless. For instance the ceremony you witnessed today on behalf of a woman who was seven months pregnant has the effect of making her happier with the belief that she is more likely to get a male child who will be healthy and of good character than she would have been had the ceremony not been performed. This has been brought about by the suggestive power of the ceremony. Her thoughts will hence forward be bright and optimistic and to that extent will definitely help to produce a better child. In order to induce this frame of mind she had to be taught about Gods and Goddesses etc. What does it matter whether they exist or not so long as the practical end in view is achieved. Similarly when people believe that they must live a good life in order to secure a better fate after death it helps to keep them within moral bounds and even to perform works of charity. It is for this reason that Sankara did not condemn religion but only tried to purify and lift it, and encourage people to do their religious duties properly, but the whole system depends upon the belief and faith of the devotee and falls to the ground when he loses his faith in the existence of God and in the efficacy of religious rituals. It is at this stage of his mental development when the mind is filled with doubts that Vedanta permits him to obtain outward peace, grows with his criticisms to religions and affords him the philosophy of truth with which to replace it. Thus you must either uphold or attack religion according to the mental state or evolution of the individual to whom you are talking.

¹⁴ Quester, student

(3.7) Religion has been tried for 2,000 years. What has it done to prevent wars and all the other evils? Its future promise must be judged by its past performance.

(3.8) It is utterly impossible to unite the different religions or churches together. Even if such a thing were possible (which it is not) what are you going to do with the millions who are atheists or agnostics? They will not unite with religionists. You can only say "Let there be tolerance"--and that will be useful work--but you cannot bring them together in a unified structure. The only way to real unity is the search for Truth.

(3.9) People talk of religion being the cause of love, but they mean love only among themselves, among their own sect, and not the wider love of humanity.

(3.10) As the intelligence of the masses slowly rises, they will begin to ask questions and to find religion unsatisfactory, thus they turn to atheism and with it communism. They begin to want satisfaction of a visible and tangible kind, not promissory notes on Heaven.

(3.11) If you say that God has creative power, then if God created us, why did he create in us the capacity to do evil? If He made evil, He is a rascal. This fallacy exists in all religious reasoning.

(3.12) A world unity of religions, such as Sir Francis Younghusband's Congress is not possible. Religions will arrive at a common understanding when men cease to think altogether for so long as thought continues they will hold different opinions. The idea of world religious unity is imagination. I and my wife are so close together yet we cannot agree on so many points every day. The only possible harmony is "Let us agree to disagree." To say that essential religious truths are the same everywhere, is to use meaningless words, because no two definitions of truth are the same. But to advocate inter-religious tolerance is another matter and is good.

(3.13) A deputation of villagers came to His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore yesterday to ask for a gift of an idol for a small shrine which they were putting up. His highness gave them the required money although he was himself an Advaitin. He realized that the villagers could understand nothing higher and it would be cruel and useless to tell them the idol will not help them. Similarly the Vedantin has to meet people on their own level and just as I give toys to my children so he has to give the religious people things such as rites, ceremonies, creation stories, histories of Gods and Goddesses, etc. to those of undeveloped intellect.

(3.14) The Western world is giving up religion. That is inevitable owing to the decay of religious organizations. But their mistake is to rest satisfied with such negative inner life and not to aspire to something higher than religion after giving it up.

(3.15) Religions keep people within moral bounds; without their help there would have been no hope for mankind. That is, religions prevent the masses from becoming even more beastly than they already are.

(3.16) Religion is a matter which must be left to individual feelings, not to intelligence.

(3.17) Every man has got a right to believe in whichever religion he pleases. No religion should be criticized. Only in the sphere of philosophy and truth can criticism arise and do personal rights of faith disappear.

(3.18) Religion is for the purification of the mind and not for the perception of Truth.

(3.19) It is wrong to tell deeply religious people to abandon religion. Don't unsettle their minds when they cannot rise higher.

(3.20) If you displace common people's faith in God and give them nothing to replace it, they will lose ethical restraints and descend to steal and murder. Hence their faith should not be prematurely disturbed. It serves a useful social purpose, when operative.

(3.21) Plunging into Lake Manasarowar¹⁵ means plunging into the mind and seeing the whole world in it. The physical journey is prescribed for those who are incapable of performing the mental journey.

(3.22) Scriptures are like diaries, after experiences of truth have been written down for others' reference and guidance; but the full truth may be only partly revealed; the rest is fable.

(3.23) Individual happiness is sought by religion, whereas Truth seeks universal happiness.

(3.24) For social purposes a religion is needed because it unites a body of people, brings them together in a common fold. Hence it is useful as a value: people however erroneously confuse social value with ultimate truth, for they jump to the conclusion that because it is useful in keeping people moral, for instance, a religion is therefore true.

(3.25) If by God you mean the highest truth we are worshippers of God. If however you mean a God with moustaches, hat, etc. then we are atheists.

(3.26) Every man has a right to hold his religion as being true, but he has no right to thrust it upon others.

(3.27) Religion and yoga are useless to the seeker after highest truth, but never say they are useless to others. They are helpful to 99.9% of humanity for one in a 100,000 is passionately seeking truth.

(3.28) Religion is essential for bringing up children in the way of good life. Therefore we say, do not quarrel with religion; it has its valuable place for those whom it alone can help, who cannot even rise to the stage of mysticism. Those that criticize religion are quite correct so far as they themselves are concerned, but they are wrong where the world

¹⁵ Sacred Lake in Tibet

at large is concerned. It should not be taken away; to say the world can get on without religion is foolish.

(3.29) Religion enables man to get consolation, some satisfaction, and to do his duty in the world, but it will not enable him to get at truth.

(3.30) The best illustration of the evolution of primitive ideas of God to the most exalted is given by the Vedas, which is a conspectus of all these varieties within a single system.

(3.31) The history of religion is the same all over the world even among lands far apart for its history of the evolution of the human mind.

(3.32) Religion will always change. New interpretations, new rites, new dogmas will inevitably be born within old religions. Change rules the universe. Religion cannot escape it. What is useless in it will vanish. Notice how few believers keep up the full rituals nowadays. Modern economic social system alone prevents it because it is outworn. People must change their religious and social customs or they will suffer.

(3.33) The teacher has to consider the kind of society in which he lives and their prevailing beliefs, and adapt his teaching to suit, i.e. to help them.

CHAPTER 4: THE MEANING OF MYSTICISM.

(4.1) Ascetic renunciation of the world and its desires may be usefully recommended as a temporary discipline to those who lack self-control. It will act as an antidote, counteract their inherent tendency, but the man who is already sufficiently level-headed and calm needs no such external discipline. In any case this ascetic regime is to be recommended only until the practitioner achieves some degree of self control after which he may relinquish his external asceticism.

(4.2) Renunciation of the world is a temporary discipline and for the training of the mind, for the mind to become detached and to achieve external peace, remaining unaffected amid troubles. It has no other purpose.

(4.3) Keep the mind unconfused and unconfounded by other thoughts than those pertaining to the theme selected for concentration. This is the principle and virtue of yoga.

(4.4) Peoples' minds have natural tendency to run in various directions through pressure of attachments, environments, upbringing etc. Hence retreat into solitary place for yoga is good for them to stop this tendency, to get concentration. After that they should take up Vichara and not remain in yoga. This is the order. Yoga first, next inquiry. At this first stage it may be useful to kill mind, keep it quiet, but it should awaken into full vigor in Vichara.

(4.5) Concentration is merely having as few thoughts as possible. It is helpful because you then stop exhausting the mind in the drsyam, and give it the chance to know there is a drg. That is the philosophic value of yoga.

(4.6) Vedanta does not say that Yoga has no value: Everything in this world has its value, but that is not the highest permanent value.

(4.7) Ignorant people who are impressed by the appearance of sadhus¹⁶ with long beards, and show reverence to them, are really prostrating to a beard!

(4.8) The glamour of yoga, mysticism and religion is mesmeric. It is extremely difficult to get anyone out of it, but when the spell does break they regrettably rush to the opposite extreme of gross materialism, as in Russia. That there is a third and higher path available-philosophy--they do not know.

(4.9) This body is useful; treat it as it deserves; don't torture it by asceticism.

(4.10) Dissociation of Mind is what has occurred when a man who is quite sensible and balanced and practical in worldly or professional affairs, falls victim to some idiotic charlatan of a pseudo-guru. In other words the 'I' predominates, and refuses to listen to reason.

(4.11) Sublimation, the process of diverting the mind to something higher, is what is good in asceticism, for in this any bad thoughts drop away.

(4.12) It is merely seeking individual gratification, i.e. the asserting of the 'I' to take to Sanyas¹⁷ merely to escape from the responsibility, the bother of worldly duties. But if you start with the idea of taking Sanyas as a discipline to be more useful in the service of humanity, then it is right, correct and noble.

(4.13) Yogis who set up Ashrams, Swamis who travel with retinue, Sadhus who wear no loin cloth are all types which may be grouped under the "the theatre" because they are really displaying their body and thinking of the ego. The true Gnani will exhibit no outward signs of difference whatsoever. Similarly the other two types of physical and egoistic display may be grouped under the heading "cave" and "couch." This three-fold classification was made by Bacon.

(4.14) The Sanyasins who renounce the world but take food from others without doing some service (say, giving instructions) in return, are thinking only of their ego, of getting food without trouble.

(4.15) The wearing of the yellow robes was intended to remind the wearer of his vows and aspirations and thus acted as a check on his impulses. This is its good point.

¹⁶ Renunciate yogis, a common sight in India

¹⁷ Vow of Asceticism

(4.16) The body is valuable. It must be preserved and not ill-treated by asceticism. For it is our instrument of living. And whilst alive we know that we can reflect about truth. What happens after death, what opportunity to learn truth is there we do not know. Truth is the object set before all human beings as the purpose of their lives. Hence we must care for the body, keep it alive and avoid death.

(4.17) Sanyas is really given to divert your mind from all pleasures of body and mind and give it wholly to truth.

(4.18) The ascetic who teaches that the realized soul can give up all temporal and religious duties is teaching people to give up Brahman. What is there to give up for a true sage? He sees Brahman everywhere.

(4.19) The yogi has to undergo a particular discipline, he has to practice, so for him it is really necessary to abandon the world and retire into ashrams or forests. It is quite a correct duty for him. But for gnani, this is quite wrong. The gnani goes to the opposite, he goes into the world but is not of it. He wishes to set an example to others.

(4.20) If you pay too much attention to your body, if you over-eat and over-drink, then you hinder higher development. This is all the meaning of physical self-denial and asceticism. As the Gita teaches, do not go to extremes, be moderate, neither feast nor fast in food. If you fast too much you can't think effectively. It is alright for mysticism but not for philosophy.

(4.21) The Buddhist attitude towards woman to regard her body as a bundle of decaying corrupt flesh is given only for beginners. Later when this has detached them, they must alter, they must raise to higher level of regarding her as Brahman.

(4.22) Don't take a living unless you work. Renounce really means look upon the world as an idea.

(4.23) If people cannot practice meditation, if their mind is too uncontrollable, then advise them to read wise books or inspired scriptures.

CHAPTER 5: THE MEANING OF PHILOSOPHY

(5.1) The facts of Vedanta are open to all but the individual capacity to understand them will naturally vary. This the only esotericism of Vedanta.

(5.2) Vedanta says Truth is reached by stages. Hence there is one version for children, another for the more advanced. It is not a question of "esoteric" but of capacity to receive truth fit for one's stage. Hence it reconciles all versions, whilst pointing to the highest goal.

(5.3) Do not say that modern scientific and educational development has spread use of reason; it has not reached that high point--call it intellect, if you wish but not reason. Still

we have progressed; we shall progress beyond religion and beyond science; after that we shall use reason and achieve philosophy.

(5.4) First find out what stage a man is in. Does he want merely to get on in life, if so, prescribe religion; does he want peace? then prescribe yoga; or does he want truth? Then alone should you initiate him into philosophy.

(5.5) Men are divided into three classes of intelligence. Those with lowest are given religion, those in the intermediate are given yoga, those in the highest are taught truth. We do not say religion and yoga are bad; but only that are steps, not the highest level.

(5.6) Sri Ramakrishna adapted his teaching to the people he was talking to. To common people he said "If you utter the name of God it is enough." This was the highest they could practice. But he had quite a superior teaching for the few who could grasp it. So when people say Ramakrishna taught this or that, and the teachings contradict each other you must stop to inquire to whom did he teach this and with what idea?

(5.7) The different castes were prescribed for varying grades of intelligence. According to Mandukya Karika III men are divided into three grades of intelligence (Buddhi), high, middling and low. Religion is prescribed for the lowest; they are there and not to be condemned, but as a man of more wisdom you must pray and worship with them because they are like children, not knowing better. The highest stage is that of the man who can think for himself, he has the right to think; whereas the lowest regards questioning as blasphemous and dangerous to religion. My own guru refused to teach Mandukya to most persons, for they could not understand it, even though they were sannyasins, and they would only misunderstand it. Hence we permit and approve of religion for others who cannot rise higher, but they ought not have the conceit that this is the highest. The former Dewan of Mysore wanted to spend his life with my guru to study the highest, but he was not accepted because unready. There is no inconsistency because this is meant for the lower stage, while that is meant for the higher stage; each is a step upwards. The Vedantin helps people according to their stage, telling religious or mystic fables to intellectual children but truth to the thinking man. In the Vedantin worshipping in a temple with the masses practicing yoga with yogis and then denying God with his fellow Vedantins, there is thus no inconsistency.

(5.8) Indian philosophy gives a connecting link from primitive religion to the highest truth "knowing which nothing remains to be known."

(5.9) You must not yourself instill doubts in the minds of others: these doubts must arise of their own accord and only then may you answer them. If the young college students are beginning to question the truth of religion and come to ask you to clear their problems, then you may give them one point nearer the truth; but it would be unwise to go and tell them that their religion is untrue. To unsettle a satisfied mind is to lead it into bewilderment, with probable immorality as a consequence.

(5.10) The name "system of Advaita" should not be used because incorrect. All systems are ours, because there is non-contradiction in our view. The Advaitin feels there is no clash with others, he quarrels with none. He sees all their points of view. He knows that they take things as they seem to be, hence are necessarily dualists. Our religion is Truth, our philosophy is truth, call it "search for truth" and leave out names.

(5.11) We do not object to giving the masses the spiritual pabulum they are fit for; that is alright. But always do something to lift them one step higher; always mix with the pabulum, or say something as some slight impetus towards Truth. This can be done with temple worship.

(5.12) The Truth of Vedanta is so strong that it makes one feel impregnable in argument and invulnerable in exposition. Hence it gives intellectual courage.

(5.13) You may be born an animal, an insect, a plant, to be born a human being is the highest privilege because it is much less common numerically than the preceding (animal, plant, mineral) forms. Hence we should use this great opportunity to seek truth and reality.

(5.14) At every stage in life, wherever you turn or go, ignorance meets you. What is going to happen tomorrow to me, or to the world (war) this year? What will happen to this seed if I plant it, will it grow? What is happening inside my body? What is the ultimate condition of this table matter? You must finally answer "I do not know." Why are there so many schools? All seek some kind of knowledge, the removal of ignorance. When you visit a foreign country as a tourist for the first time what do you seek? The satisfaction of it? But that really means that, at first you did not know this country, you wanted to know it; the satisfaction really consisted in removing your ignorance of this country. Hence everywhere everyone is seeking knowledge and the putting an end to ignorance.

(5.15) The form of philosophy must be adapted to our present 20th century environments if it is to become a living force and not a museum curiosity.

(5.16) Indian philosophy alone has pursued Truth to the farthest end. Many Westerners say "Ultimate truth is unknown." But Indian philosophy says, "if you will stick to the pursuit you will get it."

(5.17) Philosophy means an enquiry into the nature of the world. How it came to be? What is it? What is it for?

(5.18) Philosophy is not making various theories about the Absolute, nor hairsplitting of words, nor imagining things. It is directed towards life and has the highest value in weighing life properly.

(5.19) Science is true so far as the world of science is concerned, yoga is true so far as I sit quiet in meditation: the yogi's experiences are not lies but truly described; all these are

however only relative truths, true only from a certain narrow point of view, they come and go, they contradict each other; whereas we seek the Supreme Truth which is higher than all these, which is uncontradictable and does not conflict with anything else.

(5.20) We need all phases of human thought and belief to help us if we want a complete answer to the problem of human life. Philosophy is all-comprehensive, assigns a place for everything, and thus supplies this answer. It surveys the whole. If you exclude religion, you have no philosophy. If you take only religion, if you view life from a particular standpoint, again you have no philosophy.

(5.21) Philosophy wants to understand the world as much as it was a million years ago as it is now, i.e. it does not depend on and is unaffected by the personality, the coming and going of avatars: that belongs to religion. Nor does it deal with the next world: it can deal only with the world in which we live. It studies truth irrespective of time (epoch) or locality.

(5.22) The first step in the study of philosophy is to "analyze" e.g. as cloth when analyzed is found to be nothing but thread.

(5.23) Truth is an interpretation of the whole of man's life. Thousands of men have given their interpretations, which sages call mere co-opinions. But Truth is universal and ultimate.

(5.24) Why do you refuse to read Ramanuja? It is not a waste of time. The Vedantic student should be willing to examine everything, to inquire into all views and then only reject those that are unproved.

(5.25) Philosophy is the pursuit of truth. Metaphysics is speculation. The philosopher weighs metaphysics even as he weighs religion and other subjects in order to find out how much they contain.

(5.26) Nothing is outside the scope of Vedanta's inquiry. The various religions, the different forms of art, the numerous systems of philosophy, the opposing democratic and totalitarian political doctrines,--all these are equally carefully examined by Vedanta and found to be but single steps leading upward, not ultimates. They are alright in their places as steps. Vedanta alone deals with all the steps plus the highest goal too.

(5.27) Philosophy is the interpretation of the whole of life. You are obliged to see, hear, eat, walk and read newspapers in the whole. Philosophy is not the interpretation of the Koran, Vedas etc.

(5.28) What distinguishes truth from science, metaphysics, art and other departments of knowledge is that it takes the view of the totality of life---a comprehensive view of the whole.

(5.29) In Vedantic discipline we do not give up the objective world; but along with all the phenomenal we inquire. Nothing is given up. All the data are taken into account, and each is analyzed, tested and found to be of the nature of the mind or Atman.

(5.30) If you view a subject from your own standpoint alone, or from one technical standpoint only, you cannot view it rightly. Philosophy is the interpretation of the whole. Is it possible to get knowledge of the All? Vedanta says: Yes, not in its details but in the sense of knowing its essence.

(5.31) What is this human life? So many million persons are born and so many die. What does it all mean? Every man has got a right to imagine, and so he may say God has willed it and leave it there. But we wish to know whether there is any proved evidence to help get this meaning: that is philosophy. There must be ascertained facts before we open our lips.

(5.32) This philosophy is not mine, is not Sankara's, is not any one's. Hence it cannot be labeled. It has come down to us from time immemorial. Who originally taught is unknown.

(5.33) Truth is the most important problem in philosophy.

(5.34) Truth means the evaluation of all knowledge and experience with a view to attain to the highest truth. Why are you quarrelling with each other? It is because each man thinks what he sees is truth and they fall out.

(5.35) We speak of the ancients as being all knowing, but the truth is that they knew some things but were ignorant of others. We have to use discrimination when estimating their knowledge.

(5.36) Philosophy is the search for truth. It is not opinion, not speculation, but reality which is verified by appeal to life as a whole.

(5.37) The Indian belief that philosophy has a threefold aim, i.e. Sat, Chit, Ananda is matched by the Western belief that it aims at reality, knowledge got from study and happiness. There are three classes of men in this world, the majority seeking happiness, ananda, overcoming misery, whereas others seek Chit, knowledge, while pure metaphysicians and scientists seek reality. All these are merely aspects which appeal to different tastes, or temperaments or tendencies. But Vedanta goes beyond these three for it seeks Ultimate Truth.

(5.38) After having done everything, achieved everything, had the greatest pleasures, even then I shall be taken away and must die. Hence the thoughtful man inquires into the meaning of death. Thus philosophy springs out of death.

(5.39) Philosophy is not the totalization but the general interpretation of experience.

CHAPTER 6: LOGIC SCIENCE & PHILOSOPHIC REASON

(6.1) There are three stages of mental development, first, instinctive, which deals with sex, herd, nutrition and other animal instincts, second, Intuitive, which arises from repeated human experience, third, Rational. The last must be made supreme.

(6.2) Buddhi is the highest mental faculty. It is next to Atma. Buddhi is wanted. Gita says: "Through Buddhi you reach me." Even in material affairs it is the man with the sharpest intelligence who wins.

(6.3) Logic is not the same as my Reason. There should be a distinction between them. Logic cannot know the Absolute. It is of intellect, not reason. Reason can know the Absolute. Logic applies only to the objective (seen) world. Europeans have not analyzed the mind itself yet. Hence they cannot understand us. If your Witness Self could see itself.

(6.4) Reasoning in Advaita is thinking applied to all three states to prove something. It is in this sense that Sankara used the word, which pundits do not grasp.

(6.5) Reasoning must not be confused with intellectual argument. The latter is used by lawyers for logical building up of evidence of seen objects only but the former is used in philosophy to refer to evidence of all three states (avastatraya). Reason (Buddhi) sees the appearance and disappearance of objects including ego; whereas logical intellect (manas) is limited to them alone.

(6.6) How can you witness the mind of another? All you can do is to witness his bodily actions and guess at the mind behind them. Yet Western psychologists, especially behaviorists and Freudians make this error. Vedantic view is that you can only know your own mind; never another man's mind. Even thought-reading is only looking first into your own mind, and saying what you believe is in the other man's mind. Hence it is your own mind, and saying what you believe is in the other can's mind. But is your mind confined to your body? No. It is everywhere; hence it is the same as the other man's mind. This renders telepathy possible, but the thought reading must still be done by your own mind, not another's; you know of the other man's only such thoughts as appear in your mind, and therefore it is really and ultimately your own mind you know.

(6.7) When I advocate science, I do not mean mere elementary scientific facts about oxygen and hydrogen, but advanced science, that truth to which it leads, the meaning and aim of all science.

(6.8) Those mystics who say you have to rise beyond reason are insane. Common sense tells you that the only way to distinguish between stone and a fruit is to use your intelligence. Otherwise you will try to eat stones! That is, to arrive at the truth of any matter or objects, you must use reason. How much more when you want to arrive at the truth of life, and the universe? This is the only way.

(6.9) Vichara means that without thinking about the truth of it you cannot attain it. The mind must be used in reasoning: it is kept quiet in yoga, there is no possibility of knowing the final truth, because the instrument of knowledge--the mind--is not functioning. Vichara depends entirely upon Buddhi, i.e. reason.

(6.10) If contradictions are present, how can we be certain anything is true? Hence truth must be the uncontradictable.

(6.11) To the extent that you show there is no possibility of difference, you get at truth.

(6.12) If people ask why should reason arrogate the final appeal to itself, we reply: Your use of the word why is sufficient proof that you are seeking a reason for your satisfaction. Thus unconsciously you make the reason highest.

(6.13) Until you verify any doctrine, whether it be dualist or non-dualistic, it remains only a hypothesis.

(6.14) Vedanta is not so much interested in the results of Science as in its method of verification. Experiment and observation we agree and follow as far as possible, but it cannot deal with ideas and thoughts. Hence it is the verification method used by science which we base our philosophy on. The collection and change of theories is not our task.

(6.15) Hasty generalization is another fallacy. We should decide only after having examined and inquired into as many facts as possible.

(6.16) Knowledge is the only means of attainment, not yoga.

(6.17) People cannot distinguish between ethical truth and philosophic truth, between a man's speaking what he honestly believes to be true and what really proves such after test or experiment and all others also agree.

(6.18) Reason is that which distinguishes real from appearance. There is a difference between reason (buddhi) and thinking which is most important you should grasp. Both are two different kinds of thought. When thought starts to reflect about itself, it becomes reason, but to do this requires the utmost concentration, which is difficult. The thinking process must critically return to itself, examine its own nature. When it does this, it will discover that it can only produce dualities, drsyams, ideas and never yield the real perceiving that the Real is unity. Reason ceases to work for it is no longer needed. All is then real. So judgment, discrimination etc. becomes unnecessary. This is quite different from the intuition of mystics. But the mystic never achieve abolition of thought; he only changes one imagination for another. With the latter thought must disappear, the world objects must disappear, whereas with the philosopher, thought remains, world remains, but they are known as non-different, as Brahman.

(6.19) Intellect is precisely the same faculty as Reason, only the former is confined to waking whereas the latter applies to the three states.

(6.20) The question of verification follows immediately after the question of truth, because every man says, I know truth. "How does he know that what he sees or what he thinks is true? This is the work of verification. It is most important and most essential part of Vedanta.

(6.21) What is the test of truth. The first test is its universality, as two plus two make four. The second test is that truth is beyond all possibility of contradiction.

(6.22) Vichara or enquiry is of the highest value. We can begin Vichara at any time for all the 24 hours the mind is with you. Discrimination, company of the wise, practice of detachment etc. are only helps to enquiry.

(6.23) Verification is the chief characteristic of science and essential to philosophy. In this sense I say that even ancient Vedanta possessed the scientific method.

(6.24) The two main features of science in which Vedanta is interested are generalization and verification.

(6.25) The characteristic of Truth should be like the characteristic of fire which is hot to all men. Truth means that which is accepted by all to be alike. It is impossible to mistake truth, when you have it for anything else. If it is not like this then you have not truth but a conviction.

(6.26) Scholasticism says "According to this theory it is so" or "According to that theory it is so" or "According to Sankhya¹⁸ it is so" etc. All this is being based on assumption, not fact, and can never arrive at truth, only opinion. We have to follow a certain method which is not followed by non-philosophical. People interpret the same thing in different ways. How are we to know which is the correct one? The aim must be to know truth; otherwise we fall a prey to imagination.

(6.27) Those who talk of other worlds, whether mystic planes or religious death-worlds, go beyond our experience and I can only bow to them and withdraw. I can deal only in the world before me, the only world I know. Ask a Christian, a Jew, a Muslim and a Hindu to put their finger in a fire. Will they disagree about its power to burn and pain them? No. They will all agree about the nature of the fire: i.e. there will be non-contradiction. That is precisely the same as the Vedantic definition of truth: when men really rise to it they will never disagree about it.

(6.28) In the absence of philosophy science is supremely valuable because it tends toward racial nondiscrimination and because it rises above national distinction and prejudices. Hence its spread is one of the most fitting ways to spread universal understanding especially if complemented by mysticism.

(6.29) Non-contradiction is the test of truth, says Max Planck.

¹⁸ Dualistic school of Hindu philosophy.

(6.30) It is by the process of negation and affirmation that Brahman becomes the subject of reasoning. It is by reasoning that the identity of Jiva and Brahma is established. A direct knowledge of Brahman can never arise through any mystic initiation. Yoga has no place in it. It can arise only through reasoning. Want of faith is the obstacle to religion. Want of inquiry is the obstacle to philosophy. Even Vamadeva reached Brahman by inquiry. To one who makes no use of his reasoning faculty, knowledge of Brahman is impossible. If a person cannot undertake the inquiry through want of time etc. he should be engaged in meditation etc.

(6.31) Philosophy is reasoned proved truth; mysticism relies on personal experience as truth; scholasticism takes private interpretation as truth.

(6.32) There are two samadhis, one yogic empty trance, and the other keen concentrative thinking.

(6.33) The Yogi who practices discrimination and enquiry during his meditation is simply thinking and using his reason; to what extent he is practicing Vedantic Vichara and is like one of us. There are unfortunately so many different kinds of Yoga. But which yogi uses reason? When Yoga means killing reason, as in most cases it also does, then we refute it. Hence the meaning of yoga referred to in speech or writing should be given. Sankara upholds yoga as a preparation only.

(6.34) Conversion can occur only in the sphere of religion, never in the sphere of true Vedanta. When a man knows Truth, how are you going to get him to give it up for imagination?

(6.35) "All men are mortal". Have you seen all men? How are you going to see them all? Therefore as logic is built upon more imagination, as assumptions, therefore it is no path to philosophical truth. It is like religion and mysticism. You postulate certain things and show they agree with others that you have already taken for granted. This is called the "coherence" theory of truth. But it is fallible. Logic is based on experience. Experience changes from time to time. Hence it is fallible. Thus the 18th century people said talking at a distance is impossible, today we have radio. The 18th century people went by their experience. Mathematical truths come under the head of logical truths. When we speak of God, we cannot give either the correspondence or coherence theories. We cannot verify ideas of God. But these difficulties come only to a man who seeks Truth.

(6.36) Vedanta means fact, verification, proof.

(6.37) Truth is that on which no two persons can disagree, in which there can be no contradiction, no difference and no doubts.

(6.38) We cannot say human reason can know ultimate truth, but only that human reason can know there is an ultimate truth, that it is.

(6.39) Physical laws are after all only my idea of things. The only real way to know these things is to become them. Hence scientific laws do not explain, they merely describe.

(6.40) Logic deals with causes whereas Reason deals with distinguishing between truth and falsehood.

(6.41) To those who object that it is humanly impossible to learn all the facts as life is far too short for that, hence it is consequently impossible to attain truth. Our reply is if even if there are millions more facts unknown they will all turn out to be ideas. Every fact, whether known or unknown, is in the end mental construction. A further reply (although the West will be unable to see the point) is avastatraya, which does give the totality of all possible facts. To those religionists who supplement the above objection by drawing the conclusion that therefore we are forced to rely on a mixture of facts and guesswork, we reply that you thereby confess you are not seeking truth.

To those scientists who supplement the objection by drawing the conclusion that we are safe in being guided by the facts we already know, we reply, then you thereby confess you are seeking only practical not ultimate truth.

(6.42) It is the scientific discipline of the mind that I refer to when saying that philosophy must be based on science. I do not refer to practical inventions of science or its utilitarian side.

(6.43) A truth is verifiable in science if it can be tested and in logic if it can be proved.

(6.44) We should start with science to understand the world but we must finish with philosophy for the full explanation is essentially philosophical.

(6.45) The characteristic of truth must be that all men must agree to it. That is why we need the mathematical method. All men, even animals recognize that if you add one thing to another you have two things in consequence.

(6.46) The same truths which modern science gives can be found in our old Upanishads, Sankara and Gaudapada. But the old presentation does not convince now because it is based on authority, even though it be correct, whereas Science proves its case.

(6.47) If science pursues its researches and does not stop, if it seeks constantly also to ascertain truth, it will be led into philosophy because there is nowhere else for it to go.

(6.48) The usual objection that the ancient Indians did not know science and therefore our Vedanta cannot be correct is refuted thus: Modern science leads in the end to discovery that world is mind and that causality is nonexistent. Precisely the same discovery was made by Gaudapada and Sankara. How? They had the spirit of science, the desire for ascertained facts and being intellectuals of the highest order, saw the truth.

(6.49) What is the distance from here to Calcutta in your dream journey? It is only mental, in your mind, an imagination. Similarly in the waking state the same distance is

also mental, idea, mathematics, inasmuch as applied mathematics is concerned with time-measurements, (days and years) and space-measurements (2 ins. and 5 miles) is bound up with time and space. When the latter are shown to be imaginary, mathematics collapses with them. Nevertheless, mathematics is the nearest science to philosophical truth, for scientific theories are based on mathematical calculations and the accuracy of science is derived from mathematics because it is an activity of pure reason. But reason works upwards from lower to higher certainties in the practical world, mathematics being the highest of these stages but still does not reach the absolute philosophic world. Hence the chief use of mathematical study from the philosophic viewpoint is that it makes the mind sharp. Pythagoras was perfectly right in demanding mathematical capacity from applicants for entry to his school.

(6.50) Reason becomes Atman when it is by itself, chained to no other thoughts: when it to so chained, then it is reason.

(6.51) The Western use of intellect and reason is excellent; only they do not push it far enough, to the very end.

(6.52) Modern science is the starting point of philosophy. Science, however, deals only with one side whereas philosophy deals with all--inside and outside, the knower and the known, for it is the knowledge of the whole of existence; that All is the Universal Self.

(6.53) We learn through the method of trial and error, through the experiences of many lives. We try many things in life and through mistakes and suffering learn what to avoid and what to seek. Thus we learn right reasoning through studying faulty thinking. Similarly you know there is Gnan only after you know its opposite--ignorance sorrow etc.

(6.54) Common people and primitive minds fall into faulty thinking through certain characteristic fallacies, such as the fallacy of wish - taking what pleases them as true; the fallacy of fear - taking what you dread as real, such as witches or evil spirits; fallacy of simplicity - taking what is apparent obvious and superficial as true because it is less troublesome.

(6.55) Ramakrishna did not learn any practical science but he did have certain knowledge of truth all the same. He was therefore scientific. Krishna too did not learn practical utilization of science but he had exactness and certitude of knowledge, of truth and therefore possessed scientific knowledge. When you have an exact and certain knowledge of philosophy you can utilize it for the welfare of mankind; this is the practical side. Science can be applied in two ways, either to make man more miserable or to make him more happy.

(6.56) Gnana yoga's method is inquiry and discrimination; "this is true, that is unreal, etc.

(6.57) "Never look at facts!"--this is the characteristic equally of the insane as of the religious. Every awkward inconvenient fact hostile to his belief will be regarded by the devotee as a test of his faith or his devotions and dismissed. The lunatic also dismisses

such facts when they conflict with his delusions. Therefore the scientific approach based on solid facts, is the safe and essential way.

(6.58) Science deals with the physical world, philosophy with the physical world and then goes beyond it into the higher level, consciousness.

(6.59) "Renunciation with knowledge is the means of attaining perfection" Gita. This means ordinary sanyas does not give truth, there must be exercise of reason along with it.

(6.60) Neither Yogic Samadhi-bliss or worldly pleasure should be allowed to draw the mind away from evenness; for neither can give Brahman. When the mind is distracted by either, either internal or external bliss, it should by effort be drawn back to steadiness, evenness. This state alone yields Brahman.

(6.61) It is an error to say that science is based on facts whereas philosophy is based on ideas. The latter is based on facts too. In fact it starts with the fact observed by science, but carries its inquiry deeper. Therefore when the scientist wants to go more deeply into the meaning of his own facts he becomes a philosopher, automatically, merely by deeper reflection. Science merges into philosophy ultimately and there is no other way for it.

(6.62) The notion that truth is agreement of opinion with fact, is unacceptable, because impossible of attainment. How can you show that your opinion, i.e. your idea is the same? If the fact is a bar of iron 2 ft. long, can you produce an idea also 2 ft. long and lay it alongside the bar to see how far both agree? No. You cannot.

(6.63) Those who claim to have had occult experiences are like the insane, because their experiences are similarly incommunicable to others. This breaks the first canon of science, i.e. truth must be communicable and verifiable. Facts must be communicable and verifiable to everyone, and not, hidden as "occult experience," if they are to be true facts.

(6.64) Truth is that which cannot be contradicted by any man at any time, and such is the truth we want. Is there an end to philosophical thinking? If you take the external world alone, or the internal world alone, there is no end. But if you combine the two then there is an end--Truth.

(6.65) What is the definition of truth? That of which there is no doubt, of which there can be no doubt, and there can be no possibility of doubt, and above all, when you see, by thought, all things in your self. ("Can be no doubt" refers to oneself, whereas; "no possibility" refers to doubts raised by other men).

(6.66) Gnana is that knowledge, knowing which everything else becomes known. Truth can be known by its being impossible of contradiction, and depending entirely on what is not yourself.

(6.67) We have no such thing as our Vedantic System. We are only seeking truth and possess no organic system. Only the ignorant talk so for they are attached to theories,

even Vedantic theories. The Gnani has samatvam--the sameness of everything, for he knows truth is everybody's property: not that of any separate school such as Vedanta. Wherever the test of truth is upheld by experience and not by dogmatic statements, there we are. The gnani knows everything to be only the Atman or Mind.

(6.78) Deductive thinking is true for practical purposes but unacceptable for philosophic inquiry. "All men are mortal, Socrates is a man, Socrates is mortal," is unprovable philosophically. How do we know that Socrates will die? We only infer, but never know through impregnable proof that will always be true.

(6.79) Our final position regarding that which cannot be proved is "We do not know. We cannot call it truth, however."

(6.70) We do not depend on any personality. We want only the principle of truth. We do not even say that we want to study or teach Vedanta. How can you know at the beginning of our investigation that Vedanta might not even prove false. We study only truth. On the other hand you might say that V.S.I. is a humbug, but before you really know that what you believe about V.S.I. is true you must first examine all the evidence. We have nothing to do with faith. We are concerned only with that which is true, not faith.

(6.71) There are practical truths of everyday affairs of the world life. There is also the half-truth. The only way to know whether you have got the correct idea of truth is to see if it can be contradicted. Mathematical truths provide the closest to this definition, because as far as our experience goes one plus one never equals three. Still mathematical truths are in the realm of practical truths, as well as the idea expressed in the phrase "as far as our experience goes." It is not even existent in the realm of highest truth where there can be no contradiction.

(6.72) Truth means the absence of conflict. The less of the contradictions the greater the harmony and the good of all.

(6.73) We also start by asking "Truth--what should it be like?" Truth is what all want, including animals. Thus if you take an egg out of a nest, the bird will perceive the loss, i.e. it will see that there is something wrong, untrue.

(6.74) We give a definition of Truth--absence of contradiction, which can be accepted by all, and then we proceed on this basis.

(6.75) We must get at the truth without imagination. All the philosophies of the world are based on imagination. Hence they contradict each other. A thousand persons imagine in a thousand different ways, each one believes that what he imagines is true, but where is the proof? People do not get truth because they are attached to their particular and peculiar ideas. Attachment is the root of all evil.

(6.76) Truth should appear as readily as a mathematical formula, that two plus two equals four.

(6.77) Buddhi is not intuition but "that exercise of thinking faculty which distinguishes between error and truth," as Gita itself defines truth. But Buddhi must be purified. The aim is to purify it and make use of it. The more it is purified, the closer to truth you proceed. It is the balance with which things are weighed.

(6.78) Indian philosophy rests on truth uncontradictable, beyond all possibilities of doubt and dispute, on knowledge of all existence, attaining which everything becomes attained. It seeks identity of one's self with all.

(6.79) Indian philosophy appeals to neither intuition nor intellect but reason absolutely.

(6.80) When I am told to go and practice Yoga and then only I shall know its truth, I reply "How do you know that Yoga leads to truth?" This at once involves epistemology of which every yogi is ignorant and which he has never taken into consideration. Yet it is the very foundation of knowledge; without knowing epistemology a man who mentions truth or knowledge simply does not know what he is talking about.

(6.81) I have the greatest regard for Huxley because he used the title "agnostic" meaning "I do not know. I have not seen."

(6.82) People quote from Koran, Bible, Veda, as proof but nobody asks the question "How do you know that what Muhammad, Jesus, Rishi says is true?"

(6.83) The lack of evidence for anything is sufficient ground for refusing to accept it. We must have proof before belief. If, for instance, we cannot be certain about the possibility of life after death, if we cannot be shown, we just refuse to assert or admit it.

(6.84) Vedanta's attitude to mystics is "granting that, if we place ourselves in your position, if we follow up the yoga-practices you prescribe we shall have the same mystic experiences you have had, how are we to know even then that those experiences are the truth? We shall still be faced with that question even after the experience. Hence the need of inquiry, whether before or after into "What is truth?"

(6.85) Those who start with the idea of God have no business to do so. How do you know there is God? If they arrived at the existence of God after and not before inquiry, that will be quite a different matter. But in assuming God they merely guess and imagine without facts.

(6.86) I may have my ego and assert that I am right. You may have your ego and assert that you are right. That is why we have to be no respecter of personality but only of truth.

(6.87) If anyone quotes an authority as final, apply the "method of disagreement." Thus if Christ says so, reply that Krishna says the opposite! If a man quotes Sankara in proof, you may quote Ramanuja in disagreement. This may eventually show the man that no person can be a final authority. If you want to overthrow an opponent, simply say "You

say so, but C. says something else. You contradict each other." The Gnani on the other hand has no position of his own. He does not even hold an Advaita position. He ceases to posit anything. As soon as you posit any one thing, you posit duality. If he says that the system of Vedanta is so and so, he takes a stand which can be opposed or contradicted and is no longer non-dual.

(6.88) Truth should not only be known but it should be proved, verified. Advaita does not prove that there is ONE! It proves that there is no second thing. Spinoza started with One substance, Hegel with the Absolute; but where is the proof of the existence of this ONE or the Absolute. Hence they started with assumptions; whereas Vedanta starts with no assumption whatever but proved every step taken, it does not even start with assumption that Brahman exists; the discovery of the existence of Brahman comes only at the end of our inquiry and not at the beginning. This is the great difference between ours and other philosophies no matter how similar their tenets may seem. Our method is the way of verification for every tenet; we want proof, not poetry. We do not care for either intuition or imagination which is disastrous. A man may say "I have seen God, I have realized the Absolute" but he must prove it." This is our challenge. Similarly those who speak of the Author of the Universe are telling lies, for whoever could possibly have seen Him creating the world? They are merely using their imagination because they were themselves created later.

(6.89) He who starts an exposition by bringing in Gods, is trying to force on you something which is in his mind, something moreover, which he has simply assumed. We must stick to reason, not the fallacy of authoritarianism.

(6.90) Our position relative to critics is "You say you know. Very well, we shall listen to you first, you must establish your position first, before we say anything and we shall examine its truth."

(6.91) Logic deals with waking-world facts only. Now Western thinkers are beginning to find this is not enough. Hence the arisal of non-Aristotelian logic. But logic will evolve into full reasoning only by including all three states in its data.

(6.92) You cannot permanently prevent people from inquiring. Ultimately every human mind will have to practice Vichara. Even animals and insects have to inquire. Look at the ant examining and moving among various substances until it finds food. It is inquiring.

(6.93) Judgment should be suspended until all facts are obtained. One should be cautious; you might get an intuitional flash, but even then you should wait and confirm. Lack of evidence against a doctrine is no reason for believing it. Philosophic doubt is needed.

(6.94) Every dream and vision must be tested if it be true.

(6.95) The yogi thinks that by getting to Nirvikalpa Samadhi he reaches the highest; the religious man thinks that by getting God he reaches the highest, but how do they know it is the highest?

(6.96) Can I look into God's mind? "What does He really intend by avoiding sufferings? "Does He wish such sorrows to us?" The above questions show that you are reasoning not merely taking them for granted which is rationalizing religion, it means investigation, reason, and inquiry.

(6.97) How do you know God created the world? Where is the proof? If you had seen God creating, you could admit it, but how could you have seen God before you came into existence? (i.e. were created).

CHAPTER 7: CHARACTERISTICS OF PHILOSOPHICAL DISCIPLINE

(7.1) Qualifications for philosopher (1) in the first place, the seeker must be truthful himself. Taittiriya Up.Ch.1 points out. He must love truthfulness in thought and action. (2) He must be alert in mind, observant of Nature, noting her phenomena and not ignoring them like the yogi recluse. (3) He must have courage. If he is afraid of public opinion or the world's attitude toward him, the truth is impossible, (4) Gita and Upanishads constantly repeat the fourth necessity: steadfastness.

(7.2) A complete man must keep both thought and feeling and action properly balanced. Therefore the genius is defective for he has paid the penalty of neglecting other things. The philosopher cannot afford to reject any department. He finds a place for all of them, even religion and art, and thus achieves balance.

(7.3) The realist philosophers and scientific of the West have developed the right kind of sharp mentality, only they will not go far enough but cling to the external world in thinking. They will not face the fact that world is an idea. The reason is that they are attached to world by their desires, such as sex. etc. This handicaps their thinking. Hence yoga disciplines are prescribed in order to purify the mind and render it free, unattached and thus unprejudiced in favor of external world.

(7.4) The value of meditation and yoga is to keep off extraneous thoughts. The average man cannot give attention to proper thought on Vedanta line because he cannot keep his mind concentrated along this line: yoga builds up the power to do so. Hence it is useful as preliminary process, We still the mind in order to get thought-control but once this control is attained, then we must begin to THINK, to use one's mind again in a perfectly concentrated way and endeavor to understand the Vedantic truth. So you kill thoughts only to use them again later.

(7.5) A sharpened intellect is necessary to perceive truth. Those who lack mental acuteness will not be able to grasp the meaning of the relativity of the three states. Such a dull intellect may, however, be perfectly adequate to handling the affairs of the world and a man might be clever, astute and a successful business man and yet remain incapable of grasping truth. The sharpness which is required is the subtlety and ability to move amid abstract ideas. Similarly the greatest scholar, however learned, may be unable to grasp it, because it requires real thinking and not mere memorizing.

(7.6) To sit in your room and think “I know” or to sit in your cave and meditate will not lead to realization, for Truth will not walk in to visit you; you must go and search for her.

(7.7) Unless you know that you have got a disease, you will not go to a doctor for a cure: similarly unless you are aware of your ignorance and stop saying "I know" or believing that what you know is true, you will not resort to a guru for knowledge but only for confirmation of your beliefs!

(7.8) Sraddha means the 1. the love of truth, the determination to get at truth, come what may. 2. A strong mind, 3. be a hero in the face of God's wrath.

(7.9) Yoga's value is to detach the mind from this imprisonment in the body.

(7.10) Emotion cannot be killed, but it must be brought under the control and check of reason. Reason must be kept on top, as emotion often leads the truth-seeker astray.

(7.11) 95% of our arguments are rationalizations; disguising emotions under the garb of reason and deceiving one's own or other minds.

(7.12) The achievement of full sanity depends on the permanent checking of all feelings emotions and passions by reason. This is the same as Gita's preaching and Shankara's requirement of dispassion in the would-be disciple. It does not mean that emotion should be killed or destroyed. Only that it should be subordinated and never get the upper hand. For Vedanta the mind must be kept calm: opinions, beliefs and prejudices based on feeling prevent it from attaining truth, which is achieved by reason alone. People's emotional likes or dislikes, i.e. complexes grip them so much that this is why only one in a million want Gnan.

(7.13) Vedanta demands perfect calmness of mind if you want to get truth, keeping out attachments and dislikes, anger and hatred, from the mind.

(7.14) Yoga is an excellent discipline for the mind and character to produce calmness and thus reduce the strength of passions and emotional complexes, provided it is practiced within limits. When however, it is overdone, it leads only to lunacy. Similarly a doctor will give you minute quantities of strychnine which will act as a tonic to you, but if you take too much then you will be harmed bodily and die. Yoga practice acts in the same way; a little regulated yoga is beneficial, a lot ruins the mind. If the guru knew where to tell the student to stop his practice, he would be a true guru, but for this he needs scientific intellect which most gurus lack.

(7.15) If you do not take away the ego, the ‘me,’ no proper enquiry into philosophical truth is possible, but only into religion.

(7.16) A little training in mathematics is also necessary because it forms the mind to be exact, precise and positive and certain.

(7.17) The intense concentration required to grasp the teacher's explanation of Brahman is so fine and "sharp as the razor's edge," as Upanishads say, that we prescribe Yoga at the beginning to assist the seeker to gain it. He must be able to keep all other thoughts away in order to perceive the Non-dual. Yoga fits him for the inquiry into Brahman, but he must afterwards make the enquiry.

(7.18) Yoga is intended to remove mental conflicts and further to keep out doubts and passions. It means keeping the mind always calm and alert. Yoga is a psychological training which is necessary before philosophical enquiry.

(7.19) Unless you keep out your likes and dislikes on the quest, you cannot know truth. "I like my body, therefore it must be real", "I like Hinduism, therefore it must be true". But what you like is only an idea. When you say I like yoga it means you have an idea of yoga and therefore it is imagination, and will pass away.

(7.20) Mind must be free for this higher study. Suppose a man has done you injury, you must not be constantly thinking about it or feel hostile to him every day. Better be forgiving and forget it, so that you may be undistracted to philosophize. Similarly if you are over-ambitious and discontented with your lot, your mind will be disturbed again, so be contented with what you have.

(7.21) When a student catches some thought some idea or doctrine instantly from the teacher then he is said to have at that moment a sharp intelligence.

(7.22) Calmness of mind is one of the prerequisites for being able to think uninterruptedly; needed for Vedantic study.

(7.23) Inquire further. Do not be disheartened, try over and over again. When you see that authoritarianism does not give you truth, you go further. You must have the determination to get at it. Experience tells you that every time you attempt, you progress.

(7.24) Truth may be as bitter as poison, but you must like it as nectar. Those who cannot do this are unfit for Vedanta.

(7.25) The right kind of seeker will accept and search for truth whether it brings bitterness or sweetness, whatever it tastes like, for its own sake. He must be prepared to find God as impersonal, and to lose his own individuality for the sake of truth.

(7.26) "Ask and it shall be given"--Without asking you can't get truth.

(7.27) That which dupes 99% of people is taking satisfaction for truth. Beware of that which satisfies your feelings.

(7.28) Restless mind, distracted thoughts, changeable disposition and flitting desires are impediments to the concentrated study of philosophy which have to be treated and cured

by meditation, discipline. When the mind gets steady it is called samadhi. This is the proper place of latter.

(7.29) Steadiness of mind depends upon what you are interested in. Your mind can be steady only on what your mind is attached to.

(7.30) Things and problems concerning truth appear simple at first, and hence ordinary people speak presumptuously and glibly about it. But when we inquire we find how little we know and that they are extraordinarily complex and we are obliged to go deeper and deeper into them.

(7.31) The study of Advaita is a process of hard thinking, not of mere learning like Punditry.

(7.32) Chitta-Shuddhi = purifying the mind; this is the aim of yoga; what it really means is to purify the mind from all distracting factors. In this way yoga becomes an initiation into philosophy, to stop the mind from running away after desires, troubles, etc. and thus enables it to concentrate in pursuing philosophical study to the bitter end.

(7.33) Emotion, art, heart are not despised but regarded as equally valuable with intellect, inquiry, study. That is the artistic is equal to the scientific. What is higher is the weighing faculty which sums them up. This faculty is the philosophical.

(7.34) The fundamental principle of a complex is that it is unconscious. Hence if a man has a realist complex he may study philosophy for fifty years and never grasp that world is idea.

(7.35) The notion "I know" prevents the minds of all from entering truth. It stops them from changing. Change is necessary in life, in the practical as well as cultural life. People must be ready to change if they want to progress on any line. Nature herself shows us this lesson. They should be open to learn from their contacts with other nations both the useful national arts and cultural ideas.

(7.36) Advaita wants this pre-condition that you will vow not to deceive yourself, not to tell lies to yourself.

(7.37) The ego magnifies what it prefers or desires, thus distorting outlook and incapacitating it for truth.

(7.38) You must sit in judgment on yourself, find out your own faults of character and weakness of intellect; otherwise there is no possibility to begin study of Vedanta.

(7.39) Psychology is most valuable in dealing with religious or mystic people, for you will see their God-complex or Samadhi-is-the-way-to-truth complex popping up every time.

(7.40) You must be ever ready to criticize your own beliefs, to suspect your own fallacious thinking.

(7.41) The two pre-requisites essential for Vedanta are: a competent guru and a fit student. Otherwise it is a waste of time or as Jesus said, some seed falls on fertile ground and the rest on stony. The fertile ground is the prepared student, if he is unfit, then the guru gives whatever else, such as mysticism, which he can absorb and which will lift him up to his next step of understanding.

(7.42) Our reflective thinking must be free from subjective interest which produces errors of judging. Elimination of the personal equation 'I' is essential. I saw Krishna appear, I felt him etc. The idols of the theatre and cave are all appearances. Philosophy wants to go beyond appearances.

(7.43) Thinking makes all the difference between people. One who thinks more succeeds more. Thinking is of the greatest use for the discovery of truth.

(7.44) Sincerity is impossible so long as the 'I' exists.

CHAPTER 8: THE NEED OF SEMANTICS

(8.1) The object indicated by the word and the word itself are one and the same in class because both are mental, imagined.

(8.2) First find out the meaning of words; you will find that they are simple mental images. These again are just your constructions and concoctions.

(8.3) We must begin by examining into the meaning of experience. Truth cannot be known before it is defined, before its meaning is understood. This does not mean indulging in speculation or forming opinions as to what may be true. It means inference based on life and experience in order to fix the goal of truth. It means that no important word should be received into the mind without asking of it what is felt in my mind when I use this word.

(8.4) The word 'spiritual' has done a lot of damage. Analyze it. To have any spiritual experience or "consciousness" is to think about it. Therefore it is really a thought. There is no difference between "spiritual" and "mental."

(8.5) The fact known is the reality, the knowledge of the thing is the truth: this is correct only in practical affairs, until we reach the ultimate, when there are no two things, and hence no distinction between truth and reality.

(8.6) Philosophers do not or cannot define truth. They may have many systems or theories,--therefore any definition which they do give will not be acceptable to other schools and will be contradicted by them. Therefore we say that first an uncontradictable definition of truth must be found before you can proceed.

(8.7) Define carefully the MEANING of each important term used, as it arises.

(8.8) What is meant by a "fact". Suppose I see a snake in the dark which turns out to be a rope. The seeing was a fact, but whether the object seen was really a snake is a question for enquiry. We usually take mental construction for facts. This is what we find in this world. We take ropes for snakes because we do not examine them, we are so familiar with this world that we do not inquire into it. Hence insufficiency of yoga, because it won't examine world.

(8.9) We must first define every important term we use--such as intellect, reason, time, eternity, consciousness - because it may carry one meaning to you and another to another man. Hence definition must precede explanation.

(8.10) Before discussing or teaching anyone I always ask him to define his terms and thus state his position first. Otherwise I may be using a word with one meaning given it in my own mind and the other person thinking something different. Hence when he asks what is the "cause of evil" for instance, I ask "What do you understand by the word cause?"

(8.11) The difference between truth and reality--which is unknown to most Indian writers today who confuse both--is: Truth is your idea of reality. The reality itself can only be known as it is by becoming it. i.e. non-dual.

(8.12) Knowing and being are different things. All those who talk of seeing God, contacting Reality etc. are only talking their idea of Him: for it is impossible to know a thing except through an idea of it. How can you know God when He is separate? To know all about Him the idea must go and must BE in Him. Hence Vedanta says the word "know" can't be used, only the word "Being" can be used rightly. Hence I gave the definition of Truth in Europe as the Indian phrase "that agreement of idea with fact."

(8.13) Just as music cannot properly be appreciated unless one's taste and understanding is previously prepared and educated for it, so philosophic terms cannot be understood without prior training of the mind to make it fit to grasp them. Such fitness forms the Adhikari.

(8.14) What do you mean by the word real? What are the tests and characteristics of "reality?" To reply that external world is real alone is to ignore that this is based on the feeling of its reality: but you have a similar feeling in dream. Hence it is useless to go by feeling. You must first find a definition that will hold. But people won't define, they want to go by feeling alone.

(8.15) Definition of Reality: What we really are or what a thing really is, independent of man's conception of it. Truth: man's conception of reality: Consciousness: That which becomes aware of everything else in the world. Ego: Personality or individuality as distinguished from the rest of the world. Reason: That which resolves contradiction and unifies knowledge. Intellect: that faculty of the human mind which detects fallacies and

errors of man's reasoning in the waking state. Mind: The general sum of thoughts imaginations feelings etc.

(8.16) God has got different meanings, whereas truth has the same meaning for all. The less contradiction, the greater the truth. Truth has no personality, will or attribute. It cannot be regarded as responsible for the creation of the world, pestilences, earthquakes, etc.

(8.17) Sankara's position is first of all to define Truth. Then he shows what leads to attainment of truth. Every man says "I know." But we ask him "Without defining Truth first, how can you be certain that what you know is true?" This demands enquiry into meaning of truth.

(8.18) Meaning is an idea. Therefore it exists in mind. Until you look into a man's mind how can you prove that what you mean by a word is what the other man means? How do you know that his meaning is the same as yours? For practical purposes of everyday life we do not trouble about these things, but for knowing the truth of things we have to inquire into their meanings. For practical purposes we all know what a table is, but for enquiry it seems different because it is observed differently with different mental images resulting.

(8.19) There are many theories of truth but no answer to "What is truth?" is given. For if truth is defined in any way every definition can be overthrown. All definitions have a weakness. It is impossible to accept any current definition. For instance, Patrick defines it as "correspondence theory, i.e. that your idea or judgment corresponds with the fact. But how do you know that your idea is an exact copy of the fact? You have only an impression in your mind. How can you be sure that every item of your expression is exactly like the original? No. It can't be done.

(8.20) A critical examination of concepts is required. As soon as a man utters the word "God" we should ask what he means and let him make the word clear. Without understanding the word we are using, of what use or value is our knowledge? When we inquire we shall find how difficult it is to define exactly words which are commonly and superficially used in knowledge, such as "space" "law" "cause", "truth" etc.--: Brihad Upanishad even says it is impossible to define space; whilst Mandukya says we do not know what a cause really is. Nay, we have to go deeper in philosophy and ascertain the meaning of meaning.

(8.21) To understand a word is to have an idea, an idea is only a Drsyam: therefore all scriptures are only ideas and can never give any idea of the Drg. Even Mandukya does not give any idea of the Drg; it only negates by saying "It is not this, it is not that" etc. It only shows the contradictions of human thought and leads you to give up all systems and standpoints.

(8.22) Is the term "Mind" or "Consciousness" or "Awareness" a word? Yes. Has a word a meaning? Yes. What is a meaning? Something which you imagine. Then how do you

know whether your imagined meaning is correct? You refer to your own experience to see whether it corresponds. But this means that you are referring to your thoughts only.

(8.23) How do you know that the One is in the Many? or that "We shall be perfect?" or that "Every individual is an emanation from the divine?" What is meant by the word 'divine' or how are we to be merged in the divine? These are questions we ought to ask those who make such dogmatic mystical statements, for they take us to the higher region of philosophy. Otherwise they merely give satisfaction.

(8.24) Those who want 'stillness' of spirit cannot get it without its complementary 'activity' or 'peace' without 'agitation.' The two must go together, otherwise both terms have no meaning. If those mystics who use it would only inquire deeply into the word, it would re-educate their minds. The peace they seek is unattainable. Real peace, real satisfaction can come only when you rise above these dualities and know Brahman.

(8.25) The term 'formless' is derived from 'form.' Both are inevitable because both are ideas. Hence it is not adequate to describe Brahman.

(8.26) You may say a certain concept is valid but what is meant by the term? It occurs in every book on logic but it requires definition. What is valid to you and may be valid to me may not be valid to someone else.

(8.27) Action cannot be understood unless one goes to the root of its meaning and then one sees that it is inseparably coupled with inaction, and that both are merely ideas, concepts. Therefore those who say Brahman is static, still, are wrong: this is merely their imagination about it; others who say Brahman is incessantly active are equally wrong. Brahman is beyond both these ideas.

(8.28) The word soul is dangerous because it brings all sorts of imaginations into people's heads: it is preferable to drop it and use the word mind.

(8.29) The philosophic statement that we cannot look into the mind of another man is not to be confused with the practical statement of the same thing. Thought-reading as done in psychological experiment undoubtedly occurs, but this is on the lower plane.

(8.30) Philosophically we mean that it is impossible to understand perfectly what precise meaning Plato had in his mind when he used such words as "real", "truth" etc. or what a man is imagining when he says something.

(8.31) We have to go to the things themselves; not to words. You may use any word you like provided you define what you mean.

(8.32) To the objection that we can't define truth or reality in advance, we say then take any theoretical definition that appeals and try to work it out and see what the results are, always knowing that it is purely tentative. Thus you can check the worth of this definition.

(8.33) The Greek word nous and the Indian word buddhi both mean the same, i.e. "reason". Yet curiously they have undergone the same historical phases, being interpreted as 'intuition' by many mystics like Plato and as "reason" by the few philosophers.

(8.34) People often confuse Monism, belief that ultimate principle of universe is one, with Monotheism, belief in a Supernatural God, dictator.

(8.35) The term Absolute may mean that which includes all things as a totality or it may mean that which has nothing in it. Hence it is an ambiguous word demanding care in its use.

(8.36) I agree with you that the use of technical metaphysical language is not essential and is partly responsible for the metaphysician's losing themselves in a forest of words, as Sankara says. Vedanta can be explained in simple terms; there is only one word students really have to learn the meaning of that, is the word truth.

(8.37) Brahman is neither Sat nor Asat, real nor unreal. We cannot postulate either description of it. For any word that you utter will immediately suggest its correlative. Suppose you mention light. That will bring with it the idea of darkness. Or if you mention the existence of the soul, that will relate non-existence of soul. Hence words are of no use to describe Brahman, even such philosophic words as the Real.

(8.38) What is energy? What is it that causes dissolution? What is behind Atomic motion? What causes trees to grow? It is Mind. Mind is the active agent, the mover. You use the word move: the world is in motion. But what is it that makes it move? This is a semantic analysis of vital importance. What do you do when you try to understand this word (or any other)? This point is being discussed in modern scientific philosophy. But it was discussed and solved by Brihad Upanishad. Similarly with the word change. What is meant when you say a thing has changed? Let us get to the root of the matter. The answer is that you cannot have a meaning for a word unless you have it in your own experience. The ideas of change and motion must originally come to you within yourself, otherwise it is meaningless. Hence we say, philosophers must learn "the meaning of meaning." This is the Indian term "within your anubhava (experience)." This science will tell you the world works in such and such a way, but science can only get a meaning for you by looking into yourself. Hence "That Thou Art'." You see the world in yourself. Everything that you see in this world, is in yourself.

(8.39) You may know that all books may be thrown in the dust bin, because they are all ideas, but this does not mean they are useless. They can be used like one thorn picking out a second one, that is embedded in the flesh. So words, as expressive of ideas, although useless for knowing Brahman, are useful for removing ignorance and error which bar the way to such knowledge.

(8.40) The word absolute is nonsensical and Brahman should never be translated by it. Yet the academic philosophers make this mistake. Ultimately there is only Mind. If you think of the Absolute then you are thinking of yourself as one and the absolute as another i.e. of duality. Hence absolute of philosophy is not the non-dual Brahman.

(8.41) To negate anything is unconsciously to affirm its opposite as existent. For affirmation and negation are an inseparable duality.

(8.42) The fundamental principle of human thinking is that no word can give a meaning unless its opposite is by its side. Misery is to be marked off from happiness, etc. This principle that all meanings run in dualities has a most important application in Vedanta, for when applied to the notion of cause and effect, it destroys the illusion of causality.

(8.43) Those who talk of "the experience of Brahman" talk nonsense. They need Semantic training. For you cannot have experience without a subject-object relation, i.e. duality, which is not Brahman.

(8.44) We say to Science: "You have explained the world, but what is meant by explanation? This must be gone into. It is a mental process. It must be psychologically analyzed. What is it that happens in you when you have "explained" anything?"

(8.45) What is meant by meaning? It is a thought. Hence meaning is only a drsyam. This in turn implies a knower of it. Hence there are two. Hence it is not Advaita. This is what I call "the meaning of meaning" which must be got at.

(8.46) If you examine the mind of even a magistrate who delivers judgment on overwhelming evidence and inquire into what it is doing, you find he is only imaginatively constructing the crime, i.e. he is imagining the whole thing. He is unable to know its truth.

(8.47) The word real is often confused with the word concrete, leading to the wrong conclusion that the abstract is unreal.

(8.48) Every man superimposes his own experience on others and imagines that their experience is like his: this is the fundamental fallacy of humanity everywhere. Thus you have never superimposed another man's pain. You can know the meaning of pain only by looking into your own self-experience. Hence your pain is personal experience but your definition of the other men's pain is pure imagination. Hence your interpretation of a man's description of his pain is not in correspondence with it but only your imagination of it. That is why Vedanta ascribes such importance to the question: What is meant by a meaning? Such a query goes to the bottom of the matter. For the answer to it is that we are imagining the whole world, including your own self, it is all nothing but our idea; and it all has nothing to do with the Seer of it, Drg.

(8.49) The ultimate value of Semantics is to show the futility of all words in quest of truth; thus causing you to go beyond words into silence where alone Brahman can be got.

(8.50) How do you get a meaning for words? What is meant by understanding a word? Each time you get only an idea. To use the words truth, reality, Brahman, is merely to form an idea of them, i.e. a drsyam, an object. Sages use such words only to help others rise from lower to higher steps, not to explain them. Each dual statement is used to demolish another, to point out the absurdity of another, as one thorn is used to pull out another, so the guru has to use those incorrect statements of truth to help student rise to the final statement, which being non-dual must be unspoken. Hence discussion and learning about truth are not useless although they cannot yield finality, because they are all riddled with duality, with objectiveness (drsyam), i.e. contradiction. The best explanation is silence. So long as talk proceeds the words are helpful but still they are in duality, but in the highest stage all these words yield only subjective ideas whereas truth is not an object. To understand an idea means having a duality, i.e. a knower and a known., the drg and a drsyam. To rise to a higher level, Brahman, there is no question of understanding for there is no duality there. So long as we speak or write we can never leave duality; hence the only genuine expression of Truth is perfect silence. He who utters the word Brahman does not understand it, for in that moment he assigns a meaning to it, i.e. an idea, imagination.

(8.51) The words "verify" and "validity" are two of the most difficult in philosophy. Every man may use them but none knows what he is doing. For they imply the whole problem of "What is truth?" What is valid for one man is discarded by another. Emotion is verification to A but not to B. The Rationalist association set up experience as the test of verification but they forget that although their experience excludes God, the "experience" of religionists includes it.

CHAPTER 9: RELATIVITY AND THE TWO STANDPOINTS

(9.1) Just as we have demolished the notions that time and space are real in themselves, so in order to arrive at Truth from the highest standpoint, it is necessary to demolish the notion of causation and to show that this simply does not exist and that all so called pseudo-effects are already and pre-existently contained in and a part of the pseudo-cause. However, this represents an extremely difficult and most advanced stage of our enquiry and must be deferred until the earlier stages have been surmounted.

(9.2) Einstein showed that a man on the moon would have a different time from the man on the earth. Hence he said that every man has his own individual idea of time; i.e. relativity. He also showed thus that time and space are inseparable. Time space and causation are ideas, which again are collapsed ultimately in the Brahman.

(9.3) Practical truth is not completely separated from philosophic truth; it is only a step leading to it. If you go more deeply into it, the same empirical truth takes you to the ultimate truth. The divorce is only apparent. You can stop inquiring wherever you like. If you want to stop at practical truth you may do so, thus creating the divorce yourself.

(9.4) Einstein proves not only that each man sees the table differently, because he is in a different position, but the same common table as it is, is never known or thought of by anyone in the same way. Hence Kant was refuted by Fichte showing there was no such thing as a "thing-in-itself." After Kant showed that time space and cause are our mental conceptions and thing-in-itself cannot be known; and now that Einstein has strengthened this position, we see that there is no final position and no final truth. The analogy of all men feeling pain in fire proves certainty of the pain, but not the truth of it, for we cannot compare what kind of pain each man feels inside.

(9.5) Yes, you may say that Einstein's relativity is a modern version of the snake/rope analogy. It is also an approach to Sankara's adhyasa¹⁹, but does not go so far because Einstein does not deal with where all this relativity is coming from, whereas Sankara shows it comes from the self.

(9.6) Einstein's teaching cannot replace the value snake/rope analogy. It has points of similarity but there is a unique and important difference. The snake/rope analogy shows that you may actually see what is not there; this Einstein does not know.

(9.7) Einstein's relativity is looking at different parts of the elephant from different places and so getting different results--tail, leg, etc. but what Einstein overlooks is that this still leaves unexplained what it is that is being looked at, that it is an elephant. Einstein leaves unanswered the question of what the world itself is. This he does not deal with because he won't venture from science to philosophy and it cannot be done otherwise. Hence his approach is limited. Thus there is need of an ultimate standpoint which inquires into the nature of the thing itself which relativity sees only in part or appearance.

(9.8) The common weakness of Indian philosophy and mysticism is to think that experience is the same for all. This is wrong. Einstein has shown that we see things only from a particular point of view. No two persons can have the same eyes in the same precise position, hence they cannot see the identical object.

(9.9) When a man is making maps, the 'correspondence' or 'copy' theories of truth are quite enough for him. When a magistrate is hearing evidence the 'coherence' theory is enough. But for philosophy these are not enough. The former are relative and belong to vyavaharik²⁰ standpoint. They are justifiable because practical life does not afford the time to go into fine proof.

(9.10) Color-blindness is scientific fact. Having been taught to use the word red, inside he is actually perceiving green. Yet both use the same name! How do we know that others see the world in the same way? Such a question is insoluble. All brains are relative. So Einstein says I may call this table, you also may call it table but my experience is not same as yours. This he has proved mathematically and scientifically.

¹⁹ Error. See Sankara's Commentary on the Brahmasutra

²⁰ Consciousness absorbed in worldly concerns

(9.11) It is inevitable that thoughtful people will have to come to the position which recognizes the two-fold viewpoint—Vyavaharic and Paramarthic--the immediate and the ultimate. For you cannot get absolute truth in this world. Time does not permit of proving every detail; hence we have to use belief to a large extent! For instance, we have to believe in our cook that he has not permitted poison to enter the food. We simply have not got the time to investigate his cooking each day. Also we have to believe in the doctor and other experts. For worldly life the practical view cannot be avoided because action is impossible if we have to wait to get all the facts. Hence the practical viewpoint is necessary for active life; it is the only possible one, but when you come to philosophy then it is too defective and we must adopt the ultimate view. Hence beginners who say "Henceforth I shall never believe anything" talk nonsense. As far as we can, we may use reason, but where time does not permit we must believe. Hence a two-fold truth is inescapable.

(9.12) When you say that from a far distance an object is small but from a near distance it is large, whilst during the intervening standpoints it offers a variety of sizes to the eyes, you are merely saying that the mind is imagining the object in these various ways. Einstein's Relativity also offers a variety of possible appearances of the same object to different possible observers which means that they are really only imagining the object; their mind gives them the whole thing and each forms a different idea of it. All that they get is an idea. Nor is it philosophic to talk of the object "as it really is apart from its appearances." For who has seen and which position is the ultimate one? Impossible. For any 'real object' or 'object as it really is' is also only an idea and hence no more and no less real than the appearances.

(9.13) It is a teaching of Mandukya that whatever may be asserted, its opposite can or will be asserted, hence it will be contradicted. Truth must be the Uncontradictable.

CHAPTER 10: PHILOSOPHY OF SENSATION & PERCEPTION

(10.1) Sense knowledge cannot always be depended on and is to be accepted only after thorough investigations if the real Truth about anything is desired. By "real" one means the truth in all its fullness. Now the ordinary man accepts his sense of knowledge without inquiry; without verification, therefore he has no right to regard his knowledge as true.

(10.2) We begin by inquiring into external world. We inquire into the nature of internal worlds i.e. minds ideas thoughts, etc. We inquire into the meaning of words we use. Finally we ask what is that which is unchanging and real?

(10.3) The contradictions or antinomies in knowledge arise in epistemology. The example of the mystery of motion usually given by Zeno the Eleatic of Achilles' crossing the stream is no doubt difficult of solution but the inquiry into it does not go deep enough. (Achilles could go only half way each distance but never to the end; thus half the first yard, half the next inch, half the next hundredth of an inch etc.) This problem of motion can never be solved if you take space as a reality, but if you take space as an idea in mind, if you take the theory of idealism as embracing motion and space, the problem

falls to the ground. These problems are not final, therefore, but they have a value in making us think.

(10.4) When you bathe in the Ganges you may see the sand there. Where did this sand come from? It came from the attrition of the Himalayas. What does this mean? That the great mountains also are in constant change are disappearing, are Maya.

(10.5) Perception: What happens when you see an object? Light rays are transmitted from it to your retina. The object itself does not impinge on your eyes, only the rays. After that vibrations or impulses travel up the optic nerve to the brain. What happens to the nerve during this passage of vibrations. Rapid oscillations! The sensation reaches the brain. What happens next? The sensations are converted into ideas or images. What converts them? The mind! At this moment alone—not before--do you become aware of the object. Moreover all you know of it is the idea or image which now registers in the mind.

(10.6) If you see anything, it is bound to pass away. How is it seen? By the mind. Therefore mind alone produces ideas of world. Realize all things pass away, that just as dream world passes away, waking world also passes. It is not as Yogis suggest, the non-seeing of the wall which reveals it as Maya²¹, but on the contrary the seeing of it. For perception of objects is a mental act which involves mind and its ideas alone.

(10.7) Discrimination between Self and Not-self is the first step in Vedanta. Begin by analyzing the physical body: the same applies to all other objects in the sense-world. You find that the body is composed of elements, five in ancient analysis, more in modern analysis, whose union composes the body or object. But this union is only temporary as death is the law governing all compounded things. Therefore that which man dreads most, death, will inevitably come to him and dissolve the elements of his body. The lesson of this is to wean his mind away from the sense of reality of physical objects and thus to destroy his belief that they can yield real happiness.

(10.8) The Hindu theory that the mind actually travels to an object is absurd. Why does the mind get a different and more correct impression as it approaches nearer to a hill. Why did not the mind, if it traveled, bring a correct report at the very first. Mandukya alone of Hindu books has rejected this theory, which is unscientific.

(10.9) When you examine the plant world, you find it rejects oxygen you accept and take only the carbon which you reject. Thus part of you passes into the plant. You eat plants and the latter passes into you. Thus one and the same substance circulates in different bodies or forms. It is impossible to say what is yourself and what is not, when everything is self. You cannot say that nothing exists, merely because we say all is Maya. That is the view of Sunyavada²² Buddhists. We say that non-existence cannot be understood without knowing the meaning of existence. It is impossible to talk of non-existence and use meaning as well as sound. You can only say a thing does not exist there or here. While we are actually seeing the world, it would be madness to deny its existence. Maya does

²¹ Changing, illusion, unreal

²² Void or Emptiness school

not mean that. We see change, i.e. ideas come and go; experience shows that one thing changes into another, only foolish people say that anything can become nonexistent; so the whole world must remain existent in some way or other and cannot totally disappear.

(10.10) The insoluble gap which exists for science between the physical sensation and mental awareness of it disappears for the Vedantin because on inquiry he finds that they never saw a physical sensation, it was really a mental sensation, an idea in the mind which you may easily copy into a second similar idea.

(10.11) The world scene is constantly changing. The stars, moon and everything changes. Maya asks "What is the meaning of this change? People ignorantly attribute mysterious power to Maya, but it is simply change in its true meaning. Maya is that which appears and afterwards disappears. People accept the fading of a flower without inquiry: only when you ask what has become of its vanished color you are asking the meaning of Maya.

(10.12) Seed which becomes plant, plant which becomes tree, tree which becomes seed again--all this is Maya, i.e. impermanent, changing.

(10.13) What do you mean by change? It means the coming-in of an idea and the going-out of another idea. The moment the mind begins to think, change occurs. Thus the succession of ideas is called change. In deep sleep there is no idea and no change either. Ideas always indicate change. You never know change unless the mind is thinking.

(10.14) Maya means that which appears to be real but is unreal; also that which disappears when you know its real nature.

(10.15) In order to understand the problem, we begin by teaching that the imaginary snake dissolves in the rope. Now at a more advanced stage, we teach that as the snake was mind where could it have been lost, but again in the mind, which means that it was not really lost. Hence all that can be said of it (and the world) is that it appears and disappears. There is no destruction.

(10.16) When the image of an external object is cast upon the retina, there is a transmission of it from the eye along the optic nerve in the form of a vibration. This is carried to the physical brain. What happens next? It is taken up into the mind. How? We can only liken the operation to the sending of a message along telegraph wires. The message is received in the form of hissing sounds. The latter are interpreted by Morse code, and converted into alphabetical letters and thus into words: But where is this interpretation effected? It is done in the mind of the receiving telegraph operator. Similarly the nerve vibrations are decoded and converted into mental constructs, the picture according to the message of the vibrations. What it constructs is purely an idea. But that idea is all it ever sees of the external object.

(10.17) One thing is converted into another everywhere in Nature so that ultimately there is only one thing.

(10.18) Unreality of the world means that everything is continually changing, is momentary.

(10.19) "I see the wall" means two things--not only the wall there but the mental picture, something transpiring in my mind. That is the first step, the ABC. After that we go into the analysis of the wall i.e. object to find out its real nature, which also turns out to be mental. This is the proper way to conduct philosophic analysis. There is the object first, that is undoubted, and there is also the thought of it. Only after grasping this may we proceed further to inquire what all these are--thoughts, things, words (names) etc.

(10.20) Anything which is produced is bound to go. If you think of the teacher as Atman he is always there; but if you think otherwise through ignorance, then he will seem to disappear. When you know the waves as water then it is always there but when you think of them only as waves then they will seem to vanish. Hence if you view the world of objects as different from Brahman, then you will see them disappear and appear: but when you go to the truth, the imagined differences will vanish and the world-unity as Brahman will remain. If you know that this body is of the same substance as the plant (via decomposition into manure where is it to be lost or cease to exist), the constant change seen in the world does not change the essence of the objects, only their appearance. When you know what the reality is, then you are unable to think of the appearance as being different. The essence remains, then, even though the forms change. The world that we see, this body and this mind, are all of one stuff. This explains the mutual interdependence and interaction which science discovers.

(10.21) Death follows death in continuous and unending procession. Science sees this. All forms are transient, changing almost immediately. Nothing is permanent. All disappears. Even your body is ever changing. New oxygen is being inhaled into my body every minute; carbon is being exhaled. Therefore my body is being built up from fresh components every minute. Similarly food curries build body.

(10.22) Advaita does not deny the existence of the world. It only asks of what substance can the world be. The Advaitin sees the world as much as any one else.

(10.23) Nobody has seen non-entity; only the continuous change of one form into another.

(10.24) What is it that makes a child cry because it loses a toy in dream? It is because of its sense of reality. This sense of reality of the waking world is called Maya. This is ignorance, a creation of mind and is got rid of by obtaining knowledge that everything is only Atman.

(10.25) What is the thing which is always present, then in the body. It is only imaginary. There is nothing really here. What makes you think that the same body is still there, then? Hence 13th chapter of Gita says "Inquire into the nature of Prakriti, matter, and you find there is no solidity, no reality in it, but if you do not inquire then matter is still there."

(10.26) When you understand the nonexistence of the body, as science shows, which is ever-changing, you know then that the body is but an idea. Even the body you had as a child has disappeared. What is permanent in it? If you refuse to face philosophy then death comes finally and teaches the lesson which all life has been trying to teach you, viz. that body is ephemeral, ever passing and illusory. It is only an idea. Only the ignorant say I am the same body as yesterday. They do not inquire but merely believe in what they consider to be truth. But the wise seek the permanent, the unchanging, the Atman which knows.

(10.27) (a) T.H. Huxley's exposition of idealism (re: sensations and perceptions) is accurate and Vedantic. He was best of all scientists.

(b) We do not see the world; we see our concept of the world; we do not perceive objects; we perceive concepts of them.

(c) The incapacity of the masses to take in this single truth is due to the immature development of their minds, and to the imperious urgency of physical life. When such unready people apply themselves to truth they first bewilder themselves and then misrepresent the truth, both to themselves and to others.

(d) The mind is true perceiving power the physical sense-organs merely provide conditions of perception.

(10.28) The old antiquated theories which prevail in India that the Atman goes out of the sense organs to the distant objects is nonsense. This is called "tarka."

(10.29) You see John. What have you done by seeing him? His picture has fallen on your retina. That picture is say 1/2 inch long. He is six feet tall. Hence you did not see him but the picture and hence it is the mind which has seen him. It has formed an idea of John. When I compare my idea of John with John and form a judgment, you have only compared one idea with another idea. It is impossible to see John in himself. Hence the impossibility of accepting "correspondence theory" of truth. The same applies to touching John and any of the other senses. It is the mind which really senses. Does the mind come directly in contact with John? No! Therefore it merely forms an idea of John. John is only an idea. To form a judgment of him is merely to compare one idea with another. Two ideas cannot come at the same moment. Hence one of these will be a memory, not a fact. Now what do you mean by comparing? Can you see the two things side by side? No--Because when one idea comes the other is gone. There is a difference of time. Hence how can they be the same? Hence Buddha said you can never step into the same river twice. The water has flowed and fresh water is here. You step into different water, hence not the same river.

(10.30) Roughness, smoothness etc. are qualities which cannot exist without a mind to perceive them, i.e. they cannot exist unperceived; therefore the individual object to which these qualities belong cannot also exist unperceived. It is the mind that presents everything to us. Whatever is seen is seen by the mind.

(10.31) When the nerve-vibrations are present, mind knows the thing. When they are not there, mind is unaware of any object. Hence the scientific account of sensation and perception is purely inferential although based on sound facts as far as they are known. We are never conscious of how sense-impressions are manifested into perceptions but we infer the process. The only certain thing is the mind's own activity.

(10.32) If my mind were elsewhere, thinking of something else, then I would not see even the wall that confronts me. Hence the mind is the real seeing agent of things. We say in the elementary stage that mind conjoined with eyes does the seeing, but as we study deeper we find the eyes are themselves creations of the mind, hence mind alone is the seer, as Upanishads say.

(10.33) All that we know is the visible world. That it is ever-changing we learn only after inquiry, until then we wrongly ascribe permanence, reality to it. Yet although the ascription is wrong, the sense of reality is there because it is within ourselves, in Atman, and we superimpose it on the world that is visibly seen.

(10.34) The proof that our idea of the thing is known first, lies in the fact that if a nerve in the hand is paralyzed or cut, I may touch this stick but will feel nothing. Why? Because the nerve fails to communicate the experience to the mind and so no sensation arises. The mental sensation is what I first know. All the rest, such as existence of an outside object, is inference or assumption.

(10.35) If you go on inquiring into physical processes of sensation, your inquiry lands you into thought, the mental process. Science cannot discover the relation between physical and mental for the simple reason that the physical is ultimately mental. It has set us an artificial non-existent problem and vainly strives to solve it. So long as duality grips the mind, the latter seeks to establish relations. Hence it tries to find out the relation between mind and body--a hopeless task.

(10.36) Injure the optic nerve and although an object is before you, you will see nothing. This is proof that we have the sensation first and only afterwards become aware of the object. When we receive no sensation, we never become aware of the object as in sleep. Why? Because the object is an inference which we make from the sensation itself.

(10.37) The fact that objects are inferences drawn from sensation is obscured partly because of the rapidity with which the inference is drawn and partly because people never stop to inquire and reflect as to what is going on when they see an object, and partly because they will not think matters out to the logical end owing to their innate belief in causality predisposing them to look for a separate object as the cause of their impression of it. When everything is found to be but Mind--whether it be object, seer, senses nerves impression etc.--then all becomes a unity and there is no room for cause and effect because there are no two things.

(10.38) It is wrong to say we rely only on our senses alone for information, the mind also gives us things, such as peace, satisfaction.

(10.39) What do I mean by seeing this wall? It is only when your attention is directed to the wall that you see it. Science says rays of light form an image on retina. This is proved by photography. Present an object to a camera. Picture of the object falls upon the sensitive plate because rays of light proceed from the object to lens or viewfinder. This was not known to ancient India, so the pundits and old books said that the mind went out of the body to the object and brought an image back to the body. This is nonsense. The image's impression is carried by the optic nerve to brain. Cut off this nerve and the man sees nothing. This proves the nerve is necessary to communication. How? It vibrates and sets up these vibrations in the brain. Science has to stop at this point. It cannot explain, nobody knows how this vibration is converted into idea. The mind constructs from these vibrations, an image. This establishes beyond all doubt that it is the mind that constructs the image, the picture. Thus idealism is irrefutably proved. How do we see an object as six feet long? It is the mind that actually--constructs the dimension. Here philosophy begins and physiology ends. Which is the first thing you get, the information about the object or the object itself? Science says the mind depends for its information upon its servants--nerves, eyes, brain. Philosophy says however "If the mind cannot go directly to see the object, it depends entirely on its servants, on what they tell it. They speak in vibratory language. This is the telegraph code. The mind never sees the object therefore." Scientists have experimented by irritating certain nerve ends and this has produced certain images in the consciousness. This shows that the mind has concocted its own objects, has worked up the vibration-information received into ideas. What is the original stimulus for the vibration? The mind asking itself this question can only answer itself by inferring or assuming an object outside. But never forget that mind has never come into direct awareness of an object. There is no proof therefore that a separate object exists outside but mind habitually assumes it to be there from the beginning. It has in no case seen it directly. What then is the stimulus? This very question involves unconscious assumption that the outside separate object exists. Those who say we must have previously seen the object in order to form an idea of it subsequently, we reply: Did they ever see an object independently of the mind? Is it not the mind that first gave information of the thing, of its qualities? The object, the rays of light and the whole sensory organ-nerve-brain process is not known by the mind at the time, it is only imagined afterwards when it analyses the way in which its knowledge arises. All the mind really and indubitably knows is the picture, the idea which it forms itself. All the rest has been imagined by it. All this is itself an idea. The object as cause of the idea is unprovable but is assumed by the mind at the very start of the process, it itself remaining unaware that it has started with the assumption. It wrongly takes the separate object for granted. Whatever else is offered in place of the object as cause, such as God, must also be something unknown and unknowable, for anything known can only be an idea; mind knows only its own constructions. This effectually kills materialism, for no matter is thus findable. Mind alone is. Dream illustrates this. In dream you can have a dissection room, objects, a body, sense organs, optic nerves, brains and vibrations along the nerves, just as you have them here--all the five senses in fact. But you know on waking that they are all mental. So why should it be impossible that the same series of things in our waking state are mental too? What is it that infers the objects? It is mind. What is an inference? An

idea. What is it that asks for the cause of its sensations? It is mind. Thus everything resolves itself into the mind's own concoction.

(10.40) We use the term "seeing" so frequently as though it were a simple process: really it is complicated. What is meant by "seeing" must be examined.

(10.41) Thinking is questioning experience. Something happens--a thing is seen or heard and we ask "What is that? What do I see? What do I hear or feel?" These somethings bring a message to the mind for inquiry. Reality is only inferred. Every object presented to us brings with it a question "What is it?" This is the natural condition of the mind. It wants to get at the true explanation of a thing. This is the basis of truth.

CHAPTER 11: ILLUSIONS OF SPACE, TIME, EXTERNALITY

(10.1) Illusion does not mean the non-existence of anything. Those who do not understand Vedanta teach this wrong definition.

(10.2.) Experience of life shows that after deeper inquiry many things are not what they seem at first sight, that the naively realistic view of the ordinary man is insufficient as we go deeper.

(10.3) Every man thinks he is pursuing truth and would be indignant if he were told that he was pursuing his own personal feelings about it. Admittedly the idea of truth comes to all persons, but who inquires into its nature? Every man has the conceit that his interpretation is true, although he has never taken the trouble to find out how it is true.

(10.4) Vedanta does not dispense with externality; take the case of Dream when the 'fear' is inside and the 'tiger' outside. We perceive both internal and external. The external world is reduced to ideas and the ideas are reduced to Atman. Vedanta is neither Idealism nor Realism.

(10.5) Empiricism = taking things as they are known to the senses.

(10.6) Advaita does not deny existence of external objects: it denies their reality.

(10.7) People who use the word "external" ought to define it first. They speak of an external world. External to what? Is the body external or internal to the mind? If the body is included in the world (as it must be because it is built up from food, water, air, taken from it) then if the body is internal (as it must be to the mind) the whole world must also be internal.

(10.8) What is it that tells you of the chair? The mind, because if your attention is elsewhere you are not cognizant of the chair.

(10.9) Where do you see the snake? Outside. Where is the snake? In your mind. Thus inquiry shows that the body is really inside the mind. It is the nature of the mind to

concoct scenes. That is the best word we can really say about it. With occasions those scenes will vary.

(10.10) Answer to the question regarding the idea of ideal chair sitting on it is fallacy. The questioner forgets he is also an idea, his body too also an idea. He has not given up his faith that body is real. Why does he think it impossible? He thinks his body is different from idea. He does not know that mind and matter are both ideas. It is same as Dr. (Samuel) Johnson's objection.

(10.11) Amputated limb soldiers in war who had a certain nerve touched in the arm were at first telling the doctor, "do not touch my finger. It causes me pain." He felt as though the hand was there. There was nothing, still he felt it. It was his idea only. This is analogous to Idealism. We feel the external world is and real but it is not there.

(10.12) What is your great grand father to you now? You may say he was such and such man, but that only means he is an imagined figure, for you have never seen him, and he is only an idea. Similarly yesterday we had a conversation. What is that to you now? Merely a memory, i.e. it has now been reduced to an idea. Ignorance makes men think that time, things, persons are real.

(10.13) What is Time? What is eternity? How can you know that God is eternal? Did he tell you so? If, so, how does he know? For He might die tomorrow! How can you know that there is such a thing as eternity. And if you know it you must yourself live all eternity, be coexistent with it. Are you?

(10.14) Take anything which grows and changes, say a seed, and state at what precise moment the seed became a plant, the babe a man. This is impossible, therefore the time change is really your own conception, not in the object. Can you have an idea of time unless you have in it beginnings and endings, breaks and changes? But when you try to get hold of the latter, they vanish.

(10.15) "Past" must have a meaning. It is an idea. Future is an idea not yet come. Hence whenever you are thinking; when you think of the past you think it in the present. I get the idea of present only by distinguishing it from the past or future. It is an idea. Can you experience this present really? What is meant by the present? It involves distinction, it depends past and future. Both these do not exist. Therefore present does not exist as such. The conclusion is that all time is but idea, imagination. When you think, all thoughts exist in the present. Hence we call it eternal. But all idea of time is conception of mind. When can you draw a line and say this instant is the present? In reality you cannot do this, you cannot hold the present. Time is only an idea, and all events therefore are ideas with it. The present appears to exist and yet it does not. Hence we call time Maya. But that which appears is substantially the Atman, so if time and events go, we know the Atman does not go. Hence we are not after all terming time--whose flux of events seems our life--illusory.

(10.16) Unreal in the snake-rope story means that which dissolves itself (is dissolved back) again into you. The snake you had seen is only an idea. When you approach nearer

the snake disappeared. Where did it go? It went back into the mind. Similar the ideas we form of the universe go back into the mind whence they arose. (ed. "prapancho-pasasam")

(10.17) By the time you say this is present it becomes past. What we consider as present, is only imagination. How long does the idea of the present last even? It does not even last one second. By the time you thought of present it is gone, the present itself has vanished. Moreover the past is not here. The present can not depend on that even. Idea of time is our imagination, belief.

(10.18) Time is treated in Mandukya Upanishad Karika: Time is always referred to some object or event composed of objects. It takes time to glance at any object because it has dimensions and the eye must travel from one border of it to another. Where does the present moment start or stop? It is impossible to distinguish these points, because it becomes past moment. Similarly, where does the past or future begin or end? Impossible to say. Hence we cannot form an idea of either past, present or future i.e of time. In short it is only an idea in our minds. Then what gives the strong sense of reality to time? If it were merely an idea, why is it felt by all mankind? Analyze each man, to him it is an idea also. A million naughts remain naught. Hence collective experience of mankind does not turn time as an idea in each individual mind into a reality.

(10.19) If time proved to be but an idea then eternity must be the same too: What is eternity? That which is without beginning or end--an idea. merely, because who can say what is going to happen the next minute, let alone all eternity. Even God himself cannot say "I am eternal." Even a God who has lived for a million years cannot say whether he is going to continue another single year. Hence even eternity and time, as ideas, must collapse or disappear. At this point people will fear to go further. Eternity consoled them with the thought of surviving death. If it vanishes, they feel lost, But no, something is left. To whom has these ideas come? To the Self. In whom do they appear and vanish? In the Self. Hence the Self as Witness still remains. Now the world was shown to be but an idea. All Ideas disappear into the self. Hence the world disappears into the self. Or the self contains the whole world. It is the Witness of the three states. IT IS. Why add predicates? It embraces everything. What cause then for fear? This is the Upanishad teaching, Even the idea "eternity" disappears into Self and is contained by it. Why fear?

(10.20) The idea of time is impossible in the sleep state.

(10.21) Through ignorance we consider unreal things to be real, but when we get knowledge we know them for what they are. False knowledge, such as taking a tree at night for a man, is such ignorance and is removed by inquiry. Scientists have got so far as to see the world in electrons and protons; if only they will inquire further and not stop, they will see the world is idea, and still later they will know it is only Brahman. The criticism is often made of Vedanta that we base it on queer or abnormal events such as seeing mirages, snakes in ropes etc. We reply, no, we do not limit our inquiry to them. We also inquire into real water and not mirages alone, into real snakes and not ropes

alone, imaginary snakes. Then we find the real nature of all these things--Brahman. Hence ours is a message of persistent inquiry not stopping till the ultimate end is reached.

(10.22) Only after the world has been analyzed, should we ask the question, What is it that sees the world? This leads to investigation into Atman, to What am I? But we should not begin with the latter.

(10.23) The world has existence; even the snake seen in an illusion has existence: even appearances have existence. It is therefore absurd to deny existence of anything experienced. What we ought to do however is to ask ourselves, what is meant by existence?

(10.24) You do not see the external object as outside your minds (upon realization) although you continue to see it as outside your body.

(10.25) It is an error of all the scientists, psychologists and philosophers to regard illusion as extraordinary, abnormal and peculiar perception. What you have to grasp and explain is that it is perception--unadulterated plain perception operating as it always operates. It is the ordinary process of sight touch etc. This is the most important point. Therefore illusion must be treated as a part or continuation of the normal process of sense-perception and experience.

(10.26) There is no such thing as a measure of time. Close analysis will reveal that all our measurements based on planetary revolutions are ultimately nothing else than mental impressions. Time is how we think it. Einstein has begun to point to this truth without however, realizing the tremendous consequences which must ultimately follow when this path of analysis is pushed to its logical and fullest extent. Thus by comparing the dream state with the waking state, we may perceive how, as dreams occur in the mind, time is purely mental. The same discriminations apply to the notion of space also. Those who object that dream standards are hallucinatory and therefore inadmissible as evidence need to be reminded that were this discussion conducted in the dream state, they would use precisely the same, argument about the hallucinatory character of the waking state, whilst they would uphold the definite reality of the dream state. The fact is that they possess no proof beyond the idea that they are now in the waking state. And further, if dream is mere hallucination, why should nature have given us this state unless she regarded it as being at least as real as the waking state?

(10.27) Sankara used the idea of eternity only to oppose the idea of time, to show it as illusory. But he never meant eternity is real. That would be to misunderstand him.

(10.28) There is a hypothesis involved and hidden in Zeno's famous paradox of motion. It is that space can be infinitely divided. Even when you divide space you are only imagining that you are doing so.

(10.29) People always make a mistake in confusing reality with existence. Appearance may exist, as snake or mirage, and yet not be a reality.

(10.30) There is a difference between super-imposition and imagination. The first requires a second thing to support or receive it which resembles it; the other is only the mind manipulating itself. But when you know everything is Atman, you know there is no duality, hence super-imposition is impossible. What then did the mind do? You cannot explain adequately by saying it imagined because all your imagination will not bring London before you as it is. The mind has projected the appearance so as to make it appear outside the body. Hence it imagined it first and then projected it outside. How did it come to appear outside? This shows that if you say the world is imagination and stop there, it does not explain fully. You have to grant that the mind has a two-fold power, the second being projection or superimposition of the form of objects upon itself. When you see anything outside you, it is the mind which has created it for you, and as in dream or mirage it can also project it to appear outside.

(10.31) The words "projection" and "external" are unphilosophic. From where to where can there be the projection, when you know that the body is also an idea?

(10.32) There is no such thing as "outside" teaches Mandukya. In your dream you see a mountain outside, but it is not really so. Sankara has said that you see the mirage or the snake outside, but they are really in your own mind. You can never have anything as outside without the mind showing it to you, without thinking it, without using the mind to tell you. This is the reply to the realists.

(10.33) What is it that prevents us seeing world in self? The error of thinking mind is in the body instead of reverse; mind cannot be confined to the body: we do not know its extent: nobody has seen it inside the body.

(10.34) "Inside" and "outside" are terms having reference to the body. But the body is mental, idea, hence as dimensionless as Mind. What is the use of such meaningless spatial terms?

(10.35) We cannot say where the limits of the mind are. The mind is like a mirror and our body is like a reflection in this mirror, just as all other objects are. When you know Mind is unlimited and that your body is limited, then it follows that the latter must be within the mind.

(10.36) Time and space being only ideas, no thing can exist either inside you or outside you; it is really the same as you i.e. non-different.

CHAPTER 12: DOCTRINE OF MENTALISM

(11.1) Walking through a disused ruined graveyard in Mysore with VSI he remarked: this reminds us of what we too shall become. Where are all these dead people? They are only memories, i.e. ideas, even to their kith and kin. The transiency of human life is another indication that it is but an idea. Hence the study of death's inexorability as man's destiny

should cause us to reflect that whole of life ends in death and that nothing is left but an idea.

(11.2) Yoga is valuable to bring seeker to indifference to sensation and sense perception and thus prepare him for idealism of the world.

(11.3) The Western philosopher cannot get over their tallest hurdle, not because they cannot see that the body is an idea but because they are so strongly attached to the body that they modify or fit their theories to please this attachment. In short, they refuse to give up the body.

(11.4) Only those who think body and world are real, are given yoga and mysticism, which is the middling class of intelligence. Those who grasp that they are mental constructions belong to the highest grade of intellects.

(11.5) Desire, attachment, passion are regarded as handicaps to path only because they prevent mind accepting truth that matter is an idea. Naturally you will say "I like my house. It is so comfortable and luxurious. I refuse to regard it as a mere idea," if you are so passionately attached to its reality. They do not necessarily mean specific desires for wealth, women, etc.

(11.6) You cannot teach higher Vedanta to anyone who is incapable of grasping the truth that world is an idea.

(11.7) After long experience I have now realized that to use the word "unreal" in such connection as "the world is unreal," is unfortunate, and causes misapprehension on part of others. So I have decided to and advise you to use the word "idea." It is better to say that "the world is an idea." Similarly, do not talk of mental "abstraction" when you mean withdrawing the mind inwards from the external world, but rather use the word "detachment."

(11.8) It is knowing that is absolutely necessary for the existence of a thing; the objects are not different from the mind.

(11.9) No scientist has been able to explain how and when you—your consciousness--came into existence.

(11.10) The mind has no place; in dream it appears and disappears; it is constantly changing. Atman constructs the mind you use as it constructs the physical objects-ideas. The finite individual mind is a mental construction.

(11.11) Imaginations=mental presentations—mental constructions=ideas.

(11.12) Nowadays objective idealism generally is accepted. It teaches that the external object is there, but your mind interprets it and forms a picture for you in the form of an idea. Thus a combination of object plus idea = this system. The opposition is usually

directed against subjective idealism which says you know only the idea of the object. Curiously however, the arguments for the latter are much stronger than for the former, because even when you say there is an object, outside, it is your mind which tells you so. All you get is a thought.

(11.13) Objective or Ontological Idealism teaches there is a real outside object of which my mind tells me, and my mind could not form the idea unless the object were there, whereas Subjective or Epistemological Idealism teaches that I do not know whether there is any outside object other than my mind. I neither deny nor accept it. I say simply that I do not know. Even if it existed I still know only what my mind tells me about it.

(11.14) Idealism can never escape to the truth except by the road of non-causality. Otherwise it will always be deluded by its notion that a thought must reside in the mind of a Thinker, i.e. produced by a Universal Mind or God i.e. caused by such a Mind. Berkeley never saw this, but Kant began to suspect it: however he had the weakness to imagine "transcendental" cause.

(11.14) European Idealism says the external world is a construction of the mind. But Gaudapada alone of all philosophers whether Western or Indian rises still higher and shows that as a causal relation is never found between subject and object, then the Idealists are talking nonsense.

(11.15) It is not mere egoistic imaginations, but those in the mind itself. This must be understood. In your dream the most important thing is that you yourself have been constructed by the mind, for in your dream you are either a king or a hunter, or a beggar, i.e. you are yourself imagined or constructed by the mind. It is not my idea but the common Mind which imagines that and this person. You may have seen the birth and death of other beings, thoughts and feelings, but you have never seen the birth and death of the knower, or seer. You may imagine it but even that implies the imaginer. In other words you must be there before thinking. Hence in this sense, the self is termed "the unborn." We have never seen its going, so we cannot call it mortal. Hence too all things and ideas must be of the same stuff as the Seer of them because they disappear into self.

(11.16) The European idea as soon as word "mind" is uttered is that it means "the mind of an individual" whereas we Vedantins mean by it "that to which anything appears." This is an important and vital difference. Ours is thus a common mind.

(11.17) An idea is a mental creation.

(11.18) An idea means that you imagine. In Vedanta the word 'idea' stands for mental construction --not that which the ego has constructed, but that which is constructed by the mind which itself sees the ego--the common mind.

(11.19) Re: the Heart: Atman in heart (Hrid in old Sanskrit because in those days they thought mind was in the heart). Mind can reduce itself to pin point (in heart) or expand to take in universe. This is for yogic practice only, not Vedantic inquiry. It is useful for such

practice to take Atman as being in heart to have a point of concentration, like the heart within as introversion, but it is a mistake to think this is highest.

(11.20) When someone is awake, we usually call him conscious, but pure awareness still exists even when he is under anesthesia. We must separate pure consciousness from the ideas in it, such as the ideas of waking objects and environment.

(11.21) The Vedanta notion of mind does not confine it to the body. Mind is like a looking glass in which all bodies, all the universe appears. The mind must not be limited to this or that point in space.

(11.22) The English word Consciousness is somewhat misleading. To Vedantins it means "Consciousness of the universe" which you have in waking and dream, as one thing, and pure consciousness, as another. Deep sleep is the nearest to understand pure consciousness. Not that the external world is kept out, but you don't and can't see it as separate because it is reabsorbed into you.

(11.23) We do not know the dimensions of the mind. All space is in your mind only, not outside of it. c.f. the mind can imagine the Himalaya mountains.

(11.24) Those who talk of brain-consciousness are talking emptily. We do not know what it is, nor what is "brainless consciousness". We know only consciousness. Science does not know the true relation between consciousness and brain, if any.

(11.25) (a) There is only one Mind--let us call it the "Overmind." Every individual human being is an inlet to the one Mind. In Sanskrit the latter is called "Sarowar" meaning "the lake" hence the name of the sacred Tibetan lake "Manasarowar," meaning the lake of the mind. If we imagine individuals to be pipes running out of this great lake of the Overmind, then whoever goes only a little way into the lake becomes conscious of the minds merest him; whoever goes to the deepest extent can then tap all minds. This is the secret of telepathy. Insensibility to the body, or temporary insensibility of the personal ego, permits the individual to enter the Universal Mind, as in hypnotic states, trance, etc. The medium who gives up the ego to that extent gets rid of the obstruction to entering into the Universal Mind. She may then ascertain the past or predict the future, because both are equally present in the Overmind. However, she does this only temporarily and she does not contact the Divine Self, only the eternal infinitude of time. There is no limit to the Overmind, just as space has no limit. The notion that the mind is enclosed in the head is a mistake. There is but one Mind operating through a multitude of individuals and appearing different in each. This applies also to animals. To tap this Mind to its deepest extent is simply dependent on the amount of concentration one has. Herein lies the key to all occult phenomena, just as during the dream state we see people, hear them speak, fly the world, etc. so the psychic senses derive their reality from the Overmind, for these senses operate from the dream state. The occultist brings his dream state into his waking state. The medium who hears spirit voices is like the dreamer who hears them too. All occult phenomena presuppose the reality of material limitations and hence have no value

from the standpoint of truth. In fact, they may even become snares for the truth seeker, if he does not recognize them as being the pseudo-spiritual phenomena that they are.

b) The One Universal Overmind is the source of genius. It is NOT Brahman. It is reached by forgetting the personal 'I', then concentration.

c) It is because the mind is not confined to the brain box, but stretches far outside the body that certain kinds of psychic phenomena are possible. Similarly, because past, present and future exist simultaneously in the Overmind prediction is possible.

(11.26) The Unconsciousness can only be a consciousness without objects; otherwise it has no meaning. Therefore it is really and somehow consciousness.

(11.27) That which you know best in the world, that which is nearest to you, that of which you can never be free, whose existence is supremely certain, is your consciousness. You may doubt anything else but you directly perceive yourself. Hence we begin the study of Vedanta with the study of consciousness, not, as is mistakenly done by Indian theologians, Western metaphysicians like Hegel, with the supposed Absolute. Just as to explain the nature of gold, we take a single gold ornament first and then tell you that all gold ornaments are made of this same single material so to explain the nature of the unknown Brahman, we start with something known and familiar, viz. consciousness, which you have in the three states, and proceed step by step from that onwards. You know your Atman, it is directly perceived, thinking implies a thinking capacity, i.e. a thinker. This Atman is your consciousness. After showing that this consciousness, this self, is Brahman, we then explain that everything else is of the same nature which should enable you henceforth to understand all else. Moreover everyone has and knows this consciousness, therefore it is a universal datum. It is something which everybody can grasp, not merely some occultist or mystic; therefore there is no mystery-mongering in our study.

(11.28) If, as materialists say, the interaction of material brain atoms produces mind as a byproduct, we reply that you could not know this unless someone had seen it happen. But nobody has yet seen it. This theory is childish.

(11.29) No philosopher, whether in India or Europe has even been able to define the meaning of 'mind' and 'consciousness'.

(11.30) It is more correct and a step up to Vedanta to understand that you know only 'mental states' as Hume pointed out. For in Vedanta we say we know only three final states of mind--waking, dream and sleep--which come and go like other states.

(11.31) Before any thought, idea, opinion could come in, there must have been the mind. Before you could know that God created world, mind must have been there to tell you so. Before you can attribute to anything its primordial nature in the world--whether it be Force, Matter, God or Electricity--the mind is prior in telling you of a primordial principle. Therefore Mind is the only reality we know. All else we imagine, believe or wish.

(11.32) All instincts, occult powers, mysterious faculties, are forms of the mind.

(11.33) Mesmerism is perfectly possible. Moreover a crowd of 100 can be wholly mesmerized, because one stronger mind can master one or a hundred weaker minds. A 100 naughts still equals naught. This explains the rope trick.²³

(11.34) The mind eludes measurement, therefore it cannot be mechanically studied or analyzed as science does with other physical things. But the scientific method can be applied to it apart from scientific measurement.

(11.35) How long, high and broad is your mind? You do not know where it begins or ends. You cannot say it stops here. Have you seen your own mind, or anyone else's mind? Yet people talk of my mind, his mind, as though each mind was numbered and separated. Science now says that the mind is not limited, we cannot measure it or allot it to separate individuals; that it is everywhere. Is your mind within your body or vice versa? If you say your mind is within six inches of skull, that implies you have seen and measured it, which is a lie. No man has ever seen a mind. We may say, however, that every man has got his own thoughts, his own ideas, which are not in another man's mind, but Mind itself is all one though thoughts may be many. All the external places, cities, bodies are within Mind.

(11.36) Imaginations are thoughts which arise by an individual's effort: whereas Ideas are those which come and go of their own accord.

(11.37) Man knows only his consciousness. He never knows any other man's mind.

(11.38) Consciousness is something whose origin science has not discovered, when and how it comes and when and how it goes cannot be seen. Science does not even know its true relationship to the body.

(11.39) The secret of psychic healing or occult phenomena is this: the people who approach the yogi have intense faith but weaker mind. The yogi says or does something which sets the patient's own mind working powerfully on herself and, by power of suggestion, causes her own cure. Mind can affect one's own body only, not another's. The miracle ascribed to the yogi above was really performed by the patient herself.

(11.40) Forgotten memories of something seen read or heard many years ago frequently account for the sudden and unexpected arising of occult visions or other phenomena. But unless one has a scientific frame of mind, one will ascribe these events wrongly. This is the same as the Hindu theory of samskaras and vasanas, which in our view are buried not only in the subconsciousness of this life, but also from former incarnations.

(11.41) An idea = what is present in the mind.

(11.42) We say mind is everywhere because we cannot determine its limits. But what is "everywhere?" It is space. What is space? An idea, i.e. mind. Thus you see that when

²³ A famous fakir illusion where a rope is seeming sent up into the sky and a boy climbs up it.

analysis is carried to its last, which is the principle of Vedanta we find the Mind is really indefinable, and indescribable: That is the Drg.

(11.43) We cannot see anyone else's mind, only our own. Therefore, we must say, if we would be honest, that Mind is one. To say that everybody has his own mind is merely an imagination, an inference; it is unprovable, for all you can see of another person is his body, never his mind. Hence Vedanta can only admit Mind to be one without a second.

(11.44) Consciousness outside is meaningless. Who has measured consciousness? How can you get outside your mind or consciousness? When you think of the mind you are unconsciously thinking of the body, and mean consciousness outside the body.

(11.44) How is it, critics say that every man has a different mind, yet you say there is only one consciousness or Atman. Reply: There is only one sun but it will cast a million separate reflections on the ocean, or a fire will throw out a hundred sparks; in the same way understand the Self.

(11.45) We need to be careful in using the word Consciousness with Westerners, because they apply it only to awareness of objects whereas India has specific Sanskrit words, whose equivalents in English do not exist for pure, transcendent, objectless consciousness, inclusive of deep sleep, dream and waking.

(11.46) Sushupti is "The Unconsciousness" of the Western psychologists: they have absolutely no idea of Turiya.

(11.47) The Western theory of the Unconscious is a step forward to our definition of consciousness but they cannot grasp it. They do not see that, if you give any meaning, whatever to the term "unconscious" you have to be conscious of this meaning, therefore your unconsciousness is really conscious. In deep sleep consciousness is ever and always present, according to Vedanta, and when you talk of unconsciousness, you have to be conscious, therefore it is nonsense.

(11.48) The "Emergent Theory" of Aristotle, S. Alexander and Lloyd Morgan says that mind ultimately emerges from the body as its main product. It is not very different from materialistic theory of origin and nature of mind, for it also ignores the felt priority of mind, the fact that it tells you of body before body can tell you of mind.

(11.49) Have you seen this wall without using your mind independently of your idea of it? No. It is the mind that gives you the wall. Therefore the "correspondence theory" which says truth is that which conforms to reality although necessary for practical purposes (otherwise we cannot get on with the business of life or do anything) is useless for philosophic purposes because mind alone tells you about the wall. There is no other reality outside you than the mind itself. Then to what is it able to correspond? How can you put your idea alongside of any object to compare them? If your idea is of Chamundi Hill can you examine it in correspondence with the hill? It is impossible. Mind cannot be measured like matter. Nor does the "copy theory" survive examination, better than the

"correspondence theory." Can you hold in your mind an exact copy of the Himalaya mountains of precisely the same height and length as the mountains themselves? No. It is an impossibility. Thus we finally arrive at the fact that the wall is mental.

(11.50) Nobody knows how mind and body are coordinated: they can only say 'it is so.' No living being without a mind has ever been seen. The notion that they are separate is only your construction. You may see a person at a distance and mistake him for somebody else. The latter is then only your mental construction of picture. This shows that it is the mind that works first and not the object. This proves that mind is fundamental. Nobody can answer the question 'How does the brain produce thoughts.' Why? Because they make the mistake of believing that the physical brain comes first. If the brain were the cause of thoughts, it would be possible to show the connection, but that has never been done. There is an uncrossable gap. Therefore, this materialistic doctrine is mere speculation, not philosophy.

(11.51) Maya as change: this change is only an idea, a thought. So Maya ultimately means ideation, but according to context you begin by having idea of Maya as change in mind.

(11.52) Energy, Force, itself is only a concept. You cannot see it. A concept is an idea. An idea is a part of the mind. Therefore if science reduces the material world to pure force, we may philosophically reduce that in its turn to Mind.

(11.53) The world is unreal--It is not an external object, it is only an internal idea.

(11.54) Spiritual Healing: That Kerin saw a vision is undoubted, that the cure was effected is still more unquestioned. It is the mind that cured her. It is the subliminal state rising to the luminal. Every man has seen only one mind. If you go sufficiently deep into it you will find it is the One Mind of All. That is the latent, the subliminal. It is most important. When we use a word it must have a meaning. To define a meaning is just forming an idea of a word. When I say mind what happens is that you feel an idea of a mind. So to know what mind really is, you must drop the idea of it. Then you will sink back into mind itself. This is tantamount to concentration or thought cessation. Then you contact the universal mind, which is the only mind and which is really an aspect of Brahman, although to know it as Brahman one has to go still further. This universal Mind, is One, not two or three. There, "this" as mind controls body, all miraculous healing and occult powers happen. Dorothy Kerin has had the idea of being healed and it was the universal mind which cured her, not Jesus. This was her own imagination, she certainly saw the vision of Jesus, however, but it was self-created. Those who strongly hold the idea of a sage or guru will see him in vision or meditating and get peace from him, but still it is only their mind which creates the vision and which gives the peace. To those who ask me whether Guru projects himself to them directly or whether they create their own visions, I refuse to reply and say answer belongs to advanced stage (where initiation into esoteric doctrine of Universal Mind is given.)

CHAPTER 12: DOCTRINE OF MENTALISM

(12.1) Vedanta does not say there is only your idea of an elephant and no elephant outside. This is what Europeans think of Vedanta, mistakenly. We admit that the external world exists, but we say that if you inquire into the nature of this world you will find it a mental construction; if you inquire into the external world, you will find it idea also. Hence we say that the external elephant does exist, but it is only an idea while the idea of the elephant also exists: when analyzed both are found to be of the same stuff--thought. We are not so mad as to say the external elephant is not there and that you can dash your head against it. It is there but both it and your body are ideas.

(12.2) The universe itself may be said to be pervaded by the mind, i.e. I can stretch my thought anywhere, to include any distant spot.

(12.3) Johnson's crude refutation of Berkeley was natural because he was not a philosopher. Berkeley later visited Johnson in return. He knocked at the door. Johnson asked 'Who is It?' Berkeley gave his name. Johnson refused to unlock the door, and called out "No matter! Come in" He meant that Berkeley regarding the door as idea, and not material, should come through it. The fallacy in Johnson's thinking is not to see that Berkeley's body is also idea, unreal. He regarded Berkeley's body as real and the door as unreal.

(12.4) The external wall is dependent on my mind. Unless my mind is active I see nothing and the wall does not exist when my mind is not there, as in sleep. To say that the wall is still there in sleep is unprovable, hence unacceptable for Vedanta.

(12.5) Because we are always thinking of ourselves as body, we continue to see the universe apart from ourselves. But if by new habit we think we are Mind, the world is in us, this is the value of idealism.

(12.6) I agree with Berkeley's phrase "Esse est percipi". This is equivalent to my doctrine that to say anything exists it is the mind which tells you it is there, for perception is performed by the mind.

(12.7) When we say world is idea, we mean that the world as we see is only mental. We do not mean it is ideal--that is a totally different meaning. "Idea" is not synonymous with ideal.

(12.8) The old query "How can a nerve-vibration be converted into an idea?" has broken down. Vanished as latest science has solved it by saying that the two are not separate, that mind and matter are one.

(12.9) Mentalism is a better name than 'idealism' because Berkeley, and Jeans have associated latter with God.

(12.10) With the mind, one can think of the room where one is seated, of a country 20,000 miles away, with equal facility. Distance is no bar or limit, and the mind can

travel or rather extend in every direction. Hence I say that the body is in Mind, rather than mind is in the body, as yogis say. And since there is no limit to the mind's extension, I go further and say that the universe is in the mind. Therefore the world is only an idea.

(12.11) If the mind can be influenced as it can in hypnotism to perceive other people's ideas as realities, why should it not be able to so influence itself as to perceive its own ideas as realities? The Indian rope trick, which I have never seen, is an instance of mass hypnotism, but the altered clock feat which I have seen is no less striking as an example of mass hypnotism and if 500 people, sitting together, can be hypnotized into seeing their watches and a large clock as being one hour slow, why cannot the entire population of the world be hypnotized by the power of Maya into taking their own ideas or the external universe as reality?

(12.12) The world passes away like an idea. Famous historical figures are now only ideas.

(12.13) When you understand that the world is only mental, then only can you become a sanyasi; until then no one is really a sanyasi. The giving-up, the leaving off a certain things really means giving up the notion that external world is real but just an idea.

(12.14) The process of perception described by science is correct but it hinges on the point where you become conscious of the object. And this point is only when the impression reaches the brain and mind says the object is there, until then you are unaware of the object. Now the belief that there is an object outside is the inference you unconsciously make because you are habitually gripped by faith in causality. Yet it is only an unjustified inference. Why do we not see that object is only idea and not outside the idea? Because we wrongly think mind is confined to the physical brain. Hence the need to get rid of causal belief before objective idealism can be transcended. It is this blind belief that there must be a cause which makes us look outside for a cause for the idea which we imagine to be inside the head. Mind cannot be measured, you cannot limit it to a small space. Berkeley must be credited with having seen this; when he said, 'esse est percipi' he meant nothing is perceived outside the mind; he did not mean to be perceived outside the body is to be existent. Kant however added to this by discovering the attachment to causality which holds the mind unconsciously.

(12.15) Jeans is correct in dropping the word "idea" and using "mental" instead, meaning the same mindstuff as in dream for example.

(12.16) The teaching that there is an excitation in the brain which is followed by a percept is quite correct for practical purposes of physiology but not so for higher standpoint of philosophy. For who can see what is going on in the brain of another, be it excitation of otherwise?

(12.17) If the pain supposed to be caused by a pin is not in any way like the pin itself, as effects are usually related to causes then in what way is the sensation of a wall like or related to the external wall itself?

(12.18) What is it that ultimately exists? is the question asked by ontology. When you think of how the mind works to get its knowledge, you deal with epistemology. My knowledge comes from ideas, is epistemology. What my ideas really are, is ontology. It is the difference between what exists and what is known. Hence there are two kinds of idealists, epistemological and ontological. Hence the need of saying what you mean when you use the word "idealism."

(12.19) The entire sensory system is after all only a mental construct and as such exists only when you think of it. It is re-created every time it is thought of, which means every time it is observed or seen. Do not commit the error of thinking it existed prior to the thought of it.

(12.20) There are two interpretations of ideas. First those ideas which are voluntary, second those which are involuntary and which you can not help admitting to your mind. The word "ideal" is therefore ambiguous, for sometimes it is used in the first sense which refers only to single ideas and sometimes in the second sense which refers to those of spirit and mental, e.g. the first is your voluntary thought of bread, the second is your involuntary mental experience that is perception of bread.

(12.21) We do not know how consciousness emerges out of unconscious substance. Jagdish Chandra Bose discovered that even plants show some kind of consciousness. When atoms, gases or electrons attract or repel each other, does this not indicate that there must be some awareness, intelligence, i.e. consciousness present in them. Thus science is moving to the recognition that it is everywhere.

(12.22) Nirvikalpa samadhi produces the knowledge that everything disappears into the mind. That is its only value.

(12.23) How can any object in the world not exist as part of the mind because we are not thinking or not perceiving it? For when you say you are not thinking of Calcutta you actually do so.

(12.24) Our answer to those who say idealism is only true of known things but need not apply to the unknown, the unperceived things, is: If you are going to deal with the unknown what guarantee have you that they even exist? None except that either in past or present, either by some other person or mind has it been known, perceived. Thus you return to the fundamental fact that the existence of a thing depends on your knowing it. Otherwise you merely infer it, but inference is not direct verification. If you say the wall existed unperceived, while you slept, this is not correct. 'It was only after waking that you inferred it had existed, i.e. your mind told you so, which is again turning the wall into an idea!

(12.25) Those who say we cannot know an object in itself talk rubbish. For when they say this they are imagining the object, and thus actually knowing it as idea.

(12.26) The phenomena of hypnotism do not offer conclusive proof of mentalism but only of the fact that thoughts can be spatialized and externalized, can be seen outside. For the things seen by the hypnotic medium are not seen by the others who are un hypnotised, i.e. hence the phenomena are not universally valid, which is what science requires in proof. Adequate proof must show that this tree which everybody sees in the waking state is only idea. If you object that there are cases of mass or crowd hypnotism that is not valid because hypnotism only applies to weaker minds responding to stronger ones and if among the crowd there is a mind stronger than the hypnotist's, he will not see the same phenomena as the others. However, another conclusion which may be rightly drawn from hypnotism is that all minds are somehow connected.

(12.27) Vedantin does not say there is no external world. He says only that the external world (of objects) as well as the internal world (of ideas) are all of the same stuff, i.e. mind.

(12.28) Materialists who say mind is unknown and inferred from brain, which is alone known, are wrong. For it is awareness, mind, which tells us that the brain exists. When attention is not present or when one is asleep it is impossible to know there is a brain. Hence mind does have an existence apart from the brain, unless the latter be regarded as idea. Consciousness is first and fundamental.

(12.29) The wall is not different from your mind; it is a part of it. This is not denial of its existence; we fully admit that the wall is touched, felt and seen; despite that, it is idea.

(12.30) The mind forms the picture of the object and then presents it to itself.

(12.31) The desire for travel, to see other lands exists because you seek to know the place and thus bring it into your mind, your memory, and to keep it there even as idea. Henceforth it, being known, exists inside you and you are non-different from it.

(12.32) When analyzing sensation show that science is perfectly correct from the practical standpoint when it says there is both an independent object and separate idea of it, but that when we go more reflectively to the ultimate standpoint the gap between both disappears and then the external object is discovered to be an idea. You cannot say that there is only an idea and not an independent object. You can only say that the material object when analyzed turns out to be an idea, but it certainly disappears as an independent object. Therefore there might be two ideas of the same object, but when we rise to philosophy we discover that there is only one idea, a percept.

(12.33) Those critics of Idealism who ask "What was the world before human minds existed?" ask an unaskable question which is quite out of order. The first fallacy is that matter existed before mind. How do they know this unless the mind is first there to tell them? Science now admits, moreover, that we do not know when mind came into existence. Hence no critic can definitely say it came later than the material world. We can only say that Consciousness is fundamental and everything else is derivative.

(12.34) After we have completed the physiological inquiry and shown that sense-experience is ultimately the experience of thoughts, you will be asked "What becomes of the original object which gave rise to the whole process? How to account for it?" Vedanta replies that whatever the object be it will have to be known as an idea because we can know only mental things, because we can know only mind. Even if we get at it, we shall find it cannot be independent of mind. If people say it is material we shall know this so-called matter as being mental, but science has already exploded matter and proved its illusoriness. But we do not stop there. Vedanta says that if we have to recognize the original independent object as being an idea then the intermediary parts of sensory process i.e. eye, nerve, brain, must logically be ideas also. What happens therefore is that we return to our starting point and discover that the original outside object which gave rise to the sensations is our perception of it, that the thing is the thought perceived, the seen image in the mind was also the object supposed to exist outside and to cause the image to arise. How so? Because we began with an assumption that there was an object independent of the mind and we continued to assume that the thought which arose was independent of this object, so finally we have to decide that the object itself must be still there outside. But our initial assumption was unwarranted; it is only our imagination at work; and the truth is that there is no duality of thing and the perceived percept of the thing; rather there is only one entity: i.e. the thought itself. Much of this confusion has arisen because of the use of the word 'idea' of things for we habitually believe that ideas are internal and do not grasp that they may be external too, that therefore space is as illusory as matter. The essence of this explanation is that the whole thing is traveling unconsciously in a circle. We start with an idea and end with precisely the same idea. What we start with we call outside object and what we finish with we call percept. Our illusion lies in thinking the two are different; they are not but one and the same.

(12.35) If a man says Mind is the product of material evolution, we reply: Were you present 200 million years ago to note the beginning of such evolution? No. Then you are merely imagining. Secondly what is it that must be previously present which enables him to make such an assertion? It is mind, awareness! Hence mind comes first, matter, whatever it be comes afterwards.

CHAPTER 13: THE ILLUSION OF WORLD EXPERIENCE

(13.1) When you cannot see into a man's mind you can only say you cannot accept that there is a multiplicity of minds, you can only see his lips moving but not his mind moving. Hence you can neither accept nor deny this doctrine of multiple jivas²⁴. It is unproven hypothesis. To say that each mind is different, is unproved because you have never seen mind. Can you say where it starts and stops, have you measured its thickness? All is supposition, not proof.

(13.2) In all mental operations there are two factors--the knowing capacity and that which is known. The known things are all passing away and are therefore unreal. Without the knowing capacity i.e. the knower in existence, there could have been no such thing as

²⁴ individual souls

knowing these things. What is meant by word know? Knowing implies two factors, the knower or the knowing capacity, or that which becomes aware; and the known. Without these two factors you cannot use the word know. We find the known always passes away.

(13.3) Thought is only a drsyam, no matter how exalted it be. Thought never touches the Drg, but remains always in the drsyam. We foolishly believe that the more you think, the more you will get; but it is really an error. It remains only a thought and gives you back only a thought.

(13.4) You can only know an idea when you discriminate between it and the state of mind when it was nonexistent just as you know a sound by its contrast to silence.

(13.5) The only certain thing about the body is that it is forever changing; the greatest change of all being death which no one can prevent. In contrast to the body the mind is the only thing of whose unchanging character we can be certain. For the mind tells you about all the bodily changes, remaining itself relatively constant, as a standard of reference for them.

(13.6) The term WITNESS, Seer, Sakshin, is used in a non-dual sense, without reference to objects witnessed, absolute awareness, not relative.

(13.5) Thought is present in feeling. Your mind produced the thought. Feeling is a kind of thought. Thoughts, feelings, will be all modifications, nothing more. Even if it is of God, it is still in the mind.

(13.6) Both birth and death coming and going apply to drsyam. Therefore we say birthlessness is the characteristic of non-drsyam, i.e. Brahman.

(13.7) If by consciousness you mean awareness of a drsyam, a duality, i.e. when the mind is active it knows thoughts, emotions etc. then unconsciousness would only mean the absence of duality, not the absence of the capacity to know; unconsciousness does not mean the nonexistence of that which disappears from consciousness, it merely means that mind has ceased its functioning. Finally there must be a kind of awareness which we do not understand and which is still existent when the object, the known, the thoughts are absent.

(13.8) Drg/Drsyam gives you a key to analyzing all statements, all revelations, all assertions, all gods even. For it tells you that anything that can be made known by mind is but an idea; something imagined, and never reality.

(13.9) Consciousness usually means a duality, something to be conscious of is implied. Therefore it is an unsuitable word to indicate the pure objectless awareness which exists prior to thought. The ego, the individual self is not the self which is the Witness or Drg because it often disappears even during waking as in reverie when you are lost in thought.

(13.10) It is the drsyam that is ever-changing we reply to Bergson, Vijnanavadins etc. but never the Drg. The ideas come and go, yes, but that does not prove that one idea produces (causes) another. For if the previous idea has really vanished, memory of it would be impossible. Its disappearance into Drg is no real disappearance. We only remember that it has gone and come; that which perceives these ideas can alone be said to exist: That is Mind, Drg. We only rely on the Drg, and none has seen the birth or change of Drg.

(13.11) Does consciousness mean a duality; knowledge, knower and known? Does consciousness mean that which is capable of knowing, Gnan? Are you conscious of anything in sleep? You are conscious of it only when you are in the waking state. Consciousness there may be with or without object.

(13.12) The Idea of an object does not prove the object exists. Ego is only an Idea. When you think of the "ego" alone it comes. Mind knows its appearance and disappearance - you see the changes of the ego in dream also. The witnessed appears and disappears; the witness is never known to be appearing and disappearing. That which appears and disappears is not the permanent entity.

(13.13) Critics will object "What is the use of saying negate objects? It is impossible." They confront us even when we say 'Negate.' Reply: Have you ever had a dream within a dream? Suppose you dream of journeying to Kailas and in the dream you fall asleep and have a second dream within the first. Unless you have sharp mind, the memory of what passed in the second dream may elude you. Now what is the nature of the second dream? Mind! And of the first? Mind. Hence they are made of the same essence, they are non-different, but appear to change. Similarly this world is of the same essence as consciousness, is non-different from it but appears to change and be different from it.

(13.14) You cannot say how things have appeared, only that they are and they are in the mind and are the mind. When mind works, they appear. Stop thinking and you will never see any object.

(13.15) I am not this body, nor this wall; I am the seer of both. The body may be moving, but you are seeing the changes. The body grows but you remain the witness of these changes. You are the Witness, the Awareness.

(13.16) Do not imprison yourself in your own creation by imagining the mind to be limited to the body. Just as space fills both inside and outside of a jar, so mind permeates you and the whole world outside.

(13.17) We can't say that we see objects independently of the mind. cf. Kant "Time, Space and Causation" are mental. But a mind cannot change a horse into an ass. And the essence of objects themselves is mind alone, Atman alone--this Mandukya teaches. Mysticism encourages you to be lazy, to think the external objects are created by Iswara and internal objects created by Jiva. Both Iswara and Jiva are your own creation. Don't waste your time in talks of Jiva and Iswara disputes; rather inquire into the nature of Brahman.

(13.18) We do not perceive an object as it really is in truth, but only as it appears through the screen of imagination.

(13.19) Maya means that you know the unreality of a thing only when it disappears. When you know this world is continuously disappearing, you may perceive its unreality. Science shows it is changing every minute, every second.

(13.20) Death is but an idea. It is connected with the body. Ideas come and go. But that which sees the birth and death of things is the Atman. He is immortal.

(13.21) Knowledge does not destroy the world; it only destroys its unreality—because everything is Brahman. c.f. knowledge of the dream objects, which does not destroy the objects; it shows that everything is mental.

(13.22) Why do we not feel this world to be idea? Reply because of the strength of our attachment to the body, of our identification with it, which in its turn is due to not having inquired into the nature of the body and discovered its constantly changing nature. We have to take the Witness-attitude to see the body as fleeting appearance.

(13.23) The mind is continuously presenting you with changing conditions, ideas. Whatever is created by the mind, may appear to you to be real and existent. It is a mistake to think that mental creations are seen to be unreal and non-existent.

(13.24) You know most intimately and directly your mind; all objective things you know only inferentially, as the mind first speaks of their existence to you.

(13.25) Critics are under the mistaken impression that we say external world does not exist. No, we emphasize it does exist, but we say its existence is mental. The world is Maya, i.e. an idea.

(13.26) As nobody has ever seen the beginning of the world, nobody can ever see its end, and hence it cannot be mortal. (This does not refer to things in the world, those we do see have a beginning and an end; it refers to the world as a whole).

(13.27) We have got in our mind the idea of time; of seeing this at one time and that at another; but this is all in the world of Drsyam. It does not touch the perceiver. It is imagined.

(13.28) It is impossible to get to the knower, the Drg, before it is understood that the world is an idea.

(13.29) Vedanta refutes the dualism of realists by using the arguments of the idealists, but once refuted, we abandon the idealism which asserts mind is a momentary series of ideas and go further to the reality of Mind (Brahman).

(13.30) Instrument of knowledge means the sense organs, both external and internal which are only for the knowledge of Drsyam. Buddhi is an instrument on the other hand for applying Neti, Neti,²⁵ for getting the knowledge of Atman.

(13.31) Change is everywhere. Even Himalaya mountains spring up and other ranges disappear. Those who say that by some effort in Yoga you got moksha, try to introduce a new thing (moksha) which having a beginning must have an end. Production and destruction go together. Therefore Yogic moksha is not true liberation. Not by doing anything can lasting permanent liberation be realized. Similarly the endlessness of the soul in religion is illusory: only the Drg is endless in the sense that we cannot truthfully speak of its appearing and disappearing.

(13.32) In mediumship all we know is that the medium, who is another living person speaks; there is no proof that it is a spirit. Every religion contradicts the others about after death states. The only certain thing about death is that it forces you to renounce and give up everything you possess--wife, money, fame etc. To get at the truth of death you must inquire into the meaning of life now, in the present. Find the meaning of the world and of yourself. Thus you learn there to no dissolution, nothing real can be lost, for everything exists as it does in truth, i.e. as Unity, the One.

(13.33) If one has to enter the kingdom of Heaven, then God may one day get annoyed and throw one out again. Why not? Who can read God's mind? No.--anything that begins must also end. Liberation is not of that kind.

(13.34) So long as we think at all, we have to think causally, temporally and spatially. It is the way in which intellect works. And it is so constituted as to produce the appearance of materiality. The world is like the deception of the cinema pictures as pointed out by Bergson, passing before us with height, breadth, motion etc. Hence we get bound by illusion. But the way out to reality is not, as Bergson thought, through intuition. That is also a blind. The only way out is through Avastatraya.²⁶

(13.35) Ideas cannot exist independently, they must exist in Mind. Similarly Bergson's ever-changing flux of pictures is a cinema-show which must have a screen. Motion is illusory in the sense that it also is only an idea. Don't think that ideas are running from one place to another.

(13.36) Another aid which is derived from Yoga practice is that it temporarily suppresses ego. Such suppression is essential to arrive at Truth. What the yogi does not understand is that while he talks of experiencing bliss in trance, he reveals the presence of an ego who is the experiencer. To transcend bliss and to transcend trance, one must have gone into, through and out of Yoga.

(13.37) Egocentricity is the common psychological state of mankind whereas selfishness is the common ethical state of mankind. The two should not be confused.

²⁵ The analysis of 'not this, not this', the negative way

²⁶ Analysis of the states of consciousness, waking, dream and deep sleep

(13.38) Even in the waking state we forget the 'I', the ego occasionally, just as we forget it completely in deep sleep, for it is only a mental construction.

(13.39) There is only one mind. Each ego, each 'I' is itself an idea in this universal mind. This explains how personal separateness is an illusion.

(13.40) It is impossible for the knowing Self to become a Seen. Wherever any such thought as that of mortality comes to you, ask yourself, "Is it my thought or is it the 'I'?" This is Gnana Yoga. Ask "What is this thought?" What is the essence of this thought? Immediately the Atman will be there in reply.

(13.41) There is no such thing as knowing the knower. That knowledge implies two factors, and the knower not being something to be seen, can never be known as such. When we speak of relation, we deal only with the known world. When the known goes, we say that because we actually see the known going; but we can never see the knower go. We can only say "I do not know" about it. We cannot speak of the known without the knower. But when the known has vanished, there is nothing to be said about the knower. The act of conceiving in thought demands two factors. We cannot conceive the Drg, the seer or knower, because we can say nothing about it, without making it an object. It cannot be pulled down to the level of the Drsyam, the seen. The duality of Drg and Drsyam is not the same as the duality of two things in the objective world, for here both are known and seen, whereas there one is known; the Drg remaining unknown and all you can say of it is "I cannot make any statement about it. It is incomprehensible." If Drg disappears, as does the drsyam then you must posit another seer to replace it; but in fact no one has ever seen its disappearance. We never use the word Drg without Drsyam. It has no meaning apart from it.

Self is not a thing unknown to any one at any time. Let a man think. As soon as a thought comes, there must be a knower there before in order to know that he is seeing a wall etc. The Drg exists before the thought appears or the thing is seen; otherwise neither knowledge nor sensation could happen. When can you say the Drg is not there? It is always there. Even if you say it can be reached only at the end of a long path, it is impossible for it to be ever absent even while you say this. The knower alone makes it possible for you to know anything at all. "Though, thus quite self-evident, easily known, quite near, forming the self, Brahman appears, to the unenlightened mind as unknown, very remote, as though he were a separate thing," says Sankara's commentary on Gita. Those who do not look at the seer, the witness, and perceive it is the only thing that neither comes nor goes, are deluded, and turn outward towards things objective, which run away. So long as the mind only runs from one object to another, from one idea to another, impermanent and unreal, they ignore the Atman and are ignorant. Where is the time for them to think about the Witness?

(13.42) Mind when active is called mind! When it ceases to be active i.e. sinks back and is only itself, the essence, the substance or material, it is then called Atman, the Self, the Seer.

(13.43) The mind itself is the Drg: it can never be seen. Hence you cannot rightly speak even of my mind. You know nothing of it directly. Vijnanavadin Buddhists say mind comes and mind goes; it does not really exist. He says nothing external exists. This is absurd, because who says the mind comes and goes? That which saw knows this, is the real mind: the Drg; the rest is Drsyam. To perceive this requires a special sharpness of mind.

(13.44) Mind is of the nature of the essence of the self. What is meant by the Self or Soul? Has the word a meaning? Yes. Then it is an idea. Where are ideas? In the mind. Hence the soul is a creation of the mind. That is why we call Atman, the Mind.

(13.45) The Aham²⁷ dies daily in dream: because you change identities there, as hunter, king etc. and in sleep. The aham of your childhood is dead too; thus ego changes constantly, and yet you mistake it for a reality. That which perceives the ego is the unborn, the unchanging reality, however.

(13.46) Body is what I know, what I perceive; perceiver is distinct: body is a drsyam, a thought; I am not my thoughts. The answer to the query "What am I?" is "I, the Atman, am pure knowing." When there is a duality, doubt comes. And so long as a man thinks there is a second thing to be obtained, he can never be happy because the duality is always there. The Gnani, on the other hand, regards nothing as different, i.e. as a second thing, and therefore escapes this unhappiness.

(13.47) Ears, nose, hands may be chopped off, legs shot off on battlefield, but the notion I does not disappear, for that which you call I is the Drg, uncuttable, indestructible. It is infinite because you cannot say where it begins or ends. It is immortal, because you have never seen it die. The earliest ancients used the word 'I' and the latest moderns use it. For the self is eternal.

(13.48) People think that the 'soul' or 'spirit' is something different from the mind. They believe that the mind is really two. This is the confusion among Dwaitins, Vishishtadvaitins and Europeans. If 'Soul' has any meaning, if 'spirit' has any meaning, so long as you think of them, they are merely ideas. No, Mind is the highest: it is consciousness, gnanam.

(13.49) The individual is a bundle of memories, desires, etc. What are memories and desires? Something imagined. Therefore the individual self is entirely an imagination.

(13.50) The notion that you will go to some world after death, some astral plane or religious heavens will disappear as nonsense with the disappearance of belief in the reality of the 'I'.

(13.51) The dog cannot reason like Aristotle but he does reveal a kind of rudimentary reasoning in his behavior. It thinks elementarily. This is Sankara's view.

²⁷ The 'I' thought, the 'I' maker

(13.52) WHAT AM I? The 'I' disappears every night in sleep, so what is the use of being attached to it? It is illusory.

(13.53) Atman is that which knows everything, that which sees. Atman alone remains after you get rid of all thoughts and ideas by identification with self. Atman is only the seer, it is not Brahman, that is an error. It becomes Brahman only after inquiry.

(13.54) That which becomes conscious of all the things contained in consciousness, is the seer, the Atman, the Knower. You have never seen the Atman, for he is never an object. Hence logic, inference, cannot be applied to him, because intellect, logic is for objective world and waking experience only, the state where we infer effects from causes. The greatest mistake is to think of the seen as yourself, to confuse the object with the subject. There is no proof that the seer is confined to you, yourself or me, myself. It is universal.

(13.56) People wrongly think that the Aham is the Witness, even though the ego vanishing every minute.

(13.57) What is meant by birth, appearance or arisal? It can only be applied to drsyam. That to which such words cannot be applied is the Drg. It is the only thing known that does not vanish. For this reason we call it "the unborn." But as everything that is seen, everything that is known, is only your own self, the Drg, therefore all things are really unborn, uncreated.

(13.58) Once you understand the ego, you will have understood 90% of Vedanta. You must learn that the ego is different from consciousness.

(13.59) Homogeneity is the natural condition of the mind. Through ignorance we create dissociations within it. The first dissociation is the I.

(13.60) How can you say that "self" is different from "mind." It is the mind that thinks of the "self." What is mind? That which becomes aware of anything is Mind or self; you may call it by any term. I cannot say where my mind is or my mind is not; then how can you say that God is here or is not here or anywhere. No idea is permanent, not even the God idea.

(13.61) There is no connection between the Witness and the Ego which appears and disappears, is happy or miserable, which the Witness sees (like eastern and western oceans never meet). The witnessing consciousness remains unconcerned.

(13.62) Vedanta does not rule out multiplicity of individuals and things; it admits this separate existence: It would be mad to deny that. But it asks, "What is meant by each existence? What has become of the vanished or changed individuality of each existence? What has become of the child I once was?" When you are superficial and fond of imagining, you can say what you like, but when you go deep in inquiry, you see that multiplicity of the universe is not what it seems.

(13.63) How did ignorance come into pure Atman? Vedanta says: It is difficult to grasp at the beginning. It is the same question in another form as, "Why did God create evil and suffering?" There are many ways of answering these questions, the highest being given in Mandukya Upanishad, but a lower explanation being given in Gita. Avidya is born of Tamas. It causes in the person the contrary of Truth, i.e. you imagine the opposite, as taking a rope for a snake. It is the incapacity, the dullness, of the mind to understand it. But when the mind gets clear, then we "see" the Truth. Hence the inability to see is not in the perceiver, but there is something which comes and goes, which hides and prevents you from "seeing." This "something" is like a veil. What prevents you from seeing is not yourself, it is a fault of the mind, not the seer. The mind is only an instrument which you utilize. If this ignorance were a property of the seer, it could never go, but it is not. Then ignorance is something that comes and goes, but the seer is untouched by it.

(13.64) The critic says why do all men see the same thing, if it is only an idea? Why do they not see differently? One man does not say it is a cow, another does not say it is a horse. The critic assumes that you are an ego-centric Solipsist, who alone exists and created the world. But we do not fall into Solipsism because we make the ego also an idea, and do not assume its reality as does the critic. Mental ideas may be objective.

(13.65) Where do all the ideated objects of the world come from? We do not know. No creator who put them in our minds is indicated or provable. We can only infer that they must have come from the Drg, the Atman, itself. No other explanation is rational. But this explanation is only a preliminary stop and is dropped ultimately (with the dropping of the Drg, Drsya relation) when non-causality is studied and the question itself falls to the ground.

(13.66) It is not enough for Western philosophers to know that the world is an idea. They ought also know that the ego itself is an idea, their own body is an idea also. This is even more important doctrine and one which they have not been able to grasp. Thus the 'I' is an idea within the great idea of the universe.

(13.67) Do not make the mistake of thinking that because the world is an idea, it is your idea. There is no 'I' where this is seen. Berkeley tried to escape from this mistake but fell into error of ascribing world to God's mind. He did not see that God also was an Idea. Hence the world is not your idea, but idea.

(13.68) Nobody has ever seen God imagining the world-idea, thus bringing it into existence in our mind. Then who must be the imaginer of our objective ideas? If you want one, then it must be yourself because all these ideas appear and vanish within yourself. Proof that Atman generates, sees and enjoys the objects is given by dream.

(13.69) The ego-thought and the world-thought arise at the same time but independently. However you cannot see the objects as apart from each other unless the ego is present. Hence it might also be added that ego rises first. In any case the world is not produced out of the ego-thought, both are independently produced by Mind.

(13.70) Yoga implies duality! Yoga = joining two things, a something to which the yogi is to be joined. He thinks, "I want to know Brahman, I want to attain Union." So he has the ego and cannot attain. Whereas the first thing in Vedanta is to question the 'I' until its illusory nature is perceived and the seeker no longer says "I want to attain Brahman." The Vedantin has nothing to get for the self, as it has vanished on inquiry, not even will he say, "I will work for the sake of others."

(13.71) Yoga lulls the ego to sleep but it will reappear when the practice is ended. The only way to overcome the ego is to inquire into it. When you realize that it is only an idea it will then lose its power over you.

(13.72) The Witness itself is gnanam; it is quite erroneous to say it has gnanam. It is thinking, seeing, the distinction between objects and the knower is produced by itself.

(13.74) Every thought is an object, drsyam. That which cannot be cognized by any thought, which is beyond all doubt because it is that which is the ultimate consciousness of the doubter, that is Brahman.

(13.75) Rope is the substratum of the snake in the rope: the snake which you see in the rope has no real existence. It is only in your mind. i.e. it is your imagination. The next step is then only "What is the rope". It is also your imagination. Everything is only a superimposition, i.e. an idea in the mind.

(13.76) Who knows the waves? The ocean knows the waves.

(13.77) The ideas can exist only in mind. Unless the rope is there, we would not have seen the snake.

(13.78) What we can say is only that ideas appear and disappear in the mind. Now what is appearance and disappearance? These are also ideas in the mind. Hence we say that the ideas also are of the mind. Now what is Mind? The most we can say is that it is that which becomes aware of ideas.

(13.79) If you have ideas, where are the ideas to stand? Can it stand in the void? No. There should be a substratum for the ideas to stand on and this is the mind. Turiya cannot be indicated by words for words indicate ideas and it is only that in which the ideas come and go. We see a snake in the rope. What is the relation between the snake and the rope? There is no relation.

(13.80) Everything else can be contradicted but not that which knows everything. Hence that Drg is the truth. This non-contradictability characteristic exists because all the other things pass away, but Drg, Atman does not change.

(13.81) Every form comes and goes; now forms arise and follow: science proves that all things change and vanish: what has become of the forms? What is form? Form is that which has no independent existence; it can't stand alone. Where does it go? It goes back

into mind. Hence the first stage is to see form as Maya; the higher stage is to see it as essence of Mind, i.e. Brahman.

(13.82) You must not fallaciously say mind is immortal merely because we cannot see it die. This is bad logic. Because a thing cannot be disproved, this does not prove it to be true. To prove immortality we have to rise higher than Idealism, we have to go to the more advanced Indian teachings.

(13.83) What has become of the red color of a faded flower? It was only a piece of your imagination. If color were a thing where is it after fading? If perfume were a thing and not idea why can you not locate it again? Hence the meaning of change is that it is only appearances i.e. idea.

(13.84) We unconsciously superimpose the permanence of the Atman upon the flux of the visible world, and thus deceive ourselves. This is Maya. The sense of reality and permanence which we ascribe to the appearance arises from within ourselves. It is a genuine sense but it is misapplied.

(13.85) The first stage is to regard all things as Drsyam, and separate yourself from them. But this is tentative and is for those who still labor under the ego-complex. But the next and higher stage is to see them all as Brahman, then you no longer turn away from them, all is then 'I'.

(13.86) If you analyze all the objects in the world, all the bodies, you will find that ultimately there is only one substance, one thing which changes into all these different forms. We then go further and say that this unitary substance can be traced to consciousness.

(13.87) Look within yourself. You see Drg, perceiver, and drsyam, object, thought. Everything you think of is drsyam, hence never towards the perceiver. Anything that you may say, any answer you may receive, it will be in the world of objects only: it will never approach their perceiver. Hence objectiveness implies duality. Ideation implies duality, and duality denies the real.

(13.88) Unless you grasp that world is an idea, there is no other way of proceeding to the higher truths of Vedanta.

(13.89) All the past history of the world is now only a series of ideas. Thus what you consider so real now is known a little later as idea. Everything in this world is being converted into ideas constantly.

(13.90) As Bergson and the Buddhist Idealists teach everything is idea, that each idea is fleeting. Thus this table lasts only a millionth of a second but the continuous multiplication of the same idea of table fuses the countless ideas of it and gives the impression that it is lasting for twenty years. The time itself is only an idea as Kant shows and Einstein implies. It is precisely the same with a cinema picture of a table; it shows for

a half-hour the same table but actually it consists of thousands of separate pictures fused together. So our world of ever-changing flux appears stable because the multitude of ideas follow with such rapidity as to yield the impression of stability.

(13.91) The first stage is to know the world is idea; the higher stage is to inquire what they are and to know all ideas are only mind.

(13.92) The mystic's stigmata show how mind influences body. Vedanta goes farther and says Mind creates the body.

(13.93) Death means conversion of forms considered real into ideas.

(13.94) What did the Greeks mean by saying that philosophy was the study of death? Well, what is the chief characteristic of an idea? It is something which comes and goes, transient, hence always dying. This is what you mean by an idea in contrast with the objective world of mountains and bodies around you. The ideas live only for a few seconds and vanish whereas the objective things persist at least for the whole of your lifetime. It is this striking contrast which makes you say your thoughts are ideas whereas the surrounding things are realities. But now consider. What is the ultimate fate of these things and bodies? Will they too not have to die? They will--even though it take but 70 or 80 years in the case of your body and 70 or 80 million years in the case of a solar system. All will decay and disappear. Hence they too are idea, the only difference being that they occupy a relatively longer time to exist. But consider again! during dream a few moments may seem to take a whole day. Therefore time itself is only an idea. Einstein found that planetary times differed but he did not see farther that the time of the entire universe was also Idea. Thus the whole of existence is idea because everything is subject to death. Death is the problem which faces every man; he cannot escape and therefore ought to study it. This study of what death means is philosophy! But what is it that knows these things as dying, these ideas as appearing and vanishing? That Witness is what we call the Atman: that does not pass away and hence does not die. In this sense you can see all these ideas, bodies and things which vanish, vanish only back into Atman and live perpetually therein. Thus ultimately there is no death when you can look so on all things as being Atman. It is thus that the philosopher conquers death, thus that he sees the universe in Atman, hence in himself as Atman. This is a secret teaching which I give you. The secret is that after death you will continue to live on in those you love most, for you have identified yourself with them.

(13.95) The purpose of illness and disease is the same as the purpose of death. They teach men that everything is in flux, vanishing and transient: yesterday you were strong and healthy, today you are weak and ill. What became of you health? It is the same problem of as what became of the faded color of a rose? The lesson of all this transiency, of all illness, is that the body is only an idea.

(13.96) What we find to be unreal and changing is still an idea and therefore Mind in the end. Thus converting the world into unreality is a necessary half-stage to converting it to Reality. But it is only a stage and we should not stop there.

(13.97) How do you know that you are not the body? 1. It is seen by you as an object. 2. It has all the characteristics of drsyam, i.e. it is changing gradually and you are seeing the changes.

(13.98) All talk of Maya is only a tentative position. It is for those who cannot think of Mind by itself, who cannot detach Drg from Drsyam. In truth, however, Maya is only an idea, and ideas are only Mind.

(13.99) Maya's "concealing power" merely means that when you look at an ink-bottle you think only of the bottle. But a gnani will think of the Self too, of the ink-bottle as being Self. Hence in the first case the Self is concealed by the ignorance of the man.

(13.100) In the outer world we see things; appearing and disappearing. Where do they go? In the inner world of dreams, we see ideas appear and disappear. Where do these go? That into which all these go is Mind but it is indescribable. We cannot say what it is ultimately, but we know it is.

(13.101) The flux-oneness principle applies not only to physical world but also to mental world. The very words you use were got from others, the ideas you think were learnt from others, hence which of them can you say are really your own? In this way the oneness of mind-world is seen.

(13.102) Getting rid of world does not mean that it must become imperceptible to the senses. It means that you must know that it is destructible, it is ever-changing. You must know its real nature; its unreality. You must give up the notion that it is real. The knowledge of Atman cannot destroy the objective world, but can only give you the idea that it is unreal. Modern science proves that everything is changing every moment. Philosophy has to consider and answer the questions: How that which changes, appears to be, changeless?

(13.103) Every minute a thought dies and a new one is born. Hence there is internal series of birth and death, just as every minute external forms are born and die instantly.

(13.104) The Ultimate is not a void because of this fact: the world illusion is there, you cannot deny its existence: the snake illusion is there, even though it is something other than snake. This is quite different from the barren woman's son, which not only does not exist but has not even an illusory existence. The distinction must be noted. When you speak of illusion, remember it has two meanings (a) non-existence like a barren woman's son, (b) illusive existence like snake-rope. The world illusion belongs to the second class, but not the first. There is something existent, but it does not exist as it appears. World is constantly changing and disappearing, this is maya, but it has a substratum. So we say just as snake illusion cannot exist without a rope, so ideas can not exist without a mind as substratum.

(13.105) The man who knows thoroughly that everything in his life is only a changing drsyam, that drsyams are but transient thoughts; if he then identifies himself with the Drg, he can stand unaffected by loss because he knows that he, himself, the Atman, can never be lost or lose anything in itself. Knowing the drsyam as a part of himself, he no longer considers it as drsyam. Such distinction exists only when enquiring. The ignorant man imagines he is related to objects, imagines there is causal relation with them and then imagines his sufferings because of their transiency. He foolishly believes that anything can go away from his Atman, because he separates himself from them.

(13.106) Unity is here and now, always has been and always will be. But so long as man ignorant of this truth, he will only see variety.

(13.107) Though we start with doctrine of change continuous and everywhere, we end with the opposite doctrine that there is no change in reality, nothing is born or dies.

(13.108) Whoever speaks of the oneness of things must first of all prove the illusory nature of external world; otherwise he is only like the yogis. Then alone can unity be proved.

(13.109) This enquiry is much more than gramaphonic learning by heart; it is to distinguish the imagination from that which is unimagined in the mind. Vichara is that which helps you, after enquiry, to reject the useless, the imagined. Similarly when you analyze water you separate oxygen from hydrogen; once this is known it is unnecessary to analyze it again, you will immediately know that water is oxygen and hydrogen, i.e. two gasses, whilst accepting water as liquid. So after you have analyzed the world, know it to be idea and Brahman, once known there is no need to analyze it or to give up the world.

(13.110) "Attachment to objects" means taking them to be real. When attachment goes, gnana arrives.

(13.111) You will find some little defect in everything in this world.

(13.112) The principle of unity alone can give you perfect satisfaction as then you can have nothing taken away from you, what you possess you will have until all eternity.

(13.113) That part of a man which is called body is born and dies, but we never see the whole man, i.e. body plus mind born or die. We usually use the word man without thinking of its meaning, we do not care to be precise. When you analyze deeper you will find it impossible to separate both body and mind. The two go together in truth. Vedanta says the two are not separate entities, but really one entity. Death is merely a change: when perceived by the eye, we call it death: when perceived by the mind, an idea, but both changes are really ideas. It is the mind, which is doing all this working. Religious people say, the body will perish, but the mind will go elsewhere. Philosophy does not agree. It finds man to be compound of both, both are unity, both are Atman. There was never a separate body, If there were where is your body as a child? Mere perception of

the body does not give it existence in truth, therefore we see illusions of mirage, but that does not mean mirages really exist; they are appearances.

(13.114) The body is part of the external universe; it holds its own reality and keeps you from seeing the world as idea. All the 24 hours you think body is real and occupy yourself with it. But as it is part of the Seen, and the world is seen, you take latter to be real also. Only when you perceive that both these; that whatever object the mind sees--even your own body--is only an idea, is your own mind, hence your own self, then you can go further and find that very self in its essence is Brahman. That truth reveals all objects and persons as ONE.

(13.115) Death causes fear. What is the meaning of this fear? It arises from the meaning you attach to the word death. The train of ideas (kalpanas) of the loss it entails comes into your mind and frightens you. Therefore it is the thought that causes fear. Hence when you know this why should you be afraid of a thought? The obstacle is that you do not want to look upon this body as an idea. Yet the word 'body' brings to you only a thought. In dream and sleep all ideas sink back into the mind, like the waves into the ocean, why then be dissatisfied? The waves are still in the ocean, the ideas are still in the mind. Therefore nothing is really lost, at death is really a going back to itself. So you must inquire what is the self? If men knew this, that higher than the mind is the Atman, that everything goes back into it and IS there, what room for fear?

(13.116) All the world is in me. All mankind is in me as idea. The idea is not a dead thing because it is mind, a living entity. Therefore all men are not different from me and thus we arrive at the unity of mankind.

(13.117) How far does the Atman go, where is it limited? I am the same being everywhere. Its separateness from others is only imagined, (as through the body). All other human beings are within this Self and non-separate from it. If you think of being different from others or from God, or from suffering people you can never realize self. This is true Ahimsa, only those who know it refuse to inflict injury to others.

(13.118) Suffering is also an idea; let it come and go. For every man has sorrow in this world. Similarly when you know body is only an idea, you can look forward to its death, the greatest of all sorrow with equanimity. For when an idea disappears, it goes back to its source: cannot be lost. The mountain you saw in dream has vanished. Where? Back into the mind. The form is not different from the essence, body from self; hence there is neither coming or going, that which is, is and forever.

(13.119) When you eat, you are establishing unity with the food. When you love another person, you are establishing oneness with him or her when you go to sleep you are returning to the primal state of unity. When mountains crumble infinitely slowly it is being dissolved into unity of substance. When river flows into the ocean, it is seeking to merge in oneness. Everywhere you see every form, every individual whether animate or inanimate trying to kill duality and achieve non-duality. We Vedantins are doing this work consciously and quickly.

(13.120) You may feel the pain if your finger is cut. But if you know the truth, you will only say that I am only the witness of the pain, which is a drsyam. The agnani gets identified with pain and says that "I have pain". Sri. Ramakrishna's throat trouble not that he had no pain; but he saw it was only the body's.

(13.121) That mind influences body is known from the annals of medicine, but how it does so, is not known, is still a mystery, This is what Advaita says too, for it says that apart from and independent of the mind, we can only fall into mystery, we cannot say anything more than that everything is only mind; mind (i.e. Brahman alone is for certain.)

(13.122) Buddhist pessimistic viewing of all beautiful things such as woman or Nature as subject to decay and hence ugly is only true of individual things but not of the Whole. If we regard a woman only as a part we see the decay but if we perceive that the decayed atoms are reborn into other parts, other beings and. live afresh, if we see that there is something in the woman which is not subject to decay, if we see parts as Brahman then they lose their ugliness.

(13.123) What do we know beyond the proton? Nothing. There is mystery beyond. If we want to go beyond we can only imagine. Thus the world is still wrapped in mystery for everyone even the scientist. This mystery is Maya.

(13.124) If the body is a reality, where is your body as a child, when it ran about, was different in appearance and different in structure? It has vanished. Then what was it at the time? What else but an idea? And how can a thing which changes and disappears be real?

(13.125) When you ask why knowledge is relative, partial and incomplete you have to learn the distinction between drg and drsyam to find an answer. Relativity leads man to idealism. Idealism leads you to mentalism. Mentalism leads you to avastatraya. Avastatraya leads to Brahman.

(13.126) The first characteristic of Maya is change, impermanency. The second to "What has become of the forms which have gone, of the names and forms? They appear to be here but are not here now. Where are they? This is the same question as "What is this world?" and "What do I mean by change?" This requires a lot of ever-deepening semantic examination of the meaning of this apparently simple word "change." We then find it merely means that we pass from one idea to another. Hence the forms which changed have vanished into the origin of idea, i.e. Mind. At this point Maya disappears and the illusion of stable forms produced by these imaginations was the Maya. You then discover that Maya, avidya, form, prakriti²⁸ were really nonexistent. Hence the answer to the question "What is this world?" is that it is an idea, and an idea is something that is unreal. In this sense the world is unreal. But this does not mean it is unseen.

(13.127) The keynote to Vedanta is to understand that although a thing is present to the senses and appears to them, still it is unreal. Few can grasp this point.

²⁸ Matter in the Samkhya system

(13.128) Just as the scientist simultaneously sees the table and yet knows it to be electrons, so the gnani sees the table and at the same time knows it to be Brahman. In both cases there is no conflict between the sense-perception and the mental knowledge.

(13.129) Illusions may be objective, but still unreal. This is the first stage of our inquiry. The next and the higher stage is to see all those in yourself, hence to be real ultimately as Self, Mind.

(13.130) The mind is virtually the external world, i.e. in effect but not in fact. This is the first step. Second step: Convert everything into ideas. Third step: Where do these ideas rise from and into what do they disappear as in dream? It is the mind--just like waves rise and fall in ocean. Hence world is also Mind. Fourth step: That which sees all these changes of three steps, exists always.

(13.131) Maya does not mean that it is illusion. It means only that it is an idea, which exists momentarily, but is not really permanent. Ideas come and go continuously when the mind is active.

(13.132) When we say the world is within the mind, we do not mean to say it is within the ego-mind. It is within Mind, not ego. But people confuse both. That is why we say until you got rid of ego, this great truth cannot be seen. The I misleads you by preventing the sight of this truth.

(13.133) The external world is only idea, it becomes mental, hence it becomes "invisible." So practice regarding all forms as being Mind.

(13.134) If you want to say a substratum should exist for anything, say for instance substratum of a rope for a snake, then why not a substratum of ideas? Turiya is that which is the substratum of our ideas. But if you say it is the substratum or support of ideas, then the question of relationship arises, between the meaning of idea and the knower of the idea. There is no meaning or relationship except as itself an idea, which is an object; and the object has nothing to do with Turiya. Turiya is the witness--that is all--but witness implies duality.

(13.135) Happiness promised in the world after death, as by religion, or to one's posterity as by science, will not satisfy philosophy. It seeks happiness, here and now, in this life where one can be certain of getting it.

(13.136) A gnani may be reborn in three days or three years. And if he thinks of form in any shape when dying that will bring him back to incarnation again. So if he thinks of serving humanity just prior to death, and wills it, he will reincarnate in order to fulfill that task. And if he thinks of a particular work or service he will incarnate in such a way as to carry it out. And if he thinks of his group of disciples and wants to continue their instruction, then he will be reborn in their neighborhood or they will be reborn so as to meet him again, and thus instruction will continue. Whatever picture he holds in mind

just prior to death will draw him back to earth and materialize. Where he dies in sleep his subconscious tendencies will dictate the next birth. These tendencies are vasanas and samskaras. So the student should think of his guru when dying in order to meet him again. If student dies in sleep or suddenly then all his subconscious thoughts of devotion to his guru will bring about the same result as if he had thought prior to death. It is really the two together which determine next birth. Hence the importance of psychology to philosophy, with its teaching of the power of subconscious. Were the gnani not to hold this last thought of service of humanity he would not be reborn. It acts as a downward pull. However it does not cause him to lose his gnan because side by side with it he knows humanity or his disciples to be also Brahman.

Chapter 14: THE ILLUSION OF EGO EXPERIENCE

(14.1) Everybody says 'I' but every one sees differences in each 'I'. Remove the difference and take the common factor of all the 'I's. This is the real 'I'.

(14.2) "Individuality" has no meaning. That is the point. The Drg is that which has no limitations--all ideas regarding limitation are imagined. We have to catch that which is between two ideas in order to eliminate ideas. I am "the knower" in all. The mind creates many contradictions in dream and yet the mind is one. Know this and apply it to life as a whole and pierce delusion of individuality.

(14.3) The individual mind can only imagine, it is identified by the ego etc. It is the universal mind that creates or projects the whole universe as well as the ego. If you can cast away the ego consciousness, the individual mind is the same as the universal mind.

(14.4) Is there a thing called the individual mind? Who asks that question? The question presupposes that there is an individual mind. What is this 'I'? Everybody uses the word I, but they are really different. What is the common factor of the different I's? That factor is the real 'I.'

(14.5) The practical man says, Why should I practice anything, what benefit to me (the ego). The religionist says, practice religion to get heaven in the next world for me (the ego) and the mystic-yogi says, practice mysticism to get ananda for me (the ego), In all three cases the ego is present--hence no gnana is possible. On Advaita nothing is sought for me. Truth is sought for her sake alone.

(14.6) He who gives up the ego will achieve gnan very quickly. So long as the black serpent of Aham, the ego, is, it completely covers the truth and prevents you from seeing it.

(14.7) You will know that everything is Brahman, when the 'I' goes, everything is immortal being Atman. It is impossible to die. Though thou art only the Drg, you identify yourself with the Drsyam. "I" which is dying everyday in sleep; the 'I' vanishes every moment in the waking state also--not to speak of the dream 'I'. The 'I' idea comes and

goes; no idea of it is permanent. Think ever that you are witness of the changing 'I's. Use one thorn or idea to get rid of another thorn or idea.

(14.8) So long as Aham reigns in a man it is a guarantee of his ignorance. No matter what profound realization or knowledge he claims, if his conduct reveals that the 'I' rules him, do not believe his claims.

(14.9) There is no such thing as liberation after death, this doctrine is punditry. It must be attained here alone.

(14.10) That the Drg is everywhere common is easily proved because everyone refers to himself first by 'I'; he adds his personal name only secondarily: the 'I' is always spoken first--I am here, I am doing this. This is true in all languages, used by all men as the primary answer to any questions: personal names come later. Why does every man use the word 'I'? If he is essentially different from others why does he use the same word 'I'? This proves that if a man is really different from another why does he use the same notion 'I' as the other man? How did he get this notion called 'I'. How did it come to him. Why does a woman use the same word 'I' as a man although she knows that she is so different in many respects? They should have used a different word. The whole of humanity is classified under the name 'I'. What is the common feature of this multitudinous 'I'? Just as various ornaments are all made of one element-gold, what is that finality which comprehends all and is common to all and what is the single common element in all human beings? The universal use of 'I' indicates that one exists, admitting the various differences that exist. That common feature is which Vedanta seeks. In short we are inquiring into the meaning of the word Man. Similarly a thousand waves are all really water. So we inquire into meaning of word 'water'. The unity cannot be taken together.(as an assemblage of parts)

(14.11) No ego really disappears into annihilation. It is forever in the Self, as the waves disappear into ocean; It goes back just as it does in deep sleep, which is not external annihilation.

(14.12) What is death? For novices we say it is an idea, but for advanced students we teach that death also is Atman, the Self, and hence not to be feared. Only you have to continually regard it in this way--this is Gnana yoga.

(14.13) So long as you think of yourself as ego you will die, but when you think of yourself as Mind, you will be immortal.

(14.14) Man has got the Aham which is attached to the body. The 'I' is there always, all the 24 hours, at the bottom of our acts and thoughts. He has to get the widest 'I' which is identified with the whole universe. Then he is Brahman.

(14.15) Ten years ago you were a child playing, now you are an adult with a different outlook. The two personalities are changed and different, and both are therefore illusory. Hence we say get rid of the attachment to the ego and you get truth, or true self.

(14.16) A man writes "individual life is a phantom." He is wrong. The individual is a phantom, but never life.

(14.17) Those who talk of the 'I' becoming merged in Brahman are not philosophers but mystics. Vedanta does not admit even the existence of the 'I'. The proof is that it disappears every night in deep sleep. Yet in the book "Contemporary Indian Philosophy" all the essays except mine, proceed on the assumption that the 'I' is real.

(14.18) If you do not get realization here, on this earth, in this world, you will never get it. Besides, we know only this present life and we cannot afford to take chances of suppositions of attainments elsewhere.

(14.19) Do not think of Heaven, which can at best be temporary. You can't get rid of yourself. The "knower of Brahman" is absurd. Liberation during this life is the final step, (why talk of after-death business) resulting as a consequence upon giving up all mental creations. If you are to get Brahman it must be only here--emancipation in this life. Christianity, Islam, all religions speak of next life and heavenly pleasures. Vedanta wants it here and now. Pleasures and pains of this world can affect only the Jiva, the ego, the I--not the Drg. Pleasure and pain are as much objects as the Jiva or 'I'. This knowledge can be guided by inquiry. Therefore we must always be engaged in the inquiry into the nature of the Universe, the Jiva that sees it, and then the nature of the Jiva, a determination of its nature as Brahman. People mistakenly think that the 'I' is Atman, just as you take a shell (pearl) as silver. That which exists really is Atman only. The 'I' which is changing is wrongly identified with the unchanging Atman, Drg 'I'. How do you know? Because the former 'I' changes, appears and disappears. Mind alone is the cause of bondage and freedom. We do not rely on immortality, because it is said so in the Upanishads; but because it is actually experienced. Of what use is quotations? Vedanta appeals to facts.

(14.20) Most people shrink in fear of losing their ego; this is due to ignorance for the truth is that the 'I', the ego, is also Brahman, and as Brahman cannot really be lost.

(14.21) The difference between us and other schools is that they have the erroneous belief that there is some Reality, apart from us which is unborn and eternal, whereas we know it to be our very own Atman.

(14.22) The Atman imagines the Jiva, the Jiva imagines the world--that is the Kalpana, the process.

(14.23) The individual self is only an idea. Yoga is only an idea. Even Vichara-practice is only an idea, but it is the highest. Hence the personality is only born and dies as ideas, as imaginations not really. Hence the real self is neither born nor dies. Nobody has seen the Jiva go. Hence nobody knows what becomes of it. There are no two selves, the personality never exists apart from its ultimate entity, Brahman.

(14.24) All objects and creatures are mind alone. In advanced Vedanta you convert this statement into "are Atman alone."

(14.25) When you know that 'I' or 'me' is also your mental-construction, then only can you attain Atmic consciousness. For the 'I' also appears and disappears and changes like all other ideas. That which sees the 'I' coming and going is the pure consciousness. It is not individual consciousness, which is a 'seen.' The 'I' is thus a part of your imagination. Hence it is said so long as there is ego, there is bondage.

(14.26) In deep sleep all ideas of objects are converted into Atman, similarly in Samadhi. Even the idea of Ego, which is manufactured by the mind also, must be converted in Samadhi to Atman. Thus the finite ego is not the Atman. The Yogi who comes out of Samadhi has then to manifest the 'I', the ego, for he talks to you, he sits, he eats, he walks.

(14.27) Why should the fundamental instinct of love--in its various evolving phases from animal to intellectual--exist? Because the unity of mankind is the truth; its individualistic separation is illusory.

(14.28) The Atman in you is present in all your activities of work or pleasure, and hence you should one day find It as being the real hidden object of your activities. When this understanding comes, you are ready to give up the inner burden of those activities with their consequent anxieties, just to find peace, and be free of the anxieties. For that peace, that rest, is really the peace of Atman itself.

(14.29) The mind should not get confused. It should not think that "This particular thing is mine." This is what is meant by attachment. If you say that the whole world is mine, if you think of the whole world, that is detachment. It is when you think of the individual thing or individual man or object that you have attachment, but it has to be got rid of. Give up the individual attachment and you will find the whole.

(14.30) The first thing in ignorance, the root of it, is egoism. So long as you have 'I', it is useless to think you can find truth. This is the opposite of all other religions and philosophies, which take the individual self for real and build up promises or attainments on it.

(14.31) Death is one thing that is absolutely certain; what will happen after death in next world we cannot be certain of. Let us therefore seek the true immortality which can be gained here in this world, and once gained, will be forever. This is to know ourselves as Atman, Drg which never goes but sees the vanishing body and is always there. This is the sage's outlook.

(14.32) To the gnani both death and rebirth are ideas and hence do not exist in reality. Do not ask him therefore what is going to happen after death, because the question is meaningless to him. Everything is but mind, ideas, to him.

(14.33) Where is the death for him who, knowing the whole world including his body and ego to be an idea with him, knows that he (as Mind) continues even if the idea passes away just as a dreamer remains alive even when his dream-ego and body dies? And just as the dreamer must awake to this fact so the man must find immortality whilst awake too, i.e. here and now in this world, not in some problematical next world.

(14.34) The true sacrifice to which man evolves from sacrificing cattle, goats or human beings, is the sacrifice of his ego. Then he gets Gnan.

(14.35) Atman is the thinking substance in man.

(14.36) The Mind as such must be carefully distinguished from the mind associated with ego. This is a point on which much confusion in Western idealism reigns. For the latter leads to solipsism and to the criticism, why don't you create a camel by thought and ride away on it? It is only the former which produces ideas that are seen by all, not merely by a single person.

(14.37) After ideas of objects are reduced to Mind, Mind itself must be reduced to Atman.

(14.38) The universal mind exists in everyone. Therefore it is possible for all to practice regarding the finite mind, the ego, as not one's real self, to look upon it as an object. When one does this, at that very moment one has become the Universal Mind, This is the gnana-yoga practice we ought to follow, although it is admittedly difficult. It involves constantly objectifying the ego, seeing the 'I' as apart.

(14.39) Nobody can question that all objects are Ideas and that therefore the whole world is a concept of mind alone. Here error creeps in because men think this refers to the individual mind, to my mind. Berkeley, Jeans and Eddington say therefore that there is a universal mind in which the myriads of individual minds exist. Advaita denies this. It points out the ego-minds are within the one mind. The Vedantic tenet of myriad sunrays reflected from a single sun is of this order, but given only to help us to understand at a certain stage, not given as a final truth. Universal mind is not Brahman. The notion of creation is still there.

(14.40) We do not say the world is a creation of my mind, my ego, i.e. solipsism. The critics of solipsism are quite right. We make a distinction between my and the universal mind, but we say ego prevents us knowing the truth. If you say my mind, you are thinking only of mind associated with ego. It then becomes impossible to perceive truth about world. Why are my ideas not seen by others? This is the problem. But it is a fictitious one, for it is based on an illusion--that ego is real, that individual mind is real. You have to go to highest Mind, to universal mind, to understand it, but then your question will fall to the ground as unaskable. To understand this better, we appeal to dream. In your dream you will see several other persons. Each does not see the ideas images objects and pictures in the minds of the other persons. Yet after waking you realize that all these separate persons, despite the fact that their individual zones of

awareness were different from the others, were nevertheless one and the same mind, the mind of you--the dreamer. Similarly in the waking world we find the identical state of affairs. We are all deluded by separateness into being blind to the one mind of which we and the world are appearances.

(14.41) Vedanta also has the idea of a Universal Mind, like Jeans and Berkeley under the titles of Prajna, Isvara and Hiranyagarbha. But these are only stages above which we must rise: they are not the same as Advaitic Brahman, which is loftier.

(14.42) Getting rid of the ego does not mean losing the sense of individuality. It may be felt, experienced but it must be known for what it is--an idea, a drsyam. We cannot deny the ego being there but we can understand what it really is--a transient drsyam. Let the ego exist, it cannot be abolished, but don't be deceived by it into seeking its satisfaction at the expense of truth.

(14.43) Death exists in order to teach man that the individual is but a drsyam which appears and disappears, hence it is to urge him to seek immortal life.

(14.44) Do not believe children's fables and intellectual cock and bull stories about a man's spirit passing at death into Chandraloka, and thence to Suryaloka and thence absorbed, in God. He has only gone back into Mind and will come out of it again.

(14.45) The moment that you give up ego you will get the "lightning-flash" and know that you are everywhere (not that you are acting everywhere) and that everything is in you. Like that other flash between two thoughts it is something extremely subtle hence hard to detect, demanding extreme concentration.

(14.46) I know only one Witness. Everybody says that he knows only his own witness. I am not conscious of another man's witness, and hence we can only say there is one Drg, not two.

(14.47) The 'I' is the first kalpana, the first idea the human mind imagines.

(14.48) Ideas disappear but not in your mind, you must get rid of ego to grasp this. Similarly when critics say world is still there when I am asleep, they are blocked by ego from seeing truth that world does not come or go in ego-mind, but Mind.

(14.50) All these different Hindu teachings that the Atman is as big as the body, or as big as the head, or as big as the thumb, are mere words, imaginations.

(14.51) When you are very angry you may behave badly. After you calm down, you regret it and wonder how you could have been so. At this time you feel the angry man was like a different person, not your habitual self. What had happened? You had changed your ego for the time being and then threw off the new "angry" ego. This shows from waking, proof that the ego can be detached.

(14.52) All religious doctrines of life after death are without exceptions based on reality of the ego and therefore illusory. True immortality is only in the common universal self.

(14.53) The 'I' is a compound of a changing factor, ego, and an unchanging factor, consciousness.

(14.54) The ego is called a serpent or black serpent because a snake is very cunning. Similarly the ego is very cunning and operates even when it pretends not to. The ego is a complex, as a psychological complex is that which works unconsciously; you do not know it is there.

(14.55) The way to get rid of ego is to note its numerous changes and study its transient illusion. In dream you have one I, in waking you have the different 'I's of childhood, youth, manhood, old age; or as husband, pupil, master, traveler. Finally note its disappearance in sleep. Another way is to practice humility all the 24 hours.

(14.56) The gnani conquers death because, by identifying himself with all mankind, he continues to live on in them even after he is gone.

CHAPTER 15: AVASTATRAYA

(15.1) Indian philosophy: Its uniqueness relies on totality of experience by coordinating the three states, waking dream and deep sleep-- not on waking alone like other philosophies, arts, sciences and religions.

(15.2) Even when you are seeing the three states, you are still in the Atman; for it is always there. Hence to talk of "shifting the consciousness from ego to Brahman" is wrong because your consciousness is already in Brahman and therefore does not need shifting.

(15.3) The Western idea of consciousness implies an objective relation, whereas Vedantic idea is that it is the unrelated subject alone.

(15.4) It is quite impossible to know that there is a waking state, unless you have a dream and sleep to compare it with (like contrasting colors). Hence knowledge is possible only when you have differentiation. And since the Drg is the undifferentiated it can never be known in the ordinary sense of being distinguished from anything else, as the three states. You cannot talk of the absence of objects when there are no objects for contrast.

(15.5) Dream state is precisely the same as the function of imagination in waking state, remarks a Upanishad.

(15.6) "We are such stuff as dreams are made of" said Shakespeare, showing that he was an idealist.

(15.7) Dream is the same as waking state so long as it lasts. Whatever applies to the latter belongs to the former also. Hence when I say intellect is reason confined to waking I include dream in the latter.

(15.8) Sleep and Samadhi are identical. Samadhi is induced and under the control of one individual, while sleep is not induced and not under control.

(15.9) There is a distinction between reason applied to waking state and reason applied to all three states. And there is a distinction between applied to waking and dream, and reason in working in them. The former is intellect or intelligence strictly. It is capable of knowing its own incapacity to know everything as is confessed by scientists. It knows its own defect which arises from confinement to waking data only.

(15.10) Intellect is that which works in the waking state alone whereas Reason is that which examines the three states; it takes them into account.

(15.11) Turiya the intellectual laying down of the three states to view them from Witness standpoint, is possible only when you, the ego, disappear.

(15.12) Deep sleep and highest Samadhi (Nirvikalpa) are the same entirely. Self is Witness when there is an idea or object to witness, but there is none such in deep sleep or samadhi-- there is nothing to witness. Only in the waking and dream states are there these objects or ideas; they disappear in deep sleep and samadhi, for both the ordinary man, the yogi and the gnani. The deep sleep state is hence identical for all these three. You call it unconsciousness, but do you not see that consciousness can only exist where there is something to be conscious of? Your friend (Yogi So-and-So) who says he goes to sleep in the consciousness and remains aware of it throughout the night is simply deceiving himself like many yogis and mystics, if he is not deluding others. It is impossible. There is no such thing as Turiya or the fourth state, which is also yogic nonsense. The goal of all yoga is nothing more than deep sleep. Slumber. Yes, nothing more! But you must keep this secret because no one will want to undergo the troubles and disciplines of yoga if you reveal it. The difference between the ordinary man and the attained yogi is that the latter can enter this slumber or samadhi as he calls it, at will, whereas the ordinary man cannot. Don't reveal this secret because yoga is necessary for the vast majority as a preliminary stage to being fit to study Gnana: It is for those who lack the power of insight and brains; but it will give them peace of mind through elimination of thoughts and all the contents of mind, as well as detachment from worldly desires, both being prerequisites to study of Gnana which demands absolutely free mind as well as detachment from worldly desires, both being pre-requisites to study of Gnana which demands absolutely free mind to attend to it.

(15.13) When we say Turiya is realized or known, we mean only that ignorance is removed. The realization is not a result of any activity because the Turiya was always there, only an unveiling.

(15.14) Form of objects and their essence as mind are one and the same. To see this, take the illustration of dream and its objects. But this perception requires a mind as sharp as a razor. If you think of form as something different from mind then the latter has nothing to do with it; and when you regard it as being non-different from Atman, then you find the objects disappear and only the Self is.

(15.15) There is no such thing as manifold manifestation in the sense of a new creation: just as there is nothing new in the dream world, all its apparently manifold objects being still unchanged Mind. Similarly Brahman is always there as the world, still one, still unchanged.

(15.16) It is not possible to say that the external changes and forms are either different or non-different from Brahman. This statement is most important. To grasp it look at dream where objects are neither different nor non-different from Mind.

(15.17) Why should men have sleep? Nature wants to teach you that it is possible to have a state where there will be no imagination, no duality, no fear. In sleep, no questions can be asked, no answers given, there is nothing. Questions can be asked where imaginations are possible, i.e. in the waking state. The secondless state is always present, even now during the waking state. When the mind has learned to inquire properly it finds this non-dual state even during waking, as it is never absent. It is wrong to take sleep as Gnana or Moksha. The case of sleep is given only as an illustration or analogy, it is like the true state of nonduality but nevertheless it is not our goal. It is given as analogy only to show that all ideas disappear in deep sleep. Whereas Moksha is present in this very moment and all can be realized here and now outside of sleep. Only to achieve this the mind must be properly trained to inquire into it.

(15.18) Turiya must be found in the waking state. The analogy of deep sleep is given by the Upanishads to indicate that sleep is the last gate to be passed before reaching Turiya, that it is like Turiya in the sense of having no second thing for the Atman to be aware of, but sleep is definitely NOT the condition of Gnana. Otherwise the Gnani would have to keep on returning to sleep in order to recover his Gnana or the yogi would have to keep on entering samadhi to see Atman. Sleep and Samadhi give Atman alone, whilst waking state gives both Atman plus thoughts and things. Hence the non-dual Atman is ever-present even in the midst of waking life. Panchadeshi explains these points.

(15.19) Sleep gives Atman. That is not enough. It must be known and felt in the waking state which means you must discover it in the midst of thoughts, and things i.e. you must examine the external world and by inquiry-practice eventually trace it back to Atman. Then only have you known Brahman and also known it to be the same as Atman.

(15.20) That which sees the three states coming and going, which knows them, is the Omniscience. Mind is still attached to form, to worldly reality hence it needs training to get above this attachment before it can perceive both the forms and the essential one reality, simultaneously. This is the real meaning of Omniscience.

(15.21) Just as all ideas sink into the mind after dream, so all ideas of the world sink into Atman, and are never really lost.

(15.22) How are we to know that all this world becomes Atman? The illustration of deep sleep is used, for before you entered it you saw a material world which disappeared. Where did it go? To answer this, ask what all the objects of the world are. They are ideas. Where do ideas go back to? The Mind. Hence world disappeared into the mind. The mind disappears into the Atman. Mind active produces ideas, when in its inactive state it disappears. When everything is Atman there is no one else left.

(15.23) Deep sleep has been given you by Nature to show how in Gnan the whole universe goes back into you as idea.

(15.24) Even when you see mountains in dream they are not different from the mind itself. The essence is the same. Similarly with Atman all things are not different from it in essence.

(15.25) If there is only one self why is one man crying and another laughing? All should have the same emotion? Hence religions believe in millions of individual separate souls. But the objection of differences between separate feelings are answered by illustration. In your dream you think of a tiger who attacks and eats you. Who made the tiger, what is it made of? Answer: the same mind has created both the tiger and yourself. Thus two separate different egos are created by one mind. Latter appears bifurcated through its own imagination.

(15.26) What do you see in the ordinary waking or dream state? You see each object and person separately, this man, that wall etc. When you say all these are mind, you reduce them to one category, the mind, and then know their oneness in essence. If however your mind is attached to this particular man, that individual woman or thing, you become unable through your liking or desire or passion for the separate object, to see the general oneness of all.

(15.27) When you kill a tiger in your dream, it is only your own mind appearing as the tiger which you kill. Similarly other creatures and men are your own self appearing as different and what you do to them you are really doing to yourself. They are in your mind, not out of it.

(15.28) Turiya is not the fourth state: Turiya is that in which all the others are merged; or it may be called the witness which sees the other three states.

(15.29) What we are trying to teach is the nonexistence of Matter. The Quran itself teaches it in a very few phrases. "The world in which we are living here is a dream and men who are living here are a dream." it says. This means that any really deeply thoughtful and concentrated mind sees this truth, but how it is so, and what it leads to, they need not know. That is provided only by the higher Vedanta. Shakespeare

thoughtfully said: "World is such stuff as dreams are made of." But this alone does not make him a gnani.

(15.30) When you get Gnana, all acts become ideas as in a dream.

(15.31) Advaita begins by using dream as an illustration. Then it proceeds to use it as an analogy, but in the final stage it proceeds to ask what after all, is the difference between our waking life and dream life? Whatever so-called differences critics may point out we shall refute as non-existent. For example, if you say that waking life is continuous and dream life is discontinuous, we reply: Not so. Even during dream you remember things which happened some months previously and also you have relations with people with whom you were formerly in relation. Moreover when science proves the discontinuity of atomic structure then the whole waking world is shown to be discontinuous also, should you insist that dream life is discontinuous after all. Again if you reply that dream is incoherent whereas waking is coherent we reply: Not so, because even waking life can be shown to be incoherent at times. Therefore we can find no difference whatever between waking and dream. They are both of the same character, that is, they are both mental.

(15.32) Sleep is merely used as an illustration of non-duality. Even in the waking state if mind is sharp we can get the lightning-flashes of sleep: it is then called sahaja samadhi: only we do not notice them. Philosophy will not end if you confine it to the waking state: it will always produce endless ideas and hence endless schools of thought. But only in the non-duality of sleep do all ideas die, when this is brought into waking state as sahaja samadhi.

(15.33) The student must pass first through the stage of scientific proof from waking world facts for idealism: he must know that things are ideas. Then only is he ready to pass to the higher stage of studying Avastatraya. Here dreams show what powers the mind possesses to manufacture whole worlds, to create externality and internality, i.e. space. Sleep shows what power the mind possesses to reabsorb, store and later reproduce all the ideas of the world, space etc. Finally having shown all this Avastatraya clinches and carries to final culmination the idealistic theory learnt from waking state facts and shows what nature of mind is, what ego is, and that everything is not only ultimately one or non-dual but also not apart from yourself.

(15.34) Science teaches that all the universe is interwoven, one thing affecting another or depending on another or related to another. Now dream must therefore have its part to play in Nature, too. What is this part? If we only reflected deeply on the matter we would realize that the third of every 24 hours given to sleep indicated the great importance Nature attaches to dream and sleep. Vedanta says dream is to open a rift in the mechanism of what is going on behind the scene as illusion does, and thus give a strong hint that all life is mind made, that the waking state is as ideated as dream.

(15.35) We do not take dream-pictures or fanciful ideas as real as our critics say, but our waking pictures as unreal. The two attitudes are totally different.

(15.36) Experience of the world is there, that is undeniable, only you will have to know that it is illusory, not what it seems. The illustration is dream. When you wake up and thus when there is no ignorance, you say that the dream world was illusory. Similarly in waking when you get rid of ignorance you say, yes the wall is there but it is illusory. For every second it is fleeting, just like a cinema picture. The wall appears stable but science knows it is not really so: hence its appearance is illusory.

(15.37) Even the sense of reality is also mental, i.e. imaginary, and this is proved by (1) dream or (2) rope/snake illustration.

(15.38) Realists who say that objects have a sense of reality not found in more imaginations, to them we reply the same sense is found in dreams.

(15.39) Did the mind go from here to Himalayas in your dream? No, the idea of space and movement is in the mind. Similarly the Atman does not move, but motion occurs within it.

(15.40) The rose and smelling which you have in a dream, are only an idea. This helps to understand why similarly the five senses which you have in waking are also ideas.

(15.41) There is no way to discover the world is idea except by modern scientific analysis of matter. Avastatraya cannot be used for this: it is only an illustration in this connection. Avastatraya is not needed to prove idealism: Scientific--such as Russell, Eddington, and even Berkeley up to a point, analyses of sense-perception forms the only real proof. Avastatraya can merely illustrate idealism, although it is the only proof when you step beyond idealism. Scientific analysis of sensation is quite enough to prove idealism. When world is known to be idea, Avastatraya is only proof of world being in you, and only way to understand the nature of Atman. Idealists fear solipsism, quite rightly because they make the mistake of putting the world in the ego, not in Atman. They have seen only ego-solipsism, not Atman solipsism, which is the truth. Proof of idealism can only be got from science. There only can you see the world and yet know it to be nothing more than idea.

(15.42) Where was the world before you woke up this morning? It must have been in the mind, similarly when you awake into Gnan you know world is Mind, finally.

(15.43) It will be a great error to write that the world is a dream. It is not. The correct statement is: "The world is like a dream." This is because both dream and waking worlds are mental constructs.

(15.44) Ideas are only momentary although one minute may look like 1000 years in dream.

(15.45) The Fourth is that which sees, the Witness and it cannot be described. It is not a state, cannot be. The three states merge in the fourth.

(15.46) Sleep is always present in all the three states.

(15.47) Think of a coconut tree idea; next moment a mango tree idea. What happened between these ideas? I do not know. Why do you remember the ideas? There is a discontinuity of thought between the idea of a horse and the idea of an ass. What was there between the two ideas? One idea is not the same as another. The mind distinguishes them; then what is there between them? This shows that 'sleep' or absence of objects intervenes even in waking state.

(15.48) Deep sleep is said to be causal relation, because every day you go to sleep and wake up and the whole world is before you again. It is also called the seed condition: A mango from a mango seed, and vice versa. Mango tree goes into the seed form and comes out again. In the tree form you do not see the seed: in the seed form you do not see the tree. In the waking you see the whole world, in sleep only the seed, you do not see the world.

(15.49) Turiya is not a state or condition. We can experience only the three states. Turiya is present always. That which knows all the three states is itself changeless.

(15.50) The Western psychologists' objection that only primitive savage races regard dreams as real experiences, is answered as follows: Vedanta does not say dream experiences are real. It agrees that they are unreal. It says that waking experiences are unreal (and here it is supported by science) and that therefore the waking state is similar to dream i.e. both are unreal, despite the feeling of vivid reality they produce at the time.

(15.51) You can understand that all the world is the same Brahman if you reduce waking world to dream state and that to sleep.

(15.52) In a dream you may become another personality. What happens? The knowing capacity in you, the Atman, associates itself for the time being with the new ego and identifies itself with it. But when the dream ends, you wake up and that ego--say a soldier--disappears. After that you know that you can be separated.

(15.53) Just as Mind really remains unaffected by changing experiences in dream, (although you think at the time that a murderer is killing you) so Mind in waking is unchanged by its myriad thoughts and experiences. Just as waking after dream shows the murderer as not having been there other than delusion, so in waking up to Gnan all the world show is seen to have been only idea, unreal.

(15.54) Sleep is due to the absence of duality. It means that there is no positive misery or pleasure. In sleep there is only absence of misery and pleasure. But a gnani must have the knowledge of the absence of duality even in the waking state. Then only there is real bliss.

(15.55) The Atman is he who sees the three states coming and going in succession; and this "witness" unites through experience. I witnessed the three states--what are they?

They came out of my mind and disappeared into mind, therefore I am also the sleeper, dreamer and the waker. I am only the witness--the fish does not belong to any particular river-bank, i.e. unaffected by any states is Atman; but Atman gets attached to the banks. In the same way, you can understand the various states, if you think deeply.

(15.56) When you identify yourself with a particular state, waking or dream, you become identified and individualized. The true nature of Prana has no identification. In deep sleep, it does not identify itself and remains unindividualized.

(15.57) Turiya is not a state. It cannot be indicated by words. It can be understood only as Neti, Neti. It is that on which the ideas stand; it is present in all the three states. If you can say that everything is idea, you must admit that all ideas must have a substratum. Ideas cannot stand in the air. There should be a mind in which ideas stand. Similarly there should be a substratum for the illusory super-imposed snake, which is the rope.

(15.58) If you had only the state of pain, could you have had the idea of pain? No. It is impossible. Yogis talk nonsense when they talk of perpetual anandam, for they could form no idea of it unless they also had pain. Is there any anandam in deep sleep? It means that after awaking, you contrast the troubles of waking with their absence in sleep. In latter there is only one state and hence no second thing for comparison is seen, and there is then unconsciousness. When there is no duality, you can say nothing about it either way. Similarly suppose you had only the waking state, could a man then know it was waking? He would have nothing to distinguish it from. Now he who says dream is unreal, automatically states that waking is real and vice versa. Hence waking is real to him who has seen dreams and to none else. To objection that all people see waking objects and testify to them, whereas you alone can testify to your dream objects, reply is: In dream you may see a 1000 persons and 10,000 objects, as in waking. At the time all these persons seemed real. Here also in waking you have a 1000 persons and same objects. Where is the difference between the two groups of persons and things? All seemed real at the time. The objection thus falls to the ground. Science helps us here by now saying that for no two seconds do the same things exist as Buddha said. Even the Himalayas are being washed away by Ganges in form of sand, and they are thus ever-changing their form. The most important principle however is that all forms, whether waking or dream, are illusory because they are perceived by the mind. Merely because things and persons appear to you as real, is no justification for taking them as such. We are aware only of a succession of waking states, each comes and passes away; similarly with dream states. To objection that the same waking world reappears reply is that the idea of sameness is illusory and must be inquired into. You may think you are in the same buildings which you entered this morning, but if you inquire and examine it scientifically, you will find it has undergone change throughout.

(15.59) You remember a dream after it has passed. You do not remember it as a waking condition, but only as a dream state. In the dream state, if you were expected to remember waking state it should similarly be remembered as a dream and not as a waking condition. In dream you have food, body, hands, table etc. This proves that what was known in waking reappears in dream, where again it seems real. How could you

recognize Halwa sweet in your dream, unless you had previously seen it in waking. This is the reply to the objection that we cannot remember waking life in dream, although we remember dreams in waking. Therefore the waking things are seen again in dream later being a repetition of something that has transpired in waking. We can't say how the mind chooses its various waking material for its dreams, but it does draw on that material for its dream-life. The careful examination of dream shows that memory of waking experiences persists during dream, but if your memory is weak: the links between dream and waking are lost. Philosophy does not treat dream with usual indifference. It studies it with care.

(15.60) The mind constructs its own picture of the world because it converts sensation into its own images. It is the same as in dream, where mind creates its own dream world that exists within it.

(15.61) The conscious inquiry into the nature of the objective world during the waking state gradually brings about a "waking up" during the dream state and one begins to realize that one is dreaming. That means that if one sees a tiger during his dream, he will understand quite well that the tiger is only his idea, or dream. But this condition will arise only after the mind has saturated itself with inquiry and discrimination during waking state.

(15.62) How is dreamless sleep known? No ideas and no objects were present then. Hence it is only known by negation; In the same way the pure self is also only known by negation.

(15.63) The interval between two ideas which pass through the mind is equivalent to the deep sleep state.

(15.64) Deep sleep and the dream state are ever present with us, but the idea of time prevents us from apprehending them, for it makes us think that such and such a thing has ended and so on.

(15.65) It is essential to inquire into the presence of objects before we can understand the truth of their reality. The presence of objects is known only in terms of their absence, that is the color black is known as black only in terms of contrast with the color white. Hence Reality is to be known only as distinguished from unreality. In deep sleep the entire universe disappears from consciousness, that is, becomes unreal. Therefore, the different states are really relative to each other. In truth when the mind gets the consciousness of Reality there is no distinction between the three states.

(15.66) The term thought must be used differently from the term idea. A thought is any passing fancy or any feeling or any desire which comes and goes within yourself. An idea is not a thought in the above sense but a sensation of some object which is apparently outside yourself. Thus you will form an idea of a table whereas you will have the thought of removing the table from one room to another.

(15.67) The point to be noted is that the dreamer may imagine himself to be hunting, ruling or flying when in waking life he never does any of these. Hence his dream ego is entirely a concocted one, fictitious and superimposed on reality. Precisely the same applies to the waking ego.

(15.68) I say that the waking state includes the others because it is only when you are awake that you know dream and sleep exist. During dream itself you take it for the time being as though it were waking, and you are unable to know otherwise. The necessary contrast to enable you to distinguish between the states can only be effected whilst awake, when only you can perceive that waking is only a state that comes and goes; you cannot perceive this during dream or sleep. Hence realization can only be effected in the waking state. Hence too the need by the West to study Avastatraya.

(15.69) When in a dream, if you are aware that all the forms, phantasms etc. that you see are of the same stuff as the essence of the mind; it is knowledge; the dream ceases to be a dream (with its reality) and it comes and goes as simply as an idea of the mind.

(15.70) When my mind is working I see the world; when it ceases to act (as in sleep) the world disappears. Therefore I infer by comparison and agreement that the existence of the world is connected with the duality of the mind.

(15.71) The attributes of the mountain you see in dream i.e. its hardness, sizes form etc. are in the mind. Similarly in this world the attributes of the various people and objects, are in the mind, the Atman.

(15.72) Mind ceases to work in sleep and death but its basis still continues and must continue.

(15.73) Mandukya points out that everything exists in sushupti²⁹, and from it you get the whole world.

(15.74) All the phases of the ego's dualistic thoughts and feelings and sensations have their origin in sushupti; they come from there and somehow they exist there: how, we don't know. Sushupti as the cause of our individual life is inferred, not seen. However beyond sushupti is the Atman. This sushupti as source is equivalent to "The Unconscious" of the psycho-analysis.

(15.75) A $\frac{1}{4}$ of a rupee is included in a one-rupee piece; a $\frac{1}{2}$ rupee is already there in one rupee bit. Therefore the $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ rupees are merged in the one rupee bit: when you have a whole rupee you don't inquire, does it contain a $\frac{1}{4}$ or $\frac{3}{4}$ rupee in it: you know that both are present therein. You can by inquiry convert, merge or dissolve all the parts of a rupee in the whole one. Similarly you can show that waking dissolves in dream, the dream disappears in deep sleep, and latter merges in Turiya. This is done by converting world of material objects into an idea. Europe is now learning this first quarter, and it has yet to learn what becomes of these ideas, and what becomes of deep sleep--i.e two more stages

²⁹ deep sleep state

or quarters. In this way everything "all this" as Mandukya says in the first sloka becomes Turiya or Brahman.

(15.76) All occult and yogic experiences of vision, astral traveling, clairvoyance, if genuine, are in dream-state but is there then no difference between occultist experiences and ordinary man's? There is. The yogi knows he is dreaming, he knows he is out of body, but ordinary man does not. Pursuing this line still further we find that when thoughts are transcended in trance the same position arrives, i.e. the man (yogi) enters deep sleep and knows he is deep sleeping, whereas ordinary man does not know. It is conscious trance. Nature has imposed the three states upon all mankind without exception ---none, not even gods and sages can escape from these three: waking, dream and deep sleep.

(15.77) Conscious sushupti=samadhi. Conscious dream= visions, mind-made by yogis.

(15.78) The essential difference between deep sleep and Nirvana which is the fourth state, is that the ego is still latent in the former state, whereas there is no latent ego nor latent intellect in the fourth state. Intellect cannot function in Nirvana and therefore cannot tell us anything about it. A further difference between the two states is the presence of consciousness in the fourth. Nothing can be understood unless it is distinguished or differentiated from something else. For this reason, deep sleep, which offers no contrasts and no differentiations cannot be known in the ordinary sense. The contrast gives one the ability to see reality. Unless we examine the mind and see how it gets exact meanings for words, we cannot see this.

(15.79) Of what stuff is the seen made? In the dream it is the same stuff as the seer, mind; hence in the case of dream you can easily see the real unity in apparent duality. So also in waking state for the time being you do not know that the world is of the same stuff as the Atman: although the wall appears different it is nevertheless non-different when inquired into. Only the knowledge of this non-difference can bring universal brotherhood and eliminate wars. The tiger and the wolf have the strongest sense of separateness and hence prey on other animals. "Maya" really means you do not know that the world is made of the same stuff as the Self.

(15.80) Just as you know of dream only on waking inquiry similarly you know of reality only on making inquiry: and just as duality of dream state disappears on such inquiry so does duality of waking state disappear.

(15.81) What is the philosophical value of sleep? Has nature given it to you merely for physical utilitarian purposes? No. There is also a higher value. When you think of a meaning, when you get an idea of non-duality, you are still in the world of duality. You begin to imagine, "Brahman must be like this; or Brahman must be like that." Thus you merely get your own imagination back. You can raise no question in deep sleep. Therefore, to help you to understand Brahman aright, Nature gives you deep sleep. But it is a help only. Sleep is not Brahman, however.

(15.82) Deep sleep is not the same as Gnan, for the latter exists when you see the world of objects and men; not when you are unaware of it.

(15.83) Avastatraya: You know that there is a dream state or a sleep state only in the waking state. How do you know the meaning of sleep or dream apart from the waking state? Only by distinguishing it from waking. Imagine a man who is sleeping or dreaming all the 24 hours. Would he ever know that there is a different state in existence, unless he awakens? It is only by taking the whole of man's experience; waking cannot be separated from the other two states: you know waking only by distinguishing it from dream. The West does not know what is meant by sleep, waking and dream. Waking is that which comprehends through understanding the other two states. To shut out dream and sleep from inquiry is to prevent fullness of knowledge being got. It is wakeful state alone which gives you knowledge of the other states. It is impossible to arrive at truth when we reject so much data as sleep and dream, and confine ourselves to waking alone.

(15.84) Vedanta takes the whole of experience throughout the universe that you get in the waking state. It asks the question: What is the meaning of dream and sleep? Eventually you come to a certain understanding about the truth of the entire existence, not merely a certain aspect of it. I do not believe in the cock and bull stories that in the next world after I die I shall have my knowledge with me. I die every night but where, in deep sleep is all my knowledge, feeling-and personality? Suppose you never wake up from deep sleep. You never regain your separate self, nor the world. It is the same in death. The world and myself disappear then as in sleep.

(15.85) Our position is not that there are no external objects, but that the wall outside and my idea of it are both mind. To understand this, you must go to dream. We say there is nothing external to Mind: which has got everything in Itself as in dream. In dream you have external objects, but they are not separate from mind when you examine them after awakening.

(15.86) The word dream is generally used with reference to the body, for it means "my dream" which occurs within my body. Your body reappears in dream, you dream a journey, but you do not actually perform it, your body seems to do it.

(15.87) People like Dr. Sam. Johnson who stamped his foot on the ground to refute Berkeley and to show the world is real, ignore that in dream they would do exactly the same--stamp their dream foot on the ground and assert it to be real.

(15.88) The three states are known in the waking state, not in dream or sleep. Hence you must detach yourself from them whilst awake, if you are to realize Turiya. In the waking world alone can we get Brahman. The mind has to be so sharp in order to catch the meaning of the word state, as applied to waking, for if it sees it thoroughly, it will at once know it is in Turiya.

(15.89) Because deep sleep is followed by dream and waking, it is called the seed or causal state: otherwise if it continued unbroken it would be called Brahman. It is a state,

something which comes and goes; the objects of each state are included with it. The gnani detaches himself from them, sees them coming and going, and thus remains in the ever-present non-dual Turiya.

Everyone knows these states are transient but everyone does not detach himself from them. It takes time to realize the truth of Avastatraya as it does to realize non-causality: although you may perceive them intellectually. At the moment you know that the three are only states, you know the Drg, which is Turiya, but you have to know this continually. Turiya is not a state. In deep sleep you have Brahman, for it is always there (it exists in deep sleep, but you do not realize it then), but you wrongly think that when an object is present, as in the waking state, there is no Brahman. You call this Turiya only when you have the three states before you, just as you call it Drg only when you have drsyam before you.

(15.90) The whole world is of the nature of consciousness; this you can realize by the illustration of dream; and the world-consciousness is not different from your own: they are of the same substance or stuff. The objects rise and fall back in this consciousness like waves in the ocean.

(15.91) Which part of the mountain seen in dream was not the mind! All of it (is mind upon analysis.) Hence none of it could have been lost, because of all the mountain was your own mind and lapses back into your mind, and as matter is only mind, having been proved to be so, the whole world is in my mind. But it is not my ego, my individual mind, which can create this world. It is the common One Universal Mind.

(15.92) Waking objects, on account of their being similar to dream objects, are unreal because they are perceived objects. This is important and must be understood. For what is it that perceives? It is the mind. What is it that the mind has in it when it sees an object? An idea. Suppose anything existed outside or different from the mind. What is it that would have to tell you about it? The mind. As in dream, the mind is that which informs you of existence of objects, i.e. it is only an act of the mind. Those who say things exist apart from or independent of mind talk like children. Where is the proof? This principle must be thought over a million times until you thoroughly grasp it. It is only mind that makes a thing perceived. Hence objects are mental states.

(15.93) The relativity of the three states: you could not know black as black if white did not exist. If only one color existed you would never be aware of that fact. Only by existence of another opposite or contrasting color do you know (it). Similarly you would not know waking as waking if life were always waking state. You know waking state exists because of existence of dream state by way of contrast and of deep sleep. Therefore the three states are present together and are always present.

(15.94) Dream is necessary to distinguish from deep sleep, as you cannot know the presence of an object without knowing its absence.

(15.95) Every man is given the three states, therefore every man can realize Truth.

(15.96) When you have a dream, what is it? This analysis requires self-elimination, purging of preconceptions. What is the dream now, at this moment, in the waking state? If you concentrate you perceive dream is only a thought, an idea; it is only your own mind. Similarly, all our action and thoughts of to-day, now, will be nothing but thoughts, ideas, tomorrow. Hence all we are doing is, even now, nothing but an idea. Yet it falsely appears because of attachment to the false idea that all this is real.

(15.97) The aim of yoga is to empty the mind of its contents, but this is successfully achieved by millions of men during the deep sleep state. Yet they never find Truth. That is why something more is needed. Deep sleep is not liberation. It is not Reality. Reality is existence in the external world of matter, as much as in deep sleep, but only the sage can perceive this. We have to tell novices that deep sleep is nearer the Overself, merely to induce them to begin and carry on the quest which shall pass into and through and out of yoga. If yoga were enough, why did not Krishna tell Arjuna upon the battlefield to sit down and keep quiet? Instead of that, He told him to go into the thick of the battle of life and to fight, that is, to act.

(15.98) Sleep is Nature's greatly merciful gift to ordinary men to enable them to contact their divine self nightly. Such is its mercy.

(15.99) Deep sleep is simply having no ideas.

(15.100) The dream-state has been given to man as an illustration for the purpose of pointing out to him that the external world is likewise an idea. You see a thing in dream as different from you, but yet it is of the same substance – mental - it is not for nothing that dreams exist. How did the sense of reality during the dream arise? This must be answered. It arises from the Atman, not mind. There is no other illustration but dream which can prove this truth.

(15.101) If a man in dream knows the world to be idea, this is a good test that he has reached the higher stage.

(15.102) You must think constantly that the world is an idea till it gets so firmly fixed in your mind that the proper test of your grasp occurs--when in your dreams you will say to yourself too that even your dreams are but ideas.

(15.103) Until you become fully aware during the dream state that you ARE dreaming, you are not ready for higher Vedanta teaching which gives Gnana. You must begin to practice to perceive your dream experiences so as to become conscious that it is a dream in dream state itself. This will cause the waking self to grasp the idea that both idea and the object constitute the whole category of existence. All is Mind. If this memory that what you see what you think as well as your individual self are ideas then that is Gnana.

(15.104) Dream is called the second state, the sphere of Taijasa, which means light. Why is dream world called the light world? Because there is no sun, moon or stars, yet there is an entire illuminated world visible to the dreamer. The light is still present there. Whose

can this light be? It must be that of mind. The mind emanates its own light, suns and moons. How is it that when we shut our eyes, when we enter a state where there is no sun or electric light, we perceive anew scenes, persons, etc. in dream, reverie or imagination. It is because we experience them by the mind's own light. That which is said to be only mental and inside, is thus able to produce the world outside. The old ideas reappear and produce the external world, impressions, vasanas. This is our scientific basis for the theory of rebirth too.

(15.105) If you subtract from your experience every thing which is known, then you have the Turiya, objectlessness: to understand this note that sleep is objectless but you get no knowledge of it except in waking state. How do you understand deep sleep? You imagine nothingness. What do you do in such imaginations? You are negating every idea. Hence if the mind can be so concentrated as to thrust all ideas aside, you understand sleep. Hence if you learn the way to negate ideas, which is possible, you may reach reality. But you can see it only for a lightning-flash of a second, it is so quick. You know it has come but cannot catch it. The moment an idea arrives you know that it was preceded by the blank. Hence the interval between two thoughts is Turiya. Therefore you have to examine your own mind with tremendous watchfulness to get it. The three states come of their own accord. But Turiya is seen by intensely sharp vigilance only. Turiya is the absence of the three states. It is always present but must be probed for. It must be always there because it is implied by the presence of the three states. Were it not there you could never think. Turiya only can get the meaning of existence and non-existence. When you can realize within yourself the non-existence of objects, that is Turiya.

(15.106) It is the want of Buddhi, the incapacity to see sharply that prevents understanding that Turiya, the state in which the other three are now, is here and now. The moment you grasp Turiya the unreal appearances disappear. Nothing that is done can get it, hence yoga cannot reach it. It is exactly the same as when you try to remember that you had deep sleep last night. What do you do to get such remembrance? Do you practice yoga? No, you negate the waking and dream states, you shut your eyes and try to think them away. Similarly the moment you negate objects, external and internal, you grasp the Drg in a single second, in a flash. It cannot be done by Samadhi.

(15.107) All scriptures imagine a mystic creator for the universe, but Life itself when examined reveals that the true creator (or emanator) is deep sleep, because all your ideas emerge there from and all the objects in the universe are but ideas which come and go and seem real for the time only because your mind makes them so.

(15.108) Knowledge of Atman is true knowledge, not merely the absence of duality as in Sushupti where you don't know that it is Brahman. Gnan is to see the world and say that it is all Brahman. Even the Himalayas are in you. The control of mind is essential to know the unreality (not the absence) of the phenomenal world. Sushupti can't be equated with Gnan.

(15.109) Use dream as an illustration frequently. This is Avastatraya method. Last night in dream what were the actions, the food eaten etc. All were in mind. All were mind.

Similarly all here is Brahman. All is Brahman. What is there to give up? Beginners must renounce world but thinkers find there is nothing to renounce.

(15.110) The mountain seen in dream is not lost. It has gone back into the mind and is still there. You cannot say, "I have lost a portion of my mind called "mountain". Similarly all the world idea retires to the mind, and is realized as identical with Atman.

(15.111) People quite wrongly believe that deep sleep is the pure Brahman condition. Sleep is a different kind of non-duality, not the highest. Brahman must be seen when discrimination of the manifold is seen, not when it is absent, as in sleep. You exercise your Buddhi and understand that this wall, table, man are Brahman.

(15.112) You will know that you have understood Vedanta when in your dreams you can say: "This mountain, these cities and people are all mind," This is the test of whether you have advanced from theory to successful practice.

(15.113) You can talk of the three states only during waking. You do not think of the waking world when dreaming, nor of both when in deep sleep.

(15.114) You can have the equivalent of dream right now by shutting your eyes and imagining that you are visiting some place, meeting some person, etc. Moreover you can also have the equivalent of deep sleep if you can succeed in making the mind as sharp and fine-edged as a razor, when you will detect blankness even in the midst of waking state: it can only be momentary, but it must be the thoughtless.

(15.115) During dream you have got only mind, one and indivisible, yet you do not think it to be mind, but you take it to be mountains, streets, sounds and persons. Similarly in waking you take the same things as distinctive whereas they are really one mind.

(15.116) In the dream world there is no real sun, stars or electric light, yet we see all the dream-objects. By what light do we see them? It is by the light of the Mind. Such is the wonderful power of mind that it creates sun, stars and electric light, in dream.

(15.117) We do not say the dream is as real as waking; we say it is as unreal as the waking. The difference is very important.

(15.118) In sleep there is no positive misery or pleasure, but only absence of misery and pleasure, i.e. absence of duality. But a gnani must have the knowledge of the absence of duality even in the waking state. Then only there is realization. We must distinguish between absence of duality and the knowledge of absence of duality.

(15.119) But Turiya is that which sees all the three states, the states do not merge into it and come out of it again. It always sees the states coming and going. This is the difference between sleep and Turiya.

(15.120) You cannot prove positively that consciousness has vanished in sleep. You can only show it negatively. For you cannot know the limits of consciousness: you cannot posit where it starts, stops, vanishes etc. This is what Europeans do not understand. We use the word consciousness to include non-dual states like sleep, whereas West uses it only for duality states. Westerners do not grasp that consciousness can remain without objects, as in sleep, and yet be conscious still, This is "contentless consciousness."

(15.121) Dream shows that a second object can be present (duality) and yet you know later it was not really so. Similarly in waking our sense of duality is a delusion.

(15.122) They object that there is nothing in deep sleep. I reply that the term nothing indicates the existence of a thing to start with, therefore non-existence implies existence. Nothing must have a meaning, i.e. a thought and if you had not seen there was a waking world you could not negate it in sleep. Waking and sleep go together, one is not possible without the other. You get deep sleep even in the waking state. It comes during interval between two ideas, when one goes and the other appears. Hence non-existence of Brahman in sleep is wrong. It is like the waves disappearing but their substance or essence, water, remains.

(15.123) Because we are not aware of any other things in sleep, we have to admit that every idea both internal and external has merged into the mind during sleep as undifferentiated consciousness.

(15.124) Dream also is a waking state to the dreamer. When we get up we have another waking state. Strictly speaking, we have a succession of "waking states."

(15.125) The illusions of dream disappear on waking when they are seen to be unreal. Similarly the illusions of waking also disappear when Gnan dawns and it is seen as equally unreal. The objects, persons, and talks of both states are all ideas. The next step is to know the nature of all these ideas are only the Mind. All names and forms are imagined, but I am always there, whether I see them or not.

(15.126) We imagine the waking world and then imagine the dream world and then proceed to find the former as the cause of the latter. This is our delusion. Dream experience is entirely the result of our imagination, not of our waking experience.

(15.127) Those few who never dream cannot apply the Vedantic analogous to it, nor the Gnani-test of feeling himself the All in dream! However this does not matter, for they can still apply the latter test to waking only but they are unfortunate in missing the former illustration; this will not prevent realization through.

(15.128) The three states come and go, impermanent and therefore have no value from truth standpoint, All yogic visions likewise come and go, and are valueless. They are but projections of the mind, as the Jyoti-light seen by yogis and mystics, quite genuine but of no value to the Truth-seeker.

(15.129) Nature has mercifully given man a nightly demonstration of the goal and the truth of life, in the experience of deep sleep. There you have the comparative bliss of dropping all objects, whether dream or waking, and later the lesson of seeing them arise again from the same state of apparent nothingness. Everything is found in consciousness or mind, both objectless and objective. But Europeans know only the latter, not the former. They must learn the lesson given by Nature through deep sleep. No yoga can give a greater lesson, and even in waking state the same lesson can be learnt by use of buddhi: through which an object may go but pure consciousness remains. A room in darkness does not mean that the objects therein have vanished or disappeared. Similarly these external objects, sounds, persons, go back into the mind in deep sleep and reappear on waking. When the external world subsides in deep sleep, the truth is that it is only an emanation of the mind, a form of thought, it was the mind and remains the mind. This is to help understanding everything as Brahman. Nothing is lost or disappears; It is and always was Brahman.

(15.130) Einstein's theory of relativity is applicable to dream experience. Four persons viewing a table will have four different pictures of it in their mind, says Einstein. Each sees his own mental structure, what his mind tells him, i.e. his own imagination. Similarly the dream-world seen by a dreamer is entirely relative to his own mind. Each dreamer will have an individual world of objects of his own presented by his mind; relativity reveals that no two persons see the same thing in the same way, consequently the whole world appearance is idea. (because things are thoughts, ideas, it is possible for a unique object to be seen from a multitude of standpoints by different individual observers and still be the same object, makes relativity possible. - editor)

(15.131) Those who object that the means and ends of waking are different from those of dreams, and therefore they are not on the same level, ignore that you have time, space and causal relation in both states. These three things make the waking world real to you: and are its chief characteristics; similarly they give the same sense of reality to dream. They say waking is real and dream is illusory. We say both are illusory.

(15.132) Where is the need of a divine creator when your own dream experience offers proof that you yourself bring into being a whole world of objects and persons, and if you can create a dream world, why not also a waking world? Only do not forget that 'you' does not refer to the ego which is itself a produced thing.

(15.133) (The) Advanced state of this path, resulting from the constant practice of inquiry and "awareness" is that the attitude thus developed during waking will repeat itself during dream. Even in dreams the Gnana-yogi will thus separate himself from his dream body, know all his dream objects to be mind, etc.

(15.134) We do not say that the three states do not exist; that is not our point; we say that what is felt as real in each of the three states is one and the same thing (the Atman or Self - ed).

(15.135) Why is waking not known in dream? Reply: It is known. You think you are awake during dream.

(15.136) The best illustration that everything is within you, is dream. Therein all things, scenes and persons are in your mind, are your mind. In the same way the external world is yourself and in yourself.

(15.137) Many thoughts appear within the mind and are limited by time (and) space, but you do not know any limits to the mind itself.

(15.138) The diamonds you wore in your dream were only mind at the time and disappeared into mind. Thus they are not lost really.

(15.139) That which appears as the three states plus that into which the three states disappear, these two together form the Supreme Brahman.

(15.140) Where do ideas come from? Only from Sushupti--where else could they come from? Sushupti is unindividuated mind.

(15.141) Vedanta does not regard Turiya as the fourth state, in a numerical line, but as that which is present and subsists in the three states. The former is an error because Turiya is not a state. Turiya is the witness of the three and is That which knows of their existence. But how is it to be known in deep sleep apart from the sleep? You have to do what is done in algebra, you separate or drop out the three, take away the differentiating factors and whatever remains is the Drg, Turiya. It is the only thing of which you can be certain that it is not transient but always there, whereas waking, dream and sleep come and go.

(15.142) The three states are themselves mere ideas and time in them is also an idea. You have to be careful when writing about them to distinguish clearly between the objects seen in the states and the experiences of the states. What is past time? Imagination! What is the future? Something imagined; but if you take away these two states, your present becomes meaningless. How can it exist independently of the other two? Hence the whole of time is idea and the three states, being dependent on time, are also reduced to idea, to being merely imagined: So taking away the three states as illusory, unreal, what is left? The Atman.

(15.143) At the point of passing from wakefulness to sleep, see what it is; that is Atman.

(15.144) Even in sleep when you see nothing and know nothing, still it is as much Brahman as in waking when activity and knowledge abound. For Brahman never changes, is not mutable, does not increase or decrease; hence talk of gaining moksha³⁰ is nonsense.

³⁰ Liberation, enlightenment

(15.145) When you think of a dream you can reduce all its sights to Mind, to your mind. So when you get Gnana, you reduce all to Atman and no longer rejoice or sorrow over differences of experience because you now know them all to be One.

(15.146) Knowledge implies a knower and a known. Such distinctions do not apply to Gnana. Yogis misinterpret this to mean Nirvikalpa samadhi. The correct understanding is that even though there are different objects yet at the same moment, you will realize they are non-different. The best way to grasp this is to look at dream, wherein the object known, the process of knowing and the knower are simultaneously only Mind.

(15.147) It is absurd to say, as yogis do, that Brahman is found only in Nirvikalpa samadhi, in the absence of world. This is the same as sleep. If that were so, why did the Upanishads speak of a "fourth?" This truth is that waking is Brahman, dream is Brahman, sleep is Brahman.

(15.148) You must have a keen mental eye, a hawk's eye to see truth in a moment. He who thinks of the three states becomes the perceiver of the three states and is the Atman.

(15.149) When you see the mountain and when you do not see it, the substratum is there. The substratum is only the mind. It is only the Gnani that knows this. Just as all sounds have for their substratum the sound Aum, so the mind without ideas and forms exists even while there are ideas and forms.

(15.150) If the Turiya were not there, you would not be aware of anything. Turiya subsists in all the three states; otherwise we would not be aware of them. If anything is real, we cannot get rid of it; it cannot appear and disappear. But because the three states appear and disappear, they are said to be unreal.

(15.151) Turiya is not something we get after removing the three states. Turiya exists always. Removal of the states does not mean the production of a new entity. When you get at Atman as the witness of the three states you cannot become aware of the Atman; it is the Atman that is aware of the three states. Remove the darkness and you see the object. The two are simultaneous. They are not really two. When you remove ignorance you realize the highest truth. If I believe that the absence of the three states gives realization when the mind is still in an elementary state, i.e. the mind merely imagines that which becomes aware of the three states. What is between the disappearance of one idea and the appearance of another idea in the mind? It is just like sleep, though it is momentary. If there is no interval between the two ideas how can I distinguish between the two? Between the two ideas, there is only the mind. It is known to him to whom it is unknown; it is unknown to him whom it is known.

(15.152) We know only one Mind. We never know but only assume there exist other individual minds; all you get is the thought of them. Even when I am thinking of the minds of the dream state, it is still the same Mind that is operating; they were only thoughts of this Mind.

(15.153) Whatever is in the mind can appear outside as objective existence.

(15.154) Those who think because I am not conscious of the creation of the world by my mind, therefore I did not create it, are wrong. Look at dreams. You are not conscious of creating them, nevertheless they came out of your mind, whether you were aware of them or not. They are mental. This proves that the world of waking can also come from the mind without your knowing. This non-knowing is called agnana ignorance; you have to see that, as Avastatraya says, the whole world is created by mind.

(15.155) He who thinks God is one and I am another can never understand truth.

(15.156) Misery is due to duality. When you know that everything is in you, not elsewhere and when you know there is nothing other than yourself, duality disappears and misery vanishes as a consequence.

(15.157) So long a man thinks that there is a second thing, he is under Maya and in bondage; so soon as he sees oneness only, he is wise and free. Nothing could be easier than this.

(15.158) The doctrine of the "Lightning-flash" of glimpsing Reality mentioned in Upanishad must not be misunderstood. It has two meanings. The first is merely for beginners to encourage them to go on. It is the teaching that they have to get beyond thought and between thought, to stop thinking for a fraction of a second as it were. The higher meaning is that the students suddenly grasp the idea that all the world is only a thought, and that he himself is also a thought and that all this thought-world is inside himself, is Atma, Brahman. With that he recognizes that the thought itself is Brahman with all its ideas it includes Brahman too, including the idea of himself. This sudden understanding may last only a fraction of a second at first. Hence it is called "Lightning-flash." It is not samadhi in yogic sense. He has to repeat this glimpse of true understanding more and more times until it becomes a stable grasp of the truth.

(15.159) You avoid, check or control vasanas because they are imaginations, hence drsyam. For if you do not check you will never know the drg. Hence knowing truth requires greatest discipline.

(15.160) All the obstacles to realization are duality. The path is therefore to remove them, to unify. But it must be done correctly, not a pseudo-removal. The differences of variety in this world are of great value to the thinker, for they cause him to inquire and then pursue his enquiry to the end and thus eventually rise above all difference of duality into non-duality. But in the inferior minds these same differences will cause only strife, war, dispute and bloodshed, in fact all the world's troubles are caused by the sense of duality.

(15.161) We use the word "knowing" the truth or reality only for beginners, know implies duality. But we have to use it for convenience of instruction until the pupil is able to perceive himself that he is, was and ever will be Brahman.

(15.162) If you say you are an Advaitin, then you have got a meaning for the word which means you still think Advaita is duality. Hence we say it is more correct to reject the label "advaita" as well as all other labels; saying instead "search for truth."

(15.163) To be established in non-duality means that wherever the mind goes, whatever you see, it always reminds you of Brahman; whereas novices may get a flashing glimpse of Brahman but it passes away as soon as the vasanas of this world rise again.

(15.164) It is only when gnana yoga is practiced all the 24 hours, that the mind becomes steady, i.e. attains sahaja samadhi in truth.

(15.165) Every new birth of a form is still only Mind, so it is nothing new, no second thing.

(15.166) You are only aware of your ignorance in the waking state. Hence you can get rid of it only whilst awake.

(15.167) Real Gnan, when it sees the waking state, thinks everything it sees there to be only an idea; just as the man who has awakened from dream similarly regards his dream-world. This is to be achieved by constant practice in right thinking until it becomes natural.

(15.168) In dream you may be travelling to Bombay and yet your mind has not really moved. Hence mind is motionless and yet paradoxically in motion at the same time.

(15.169) We know of no other thing having produced our dreams, although we may imagine or speculate, other than Mind itself. The dream is Mind; its objects are mind its results are mind, it is but one substance Mind: And yet it appears as a duality or multiplicity! Similarly waking world of objects, i.e. ideas are also non-dual but appears differently.

(15.170) The gnani is he who knows in the waking state that the world's reality is illusory: thus he is as though asleep whilst yet awake.

(15.171) Think of all the beautiful women you had in dreams, realize they were only ideas; and apply the same conclusion to the women you see in the waking state. Do this to all other sensual pleasures. This is the practice which leads to enlightenment. Dream is the key to understanding the world rightly.

(15.172) There is no attainment of Turiya. It is always there. It is that which is aware of all the three states.

(15.173) The Self appears only in the waking and dream. In sleep we do not experience it as appearing and disappearing. Where did the self disappear during sleep? That into which it disappeared and from which it appeared at waking, we call the self. We do not know whether it disappeared into God or Overself etc. for we do not see it come and go

into a second entity. Strictly speaking we cannot even say that the self appears and disappears into the Self; for we do not see it. But the nearest approach is that individual ego entered the universal ego, just as all the sounds come and go into soundlessness.

(15.174) In the waking, objects appear to be real. In dream everything is produced by mind and is therefore ideas. By studying dream phenomena we come to the conclusion that everything are ideas and nothing but that. In sleep everything goes back into the mind and therefore we say that ideas are also mind. Deep sleep is, as it were, the container of dream and waking.

(15.175) All the three states are Brahman. To think that waking is not Brahman whereas sleep is Brahman is an error: similarly to say that Turiya is Brahman and not the three states, is error. All is Brahman without exception. If you take Mind to be Brahman, then just think: when you pick up this book science tells you it is idea, hence Mind is then present. When a dream-mountain is seen is not Mind present? When in sleep even though no objects are seen, is not Mind present? So Mind, Brahman, is everywhere, in all three states and even beyond them.

(15.176) The fact that sleep is a drsyam is proved because we know it as being sleep only after we are awake, i.e. when it is past and gone, i.e. when it has vanished. And is it not the characteristic of drsyam to vanish, to change? It is only a temporary state whereas Brahman is permanent and not a state. Moreover it is the activity of buddhi which brings the understanding of Brahman and buddhi is inactive in sleep. Finally the sleeper sees nothing whereas the gnani sees the world, sees Brahman even in waking.

(15.177) You know that dreams have come from sleep. If you want to know what is common to both their essence, you have to take away from dreams the names and forms, then you will have the Mind left. This Mind is the common feature of dream, sleep and even waking. This Mind has undergone no change amid all these appearances. Therefore the idea of causality is inapplicable to it, and have no meaning.

CHAPTER 16. THE ULTIMATE AS TRUTH

(16.1) Vedantic Sadhana (discipline) can only remove your own ignorance; it does not bring a new thing, for Brahman is here and now.

(16.2) The mind does not go, but it is kept quiescent, not agitated. This Asparsa Yoga is the highest and is referred to in Mandukya Upanishad. It means "nonduality Yoga" and is the real Gnana yoga, for nonduality is the true Gnana. In Asparsa yoga there is no second. It is an ancient Buddhist term adopted by Gaudapada.

(16.3) The test of truth is to be able to see the whole world in you, not excluding even an ant from your sympathies.

(16.4) Continuous reflection is necessary during the early stages of this path and it must continue every time a new object is presented to one for cognition, until it becomes a habit.

(16.5) In every form Brahman is seeking to know itself. In the rock which is crumbling, in the grass which is growing and then decaying, in the yogi who is meditating, there is Brahman in various stages of evolution gradually getting to know the truth of itself. Hence everyone is really seeking truth. Only they apply this desire to truth of the stage they are at. When they have a certain pleasure, they think this is nice and true satisfaction. They do not realize they ought to go beyond and thus know a higher satisfaction. If you face a cow with a stick it will turn aside in fear; if you face it with a bunch of grass in your hand, it will approach. In both cases the cow sought to know the truth for itself.

(16.6) For the oneness with all things cannot arise until after you have sought and achieved the sense of their welfare. This self-realization may be achieved at first, as Upanishads say, in lightning-flashes, in fleeting momentary glimpses, but later this must be stabilized into permanency. And as the gnani knows the world to be an idea, a mental construct, the sense of unification and love to all mankind is simultaneously its materialization, for he knows no difference between idea and matter. Hence too the gnani wishes all beings to be happy, loves even his enemy, wishes him no harm, for he knows the truth of universal self-identification. Thus to the extent a man realizes the truth, he can do good and no more.

(16.7) If God exists, as he does for religionists, and exists separately from them, then there is duality, which always implies contradiction. Vedanta says God is an idea, a thought, an object, therefore I, the Drg, contradict God. When there are two, one thought contradicts another for one thought comes at one moment, and the other at another moment, both moments contradict; you cannot say they are identical. You cannot find non-contradiction in this world. We boldly say that God does not exist, because his existence implies that I am different from Him. Any kind of difference means contradiction. Nothing whatsoever other than the Atman exists. Non-duality means the negation of all thought.

(16.8) Truth is not only that which is beyond contradiction, but also that in which is no possibility of contradiction. Such a state can only be realized as non-duality, where there are no two persons. The illustration for that is deep sleep but sleep is not the ultimate reality. It is merely an analogy. Brihad Upanishad teaches, "if you think there is another entity whether man or God there is no truth." This is the teaching since time immemorial of those who have inquired into truth.

(16.9) That only which is permanent, unchanging in the changing world is reality.

(16.10) Everyone hears of Brahman. People can only imagine it.

(16.11) You require words only to distinguish between is there and not there, but you can't posit either of Reality, because your saying so is only an idea, not reality. It is beyond words. Words are of use, however, as a thorn to pull out the thorn of other words that hinder knowledge.

(16.12) Intellectually knowing the truth is only an imagination, whereas realizing the truth is knowing it as such.

(16.13) Yogis think that keeping out thoughts will give experience of Brahman. How can you keep out a portion of Brahman of your mind? It is utterly impossible. To say that such thoughtless experience is possible is rubbish, Moreover even if it were possible, what is it that the yogi will keep out? They will only be keeping out Brahman! For the mind is none other than Brahman, as everything is Brahman. The yogi has got the idea of duality and therefore cannot realize truth. His experience of bliss is not Brahman, for Bliss is something you have to experience, therefore it will have to go as it came; hence it is only drsyam. Yogis seek bliss through ignorance.

(16.14) Intuition always implies knowing something, hence a second, hence it is rejected as duality. Even if it is intuition of the infinite, of bliss, God, etc., it is still a pointer to duality. Therefore I say the way to truth, i.e. Non-duality is not intuition, not mysticism but reason.

(16.15) Yogis make the fundamental mistake of thinking that these are things (meditation or actions) which are other than Brahman. The very idea they concentrate on is itself Brahman and hence needs no special effort. It is impossible to treat your mind as different from Atman. The AWARENESS i.e. Atman must be there PRIOR to all attempts to control the mind: therefore it is a fallacy to believe that any yogic exercise can create this awareness, this knowledge of self.

(16.16) It won't do to say Reality is only within you. You must know that this table, this book is also Reality. All that you see is reality.

(16.17) ASPARSA YOGA: is the summit of Gnana yoga. Asparsa yoga is not the same as Non-causality. It is the viewpoint of anything as reality, non-dual, whereas the latter deals with the relation between two things.

(16.18) Atman cannot be known in the sense in which we know objects of thought. It can be known only to the extent to which you know them, for you can only think of the knower when you are in the presence of the known, i.e. objects, for the latter make you aware that a knower must exist. Thus duality makes you think of the knower, but it cannot make you know the knower. The knower is known in the world of duality only by implication, as you cannot think without him. The knower is a concept, and cannot be known in itself.

(16.19) Ultimate truth is known only in the negative way. You cannot make it an object of knowledge. You can know that you cannot have an idea of an object unless you posit a

knower, unless the knower is implied already. The Drg itself is Gnana, that is, it knows everything else. The self is known only when you see something else, for that other thing reminds you of it. The self is unknowable as an object. Knowing the ultimate truth means knowing that Brahman exists. The word 'know' implies duality, something known; on the other hand Gnana does imply an object. Brahman knows the ego as an object. The knowing powers, the Drg, the knower can have no statement made about it, other than that its existence cannot be negated. The ultimate truth which you can know is that Brahman is not something to be known.

(16.20) From the standpoint of the mind's working, you say that its thoughts are transient and illusory; from the standpoint of ultimate result when you seek the essence of the objective world you have to resolve it into the One mind. Is this mind also illusory, although longer lasting than individual thoughts? To ask such a question is to think about the mind i.e. to set it up as an object, to remain in the world of duality. Hence you cannot get a correct answer about it--only a thought. The mind as knower cannot be known by thought; only by non-thinking, by silence, questionless.

(16.21) Even the highest thought of Brahman must disappear in deep sleep. Thought is changing and unreal. It passes away like dreams. It is impossible to eliminate thought entirely in the waking state. No Yogi has ever succeeded in doing so. If he does he will at once fall asleep.

(16.22) From the standpoint of worldly communication through words we say strive to know Brahman: but from the highest standpoint words can only be applied to an object. When you say 'I do not know Brahman,' there must be something in you which knows you do not know, a Witness, and which thus contradicts you.

(16.23) The seer in me, the seer in him, the seer in someone else, are all one and the same; not separate from each other. Nobody has ever seen more than one seer.

(16.24) He who knows the Drg is Brahman, he remains satisfied. Not he who is concerned with drsyam. Death is itself an imagination. Death is an idea, which you don't even have in sleep. Death idea exists in waking and dream states only. Hence Atman is immortal.

(16.25) Thought itself is mind. Mind sees itself as mountain in dream. "I" is also an object of mind or Atman: Vedanta wants only to deal with certainty--the Mind alone we know; all the rest are ruled out. "This duality that is cognized is mere Illusion (Maya). This duality does not go, this Maya does not go. Causality itself is Brahman. Playing is mind, I am Mind, tennis ball is mind--in my dream Tennis Play.

(16.26) There are three stages which succeed each other in the way human beings look at life and the universe, first, ordinary materialism. This declares that there is nothing beyond the physical matter. The second stage says that the world is an idea. This is a higher step, but it is not final. The third stage the inquirer asks what is an idea, thus he

penetrates to the ultimate reality, summing up; stage one is confined to matter, stage two is confined to mind, stage three liberates man into reality of the Overself.

(16.27) The world exists in Me; it is made of Me; it is Me therefore. Only ignorance makes it seem separate, something different.

(16.28) If you constantly inquire into the nature of Brahman i.e. by discovering what is non-Brahman, you are negating and what are you doing in yoga? You are keeping away, i.e. eliminating all thoughts until in Nirvikalpa you negate all thoughts. The difference between both is vital however: the Vedantin inquires into the world and then regards it, arriving at Brahman ultimately: the yogi refuses to consider the world and therefore arrives at a mere cipher, nothing, blankness, for he has not refunded the world into Brahman.

(16.29) When you see the second thing and though seeing it know it to be none other than Brahman, then you get Gnana. On the other hand, Nirvikalpa Samadhi is the non-seeing of the second thing; hence cannot yield gnana, for the yogi does not see and does not know what the world is.

(16.30) When science seeks to classify things or to generalize them, what is it doing? It is unifying knowledge, it is unconsciously seeking unity. The human mind is always restless until it finds unity: hence it is always seeking general ideas, unification. The difference between the ass and man is that the former knows only variety whereas man can and does know unity, if in limited spheres. Thus science finds that diamond and lead-pencil, coal are all carbon, i.e. one and the same, i.e. unity. It is the ordinary animal sense which everybody possesses to see the duality and multiplicity in the world, but philosophy is needed to bring all this into oneness. Thus it justifies itself. When the ancient philosophers reduced all things to five elements, they were unifying.

(16.31) If there is direct cognition of Brahman in Samadhi why don't you go and sleep, for sleep and samadhi are the same? Knowledge of Atma only is true knowledge and not the absence of duality.

(16.32) The destruction of the world and Jiva does not mean that they should become imperceptible to the senses but there should arise a determination of their unreal nature; for if that were not the case, people may find emancipation without any effort on their part as during dreamless sleep and fainting. That Atma remains as the sole real factor, means that there should be a realization of Brahman as the sole unity and not a mere absence of the cognition of the world; otherwise there would be no such thing as emancipation in this life.

(16.33) If it is said that you get gnana in samadhi in which there is no duality, it is no better than sleep. If it be said that there is a direct cognition in profound contemplation in which there is no difference between the perceiver and the perceived and in which no duality can occur; then why not admit the same in deep slumber. If it be objected that there is no knowledge of the nature of Atman in deep sleep, then you admit that

knowledge of Atma only is true knowledge and not the absence of duality. That Atman remains as the sole real factor, means that there should be realization of Brahman as the sole entity and not a mere absence of the cognition of the world; otherwise there would be no such thing as emancipation in this life.

(16.34) That alone is called Truth which is a fact that can never be changed under any circumstances.

(16.35) The common bearing of truth is agreement with the fact. But what is agreement? How can you speak of one thing agreeing with another? The first theory, the idea (of the building) is a copy (of the building), a photograph and the person photographed. If you want to know that one thing is a copy of the other, you must have them together and see them both alongside. But can you see the tree and the copy of the tree? The Correspondence Theory is: the idea corresponds to the object. But how can you see the object and the idea and their correspondence?

(16.36) Ask a man who claims to know it, "what is the meaning?" If he gives as meaning, then he is wrong for he is in the realm of words, a meaning implies thought, word. Advaita is beyond reach of both. What you imagine is only imagination and not reality. Science begins to realize this by saying there is no such thing as matter, it is only a concept, and a concept is not reality.

(16.37) The God seen in vision by mystics is only a mental projection. He may be seen outside the mystic's body, may appear as a totally distinct figure, yet still be only imagined.

(16.38) Seeing nothing, having a blank in the mind, as in Nirvikalpa Samadhi is on a level with deep sleep for value. The objective world is in the mind and must be understood, and must be perceived to be understood.

(16.39) Man is not the creation of God; God is the creation of Man.

(16.40) No Hindu Sastric text says that Nirvikalpa Samadhi can get you gnana. It comes only after samadhi, using the latter as a preparation. Hence Patanjali's claim for realization through yoga is merely a bait to seekers to adopt his preliminary state, but it is not literally true. Yoga cannot give gnana. Those with weak minds tire soon and cannot keep up the concentrated inquiry into truth, the three states etc. without which you cannot see nonduality and their real meaning. Yoga helps you to keep out unnecessary ideas, hence it helps to keep up a train of concentrated thought. This is its value as preparation for Vedanta. Those who grasp quickly the Vedantic ideas, when explained to them have gone through their yogic disciplines (preparatory) in former lives. Hence I needed only a little yoga practice in this birth.

(16.41) By shutting your eyes in Samadhi you do not know the universe. Hence the universe can't be known as Brahman through yoga alone. You are in a non-dual condition in sleep or samadhi, One without a second, true, but you did not know it at the time. You

say only in the waking state afterwards. Hence there must be inquiry so that you find non-duality whilst you are awake, so that you can see nonduality at the time not afterwards. Hence too the need of inquiring into the universe and knowing it as Brahman whilst you are awake, and not during sleep or samadhi. When can you say there is no error in your knowledge? When you see all be beings in yourself; then there will be no doubt--says scripture. Hence you must see the beings and objects, if you are to see them in yourself. But sleep and Samadhi does not show them to you. Hence their knowledge is not perfect, not free from error and doubt.

(16.42) Dhyana Yoga--steadying and concentrating the mind--must be first performed. No other thought must interfere. This is done first, but after that you have to examine world and see it as unity through this sharpened insight: after dhyana (study of matter) you have to get Vijnana yoga in order to know this unity.

(16.43) When the yogi enters this highest Nirvikalpa (idea-less) samadhi, he will at once enter deep sleep. This will make plain to him after he wakes, that the inner self he sought and found, the Atman, is reached only when all his ideas are refunded into it, when there is then all the features of non-duality, one without a second. However the yogi must later wake up, emerge from samadhi and there is duality again, for world of objects confronts him. So now he has to work on the next stage which is to find consciously in the waking state the same non-duality that he unconsciously knew in sleep. This is done by learning that the world is idea, and then refunding the world-idea back into its source, Brahman. Only at this final stage dare he say "Atman is the same as Brahman." Now he knows it.

(16.44) Nirvikalpa has no duality, hence it cannot tell you about the universe. The yogi who emerging from samadhi and says he found Gnana there, says it to a second man, hence there is duality again. If he were a real Gnani, there would be nobody for him to tell that he had experienced Gnana.

(16.45) There are two different samadhis, philosophic and sahaja samadhi (this is the highest) in which you are in full wakefulness, and then you ask what is meant by this world, the world is seen in this sahaja samadhi. Whereas Yogic or Nirvikalpa samadhi, is just like swoon or deep sleep, where you are unaware of anything, not even the world. See Tattireya Upanishad and Panchadeshi regarding this.

(16.46) All yogic visions, however wonderful will pass away; they go as they come. They have the value of dreams. They are not truth which is unpassing and beyond change.

(16.47) We do not seek God in the quest; our only object is Truth. If we find that Truth happens to be God, all right, we must accept it; but we cannot pre-judge the issue.

(16.48) We are not opposed to God, we are not atheists, but we want God free from our or others's imagination, as He is in truth, as he exists apart from human imaginations. Imagined Gods cannot help us. We do not say God is not there, He is, but not as you imagine him. We want the God above all imaginations. THAT which exists as truth. Hence we do not use the word God. It will be misunderstood.

(16.49) The mystic who talks of finding himself in other forms thereby acknowledges that there is otherness, that other exists whereas the Gnani knows only the One.

(16.50) So long as we are speaking we are in the world of duality: so long as we cease to speak, we are in non-duality. Advaita means silence; no system of doctrine exists in that silence. But the study and speaking of Advaita is helpful so long as we have not reached wisdom. Advaita means philologically "not-two", the absence of a thinker and a thought. He who thinks there is a God separate from him, cannot get truth. Show a hot poker to a Jew, or Gentile, man or cow, child or woman and all will shrink saying in union, "I shall be burnt." This illustrates nature of truth, which is same for all people and as uncontradictable as that red-hot poker burns all people. This shows that truth is characterized by Universality, i.e. non-duality.

(16.51) Brahman can be realized as it is. Otherwise all this teaching would not have been given in Mandukya.

(16.52) It is the attachment to the form of separate objects which keeps you from apprehending their unity, not the seeing of them. How to think of both form and essence? By practice you must get to the stage where you can think of both simultaneously. This is done by knowing that the form is made of mind only. This requires sharp intelligence and constant repetition of practices of seeing both form and essence at the same time.

(16.53) False and true knowledge exists only when you talk in the ordinary way: when you know the truth, however, such classifications can not arise because everything is then known to be the Mind and no questions of where and how or why can arise.

(16.54) When Vedas say: "That thou art" the meaning is that you must make an effort to know the Brahman. Atman is there always. You have got it, there is nothing new to be acquired, only have the sharp brain to see and understand it, when told about it. But there is a difference between understanding and realization. Effort is required for this understanding only, whereas once understood no special effort is needed to remember your understanding: until then you only have an idea of Atman, you only partially understand it. But once you thoroughly grasp what it is and that all these things are Atman, you will then constantly find it present everywhere without further effort, because you will perceive Brahman by understanding, even in the midst of worldly existence. For when there is only one thing (Atman) known, there is nothing to change, nothing to appear or disappear; when you speak of remembering or forgetting Atman that implies you believe in the existence of something else, i.e. a second thing, which is to be remembered. That would show you have not known that all is one. But knowing it, there is no second, consequently no intermittent perception of Atman, but a permanent effortless understanding that it alone is.

(16.55) When you get a glimpse of truth try to repeat it a number of times in order to establish it. This is the meaning of Gita sentence: "The self must raise itself by the Self."

(16.56) The initiation of silence of Dakshina-moorti is the very final stage. Beginners and intermediates must be helped by speech and discussion. Only after they have been through the inquiry of reasoning and vichara are they ready for "silence" which corresponds to "deep sleep."

(16.57) When you say all these are imagination, you want to attain to a state when you can negate all ideas and imagination--one thorn pulling out the other thorn and both thrown away--that is the whole of Vedanta, and hence "think much, speak less, write much less" as a tip against misleading others.

(16.58) I differentiate between a philosophical system and a philosophical truth. The former can evolve or change; the latter is ultimate and final.

(16.59) There are two distinctions in logic: (1) contraries: Thus "All men are mortal." The contrary to this is "No men are mortal." (2) "Contradictories": "Some men are mortal" is the contradictory. The ultimate truth is non-contradictory, not non-contrary.

(16.60) Do not confuse the two factors (a) the capacity to understand which matures after constant reasoning (b) the truth or knowledge of the world which arises from applying this capacity to the world. This capacity is often what is meant by 'intuition' or by 'insight.' When Buddha used the latter word this is what he meant too.

(16.61) The word One is not understood anywhere except in Indian Vedanta. One always means two when analyzed. Hence the Upanishads are careful to show they do not mean this monism, but "One without a Second" i.e. Advaita. No Western philosopher has seen this point. Monism is really pseudo-monism, i.e. duality.

(16.62) Make your mind capable of grasping the doctrine of unity; then when it is expounded to you, you may grasp it in an instant. The long discipline is entailed by this preparation of the mind; the understanding of truth may be swift as a lightning flash. However this glimpse must thereafter be practiced continuously throughout the day until it is permanently stabilized. The glimpse was the truth, and if it was genuine, this truth can never be forgotten.

(16.63) The limitations and illusions of the world I have not seen anyone else impose on my mind. Therefore I must conclude that they are self-imposed. I am infinite but in dream I impose the limitation on myself in the form of a tiger which I see there but which is only my mind, i.e. myself. Similarly in waking I impose other limitations in the form of other objects and persons, we are all really Me. Therefore constantly reflect and practice this exercise: viz. "I am not limited by the body, I am unlimited." Do not confine yourself to your own body.

(16.64) Associate the idea of Brahman with all your activities--eating, working, pleasure. Do this as a 24-hour daily exercise, practice. This is Gnana yoga. You must not think "I am Brahman" and then regard your food as non-Brahman. You must practice every minute the gnana yoga "I am only the witness, the seer, of all these things." With one true

Vedantic idea remove all false idea, then throw both ideas away and lay hold of that which is beyond all ideas. This is Gnana yoga practice. Till this chapter, this is what we have been doing, now the time has come to discard all Vedantic ideas and realize Brahman, which cannot be described by thoughts or words.

(16.65) Why is Brahman beyond speech? Because whenever you use a word, it implies a meaning, a thought. When you get a thought, there must be a witness of the thought apart from it. The thought is not, cannot know and does not grasp its witness.

(16.66) The final stage of Vedanta Path is called realization because it involves making real to oneself the ideas already studied, i.e. to experience them as such.

(16.67) Ask any professor of philosophy what is the meaning of ONE or whether ONE exists, and invariably he will give the wrong answer. He does not know that One cannot exist, it will always be two (the person who thinks of it and the idea of it, both thinker and thought, seer and seen) and that therefore the ultimate is not Monism but not-two i.e. non-duality. ONE is not monism but duality!

(16.68) Ignorance manifests itself as imaginations, ideas.

(16.69) The notion that it is true that intuition is used by the highest men but it is really insight, matured after constant reasonings, is incorrect. There is no insight needed because the Brahman is always there. When the clouds pass the moon is seen. No insight will reveal the moon of truth, only the passing of the clouds of ignorance. Hence there is no intuition or insight to be gained or matured, only a removal of something which obstructs. Were there is something to be 'seen' by insight, then it would be a false Brahman which is "without a second."

(16.70) To critic who objects of what use is a characterless abstract Brahman, we reply: "You start with presumption that there must be a use; you are a worshipper of God use; we however are primarily concerned only with whether it is true, and we want truth, whether it is going to be useful to us or not."

(16.71) The practical method which leads to realization is the incessant inquiry into reality, and the continual reminder that all, including yourself, is Mind, not body, pursued in and through the daily experience of life. This practice must go on for a long period until it becomes second nature, ingrained. Then it matures into realization.

(16.72) The individual does not exist in Advaita. Hence we do not assert that our own system is true and others false: such a statement is the expression of egoism. We say that at such a stage A is true, at another stage B is true, etc. Thus we do not cling to any particular opinion, we are neither attached nor repelled by any system of opinion.

(16.73) The Vedantic use of term omniscient differs from the theological. For us it means "knowing everything to be Brahman"; for them it means that God knows what is

happening everywhere or that he knows how to make U-boats and every thing else in the world.

(16.74) The opposition of practical and philosophic viewpoints is irreconcilable only at the beginning, when we have to effect a tentative separation of Drg from Drsyam. But later on in our study both are reconciled when the drsyam on deeper enquiry turns out to be nothing other than the Drg. Again so long as the drsyam is considered only as such, causality must be held as true of it, but when it is eventually merged into the Drg, then causality is seen to be inapplicable to it, because then it is seen to be the Drg. At this last stage which is the Gnani's, there is no such thing as two viewpoints to be held simultaneously because they are opposed to each other; both are united in him because he has united all things, as Brahman. The continued and unremitting practice of regarding the world as an idea must go on, until it becomes your very nature. Then only does theory become realization.

(16.75) The Tibetan definition of non-dual as meaning neither of the two alternatives, such as "existence" nor "non-existence," is correct only so far as your intellectual conceptions go but not as an actuality or reality.

(16.76) Truth is completely unified knowledge.

(16.77) Any written description or verbal reference to Supreme Reality can only be your imagination about it: hence the great Bhava kept silent when asked to tell of the Brahman. Silence is the only correct way of speaking of It!

(16.78) The highest is to feel that the universe is myself, this is Gnana. To say the universe is in myself is not the highest. A man enjoys natural samadhi when he attains truth, not the sleep samadhi of the yogi.

(16.79) The real secret of Gnana yoga is that it is a continuous practice of enquiry whereby you try to eliminate all those ideas and objects which constitute the field of awareness, from the awareness itself. That is why it is called Gnana Yoga. That element of awareness which is contained in all ideas etc. is what you should seek. It is the unlimited element, not that which is limited to a particular thought or thing. Therefore we do not use the term consciousness because that implies being conscious of something, of a second. Even then, awareness is not quite the precise term, but there is no fit word available. Hence Upanishads describe this state as indefinable, unseparable and indescribable.

(16.80) By constantly inquiring all the 24 hours into the nature of Brahman, you will also automatically get the control of all ideas, imaginations, emotions, etc. without practicing yoga.

(16.81) If Brahman is beyond thought and speech, why study books or listen to lectures on Advaita? Reply: On the principle of using one thorn to prick another out of the flesh and then throwing both away, we use these books and lectures to remove wrong thoughts,

misleading words, to get rid of erroneous assumptions about Brahman, thus removing our ignorance.

(16.82) Kena Upanishad gives the illustration of the lightning-flash of Gnan vanishing from view instantly. However this flash has to be repeated many times perhaps hundreds, until it becomes stable and a steady fixed light. Zen Satori is not the same, because based on intuition, and hence not proved by reason and therefore open to each man's misinterpretations. This illumination comes only after constant and frequent reflection, thinking; hence the futility of Yoga to achieve it. Even the first single flash of understanding is true Gnana, but it has passed away, and you must seek its repetition constantly by such reflection until the light stays fixed and does not depart. However even after the first illumination, you will never be mistaken again for you will understand the true nature of things; although the permanent conviction may have to be established when you imagine a Brahman, there is both imagination and you--a duality. Thus you only get a thought in return--no more. You must keep alive the insight no matter what you are doing. This demands constant concentration throughout the day--not merely sitting to meditate for half hour. This flash is an absence of thought, like conscious sleep, where duality disappears. The first flash is the beginning of realization and gradually ripens into full realization. The process is to associate the insight gained by the first flash with everything that you do--eating, working, talking,--with Brahman until it becomes settled realization. You repeat what you saw in the first flash by associating it at every moment henceforth--"This is Brahman, that is Brahman, this is Brahman etc."

(16.83) Nonduality ascertained by reason or after enquiry is alone Truth; and not the nonduality which you get through sleep, chloroform, yoga etc. The non-duality must be perceived in the waking state, by a sharpness of reason, of thinking--that moment in the waking state in which you know that the three states, waking dream and deep sleep are only states (coming and going), it is knowledge. By non-duality we mean, even when there is duality, to know that there is only one thing, mind (as in dream) or Atman, in waking state, after enquiry.

(16.84) In Asparsa yoga there is no second thing to be in touch with. If you realize Brahman you will know that there is no other to be in contact with. --If you know Brahman, you know it is Brahman. All other systems deal with duality.

(16.85) You must go on eliminating until all duality goes. Seeking yoga is the practice of Neti, Neti, not seeking the positive Brahman.

(16.86) Liberation (Moksha) is not something to be got after death, it means liberation from ignorance whilst alive.

(16.87) Truth is where no human mind can ever think of contradicting not merely my mind alone; where there is no thought, no other being: no thinking, no second; that is nonduality. There is nothing to be said about it; not even that we exist there, not even that happiness and peace are there.

(16.88) How can there be any discussion, any difference of view in a state where there is nobody else to argue with you or to oppose you. That is non-duality. How can any question arise?

(16.89) We must get at the truth without imagination. All the philosophies of the world are based on imaginations and hence they contradict each other. Let a thousand persons imagine in a thousand different ways, but where is the proof? Each one hugs what he imagines to be true. Even the Void being a mental idea is also an imagination. You do not get truth because you are attached to particular peculiar ideas. Attachment is the root of all evil.

(16.90) To say that a thing exists, there must be a second to say so or a mind to know it, or a witness. This is objection made to making verbal statements about nonduality. Why you say "My ideas are gone", "My memory of youth is gone", "My childhood is passed" how could you know this unless there were something to say so. You must have been aware of a thing's or thought's nonexistence, otherwise you could not say that it has come. On the same principle pleasure must co-exist with pain and you could form no understanding of one without the other. You must have white to know the meaning of black. The mind cannot think except by differentiation. Hence mystic says "I have achieved Ananda." It merely means that you have got something different from what you have already got, hence when we say that no second thing exists we are positing that a knower existed and then there is no non-duality, as when we awake from sleep.

(16.91) When we talk whether in affirmation or negation, to make a statement about nonduality we imply the existence of one who says so. Only when nothing is said, (silence) is there nonduality.

(16.92) Truth will eventually conquer, as mind evolves, because all its substitutes will break down through their defects, but it will take a long time.

(16.93) It is called Gnana Yoga because the practice of discriminating between thought and reality must be kept up for many years until it becomes habitual. This must even be pursued until the sense of the ideality of the world persists even amid earthly and personal sufferings.

(16.95) It is absurd to characterize Advaita as a negative philosophy because of its non-dualism, for it posits by negating, and declares all this to be Brahman hence it is not nihilism. "Everything is Brahman" is only one aspect of Vedanta: there are two aspects, the other being Neti, Neti: the latter is negative because we cannot reduce Brahman to words, but the former is surely positive.

(16.96) When the gnani sees the outer forms of a book like others he does not and cannot reject the form; for he knows immediately it is mind and Brahman. He has trained his mind to couple both together instantaneously. There is thus no conflict in his mind.

(16.97) The Gnani thinks of both the individual personality he sees and the Brahman that is in him: this is non-duality. He does not stop seeing John Smith, his nose ears etc. but with all that he knows the Brahman from which John Smith is inseparable. This is difficult to grasp, it is done by repeated practice over years; as Gnana yoga; had it been easy we need only to read a text book of Vedanta and millions would now have been gnanis.

(16.98) For one second or one minute you may attain glimpse of Gnana, but only he who has disciplined and practiced can make it a permanent part of his nature.

(16.99) Men may know Vedanta intellectually but they may still have their weaknesses, they still need to become fully convinced to the utmost: therefore realization of its truth comes gradually.

(16.100) It is not enough to grasp the intellectual truth of non-duality; you must next fix your mind continually in it. i.e. you will get in glimpses at first but you must not rest there; you should stabilize them through constant reminder that the world is not separate from yourself, in order to become a gnani. Knowing the Atman to be non-dual is first stage, realizing it as such is second stage.

(16.101) The higher meditation comes at the stage after meditation at fixed hours has been practiced and mastered. Then this is given up for self-recollectedness to be done throughout the day wherever one is and without fixed times. That is the secret. It is Gnana-Gnosis.

(16.102) The definition of truth according to Vedanta is nonduality.

(16.103) The Advaitin does not set up any position of his own because he knows non-duality to be truth and hence cannot differ from others whom he regards as himself, but shows the inconsistencies of all other positions. He sees the whole universe in himself, as in a dream with the same mind existing in all, so how could he quarrel with anyone.

(16.104) What is the difference between Atman and Brahman? When you dissolve all the world into ideas and then the ideas into yourself, knowing they are ultimately in you, that is Atman. When you actually see the universe before you and know that it is the same as yourself, that is Brahman. When you are dreaming and know that the dream pictures of cities friends etc. are yourself, that is Brahman. We have first to pass through the stage of discovering Atman and then only can we attain the stage of discovering Brahman. Nevertheless it must not be thought that the two are different both Atman and Brahman are one and the same thing but viewed from two different angles.

(16.105) The nature of truth is to be free from contradictions. We approach nearer and nearer truth as we find less and less contradictions. The only thing which is so free is non-duality.

(16.106) Wherever there is impermanence and transiency, there is necessarily duality. But that which knows these things are passing away, that is the pure non-dual consciousness.

(16.107) The lightning-flash actually eliminates the ego but it lasts for the minutest fraction of a second only; it is a kind of deep sleep in the midst of waking state, a return to the Unconscious. For the rest of the day it is of course impossible to eliminate ego, for we have to attend to personal affairs. Hence what we have to eliminate then is the attachment to ego.

(16.108) Philosophical thinking leads ultimately to the understanding that there IS something behind thought, the Witness itself. That is, there are two factors in thinking, the idea or object and the awareness or consciousness which is the thinker of the idea. Philosophy leads us to discover this latter factor and in this sense leads us to Truth. Even Reason itself has to go in non-duality.

(16.109) The stages of teaching Advaita are (1) to reduce multiplicity to unity by reducing everything to mind. This is Idealistic Monism. (2) To ask what is this One, and to proceed to Nonduality, Brahman.

(16.110) When you want to know what wood is, you have mentally to negate the names and forms of table, chair or door. This negation is an abstract affair, for the table, chair and door still remain, they do not physically disappear. In the same way if you want to know Atman you have mentally to negate all names and forms of objects but the objects do not actually disappear.

(16.111) Every thought as thought is known only by distinguishing it from its opposite. Pleasure (Ananda) implies pain. This is what Gita means by saying we must rise above the pairs of opposites, i.e. we must rise above the dualities inherent in thinking into nonduality. This is the real meaning of Advaita.

(16.112) If there are two entities there will be differences between them. If there are two persons, or even individual and God, there will be difference of opinion. Hence truth can only exist in non-duality. Hence the work of philosophy is to remove wrong ideas about truth from the mind and to remove duality from the outlook.

(16.113) All such terms as change, non-existence, eternal, etc. imply each other. Hence they are only ideas, mental constructions. Any word used will only be an idea that covers the Atman and does not reveal it. They will only keep people in the realm of discussion although it is quite necessary for practical truths which can never grasp reality; for it yields only thoughts, i.e. drsyam and is necessarily devoid of reality. All discussions of the nature of the Highest are mere imagination.

(16.114) "Duality ceases to exist"--means duality as two separate realities ceases to exist. Duality still exists but the knower knows that they have not got separate existence in Reality, i.e. the duality has not got existence separate from the only ultimate reality.

Unless you get at truth by inquiry, you have to take it for granted that there is duality (e.g. distinction between teacher and taught.)

(16.115) Karma doctrine is irrefutable for those who believe in causality, i.e. for ordinary people and scientists. We see in this world that every action brings results, that even if you escape now from the consequences of telling a lie the time will come either in this birth or another when you must suffer for it. But those who have given up belief in causal law because they rise to ultimate, karma can also be given up.

(16.116) Non-Duality means not the non-existence of a second thing, but its nonexistence as other than yourself. Mind must know it is of the same substance as the objects.

(16.117) Truth is possible only in duality when there is both a knower and a known. Hence truth is your idea of a thing. Reality is the fact, the thing itself. Truth is used for communication about the reality. Ultimate truth, beyond all doubt and contradiction, can only be not your idea but the Reality itself. Hence ultimate truth and ultimate reality are one and the same.

(16.118) How can we know that God is everywhere? It is not possible. Now what is God? It has no meaning for me. It is a mere sound to me. This Atman is the seer. We cannot prove the existence of any God which is everywhere apart from Atman.

(16.119) Knowledge of Atma only is true knowledge not the absence of duality. Knowledge cannot destroy the world.

(16.120) Gnan requires constant looking into one's own mind, examining one's own thoughts, testing if they lead to truth, widening one's sympathies, identifying with whole world, and all this must be done for a long time, for it grows slowly.

(16.121) When you get convinced, certain, of the truth that the world is nothing but Brahman, that there is no second thing, no egos, that very moment you become Brahman.

(16.122) See what is between two ideas. When you catch the mind between the two ideas "horse--ox" then you catch the non-dual, but the mind should be sharp enough to do it.

(16.123) You have to practice thinking that you are neither the doer nor the enjoyer, and thus you will gradually realize a state where whatever is seen is only Atman.

(16.124) The occasional "lightning-flash" glimpses are not enough. They must be stabilized. The yogi may get such glimpses but only in the gnani are they stable.

CHAPTER 17: PRACTICAL PHILOSOPHY

(17.1) The problem of evil, pain and suffering exists whilst we do not perceive that everything is Mind, unity, and particularly whilst we regard the body as real. It is insoluble so long as the body is taken to be real. But when you see the body is only an

idea and that the reality is Mind, then the suffering merges into this mind. Like all ideas the idea of body disappears back into the mind and really was the mind all the time. Constant practice is needed to instill the outlook that everything is one, Mind, none other than it, not a separate thing from it. When this is done the body is not thought of as being different from Mind and so its pain is regarded as you would regard the pain of a dream-body after you awaken. The reply to Joad's criticism that science reveals the existence of animal suffering long before human race appeared on the planet is that he over-looks that it is all Mind, and therefore in relation to oneself; we think this; they are ideas relative to us and inseparable from us. To think of suffering is to think of separate entities as being real and to forget that there is only One, Brahman, pure Mind.

(17.2) Why is Karma Yoga really based on Gnana yoga? Because, it is work without expecting return. If you do expect, then it means you have not separated yourself from the thing expected, i.e. duality. Also it teaches elimination of ego.

(17.3) Man ever seeks his happiness: this is quite natural. None--not even myself--is the exception to this rule. All must seek it in some form or other.

(17.4) He who has to go to Kailas to find peace, knows nothing of Vedanta. Any man in any place, if he has got the knowledge of truth can enjoy peace. Whether in palace or cave, he knows both to be illusions (ideas) and does not depend on such.

(17.5) Advaita is finally to be judged from the point of view of the life we lead and not mere words, the practical good it can do rather than abstract discussions, the reasoned ethical guidance it can give rather than dogmatic injunction.

(17.6) "If thou art ignorant perform action to purify the self. If thou art wise and knowest truth do thou perform action for the protection of the masses."--Shankara. It is because this attitude is lost that India has been ruined.

(17.7) The difference between religions, science, art, etc. and philosophy is that the former study only one aspect of life whereas philosophy studies the whole of life. The truth and test of this is the results we witness all around us today. Religion has failed to improve man's conduct towards his fellows of another religion. Science has turned warfare into massacre and so on. Philosophy however wants all the aspects of life and is comprehensive, and is everywhere, and wants all aspects to be considered costed and weighed. It says let us put all these aspects together, use scientific methods of proof, gain a synoptic view and know what life really is. Bacon said "Philosophy takes all knowledge for its province."

(17.8) Do not make the mistake of prescribing mere religion as a cure for the world grief, but point out that the only remedy is TRUTH and that the world is yet to find truth, and that only by honest enquiry can truth be found.

(17.9) If you want to know the higher philosophy you must give up both love and hatred, attraction and repulsion. But in the practical world and from the lower standpoint both are

essential, for you must hate vice and love virtue. From the ultimate standpoint, however, love is not possible without an implication of hatred, and vice versa. Both are logical opposites within a whole.

(17.10) Even eating vegetables is killing life, but it is one degree higher than meat-eating and hence preferable for seeker.

(17.11) "Balance" is the essential teaching of Vedanta. Thought must be balanced by action, solitude by service in society, Nature by cities.

(17.12) Spiritualism is true from the standpoint of ordinary man and material world, but false from the Vedanta standpoint. Waking world and dream world, material world and spirit world rise and fall together.

(17.13) Ordinary morality does not exist for Vedanta, neither virtue nor morality. Its test is the wide one of the benefit of the ALL, all life whether animal or human, of compassion to all.

(17.14) Truth rights negation, and implies absence of harmfulness, of contradiction and conflicts. Where it is present there alone is harmony, whether between husband and wife, Government and people, and nation and nation. This is the practical application of truth.

(17.15) REBIRTH: A man must be born a large number of times before he reaches satiety with worldly births.

(17.16) REBIRTH: Samskaras³¹ of the mind can lie buried deep for many years and then reappear suddenly into conscious life. Thus a man who met Swami Vivekananda for a few minutes and was apparently unaffected by it, had a vision of the Swami 20 years later and as a result gave up immoral life and donated much money to the Ramakrishna Ashram at Bombay. Explanation is that Vivekananda's more powerful mind did deeply plant some samskaras in the other man's but they lay in the subconscious for 20 years. It is really the same thing as samskaras appearing out of former births and manifesting in the present one.

(17.17) Transmigration means identification with one object at one time, with another at another time. Disappearing is an impossibility. Because it is always real, it never disappears. It is always Brahman and it cannot disappear, i.e. objects and ideas, the whole universe, how can they cease to be Mind (as dream objects) or Brahman. It cannot disappear, whether you see the dream mountain or if you do not see it, everything is mind. There is no such thing as going and coming.

(17.18) Highest ideal in Vedanta is to feel that the whole world is one, that if a man in England is harmed you feel with him.

³¹ latent tendencies, habits or complexes

(17.19) Philosophy is all-comprehensive and deals with the totality of life. It rejects nothing but asks, "What is the profound meaning and value of this dancing, this aesthetics, this religion, this science, this yoga, etc.? Why does this flower, music, sculpture give me pleasure? Each of them has their value, also its limitations, so philosophy will not limit itself to any one of them but views the whole.

(17.20) The Yogi shut their eyes, cut themselves off from the world and thus imagine they have destroyed misery. It is like getting rid of pain by taking chloroform. The yogi takes chloroform and is thus not aware of misery, but it to a temporary process, Gnana alone faces the misery, penetrates, understands and conquers it by knowledge.

(17.21) The wider a man's sympathies as the nearer he is to truth, the narrower his prejudices the farther from truth.

(17.22) The man who makes enquiry, questions everything. "What is pain, what is pleasure?" etc. He asks and finally sees that everything is Brahman, including both pleasure and pain. The Yogi however thinks that by making himself insensible to pain he avoids it. He gets into a kind of sleep which he calls Samadhi and thus removes pain temporarily. He shuts himself away from pain, whereas Gnani deliberately examines it.

(17.23) When I know all is Brahman I can help others who are suffering, because I consider him as myself. And consider that I am suffering in him. I see a second person, duality, but I know as a gnani that he is the same person as myself. If everyone sympathized with everyone else then gnana would have been universal. Gnani knows truth and always acts to help others whereas ordinary man may or may not help others. The Gnani knows all life is one, ignorant man does not, that is the difference between them.

(17.24) There is no opportunity to develop your character if you run away to a cave. The opportunity can come only when you have to deal with others, i.e. in society. Most of those who run away are seeking personal satisfaction and fall deeper into the ego by this absence of opportunity to uplift or unselfishly help someone; there must be a second person present i.e. in society, to permit you to unfold character.

(17.25) Happiness is not a characteristic of Atman for it is merely an idea, an imagination that comes and goes. It is only for beginners that we sugarcoat the pill of truth by saying that if you get Brahman you will be blissful. Later they will learn to seek truth for its own sake, irrespective of bliss or happiness.

(17.26) The reality is called "beyond suffering" because when you attain it, you have nothing more to be sorry for as everything will be known to be there in the Real, and cannot be lost.

(17.27) The existence of desire in man is a confession that he is seeking something outside himself. This proves he does not know the truth of his self, because there all is satisfied. The Atman-knowledge gives contentment.

(17.28) Non-duality alone is fearlessness and bliss. For even if there is God, there is a second, and you may fear that God will get angry with you. When all imaginations are taken away, there is only non-duality left. The best illustration is deep sleep, where there is no fear. So if you attain a state where there is no second, you attain bliss and fearlessness.

(17.29) If you think that eating and working are realities, separate from the Supreme Reality, then you are dualistic, and will shrink from Brahman. We do not deny them but say they too are Brahman.

(17.30) The Gnani's idea of service will comprehend that whilst he tries to relieve physical suffering, to remove ignorance is still higher and more necessary service.

(17.31) When you realize that the 'I' does not exist, then you cease to want anything for yourself, but you--may passionately, like Vivekananda, want it for the help of others.

(17.32) The real meaning of doctrine of non-violence is that if you harm others it is equivalent to harming yourself.

(17.33) Unless Vedanta promotes the well-being of ALL, it should be thrown away: this is the difference between it and all other philosophies. They may teach universal brotherhood, but this is quite different from the feeling of oneness in Vedanta. There are separate individuals in brotherhood but none apart in oneness, or identity.

(17.34) To learn by erring and suffering is the surest path to Truth.

(17.35) It is not enough to repeat Sanskrit wisdom like parrots, but it must be lived. And the highest test of it is the universal sympathy which it produces. The greater the true knowledge, the wider the sympathy, and as we rise higher, the less the distinctions which we make.

(17.36) The Gnani can kill a snake to save a threatened child and not incur karmic sin, because he will be acting without ego: it is being done for another, not for himself.

CHAPTER 18: ETHICS

(18.1) How can the question of altruistic sympathy rise when there is no second? This is the erroneous criticism of Vedanta made by some. They have not grasped it. For the student has to practice Vedantic ethics in order to realize Truth, and this means practicing oneness with others. The critic has confused the two standpoints, the practical and the philosophic.

(18.2) BIRTH CONTROL is ethically permissible, also by Sastras, but artificial abortion is sinful and unethical. Re Abortion: Once the living has made its appearance we have to accept the consequences and protect its existence. It will be making bad Karma to end its existence.

(18.3) No man in this world is perfect; do you mean to say that there are not many faults in me too. What we have to do is to weigh all the virtues as well as all the defects of a man's character, and then if there are more of the former, he is entitled to be called a good man. That is why I defended Duke of Windsor.

(18.4) The whole of ethics is based on the ego and its denial.

(18.5) Sin is private crime; crime is public sin. Sin may be merely mental whereas crime is active.

(18.6) Morality based on custom is relative. Hindu women who are even touched by the hand of a man regard it as immoral and are shocked--except among those modern girls who have thrown themselves into Western style of life. Western women are touched and held by different people during dances and they are not shocked but delighted.

(18.7) If you wish to test yourself and find what progress made, watch what happens in the presence of a great temptation, such as receipt of money, or meeting beautiful woman, as also at the advent of bad news, and note how you reflect. If you remain unaffected, then you have achieved mental equilibrium, and liberation from ego. If you are affected, then the 'I' is still there in you. To the degree that you pass this test you are achieving, realizing. A moment's anger you may have, but if immediately after you practice recollection and understand that it is the presence of the ego which causes anger then you will regain equilibrium. It is requisite for the seeker, however advanced he be, to practice this self-examination constantly, to ask himself, "Is it for the sake of the 'I' that I am doing this? Is it for the sake of the body I do this? etc.

(18.8) The enlightened man does not criticize or praise men, but he does criticize or praise actions. He does not speak ill of persons, but he must condemn or discourage or praise or support wrong or right actions. The ignorant however condemn or slander the persons concerned. For he must set an example and guide people into the paths of right action which are stages of discipline that will gradually lead them towards Brahman whereas wrong actions lead them away from Brahman.

(18.9) When Brahman is known you do not feel anything as duty, although you will do it. But the man who is still attached has the feeling of duty to be done.

(18.10) Vedanta teaches you to help others, not because their pains must necessarily be felt inside your own mind too, but because you are your neighbor--Tat Twam Asi, just as the tiger seen in dream is still your own mind.

(18.11) Love and compassion for all mankind is the result of finding truth.

(18.12) Philosophy is not different from life, or from the world. Unless you treat all persons equally, there is no philosophy. Hence it adopts the welfare of all world and

serves humanity. It is not merely a spinning of words. It is truth. The Gnani sees every object and person as of the same essence as himself, the Atman.

(18.13) If you think "I am a Jew, he is Gentile", again you prevent yourself from getting Gnana. Only when you put aside these distinctions and desires, can you obtain unity; otherwise you obtain only misery. This idea of harmony between all religions is not ours, because it presupposes the existence of different faiths, separate existences, which do not exist for the gnani, but which exist for the adherents of these faiths and consequently which prevent true genuine unity and harmony of mankind. So long as you have the idea of distinction you can have no real idea of oneness. Truth is impossible so long as you have multiplicity (Mandukya). The wife who feels completely for her husband's sufferings has begun the path of Gnana but she will achieve Gnana fully only when she feels the same for the whole world. The wider your sympathy, the greater your progress.

(18.14) Those who eat meat thereby reveal lack of sympathetic feeling for the slaughtered animals. Hence they can never arrive at full gnana because their sympathy is not truly universal; such a feeling is the result of or leads towards, true gnana, and it will not permit flesh-eating.

(18.15) In exact opposition to the ascetics I teach the earning, making and spending of money so that we may use it to help the deserving and to improve common welfare.

(18.16) Why do you feel sympathy with the sufferings of another person when you behold them? Why does a mother feel for her child? Why do you have pity on the persecuted? Answer: Because there is a common soul of all mankind, the Overself of P.B.³² which is the unity behind life.

(18.17) It is the idea of money which gives you happiness. If you have money in the Bank then it is the idea that money is there which brings happiness. It is not the money itself. Similarly it is only the idea of the loss of money which brings misery. But the Atman knows that ideas come and go, no idea can last for ever and hence it remains unruffled. "Neti, neti" means negating all ideas and nothing more. But death, prosperity, happiness, refer only to something seen i.e. an object, an idea. The Atman can in no way be changed, or be happy or suffer. It is always the same. These ideas of wealth, pains world etc. are all contained in the Atman, just as they are during deep sleep. Know this and thus be a Gnani and remain untouched by anything.

(18.18) Contrary to the ascetics I advocate marriage and the sharing of life with a partner.

(18.19) Character--all the virtues taken and coordinated--is the highest of values. For the power of good character lies in its influence to impress itself upon others. The development of character is of supreme importance in the scale of social values. Reliability of character is a thing which the world rightly appreciates.

³² Paul Brunton

(18.20) The vast universe was not directly created for man alone, but for all living things, although they are still evolving to human stage, and although man alone can know truth and although this knowledge is the chief end of man's life.

(18.21) Vedanta is utterly practical. It is not a matter of intellectual debate but of social life and death. It has the well-being of the whole of mankind at heart for its chief teaching is the oneness of all.

(18.22) The philosopher will know the limits of the pleasures of the flesh. He accepts them so far as they go, but he is under no illusion about their proper place and value. He will therefore make a good husband or lover without detriment to his philosophy.

(18.23) The growth of Vedantic social ideal of oneness is illustrated by change in method of bee-keeping. Formerly when time came to collect honey, a fire was lit and the bees smoked out, most of them falling suffocated and dead to the ground. Nowadays we are more humane and a different method is used which does not kill the bees. We are beginning to feel with and for the insects as well as for higher animals. That is practical Vedanta.

(18.24) Christianity's highest ideal looks upon another man as a brother, but Vedanta looks upon him as one's own self. Universal brotherhood is not the highest ideal, but identity.

(18.25) (1) First know what this world is. (2) Then see what sufferings are (3) Seek to free others from suffering. Nature herself is forcing nations to realize the Vedantic social ideal of equality, sameness in all, that united they stand, but divided they collapse. This ideal means that everything is Brahman.

(18.26) When you love anyone, whether your neighbor or your dog, it is Atman that you love. This is an ideal which we should seek to possess; and to the extent we can succeed in attaining it, we could be happier.

(18.27) Whatever happens to the wise, whether it be success or failure, pain or pleasure, he will think on every occasion that it is Brahman and thus lift himself above material experiences.

(18.28) Morality has no meaning when everything is One and consequently no question of a second person can arise. How could a Gnani think of injuring another man when he knows this other is not different from himself? All theories of ethics pale away before this lofty attitude.

(18.29) When the thoughts of wanting wealth or fearing to lose it come, think: "I am the indestructible, I am the One Self, I am the ever serene." This is given as an exercise to be practiced.

(18.30) So long as you believe illusory objects to be real, you will be attached to them. Thus when you see a woman, if you know she is only an appearance, a mirage, how can you become attached to her? It is when she is mistaken for what she is not, through ignorance of the Self, that you become entangled.

(18.31) Right action is really a matter of right understanding.

(18.32) There are four attitudes towards life (a) the lowest is the practical which seeks to make money out of it, (b) next higher the aesthetic, which seeks to extract emotional pleasure from it and which may be bracketed with religion, although the latter is frequently mixed up with the practical outlook in its prayers or expectations of being rewarded with material benefit for its piety: artists also sometimes mix pecuniary motives with art. (c) still higher the scientific which seeks the truth about it; while highest of all is (d) the philosophic which takes all these other attitudes the whole lot from point of view of truth. We say bring your practical experience, your artistic, religious and scientific experience and we shall value them all. This is the meaning of Vedanta saying that it wants "the truth of all those truths."

(18.33) When we say Vedanta seeks the welfare of all, that also includes myself. I also should be happy as much as other people.

(18.34) Vivisection from the Vedantic ethical standpoint is justified insofar as the lives or health of a few may be destroyed in order to save those of many, but as far as possible it should be avoided. On the same principle the profession of a soldier is justified because a limited number fighters are killed, to save the lives of millions.

(18.35) Vedanta aims at the welfare of all beings, not only human beings.

(18.36) What is the use of Advaita? It is only the discussion of empty words. Life cannot be separated from philosophy, and the latter if it is to have any value must have the greatest bearing on the former. Philosophy leads to something practical in life, in the world. For when you know there is no duality, that all human beings, all nations are one body (Mandukya) although differing as the fingers from feet on the same body, the welfare of the All will be sought in practical ethics. The mistake generally made is that Advaita means the wiping out of the world and mankind and your own individual self alone remaining. The truth is that the world remains for the Gnani, the Gnani wipes out nothing, he is the most practical of men, he still sees the All of multiple objects and men, but he sees also their Oneness, and their non-separateness from himself. He identifies himself with everything, every one, even animals, their sorrow is his sorrow; their happiness, his happiness and their well-being becomes his aim. The study of Advaita must be repeated until you are absolutely convinced, your actions will be the test or evidence of such conviction, which alone is realization.

(18.37) Every worldly happiness is something experienced; is a seen (Drshyam). All this "seen" ultimately merges in the Self; suppose you enjoyed the best fruits yesterday. What is that joy--an idea. Where did it go? Into the mind, i.e. into yourself. If you think it is a

joy separate from you, then you do not know truth. When you know everything is in you, not apart from you, then you have the unchanging happiness and are not perturbed or excited by the changes or worldly joy. To depend on any external object or person for your happiness is to depend on another, on a second, on duality. It is an imperfect and unreliable happiness for it may change or disappear at any moment. Only in Atman is perfect happiness i.e. sameness of mind.

(18.38) The wall or the woman is only the Atman, yourself: therefore you need not run after either. But when by inquiry and discrimination you know, realize, that whatever appears before you is only Brahman then it will not much matter what you do. For then you cannot turn away from Brahman. If, however, you think that a particular happiness is something different from what you have now, something new, a second thing, then it is not the Drg, the Atman, and you are lost. The Gnani says "Let me know the Brahman in all this."

(18.39) We cannot live without killing and causing some pain to something. Science knows this. Water contains millions of microbes, vegetables and fruits are living entities, even air has germs. However the virtue of being a vegetarian is this: Consciousness is more advanced in animals than in plants, hence where creatures are more conscious of their pain than others, we ought not to eat the former. There is a ladder of evolution in consciousness. Reaction to certain stimuli is greater in animals than in plants, science proves this. Because animals have a lower grade of development (than man): it is a question of causing the least pain.

(18.40) Do not think when I say the world is a dream or man but an idea, therefore both are to be ignored as empty. For much as a dream person seems to be real and you also seem real, both being on the same level i.e. you think others and yourself are real or unreal together. Therefore do not think your own body to be real, demanding food for it, and yet think that other's bodies are unreal, and their sufferings are not worth believing. This is error. A further point is that in dream all the friends you see and yourself are made of one stuff--Mind. Therefore the moment you make a distinction between yourself and another man there is no Vedanta. The goal of Vedanta is to see the other man's sufferings as your own. Because in dream all the scenes and all the people are made of the same essence as yourself, they are as real as you are, Whatever I am, you are. I cannot be dissociated from you, the whole world is one. Do not treat other people as mere ideas but your own self as real. If they are ideas, so are you. If you are real so are they. Hence you must feel for them all just what you feel for yourself.

(18.41) Although working selflessly for the welfare of others it is the natural fruition of attaining Gnan, still even the aspirant on lower stages must also strive to emulate this ideal because nobody jumps into selfless service in a single day, but he must keep on trying to practice it even whilst he is yet imperfect. Thus he is learning how to be a gnani.

(18.42) Even the Gnani must use his ego to fight or deal with wicked people who themselves manifest ego; thus he will use his own ego to remove another's ego, as one

uses a second thorn to pick out the first which is stuck in your flesh. But with harmless people he will not show ego.

(18.43) The gnani is neither elated nor depressed by the vicissitudes of fortune because he knows that everything is Atman, that in Reality he has neither experienced loss or gain, that everything is as it is, unchanged Brahman.

(18.44) In the earlier stage of Gnana Yoga, whenever the thought “rush to relieve his suffering” in order to overcome this feeling of duality by identifying yourself with the other person. In the advanced stage or ultimate realization of Gnana however, you do not see the suffering person as different from yourself, and therefore help is given as a part of yourself. He is Brahman, you are Brahman, and there is neither he nor you at this stage, although you see him still. It is like relieving pain of one finger when gnani relieves another's pain.

(18.45) What is the fundamental reason why we should control the senses? Because their characteristic is to make you think erroneously that the second thing is real, that the objects are real.

(18.46) The attitude towards action is to act as though your body were another's. You may have your I in your thinking, there is nothing wrong in that (see Ashtavakra); only you should know that the ego is only a thought, an idea just like the ego you have in dream.

(18.47) Men want to avoid adversity, peasants want to avoid rain at the wrong time, nations want to avoid war, ambitious men try to become rich as Croesus, but all these fail. Why? Such matters are not quite under our control. There is an element of inescapable fate, of iron necessity, about them. Even Krishna could not stop the Mahabharata war. The moral of this is, do not worry yourself over things you cannot control.

(18.48) Balanced life is a message of philosophy. It is called Samatva; i.e. equipoise.

(18.49) Sense-enjoyment will bring pain or reaction and thus bring about indifference eventually. The wise man knowing the objects to be unreal, maya, treats them with indifference in consequences too.

(18.50) Both the Gnani and the ignorant give in charity to the poor but the latter gives because he believes in duality and regards the poor as another person, whereas the Gnani gives because he regards the poor as himself.

(18.51) The craving to do good to others on the part of those even who are unphilosophical arises from the unconscious truth which underlies everything. The craving to injure others on the part of the brutal arises from the desire to get rid of trouble or suffering caused or thought to be caused by the enemy, i.e. the desire to get rid of duality: it is at bottom the same craving for non-duality as in the former case.

(18.52) Vedanta seeks not merely well-being of humanity but rather the well-being of all that exists.

(18.53) Every time you take a meal you are seeking to unify the food with yourself, to practice non-difference. This exists even in the practical world.

(18.54) Hatred is the very negation of oneness for it emphasizes separateness, hence it must be overcome.

(18.55) (46.11) Do what you are obliged by duty to do, it does not matter so long as you look upon the world as being only thought and within your mind.

(18.56) The notion that a Gnani should never get angry or never pretend to anger is erroneous. He may do so if it is not in his egoistic interest, if he sees harm is being done or if it is for the benefit of others. Krishna urged Arjuna to fight, even to slay.

(18.57) There was a philosopher near Nasik. A dog came, stole a piece of his bread and ran away. The man ran after him for a long distance down the road. People stared, thinking that he had gone mad through too much Vedanta. After a long chase, he caught the dog, opened its mouth and took away the piece of bread, Then he produced a pat of ghee he was holding in one hand, smeared the bread and put it back in the dog's mouth, saying: "We are one. What I have is to be shared with others. I always take butter with my bread. So you must have some on yours too. For we are one Atman."

(18.58) Critic objects that Hitler may have read Gita's statement that killing bodies is not really killing! Hence he can justify his actions so. Reply: This is mere pedantry, juggling with words, non-application of the great truth of Vedanta that all Mankind is one.

(18.59) Compassion should be shown to all creatures even worms; do them no harm, if possible.

(18.60) Why does a parent love the child? Why do crows call each other when feed is about? What does this sympathy mean? All this shows there is an actual trend toward oneness.

(18.61) In our experience so long as the ego desires a thing, it may not come. If however you give up the desire and forget it you are to that extent giving up the ego. And then the Universal Mind not infrequently brings you the very thing that was formerly desired. There seems to be a mysterious connection or law behind this. For we see it in the subconscious solving problems later which conscious mind gives up in despair and dismisses.

(18.62) The other persons are yourself; you cannot injure others without injuring yourself, this is philosophically true and works out empirically true also through Karma.

(18.63) The man who is still believer in multiplicity, who is still held by the sense of differences, will always condemn or strive with others. But the sage who sees non-difference alone never condemns or strives with others for he sees them as himself.

(18.64) There is no end in this world to desire. Satisfaction can come only from being satisfied with Brahma-knowledge which puts an end to all desires. All other desires are followed by further ones.

(18.65) Ethics admonishes men to subordinate the ego from a practical standpoint, but only philosophy explains why man should do so, for it proves that ego is unreal, passing away every moment.

(18.66) The questions of optimism and pessimism have meaning only from some individual's standpoint. Those who are getting on very well in life will naturally favor optimism.

(18.67) There is no real freedom for those who believe in God for their morality is based on doing what God is supposed to communicate through conscience or otherwise; hence they are not free. Nor is there freedom for those who base their ethics on pleasure for they are compelled by their desires to seek pleasure.

(18.68) The sage will live as he pleases, above codes but this does not mean he will do wrong, harm others or cause suffering. For his self-identification with them will prevent this.

(18.69) The gnani feels no difference whether he is approached by an exceedingly beautiful woman or by a dirty ugly old woman; he will be mentally the same, undisturbed, neither attracted in one case nor repelled in the other. This is because his analytical insight has become perfect and because he sees non-duality in all. To desire sex is to seek a second thing which is ignorance.

(18.70) What is it you can renounce? Everything is Brahman. You can only give up Brahman: Hence the gnani is above renunciation.

CHAPTER 19: KARMA

(19.1) The full truth about Karma doctrine can only be known when it is studied from two aspects, the lower and the higher. The lower aspect is that which relates to the individual, whereas the higher relates it to the whole of mankind. Let us compare the individual person to a finger. Suppose you cut and poison the finger. The poisoned finger sends by its blood circulating all over the body, poison thus affecting harmfully the heart, the head and other organs. Why should thus other bodily parts suffer through no fault of their own, through the existence of the finger? The reply is that because the body is a unity composed of constituent parts, no constituent in this unity can be injured without ultimately injuring the rest. In precisely the same way the acts of an individual affect not only himself, but also his family, his community, his nation and ultimately all mankind,

because he and all other human beings constitute one great family. Just as the condition of the finger cannot be scientifically considered apart from the condition of the rest of the body, so the condition of any individual human being cannot be properly considered apart from the rest of mankind. All form one family, one organization in which smaller and larger unities are reacting continuously on other unities, just as at Hassan we saw an illustration of this double working of Karma. Years ago the forest trees in Hassan District were cut down. As a direct consequence the rain fall has now failed. This again has led to the failure of the crops for animal and human consumption. This again led to the deaths of thousands of cattle through lack of both fodder and water as well as starvation for thousands of peasants. This physical calamity arose out of the mistake performed many years ago by earlier generations in cutting down too many trees. Thus the present generation has had to suffer for the mistakes of an earlier generation, showing that the humanity of the present epoch cannot be artificially separated and considered. The unity is like a flowing stream which moves through past present and future and retains its own self-hood. The suffering of peoples through their own epoch should teach us the truth of unity of all men because we feel for the sufferers. At such a time as at present the universal Karma has given us the opportunity to be born in order to go to the relief of the sufferers so that instead of selfishly bemoaning our own fate, we can look upon our troubled time as an opportunity for service of the rest of mankind, who are none other than our own self. Another illustration may be taken from contemporary events. Hitler said that he had raised out of degradation and misery in which he found Germany. If that be true, then the wealthier countries like England and France who permitted this degradation to exist could have avoided their indirect responsibility for the appearance of Hitler. It is useless for them to say that the poverty of Germany was her own affair, for the law of universal Karma will not permit them to separate themselves entirely from other nations. They should have gone to the help of Germany and then the necessity for Hitler would not have occurred. Now they have to fight a bitter war to crush Hitler and even though they will probably succeed in doing so, nevertheless they will have to bear heavy loss and burden which war necessarily brings. Thus their Karma punishes them for neglecting to go to the assistance of Germany before Hitler arose. Thousands of others can be taken from history showing that we are all linked together and cannot afford to stand apart selfishly from the misfortunes of others.

(19.2) Our circumstances and characters must be traced to causes in a world unseen unknown and hidden from us: we can't help that. But the causes must have been there, pre-existent.

(19.3) Karma is a scientific hypothesis, as scientific as any other accepted by science. We find ourselves born with certain mental characteristics and capacities. We cannot see how they were acquired. We see everywhere in life that every effect has a contributing cause, that every point has been reached by prior evolution. Therefore we say that the ego must have come from somewhere, in a manner unknown to us, where it had previously existed and evolved.

(19.4) If we rise higher, we see that the bondage of Karma is due to our own will; that we can negate that Karma and become free.

(19.5) Karma doctrine is reconciliation between freewill and necessity; it puts the two together by saying your present has been determined by your past acts. Thus there is free will but it is within the limits of determination. But it does not attribute present conditions to any God: it does not shirk responsibilities. Man has got certain freedom and certain limitations.

(19.6) Philosophy tells us that the world is imagined, your body is idea. Therefore you create the world. This creation is Karma.

(19.7) The last thoughts and subconscious tendencies of the dying will help to determine the nature of next body.

(19.8) Predestination really includes free-will. The two seem different only when we adopt different points of view. But everything in this paramarthic world is pre-determined because everything is causally linked together. The only true freewill is rising above causality, karma, altogether. Absolute freewill, for ordinary individuals is an illusion.

(19.9) Karma is just as much applicable to mental as to physical acts, to thoughts as to deeds.

(19.10) There are two aspects of Karma (1) for the sufferer, an opportunity to understand that his woes are self-earned karma and to be careful not to create bad karma, and (2) for others, an opportunity to come to help the sufferers. This explains why we are born today in troubled times (1) to get rid of much bad Karma (2) to have more opportunity to be of service to others.

(19.11) The idea that if you do wrong God will punish you, is anthropomorphic. Just as one man punishes another for ill-doings so we transfer the same characteristic to our notion of God. Religion transplants ordinary human qualities to supernatural beings whereas Karma removes all need of this anthropomorphism.

(19.12) Anadi=beginningless. This is how karma and the individual soul's origin are regarded. Science also says now you cannot say when consciousness came into man. If you say he evolved from plant to animal thence to man, we now know that even plants have consciousness. This is the same as the doctrine of Anadi, which confesses that we do not know when or if things had a beginning.

(19.13) Karma has been much misunderstood because it was interpreted by an outlook based on the reality of the ego and in ignorance of the Atman being the Sole Existent. So long as we apply it only to individuals and not simultaneously to society, so long we do not grasp it correctly. For there are two kinds of karma: Individual and Collective. What an individual does reacts inevitably on society, but may or may not react upon himself outwardly as a separate individual. A mother's conduct reacts upon her infant's welfare whilst the infant's conduct reacts upon the mother's welfare; the two cannot be separated; in addition, there may or may not be the reaction upon oneself outwardly although there

is always the reaction on one's own mind. Consequently karma means that one's acts will always affect others and therefore we should be careful about them just as they will somehow affect oneself too. Even if an individual escapes the physical effects of his evil actions (he can never escape the mental effects and they, as tendencies, will lead him to reproduce the same causes again and again until the physical effects are certain to catch him eventually if only on the mathematical law of chances) he will have injured society by his evil-doing. Into this same society he will sooner or later have to be reborn and thus he will have to suffer its defects or limitations to the making of which his former acts contributed! In this way, he reaps as member of society what he escaped from reaping as an individual. The gnani, however having dismissed the illusion of causality, dismisses karma with it as an illusion too. For him karma is of no use or purpose because he will never injure others for he regards them as himself, but as he has a duty to help the society around him to progress he will certainly confirm their belief in karma, until such time as it can rise to the height of philosophy when he can reveal the truth and when they will automatically be good because of the higher knowledge of mankind's unity. The highest lesson of karma, in the practical world is also its introduction to the understanding of karma philosophically; and that is to show (how) interdependent all humanity is, how every act spreads like a ripple to affect others born or still unborn, and how we are all one family and in injuring or benefiting the family we injure or benefit ourselves, either indirectly or directly, either now or later. The Karma doctrine has value only up to the scientific world, but in the highest flights of philosophy it has to be discarded along with its twin--causality. Take the case of 90 children drowned by German sinking of British ship. What benefit can these children have derived from such Karmic retribution? They are too young to understand the purpose of their suffering and so derive no benefit from it. Such doubts must arise and with them will come the beginning of philosophy as doubts have arisen to science about causality. Both causality and Karma are useful in practical world but untrue in highest philosophy. Why? Because Karma will then be found to be only an idea, i.e. an imagination. The children will be seen as ideas too for then all will be seen as One. The children's suffering will be ideas; they will be in oneself, their death will not be meaningless for they will go on living in oneself, as other forms i.e. ideas. Nobody and nothing, living or inanimate, exists or can exist alone. All are either dependent or linked with others. A baby is utterly unable to live without help from others--its parents; similarly every individual human being is in some way or other tied up in fate and fortune with society. Hence Karma has a philosophic purpose which reveals itself when its practical purpose breaks down when doubt arises about Karma's justice or usefulness in such cases.

(19.14) It is not possible to go with a man to the next world and then to return with him to this world again in a new body. How then can anybody know, prove the subsequent reincarnations of any individual? Hence all such stories are mere speculation. Those who speak of reincarnation and karma, without introducing science to show the continuity of matter and energy in various forms, are dealing only in religion, not truth.

(19.15) When you know that world is mental construction, that Mind builds the body idea, you will know that death does not end life for the mind will go on building further body-ideas by its thought, i.e. re-incarnating. This is a scientific proof of rebirth.

Moreover science now says that you cannot distinguish Mind from matter, just as it earlier said you cannot distinguish matter from energy. Therefore when you go to the root of the matter, you always find non-duality at the end.

(19.16) Life is really a perpetual effort to get rid of sorrows, troubles, wants and desires! Hence each bliss is really their removal, but it is a never-ending process if philosophy is not practiced.

(19.17) Wherever possible use science as the basis for all teachings for illustrations and proof, particularly making use of the Theory of Evolution in its application to the idea of Rebirth with the ideal of ultimate perfection at the end, using Huxley's favorable statement on the Theory of Rebirth.

(19.18) Evidence of Rebirth: Consciousness is a stream of continuity. It must have come from somewhere before birth of body: body-heredity, true, but what of consciousness heredity? We can't say where consciousness came from, but rebirth is logical. We can't say when mind begins or at which point a being begins to reason for even animals show an embryonic thinking power. Reason declares there must have been a cause for this, and the cause can only have been pre-existence, past experience, reincarnation.

(19.19) There is no doubt that thought creates environment even though it may not succeed in doing so till a later birth.

(19.20) Both fate and freewill are seen in life because the human mind thinks in dualities; by getting rid of this contradiction as being a condition of human thoughts we rise above causality and its failure.

(19.21) Why should you have this particular thought and not another? This is a question which nobody can answer. Therefore if anybody says there is perfect freedom, he is talking nonsense. For freedom has no meaning apart from necessity, and the latter has no meaning in the absence of the former. The two come together.

CHAPTER 20: POLITICS

(20.1) Whoever realizes the Brahman as everywhere will not see men of other nationalities as different from himself and will treat them accordingly. He will not separate himself from them. The National and racial strife in the world is the result of their ignorance which regards men by their bodies alone. Wars will not end as long as history goes on; they will continue to inflict suffering on men until they learn the truth. Thus Nature teaches man by bitter experience when he refuses to ascertain truth by peaceful reflection.

(20.2) Those people who want us to conform fixedly, absolutely and unquestioningly to the customs habits and ideas of antiquity, are talking absolute insanity. The world, life, thought and men are different today. Nature does not keep quiet. She unsettles everything. Our misfortune is, not that we are thrust into such uncertain times, but that we

do not want to think. It is most difficult and troublesome to unthink the old tendencies and to doubt what we slavishly believe in, to make the admittedly hard exertion required by strictly rational thinking to seek evidence and proof, to dispel its illusions.

(20.3) Communism being a method of external change only cannot succeed; there must be education, persuasion and development of mind and outlook to precede it. The capitalist countries like England already pursue a more enlightened policy by heavy death duties, income taxes, property taxes etc. whilst the rich people there give so much in charities. That is a better method than bloody violent forcible communism. It leaves individual freedom and all that is needed is to teach the rich and the rulers their duty to help the less fortunate people. Then they will of own accord carry out such duty. Vedanta's teaching of oneness of mankind is the only lasting power to bring this about.

(20.4) Although it is impossible to teach philosophic truth to all mankind, nevertheless, some step forward in this direction are certainly practicable. The most important and most urgent of these is to give ethical instruction in every school either as a part of the lessons in religion or as a part of moral instruction. And this teaching should be that all humanity is one family and therefore all should be treated with goodwill. For without such education people will merely drift into narrow selfish ways whereas with it the young impressionable minds of children will be gradually guided towards unity. Education is the most important instrument for effecting such improvements.

(20.5) We say that the unconscious cause of love is that both are Brahman. If you object that we hate our enemies, the reply is that this is because our deep ignorance of this fact that both of us are Brahman that leads to hatred. The less we are ignorant, the less we hate.

(20.6) The value of a virtuous and ethical life is only in so far as it suppresses the ego and thus fits a man for truth.

(20.7) In the controversy between those who would keep ancient forms of society, politics, economics, education etc. unchanged and those who would destroy all that is old and have only new customs, the philosopher espouses neither fully, but takes all factors into consideration. He realizes the truth that the world is changing and that this change is inevitable, a cosmic process. Therefore he regards as fools those who reject all modern innovations. Take the case of India. We see caste system breaking down all around us. Yet the Laws of Manu were enacted for a society which was based on rigid caste arrangements. Today we have 80 million Muslims in India who were not here in Manu's time, we have some millions of Indian Christians; what is to be done with them? There are many other factors existent today here which were non-existent in Manu's time in economic political and other fields. But the greatest change of all is that we are living in a democratic era when the very notion of caste is against the spirit of the times, whereas it was the exact spirit of the times thousands of years ago. Hence the philosopher is flexible in mind and would adapt social forms to the needs of the time in which he lives. It is rubbish to talk of a social arrangement which must last till all eternity; there is no such thing in Nature and man can't create it. Change, Maya, is continuous. The philosopher

will therefore seek out what is good for present use in ancient forms and then not hesitate to reject the rest, whilst he will add new materials particularly suited to contemporary needs. Where rulers are not wise and adaptable they risk revolution when the pressure of new needs attacks worn-out forms. This is true of every department of practical life, that wisdom lies in balancing new and old harmoniously but fearlessly. Hence the blind adulation of ancient Hindu methods of life, education, society etc. is without regard to modern outlook is nonsensical.

(20.8) The thirst for wars will go on repeating themselves until people learn the truth of Vedanta. They think the spread of religion will help, but not so; religion will make matters worse. The 1914 war has reappeared in a more formidable form, because the method of treating grievances is the same. England should have gone earlier of her own accord to Germany and other nations and discussed what could be done to remove these grievances. War does not solve them. Buddha was right: Hatred will cease only by love, never by returning hatred.

(20.9) The business of philosophy is to be concerned with sociology as "How to make everyone happy?" and "What are the best ways to cause progress of the world?" whereas, religio-mysticism is concerned with "I am happy, I don't care what happens to the world." i.e. personal satisfaction.

(20.10) The fundamental test of philosophy is "Has it improved social life? What good can it do to humanity?"

(20.11) The process of identification with others proceeds slowly in an ever-widening circle from family to tribe to nation to race and finally to all humanity in the case of a gnani.

(20.12) No religion has yet succeeded since earliest antiquity until now in giving peace to the world. The Muslims split into Sunnis and Shias, have often fought with each other. The Christians are killing each other, today in Europe. Hence mere religion won't suffice to bring peace on earth. Something more is needed: that is Gnan.

(20.13) The nearer the nations approach to oneness, the more will they attain prosperity and happiness. This is also true for individuals; the more they achieve harmony with other individuals the greater their worldly well-being. This is the practical proof and illustration of Advaita.

(20.14) Society is constantly changing whether it likes it or not; this selfish interests are being taught by nature. The Truth of non-attachment, non-desire, the greeds of capitalism breeds communism, the greeds of monarchy brings republicanism.

(20.15) The immense practicality of Vedanta is hinted at in the Upanishads which assert that prosperity and peace can come to the mankind only after it accepts the idea of its oneness. All other ways are illusory and will fail.

(20.16) The value of history is to profit by the study of the mistakes of other individuals, nations and races. The teaching of history is wrong. To say that the Battle of Plassy was fought in 1757, that the warring generals were Clive and Suraj Dowlahl that 50,000 soldiers were engaged on one side and 80,000 on the other is not enough. Students should be taught the cause of the war, the consequences, what led up to it, etc. the errors or crimes committed and then results. That is why the leaders and rulers of the people should be taught wisdom philosophy, and the patience to refrain from action until either (a) he is wise enough to act correctly alone or (b) he is able to secure the guidance of a wise man. This is the entire lesson of the Bhagavad Gita and is summed in the 18th chapter where Krishna says to Arjuna: "Now that your doubts are dispelled, act." Krishna wanted Arjuna to wait until he was fit to act, to fight, until he had been instructed in truth. But until the 18th chapter, which means whilst Arjuna was still not a mature sage, Krishna tells him to obey him only, i.e. take the advice of others who know the truth. Here on the battle field, you have no time to consult others. Therefore obey me. In the earlier chapters of the Gita Krishna teaches religion, mysticism and yoga largely, hence he does not permit Arjuna to act on his own responsibility then.

(20.17) Nobody ought to be allowed to die of starvation, that is the duty of a government; otherwise what is it for? No beggar should be found in a well-ruled country.

(20.18) Truth and peace and prosperity go together, are inseparable. This is what West does not realize. They seek vainly to bring earthly happiness by disregarding truth.

CHAPTER 21: DOCTRINE OF NON-CAUSALITY

(21.1) Unless you know the meaning of non-causality, you cannot understand the meaning of non-creation of the world. But one must develop intelligence first to understand this.

(21.2) One thing becoming another is an impossibility. It remains the same forever. That is proved by Chapter 4, Mandukya.

(21.3) The theory that world is illusion is better than theory that God created it, but it also is erroneous from the highest standpoint. It should be adopted along with the Drg-Drisyam theory, as a preliminary step, until you reach the doctrine of non-causality, but once the latter is grasped then even the Mayavada³³ doctrine is given up.

(21.4) Those who ask "Why did I get this delusion of the world?" do not understand that because they are deluded, because they assume the truth of causality, therefore they ask this question. They have already imagined there is an answer when in fact there is no real problem. Nothing is produced or born, everything is already there as Mind.

(21.5) If you know the true meaning of causality, it is impossible to say there is such a thing as wrong knowledge. If you know that everything is produced by the Mind, whether it be a mirage or the sun, then you always know everything correctly, i.e. as mental in

³³ The teaching that the world is a dream or illusion

nature, you will not get lost or confused in understanding the world. But those who are still in the stage of causality, will get confused and say, the wall outside is real but the wall inside my mind is only an idea, because they will seek a cause for the idea of the wall. When you know there is no such thing as causal relation, you will know that it is only the mind which appears and disappears as objects, and it will then be impossible to ask any questions, for all questions depend on the delusion of causality, the causal complex. All is then known to be mind, all is unity. Avidya³⁴ disappears when causality is given up.

(21.6) Evolution entirely depends on causality, you know also there cannot be an evolution of the universe.

(21.7) The highest test of the fitness for initiation into Advaita is the grasp of the doctrine of non-causality. Hence I regard Planck and Heisenberg as having been advaitins in a former birth.

(21.8) Criticism: Creativity means or implies change. And change implies causal connection. What is Creator or Lord? What does freedom mean? Where is the proof? How can you prove that God has creativity in Him? If you do, you bring Hinduism to the Law of Causality. Where then is His freedom? When you say God is creator, what you do is to rely on your imagination and nothing more. It is an extension of or application of causality. Thus creativity has no meaning. It is as good as saying "God is like me", as I have a will, He has the will. How can you explain emergence? You are viewing the Absolute from the particular, and then Brahman is only an idea--a duality. Hence it is that Brahman is said to be untouched by tongue. To call It Absolute and then call it Cause is absurd, since it is possible in the world of duality alone.

(21.9) God did not create a world. There has always been only the One, no diversity. But do not tell this to all, only to those capable of understanding. Otherwise you will harm them.

(21.10) Drg does not produce the Drysam. Ajatavada³⁵ says there is no such thing as cause and effect. There is no production of the universe; there is no such thing as manifestation. "Fools think I am manifesting myself," Says Krishna in the Gita. But there is no appearance of reality. Everything is the same, is one. Hence there can be no causality. This is the most difficult principle of Advaita.

(21.11) The ideas are constantly coming, hence you think, you imagine that there is change going on, that there is causal connection, but in reality it is not so.

(21.12) Cause and effect theory is a super-imposition imposed by our minds on phenomena. Those who praise God for answering their prayers or who attribute to some yogi a benefit obtained through his blessings are people ignorant that causation does not

³⁴ Veiling, ignorance

³⁵ Non-causality school of Vedanta

exist as they think it, but is constructed by their own minds. Critics of our stand-point usually have never stopped to think "Am I right?" They are deluded by the ego.

(21.13) Secret of Karma: It has no effect when "I," the Aham disappears. When you talk of multiplicity, karma and causality work, but in unity it disappears.

(21.14) In the study of truth, ultimately there is no Karma and no causality but in the practical world they hold true.

(21.15) Hume denied cause by saying one sensation comes after another; we do not know that the first was the cause of the other; we merely infer it.

(21.16) That there is an external object producing ideas in me, is based on the law of Causality. The object is the cause of the idea. We reply that the causes are only ideas. I had one idea before (a red hot poker) and I have another idea (warmth). I really infer the first sensation causes the second. I merely imagine it. I do not know.

(21.17) Pandits say Maya is a shakti³⁶ of God, which is almost the same as Berkeley's doctrine that objects are ideas created by God.

(21.18) Hume's position was correct: He said "I see two things: one follows the other. But I cannot say one is the cause of the other. He said, therefore and Kant followed that the causal relation is our human idea, not necessarily a fact. The causal idea is imaginary. How gas is turned into water, we do not know. We cannot say that gas produces water, only that both exist side by side.

(21.19) Whoever distinguishes between a cause and an effect is a dualist, even whether he says world came from nothing or from something. Therefore Sankhyas and Visistadvathins are dualists. Ramanuja says God has got all this universe as his body: that the latter is changing whilst God remains unchanged, i.e. Purusha sees whilst Prakriti remains. Hence he thinks there are three things externally, Purusha, Prakriti and Jiva. He says wherever there is God there is always matter. Vedanta says who saw them always there? The position is therefore unprovable and hence to us unacceptable. We can easily create doubt in this position, and show it cannot be final. Where is the illustration from human experience of life that the immortal has ever undergone a change. But the common herd (average unreflective persons) take these things to be true because they are quoted on the authority of some religious book, instead of ordinary experience as we do in Vedanta.(Philosophy)

(21.20) God has produced plague, got angry with man, destroyed millions in the past. How can we say whether he won't change his mind again and produce more terrible diseases than plague, greater evils than death? All this is only the conception of man, how the human mind thinks of God. Whoever maintains that the immortal ever changes, is in this false position. For (a) if you admit change in the nature of God, ultimate reality, there

³⁶ Consort, creative power

are difficulties, contradictions unending (b) if you admit change and changeless there are absurdities, (c) all we can truly say is that we know nothing about it, i.e. non-causality.

(21.21) At this moment you think of the mountains, rivers, towns and people of dream as being the mind you have Ajativada. But when you think of them as having being created by the mind, you fall into Vasistavada. The first is our Vedanta doctrine because it is based on causelessness, things are as they are, and we leave it there. The second is based on the idea of someone, an imaginer, who produces the world. Vivastavada, however is the nearest step to Vedanta out of all the wrong teachings.

(21.22) "The existent cannot pass into birth" (Mand.) means cannot become an effect! It is only our imagination that something produces an effect; we merely think so. Kant very nearly reached this position when he said that causality was an idea, a mental framework through which we see the world. Kant has not traced the relation between Noumenon and Phenomenon, how the phenomena came into existence. Fichte and Schelling both attacked him also (rightly) for not proving the existence of Noumenon: he only assumed it (he could give no proof). That is why he was superseded by Hegel and others. Vedanta goes straight and says fearlessly we can't trace an effect to any cause: we admit only that we see both side by side: we deny proof of causality. Hume said everything (not only causality) was an idea, but could not prove non-causality as Kant did: moreover he did not know of the seer, only the seen. Kant said there was a something, a thing in itself, which appears to our mind as a table. Vedanta says there is a Seer only who sees the idea of a table in his mind. These are different positions Kant not only assumed a seer, but also a second thing, a thing-in-itself apart from the mind of the seer, whereas Vedanta accepts no second thing apart from the latter.

(21.23) Kant proved human mind is so constituted as to accept everything in terms of time, space and cause. All human and animal minds think in the same way.

(21.24) Vivartavada's theory of world creation is not the highest, nor (is it) Vedanta; it is illustrated by the magician producing illusory rope trick without being himself affected by it. Vivartavada, says God imagines the world and sees it, Brahman ideates the world with out being affected remaining himself unchanged. This is not our view. We say no world at all has been produced, because when you know truth you can no longer talk of cause and effect, as does the Vivartavada theory. Brahman is thus the cause of world in Vivartavada. Sankara's Vedanta Sutras comment does not go beyond Vivartavada. The highest is Ajativada, where there is no causation at all. There can be no Moksha if you believe in Causation. (Mandukya).

(21.25) No man has ever been able to show in what manner, how the gas form changed into the water form, how hydrogen and oxygen became water. That water is produced is admitted at once, but how water, or oxygen, were formed, is inadmissible and impossible to show. Inadmissible because that causal relation exists in your imagination.

(21.26) How the seed grows into a mango tree, I have not seen, I do not know, says the Advaitin. At one time I see the seed; followed by a sprout. How the cause becomes the

effect we do not see; but we see a sequence of water, when heated, changing into vapor. When did the seed cease to be the seed, and become a plant. We do not see the two things at all. If I examine anything, I see carefully, I see only Brahman. (Did you see how your mind changed into the form of a mountain in your dream? Why are we not able to see the change? Because there are no two things but mind or Atman alone.)

(21.27) There are two great schools of thought on Cause now in Europe and Ancient India. One says that characteristics of tree already exist in the seed and merely come out; the other says that they do not exist in the seed but evolve i.e. emergent evolution. Both schools are really correct in their view but they are both incomplete. Both views may be verified by fact. Thus produce an elephant out of nothing! You can't. You need a parent elephant to start with. Similarly the world cannot be produced out of nothing! On the other hand if all the characteristics exist already in the cause, then why don't you eat seed, making it into a full-grown mango first! You can't. Hence those theories are imperfect.

(21.28) The notion that world is ever-changing precludes the notion of causality, because it proves that there is only one stuff or substance in all objects; the causal changes being illusory.

(21.29) There is no real causality in the notion that Sushupti is the 'cause' of the other states because it was always present in them. It is the same as the mind which seems to produce a dream, but really the dream-mountain is still nothing else than the mind. However at the beginning of our studies we say mind produces dream-objects, and that sleep produces dream and waking, but at a later stage we drop the tentative position with the causality involved in it, because there is only unaltered oneness.

(21.30) When you believe the mind, in dream, has appeared as a mountain, it is the Vivartavada view. When you know that the mind has not changed in any way, it is called Ajativada.

(21.31) When you look upon everything whatever it be in the world as being nothing but Mind then there is no duality and hence no production or causation.

(21.32) When you know there is no such thing as causal relation, then you will not ask the question "Why?" of the world. This shows that causality is a complex working a priori in the mind; psychology is useful here to explain power of complexes; the idea of cause is in the mind previously and is unconsciously projected outwards.

(21.33) We do not deny that a succession of ideas, objects appear before us; what we deny is that there is causal relation between them.

(21.34) The Advaitins who say cause and effect are the same, identical, and there is no distinction between them, have gone high but still not reached the highest truth, which is that causality itself is only an idea, meaningless, imaginary and not really existent. Go to Reality. You will not find cause and effect. The mind constructs it.

(21.35) The external world is a construction of the mind--until you can grasp this, you will never understand Vedanta. When you know that these forms, these ideas are only the mind, you will know that the mind has neither changed nor disappeared. Suppose you see a tiger in dream, which part of it is not the mind? Is the shape and substance and softness of the tiger not the mind? Therefore inquiry shows that every part of the tiger is only mind. This must be understood because the objection is often made "when you see the external world is there not duality?" The point is Brahman is there even when you see anything or everything in the objective world, even as the dream world being seen is not real duality when the dreamer knows it is all one--mind. Thus alone can you see unity in multiplicity.

(21.36) All you can say is "I saw a thing now. The next moment I saw a change." You cannot say the one thing was caused by the other. Similarly you imagine your thoughts are produced by the mind, but you could never prove or show that "did you see the mind producing them?" You see only that they appear in succession. If you say mind produces thoughts, I ask how is mind produced? You cannot answer because there is no such thing as one thing producing another.

(21.37) The objective world being in the mind is the Mind; hence there is no causal relation between them. Hence there is only one substance—mind, hence all is one. Causality is in the realm of duality and disappears on deep thought.

(21.38) If no such thing as cause exists, and I bring a red hot poker and touch you with it, you dislike it, dislike it because it produces the effect of pain. So how can causal relation be a mere theory, asks the critic. The mind takes the color of whatever external object is placed outside. That there are outside objects must be admitted as otherwise no such objective variety of sounds sights smells etc. could have entered the mind--this the objection raised by critics. These are strong arguments against Vedanta, which we meet with as well as the most frequent. Unless the answer to these two objections is clearly grasped you will never really understand Advaita but read and repeat it like a parrot. Kant fully realized these difficulties, and Hume partly realized them. This is the essential central problem of all philosophy. The reply requires most concentrated attention to perceive. Whatever has produced a jar, i.e. clay, when this "cause" becomes the jar the clay has not vanished: It is still there. Hence the cause is always found in the effect in the external world and cannot be separated from it--no matter what changes of form it has undergone. So when you speak of pain, the cause of the idea of pain must also be there within it. All talk of cause and effect is inconsistent and imaginary, when deeply inquired into and if you keep on asking for the cause you will go back in an infinite regress without end, and never stop. Thus what is the cause of heat-fire, what is the cause of fire—coal! What is the cause of coal--imbedded trees! What is the cause of the tree-seed. What is the cause of the seed--tree. Hence you can never get at a final cause. Hence Aristotle and the religiously-inclined European philosophers got tired and said "Let us put a stop to it, adopt a first cause, and call it God!" But Kant refused to do this, and found that the very notion of causality was human imagination. You may argue I do not cause pain to myself. But have you ever thought of your dreams? Has not your mind

created tigers which attacked you, snakes which bit you, enemies who fought you, during dream? This shows you have caused pain to your self. But Europeans cannot understand this because they do not know Avastatraya. They must pass through yoga first. The next stop will be the appeal to universal experience-the three states, to the higher reason. Is there not perception of variety during dream? Is there not sensation of pain during dream? But do not make mistake of confining Mind to your ego. That which knows the ego, comes and goes, which sees it, that Mind is the substance itself of all your experiences, is non-different from them as the clay is not separate from the jar; it is the same thing in the end! Therefore only Mind exists, and no duality, no question of cause and effect can then arise; when the mind thinks of illusion, ignorance then the latter exists; when it is not thought of, it does not exist. Illusion means imagination. When imagination is gone, the Mind is itself. Aren't those perceptions and sensations illusory? Similarly these waking experiences are seen to be illusory, apart from mind, which ignorantly looking for causes infers an external world: Thus the whole question collapses with the collapse of the independent existence of this world. You start with the preconceived idea that there must be a cause, and then you seek it. Get rid of this idea, and you will not seek for one. You have externality and internality in your dreams both being your mind, yourself: similarly in waking you have external things and internal feelings but both are still your mind, yourself. There is no proof that they are otherwise. You must ask why did this thought of cause come to me and not blindly accept it like an ignorant man. Inquire into this feeling of cause first before you yield to its pressure. When you examine, you find only one substance, and you cannot speak of causality then.

(21.39) Vedanta does not say that we do not see causal relation, it says that when you inquire into what you see, you then find that there is no causal relation. The superficial view is not accepted as the ultimate truth. Inquiry into causality is the most difficult part of Vedanta.

(21.40) The mind is really identical with these objects which appear as external. Hence there cannot be a causal relation between them and mind.

(21.41) Those who have faith in causality will always go on believing that somehow the world was produced by Brahman, But they start with a lie for causation is unproved. We know only that one thing appears after another, which is not the same as "being created" by the other.

(21.42) The mind has got this weakness that it wants to know the "how" and the "why". Hence it seeks for causality and refuses to realize non-dual truth.

(21.43) Nobody knows nor can anybody ever know how a seed becomes a tree. We know only one antecedent fact--the planting of the seed--and one consequent fact--the growing of the tree. Hence we know no causes, only antecedents.

(21.44) Brahman can never be got by practice, whether yogic, samadhi etc. The reason is there is no such thing as causal relation, hence no practice or effort will, as cause, produce Brahman as effect. A limited cause cannot produce an unlimited effect. Brahman

is got by understanding only. But those who do not know the truth of non-causality will advocate Yoga as a means of reaching Brahman; such is their ignorance.

(21.45) In the world of practical things you have causality, but not in the world of ultimate truth.

(21.46) This thing comes before, that thing goes after--that is all we can truly say about the so-called causal sequence; the notion of cause and effect is superimposed by the human mind on both things.

(21.47) J.A. Thomson's reference to the "totality of conditions" is a mistake. Nobody has ever known or can know all the conditions comprising of a cause for anything; they may know the immediate causes only.

(21.48) If A and B are in causal relation, then A comes first. Cause precedes effect. Now what do you see first of the external objects? Why, you see the mental impression of same, and no thing else at any time! Hence if the mental impression comes first, it must be a cause! This is my reply to the objection that external world is the cause of our mental impression of it. No, there is only the mental impression as cause; there is nothing external in existence.

(21.49) All we can say is that the tree had already pre-existed in some form in the seed that the human intelligence and mind had pre-existed in the amoeba. Evolution merely brought out what was already there. We do not know what form this preexistence took.

(21.50) So long as you see an effect, there must be a cause. When you ask for the reason of all this world,--multiplicity, you are in this position. So long as you have these ideas of multiplicity, they must exist somewhere, there must be a perceiver of them. Where are the rivers and stars you see in dream? Where do all these world-ideas exist? They must exist in a Mind, otherwise how could you be aware of them? Unfortunately we have the false idea that the mind is confined to the skull or head, and that the ideas are outside it. In truth we can never say where the mind is limited! It exists within and without the head. In dream you cannot limit minds for mountains appear within it; in waking you say "my body" and thus force the mind to appear within the body; whereas it is the body that, being an idea within the mind it actually exists inside mind. But if world is an idea, it must have something to stand on, some support or substratum. It is existent in yourself. The mountains and persons you see in dream were all within yourself and this proves the mind can hold ideas even of gigantic size, such as the world. Now there must be a seer of these ideas, an Atman wherein they live and have their being. As an illustration of this take illusion created by a magician. The illusion must have a support. Someone to think the thoughts which produce the illusion. You require a magician to produce magic.

(21.51) Kant's arguments to show that cause is only the construction of our mind would say that the cause and effect series is infinite and unending process, the Noumenon being outside our knowledge.

(21.52) Re: Karma Theory from Vedantic standpoint: If my tendency to goat-flesh in former birth makes me do same now, my present tendency will make me do it in next birth. Thus the cause of previous birth becomes the effect now: the effect now is the cause of next birth tendency. The position is thus inconsistent, as cause here is also effect. It has a beginning also not a beginning. Where is the beginning of the goat-flesh eating tendency? It appears beginningless as cause and effect. Yet it must have begun somewhere. This inconsistent position can disappear only for the Vedantin, who sees both cause and effect as the result of imaginations, not real.

(21.53) Even in science the ultimate nature of matter is energy, but the energy can't be the final for there must be something else which produced energy, and even that can't be the ultimate. Hence we can only say there is a series of changes. We cannot posit that anything in this world of duality is really ultimate. There will always be contradictions here. Only in non-duality is there escape from this infinite and inexplicable regress.

(21.54) All you can say is that "I noticed this thing previously," You dare not say it is therefore a cause."

(21.55) You must differentiate between immediate cause and ultimate cause. It is the latter to which we refer in non-causality. The tree must have a seed as cause, but now you are faced with the inability to trace any ultimate cause of the seed. The Advaitin admits fully the causal relation so far as this world is concerned; i.e. so far as it is not fully inquired into and as it is viewed by the ignorant.

(21.56) Causality is only an idea, nay imagination. There is no such thing, but habit not only in this life but for many lives, has so accustomed us to thinking causally, that only the few can give up this illusion.

(21.57) What is the meaning of God? If it is one thing becoming another, we prove it is impossible for anything to change its nature. If it is something self-sufficient, how can that which itself had no cause be the cause of some effect (the universe)?

(21.58) Supposing God does create: that would imply he has produced something new; this means that He has changed to some extent. (for all things are He). If he has changed, then He is not immortal or eternal, and may die tomorrow.

(21.59) The sum total of a cause cannot be ascertained. It is simple but incorrect to say a bee is the cause of honey. For bee needs pollen, pollen needs flowers, flowers need water, water needs clouds, and so one could go on ascertaining the true complete cause of honey and never come to an end, even though the search drags you through a thousand different things. Hence Vedanta says there is nothing new really born or produced or caused which is not already existent; or in other words, Brahman alone is, even though it seems to appear in a myriad forms.

(21.60) Mahabharata says that Brahman is uncreated: this means it is (a) uncaused, and (b) without any causal relation with anything such as the world.

(21.61) To be exact, we must say that nobody has ever seen a Jiva born, it is only our imagination. Did you see your own birth. "But my present existence proves it." No--your existence is not denied, we are discussing birth. "But I have seen other people born?" Yes that too is not being discussed, we are dealing with you, not others! Similarly you cannot be present at your own death and witness it. Therefore we say neither birth nor death can ever be proved. What is left? Only to imagine them! To say positively that you were aware of your body's birth is therefore to tell a lie; much less were you aware of the birth of your own self; and much less will your awareness of its death be possible. Objection: But everyone can see that a son is born to a father: Reply: We agree but we are inquiring whether the word and idea 'birth' is true or not. We have found that they are mere words, imaginary things. There is no change really, only an imagination, an idea.

(21.62) If the soul is eternal, how could it be subject to change, such as reincarnation? If eternal it is uncreate and unborn; how then can it get born again? If the cause is unborn, how can the effect ever be born. This is what we ask the Sankhyas.

(21.63) To those who say God is cause of the world we reply: Before world is produced, what is God? He is then neither cause nor effect (no world effect being existent). If he was no cause then, he cannot be a cause now.

(21.64) Objection is made to causality because every idea must have external experience or external object to cause it, such as a pin to cause pain of pin-prick or an elephant must appear, to cause its mental impression. Reply: This is also a criticism of Idealism. It is the strongest argument of the realists, this one of pain caused by a physical instrument. We ask "Is the pain independent of the pin's point or has it gone out of it? What is pain? Is it something emerged from the pin or was it already in my body? If it came from the point it must have existed in the pin. If it was in the body then it could not have come from the cause (pin). If the pin had not come into contact with the body you would not have a pain. Did the pin drop the pain into the body? These questions are unanswerable so long as you set up a cause effect duality. Huxley deals with this problem using a rose for illustration and asking whether its fragrance was dropped in your nose at the time of smelling. Berkeley, however first put forward the principles of the same problem: can you really separate the cause from the effect? We go to dreamlessness to show that external objects are not seen outside self. We say that if pain is there, it must be caused by your own self as in dream you may take a pin and have precisely the same experience of pain. The dream-pin appears to be outside you and separate but it is not. Latest science too says mind is inseparable from matter. Huxley asked, is the smell of the rose in your mind or in the rose at the time when you are smelling it? It is not possible to say it is either wholly. Only for language sake we say it is in the rose but analysis find it also in the mind i.e. yourself. We go to the cause (rose) after we are aware of the smell, after we have it in our own consciousness. Therefore we only infer the existence of the cause after having discovered smell--not in the cause--but in our own self. The rose is thus an inference not a direct experience. Putting this in simpler language, we merely imagine a cause, the mind makes a construction of it. For what is an inferred and unseen cause (which is all

you have until the touch, sight, sensations arise) but an imagination? What does the mind do in this case? Forms an idea!

(21.65) The hardest thing in Vedanta is to see that causation rises and falls with the ego. That is the last secret of Vedanta. When you see that ego comes and goes, is unreal, that Mind alone is, then ego is seen not other than Mind, no-two, and the question of its cause and of world cause simply does not and cannot arise.

(21.66) In practical life, we cannot say that there is only determinism or that there is only freewill. Both are there. But in the higher reality of paramartha there is neither fate nor causality of any kind. For both are dualities, inseparably coupled: you cannot have determinism without having freewill at the same time. For who is it that has either of them. It is ego. Hence the getting rid of ego causes the whole question to collapse and vanish. Hence the gnani is said to be free from karma for he is released from the dilemma of fate versus freewill.

(21.67) Rebirth is a fact to you only so long as you think of yourself as an ego. So long as your attitude is "Now I am John Smith, last birth was Signor Malto, next birth I shall be a monk." You are identifying yourself with the 'I.' But when you drop the 'I' how can rebirth exist for you?

(21.68) Karma doctrine is good and true so long as you hold to the ego. But when ego goes, then karma goes, rebirth goes for whole world is then in you, so how can you be reborn?

(21.69) Instead of inquiring whether causality exists we start by assuming it. That therefore is a fallacy. And once having assumed it, we begin to look for a cause of the world i. e. a God.

(21.70) Causality is nonsensical when you consider how no one thing is really separate and independent from other things, but all are connected together and in a sense merge into a composite unit. Thus flower depends on earth, seed, water, heat, sun, manure,--all joining together to produce the flower: hence neither one of these can be said to be the ultimate cause of the flower. And each of these is in its own turn dependent on others. So where are we to stop and say this is the cause? It is impossible to stop.

(21.71) That the same medicine will always have the same effect is only a probability. Some are cured, others not. Sometimes it is successful, at other times a failure. Men take only the successes, ignore failures and deduce the principle of causation from it. We deny this is any proof that medicine is cause of which cure is effect. It remains unproved, hence there is no certain principle of causality to be observed at work here. Similarly fallacy of astrology is there is no proved connection between fulfilled prediction and positions of stars. We hear of the successes and deduce that they are the consequences of principle of causality. But we don't reckon numerous unfulfilled predictions which should be taken as denying this principle. Vedanta doesn't deny successes of predictive astrology but denies there is proof of the connection between them and aspects of planets. Similarly

too with cooking. We can't affirm that same cooked food will always produce precisely the same effects on everyone. Sometimes it gives dysentery; some like it, others reject it. Hence there is indeterminacy, uncertainty about its effects: hence too there can be no proved causal principle always at work in cooking and eating: only probability. Vedanta wants certainty, i.e. truth, hence it is forced to deny causality as sure truth, and accept it only as a practical probability.

(21.72) "Cause" is what produces an effect; it is that which is followed by something else, or it occasions something. But the idea of cause comes in only in ignorance. Cause is ignorance. It is non-apprehension. Effect equals misapprehension. Both non-misapprehension and misapprehension occur in waking state and dream state. Cause and effect is not possible in the Drg since there is no duality in drg, and since drg is knowledge itself. You think an idea different from the mind. It is not. Ideating when regarded as different is a misunderstanding of the essence of the mind. Cause is the same as effect but you think the effect is different from cause. Herein lies the misapprehension.

(21.73) When you can point out the time when the cause becomes an effect, you can prove causality, but nobody can point out such a moment. Both are therefore the same.

(21.74) No connection between Drg and Drsyam has been proved. There is no causal relation between them.

(21.75) The mind is wedded to cause as Kant has pointed out, and whenever it looks it expects to find a cause because it presupposes things as effects.

(21.76) Cause and effect are found in the sense-world but God is said to be beyond this sense world. How then can we ever know or prove that he created this world? It is not possible to do so.

(21.77) The scientist can only say I had that idea then, I have this idea now, i.e. succession but not causality.

(21.78) It is the weakness of men that they postulate a First Cause in order to escape from the riddle of how the causal series began. Aristotle did this and all the theologians have gone this way. But to more thoughtful minds, this problem indicates that there is something wrong with causality itself.

(21.79) The idea of creation comes in naturally when we admit that there is manifestation. But is there really any manifestation? Vedanta says that really speaking there is no manifestation. Only if we once admit that there is manifestation do we have to account for it.

(21.80) The conception of representing God to have created the maya illusion of this world like the juggler performing an illusion which deceives all is not the highest. "When you reach the top of this house, you will understand that everything, even the steps, are of the same material" said Ramakrishna. The meaning is the mind creates the whole by mere

thought, and even in the case of material objects, the thought exists before the object. Before building a house, we have to think about it and thus the idea exists first in our mind.

(21.81) An effect seems different from cause. But really both are the same, both are ideas; and ideas are in the ultimate analysis, mind. Thus effect is only a misapprehension that it is something different from cause.

(21.82) Can we not say that the Atman creates the Jiva out of itself? Answer: We cannot prove this statement. We have not seen the one creating the other. Because the ego appears and disappears into the Atma just like the waves rising from and falling into the ocean, we argue that both are one and the same.

(21.83) Sankara says that there is no causality from the ultimate standpoint. He does not deny that there is cause and effect and that effect follows cause in the objective world.

(21.84) Causality cannot operate when there is no two. Cause and effect mean time. At what time did the cause become effect?

(21.85) If God created the world, how could he have created something out of nothing? You must have clay to produce a pot, a seed to produce a tree. If you say He produced it out of Himself then He is subject to change, and is therefore not immortal. That which does not change can never change. Hence we reject creation.

(21.86) He who says there is no God is a fool. He who wants to know God as He really is ultimately is wise. My criticism is against peoples' idea of God, their imagination of God. If you think of God as Creator, it is nonsense. Where is the proof? Did you see God creating? Look for God as He is; he is not a creator. That is imagined. Creation and causality cannot exist. Hence God cannot be creator. See Verse 23 Chapter II of Mandukya Karika. "Those who are familiar with a person call God a person."

(21.87) One school says that God imagines, thinks the world first and thus creates it. Another that he spun it out of his own being like a spider or changed a part of Himself into world, a third that he created it out of nothing, a fourth says he took prakriti as a potter takes clay and made the world. All these are more or less reasonable childish stories of religionists, which are useful just as Arabian Nights stories are useful to give delight to people.

The reply to those who say he made it out of his own substance is: How is it possible for one part of him to be mortal and the other part remain immortal? (Mandukya III, 22). Is this possible? Religious people say: Don't blaspheme by asking such questions, but believe. For in this theory, one part of God is dying and being reborn, whilst the other part remains unchanged. But is there any illustration in our experience of the world where such a thing happens?

Take European pantheism with its immortal God in Nature. How can you prove anything is immortal? How do you know that God will never die? He may have lived for 10,000 years but that does not prove he will continue for a similar period. Experience

tells me all things are subject to change. I am a part of experience; therefore I shall die. Hence we cannot prove the eternity of God. Only religionists believe it, but we find satisfaction only by reasoning--not believing. Similarly those who say the Atman undergoes change cannot ever posit it as immortal.

To theory that God ideates the universe, reply is why should He think of creating sorrows, sufferings; why should be imagine that which is painful to others. How wicked such a God is! If he is all-merciful, why all this? How can we depend on him if He is so changeable as to be kind to you one day and brutal the next? When you reason this theory will not stand.

(21.88) If Atman is changing too by nature how can there be certainty of Moksha, liberation or satisfaction? All these theories are absurd.

(21.89) As God alone was present at creation, as no angel or man had then come into existence, nobody else could have witnessed the initial start of creation. Before creation what must there have been? Obviously Unity, and when all creation has dissolved, what will be left? Again Unity. Hence there was and will be only One, even on a religious basis.

(21.90) When you identify the world with the One, then all this phenomena is the Atman, and no notion of its being produced is called for.

(21.91) Non-duality means there is nothing else. There is no causality so far as Atman is conceived. Hence it is unborn. But still higher level to which we must rise, as birth is regarded as being distinguished from unborn; hence where nothing is born the use of word unborn is meaningless has no reference to truth. It is best at this stage to comprehend that you can say nothing true about the question. Hence to say Brahman is eternal, unborn, unchangeable, omniscient is not done by the Advaitin. These words are used only in the earlier stages in contrast with the transient, and to direct your attention to a higher view.

(21.92) Unless you know that the world is an idea, and latter resolves into Atman, you have to concoct religious or yogic creation-stories for the world, cycles of evolution etc.

(21.93) Evolution is an hypothesis: The West believes that there is progress; our Indian pundits believe there is regress, that we are descending into Kali yuga. Both are stating opinions. In life we find evolution plus involution and we really do not know which is higher and which is lower.

(21.94) The fallacy of causality is that we have to ask what is the caused for the ascertained given cause, and then again to ask what is the cause of that in turn. This leads us to an infinite regress, as with time. This why Vedanta says causality does not explain anything in the final analysis.

(21.95) No scientist knows what exactly happens when two events follow each other regularly; he cannot say how a seed turns into a tree. The causal connection between

them is made in our mind, is made by our thinking, but we do not actually see the connection; we only assume it. Therefore causation is meaningless.

(21.96) We, like Gaudapada and Sankara, make use of idealism to overthrow the realists. But after this is done, then the idealists themselves are attacked when it is shown that there are really no external objects, i.e. ideas, at all, as it is only the Mind itself which takes all those different forms. The ideas have never really been produced and were only illusory appearances of the Mind alone. When the question of causality is put to the idealists, when they are asked how the mind came into existence, they cannot answer. Here they cannot go farther and here Vedanta steps in to show there are no two things and hence no causality.

(21.97) How can we know that man's ancestor was an ape? Evolution is only a hypothesis. We were not there to witness it. Scientists can only form ideas, that is, mental constructions, about earlier times, prehistoric evolutions, cosmology. But this is not truth, only imagination. Hence we can only speculate, never know. It is and must remain a mystery. There is no absolute certitude of fact. It will forever be wrapped in mystery. This mystery is what India calls Avidya, Maya. It can only be understood when we grasp that the world is Mind and that Mind is always constructing. Nobody knows how the world was produced. Avidya, Maya is the ultimate mystery. It is not a shakti of Brahman except for the primitive mentality.

(21.98) The critics of non-causality do not realize that during dream they also have the same strong belief in cause and effect as during waking, yet when they awaken they discover that the dream was only an imagination, unreal; hence its beliefs were also unreal.

(21.99) The difficulty so many scientists find in accepting non-causality is chiefly due to the fact that they fail to make a distinction between the practical unenlightened (vyavaharic) standpoint and the profounder philosophic (paramarthik) standpoint. They confuse the two. What is true in vyavahara need not be true in paramartika.

(21.100) We cannot say at what stage a cause becomes an effect, we cannot say when one form (cause) is been changed into another form (effect). You can go on searching for a final cause of anything which can be separated from its so-called effect but you will never succeed. Nothing exists in independence and therefore no thing is separable from anything else. Yet those who ask for a particular cause of a particular effect commit this fallacy of believing that there is a line of separation between them. There is not. But if there is not, then their duality disappears and the search for cause, being based on it, becomes nonsensical. The fallacy arises out of your initial taking for granted that they do exist separately. This so-called relation of causality is only your imagination. Hence the great semantic need of not being carried away by mere meaningless words like the terms 'cause' or 'effect.' However they have vyavaharic meaning i.e. uninquired meaning.

(21.101) The objection that an idea must have a corresponding external object as cause because no man would like the experience of pain, for instance, and were things only his

ideas, he would never create ideas of pain-bringing objects nor imagine what is harmful to him, is replied by us thus: The Advaitic way of argument is to make the opponent stick to his statement and then to show it leads to a fallacy. You are asking for a cause. This contains a hidden fallacy. You take it for granted that there is such a thing as cause but you have not proved there is a cause. It is equivalent to asking "Have you given up beating your wife?" Try to draw a line between your idea of the wall and the wall itself between the known wall and the existent wall. The first is a fact, the second is a supposition, between the believed cause and the believed effect. The truth is that wall and the thought of it are one and the same, just as the thread and the cloth are the same; one cannot exist apart from the other.

(21.102) Why is time a question of such great importance? Because it involves the deeper problem of causality. The cause comes first and the effect subsequently, hence time must pass between them if they do exist. Therefore if time is shown to be illusory then causality will have to be regarded as illusory too. When time collapses, causality collapses with it. That is why Kant put them together. Hence too the study of time should precede the study of causality.

(21.103) The failure of science to make a distinction between practical life and ultimate truth accounts for its bewilderment, when dealing with Heisenberg's Principle of Uncertainty in the microphysical study of the atom. For the laws which obtain in the practical world gradually disappear and are exploded in the ultimate realm. Thus causality which admittedly rules the practical world becomes less and less as science probes deeper and ultimately vanishes.

(21.104) The relation between drg and drsyam is a non-causal one, so say that drg is the cause of drsyam is to turn the former into the latter.

(21.105) If you say Brahman manifests itself as universe, that brings in idea that it is active, i.e. the idea of cause and effect, the notion of God creating the world. To rise above this error you should get to Ajativada, viz. I am witnessing the world. The world appears and disappears. I remain untouched. There is no causal relation between us.

(21.106) Causality implies duality. i.e. one as the cause of the other. If there is only one there is no causality. When the mind negates the three states, there is only Brahman and there cannot be any causal relation there.

(21.107) A question as to the cause of creation of all the world means that you are ignorant. When you look for the cause of the object it is Maya. Everybody describes the theory of creation according to the stage in which he is. All these theories are due to their own ignorance. Idea of creation is the lowest. That every individual is a ray from the divine sun is the next higher stage. But what are these all except non-dual Brahman alone. This is the highest stage.

(21.108) When the mind sees an object then only the mind asks for a cause. The causal idea comes to you only when you are seeing something i.e. in the world of duality, i.e. in

waking and dream. It is the mind that makes you imagine that there is a cause. An independent causal relation cannot be established. Bergson says that there is continuous change. But what is it that sees the change. Causation is only in the drsyam world; we should not superimpose this causation idea on Atman. But Gaudapada argues that we cannot exactly say that this is the cause of that. When did the seed change into sprout? When did the child become adult and the adult become the aged man? The change is continuous process. The scientist only notes how much it grows or changes in an interval of time. He cannot either give the exact time of change or how it changes.

(21.109) When you understand non-causality, you will then understand how there cannot be change, how there is non-duality and all the highest advaitic teaching. When everything is mind, there is no question of mental constructions. The moment you see that the whole of the world is also Mind, you will see that mind does not really construct as mind--nothing new has come; but viewed from the standpoint of ignorance, there are ideas. Even when you see the world or know the ideas, they are still only Mind. In no other way can Oneness be established.

(21.110) It was Max Planck that first proved to the world that there is no strict causality. He affirmed that we cannot prove that there is strict causal relation in the world. For scientific investigations it is assumed that there is causal relation between events but it is only a working hypothesis, that is all. No scientist has proved that there is strict causal relation. This does not mean that there is no cause and effect and that effect does not follow cause. It means only that we cannot say for certain that one event will always be followed by another event. Modern physics recognizes it is based only on probability. It says that there is no strict determinism.

(21.111) There is nothing to show that there is any causal relation between two things, yet we start with the unconscious assumption that the relation is there and hence seek to put it there by imagination.

(21.112) There are three religious and mystical theories of universal creation. (i.) out of nothing. This is Christian--Jewish. (ii.) out of a second substance. This is Sankhya tenet of prakriti. (iii.) out of God's own self. This is the Upanishadic tenet of spider spinning a web out of its own body. But all these are not Advaitic.

(21.113) The old scientific notion of causality was that there was a fixed and invariable cause for everything; the modern notion of indeterminacy is that there may be other causes for the existence of a thing besides the known one. In short, there may be something which we do not know in operation. The old notion was strict determinism; the modern notion is that a thing may or may not happen, i.e. non-causality. The latter was known in India as ajatavada. Till now scientists said that Nature was causally precise. Now they say there is no certainty. You may plant a seed and a tree may or may not be the effect. For practical purposes i.e. ignorance through lack of inquiry we accept the seed as a cause and a tree will probably result but for philosophic purposes of absolutely certain, not probable knowledge, we must confess that there is no certainty about the causality of the seed/tree.

(21.114) We do not finally accept vivarta. It implies causality in the end. For it says the world is illusory superimposition, so it implies someone who is manipulating the illusion. If so, what is the relation between him and the illusion? It is causal. Thus even though in vivarta the substance is not changed but only the form or appearance, it is not the last truth. It is overthrown by Ajata.

(21.115) Why has mind got this complex for causality? Because in seeking for cause it has for the moment to drop, forget the effect. Similarly in seeking for the cause of the world eventually it will have to drop, forget, negate, the world and thus it will arrive at Brahman.

(21.116) What is the meaning of free will? It means doing something. Why do we do anything? To produce an effect. Hence it is erroneous to presume that free will rises above causality: the old controversy between determinism and liberty is nonsensical because both are based on belief in cause and effect. Yet they delude themselves about this pseudo-freedom.

(21.117) We cannot say that any one thing is the cause of any other thing but the whole world combines to be the cause of the whole world, thus making it a unity. If you sow a seed, it must be watered. Where does water come from? Clouds. But clouds do not come without wind. How does the wind come? Thus you can go on endlessly, building up a chain of causes in which ultimately the whole world cooperates, thus showing it to be one. For this reason we say you cannot truthfully assert that the seed is the cause of the tree, because everything else in the world is also cause and all these causes being joined together, become as one thing with their so-called effects. Push the causal theory to its logical end and it kills itself.

(21.118) Eddington gets confused between vyavahara and paramartha when he deals with non-causality. We must have causality when we want to walk, eat or work, i.e. in the practical world, but it is quite a different matter when you consider what is ultimate truth. Science has got in a fix, through not grasping this fact. On one side i.e. vyavahara, it cannot give up causality but on the other it is faced by indeterminacy.

(21.119) If there is no end to the causal series, as tree-seed chain, then does this not indicate there is a defect in the notion of causality itself?

(21.120) Creation is a special kind of cause. All such dogmas as Brahman is the origin of the world, Brahma is the First Cause of the world, Atman is the Creator of the world, belong to the sphere of religion, not philosophy.

(21.121) Causal relation is only an inference, it can not be perceived.

(21.122) Mandukya demolishes causality by inquiring, what is meant by cause? What is meant by effect? 'What is meant by relation? The modern scientific way is to ask, has the word 'cause' meaning? Scholastic or mystic interpretations of non-causality such as that

of Brahma-Sutras do not examine causality here in this world but speculate on a dogmatic Brahman not being the cause of the world: i.e. they start at the wrong end and do not scientifically prove truth of meaninglessness of causal relation. They interpret non-causality as identity in Brahman but this is wrong, for it posits two distinctly separate things. How can two different things be one? The Scholastic method is interpretation: the philosophic method is proof.

(21.123) The causal idea works in you unconsciously as a hidden complex. Only the Mind is present all the time, everything seen by it whether objects or ideas is still only the Mind and is not produced or caused by it.

(21.124) Mind does not create the external world, from the final standpoint. Nobody has seen the process of production: it is only an inference. The world seen in dream is not a creation because it is still only Mind, not a thing second to or different from Mind. There is no causality. We do not tell lies, do not accept inference as fact. Similar to this is the supposition that you know who your mother is. Did you witness your birth? No. Then you can never say you know who your parent is: you only suppose it or believe others.

(21.125) So long as the belief in causality has not been transcended, we have to say with Western Idealists that Mind has produced, created or constructed the world. But when you rise to the highest level, and perceive there is no causality, then the world is seen as being none other than Mind itself, no production being entailed.

(21.126) Things happen in a certain order but this does not prove there is any causal connection between them, for the order is not invariable. We can say only that things happen; there is no such thing as a causal law. This uncertainty is what we mean by Maya. For ideas cannot be grasped: they are gone before you can get hold of one. So it is impossible to bring them into connection causally. Bergson was right in saying there is only a continuous flow. This flow of indeterminate ideas is Maya.

(21.127) The Vivartavadins who say because the spider spins the web out of itself therefore they are the same and causality does not exist, are unable to answer the criticism why if they are the same, do we see them as different? This argument for non-causality fails because it does not offer any verification.

(21.128) You cannot get at the real cause of anything, nor at the whole series of its causes. You may say that quinine (cause) is the cure (effect) of malaria but you cannot possibly explain all the factors why quinine cures malaria. When we say of a bird which cleverly builds its nest for the first time in its life, that it does so by instinct. We cannot get the whole cause from physical factors alone; there is also its mind and what do we know of that? We explain nothing by instinct. It is only a word; it is something which we imagine. We do not know the totality of conditions which are needed to bring about an event. All that you really know are your own ideas. What is behind or beyond your ideas you never know.

(21.129) When the universe is reduced by philosophy to a single entity, then causality must necessarily disappear because it depends on a duality of cause and effect.

(21.130) All that we can accurately say of Nature is that there are sequences. We cannot correctly say there is cause and effect.

(21.131) The real is neither the cause nor the effect. To say that the union of hydrogen and oxygen produces water and therefore they are causes of an affect does not explain why gases should form a liquid but only how. Science says this is example of causality reigning in practical world but it will not stand thought.

CHAPTER 22: PANCHADESI

(22.1) Panchadeshi's author was Vidyaranya, who was also a Diwan of the Vijayanagara Empire, which was the center of a vast united Hindu effort to resist Muhammedan usurpation. He was also at one time a Guru of Sringeri Mutt (monastery), renowned for his learning. He was also the author of "JIVAN MUKTI VIVEKA" and thus illustrates in his person the truth that a Gnani can be a successful man of action.

(22.2) Panchadesi says you should inquire into the nature of the universe first, then into the individual and finally, into the highest, the Atman. Don't go on wasting your time in imagining things; that is for the poet: let him do that if he wants to, but you should search for truth which means you must examine what is before you. Yoga and religion omits this important preliminary inquiry into the world and hence never reaches truth. He points out that this does not mean the world should disappear in Samadhi but that its true nature should be determined. If the yogis really got emancipation in Samadhi, then ordinary men would also get it in deep sleep!

(22.3) Therefore we must always be engaged in an inquiry into the nature of this universe, the individual personal self (jiva) and Atma. When the notions of reality of the world and Jiva are destroyed, what remains is pure Atma. The destruction of the world and Jiva does not mean that they should become imperceptible to the senses, but there should arise a determination of their unreal nature: for if that were not the case people may find emancipation without efforts on their part as during dreamless sleep, and fainting (when percepts altogether disappear).

(22.4) This book says "The Yogi who moves unseeing through this world is not better than a lump of clay in human form; it is not imperception of the world that is needed but the intellectual realization that its substratum is idea.

(22.5) This verse is the TRUTH: "The mind is virtually the external world (giving rise to pleasure and pain). Endeavors should be made to purify it. It is an ancient truth preserved as a secret that the mind assumes the forms it is engaged in perceiving."

(22.6) What is lost is lost forever: it does not come back.. Every minute the world is changing. In what way is this world different, then, from the momentary creations of the

mind? Both are continually vanishing, and vanish forever. Those objects or ideas which seem to come back are really new creations; for all is imagination. Know that you are only acting a part.

(22.7) "Though a direct knowledge of Brahman may be obtained by a study of the holy texts (i.e. Upanishads) it does not become established..." It is therefore not enough to say you understand the theories of Advaita; you may grasp idealism and Mandukya but it is not enough. The next stage after this ultimate mastery is the constant final practice of Gnana yoga. It involves ponder over and over again upon the subject until whatever object you find before you is seen as Brahman: this must become so firmly rooted that one's body seems like the body of another person.

(22.8) Verse 218 means that everything you see must become Brahman. It is a most difficult practice because every minute the mind is being drawn away from Brahman. When you take tea you think only of the tea instead of the Brahman in the tea etc. The contemplation or forming ideas of Brahman is the first and lower stage; the practice of Brahman is next and higher stage.

(22.9) "Control of mind is more difficult than drinking the whole ocean." Here the first three words mean mental blankness, absence of thoughts. This shows that despite the statements of yogis, thoughts cannot be banished for more than a minute or two. The true control of mind which is practicable and possible is to concentrate it quietly on one subject, keeping all other subjects away--but the subject, the thoughts, must be there. It is not the absence of duality which gives you knowledge of the Atman: for this absence prevails during deep sleep or yogic samadhi. There is no difference between the two, only sleep comes of its own accord whereas Samadhi is self-induced. The true knowledge cannot come in samadhi but only through learning what the whole world really is. Yoga should be used as a preliminary to such study. Then only can you understand that the external world is unreal, a phenomenon. But this truth about yoga has been lost, and our people misunderstand the scriptures, turning philosophy into religion and yogic blankness into Brahman. The secret knowledge has disappeared.

(22.10) Even if your studies have brought no realization, do not give it up. Keep on inquiring, everything that you do should remind you of Brahman. How do you know the future? You must not predict that you will not get it. A man who is trying to memorize a passage may succeed suddenly after failure, (subconscious mind at work). Seeds must take time to mature into trees. Hence persevere despite disappointments.

(22.11) Once you know what a pot is, it is not necessary for you to see a pot again when the word 'pot' is uttered and its meaning sought. Similarly once you know Brahman, its true nature will always be known to you. Every thing that you see will be seen by you as by ordinary people, but it will also be known to you in its true nature as Brahman.

(22.12) The more duality is disregarded in your actions and life, the clearer becomes realization, the more you refrain from thinking of other people as separate from you, the more sympathetic to others that you are to them, the easier will realization be possible.

Hence who ever scorns another because he is black-skinned, will never know Brahman. The less you think of the difference between you and others the more will true knowledge become fixed.

(22.13) The "I" comes and goes just as any other drsyam. You know that you are not the "I" and yet you attach yourself to it. He who gets attached to this passing "I" let him delude himself. The great majority want only this "I", with its satisfactions. You say that there is the Universe or the Universe is made known to you only (and your knowership by is) the Atman or Witness. If you say anything else knows Atman (c.f. my Atman means the Atman becomes an object, coming and going) there is no proof. Whatever is possessed by the Mind goes or perishes. By what can the knower be known? I cannot say. "I know Atman" is an impossibility. Therefore we say we cannot use any words, Neti, neti, yet we are led to say gradually leading up to point by association of ideas that Atma is the knower or Witness.

(22.14) Without inquiry into the universe it is impossible to get Truth.

(22.15) You may see the world as unreal without destroying it.

(22.16) Verse 113: This statement proves that idealism was the great secret of Advaita. This is why I say the external world must first be inquired into, and only after that should the I be inquired. Mysticism does not grasp this point because men are more anxious about themselves than about the world. That is to say, they are not fit for philosophy.

(22.17) Unless there is no unity of experience there can be no knowledge at all. We have objective experience only in the waking and dream. Hence Panchadesi begins with inquiry into the waking and dream experience, being an inquiry into the nature of truth. Vidyaranya is the most practical of philosophers. He begins with objects. In sushupti no object is experienced. Remembrance implies a previous act of experience. Knowledge begins with experience, with the world. Consciousness is self-luminous: it never rises nor sets. There is no proof that consciousness dies. The Nature of Consciousness is always to be subject: It can never become an object. c.f. sleep where there is no object, yet there is consciousness. The Westerner thinks only about that consciousness which is in relation to an object, something else.

CHAPTER 23: SRIMAD BHAGAVATAM

(23.1) "AT THE POINT OF PASSING FROM SLEEP TO WAKING, HE SHOULD TRY TO REALISE THE BRAHMAN." Skanda 7, Adhyaya 13, Verses 3-5. THIS IS A MOST IMPORTANT PASSAGE. WHOEVER UNDERSTANDS THIS, WILL UNDERSTAND VEDANTA. AS SOON AS YOU WAKE UP, WHAT HAS HAPPENED? WHAT IS IT THAT YOU SEE AROUND YOU? UNTIL YOU WAKE UP YOU HAVE NO I IN SLEEP. THE IDEA OF ATMAN DOES NOT COME TILL YOU WAKE UP. NOW IT BEGINS TO COME. AT THE JUNCTION PERIOD BETWEEN SLEEP AND WAKING, JUST AS BETWEEN TWO THOUGHTS YOU MAY GRASP THE TRUE NATURE OF ATMAN. PEOPLE GET CONFOUNDED;

THEY SEE UNCONSCIOUSNESS IN SLEEP AND EGO IN WAKING: SO THIS EXERCISE IS EXCELLENT FOR IT GIVES AN OPPORTUNITY TO GET RID OF THIS BEWILDERMENT.

(23.2) "He has nothing more to do" refers to himself but with Gnana he gains also knowledge of life's unity, so he has everything to do for the welfare of others, of all creatures. This line therefore means he has no further effort to make to attain Gnan, as context shows.

(23.3) PRAJNA is the deep sleep "mass of consciousness" in which everything is dissolved and from which everything proceeds, or consciousness in itself like space, i.e. formless.

CHAPTER 24: LAST MESSAGE OF KRISHNA

(24.1) 248: GET RID OF: They are still slaves of complexes, the three gunas merely being three progressive grades of classifying these complexes. There are the Tamas-group of complexes, the Rajas-group and even the Sattva-group of complexes, all of which must be got rid of.

(24.2) 249: END: The removal of these complexes reveals truth.

(24.3) 275. COVET: You must be born in this world if you want to attain Brahman; truth is to be found here and now, not in the next world.

(24.4) 365. Verses 16 and 19 summarize the whole of practical Vedanta, to feel with all other beings, to identify yourself with them.

CHAPTER 25: BUDDHISM

(25.1) Buddha was a Gnani, but his interpreters are not.

(25.2) Buddha did not enter into scriptural interpretation. So the Hindus threw him out of their religion. Sankara however although he agreed in nearly all points with Buddha, was a tactician and wanted to teach these truths within the Hindu fold. Hence he did in Rome as Rome does! He made himself outwardly appear as an orthodox Hindu, and thus secured his aim.

(25.3) Buddhism has failed through misunderstanding Gotama and believing that nothing is left to exist after Nirvana. What is it that sees the illusory nature of the finite ego? This is what the Buddhists need to answer and cannot on their theories. Only Advaita can reply: it is the Drg, the Seer. The Buddhists are in error in regarding the finite ego as illusory, and as having nothing more behind it: but they would have been perfectly correct in such outlook had they added the notion of the Drg. How is it that Skandas come together and compose the ego? Who sees them come and go? It is the Drg, the Atman, and this lack Vedanta supplies in the Drg Drsyā Viveka Analysis. When they say

that mind comes and goes they are forgetting that there must be another part of the mind as consciousness which notices it and which tells them of this disappearance and appearance. All their misunderstandings arise from the fact that Buddha refused to discuss ultimate questions. When Buddhism degenerates into Nihilism we refute it (See Mandukya). The truth of a single reality within or underlying the illusory ego is all-important and without it Buddhism becomes fallacious.

(25.4) Buddha taught the illusoriness of ego, but did not go farther probably because he thought the world could not understand the higher truth. Hence followers go with him to that point of his, and then deny the Vedantic doctrine of one supreme reality when Buddha himself neither denied nor advocated it. Anyway the refutation of his followers is to ask them "What is it that is aware of the ego's illusoriness?" There must be something that tells you that. That something is the Drg, and if you say this Drg itself may be illusory, coming and going, still there must be something non-transient i.e. permanent, to tell you this.

(25.5) We disagree with Buddhists (Vijnanavadin) only on the Ultimate question, but we agree with their idealism fully.

(25.6) ZEN may get a flash of peace but that is not the same as Vedantin who realizes that the whole world is yourself. Zen is mysticism.

(25.7) Ignorant commentators say Sankara and Gaudapada borrowed their ideas from Buddhism. But in Mandukya these two declare they are not Buddhists, only a number of their ideas agree with those of Buddhism, whilst they point out their difference of view from Sunyavada Buddhists and Vijnanavadins. Thus Sankara and Gaudapada both agree and disagree with Buddhists.

(25.8) Buddhism did not graduate its teaching to suit people of varying grades; hence its failure to affect society in Asia.

(25.9) Buddha's teachings that all life is misery belongs to the relative standpoint only. For you cannot form any idea of misery without contrasting it with its opposite, happiness. The two will always go together. Buddha taught the goal of cessation of misery, i.e. peace, but took care not to discuss the ultimate standpoint for then he would have had to go above the heads of the people and tell them that misery itself was only an idea, that peace even was an idea (for it contrasted with peacelessness). That the doctrine he gave out was a limited one, is evident because he inculcated compassion. Why should a Buddhist sage practice pity? There is no reason for it. Advaita is the next step higher than Buddhism because it gives the missing reason, viz. unity, non-difference from others, and because it explains that it used the concept of removing the sufferings of others, of lifting them up to happiness, only as we use one thorn to pick out another, afterwards throw both away. Similarly Advaita discards both concepts of misery and happiness in the ultimate standpoint of non-duality, which is indescribable.

(25.10) Tibetan and Chinese Buddhists who say that there are many Buddhas living in spirit bodies and helping our earth from the spiritual world are still in the sphere of religious illusion, not ultimate truth. Their statements are wrong. Every sage realizes that the only way to help mankind is to come down amongst them, for which he must necessarily take on flesh-body. When people are suffering how can he relieve their suffering unless he appears amongst them? When people are suffering how can he feed them from an unseen world whether their struggle be for material bread or for spiritual truth? No! He must be here actually in the flesh. It is impossible to help them in any other way and all talk of Shiva living on Mount Kailas in spiritual body or Buddha in Nirmanakaya, invisible body belongs to the realm of delusion or self-deception.

(25.11) Sunyavada Buddhism is nonsensical because every thought has its opposite, every word is tied to its coordinate for all thought and speech can only operate under such dualism. Hence, taking the most fundamental word, existence its implied opposite non-existence is also there, and vice versa. So the Sunya "non-entity" is meaningless without "entity". Both are there.

(25.12) Buddha kept silent, refusing to answer questions on the ultimate. Therefore he was the wisest man in refusing to commit himself.

CHAPTER 26: A U M

(26.1) Everything is made of the same substance, whether it be inside--as in dreams--or outside as in waking. Whatever is seen as object, heard as sound or name is of the same substance. European Idealism has begun to suspect this truth. This is the great lesson to be learnt. This is the meaning of Mandukya statement, "Aum is all this."

(26.2) The word AUM has been chosen because it is a short easily remembered syllable. The separate sounds of the word are symbols, nothing more. The combination of these three letter sounds in the one word symbolizes the world's unity. The three divisions of time--past present and future--are also symbolized. Moreover AUM contains three letters and Atman contains three states. Finally just as it requires four quarters to merge and make up a whole unity, so A, U, and M are three of these quarters.

(26.3) AUM= Turiya: This is not a state, as the ignorant pseudo-Vedantins say. This word includes all the three sounds, which have merged in it. So the waking merges in dream, the latter in sleep and all the three in AUM. The latter is a unity, nevertheless it contains a trinity. Thus when the word is made the subject of intelligent reflection, such meditation becomes a great help to attainment, as Sankara says, for it thus becomes an examination of the whole of life.

(26.4) Sounds imply names, names imply objects, objects imply whole world. "Au" is beginning of all sounds, "uM" is the end of all sounds, even other sound is included within them, i.e. within AUM.

Whatever may come in the future, whatever object existed in the past, whatever thing you can think of in the present--all these are included in the single word AUM, because all are named, hence are ideas, hence within the single mind.

The word is a mnemonic purposely invented to give men in one short syllable, in the smallest compass, a handy reminder that everything--this table, your neck-tie, that cow,--is of one and the same essential character. Every time any object is seen, you utter Aum and thus remember that it, and all other things, are the self. Every object in the external world is indicated by a name. Hence the phrase "the universe consists of names and forms." All names are but words. As soon as a word is uttered, what does your mind do? A thought comes. Now all these words in every language, all these sounds, all these thoughts, are compressed in the one word Aum; which also enables all objects to be comprehended by the Mind as being ideas. Hence this word is unique. Nothing exists which is outside the scope of referential meaning AUM.

(26.5) When we utter the word "sound" how can we understand the meaning of sound? It is only by distinguishing it from soundlessness that we can understand sound. All sounds are got from soundlessness. Similarly all the states are got from the Turiya, corresponding to soundlessness. We have to merge waking into dreams, then merge dream into deep sleep. And finally we have to merge even this into Turiya.

(26.6) Anything which is a thought, is an idea, and hence a superimposition. Aum is the substratum of all the words. It is the word of Atman. Aum stands for the sound and not the letter which is found in all languages. It sums up all the sounds in all the languages. As upon the mind everything else is super-imposed, so upon the Aum everything else is superimposed.

CHAPTER 27: SELECT WORKS OF SRI SANKARACHARYA

(27.1) How are you to know that the whole universe, hence Maya resides in Self?
Answer: By looking at dream. If you can realize that the mind is Atman, that there is absolutely no difference between them, that very moment you know universe is within it. Just as in dream universe appears to exist outside the body, but is inside mind. Why does it appear to be outside? Owing to maya, avidya, ignorance. For just as when you wake up after dream, all the people, towns and sea of dream are then known to be inside your mind, it was only ignorance which placed them outside yourself. Gnan is this waking up to the fact that whole universe is a creation of the mind. This is the meaning of Maya or mithya. Just as a whole city can be seen reflected in a small mirror so the whole of Madras can be seen i.e. thought of by the mind even though it is apparently confined to be a little thing like your head. This also shows that space is illusory. This great secret that world is an idea was not revealed by the Rishees to everybody because unprepared people could never accept it.

(27.2) If you look into the mind of man, you do not seem to find the universe there. In sleep it is quite blank. Similarly if you look into a seed, you do not see the tree there. Nevertheless, both world and tree are developments from mind and seed. What the magician does is to put ideas into your mind, i.e. he imagines something and makes you

see it as real. Similarly mind creates its own ideas and you see them as real. Ramajuna, however says God creates the ideas and puts them in your head during dream or takes them away during sleep. Berkeley says God puts them into your head during waking. But we have never seen God doing this: it is supposition. We know only that the same mind which was in sleep becomes the dreamer and the waker. Why did different scenes flow by during dream? Why did all these people appear outside me? Answer: Because the same mind which created them also created time and space. Such is the wonderful nature of this mind.

(27.3) If you do not want to come back to Samsara (taking these things to be real) think of waking after dream. What you then thought real is now found to be not real. Gnan is to see that all things are the mind's own creations, that none are different from yourself, that none are other than the mind itself, and that therefore there is no second thing. But this you can get only by analyzing world during the waking state itself and finding it to be like a dream. This is why truth must be understood when awake, not in blank trance, when facing and seeing the world, not in negation of it.

(27.4) This verse deals with the objection that mentalism deals with solipsism. In a dream you see a tiger which attacks you and eats you. What is it in the tiger which gives it the satisfaction it feels in eating you? It is your own mind. One and the same mind appears as tiger, yourself, eating, ground, trees. Similarly in waking the same mind appears as all these different forms. You do not grasp this because you are thinking only of body, not mind. To teach you that body is temporary and to force you to regard the permanent mind, death is sent by Nature. Suppose I die and my friend dies. The bodies disappear but That which thinks in both, the thinking entity, that which witnesses them, is the same in both, indeed in all, and that does not die. To explain this Sankara gives the simile of a jar with 100 holes and a lamp put inside. The light is really one but appears as a hundred different lights. Individual holes may be stopped up, i.e. die, but the light itself remains undiminished and unaffected. Europe sees that consciousness is ultimate but is unable to see that it is also One alone. It is one mind that appears in a myriad persons.

CHAPTER 28: APAROKSHANUBHUTI or 'DIRECT REALIZATION'

(28.1) 102. These steps to be practiced can be done either for yoga samadhi or to get knowledge, gnan. The seeker after truth has to pass through the same steps as the yogis but his goal being different, his application of the steps is different also. This special application is given in verse 104: This gnana is the first practice. It consists in saying of everything seen. "It is Brahman" or "It is Mind". Thus a beautiful woman is regarded as mind.

(28.2) When you have no idea of being separated from the universe, then there is no idea of space.

(28.3) Gazing at nose-tip is a practice for beginners. But when you want knowledge you must look on everything as Mind, have only one thought--mind.

(28.4) All thoughts disappear back in mind. They are only names and forms. Where have they gone? The Mind is also your Self. If you know whole world is dream, or is mental, when all thoughts go, you become your self. Hence he who becomes a sage is able to know himself as pure Mind. This is the meaning of non-causality. Mind seemed to be the cause of thoughts, ideas, but their elimination shows clearly that they are non-different from it.

(28.5) The guru cannot change you; he can direct you.

CHAPTER 29: SWATMANIRUPANA or Definition of One's own Self

(29.1) Those that want to prove existence of drg; it is only in its presence, for it is awareness, that proof can be given. It is a pre-condition without which you cannot talk of proof. How can you prove it then? The fact that they are proving, is proof of Drg!

(29.2) wonderful - The moment you think everything seen in dream is mind then the whole experience is lit up in a flash.

(29.3) Sankara repeatedly pointed out that if you put your hand in fire it is the universal experience that the fire is hot to the touch, and that even if a man says it is cold, the fact of heat remains. Is this not the scientific method which seeks to base itself also on facts of experience, not what men say?

CHAPTER 30: SRI SANKARA

(30.1) The question of the date of Sankara may be taken most correctly as that of the 9th century. I know that claims are made in India that he lived two thousand years ago, but I can show that there is absolutely no proof for this claim. I have carefully investigated the Archives at Sringeri Mut and find that they do not go back farther than the 12th century A.D. and that all so-called evidences for Sankara having lived two centuries before Christ are either were conjectures or Pandit's fabrication.

Regarding the question of Sankara's death, you may dismiss the legend that he did not die, at the age of 32 but disappeared into a cave. This is another Pandit's story which is quite unfounded. He did really die in the Himalayas at that age.

Thirdly you ask how it was possible for him to have written so many books during such a short term of existence. The truth is that he wrote very few books. Those actually written by him were Commentaries on Brahma Sutras and the Upanishads and on the Gita. All other books ascribed to him were not written down by his own hand. They are merely collections of notes recorded by his disciples from his sayings, talks and discussions.

Fourthly Sankara's own Guru was named Govinda and he lived near Indore. When Sankara wrote his commentary on the Mandukya his guru was so pleased with it that he took his chela³⁷ to the Himalayas to visit his own Guru who was named Goudapada. Only when the latter agreed that the commentary was perfect did Govinda release his Chela to start his own mission of teaching.

³⁷ personal student

(30.2) Sankara wrote his Mandukya commentary first, then as this revealed that he thoroughly understood the subject, his gurus requested him to write the commentary on Badarayana's Brahma Sutras, which was a popular theological work universally studied throughout India. That is why his commentary is written from a lower dualistic point, for those who cannot rise higher, save that here and there Sankara occasionally has strewn a few truly Advaitic sentences.

(30.3) Sankara had only four fully trained disciples, although he advised some kings. His doctrines spread AFTER his lifetime. His books were dictated to secretaries as he traveled. So few therefore were capable of understanding his philosophy.

(30.4) Nearly all Bengal thinkers hold views of Maya which are entirely incorrect and untenable. They do not know Sankara's Upanishad Bhashyas, but only the Brahma Sutra Bhashya. Sankara wrote his Mandukya commentary on a beautifully situated island called Omkaresvar, border of Indore State, where Cauvery and Narmada rivers meet. On this island there is also a tomb of Govinda, his guru.

(30.5) Sankara varied his practical advice and doctrinal teaching according to the people he was amongst. He never told them to give their particular religion or beliefs or metaphysics completely; he only told them to give up the worst features of abuse: at the same time he showed just one step forward towards the truth.

(30.6) SUNDARALAHARI: is a sexual poem which has been attributed to Sankara but judging by the style and contents I do not believe this.

(30.7) In Brahma Sutras Sankara says that Brahman is the cause of the world, whereas in Mandukya he denies it. This is because he says that at the lower stage of understanding, the former teaching must be given, for people will get frightened as they cannot understand how the world can be without a cause, but to those in a higher stage, the truth of non-causality can be revealed.

CHAPTER 31: BRAHMA SUTRAS

(31.1) Brahma Sutras, i.e. "Vedanta Sutras" by Badarayana, are intended for those of middling intellects, not for those who have the best brains: it is a semi-theological, semi-philosophical work; it starts with the assumption that Brahman exists.

(31.2) The opening sentence is "All this is Brahman." But nobody knows or has seen Brahman. If we say "All this is wood" and show a piece of wood, the words are understandable. Suppose you have never seen wood. Then what is the use of such a sentence? It becomes meaningless when the object indicated is seen by none. Hence the Brahma Sutra opening is equivalent to "All this is X". Both have no meaning so long as they are not understood, if we take them as the data to start from. It is for this reason that I say the book is intended for theological minds, because it begins with dogma although its reasoning is close. For it starts with something imagined.

(31.3) A man who describes Sankara's philosophy as negative (because of his Neti, Neti) does not know that this is applied only to the world of the Seen, the critic ignorantly believes that it is also applied to the Seer. Vedanta never negates the seer, only the seen.

CHAPTER 32: VIVECKACHUDAMANI

(32.1) Ideas are coming & going. Though similar ideas come we cannot say or prove that one idea is identical with another idea because they cannot be identical in time. Ideas are always changing, they are always going. This is drsyam. The similarities of ideas is also another idea. It is not the same thing that comes and goes. The sun, moon, body etc. are not the same thing at two consecutive points in time; they are changing every moment.

CHAPTER 33: SWAMI VIVEKANANDA & SRI RAMAKRISHNA

(33.1) RAMAKRISHNA practiced meditation with yogis, and he said that all these were progressive steps and did not condemn them. Yet with Vivekananda he taught that religion and yoga were not the end, for they can never directly lead to Brahma-gnana.

(33.2) Teachings other than Vedanta are for beginners only. There are stages in comprehending truth. Hence Sri Ramakrishna taught Vedanta--the highest truth--only to Vivekananda. All his other disciples were taught Yoga, mysticism or theology. He kept a Vedanta treatise (Ashtavakra Gita) hidden under his pillow when others came to talk, but when he was alone with Vivekananda he brought the book out and taught him from it.

(33.3) MAHABHARATA: "It is men having Buddhi for their eyes that succeed in reaching Brahman." (Moksha Dharma Parva).

(33.4) Why should Patanjali say that thought is not Brahman? Everything is Brahman, therefore all thoughts are it too. So why get rid of thoughts? This shows him not to have attained Gnana.

(33.5) SURESVARACHARYA: the first disciple of Sankara says in his book, "Naishkama Siddha" (not translated into English): There are a number of steps between the ordinary man and the Gnani. First step for the ordinary man is to do his duty, to distinguish between right and wrong and follow right. Second step is for him to purify himself by following right even at the expense of self. Third step is to practice Sanyas which may be internal alone or both internal and external. Only then will yoga practice begin to have effect. Next he will have to inquire into the nature of the mind; then into the nature of Atman. Then he will discover the meaning of Tat Twam Asi. Finally he gets rid of all ignorance.

CHAPTER 34: V.S.I. PERSONAL

(34.1) When I went to Sringeri Swami at the age of 24 and asked to become his pupil. I had a dream the previous night that the Swami's own Guru (then dead) appeared to me

and said: "Yes, you may start: you are now fit to read Vedanta." I told the dream to the Swami and he smiled and said it was encouraging. But years later when I had "graduated" as it were, my guru reminded me of the dream and said, "It was entirely originated in your own mind. You had seen a photo of my own guru in the monastery and heard of him, and then your self created the dream itself. But I could not tell you that truth before because you could not grasp it. So I encouraged you to go on knowing that eventually I could reveal the real truth." The numerous cases of disciples having gurus appear to them in dream, of mystics having Jesus, Krishna and God appearing to them in vision, are all entirely self-created and moreover, are in the region of mental phenomena only: not in Brahman. All intuitions, all visions however advanced the mystics may be, are but mental creations. They cannot be otherwise. The moment a form appears in the mind, it is a thought. Where else can it come from except from the thinker's own self?

(34.2) Those who say I am teaching only Sankara's system are mistaken. We want only truth, not authorities. My doctrine and position are not based on Sankara, but on inquiry into truth.

(34.3) During our wanderings in the Baba Buban Hills, V.S.I. pointed out a small cave, near a pond where a yogi he knew had spent all his life in practices: He was a chela and the Guru (who lived in the large B.B.crypt) had been instructed to keep on practicing and one day he would get the vision. The poor fellow died without seeing anything. This is the trick of these Gurus. We say with the Upanishads, "I want Brahman, here and now."

(34.4) V.S.I. was a living Socrates. He was perpetually asking pointed questions which seemingly innocent and simple on the surface, were really "depth-bombs" which exploded beneath the other man's mind and shattered all his rationalizations, illusions, complexes.

(34.5) The Monogram on my notepaper is a kind of family crest which has been in use for many generations in my family. It is nothing new however, and you will find it frequently on the popular lithographic pictures of Sri Sankara. It represents an Advaitic Mudra: the text alone being personal. The text is in Sanskrit and is taken from Isa Upanishad and means: "Where (or "How") can there be delusion or suffering when oneness is realized?" The mudra, or hand and finger posture means that you cannot understand truth unless you have avastatraya. In detail the three fingers represent the three states of waking, dream and sleep. The forefinger is Turiya and the thumb is the Atman. The bent forefinger touching the thumb means that when you separately stretch out and examine the three states, there is a seer or drg which knows them; this is Turiya, the 4th; the touching the thumb means that this 4th state is really none other than or one with the Atman or self.

(34.6) V.S.I. would humorously remark that the advantage of living long and being an old man over seventy years was that it presented you with the experience that waking life is just a dream. "I forget so many things nowadays." He said, "I do not know where I have put my fountain pen or money, I cannot remember the names of friends etc. Thus waking

life has become dream-like to me through old age; I need no other proof that waking and dream are identical."

(34.7) When H.H. Maharaja of Mysore died, V.S.I. said to me; Why did I accept the work of teaching him? It was not for personal gain. I have always refused to take money from him. And even when there were a few hundred pounds left from the money he paid for my European tour to the Philosophical Congress and individual scientists, I did not keep it for myself but gave it to British Institute of Philosophy to establish a lectureship on truth. No, I took on this post because I saw that through H.H. I might help others. So it is working out: for the people of the State have benefited materially by his unselfish devotion to their physical welfare, whilst the people of the world, including India and the West will benefit mentally through the tuition class held in Mysore and through your studies and writings done whilst H.H's guest.

(34.8) I want to make every point in philosophy thoroughly clear to you, hence to discuss it at great length, because you are likely to publish my sayings and teachings one day.

(34.9) The Late Maharaja of Mysore was so anxious to spread the philosophy of Advaita that he once said to me: Here is P.B. He has a great gift with his pen and an aptitude for mysticism and philosophy. Let us keep him here in Mysore to study Advaita and then make it known to the West.

CHAPTER 35: COUNSEL - GENERAL

(35.1) You had made your name famous as a yogi and an exponent of yoga. Do not throw all that aside now. Do not break your reputation, now that it has been built up, by telling the world that yoga is delusive. I advise you to tell them that what they have been practicing is alright, but now they ought to go up higher, just as you yourself have gone up higher. All those who are satisfied with meditation can be told to go on with their practices but those who have become dissatisfied through lack of results can be initiated into Gnana. In any case philosophy is also called Gnana yoga and therefore you can say this is a higher form of yoga. In any case tell those who insist on the practice of meditation to test all their experiences and ideas for truth, but never tell them the results which will emerge after these analyses. It is for them to discover that the experiences of yoga may be delusive. Simply show them how to make the test but do not reveal the results.

(35.2) "Is this true?" is the beginning of philosophy. Doubt is the beginning of knowledge.

(35.3) Karezza (or Vajroli in India) is practised by yogis to have intercourse without losing seed. I have no objection to it. The chief point in this and the question of morality to remember is that the seed gives brain power when retained, leads to concentration of mind, so when it is dissipated the man cannot concentrate and study Vedanta. No moral *raison d'être* exists really other than this.

CHAPTER 36: LITERARY COUNSEL

(36.1) Re: Maya: In your use of word "Maya" remember it is not the constant change of the world but the illusion which arises as a result of the change.

CHAPTER 37: KANT

(37.1) Kant has shown excellently how we think always within the framework of times space and cause, and that we cannot go away from it.

(37.2) Kant sought to show that Reality lay in what he called "things in themselves." Hegel demolished this notion by showing that there could be only one "thing in itself," which was reality. In that sense, he has got further than Kant. Without the practice of and success in meditation, however, both these philosophers could not come into contact with that about which they reflected. This is where the East can help the West.

(37.3) If time, space and cause are in the mind, Kant says, it is nonsensical for him to say that they do not belong to reality and that the unknowable real lies outside them. If it is unknowable how does he know it exists? And how can he say there is something outside mind, it is unprovable? And how is it possible to know anything in itself without using the mind to know it, and thus knowing only something mental again? If Kant had said the noumenon is the same as the Drg, then he would have been right: but instead he said it was outside the mind.

CHAPTER 38: ANCIENT EUROPEANS

(38.1) ARISTOTLE could not get beyond causality, hence he never got at truth.

(38.2) Plato rose to the truth that the world is an idea but he did not go beyond that to the ultimate, i.e. that the idea itself disappears in Brahman.

(38.3) SOCRATES: rose very high too but did not quite reach the ultimate. He is a typical inquirer who is properly prepared for this quest because he kept on asking: "What is truth." The one thing we have to do as "Viveka Chudamani" points out is to get rid of ignorance or error.

(38.4) Socrates refused to be called a wise man and asked to be known as a "philosopher", i.e. a lover or seeker of wisdom, not as one who knows wisdom. To confess that you are striving after truth and not to claim it, is the mark of the superior man.

(38.5) Socrates like most of the Greek philosophers, was partly a mystic, because he had a daemon who gave him guidance. He and they began the course of inquiry but never maintained it strictly on rational lines throughout. Moreover he dressed in simple coarse robe like our Indian Yogis.

(38.6) Socrates made the tremendous point of getting men to discover their own ignorance, of confessing that they did not really know but erroneously thought they did. This is an essential preliminary in Vedanta.

(38.7) PLATO's doctrine of archetypes, ideas that are unchanging, is self-contradictory. It is the very nature of ideas to be ever-changing. His archetypal world was an imagination. He was a dualist, and like a child when compared with Indian philosophers.

(38.8) PROTAGORAS' saying "Man is the measure of all things" is really the same as saying "the world is my idea" and the same as Einstein's relativity which makes things partially depend on the observer.

CHAPTER 39: MODERN WESTERN PHILOSOPHERS

(39.1) MEINONG: It is to the credit of this great European that he saw the great need of disregarding mere words and penetrating deeper into what my mind is doing when it says it has got a meaning. This is the essence of Vedanta, to watch vigilantly how the mind works when it assigns meaning, to catch as in a lightning flash what is happening then for this is the key to the arising of variety in the mind and the dissolving of the latter back into unity. Thus we can see that the melting down of gold ornaments into block gold is equivalent to knowing Atman; but this is only a stage whereby we get understanding. Thence we have to rise higher to understand later that even when we see variety, it is nevertheless unity, Brahman. Ultimately the two are the same. When we watch the mind's activity we discover that all these varied thoughts disappear. Where do they go? They must merge in the Mind again. Hence they are the Mind.

(39.2) G.E.MOORE: His criticism that Idealists confuse the object with its awareness is answered by saying that it is awareness that comes first and tells you of the object. For the first thing you get to know is the sensation of it, not the object itself. Take the case of a sleeping man who is tickled by an insect. He wakes up and the first thing he knows is the sensation of tickling, not the insect. Or cut the optic nerve and there is no sensation in consequence. Hence no object is ever seen. The existence of the object is made after experiencing a sensation and is made as an inference. But we must here apply some semantics. What is an inference? It is only imagination, nothing more.

(39.3) HUME: is one of the greatest of Western philosophers. He refused to accept dualism of soul and body because it was without basis in evidence. However he goes up to the Aham, pointing out that it ceases to exist in sleep and therefore he knows of no proved continuous self; analyzed the ego disappears. Unless people come first to Hume's position, that the ego comes and goes, we cannot teach them the truth of the Drg. Hume did not know our doctrine that there is something higher than ego, which itself knows the ego. Ramanuja, however, foolishly holds that the I still persists in deep sleep; but he can't prove it.

(39.4) Hume is a Western Philosopher I admire greatly. Kant acknowledged that "Hume woke me from my slumber." Hume reached the point of indicating that the world is an idea.

(39.5) LEIBNIZ: His philosophy is like Sankhya, offering morals as purushas. Moreover he said that there is a number of morals giving a purely psychical (mental) nature to them. But as mind has no dimensions how is it possible to number minds? Hence Leibniz's system is pure imagination. Similarly there are many other philosophical systems which are also merely imagined. It needs three years to study all of them. Therefore people take the school which pleases them most, just as they eat cakes they like best. It is poetry, not reason. However we cannot discourage these schools because they are all efforts to understand. They lead to deeper thinking later on. The only thing we condemn is when they show the vanity of imagining that they know everything. Now they are being swept away as useless. The coming of science has altered things. Today philosophy demands verification and a basis on scientific fact.

(39.6) Leibnitz and Spinoza have been refuted by Kant, who has shown that their time and space are not there "outside."

(39.7) Hume and Sunyavadin Buddhists declared nonexistence of Entity, a Void. This is just as much unwarranted finality, for it means you are viewing it from a particular standpoint as to declare its existence. Silence alone is called for. Absence or presence of objective world and even existence and non-existence is always referred to drsyam only; it still leaves the Drg untouched.

(39.8) HUME's famous refutation of the existence of a self can be criticized Vedantically. If he takes I as the mind, he is right in saying there is no independent substance, a self, apart from it. Kant is right in agreeing with Hume that the self is not revealed as an object, but Kant goes further and says like Descartes, you can never get rid of the self as the thinking subject. The confusion in the mind of Hume etc. is first in not knowing the meaning of word experience. They ought to have analyzed 'experience' into what is changing and what is not. Next they should have realized that you cannot have any experience unless there is a duality of the unchanging knower and the changing thing known, that unless there is a changeless, the changing experience of objects could never be known. Third the ego is such a changing object too, so what is meant by self must be made clear. Thus three words need analysis: experience, knowledge, self or confusion results. This analysis is the Drg Drsyam Viveka task. Hence Hume was right in saying there was no self if by self he meant only ego, and not mind, but he does not tell us. He was wrong however in other points.

(39.9) EINSTEIN: You ask whether Drg-Drsyam-Viveka is not Einstein's law of relativity applied to the realm of psychology. This is true up to a certain point only, but not fully true. Einstein has pointed out the relativity of all observations to the position of the observers, that is the Ego. But he has not realized that the observer himself is also purely relative and that the world which is being observed does not exist apart from the seer of the ego. Einstein has not seen the truth about the Drg, about that which sees of the

relativities that nothing can be said which permits him to see the relativities and which itself views the ego as one of those relativities. Two further steps await Einstein, first is to grasp the theory of Idealism and after that to go on to the principle of Avastatraya.

(39.10) Eddington, Jeans etc. say the object is only an idea but they have not grasped that the ego is also an idea: without grasping this point they miss the key to Vedanta. I am the Witness of the I also. If you do not grasp this point, you cannot understand Vedanta. When you see a table, your awareness must have been present even before, otherwise how could you have been aware of it? This awareness is the real Atman, not the ego. The awareness is there always, even when the table is not seen. Nothing could ever be thought of if awareness, the capacity to think of it, were ever absent at any time. When are you free from awareness? If you say that it is not at any moment, then somebody must have been aware of this non-awareness.

(39.11) Pragmatism deals only with one aspect of philosophy--what man can do; it forgets to take the world as it is. The world is changing. These changes are partly due to Nature and partly due to man. When you study these two aspects together, you have materials for philosophy. In ignoring the natural aspect, pragmatism renders itself one-sided and imperfect philosophically. In ancient Greece the mystics did not care for the changes going on in the world. They thought this static contemplation was philosophy. But the world consists of two aspects--the changes, and that which changes. Both have to be studied if philosophy is to be arrived at. Vedanta does not disagree with pragmatism, but says, "Do not confine yourself to some of the facts of life, the material ones, but study also the mental and higher ones."

(39.12) Berkeley had not the courage to go to the very end for he would have to reflect that the very God he posits as having created the idea which man sees as objects--this very God is Berkeley's own mental creation, hence an idea in his mind.

(39.13) BERKELEY's "esse est percipi" means to be is to be mentally perceived; his "perceived things" means "mentally perceived things."

(39.14) HUME. It is the essential principle of idealism that ideas keep on coming; we do not know anything more. We do not know why they keep on coming. This continuous appearance is called Phenomenalism and was correctly explained by Hume. We cannot find any law to explain why the idea of a shelf and not the idea of a wall arises. It is in the nature of Mind to be giving birth to these different ideas. One idea goes and another idea comes; we cannot say more. If you, ask why one idea rather than another appears, we say the question must not be asked. For "why" implies that you are seeking for a cause, and cause itself is only an idea. Even if you find a cause it will give, Ashtavakra says, all thinking will give only another thought again.

(39.15) HUME's failure to find a self is answered by Drg Drsyā Viveka. All his criticisms are sound but apply only to the drsyam. For what is it that tells him that there is no self? It to the mind, itself, i.e. the Atman.

(39.16) BRADLEY says that philosophic thinking can yet get at truth but owing to its very limitation cannot get at reality. We in India refute him and show that it can go farther, it can go to the very end.

CHAPTER 40: MANDUKYA UPANISHAD

(40.1) The Notes are expansions freely made by Swami Nikhilananda on the basis of V.S.I.'s commentaries. One point should be noted: The earlier portions of Mandukya may deceive you if you take them as final positions for they will be developed higher in the latter part of the book. Thus the opposition and separation between reality and illusion, between Drg and Drsyam of the earlier third of the book disappears as illusory later and you learn that there is non-duality, all is Brahman, the Drsyam is also the Drg, the Maya is the Brahman without distinction. The phrase "He who sees not and hears not, knows Brahman" does not mean abstracting the mind from the world, as yogis say, but that whatever you do see in the world it is all Brahman to you. We teach Vedanta's goal as the seeker becoming the all, the One without a second, not the One.

(40.2) AUM - Where did the sound go after utterance, whence did it come? That we call soundless Aum. We can only say that the sound Aum comes out of the soundless Aum, and since all sounds come out of me I can only use the term Self for it. Similarly all the world comes out of myself as it needs me to recognize it. Just as all spoken sounds come out of me and go back, I can only say a soundless state in me was their source. You can say it is non-entity because the sounds come out again. Similarly in sleep you can't say that you don't exist in deep sleep because you reemerge. The big self existed then. Buddha meant when he said the self did not exist, that the little self alone did not exist.

(40.3) The "three states" is the totality of man's experience, which gives you the whole world. Waking state is converted into a world of ideas. There the European stops. But what is an idea? Where has the ego sleep gone? It disappears in Brahman. The whole disappears in Brahman. That is the point. That Brahman is what we have to get at.

(40.4) What is desire? It implies a second thing, i.e. duality. Unless we rise to a unity, we have no happiness. Why does man have wants, desires etc? Because he has duality sense. Absence of desire when all duality is converted into feeling of non-duality. When you know the entire world is merged into you, what is there for you to desire?

(40.5) (Verse 28) "Ishvara" means That which creates and in which the creator is dissolved. "Prajna" is Ishvara. The whole world dissolved in Him in deep sleep. The world is an idea, all ideas get merged in yourself in sleep hence the whole world is merged in you in sleep. Then you get the same position as Ishvara.

What is grief due to? To not being able to get what is wanted or to lose what is had. But if you know that the world is an idea, and that all the wealth you had, and which was lost has gone back in me as Ishvara, therefore how can I feel sorry. If I grieve it is because I wrongly felt it has gone into somebody else. The idea of loss, the object or person lost, all go back into the mind. Hence a Gnani does not grieve. This is foolishly applied to practical life, when people have an idea, that I am a separate being from others;

only for a Gnani is loss not real loss. Unless one has realized, one should be practical in viewing loss. When you forget everything, you don't grieve over it. When you know that memory is an idea, then the misery it may bring you is nullified. All unhappiness brought by the memory of the past, is found in the mind; Gnani evacuates it as idea and is not moved. When you know mind to be all-pervading it may be called Aum, but until you know this, it must be called mind. Aumkara--Sound of Aum.

So long as you have a mind thinking, you must have transmigration. Think always of the fact that everything in past, present and future is Aumkara (as universe). Imagination of past and future appears as real to unenlightened until they awaken. Then they see it is all imagination. To ignorant world seems real, to gnani the world is seen to be as much an idea as my own body, my own personal self.

(40.5) How to think the world ceases to exist when asleep? This problem exists only for those who think external world already exists as real and who think their body also exists as real. When one sees their unreality the problem collapses.

(40.6) Ever-peaceful - means, you do not want anything, not even God or Heaven, because you know that even Heaven and God are in you.

(40.7) Unreality has two meanings, that which does not exist and that which is mistaken for something else. Here the meaning is with those things--objects which appear before you, which are seen to exist. Hence the first work of philosophy is to learn the meaning of the world in front of you. After analyzing the dream of Chamundi hill, you know that it could not have been inside the small space of your body during sleep, hence it must have been a dream. The body would not have contained the hill, hence the dream is unreal, because of its inconsistency. Hence on further analyses and examination you realize it is only an idea. It is the fact of inconsistency which is emphasized here.

(40.8) I am not an atheist in any sense, for I stick to God as Truth (vide Gita definition) and not to God as imagined by others. I do not accept an unreal God. When you are dreaming you do not regard the objects as unreal; only after awakening. Many yogis are under the delusion that if world disappears in meditation they are having Brahman knowledge. They shut their eyes.

(40.9) That the mind is within the brain skull is a fallacy. Who has measured the mind? Therefore who knows that it is confined to the brain skull?

You can see both a pin-point or a mountain within our own mind and hence it is as small as the point or as large as the mountain.

(40.10) Mandukya says there is no evidence to prove a causal relation. Therefore how are you going to prove God created (i.e. caused) the world? Moreover sorrow and misery in the world is hardly compatible with the idea of a beneficent creator. The wise course is to suspend judgment and not to admit or deny creation.

(40.11) The sloka will be interpreted in the directly opposite way by the West. They say only children or idiots make no distinction between waking and dreaming. The point is we do not say dream objects are real, but the reverse of it, that the waking is unreal. Waking is like dream. Shakespeare, Plato, and Longfellow have said so, i.e. they had flashes at moments of the truth. Now I am old, I find my childhood and youth are like shadows. The ball and the bat that I used sixty years ago are unreal. I cannot touch them. What has become of them? It looks like a dream to me now. Thus even experience teaches a man that many things that he looks upon as real are mere ideas.

(40.12) "Illustration" here means that having seen so many objects in dreams then all having proved unreal, I draw the general conclusion that they are all unreal. You cannot have referred to the dream if you had not seen the objects. (Do not think of objects of waking state now, or you will get confused). Thinking only of dream experiences, the number of objects seen by you in dreams does not exhaust all the multitude which you could have seen, yet even though you have only seen some instances of dream objects yet you draw the general conclusion that they are unreal and that all possible dream objects will for ever be unreal. This is logic. From this you may draw the conclusions that all objects seen are unreal.

Now we begin with the waking state. Here again we find a thousand instances of something like, 'all men are mortal' because so many of the men I know die. We have seen a number of objects in dream and they have become unreal. Now waking objects are also seen. Objects seen are unreal. These waking objects are also seen. Hence they too are unreal. Note: It is the being perceived, which constitutes the unreality.

Many objects are seen, whether in waking or in dream. The men I saw have died. I conclude humans die. What will happen to these living men. They will also die. Similarly I have condemned dream objects which I have seen. They are all unreal. I see the waking objects. They too must be unreal. This is the logical part of truth. It is not the only way, but it is a help like yoga. Philosophy is not more logic, but in this instance the two come together.

(40.13) There is illusory existence and real existence. The highest intellectual inquiry is regarding the external world, the world which is seen in the waking state. "What is the nature of the world which I see?" is the first question with which you must start. We can show that the same principle that seen objects are unreal applies to the waking, no less than to the dream state.

Houses and friends you have seen are real. You go to Ooty and see the roads and buildings, and say they are real. What right have you to say that? How did you get the sense of reality about them? What did my mind do in giving me this idea and feeling of the reality of these houses? Answer: You assume that whatever is seen is real. Why did you make such an assumption? Answer: In past experience I have seen other houses and they seemed real, and so drew the conclusion that all houses are real, and so automatically assume that every newly seen house is real. The mind has logically worked for some particulars (objects) to a generalized conclusion that all objects are real. In this conclusion correct? I see a mirage in a desert, yet there is no water really there. The point is that mere sense impression cannot give you the reality of a thing, and you cannot be sure that it is really so. Hence the stick which appeared bent was not bent at the beginning

and end, could not have been bent in the middle. Hence our sloka points out the same regarding all objects and appearances.

Europe has not gone into the meaning of the word real. We, Indians say that the word can only be applied to that which is changeless,(i.e. never changes).

Science now says no objects remain the same for even a second. Hence you can't say any particular form is real. Everything constantly changes. Which particular form is permanent? I do not see any change, you object? Look back five yours, ten years, 20 years, and you admit you have changed body and appearance. The change was gradual. What does gradual mean? It was going on all the time whether you were aware of it or not.

(40.14) Did you then suspect your dreams were mere fancy? No. Do you now suspect this was is a mere idea? No. The point is that it is unfair to judge dream by waking as illusory and when at the time it seemed so real, unless you are prepared to judge, waking by dream and draw the same conclusion i.e. it is idea. In dream you have a mental universe outside you and thoughts inside, the whole thing is only imagination, just the same as in waking you have these two.

(40.15) The man who runs after women shows thereby that he regards the woman's body as real. How then can he get at Vedantic truth? But our practical view is that if the woman is there already in your life let her remain but regard her as an idea. This will be alright. Similarly with wealth, position and household life. They can remain provided you regard them as idea provided you know what their value is. Otherwise you are so addicted to regarding them as real that you cannot get at the truth.

We don't call ourselves realists. We are unrealists, not Idealists. We simply say that you have to analyze the world into an idea. There is a difference between both. In dream you see a mountain appearing as real, but it is only an idea. No European philosopher has seen this difference. They confuse both.

(40.16) It is nonsense for Europeans to say ideas exist only inside, and to accuse Idealists of saying there is nothing external. Idealism admits that ideas can exist externally for which the example is the dream, wherein you see a universe outside you. Yet it is only an idea. Opponents think wrongly that we deny an existence outside us. We are not so foolish. We do not oppose such common experience but accept it. Only it is idea.

(40.17) Illusory- that which is constantly changing but appears permanent.

(40.18) I do not know of any one having produced the world. This sloka refutes Berkeley, Kant and most European philosophers who posit God as creation. Fichte: "We cannot believe it is idea, created by external creator; it must be our own mind which created the world. 1st step: The external world is an idea. 2nd step: Ideas exist in my own mind alone. 3rd step: The world exists as my own mental creation.

Who else but the self could have imagined the objective world? Ramanuja and Madwa see God as the imaginer, but where is the proof. Nobody has seen God creating. You have seen no other creator, whether God or angel. The only self is left. Therefore self is the creator because imagining means creating. The Dvaita and Religionists talk

nonsense. Has God a meaning to you? Yes. It is an idea. What is an idea? An imagination. So God has no proved existence beyond that of idea.

Where people cannot and do not think, they follow others. A Gnani will see the world and get to know it is only appearance. He is not blind; he sees everything or object as it is, but he knows it is only an idea. Just as you see a mirage, the Gnani sees the mirage of this world too; but he is not deceived by it. So long as you are ignorant or a child, you will have the idea that God has created this world because the causal notion will be there. Nobody wants suffering, and while the notion that suffering can be got rid of by appealing to God these wishes will sway the mind to believe in God. For them religion will arise, but for the man who wants truth, religion offers no consolation.

Yoga is a discipline through which one has to pass "to make the mind clear" in the old Sanskrit phrase. If the mind is not strong enough to pursue truth, then yoga is prescribed to clarify and purify it. As a step, yoga or religion is welcome; but when advocated as being the highest, then it is a mistake.

(40.19) It may be perfectly correct that we cannot dream of nor imagine a mountain if we never have seen one before, but the essential point is that even then it is an idea. It is the mind that created all the external objects. Do you see anything which is not created by the mind? No, because it is the mind that has to give you everything; outside of the mind you can see nothing. Hence we know nothing but mind. When the mind is not working what knowledge can you get? We are entirely at the mercy of the mind. You can see nothing except what your mind tells you, what it manufactures. Even those who object that mind is different from 'facts' have to be told this by the mind, hence know it only as idea.

(40.20) That is the mistake of the yogis, the fallacy of yoga. It says in Nirvikalpa Samadhi, when waking stopped, you can get knowledge. But how can mind know anything when it is not working. It can know nothing then.

"to be attached" only means to regard the world as real. Yoga is only to sever this attachment. You must so train yourself as to see, to feel there is nothing real. Nirvikalpa Samadhi is equivalent to deep sleep, nothing more. For when mind has no ideas, it knows nothing. How can it know itself? For it is subject, to know it must have an object. Subject can't know itself. Impossible. Mind which stops ideas, must stop knowing them or things, hence lose knowing-consciousness and how does this differ from sleep? It is the same.

Yoga will give peace. Yes. But to find truth intellectual effort is necessary. The yogis who try to stop the mind will arrive at peace but are doing the opposite of finding truth.

(40.21) Why do I like music? Because it pleases the 'I'. Hence the mind has created it. Then the memory of this music remains. Then you want it again and imagine it once more. The reason of hunger or desire lies in the memory of the past satisfaction of the hunger or desire. This is repeated continuously. This is the process of the Vasanas. There is no new creation really. The Vasanas cause you to repeat the desires. Repeated imagination makes you a slave of the desire which has been re-echoed from the past; the desire is only imagination deeply rooted. Thus karma is created. When a man realizes at last that his desires are only ideas, he is able to get rid of them. Until then they will go on repeating themselves.

(40.22) Know first the nature of the world. It is idea. Why should you imagine at all. This will be answered in the next chapter. It is absurd to say it is God's Leela. Why should God make all men to suffer all kinds of miseries and then call it his play? What right has he to create me? Until you know that all the world and myself is an idea explanations must be sought but they are all unsatisfactory. For the idealist the question does not arise, as the questioner no longer exists for him. He is now in the world of truth, not in the world of assumptions where God belongs to his creation. In Gita it says (Chap.13) you can't speak of either Sat or Asat (Existence or non-existent) in Truth. For those who start with the presumption that the creation of the world is a fact the objection of evil and suffering is unanswerable. Mandukya however explains there is no real creation. The notion of creation is untenable and given up.

(40.23) Vedanta is not a theory assuming that Atman exists. It says rather that if you will inquire, the conviction will automatically arise that Atman alone is because you will see and verify this.

(40.24) Akasa - means Space. It is not the nihilistic Void, but the Unlimited, Uncharacterisable,

(40.25) Illusory: individuals are seen but they are nothing else than Mind; what is seen is your imagination, idea of them; what is really there is the nondual Mind. Nothing has been produced or caused in reality, only we infer it.

(40.26) You are identical with all that you see. This is knowledge--highest point in Vedanta. The snake was only in the mind (in appearance). It is only in the mind (in disappearance).

(40.27) Everything that exists is mental and it appears and disappears--this is shown by Mandukya, first three chapters. Mind is like space--everywhere, unindividuated but appearing to be so.

(40.28) Objective world superimposed on the mind, means not from outside but from inside the mind. "Mind is not in touch with any object" means "any object other than the mind." Where does mind touch matter: where does it touch this wall? Nobody can show the point of contact; all wrongly assume matter is outside mind, that the wall is outside it.

(40.29) Mandukya, the highest of all Upanishads declares that deep sleep and yogic samadhi are one and the same.

(40.30) Atman is the highest Reality and its opposite: Note the word "and". Reality and illusion together make Brahman: nothing can be left out.

(40.31) Brahman must be realized in the waking state when all objects are present to consciousness, otherwise it is nonsense.

(40.32) "Soundless and of infinite sounds"; means both waking and sleep world must be known, both objects and non-objects must be understood before truth of Brahman is realized.

(40.33) In deep sleep and anesthesia you have non-duality but no gnan. Therefore there must be discrimination along with non-duality. Otherwise sleeping dogs would be gnansis.

(40.34) Verse 32 is the most important sloka in the entire book. Its most important words are: "On account of a knowledge of truth" is it possible for you to be away from mind at any time? Whenever you have a thought the mind is there, and the Atman is there. But when you think of duality, it is called Maya. When you think without any difference between the two, then the mind itself becomes the Atman. So long as you think the dream mountain is different from mind, and you feel happy or miserable in consequence, you will be like children or deluded yogis. But when you inquire, "What are these things I have seen in dream?" you find they are same as mind and then you get Self. In the same way, in waking state, if you make the same inquiry you get Atman. Western Scientists are getting quite near this truth, but they need to go a little further, to drop their superiority (complex) over Indian philosophy. "Want of objects to be cognized" means when you do not see anything different from you then you realize Truth. It does not mean deep sleep, every animal has that. It means knowing the truth.

(40.35) So long as you consider the waking to be a different state from dreaming, it is impossible to reply to the criticism why can't you pay with waking loan in dream money? Gaudapada points out that these are not two states and that waking and dream are one state. When this is grasped, the criticism cannot arise.

(40.36) All those who think philosophy is for theorizing, discussing meditating, writing and studying only, have not understood it. Philosophy is to show men to live: it is the most practical of things; it is primarily intended as a guide to action, for its final summing up, as stated on page 352 of Mandukya, and Gita 3:25 and 12:30 is to be always working for the welfare of all existence, not dreaming in a cave or ashram or poring over metaphysical books. The only test of a philosopher is this: Is he able to sympathize with every other man who is suffering? Is he always trying to better the mental and material conditions of others? Such a test is clearly an implication of practical activity.

(40.37) The fire-brand illustration is used to show the possibility that consciousness can appear as this or that form without actually being different from itself. You see the figure of 8 made by the fire brand but yet there is no such figure there. Similarly the mountain is not in my dream but it appears to be there. Hence we say the appearance of the world is due to mind only. There is no such thing as a place which is beyond mind.

(40.38) Real means permanent, unchanging. If the one world-stuff changes its varied forms constantly, there is really only a presentation, a seeing of things, the mind does not actually become a mountain, in dream: hence there are no real changes in the world-stuff but only apparent ones.

(40.39) The opening invocation gives the substance of the whole book: If you see all things in yourself, then it is Truth. If you see all in God, it is not truth; you see the whole world in dream in yourself--that is the nearest illustration. This identity--oneness--is the whole truth. This yoga was lost. I must see everything in me and I must see everything in you too. Then it is truth.

(40.40) This books teaches how everything that man wants may be got and that everything has to be studied in the world, so it does not mention any particular object. There is nothing which is not to be found here. The moment you remove Maya, identify yourself with your real nature, "that you are Brahman" then you attain everything. If everything is Brahman, how can you then desire anything? Everything is contained in you. There is nothing else. It includes all blessings. Nothing more is required. How should one know another. If you do not understand Mandukya, read Dasopanishad, if you fail to understand that read "100 Minor Upanishads." For Mandukya Upanishad is the highest point reached by human thought and reason.

(40.41) Atman has got four quarters; in the first quarter you find only material objects; in the second, ideas and feelings, in the third, there will be nothing at all. In the fourth where all merge the Atman is the same as Brahman. This is a summary of the opening lessons.

(40.42) If you say Brahman exists or does not exist, or is both existent and non-existent, then somebody else can get up and demolish your position. Therefore Advaitins must keep silent about it and predicate nothing about It. Both the seen and the unseen are Brahman. It is not only that which is within but also that which is without. Hence Mandukya in sloka 2 says Atman has got four quarters, which must be all put together to form the whole: if any quarter is omitted you have not got Brahman. If only the within is taken, then you get only a fraction, not true Brahman.

CHAPTER 41: VIVEKACHUDAMANI OF SANKARACHARYA

(41.1) The body is constantly being fed by particles of food, air or water brought into it from outside. This is a continuous lifelong process. Hence always in state of change. Hence you can never say you have a permanent body of your own. If you examine it, it is wearing out every second, renewing with new particles, hence we say you are not the body. You have no body; it is scientifically part of the universe. You merely think you have permanent body. That is merely an idea. The body is a cinema picture. It is constantly changing. When you inquire into the truth of it, you find it is something which is constantly going away, in the form of gases etc, it is an illusion. But so strong is our attachment to it that in spite of intellectual perception of body's unreality we persist in desires.

(41.2) First we ask "What is this world?" Second we ask "What am I?" Our mistake is to take our own body as real, and regard all others as unreal; when science shows all as unreal. A further mistake is to take the 'I' as real when it is only the body, which is unreal. When these are understood, the question is no longer a legitimate one. Going into the

truth of the matter shows that we do not say one is a non-entity but not what they appear to be.

(41.3) We disagree with Buddhists who say, there is nothing - nonentity. We believe there is some reality, even though things are not what they appear to be. If you know the truth, you will know what to do to find inspiration for action. Our subject is to know what is it that is Real.

(41.4) The first stage is to know all things in the world as impermanent. The second stage is Virag that is indifference to results--means don't expect things. If you do what you think ought to be done, do it disheartened, otherwise you will not be able to attend to this study of Vedanta. Keep the mind balanced.

(41.5) You must not lose yourself in the thoughts of world attractions. As soon as you get the temptation, put yourself the counter-notion "This also will go! It is short-lived" The mind must be kept balanced.

(41.6) If enjoyments come, keep your mind cool and controlled, level. Similarly with sorrows, for both will disappear in course of time. This means that you will still experience the joy or sorrow, but you won't get carried away by it. So long as you have a body, you must feel them. Yogis who sit for a hundred years to 'not feel', are wasting their time. We are not stones. What is needed is the philosophical discrimination of their value, the mental analysis.

CHAPTER 42: DRG DRSYA VIVIKA

(42.1) Perceiver of the changes of the mind must be a unity higher than the mind. Change involves the nonexistence of that thing before. And you have never seen the non-existence of your self or consciousness. And therefore it is always existent. What is it that is changing in me? What is it that is constant and unchanging which sees all the changes? You can say nothing about it, the seer. What are the things seen in the internal seer? None. Everything that comes and goes is drsyam. The consciousness which perceives all these changes unites that which is changing. If consciousness itself changes it becomes an object and it is no more the seer.

(42.2) Strictly speaking, as the subtle body is not an organized astral body during life, it is nothing but the idea of the physical body existing in the mind. Egoism is also an idea like subtle body.

(42.3) The world comes out of the Universal Self and relapses back into it. The Scotch metaphysician Hume declared that nothing exists—nothing material or mental existed. However, he was wrong because nothing really disappears totally, because it is refunded back, into something else. Hence the word entity in this sloka, which means "that which exists." Existence, Reality, Bliss are the only three characteristics by means of which we can think of the Universal Self. Otherwise, it has to be described by means of negatives--not this, not this.

(42.4) The food that you eat produces hair and teeth on you. Yet you do not eat hair and teeth in food, even for flesh-eaters. Hence the same substance appears to change entirely, but that cannot really be; your hair is really what you ate, your teeth are rice. The change is therefore not one of substance, but of form and name. This is what is meant by saying the universe consists of a single substance manifesting under myriad names and forms.

(42.5) Maya-tendency has two aspects. One to prevent you seeing the truth of things as they are--the veiling aspect; the other to create constant changes--the projecting or creating aspect.

(42.6) (a) In every visible object there is existence bliss and consciousness. As soon as you think of the pleasure you derive from seeing a tree, you are participating in the universal bliss. So, it is good to begin Yoga by concentrating on objects which are pleasing. Reflect upon them as sources not only of bliss, but also of consciousness and existence. The phrase "within the heart" simply means abstract ideas or abstract qualities. (b) After you are convinced that Drg is different from Drsyam that the seen is ever changing and unreal whereas the Atman is untouched and unaffected, you should then practice as constantly and as often as you can this line of thinking and reflection. Do not think of the body as a permanent entity. Do not allow the mind to wander away from this line; when you grasp the idea that Brahman alone is, make it the continuous subject of your meditation at every moment of the day if possible. By such practice, which is called 'yoga' here but which is infinitely superior to what is generally known as yoga, you will get rid of the attachment to the body, and moreover you get true samadhi, not Patanjali's samadhi where you see nothing and realize nothing. This is described on page X of the introduction, and also in verse 30. In this superior samadhi, wherever you look, whatever object you see, will appear as Brahman. You will face and move in the world, but will automatically inquire into it and reduce it all to the oneness of Brahman. This is the Vedantic samadhi, where all the multiplicity is converted into unity, not the unity of yogic trance, which is mere emptiness and useless, but the perception of one Being, Brahman, in every object and creature.

Wherever the mind goes, whatever object you see, whatever thought you hold, you will know that in essence it is all one and the same thing. You will go to the very root of the matter and discover it to be mind, and mind to be Brahman. The body may remain as an object, whose continuously changing nature you know and remember whereas the Atman will be for you the ever-stable; therefore there is nothing to be given up. You will see Brahman without a second thing. You will understand that as in dream your own mind appears as the various scenes you behold. So your own nature, Brahman, is appearing before you as all this world. This is the superior meaning of Samadhi, a meaning which is unknown to the yogis.

(42.7) When you are convinced that the Universal Reality is in everything, then each time the mind is directed towards any object you can have Samadhi, that is, perfect steadiness of mind. To whatever object mind is directed, there is always Brahmagnana, unbrokenly.

(42.8) The witness identifies itself with the waking 'I' who regards dream world as unreal: then with the dream ego, who regards it as real. In deep sleep only is the Witness alone with no ego. Control of latent desire equals discipline. Both means of mental training lead to the control of mind; and after that control is reached Gnana dawns. There is control by brute force; control by gradual process, by degrees, or by the application of Gnan. Only by Gnan is it possible to control the mind permanently. First study nature of the body (object). Science teaches everything outside is illusory, changing. Inside: Thoughts come and go, so change again. Thus mind finding no interest in objects, perceives the inscrutableness of the one substance called the Drg. If there is a permanent God, it must be the Self. Hence Upanishad says, "Atman is Brahman." If the mind cannot think, how can you have any drsyam? If you want to make the mind inactive think what becomes of form, color and smell of the faded flower. Illusion equals Maya, equals it existed, it ceased to exist. What (where?) did it go---We do not know.

(42.9) The Witness does not see the other individual even if he does see the body and mind functioning.

(42.10) The word "bliss" here and in all other Hindu scriptures does not mean emotional ecstasy. It means exalted peace. Emotional ecstasy disappears in Nirvikalpa. It could not possibly continue into that state. The bliss is held before novices like a bait, like other fruits of Yoga, but it is only to get them away from worldly attractions and to emphasize that the world is but an idea.

(42.11) Just as dream persons disappear back into the mind whence they originated so even the Sat Chit Ananda qualities disappear back into their witness when the final stage of inquiry is reached. Therefore you are asked to think of the substratum by getting rid of the form which is obstructing your vision at the moment, which is obsessing your mind so that you cannot see that thing which is remaining the same in spite of all its changes of form. The characteristic of drsyam is to change; of the drg, not to change. This distinction must be firmly kept in view.

SUMMARY OF VERSES: 1. to 30: DRG DRSYA VIVEKA

(42.12) Vedantic inquiry: 1st stage. Inquire into nature of physical body. Find its separateness as false idea. 2nd stage: Inquire into universe and find whole world, including body as an idea, then analyses of seer and seen, ask what is meant by "I am conscious," and ask what is aware? All this is constant thought of that 'I'. What is this 'I'. When you concentrate on it, you will find that this 'I' is also a drsyam, a seen, a thought. The ego is only an idea. You cannot ask the question who is aware of the 'I'-thought because that will reintroduce a second 'I' thought. That which knows the ego is an idea is called Atman. That which is aware of all thinking is called Atman.

(42.13) You will exist even when you realize the Formless, but your existence will be that of the Witness. You will be detached, not non-existent.

CHAPTER 43: ASHTAVAKRA SAMHITA.

PREFACE

(43.1) You must be desirous of knowing the Truth, consider the truth as nectar. Truth is the most distasteful, bitter and unpleasant thing; but there cannot be any question of "satisfactions" in Truth.

"Is it truth" does it occur to anyone? Imagination is rubbish. To imagine truth is not enough, knowing things as they are. "Know Me in Truth" (Tattva). The doers, the body, Ego, the attributes have nothing to do with Me--the Truth. Let bitterness be treated as Nectar.

Gnan is only for the man who wants truth, whatever it may be, satisfaction or dissatisfaction. What you do not like may contain the truth. (the urine you hate, but reflection tells you that it contributed to the sweetness of the mango), What is meant by "likes and dislikes" except with reference to your ego and body? You hate the thing you love the next moment! 'Contentment' because if you have a desire for anything, (it will be a second thing) and you cannot be contented. Unless you have "kindness" you will not overlook the faults of others, you will not be able to look at another, as not separate from you.

(43.2) The moment you know that the whole world is Atman, there is no snake. If you know the self, everything is only Atman. The world is Atman but you have mistaken it for something else. You think you are imprisoned within this body; but really the self, mind, atman, awareness is within and without the body. Hence widen your heart, mind, your self.

(43.3) Enjoyment: If pleasant things come to him, he accepts them and enjoys them but all the same he sees through their unreality. He does not run after them like the deluded who take them to be real and hence strongly want them.

(43.4) Contact - as pure mind, as drg, you have no relation with drsyam, you are non-dual.

(43.5) Dissolution: When you know universe to be an idea, you are dissolving it into your mind; it is not the blankness of samadhi, not-seeing the world, not sleep. World is Brahman and must be seen as such.

(43.6) Mind creates the form of the world, the senses see it, the I sees it, yet it is only idea. Hence world-existence needs no explanation when it is unreal, uncreated, uncaused. Hence futility of seeking cause.

(43.7) Indifference - The yogis misinterpret this to be running away, but philosophic interpretation is keeping the idea of the I out of life.

(43.8) Those who cannot concentrate perfectly do well in going to Ashrams or Kailas to learn and practice yoga, as a stage for here they will be free from distractions. But the

few who are so gifted as to have the natural capacity to concentrate, do not need to do this and need not go through a yoga course.

(43.9) Sahaja means coming of its own accord, the world being just as it is and yet he is in samadhi; everything becomes one.

(43.10) Thus the book finishes with non-causality, the most important principle to be grasped in all Vedanta. The notion of emanation implies something separate from myself; hence incorrect. The world does not emanate from mind: it is in mind.

(43.11) You cannot say how a gnani dresses or moves or works. He is trackless like a fish in water. Common people revere nude yogis because they cannot look into a man's mind, only at his body. So they worship any yogi who looks extraordinary or poses dramatically. The Gnani on the contrary will be clothed amongst people just as they are, so as not to appear different but principally because he has no "I" and does not identify himself with the body. He considers others as himself. (See also Mandukya).

CHAPTER 44: UPANISHADS

(44.1) The Brihad Upanishad teaches this important lesson: If you talk of things we are not conscious of, then we take the stand that they do not exist as fit subjects for discussion or examination. When asked whether there is a God, we keep quiet because no proof is available of his existence, and therefore all such discussion with believers, not thinkers, is useless. Not that we are atheists: we start with agnosticism, and we come to believe in a God not concocted by men, but as He is in truth.

(44.2) The teacher of Brahman dismisses everything as "not this, not Brahman" all forms he mentions being "superimposed on it." i.e. being "mere words only, imaginations about it." The teacher means that if you think dualistically that Brahman is one and I am another or that I (Brahman) is soul and that (body) is, another, you will never understand it. The teacher's business is to show the seeker's foolishness in looking for Brahman as other than himself: more he cannot teach: the pupil must think rest for himself.

CHAPTER 45: BHAGAVAD GITA

(45.1) CH.2 v.16 where Krishna tells Arjuna to fight is misrepresented by half-Vedantins as an order to kill other human beings, because they are mere Ideas, Illusory, whereas whole Vedanta says these ideas too are Brahman, and yourself and hence no killing really occurs. Only when you see all individuals, especially yourself as imagined ideas, can you rise to see them later as Brahman. Thus there are two stages. You must first see yourself as illusory before you see others as illusory.

(45.2) "Sanyasin" is defined in the Gita as one who knows the world to be an idea. Other types of renunciation are mere preparation for this, the true stage of Sanyas.

(45.3) Krishna points out, "the foolish regard Me as the unmanifested coming into manifestation." Here the word "foolish" means people of small intelligence. Such people follow orthodox religion and believe that the world was created by God. But how do they know that He did so? When a pot is created you can see both pot and its maker, but not in the case of the world. Then there is the question which nobody has answered till now, viz. Why did He create all these evils, these sufferings? Even a father would never do that. If He did so, assuming that God did create, then what sort of an evil God is He! All religions which begin with "God created the world," are fit only for children. It is a lie, it is inconsistent and fit only for foolish people. In the Gita it says, "Though you see Me in various forms, when you know the truth you know that I am the ALL." A child learns to count, by seeing and counting material objects. When the child is mature it says directly "one plus one equals two" without having to count tangible objects.

(45.4) "Whose actions have been burnt out by the fire of wisdom" means taking the world as Mind, you know all the individual ideas are lost or burnt in Mind, i.e. each is only Mind. Thus separateness is burnt. In dream you see mind in action. In sleep you see Mind at rest and all objects are then offered in its fire. Waking is just the same when you understand the world is idea. The ideas of objects disappear as separate when their are known as the One Mind. The "fire" in this phrase refers to sacrificial fire. All objects, as ideas, are sacrificed to Brahman (Mind) by sleep or by Gnan. The term "Actions" refers to both mental and physical actions. Hence merely sitting still like Yogis is not genuine inaction but self-deception. For inaction is only an idea just as much as action is idea.

(45.5) In Chap.IV where Krishna says "This yoga has been lost for ages" the word yoga refers to Gnana yoga, not other yogas: the force of the word this is to point this out. Krishna describes some of the other yogas, but devotes this chapter separately to Gnana yoga. So you see even in those ancient days people did not care for Advaita; they wanted religion; hence Gnana got lost. That is why Krishna calls it "the supreme secret." Krishna points out that the yoga must see "Brahman in action."

(45.6) Chap.VII. Verse 4: "Earth etc" Thus he begins his analysis with the world, with solid earth, not with remote Atman. In all these things earth, water etc. I am the finality." "Vasudeva sees the All." But to know this they must be examined and studied. There is a wide gulf between the yogi's "I do not care to know about the world" and the gnani's "Nothing remains to be known for him."

(45.7) Gita teaches that you know the truth only when you see the whole universe in the mind. Then as an illustration of how this is possible, the case of dream is given (when the world appears within mind).

(45.8) There is no difference between a Gnani and an avatar other than that the latter reincarnates for a special purpose or work, whereas the former comes for the general purpose of helping the world. Also Krishna says in Gita that he, the Avatara, incarnates when wickedness becomes intolerable.

(45.9) When you go to the root of the matter you will find that only one thing is taught in Gita under different veils of yogas. It all amounts to "Give up the Ego."

CHAPTER 47: ART

(46.1) In composing any work of art, you first form internal idea, thoughts, and then express them, i.e. project them into the world outside.

(46.2) An artist until he forgets his ego will not be perfect. For it is only by perfect concentration on his work or in his imagination that he works perfectly, i.e. he transforms his ego into that of his subject.

(46.3) There is no philosophy in all this art-theory. Why does man want pleasure through art, drama? Why should they desire? "Because they desire"-- is no philosophical explanation. Vitality, urge, inclination, emergence--what is all this? What is beauty, and why are men attracted to it? What is it that attracts as its beauty? These are philosophical questions.

(46.4) Beauty is a coordination of the two--the internal and the external.

(46.5) After all, the greatest beauty is within your own self. Even the most beautiful woman is your Atman, yourself, only an idea appearing to you, so why should you run after her? Then you remember she is only your mind, yourself, you will lose the urge to lust. Only by this non-duality can the highest morality be obtained. Religion cannot achieve this ethic because it is based on duality; on God and I.

(46.6) When you inquire profoundly into the nature of Beauty you will find it to be no different from that of Truth.

(46.7) Human emotions are not killed by philosophy but brought under check and control, by reason. Thus if you see a beautiful woman there will automatically rise a passion of sex for her. The philosopher immediately after feeling the first touch of this passion will bring his reason to play and consider that the body of this woman is only an idea in the mind after all; considering it as such it is then relatively easy for him to remain unmoved by her beauty which he can henceforth see, acknowledge and even appreciate without feeling any sexual passion for her.

(46.8) Vedanta teaches that emotion and art are inseparable from life, that philosophy does not, cannot and should not take them away from us. What philosophy does is merely to evaluate both emotion and art and then remove the incorrect values we have placed upon them, substituting proper values in their place. It is thus not the Vedantic teaching that philosopher should become unemotional, inartistic or incapable of enjoying beauty. He may be so, but he should know their value and place.

(46.9) When you admire the painting of a beautiful landscape you are unconsciously assimilating the external world into your mind, i.e. turning it into idea.

(46.10) The singer who feels an emotion may communicate it to numerous other persons. Yet only a sound vibration is heard, a sense-effect. Why is a mental effect produced? Because all men have got the same Mind.

(46.11) Another explanation of art is to evoke in the enjoyer the same feeling which artist had. Thus for the time being he puts himself in the position of the other person, i.e, he seeks non-difference, oneness, with other men, Hence the existence of art in life and its philosophical justification. The greatest artist is he who realizes himself as the All, who identifies himself with all things.

CHAPTER 47: SAGEHOOD AS AN IDEAL

(47.1) Krishna was a charioteer, or car driver, Janaka a ruler, Tulalhara a shopkeeper, Vyadha was a hunter--yet all these were gnani but lived and worked in the world.

(47.2) Why did not Krishna stop the Mahabharata war by his yogic power? From the lower theological standpoint he did not want to interfere, as each man must do his duty, and he knows himself as Brahman and similarly all these people, on both sides. Yogis have not the power to do such things, let alone incarnations. It has never been done in history, as the first yogi who had realized himself and obtained this mythical power would have put a stop to all human suffering. Besides, Krishna saw all the world in the one Universal Mind, all the fighters on both sides as being in it, himself as the self of all beings, not identified with any particular individual or group of individuals, so why should he interfere? In the suffering he sees only a form of himself, nothing separate. Objection: then how can a gnani be always acting? Answer: The gnani from his own view point is always in the same mood, but the outside observer sees that a gnani can only be one who works constantly for the common weal, as water must find its own level so the gnani must find himself in all people.

(47.3) He who has no feeling of sympathy with the suffering that he observes, is no sage. He identifies himself with everything, even a suffering ant or an injured snake. Poets like Wordsworth have felt or imagined their oneness with the whole universe, but they have not realized the truth of it as a sage.

(47.4) The infallible test of a false gnani, were there is no other way of testing him is whether he is actively engaged in removing the suffering of others and serving humanity.

(47.5) The gnani is not opposed to any position, religious or philosophical, for he sees all is One; but the others who are in those positions, will be opposed to him.

(47.6) You may have the best guru but if your karma, your ripeness is not favourable, then it will not avail you.

(47.7) Because the Gnani feels for others who are suffering, he has from our limited standpoint neither peace nor happiness but he desires to be born again and again to help

the world. The descriptions of such peace and happiness are merely baits to lure people on the path to truth, whose dazzling light they are not able to bear. But since the gnani looks on both misery and happiness alike as Brahman, we must not judge his inner feeling, for we cannot. To think that the gnani is inwardly suffering because he feels for others, is to think of an imagined gnani, hence a false one.

(47.8) It is utterly impossible according to Brihadaranyaka, Vivekachudamani, for anyone to detect who is a gnani. No outward sign will reveal it. The nearest but partial possible test given in Gita, Ashtavakra and Mandukya is: Is he doing good to others without thought of gaining benefit for himself? It is however possible to detect a yogi because he is on a lower plane.

(47.9) The notion that a sage has no emotion, never cries, never laughs, is wrong. He has it, only he knows its value, has weighed it, and keeps it subordinate to higher things. Only the insane ascetic who has gone to extremes may betray no emotion.

(47.10) It is impossible to attain the highest unless one has a Guru to guide.

(47.11) When Faraday says that a philosopher should have no masters it is not meant that he should not seek instructions from a guru. It means that he should not commit the fallacy of authoritarianism by quoting his teacher's word as constituting sufficient proof of their truth. His duty is to be thoroughly convinced of their truth by his own reasoning. Also it does not mean that he can escape from his responsibility to acknowledge publicly his indebtedness to his teachers otherwise he will be cheating the world and acting dishonestly.

(47.12) To prostrate before an alleged guru or gnani is for uninquiring but the seeker will refuse to prejudge the issue but will detachedly examine the holy man and study his characteristics scientifically, with a view to ascertain the truth about him. Because he sits in trance, many seekers are swept away by emotions, ignorant of the fact that lunatics do the same.

(47.13) The Gnani is ever-active but it is not for his own benefit. It is for the benefit of others.

(47.14) If the pupil is to grasp truth as it is realized by guru, he will have to perceive the ultimate state, that there is no duality, hence no guru!

(47.15) The aspirant should first test the man who he wants as guru and only after that follow him.

(47.16) It is illusion that the gnani attains the magical capacity to do whatever he likes as though he were a God or to be miraculously free of laws of nature. It is childish error to think that a Gnani should be able to reconstruct the world or change mankind overnight. The only freedom he attains is from the ignorance of ego's reality, for seeing the non-causality of the world he sees everything as non-dual, he sees himself as everywhere

present and therefore as not limited to the ego. He sees his real self as not being individual ego.

(47.17) How to reconcile the antinomies that a Gnani does outwardly become one with those in his environment, even to their faults whilst he must also set them example to rise up to? Reply: if he happens to be born amongst thieves he will steal with them but, as his gnan does not go away all the time, at some point he will pause and suggest to the others that they adopt a slightly better course of action. Thus he will uplift them because they will think he is a simple ignorant man like themselves and will be more agreeable to follow his advice.

(47.18) The sage does not regard himself as having attained perfection, because he still identifies himself with others and thus shares their sense of imperfection.

(47.19) The sage serves mankind to the extent which his circumstances permit.

(47.20) Sankara knew no science. Nor did the other old philosophers. Therefore they were not omniscient. He does not know all the sciences; but he knows the truth.

(47.21) The peace of mind, the inner satisfaction which the yogi and mystic obtain, are also possessed by the Gnani, but in addition he possesses ultimate Truth, he will have neither the emotional excesses of the mystic nor the visionary delusions of yogi, but he will have the inner peace they have won and have gone beyond to Truth.

(47.22) If the gnani is able to eat, work and attend to practical duties without losing his gnan, why should he not be able to sleep and dream like other men without losing his gnan? And this is the case.

(47.23) The sage will not do immoral things, that is impossible.

(47.24) If an enlightened man happens to be among the ignorant, he must do according to them--but always he does something which would elevate them.

(47.25) The gnani works no miracle, does not dismiss the wall which confronts him because he knows it as an idea. He understands the true character of the wall. The only difference between him and the ordinary man is like the difference between the scientist and the ordinary man. The scientist knows that the water he drinks is really hydrogen and oxygen, whereas the ordinary man does not know. Yet both drink the water. Similarly gnani knows the external world is Atma, whereas ordinary man does not know, yet both live and work in the world in the same way. There is no outside difference to be detected between Gnani and the ordinary man. The difference is entirely inside the mind.

(47.26) A Gnani is not one who does not worship; he will pray, if he is living among the religious. Yoga-Vasishta points out that he may be stealing in the company of rogues, killing in the company of butchers, but always he will be amongst them to elevate them;

to lift them up gradually to a higher ethic. But by not separating himself from them, by being like them and among them for a time, he can improve them and make them better.

(47.27) Guru is one who removes "darkness," means "ignorance." In dream you may see a teacher, pupil and instructions be given, but they are all ultimately in the mind.

(47.28) People misunderstand "omniscient." This is a misleading translation from Sanskrit. It really means "Everything is only Brahman, only of the nature of Mind." When you ask a Gnani what is table, he will say it is Brahman. That is Brahman. Hence it means that he knows everything as Brahman. It does not mean that he is like an astrologer and knows what will happen in future or what has happened in past.

(47.29) Gnanis are not opposed to any doctrine, although the adherents of all doctrines may consider (i.e. imagine) us as their enemies.

(47.30) Just as you do not shoot now whilst awake at the tigers you saw in dream, so the Gnani does not dispute about truth with those who are still beclouded by duality.

(47.31) The Gnani makes no voluntary effort, but does what has to be done; therefore he will practice both activity and abstention at different times.

(47.32) The gnani will feel that millions are suffering in the world, but simultaneously he will also know that they identify themselves wrongly with their finite selves. He will understand his limitation through being in the body and know that he cannot help them all, so he will do whatever it is possible for him to do. He will make use of his body to whatever extent it is possible in helping others, but admittedly he can relieve only a tiny fraction of humanity. He will therefore seek, like Ramakrishna to be reborn again and again in order to continue giving such help.

(47.33) Both Gnani and ignorant see the multiplicity, but Gnani does not take the differences which he sees as being real. That is the difference between them. The Gnani sees the unity behind the differences and considers the welfare of all others as his own.

(47.34) A true Gnani can never renounce anything. It is impossible. He has only renounced the idea of a separate universe.

(47.35) Gnanis are one in millions for they have ignored the opinions of whole peoples in their independent search of truth, and questioned all beliefs, all scriptures, all authorities, until they could be proved to be true. Even the arguments that religions have been followed since time immemorial makes no difference to them, because if people have believed a false thing over thousands of years, the length of time does not prove it true.

(47.36) The gnani's position is that if enjoyment comes, he accepts it; if it does not, he keeps quiet. Even when he is taking pleasures, however, he is not deluded by them and he regards them as a game he is playing for he knows their unreality: he does not take them

seriously. Clouds do not affect the sky, although they appear to; so the pleasures do not change the Gnani.

(47.37) The gnani will follow whatever occupation he wishes according to circumstances. There are no prohibitions for him. He may be a coachman or a king.

(47.38) Why do not gnani perform miracles to attract attention to truth? To whom are they to perform when there are none different from them?

(47.39) The Guru will teach you but it is absolutely necessary for the pupil to think constantly over the teachings and master them by his own use of reason.

(47.40) Those who imagine a sage must be ever absorbed in thinking only of Brahman, hence rapt in meditation or indifferent to what is going on around him, are wrong. If he is thinking only of Brahman, are not the sufferings of those around him also Brahman? Why ignore them?

(47.41) The Gnani sees unity in multiplicity--it is a sensible, rational, practical view. viz. Sarva Bhutah Hithe Ratah. His happiness consists in being identified with the whole universe. So long as there is misery in this world he, the gnani is always inevitably miserable. So he always tries to remove the misery of others.

(47.42) How can one know the true gnani? Reply: It is impossible unless you have sharpened brains. He does not want any external marks to identify, i.e. separate him from others. The word "mark" means sitting in ashrams, wearing sanyasi robes, sitting in samadhi, etc. He lives a normal sense-life, (but does nothing to set bad example to others.)

(47.43) The difference between the worldly enjoyments of the gnani and ordinary man is latter is unhappy if his desire or habitual wants are denied satisfaction, whereas gnani does not become miserable when pleasures to which he is habituated do not come. For Atman, in which he knowingly believes is the only thing that does not change, whereas the ordinary man lives in the ever-changing.

(47.44) The Gnani who enters deep sleep will not feel he is entering anything different or new. He knows the whole world is idea and sleep is merely the disappearance of those ideas. Where have they gone? Only back into the mind, i.e. himself. Nothing is lost. Thus using the dream illustration, the mountains and rivers of his dream, when they disappear, are still not other than Mind and so the latter is unchanged by such disappearance. Similarly the Gnani does not lose his Gnana because he loses consciousness of the world (i.e. ideas) in sleep. If you think he ought to retain gnanic consciousness in deep sleep then you are in error, for who is to be conscious? Reply--the Ego! Hence you want him to believe in duality, which is the real loss of Gnana! Upanishad's say "He who thinks he knows, does not know." This means that to know anything implies a second, an object of knowledge, hence duality, i.e. no gnana. Therefore the gnani will lose consciousness in deep sleep like others, but he is still a gnani.

(47.45) To objection who is to teach whom when one has realized, the reply is "The world does not disappear for sage, he sees other men as before, and he knows they need instruction: world with people is seen but its real nature is understood.

(47.46) I went to visit a yogi in a cave in Baba Budan hills. He once asked his guru who said, "Be patient, one day you will realize." The yogi continued "I have been here 25 years and now I am so weak as nearly dying. Please help me to return to North India and give up this quest. I have waited and waited and no illumination has come." The Rishees emphasize that the guru must show the pupil now what he has to give him.

(47.47) When a man says that he has seen his internal self, he is still a yogi, but when he says that he has seen the Universe in himself, he has become a knower of Truth--a sage--a gnani.

(47.48) This waking world is also real if you know it is Brahman. A Gnani who cannot see the material world as Brahman (and therefore real) is no gnani.

(47.50) The removal of the I is not enough to realize Brahman. It happens in sleep, for instance. There must also be the knowledge that everything is your self. The mystic may make some claim. So a test is to be applied. Test is, is he doing anything for others?

(47.51) The gnani rejects nothing, for it would mean to him giving up part of Brahman, which is meaningless. The absence of anything, even the world, is not Gnanam. Hence Gnani does not have to give up anything in the worlds within or without, neither objects or ideas.

(47.52) When the guru utters vocally the doctrines of gnani the ripe chela receives definite illumination and may instantly perceive truth in a flash. Such speech is truly creative in its workings in the chela's soul. Similarly the visual sight of the guru powerfully affects the mind of the sensitive chela.

(47.53) The minds of those who judge a gnani, act on the consistency theory. Hence they judge him incorrectly.

(47.54) The guru may, and should accept enough money to live on, but after that he ought not. He should take as much as is necessary to keep himself in the best condition. The guru should not starve, his body is needed to find and give out truths and for that he may accept money from those that can afford. He should ask only if he has not got enough to live on. He may take money only from those he knows to virtuous. Otherwise, he should not ask anyone, especially the poor. Every student owes a duty to beg for and maintain the Guru. But if the Guru has enough, he may in his turn feed students. Guru must see that the money which comes to him does not cause pain by its loss to the one who gives him. Asking should be only from those that have.

(47.55) After realization the Sanyasi should go back to serve the world. He will see that everything in the world is his own mind. He lives in the world and knows it for what it is worth. He knows everybody to be mind or rising higher, to be Atman.

(47.56) Test the Guru before you choose him. If he promises you something wonderful in future, that is no passing of test. He must show his worth here and now.

(47.57) The mind must be first trained in the Vedantic way for a long time: then only when it reads such books as Brihad and Mandukya Upanishads does the true meaning of the texts become apparent. Hence we cannot give a sudden revelation of Advaita in one or two letters, or in an interview or two: a course of personal mental training must be undergone. Hence we say both the philosophical books and a living guru are necessary to the seeker.

(47.58) You yourself must do the work of seeing Truth by using your own judgment and reason. Nobody else, no guru can do it for you.

(47.59) All men have not got the capacity to know Truth, as Gita points out very few have: but some among these few are so intelligent that they have only to hear it explained by a Guru when they grasp it at once. Henceforth they have only to stabilize their illumination.

(47.60) The Vedantic method is discussion between teacher and pupils not dogmatic laying down by his authority.

(47.61) We cannot look into the mind of a man to determine whether he be a sage or fool, scoundrel or good character; therefore we can only draw inferences from his actions as to what status and character his mind has attained.

(47.62) Whoever fails to see the universe in Samadhi, has fallen to yoga and is not a gnani. The sage always sees the universe and does not lapse into unconsciousness.

(47.63) PANCHADASI. "In the performance of actions or in the abstention from them there is not the slightest difference, as regards body, senses, mind and intellect between an ignorant man and the wise man...the difference between them lies in the existence of doubt in the former (ignorant) and the destruction of it in the latter (the wise.)"

(47.64) When the time of death approaches for a gnani he expresses the will to return to earth again and be reborn. Now he has achieved liberation from all his Karma. Why then should he take on the old bondage of the human body again. Answer: Because he realizes his unity with all mankind, he considers their welfare as his own. Therefore when that further incarnation comes to a close he will again express his determination to be reborn a second time. This process will go on ad infinitum, with the result that the gnani is born again and dying again just like all other human beings. So from the external viewpoint he is to share the same joys and sorrows as all unenlightened men for countless number of incarnations despite the fact that he has achieved Nirvana. The definition usually given

by Pundits and yogis in India of the word Moksha as meaning liberation from the cycle of transmigration pertains to the lower or purely religious sphere. This doctrine is on the lower level because it is based on the reality of the ego. The Vedantic interpretation of the word is "liberation from ignorance." Similarly the word Nirvana is interpreted in Buddhist countries as meaning release from the cycle of births and deaths. This too is the popular interpretation, not philosophical which is precisely the same as the Vedantic. It is quite true that Buddha constantly taught that man should seek release from transmigratory existence but we must remember however that what the sage knows is known only to himself in its fullness and that he gives out to the public only so much as they could grasp and no more.

Of course, the gnani will have a different attitude towards his pleasures and pains from that of the ordinary man by reason of his refusal to identify himself with the body. Thus Sri Ramakrishna and Swami Vivekananda expressed the desire to be born again and again for the salvation of the humanity. Buddha too has told of numerous previous births wherein he descended to help mankind. Thus the startling fact must now emerge that all the sages in the history of mankind who had ever attained Truth, Moksha or Nirvana by virtue of such attainment have identified themselves with the whole of mankind and its sufferings and have therefore, all without a single exception willed to return to earth in constantly repeated births and deaths. This they have done without any necessity or compulsion upon their part, but solely in order to serve others because of their feeling of unity with them and pity for their sufferings. This does not mean that all the sages of history are at the present moment living on this earth because they need not necessarily be reborn immediately after each death. They may need a period of rest and recuperation after each incarnation and therefore some may be on earth, and others not, but the latter will surely be reborn later.

(47.65) The gnani is not attached to any particular state because he realizes the Brahman everywhere, but only his mind is sharp enough to perceive it.

(47.66) Man who realizes his own Atman, as in deep sleep, is indifferent to pleasure or pain, whereas man who realizes Brahman i.e. whole world, feels the pleasure and pain but they are transient. This Vedantic truth is presented for common people by stories of avatar incarnating to take world misery on himself.

(47.67) The ego will not go unless you render service to mankind, try to make others happy, without any thought of recompense. If you think of getting reward for your service or teaching, you cannot have truth or teach it, you are only thinking of the 'I'. For teaching Brahman nothing should ever be taken. But for other purposes he may take money. Such purposes may include the foundation of an Ashram, wherein to maintain students, i.e. others, not himself. The true Gnani will always refuse to accept money for his teaching, but he may take it for helping others which is a different matter. However, he will see within his heart whether it is for the benefit of the world, or for his own I, he will then accept or reject money accordingly. The test is inside himself. The gnani may accept money for teaching subjects other than Brahman, such as mathematics etc. but never for teaching the highest truth. However note that teaching Brahman is only such when it is personal and addressed to individuals. To write books and articles on it is

general and not teachings. Hence you may accept payment for writings. It is the duty of his chelas to properly feed and maintain the guru voluntarily, without being asked.

(47.68) The sage takes into consideration the predispositions and mind of his hearers. Buddha did the same thing. The right teaching given to the wrong people leads to its being misunderstood and misapplied.

(47.69) The Gnani's mind is paradoxically more active and less active than the ordinary man's. More active because he uses his brains, less active because whatever happens he remains unworried and unaffected; he knows the past is gone and won't worry over it: If present losses occur he knows that all is still Brahman and hence nothing is really lost.

(47.70) The gnani should keep his gnani-hood a secret. He should not advertise it to the world. For the ignorant will misunderstand it.

(47.71) Where did you get your knowledge of Advaita from? It came from your guru. Where did he get it from? He was taught by his own guru in turn. Thus the line stretches back for thousands of years to antiquity. What does this mean? That the knowledge is not really yours, it was always given to you. You have no personal claim on it, as your achievement. Therefore the correct ethic would be to efface your ego and acknowledge this fact. Hence Advaitic authors, always without exception make due acknowledgements in the preface to their guru and confess that the knowledge was his, not theirs; even Sankara was not too proud to do this in every book. Nobody can claim title to this knowledge; it is like space, undifferentiated; without form, non-dual. Hence there is no room for ego here. Hence the gnani never claims such knowledge as his own. It is not honest. Hence to get rid of the ego-vanity, an advaitic author must say openly that his knowledge is derived from his teacher. This is most important. Such written acknowledgements on the part of a chela is equivalent to prostrating or bowing before your guru, and simply means that you efface the ego in his presence. But on the part of a Gnani, it means that he regards himself--and therefore his knowledge--to be like space, not personal, not limited. This acknowledgement is made by the gnani to efface the egos of his readers or chelas, not for his own which was effaced long ago.

(47.72) Do not be a slave to me says the true teacher to his disciples, but if you must be a slave prostrate before Intelligence (Buddhi). It is the religious or mystic gurus who demand personal slavishness. We are not respecters of persons, not even of Gods, only of Truth. We value a teacher only when he helps us to get truth.

(47.73) Gnanis have lived in the company of butchers, shop-keepers, hunters, even robbers, behaving as they did, not claiming to be different from them but occasionally dropping some word, giving some hint or advice which will ever so slightly give higher ideals to his companions. Thus he will instill hope into seeker's hearts that it is really possible to attain higher levels.

(47.74) This realization in its fullness brings absolute harmony between thought and action and makes the Gnani.

(47.75) The Gnani sees the sameness in all; this means he sees them all without exception as ideas.

(47.76) A gnani works for humanity. The idea of beggarhood is the opposite of the gnani ideal. Let every man earn his living, only those who teach mankind may refrain. The gnani does not want to sit while others feed him. He performs action for human welfare. If he is weak or ill or too old he is excused.

(47.77) Ethically we should not ask for money for spiritual teaching, nor accept it if we have means for support otherwise. Nevertheless the guru has the right to ask for money from the pupil if (a) he is needing it to support himself and family and is starving (b) if he wishes to undertake a useful work, such as printing a book or traveling on a journey to learn or teach Truth.

(47.78) Avatars and adepts are only men of superior and supreme intelligence or reason, but we ignorantly attribute to their greatness 'super-consciousness' and other fancies.

(47.79) The gnani does not try to eliminate thoughts but he accepts or knows them as Brahman or Atman. He knows that mind, self, soul are all one and the same.

(47.80) The Gnani uses sense-objects because he sees they are Brahman. It would be foolish to run away from himself: all these objects are ideas in his own self.

(47.81) It is said in Mandukya that even the Gods cannot find out who is a gnani, because he bears no external mark. Neither nudity nor the yellow robe has anything to do with him.

(47.82) Whatever the mind does, whatever thoughts arise--even of sensual enjoyment--the gnani does not need to practice mind-control because he knows these ideas to be Brahman or Atman. Because of the knowledge, sensual thoughts do not stir him to action. Thus he will not run after a woman, even though he thinks or sees her, because he knows her to be Brahman which he already enjoys.

(47.83) The Gnani, on attaining realization, will not give up his vocation in life but will continue it as before. If he was a king, he continues so, if a palanquin bearer, he will remain one. In short he still does his duty, but now it is done with the motive for the good of others.

(47.84) The notion that the gnani sees only good everywhere and never evil, is incorrect. He is fully aware of the evil character of others, he knows then he is being cheated, but he remains unperturbed though acting as required. If that notion were correct then place a pot of dung before the gnani and see if he eats it: No, for he recognizes what is bad and what is good; he is not insane even though he understands everything to be Brahman.

(47.85) Suppose a gnani is in a house on fire. He will appear to be excited in making arrangements to put it out, but inwardly he will be undisturbed.

(47.86) Gnani does not even lament death as depriving him of opportunity to serve mankind, because he knows nothing is ever lost, that the dream mountain which disappears on waking is still in the mind that made it, that there is no separate ego-mind or ego-body existent to die or be born, for Brahman is ever existent.

(47.87) Sri Krishna himself says that he can do nothing to make a man intelligent straight away. The adepts give prasad, blessing, initiations, mantrams, etc. only to confer temporary peace of mind, to help you to get rid of worries, but not to confer Gnana. The capacity to receive it, must first be inborn in man by evolutionary degree.

(47.88) Sahaja-samadhi is for the gnani, yoga-samadhi is for the mystic.

CHAPTER 48: THE MIND

(48.1) Hiranyagarbha is God when he is creating the world, God in a creative mood. The thoughts in God's mind is the entire cosmos. Therefore there is nothing in the whole world outside God's mind. God thus takes the form of mind, the ultimate existence. Garbha means womb, hence mental womb.

(48.2) Whilst awake you can think of a large distant city, say Melbourne. Can you say in which part of Melbourne your mind is not present when you think of it? No. Hence we say mind is omnipresent, pervades the whole world.

(48.3) The critic who said "The world is an idea; why don't you think a chair and then go and sit down on it" is making two errors: first he thinks the idealist takes his own body as real and only the rest of the world as an idea: second he does not know that it is not the individual mind which creates the universe and its objects but that mind which itself sees the individual, in short the common mind. The individual has no powers to make the universe, that which makes the universe makes the individual also. This point is very difficult to grasp. Berkeley saw it, but owing to his theological predilection he brought in the conception of God to account for the creation of the ideas of the Universe. That which sees these external objects as ideas is therefore able to see the individual body as an idea because it is purely a universal viewpoint.

(48.4) The critic who objects that if the Gnani has realized that universal common mind he should be able to create objects mentally overlooks the following:-- The gnani has no desire to demonstrate anything for the satisfaction of others, whilst for himself there is also no desire to create simply because he is desireless, and finally because he regards all as himself. He knows that if he is creating through the All; for him such a question never arises as that raised by the critic. Secondly he does not have to answer it.

(48.5) Those who speak of Idealism as teaching that the body is an externalization of the mind, are wrong. They are too much attached to the body to be able to give it up in order

to understand truth. For where does the mind stop? Can you measure its ultimate limit? What is outside and what is inside the mind? Neither body nor this wall can possibly be external to the mind.

(48.6) What is mind? It is that which can assume any form.

(48.7) Nirvikalpa Samadhi is only a preparatory stage which gives the discipline for rising higher.

(48.8) The difference between a yogi emerging from Nirvikalpa samadhi and ordinary man emerging from sleep is that the yogi knows that by controlling the mind he can get rid of the contents of the mind, get rid of all this world voluntarily, but nevertheless temporarily. It does not explain to him what the world is, so he is yet in ignorance, albeit not so gross as others.

(48.9) Patanjali is mere ABC. His goal is deep sleep. The occult powers (siddhis) which yogi develops are powers belonging to a state equivalent to dream state: hence they have the value of dream faculties. To the Gnani they are but mental creations as much as other ideas and not Brahman. He looks upon them as he looks upon ordinary powers.

(48.10) To talk of God's Ideas, Divine Ideation, means that you not only know God exists but you know what was in his mind. Therefore this doctrine is only your imagination.

(48.11) How do you reconcile the duality of experience with the non-duality of Truth? This problem seems insoluble to weak minds, and so they turn aside from it and take to religion or Yoga. But Vedanta can explain and solve it; so far as books can do so for books are explanations, not realizations: they are helps to the latter. So Mandukya gives here the illustration of the whirling firebrand which when set in motion appears in various figures such as 8, made by you, straight or crooked. Similarly, Mind undergoes no change in itself because it became a tiger or a mountain in your dream. The appearance of these things makes no change in the substance of the mind. In the waking state Mind still retains one and the same essence, but takes all these forms, just as it does in dream. In the cinema show you see people move and talk as though they were living, but in reality there is only a strip of celluloid, no people at all. This self-deception of the human mind which takes things as they appear, is called Avidya. Hence we must correct the errors of the mind, which is done by getting knowledge.

Nobody has seen mind move from one place to another: all we can say is that the mind is thinking. But when mind is thinking it is not really changing its own nature. Duality can be explained without bringing anything from outside. If you see a snake, where is it? You see it with your mind. Is it outside the body, then where is the body? Inside your mind? Everything in the world is within the mind, but you see it as outside. All movements of consciousness are only apparent. Is the dream body really running? Consciousness is immovable, for space itself is an idea within it. You can imagine an object moving from place to place, but the consciousness itself does not move. Kant could not go so far: could not see that there is no unknown reality outside the mind; his noumena are outside, but that is impossible because there is no space outside mind. The

whole world's mind-consciousness, both actions and inaction are therein. But without Avastatraya this cannot be understood. All thoughts of the world are within mind; when there are no thoughts of world it is not seen: This shows that the world is in mind and is mind. Hence there is no real duality of a real World and a real observer. Even Himalayas are only notion of consciousness, are only imagination. We take world as real and separate because of our previous attachment to it for the sake of satisfying our desires. The ignorant here take the idea to be real. Nothing has gone out elsewhere, nothing has come into the mind from elsewhere, wherein everything happens. Nothing is produced, caused; there is no second outside Atman. Where is the space outside Atman to contain any second thing? The best illustration is dream. People have wrong idea that mind is confined to the skull. Greatest Western thinkers are prejudiced against Avastatraya because they wrongly believe dream is unreal, waking is real, and therefore dream proof not worth inquiry into.

(48.12) If you think that mind is always there, that mind, objectified as Drsyam alone is what is coming or going, that there is no causal relation, then the Drg is seen to be consistent, and the world is seen to be really unborn. The Drg was never lost, Moksha is never attained; you are always in liberation. You can never die, never change.

(48.13) "Ever-luminous" means whatever is presented to the Atman, it knows: It knows everything is mental, is only mind, it hence knows only itself. (Mand.331). When objects are not presented, its capacity to know is still there. Its capacity is not less, even in sleep. Hence it is ever-knowing.

(48.14) The word "effulgent" Atman is the light, the knowledge, the awareness by which things become known: hence it is the one thing in Vedanta which is not negated. It is the thorn which is used to negate all other thorns of wrong ideas; when these are all removed, then the word effulgent, the thought of any attribute even immortality, even Ajati belonging to Atman, is thrown away as the instrumental thorn itself is discarded when it has served its purpose. Hence we use the idea of being to refute the idea of non-being and finally reject both. Thus all words, all ideas are ultimately cast off as not being the Drg. Silence alone falls here.

(48.15) You have seen the birth of a man's body, but you have never seen the birth of his consciousness. Hence we call latter "unborn." From Advaita standpoint the word "substratum" has no meaning. You speak of substratum only when you think of something other than it also, a quality etc. This means a second--hence duality. The mind is not really ever changed; all thoughts and imaginations appear to be changes but the mind itself remains what it was, unchanged, and as mind is not born either, it must also be free from death. One man's body may go to North India, and my body to Mysore, apparently there is separation and difference; but ask the meaning, is it separate? How far does my mind extend and how far does his? There is only one consciousness and we can't limit it to two individuals or speak of them as different: for we are obsessed by the ideas of body alone. Duality is with the body; in the consciousness, the unseen Atman, it disappears. If you are always thinking of variety alone you see duality! If you think of unity, you perceive that. Hence realization depends upon your state of mind. When

Vivekananda asked Sri Ramakrishna to get his ulcerated throat cured, by asking the Mother, so that he could eat again, i.e. Brahman, Ramakrishna did so: She replied: "Why are you thinking of eating in this body alone? Ramakrishna is already eating through millions of mouths." This means that when realizing one mind is in all these bodies, we free ourselves from the separate body limitation.

(48.16) Statements can only truthfully be made about known objects. The Brahman can never be such. Hence it is inexpressible verbally.

(48.17) Although the world-appearance is constantly changing, it is of the same mind-essence as the Atman.

(48.18) You cannot say that ideas are separate from the mind, because they could not exist apart from the mind-substance. Yet you cannot say the opposite that ideas are not separate from Mind because then there would be complete identity and you would see nothing. This position is the same with Brahman and the world of objects. The world is not independent of Brahman nor the same as it. Nothing therefore can be predicted truly of Brahman's relation to world other than to say that it is a non-dual.

(48.19) Turiya = Drg = Sakshin = Seer = Knower. The knower is that which is not any of these states. Hence when you are thinking of Turiya you are negating the states as Turiya cannot be made an object. Thus you arrive at the reality only through negating the illusory.

(48.20) We use the words Brahman or Turiya for the wordless truth only by explaining that it means that which cannot be reached by names or words. Hence these names are unique among all others, corresponding to no known thing. Silence is the most appropriate way of speaking of it, but to help students we use these words in their studies, pointing out their unique character and peculiar use however.

(48.21) If one denies the existence of Brahman or Atman, what is it that is happening? You are only thinking of Brahman as an object. But our idea of Atman is that of Witness. When you deny, the denier is there. That of which I am always conscious is Atman or Brahman.

(48.22) When the mind sees that which is common to all material things, it sees their essence-stuff by dropping their forms: this is the real meaning of samadhi (sama- the same)--not the yogic sleep or imagination.

(48.23) The mind has never been separated from the objects and creatures seen in your dream. Therefore at no time has the mind itself been separate from them. Even in the waking state, no object is ever separated from the mind. Ideas must stand somewhere, be created of something, and this is mind. We use the word mind here instead of Brahman, for it is easier to see that all things being ideas, are made of one stuff--Mind.

(48.24) Vedanta says all these thoughts and ideas will again go back into you. They will never be lost. Everything is only idea. All your ideas of the whole world goes back in deep sleep into the same mind. Hence there is no real loss and you need not be unhappy at the apparent (but not) real loss. The world has gone into you.

(48.25) The knowing entity or power is the same unity in all persons. It is Atman.

(48.26) Upanishads say the self is nearer and dearer than anything else: this means that the Mind is nearer than anything we know.

(48.27) Realization is nothing else than to know, after analysis, that everything is Mind.

(48.28) The question of why those different ideas of multiplicity arises to the mind, is unaskable by the Mind and unanswerable except by knowing truth. For where everything is one, as in sleep, which is the truth, there is no duality, hence no duality of questioner and question. Therefore when this is comprehended, the why does not arise: it only arises in the state of ignorance.

(48.29) When we talk of the body-mind problem we necessarily refer to the individual mind, but when we talk of the matter-mind problem we refer to the universal mind. Thus we must be careful to understand the use of the terms mind correctly.

(48.30) We think of a horse, next we think of a table. What is the gap between both thoughts? It must be the pure Mind wherein as there is then no thought of ego nor of an objective thing, non-duality alone is.

(48.31) Thought reading is also explicable by the withdrawal of mind from ego temporarily, so that the identification with universal mind is possible, hence with other human minds. Both methods combined produce greatest results.

(48.32) If you ask why the idea of a thing should arise when no object is really there, we reply: Mind itself is the cause of the idea: it has the desire to give birth to these ideas perpetually. This is the elementary explanation. The more advanced view is that the question should not be asked because why implies causality which is a fiction. By rising to this higher level the Atman is seen to be that which cannot be divided; the Mind is measureless; it remains a unity despite the appearances (illusions) of multiplicity. Knowing the nature of Mind the question does not arise. The differences between things are imagined: all is really one in truth.

(48.33) The gnani will possess the powers of thought-reading and thought-transference as a natural consequence of having destroyed ego-illusion and realized one Mind in all.

(48.34) The first epistemological questions which are asked by Indian philosophy are: "What is meant by thinking?" "How do thoughts arise?" Then it is found that each thought has its inseparable correlative: that the thought of bliss arises by discriminating it from the thought of misery: and that the way in which the mind works is to pose dualities

of ideas. You cannot understand a thing except by noting its differences from another thing.

(48.35) All knowing functions come only from Awareness.

(48.36) Words will always give you only a picture in the mind, no picture can represent Brahman; for this reason only we say that the Brahman is like a void; not for the reason of the Sunyavadins who say there is no reality there. The Void is an illustrational term.

(48.37) When thought is transcended, that moment--it may be one-millionth of a second--you have comprehended the Truth about Brahman transcending thoughts. For then the idea becomes the Mind. At that moment the mind negates all thoughts. This is called the "lightning flash" in Upanisads. You must watch vigilantly for it. When between two thoughts you catch this brief flash, you have to understand that the thoughts were still in your mind whether, they had appeared or vanished. Hence we are transcending thoughts numerous times daily but unconsciously. In this sense you are right in calling our doctrine "The Hidden Philosophy. The thought-gap is hidden. That gap is the seer of the thoughts i.e. Drg, Mind, Brahman.

(48.38) When you know that everything is only Mind, why worry yourself with anything? You are Mind yourself, it is permanent, and all ideas are impermanent.

(48.39) The words "static" and its correlative "dynamic" are inapplicable to Brahman.

(48.40) If there were no forms, would you get the idea of Mind? No; Therefore the forms suggest the mind's existence to you. The forms alone enable you to know that Mind is there. Otherwise you could not know it. If Maya did not exist, there would be no incentive, no purpose in seeking for Reality, Brahman. Hence it may be taken as a meaning of the world that all these forms exist to enable us to reflect on them and find the Mind, the non-dual Reality of which they are mere appearances.

(48.41) "All these become one in the highest spirit, called Mind." says Prasnopanishad. Again Brihad Up. says: "Through the mind alone It is to be realized." Hence Vedanta says therefore let us go into the meaning of Mind and thus we can get at realization. Again Srimad Bhagavatam says, "The gross universe is not different from the Mind, which is Brahman." All these quotations prove that Advaita teaches that Mind is none other than what India calls Self, Atman, Universe and Brahman.

(48.42) "Every word uttered is already a lie" said some Greek philosopher. This is the same as our Indian teaching that words can only falsify Brahman.

(48.43) You need not run away from thoughts as yogis do; let them go on but merely consider them as Brahman, Mind.

(48.44) Brahman is silence. Knowing that, you need not enter into discussion if you want to get at truth, for words are only words, ideas; but to refute others we may use words. In

the verbal expression of every position that can be taken up including ours, there is contradiction. Whatever is said by me, another man will say no, it is so and so. Thus as soon as he begins to discuss, he falls into the world of duality. Nevertheless his dualistic position will be superior to that of all others because he will try to keep the ego out of it and because it is based on reason. When he has used his thinking to refute the thoughts of others, as one thorn to pull out others, he will then have to give up his own position and merge into non-duality, positionless. The line of thoughts (this thorn) used will then fall away of themselves. In the final stage of argument gnan can only show that both he and the opponent are limited by contradiction in every word and sentence. Give up the misleading and impossible idea that you are going to establish Brahman by means of books, writings, speech and other words. All you can do is to refute other people's arguments about Brahman. He who has realized Brahman has nobody to argue with because there is then only one, no second person than himself.

CHAPTER 50: THE ULTIMATE AS REALITY

(49.1) The snake-rope illusion doctrine is the first stage of inquiry: a novice's preliminary step: but the higher stage reveals that the illusion itself is reality: only beginners talk of world as illusory: the wise make no distinction and find reality in everything. You give up name and form at an earlier stage only to discover later on that they too are Brahman. However the first step of negating the world is necessary to help student. It is equivalent to the melting process, of throwing many gold ornaments into one mass in order to learn what gold is in itself, apart from its forms. Once known we may recast the mass back into original shaped ornaments and ever after know then as gold alone. You eliminate differences tentatively by taking away all forms in order to know eventually that everything is Brahman.

(49.2) If the universe exists in me, then when the idea of me also goes, then the universal illusion goes with it. This is the most advanced position in Vedanta. In other words a separate universe no longer exists for gnani. Even the super-imposition of the world on my mind is then seen to be illusory: Gnani knows in this higher stage that super-imposition is only the mind: that nothing else is.

(49.3) You can know the Brahman only by being it.

(49.4) Atman by itself is undifferentiated, has no characteristics and is the same in all, just as the sun itself is unchanged amid all the changing colors of its reflected light.

(49.5) Mysticism may teach oneness; we go still further and teach that you are ALL.

(49.6) "All is Brahman" is not correct "All this is Brahman" is correct.

(49.7) Even here in the midst of world-imagination, the Brahman is eternal and now; the notion that the world must be shut out in order to see Brahman is therefore false.

(49.8) Nothing exists distinct from Atman. When you know truth, then the whole universal existence is reality itself.

(49.9) Even the discipline and mental training you have to pass through to acquire truth are after all imagination. You are still Brahman.

(49.10) It is insane to say the world of multiplicity is non-existent. It is correct to say it is there, but unreal, like the snake/rope.

(49.11) "Becoming one with Brahman" means seeing the whole world in you, for on seeing this you know your universal oneness.

(49.12) Those who say or think "in the course of time I shall gain knowledge, heaven etc." cannot gain truth. For they are now the inhabitants of truth and have not to gain it. They are ignorant for they expect change in that where there is and can be no change. They think they are going to change because they are attached to body and personality, this is their illusion.

(49.13) The nearest English equivalent to the word BRAHMAN is ULTIMATE REALITY.

(49.14) Sat Chit Ananda is not the highest truth, but the step immediately below it. It is Brahman with attributes whereas Brahman is attributeless.

(49.15) If Brahman is ever the same, how has it changed into the world? Reply: That is the pantheistic position, not ours. Brahman never changes, only appears to as in dream.

(49.16) Even the changing world of ideas, the illusory phenomena of Maya are nothing but Brahman in the end. Hence the changing is ultimately the unchanging, the illusion proves to be the real on further inquiry. Brahman only appears to have undergone change, just as mind appears to change in dream but it is really unaffected.

(49.17) Duality is only the appearance of mind. It is never found in sleep, when mind is not functioning. When the mind is working we see the world. Hence the world is a mental creation, is nothing but mind alone.

(49.18) Maya is also Brahman. Really speaking, there is no Maya; Brahman alone is.

(49.19) The word "monism" as used to translate "Advaita" is wrong. The correct word is "non-duality." The reason is that "One" has a meaning only as distinguished from two, three, etc. whereas there exists no "two"; there can be no "one-ism."

(49.20) The idea that Gnanam means the absence of everything, so as to make One without second, is a false idea. That is mere sleep, Gnanam means that he sees all objects and creatures and yet at the same time sees they are all One. Hence gnanam is not absence of everything, but the presence of everything. When you see many things you

must also see Oneness. This is the paradox of Gnana. It is difficult. Every fool can see the world, but he cannot see its Oneness. It is not Gnanam if you do not see it now and in the waking state. There are then no doubts. Hence after perfection in Samadhi, the yogi must begin inquiry. After a time he may finish his inquiry and reach Gnanam.

(49.21) Our philosophical teaching is not that unity exists in multiplicity but that unity alone is. Multiplicity does not exist.

(49.22) You must see your body, all other bodies, everything as ideas which you know as self. This is realization. It can come only after you know the Seen is not separate from the Seer.

(49.23) Similarly the world now is Brahman, just as the waves are even now made of water in the ocean--when things appear they are Brahman, when they disappear they are Brahman. There is really nothing new, nothing born, everything ultimately is Brahman and not different from it. Just as in dream, the persons, mountains, colors forms, actions were all mind, and nothing else, so all that you see in this world, whether beautiful, or ugly is Atman or Brahman.

(49.24) "Illusion" means that it does not affect the reality. The snake illusion does not affect or change the rope. You have not become a man, you are what you always were, eternal Brahman.

(49.25) When you think or speak of a doubt there must be a second thing. In a unity no doubt can arise. This is difficult to understand. So we use illustration of deep sleep. You do not say you are dead then, yet you do not have any second things nor any doubt in that state. Losing and gaining, fear and hope, depend on having a second thing. But unity abolishes all these changes and gives you freedom: it takes you beyond all grief and delusion because it takes you into a frame of mind where you are beyond all property, relatives, wealth, desires etc. The real object of all scriptures is to take you beyond all grief, therefore, by bringing you into unity. Worry and fear and delusion cannot exist in unity, which is the Atman. Thus Vedanta is for the good of mankind not merely for discussion or word-mongering.

(49.26) Sleeping, eating, water, rice, teaching, everything is Brahman. So how can you say that philosophy has nothing to do with worldly existence?

(49.27) Nothing can be lost. There need be no fear or sorrow. All still exists in the Atman. There is no second to be afraid of. Sorrow implies sorrowing for some thing or someone i.e. a duality.

(49.28) The Gnani sees both variety and unity simultaneously. That is the test of Gnan. Otherwise the world would have been full of sages. He is fully aware of the differences in the world, yet is aware of the underlying unity. The gnani seeing a woman sees her simultaneously as both woman and Atman; as he is already aware that he is really the

Atman, he has no impulse of lust towards her because she is already within his mind, although he knows she is only an idea.

(49.29) There is no separate individual enjoyment of supreme Bliss. That is told only to the common people. Ananda means the perpetual absence of grief.

(49.30) Highly important to students: 1st the witness stage. Separate yourself from the world. 2nd. What is the nature of the seen? Inquire into the nature of the world and find it to be idea. 3rd. Find all this to be the same as witness, i.e. stage of unity with the world; all fused as One. There are the above three stages of progress in Vedantic inquiry. The first belongs to the beginner and is Drg Drsyā Viveka analysis. The second belongs to the intermediate course; the third is the highest and the Witness is the same as the witnessed, i.e. non-duality. The first and second stages are in the world of duality. Hence the idea of Self as Witness is not the highest one. The third lifts you into non-duality.

(49.31) Vedanta shows that the lost is also Brahman, hence will come back to you; that which you hold dearest in this world, you need not be afraid of losing. Only there will be a change of appearance. In the Vedantic need for detachment there is no final or real loss of world as with ascetic yoga, but a readjustment for the unreal world disappears into real unity. When you know that the second thing is also yourself there is no fear of losing it. When you are swayed by duality, this fear arises. Know that everything and everyone disappears ultimately into Me and hence cannot be lost.

(49.32) The gnani knows that the reality is himself, that the world which is seen is only an appearance.

(49.33) People think the gnani ought not to perceive the world. Truth is gnani may see it and yet know it does not exist in reality. The illustration is audience which sees magician's illusion show and yet they know it is not real.

(49.34) The gnani never thinks any object to be real, but only mental whether it be of the waking or dream states; and he knows that all ideas, objects are but his mental construction's only. He is always sarva Drg sada!

(49.35) It is impossible for the mind to free itself from all seen objects. But even though the Gnani must see them, it is as though they were seen in a dream. You are said to be in waking state when you see a second thing, but the Gnani does not take what he sees for reality.

(49.36) The Gnani knows he is untouched by Drsyam; the agnani feels just the opposite. Duality may be perceived--the table may be seen; even when you consider the world real, it cannot affect Atman. Gnana makes you fearless since it tells you appearances are only imaginary, which is shown through Vichara or science.

(49.37) The gnani sees not only the name and form of objects, as others do, but he also thinks of their essence, the substance of which they are made. To both of them the world is still there.

(49.38) Anyone in sleep or anesthesia can be without duality, but it takes Gnan to be awake, see the world, and yet be without sense of duality and feel oneness.

(49.39) To see the whole world in me implies duality, a second i.e. the world which is to be seen. The gnani therefore sees the second but understands it, for he sees it as an idea in his mind, i.e. himself.

(49.40) If you think of yourself as one and God as another, then there is duality, but if both ego-thought and God-thought are absent, there is non-duality.

(49.41) Everything will not become one in realization. You will have everything still there, but you will know all the objects to be only mind.

(49.42) When we rise to consider all things as Mind, Brahman, the hypothesis of evolution disappears, becomes meaningless, for who is there to evolve, to question?

(49.43) If the world did not exist we could not talk of it. It has to be seen, just like a city seen in a mirror and it has to be experienced, but it has to be known as being unreal. This is a test of gnan. Similarly the aim of Vedanta is to show the nature of the world as unreal.

(49.44) People are under the wrong impression that what changes is not Brahman. This is only a lower stage, tentatively taken up in order to distinguish between drg and drsyam, to show the world of objects is only a world of ideas. But at a higher stage even the changing is known as Brahman, even the multitude of ideas is unified as Mind.

(49.45) You may put a stick in water a thousand times but it will always be seen as bent, even though you know it to be straight. Similarly you may know that all the individual forms are a unity, Brahman, and yet you will continue to see them as separate entities, even though you are a gnani. This is the higher lesson of the study of illusions.

(49.46) All activity in this world is ultimately for the realization of Brahman. Such is the Upanishadic teaching. Why do men work and eat? Because they want to keep their bodies alive, and in good condition. Why this? Because the body is necessary to live and fulfill life's ultimate object---they have to attain Brahman. Why do we meet here---teacher and pupil? It is to attain Brahman.

(49.47) Atman is not a thing to be attained, it is always there nearer than your body. No other effort is necessary than the knowledge of it.

(49.48) Only truth can give you the highest satisfaction: unless you realize that everything is in you, there is no complete satisfaction.

(49.50) All have false notions regarding Iswara. As long as they know not Brahman, they don't know Iswara.

(49.51) The Gnani sees and knows the table as a table, but at the same time he knows that it is only Brahman.

(49.52) If we say that non-existence is truth, then you have got Gnan. It is only purposes of elementary analysis that we take away the individual forms and the two states to get at Brahman. But this is tentative. Nothing need disappear, the world can exist. Maya can remain simultaneous with reality in the ultimate truth, for everything is Brahman. Nothing can be rejected. "All this" (sarvam) is constantly repeated in the books.

(49.53) The talk of when snake disappears rope is seen, hence when Maya goes, reality is seen, is merely an illustration of a particular point, illusion. Do not push it further. For when the pundits say that Maya is not Brahman they are talking nonsense. Both snake-idea and rope reality are Brahman: Nothing is to be destroyed or lost to gain Brahman.

(49.54) There is an erroneous impression that a thought is not Brahman; that imagining must be stopped to get at Atman, and thoughts banished or controlled out of existence. But Brihad points out that when there is a thought present, you have got only Brahman: and when there is no thinking, Brahman is there likewise. Whatever happens or does not happen to the mind, you have only Brahman. Thus, anything or any event may come in your dream, but all remains as Mind, your own self. Because a tiger is running in your dream you cannot say it is not Mind. Similarly if thoughts come in waking, you cannot say they are not yourself, Mind.

(49.55) Just as low intellects anthropomorphize their God, so even higher ones may make an object (a duality) of their own non-dual Atman by forming their own conception of it, for that is only a thought, i.e. an object. The way out is to know that thought is not different from Yourself: the moment you think it to be different, you turn it into an object.

(49.56) Our reply to those who say that if ignorance and illusion go, then Brahman comes, is that both ignorance and illusion are also Brahman, hence there has never really been any coming or going of them.

(49.57) If you think that the universe exists as a reality, as a second entity, other than yourself that is ignorance. You may see a thousand things but if you know they exist as ideas in the mind, i.e. in yourself, that is knowledge. Gnan does not mean things are not to be seen; they will be seen, as the mirage is seen but known to be illusory, as the awakened knows his dream-world to have existed only in his mind. In short, ignorance means taking imaginations of multiplicity for reality. Seeing multiplicity is not wrong, only seeing its contents as realities.

(49.58) All your Gods, Brahmas, Vishnus are your thoughts. You created your God, he did not create you. When you know that all those Gods are only Mind, as you are, then you know God as He really is. You should know that all the Gods are only the one single fundamental "substance"--Mind.

(49.59) Atman is Brahman means that one's self is as big as the universe.

(49.60) You may see the mirage as water, you may see it a second time after realization and know that it is not water but even as a gnani you will still see it as water but know it as otherwise. The seeing is not altered, only the knowing. Similarly the world will still be seen by the sage and, its appearance will be exactly like its appearance to ordinary men: there will be no difference in the visual sensation: but the gnani will also evaluate it as unreal.

(49.61) The desire for eating food is the unconscious desire for the happiness for unity for making the food one with your body. If however you eat indigestible foods, i.e. foods with which you cannot become one, you become unhappy.

(49.62) First Stage: (lower stage of path) That object gives me its experience. That experience is an illusion.
Second Stage: Higher: The object, the experience of it and myself are all Mind, Brahman.

(49.63) There is no limitation in you as Brahman, you were always there as It and no production by effort was ever needed. All that is needed is inquiry into what you are, not creation. There is no becoming Brahman. Investigate--and this shows you It. Where dull people say, No, I am imperfect, then to make it easier for them, we say, alright, then use effort to become Brahman. But this is only a concession to illusion.

(49.64) Man thinks that the world is outside himself; hence his desires are for external objects. When he learns the truth that the idea of the world is in mind, in himself, he no longer seeks externals, gives up desires. He gets into the habit of realizing he is everywhere, just as the dreamer who awakes understands that he was everywhere in his dream; he was in every dream place and thing. Still more, he identifies himself with everyone; practices goodwill.

(49.65) There is no distinction between unreal and real for the Gnani, only for the student. Hence in seeing the table, he knows he sees Brahman. It is not a question of seeing a table first, and then interpreting it as Brahman.

(49.66) If you think that the Gnani sees the table first and realizes it is Brahman next, then you have got the idea of time. Time is only imaginary. The truth is that Gnani sees table and knows it as Brahman in a single simultaneous operation. The eye which sees Brahman and the eye which sees the table work stereoscopically just as the two physical eyes see a single object.

CHAPTER 50: THE NEED OF ULTRA-MYSTICISM

(50.1) We are under the illusion that the knowledge of Brahman can be realized only when the perceptual world disappears. But the perceptual world is appearing and disappearing every moment!

(50.2) When I see the world am I not aware of it? The awareness is there. Awareness is Brahman. When I am not seeing the world, my awareness is still there. So the Brahman is not lost by becoming conscious of objective world, as yogis wrongly assert.

(50.3) Ascetics who want to give up the world, really want to give up Brahman. The world is as much Brahman as anything. "Everything is Brahman" says the texts. Hence their disdain for science, comforts, modern inventions, etc. is disdain for Brahman! What they ought to give up is the false-knowledge of the world, the false belief in its reality, the ignorance that it is idea. Maya also is Brahman. Get rid not of world but of the ignorance which prevents you seeing the world as Maya.

(50.4) The fallacy of the yogis is to think because they do not see the world in samadhi, they have realized Brahman. What about the world? Is it not Brahman too?

(50.5) Omniscient=knowing the all as Brahman. Yet mystics seek to know the Nothing!

(50.6) Brahman=that into which all things go.

(50.7) Meditation is useless to get Brahman, because that implies producing a second thing; but it is useful to get rid of bad thoughts or wrong ones.

FINIS.