

**Commentaries of Rajasevasakta
V. Subrahmanya Iyer**

From the posthumous collections of Paul Brunton

Edited by Mark Scorelle, 1999

CONTENTS

- 1.Beyond Yoga
- 1,2,6,(mixed) Beyond Yoga, Fallacies of Religion, and Reason
- 12.The Doctrine of Mentalism
- 13.The Illusion of World Experience
- 14.The Illusion of Ego Experience
- 16.The Ultimate as Truth
- 17.Ethics
- 17.Karma
- 17.Politics
- 17.Indian Sociology
- 18.Sagehood as an Ideal
- 19.Doctrine of Non-Causality
- 22.Panchadesi
- 23.Sanskrit Terms
- 24.Srimad Bhagavatam & Last Message of Krishna
- 25.Buddhism
- 27.Selected Works of Sri Sankaracharya
- 27.Sri Sankara
- 27.Brahma Sutras
- 28.AUM
- 29.Swami Vivekananda & Sri Ramakrishna
- 30.Modern Indians
- 31.Ancient Indians & Their Schools
- 32 V.S.I. Personal
- 33.Counsel:(General)
- 33.Counsel:(Literary)
- 33.Counsel:(Journal)
- 34.Kant
- 36.Ancient Europeans
- 37.Modern Westerners
- 38.Modern Western Schools
- 39.Guadapada Mandukya Karika(full commentary)
- 41.Vivekachudamani(full commentary)
- 42.Drg Drsya Viveka(full commentary)
- 40.Ashtvakra Samhita(full commentary)
- 43.Upanishads
- 44.Bhagavad Gita
 - ..H.H. (late) Maharaja of Mysore, Interest in Literature
 - ..Worship of Bali, One of India's Seven Immortals
 - ..Ralph Barton Perry "Lectures"
 - ..Six Natural Steps Leading to Philosophy
 - ..Letter to G.R.Malkani
 - ..Exerpts from the Mahabharata
 - ..exerpt from John Lewis "Introduction to Philosophy"
 - ..Letter to Mr.Hooper
 - ..Letter to Sir J. Jeans
 - ..Selected and Approved Exerpts
 - ..Letters to P.B.
 - ..Letter to Dr.E.J.Steiner
 - ..Letter to Hallet
 - ..Letter to Sir Herbert Samuel
 - ..Letter to Spaulding
 - ..Philosophy,Metaphysics,Examination Papers
 - ..Newspaper Interview
 - ..The Use of Philosophy
 - ..Exerpts from Thomson's Introduction to Science & Darwinism & Human Life
 - ..Letter on Reason and Logic
 - ..Reply to Nicol Reid's Article
 - ..Address to Aurivedic Medical Students

CHAPTER (1) BEYOND YOGA.

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.

Yogis claim to live hundreds of years. Where is even one who can prove it? Not one has really done so. I do not believe it.

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: those who regard them as different or higher are deceiving themselves.

If Yoga gave occult powers, why did not the yogis of India during the past thousands years use their powers to fight the battles of India and protect her from invaders? Why did Krishna, after 18 chapters of instruction in various kinds of Yoga, in the Gita, at the end tell Arjuna to go and fight? Why did he not tell him not to fight but to use yogic power?

Instead of asking the yogis like Aurobindo and the charlatans like Meher Baba "Where is the proof?" people meekly say "He is such a great man. What he says must be true."

Reclusive Gurus who permit themselves to be seen only a few times a year, who remain silent for 6 days in the week, or who will not converse with disciples for more than two minutes are doing this in order not to be properly examined, tested, and their imperfection found out.

If anyone says that God is doing this or that or has such and such qualities, he is telling a lie. Did he go and see God doing it?

To know what "seeing" means is most difficult. Scientists are not sure how much of mind-interpretation goes into the simple act of sight. Therefore when any mystic is dogmatically sure about the validity of his visions, we can only smile.

There are at least 100 commentaries on the Bhagavad Gita. Each one goes on spinning yarns imagining as he likes what the meaning may be. But once you have studied scientific vedanta you will know what Krishna really meant, you will see that there is only one possible interpretation, irrespective of your opinion or imagination.

When these mystics come and tell you about their visions, and revelations and "realizations" the best thing is to keep quiet. They do not seek to test the truth of their experiences and will abuse you if you criticize them; they want their vanity satisfied.

The less brains people have the more they will tend to follow a single man. Therefore the more ignorant they are the easier to get them into a religious fold. Islam is so strong and popular because it makes no demand on the intelligent: It simply requires belief in Muhammad.

Has it ever struck a Muhammedan to doubt whether his religion is true? Muslims particularly never use their reason because they start and conclude that Islam alone is true, because they never question.

Theological philosophers say God is a perfect being, but they have never known God, never proved his existence; hence their ascription of perfection to Him is purely self-imagined.

Our reply to religionists is that if we have to test truth in the next world only, we have no proof, so keep your doctrines; we do not want to follow them.

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."

Yoga and mysticism are primitive things which appealed in the past to early races; now they indicate undeveloped mind when they are taken for truth!

If the yogis have power of knowing the future, why did they not warn the Hindus that the marauding Muslims were coming to particular places, and thus enable the former to muster their armies there in time to save the people?

The bombs which fell on Warsaw Cathedral during German invasion whilst people were praying should have revealed to them how fantastic were their ideas of God. If it does not open their eyes, what can we do? They lack brains.

I agree from a practical viewpoint with Gandhi's constant calling on God as his guide, because he is a clever politician, and knows that to sway the masses he must invoke religion. What else can he do? The poor people are not intellectually developed so it is useless to invoke their capacity to think. Gandhi is justified by results. But philosophically his statements cannot be proved.

According to their imagination, is the paradise or heaven of religious believers. But where people have got a little thinking capacity, they begin to disbelieve through the contradictions of various contending orthodox claims and descriptions.

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

To those who assert this world is "the expression of a divine power" I retort, "How do you know?"

There are two kinds of telling a lie. First of which you are conscious. Second of which you are not aware. In the second class belong those religionists who talk of heaven, God, etc. as though they had seen them to exist.

The possibilities of scholastic or mystic argument are endless. If one says "Brahman is Nirguna" another will reply, "No, he is Saguna! If one says "This religion is higher" another will reply,

"No, it is lower." It is impossible to get anywhere with such talk because both sides are merely imagining.

We cannot see fully into another human being's mind. How then, can you see into God's mind and assert that God wishes this or that, plans so and so? This is nothing but imagination, which is nothing but telling lies.

If you say God is the Creator, then we have right to say, "Why did your God create me to put me through all these troubles? He cannot be my friend; he is my enemy." Even if it is objected that one's life is untroubled, then one cannot escape death.

For mysticism or religion you can interpret texts as you like, in whatever way that pleases you, you simply imagine away.

Philosophy does not begin with Brahman: that has to be proved, not assumed. Hence, so-called Indian philosophers who take Brahman for granted are not philosophers at all.

Lots of Indian philosophers will teach you that all is yourself, but none of them can show that this is so, none has analysed it scientifically, none can prove it. Our method is rational proof, so that you arrive at knowing truth i.e. Gnana; theirs is mere dogma, parrotism, repetition of what they read in scripture.

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

Poets are open liars, their trade is to exaggerate, only they want to tell pleasant lies.

How do you know that the Vedas knew the truth? How do you know that the man you quote knew the truth?

I ask mystics, How can they know that their happiness is the highest? May it not be that there is a higher one beyond their experience?

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.

The best way to deal with opponents is to ask them first to state the grounds for their position. How do they know theirs is true? This should silence them.

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.

Belief depends upon unstable bases whereas certainty depends on proof.

"Get rid of your doubts" Krishna taught Arjuna! But that did not mean, simply go and believe everything you are told. In the next sloka he explains that the doubt is to be got rid of "by the sword of knowledge."

There is a controversy as to the meaning of Maya. One Advaitic School says it is a shakti 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 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 anubhava, 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.

I fully admit that a number of yogis or visitors to the great yogis really feel much peace as a result. But I ask, "What has that to do with the question of truth?" The man who has drunk well, or eaten well, may also feel much satisfaction and contentment; his feeling is similar to the mystic's.

Theology, fiction-writing, religion, poetry all belong to the same class--appeal to belief, fancy, imagination, not truth.

When you cannot fully know other human beings, how can you hope ever to know God? Then why bring him in? The agnostic position is much better.

If God really were in every particle of you, as mystics claim, then you will be able to create universe, because you will be God.

If the yogis have got occult powers, why don't they 'create' money for themselves instead of begging for it?

Both poetry and religion are based on imagination.

The so-called spiritual healers do not keep scientific account of the proportion of failures to cures. One man gets cured and speaks and spreads the fame of the healer. Why he got cured we do not know; whilst hundreds may fail to receive a cure and their cases are not talked about.

There must be the prior suggestion strongly felt and accepted that one is entering the presence of a great man. Otherwise the words or person of a yogi will fail to impress the visitors; all the visions, experiences etc., which afterwards occur are a matter of suggestibility.

In matters of religion we Vedantins have no quarrel with anyone. Let all people hold any belief, any imagination they like in that realm. For in religion the question of truth does not arise, only the question of what appears to one.

Abnormalities of mind were formerly regarded as due to God or caused by evil spirits.

Only late in the last century were they scientifically studied. This science is known as psycho-pathology. Charcot was the first to formulate the truth that certain disorders were due to ideas only.

All the conduct, behavior and signs of the yogi and mystic are to be found perfectly paralleled by those to be found in madhouses.

Pseudo-gurus who deliberately deceive others with mystic teaching are immoral; if they do it unconsciously, they are insane.

The craving for religion, the fear that not to follow its rites and dogmas will bring punishment, the inability to give up the notion of its truth even when your reason demonstrates its fallacies and absurdities are merely forms of mild obsessions, i.e. a thought constantly repeating itself automatically; hence it is mental disease.

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 untrue.

Unger's statement that he found money miraculously in his drawer every day for his needs is mere unproved assertion. Let him take you for 15 days and show it appearing: this is scientific proof.

A common error amongst devotees of mystics is to jump to the conclusion that he possesses miraculous powers because unusual coincidences happen in a few cases, which they universalize.

Religion belongs to the world of emotions. That is why everyone likes it. You will always find it in primitive times, as now, linked with music, dancing and art--both emotional expressions. Religion changes as it appeals to different emotions. You will find at one pole the nude fakir is admired; at the other the gorgeously-dressed Pope is revered.

What is the use of great yogis talking of their work on 'inner' planes, unless they allow us to test them and receive adequate proof that they really can do something extraordinary. Talk is insufficient, evidence of facts must be demanded.

Do not be carried away by Radhakumud Mukerji's standing nor by the attitude of authority which he adopts in speaking to you. It has no value. He illustrates the 'I know' attitude adopted because his guru told him so, both of them not knowing really. He is certainly brilliant intellectually in his other spheres, such as history, but remember the truth that most of these men keep the quest of truth in watertight compartments apart from the other sections of their brain. They apply reason admirably to their profession or business, but drop it and use feeling or emotion only when trying to philosophize. Witness case of Gladstone, who wrote rubbish about the Bible but was one of the best finance ministers England ever had.

People magnify every minor coincidence or every petty fact where yogis or religionists were concerned, and they see miraculous or esoteric significance therein.

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.

My wife went to a famous fakir. He said he would initiate her. This was the initiation: He told her: "All the world is Maya; Brahman alone is real." Then she went away. What is the use of telling such things if he does not PROVE that they are right? And he cannot do so because he has never tried to use his reason for the purpose but simply accepts it because he has read or because his own guru told him that. The statements made by mystics and yogis generally must be proved by the use of reason, but they are incapable of doing so and hence never really understood in the true sense. So they assume pontifical airs and say “I know.”

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.

Poets are at liberty to imagine whatever they like, but the only thing wrong is that they take their feelings for reality, or when they think that whatever seems, must exist.

Mystics and yogis have got an impregnable fortress. If they say “I have seen Brahman” or “I have become one with God” how can you refute them? For you can't even see into another man's mind. But modern psycho-pathology will prove their undoing by showing the similarities between mysticism, religion and insanity.

The argument that mystic experience is as real as aesthetic experience--as pleasure of music or dancing--is real, is based on the person's feeling. We cannot deny that the mystic feels joy or the dancer his pleasure. But we must inquire into what is meant by ‘feeling.’

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

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

Finally the truth of religion can only be proved by your physical strength or by your imagination, or your power of the sword or your worldly power, never by reason.

If a yogi is honest, after the course of practice over many years, he would admit to himself "Nothing has come of all this." And he would give up his non-thinking.

The people who treat of the subject of God usually write the largest books. This is because they have a plethora of words only to offer.

Belief in religious prohibitions arises out of fear of God's punishment.

Vedanta regards the “Logos” idea of theosophy in the same way as it regards the God-idea of religion.

All the scientists say "We do not know the mysteries beyond. Tomorrow we may discover something new." The mystics take advantage of this and say: "That mystery unknown to science is known to us. Mysticism is the fulfillment of science." This is rubbish.

Yogic truth is individual truth, not universal. It is on a par with the truth of the megalomania of lunatics.

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.

"Religions place God as the unknown reality" Herbert Spencer places it as the unknown reality. Every religionist has a different idea of God. Every man has a different idea of real. Hence the need of definition before study.

The fallacy of religionist's appeal to scripture lies in the varying and conflicting interpretations of the same scripture which different men feel entitled to give or hold.

The yogi or mystic who sees or experiences something in his meditation which he takes as the highest, must be asked "How do you know it was the ultimate truth?" That was only your inference.

Can you truly say in this world that you know another person? Can you say you know God unless you are one with him? Even husband and wife cannot honestly say that they know each other fully. Yet mystics glibly say, "I know God."

Our attitude is "If there is Brahman—prove it. If there is Atman--prove it." Religious so-called philosophy dogmatically assumes both.

How do you know asks Sankara, 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.

When the mind does not know truth, it can only guess, imagine, hence doubts and questions and discussions arise.

If you say God is Light, others may also say it is Light Within. Again the light may take different colors. Then which color is correct? Others contend that God is sound and say you hear the Aum sound or Radhaswami, sound inside in meditation, still others say God is fragrant smell and that beautiful scent comes in meditation as the presence of God. All these differences of opinion, they can be endless, show mutual contradiction and general error, i.e. lack of certain truth. Moreover if you see a Light you are seeing a second thing, a drsyam.

God is either impotent, incompetent or lacking in intelligence--if he exists! But all religions are nothing but imaginations.

There is nothing so absurd which men have not worshipped in religion, nor sacrificial forms of worship so cruel which have not been indulged in. And every imaginable face has been given to

God from the African Negroes to European artists, some have made him with large teeth, others with large eyes, some with small teeth and small eyes!

What is a fact? We cannot get rid of it by shutting our eyes to it. It is only by inquiry that we know that it is a fact.

This is the death-blow to religion and God. How do you know God and how do you know that he is everywhere?

If you perform japam with meditation, plus thinking, then you may get to Atman, but japam alone cannot do it.

Dull minds--inducing children to drink milk or medicine promising them that their hair will grow--yoga is something like it. Dull minds need a bait like ecstasy or growth as suggestion.

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 Gaudapada and Sankara.

We are not condemning yoga as we do not condemn children.

If you ask "What is the difference between knowledge and meditation" we reply that knowledge will be determined by the nature of the object to be known, whereas meditation will be determined by the nature of the meditator.

His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore and H.H. the Yuvaraja when young men visited my late Guru at Sringeri. My guru did what was expected of him. He placed his hands on the youths heads and blessed them. There was no real magical power in this blessing as the people and his followers believe. He did it only to encourage the youths to take the right path in life, and not to perform any miracle upon their character or destiny. The fact that even he, although he was a self-realized gnani could not do this is proved by the subsequent developments of their two Highnesses. Although the Maharaja turned out a fine character, the blessing was unable to prevent his brother turning out a drunkard.

The son of a former manager of the Sringeri monastery is a philosophy graduate and a high accountant in the Indian State Railways. Yet when you meet him today he was on his way from North India to visit the Sringeri Guru now living, to take his blessing in the firm belief that his darshan would cure him of typhoid fever from which he was suffering. Such a belief is quite baseless, mere superstition, yet multitudes of people in India had the same belief about their respective Guru and temples.

People whose doubts vanish merely by sitting in the presence of a mystic or yogi, have merely been hypnotized.

From psychology we have to work deeper to epistemology.

If you quote any authority, say Krishna, we reply; "How do you know that Krishna knew the truth?"

People take to the path of belief or of authoritarianism merely because they are the easiest ways. To seek for proof is troublesome and time-taking.

Religion and mysticism are so much preferred to philosophy because you have only to imagine, not to inquire. The first is easy, the second is hard.

Religion and mysticism is a species of mesmerism affecting weaker or impressionable minds. Thus the panoply of a swami's yellow robes etc. creates unconscious suggestion in weaker minds of a superior power or magical knowledge. Similarly visitors to ashrams are suggested into thinking they experience great peace because they are unconsciously hypnotized into believing that will happen. But when a strong disciplined philosophic mind meets a swami or visits an ashram, he is entirely unaffected.

Scriptures are being added to from time to time. This process will go on. There is the final authority among them? One contradicts the other: duality reigns supreme.

Each man sees in his own samadhi whatever is uppermost in his mind. How does he or anyone know that what he sees is truth? Similarly each has intuitions agreeable to what is uppermost in his mind.

Believers who are anxious for a mystic or occult experience often get it. But it is only a mental construction of their own, suggested originally from outside.

Suggestions may come to you from a book or person some years read or seen, 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.

Mysticism may say that the spirit is the source of all good, but the question of questions is how does it know that it is the source? That is mere scholastic dogma until an attempt to show, to analyze and prove that it is the source, is made, when it becomes philosophy.

Suppose I see God. How am I to know that He is God? His mere statement is not enough. We must have proof, He must show that He is God.

When mystic-minded disciple sits before the yogic-guru he may see all kinds of visions; the explanation is that he expects certain experiences and gets them, or else the Guru or others suggest them; the mind of the disciple manufactures the entire experience. It is precisely the same as experiences of a hypnotic subject, which are the consequences of a stronger mind working on a weaker one.

The swami who criticized my teaching by saying that nobody else in India agrees with my interpretation of Vedanta, shows an un-vedantic unphilosophical attitude. Everybody else may be in error, for mere numbers do not make truth. He ought to have inquired, "Does everybody know truth?" and not assumed "What the majority believes must therefore be true."

People stop with their imaginations about God, Reality, Truth, and do not go to the bitter end.

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?

The onus of proof is on those who make an assertion. Religionists and mystics are required to prove; the burden to disprove is not on their critics.

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.

The weakness of all mysticism is: "My mystic experience is this and tells me A..... which can be overthrown by the mystic experience of another who says "My experience is different and tells me B....."

Mysticism charms people but reason does not. Faith, feeling or experience is on everyone's lips.

The yogi teaching that mystic sounds like Aum, Omkara, Soami, etc. are heard interiorly in meditation is nonsensical and unproved as their teaching that mystic perfumes are smelt in meditation.

When a man sees all this diversity and contradiction of beliefs and opinions, he should reflect that there is some foolishness somewhere. This doubt is the beginning of inquiry into truth.

The teachings about six chakrams (in Lingayat faith) and seven chakrams (in Raja yoga) is based on fact and fiction. It was noted that there were nervous plexuses and nodules at intervals in the spine and other parts of the body. Upon this basis the yogis started imagining that if the mind is concentrated on each one a different mystic result would be obtained. But that is mere fancy.

Inner conviction is useless in a court of appeal because mine may be contradictory to yours.

Everyone is a sick man in the sense that he has ignorance. Every minute you say "I did not know, but now I know, (by test and verification). If ignorance were permanent nothing could be known. This not knowing or ignorance and its removal of it by knowledge is an everyday experience, e.g. snake in the rope etc.

In all interpretation "I think so" is the method leading to "I know it" and it is only imagination.

It is not a moral duty for the philosopher to doubt at the commencement but a psychological attitude to adopt.

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.

Why have there been so many conflicting religions, or so many changes, divisions and subdivisions of religion, if it is true?

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.

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

I never quote from Sri Ramakrishna or Krishna to make you their slaves. No: I want you to test what they say for its truth as much as any one else. They are not to be used as authorities, therefore.

Those that want Brahman will not practice control of mind. (See Mandukya p.231). That is Yoga for duffers. The others will inquire and practice discrimination.

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.

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

If yogis could influence mankind telepathically, where is the proof? They ought to have changed the world by now.

Yoga will only let you know what you imagine. Philosophy is the sum of all sciences. If the Yogis had real occult power to give jobs, save from death, etc. why did they not save the 7,000 women taken in the 18th century by Afghans. They merely said "It is Karma, we can't do any thing." This is a trick. They benefit by coincidences and explain failures by Karma: No, they have not such magical powers. We must think. The Western scientists think only of the external world, the Eastern, the inner self. Both are needed.

What if you feel ecstatic or exalted peace in the presence of Maharishi or Aurobindo? Is that truth?

Those whose mind is agitated, troubled, unhappy find tranquillity at Tiruvannamalai or Pondichery Ashrams, because there was sorrowful disturbance of the mind, probably over women or money etc. But that is because they do not know truth and they mistake this peace for Brahman. It merely indicates the state of mind possessed on arrival at Ashram; they had a mental disease and the ashram cured it for the time. There was no permanent cure however without Gnan, and Yoga does not yield Gnana.

Gandhi said that the earthquake in Bihar was sent by God to punish India for the oppression of Harijans by Brahmins etc. This is argument without facts. For there was more oppression in South India than in Bihar. And many poor Harijans must have been killed by the earthquake.

"To believe that we possess truth is not conducive to tolerance" says a religious man. The fallacy is that we presume to know the truth, as is case of fanatic, Muslim, Christian, etc.

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.

Scriptures are of value only when dealing with persons who are incapable of understanding truth. They have no value as authority for those who use reason.

If you are in imaginative mood or poetic mood, go to mysticism and religion, but not to philosophy.

Answers to prayers are imagination, due to chance.

Religion and Yoga are useful from utilitarian view points, but from point of view of seeking truth they are useless.

There is in religion the element of imagination. That religion which I like better, which gives me satisfaction, which pleases my taste is true! Such is the limited view of ordinary man. Vedanta discards these.

How do you know that what has given you peace and satisfaction is truth? We must ask the mystic.

The question is, how am I to know that the scriptures are true? You have to look into the facts, for the proof of what has the worship of God done for the people! When an earthquake occurred at Patna one house did not fall. It was a Muhammedan house. He said God saved him: Such an argument is of no value.

Ask yourself the question "Why do I say that Yoga is right and philosophy can't give truth?" Or how am I to know that Yoga leads to final truth?"

Magic and religion are only for beginners, for the more advanced there is reason.

Sylvain Levi pointed out that yoga kills the ability to know intelligently, so that when you believe or are told by Guru that you have seen Brahman, there is no means of your understanding whether this is so. This is because Yoga suppresses thinking.

Ultimate truth will interest only .1% of people; the rest will say "We have a religion, why do you bother us?" Religion is that teaching which pleases minds which lack vigor.

The scriptures are for ignorant masses, who wholly accept the material world as it presents itself. Gnana is for those who have begun to realize that things are not what they seem.

When a devotee says that God has sent him food through human instruments, how does he know? It is only his imagination.

I do not understand the word "sacred." What is meant by it? Cow-dung is treated as sacred in India, but despised by Europeans. Where therefore is there a standard of sacredness? Every man thinks what is sacred according to his own standpoint. At the world's Congress of Faiths, every man uses words like "sacred" etc. because he is enamoured of it without giving it the same meaning, which another speaker or hearer will give it. Such a Congress is a mere spate of words, all knowing nothing of what they are talking about.

Unless a man is a fool, he will never be an atheist. How does he know that God does not exist?

We know now-a-days that each sect concocts a God to suit its own purposes: we do not care for such concocted Gods today.

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

Man himself suggests that there must be a God. It is an auto-suggestion.

Prayers and sacrifices belong to a premature stage of development. Time passes. When however no answers come to prayers, questions are asked and priests tell them that the answers come in the next world. Time passes again. Struggle for existence presses man, and doubt arises again. Faith in religion weakens as man pays more attention to facts of life and this world.

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.

Those who argue that truth is only in their religion, are vain logicians, depending on mere ideas, imaginations.

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

If God is everywhere, then he is in dead bodies. Why then do you burn or bury your God? You can't get rid of him.

To remove doubts we ought not to run away from them, as the yogis and mystics do: we ought to wrestle with them until we conquer.

To say that we know God exists always implies you must also exist always. It would be correct to say on this point, I do not know.

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.

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

The Upanishads are self-contradictory, say critics. Your Pundits even give conflicting interpretations of them. Common-sense says that the final authority therefore is using your own reason. This does not mean you need to give up the scriptures, but you should apply your reason to them. For reason is common to all, whereas schools of thought are separatist.

Religions which say "If you become a Hindu, a Christian, a Muhammedan, you will go to heaven, while others "go to hell," tell cock and bull stories.

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?

We ask religionists "One part of your scriptures say Atman is changing, another that it is immortal. How resolve such contradiction?" Hence even by faith you cannot arrive at fixed notions of certitude. It is possible only by reason. Scripture can be interpreted in a 1000 different ways and hence can never finally determine truth. Ramayana, Max Muller, Sankara, each have different interpretations for example.

Most people take their own interpretations and call it Vedanta.

My position is only truth. Those who have no brains, have the belief in religion are like children playing with toys. Religion is not truth merely because it always shows contradiction. That is to say "I and my father are one" is merely a dogmatic statement. Why should I believe it. If you assert that the sentence must be interpreted in a special way, the immediate contradiction arises because my interpretation may disagree with yours.

How do you know that the writers of the Bible, Koran etc. have spoken only the truth? How can you look into their minds when they have passed away hundreds of years ago? You cannot even look into the minds even of the living persons and know fully what is in them, how much less of a dead person?

Observe how one religion is inimical towards another. Why has God created them so?

Read Huxley on Christ's miracles. Learn to bring in the scientific mind when examining yogis' and mystics' marvels and you will find they are nothing but people's exaggeration or unconnected coincidences.

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.

In India we have millions of people still in a primitive stage of mentality. They talk of a soul leaving the body at death, when a civilized man knows that nobody has ever seen this soul.

Experience shows that God has been unable to do anything either for you as individuals or for nations.

If you say scripture is infallible I ask, What is it? A book of words! What is a word? A thought; Can you see into another man's mind? No. Then it is impossible to see if the scripture-writers thoughts are founded in fact or not.

All heavens whether Muslim, Christian or Hindu are imagined.

MAHABARATA "He who is competent to support life by his energy, he who can support himself by his own exertions, does not live, but really falls away from his duty by the false externals of a life of renunciation. That man only is capable of leading renunciant life or happiness in the woods, who is unable to support sons, grandsons, and the deities and rishis, guests and pitris. If, O King, anybody could obtain siddi, perfection and salvation or moksha

from sannyas, renunciation, mountains and trees would surely obtain it. These latter are always seen to lead lives of renunciation. They do not injure anyone. They are, again, always aloof from a life of worldliness and are Brahmacharins. If it is the truth that person's siddhi depends upon his own lot in life and not upon that of others, then thou shouldst betake thyself to action. He that is bereft of action, can never have siddhi. If they that fill only their own stomach's could attain siddhi, then fishes would attain it. For these have none else to support save their own selves.”

Where obedience to authority leads to loss of your thinking power, it is being overdone and harmful. Thinking must be combined with obedience.

“This Sarvam (all things) that you see—what is this?” is the Upanishadic advice, not yoga.

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.

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.”

If you do not make your induction from facts from the world before you, the world of the five senses, you are only drawing on your imaginations. Then you say “The Atma is like this, or like that.” but it will be only your mental construction.

First you must inquire into the nature of the body i.e. matter. Second you must inquire into the nature of the mind.

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.

Say Yoga has its place rather than its value and that its value is for a certain type of mind.

Krishnamurthi's act in denouncing his own former Theosophic teaching was a purely emotional act. It was unjustified because that teaching was suited to and needed by intellectual children. So do not deny or objurgate your own former books.

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

You cannot live without the physical world, it is the basis of your life, so it must be the starting point of your inquiry. Things, not imaginations, must be the philosopher's material.

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.

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.

To know whole truth, you must know all the world, otherwise you get half-truth. Running away from the external world means an incapacity to think, an impotency of mind.

There is one message I especially want to give your readers through you. Tell them and teach them that ultimate truth is attainable, and lead them to see the unity of mankind.

Suggestion for reply to critics: I am trying to reach a position which enables me to harmonize the highest achievements of the human mind. I fully recognize and admit the value and achievements of yoga and the benefit it confers, but I also recognize its limitations and disadvantages when pursued to excess. My quest has brought me to a clear perception that there is something higher than yoga and mysticism. Therefore I have been compelled by my love of truth to devote my further attention to these further explorations for I have devoted all too large a portion of my life to mystic researches. I have also been compelled by growing experience to realize that my earlier estimates of the character and attainments of yogis and mystics about whom I have written were excessive and extravagant and ought to be revised.

As a seeker after truth I have not deviated one iota from its quest. But now I know how far yoga leads and now I see what has to be done after passing its bounds. I have refused to become crazy which so many of those who have pushed their pursuit of yoga to extremes have done. I have taken to the ultimate path. There are competent authorities among Indian sages and Shastras to support my statement that ultimate truth lies beyond yoga. The search for truth must be pursued to the end and not stop still in yoga: if it does stop there it will do little good. I may mention as an illustration that there are millions of yogis, holy men etc. in India. What visible good did they do for the benefit of their country during the last 1000 years? A few competent men influence the thinking power only of the thoughtful, but the vast majority are counterfeits who pretend to influence the actions of men, which is absurd. I have not deserted my quest and I am still continuing to appeal to the thinking power of men. I am now following Gnana Yoga. I am going to show in my future books that there are still higher steps. People have misunderstood my position. I am now convinced that these higher steps, called Gnana Yoga, lead to a truth beyond the other yogas which I have already described. I wish to warn my readers against false

yogis. I have the highest respect for true yoga which leads eventually to Gnana Yoga. I do not condemn genuine yogis, only counterfeits. My letter was sent to the STATESMAN because I felt it to be my duty to warn not only my European readers but also my Indian ones against the danger of being misled.

Every man thinks he has got truth. H.H. the Yuvaraja told me that music provides his way to heaven and ecstasy. For him that is truth. The Yogi thinks in precisely the same way of his samadhi. Both are carried away by their blissful feelings which they imagine to be truth. None inquire but both accept feelings as truth.

My position as a truth seeker remains unaltered, but this is not to say that I must stop my quest with the discovery of yoga. My quest has continued and it has led me to something higher than Yoga, but I have put it in its proper place. In asserting that yoga cannot give ultimate truth I am following the teaching of the ancient Hindu Rishis. (Ref. Viveka Chudamani, page 23 verse 56: Mandukya, Katho Upanishad and Ashtavakra). They all make the same assertion. Finally I would ask my critics a question. What have yogis done to save India from her invaders and to protect her desecrated temples by their yogic power? I am told that a yogi once stopped a train to Bombay by his mystic power. If so, why did he not stop the present war by such powers? If I am told that they are working by telepathy and thought power, I must reply in view of the facts "I don't deny that, I want proof." I realize that most people need yoga and it will be foolish for me to ask them to give it up.

There is no such thing as "Philosophical Mysticism." All you can say of your former writings is they were "advanced" or "enlightened" mysticism.

We must ask ourselves the question "What does life in the universe signify?"

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?"

Truth is "What is this world" "What Am I" "What is the meaning of life as a whole?"

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 chela was shown the objective world first, and taught to question about it.

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.

The three basic books for the foundation work of explaining the higher doctrine are (a) Brihad Aranyaka Upanishad, (b) Panchadasi (the English translation published in Srirangam is the best and possesses a valuable commentary), (c) Ashtavakra Gita.

Until a man is ripe to receive Truth from a competent Guru, it is fatal to ask him to give up meditation.

It should be understood by novices that both religion and yoga are all right in their places and that they are steps which should lead to the path of ultimate truth, but when yoga and religion are

made ends in themselves and not means to be used later in conjunction with inquiry, they may become and do become detrimental.

We do not say yoga is useless, only we oppose those who say it is everything; it is not the final; we say that followed to its goal, it will lead, eventually to something higher.

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.

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

Sankara definitely says that Yoga is not the means of liberation on page 132-133 of his commentary on Brihadaranyakopanishad.

The man who knows philosophy knows the world. Make use of Buddhi.

He who loses touch with the external world and gives himself over to his thoughts alone takes his illusions to be realities and may be insane.

Both sides of life have to be inquired into--the external and internal worlds, mind and matter if you are to find truth. Yogi avoids external inquiry, hence cannot find truth. If he thinks he does not see the world by shutting his eyes and omitting it from his thought, he is a fool and not a gnani. If there is nothing to be seen, if mere absence of the external world from cognition gave Brahman, then every ant and animal would attain knowledge of truth because it loses the world in deep sleep.

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.

Inquiry must begin with duality, i.e. with a world to inquire into. It will end with unity. The yogi tries to avoid this duality by ignoring the world. Hence he gets a false unity only.

The causes, characteristics and nature of Kshetra--these are needed to be studied to-day and the knowledge as it was needed in ancient times. This is the knowledge of external world which Gita enjoins in Chap.13.verse 2.

There is no running away from Brahman. It is the only reality. Hence running away from world is illogical.

Those who are sent to Maharishi will gain peace there. After that they should leave to work at Gnana Yoga. For peace can be gained by deep sleep, by drugs, etc. It is not enough. Hence Maharishi's Asram will be helpful to gain yogic peace but no more. To visit it may be useful, to linger permanently will be injurious.

Yoga and Mysticism disdain books, Vedanta rejects nothing but finds all, even religion useful at stages, but says finally come up to Reason. Nothing but reason will finally help.

The mystic who talks of knowing, seeing, existing, intuiting a second being--God, betrays thereby, that he is of limited intelligence; unable to grasp truth of non-duality.

What have the yogis been able to do in any of India's difficulties? They talk of sending spiritual telepathic waves to help India but nothing tangible is ever seen or done. People do not want reason, but blind faith.

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 drsyam as does the universe thought. The yogi may get the knowledge that the drg 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.

Yoga is alright so far as it goes but you have to look at the external world also. You have to eat, you have to attend to all these physical necessities of the body. Therefore no yogi can remain without ideas in Samadhi thro' out the 24 hours. Once out of samadhi he is like every other ignorant man, unless he practices Vichara.

As soon as the yogi comes down from samadhi he finds the world to be real. If he did not why does he seek their food again?

The yogis who say the world is unreal are like the fox in the sour grapes in the fable: as though I, being unable to become emperor were to say, what is kingship, it is all unreal. The yogis do not know what the world is, are unable to prove that, hence their glib statement is worthless, not proceeding from understanding, or realization of world's true nature, following inquiry into it, but proceeding from some feeling of disappointment.

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.

We ought not to run away from the world like ascetics but strive to understand its true nature and thus conquer it by knowledge.

Without inquiry into the external world and its nature i.e. matter, there can be no such thing as Jnana, but there may be yoga. The yogi cannot answer objections raised by philosophical and scientific critics; he can but say "I know" and not explain how he knows. The Gnani can. The yogi's guru may have told him "This mystic experience is liberation." The pupil believes the statement (both being self-deluded when honest) and tells others the same, because he has not investigated if it is right. Look at the case of Surendranath Das Gupta of Calcutta who gave lectures in American Universities and wrote large books on yoga and Indian philosophy. For

thirty years he said he enjoyed mystic exaltation, trances, meditations and peace. Then this state passed away. This proves he had attained a yogic condition, but not jnana. It vanished because it was not the highest insight. The gnani, however never loses his gnana. Dislodging a gnani from his insight is an impossibility. Once he has thoroughly seen the truth he simply can't fall away from it. Your friend Prof. Radhakamal Mukerjee is enjoying a similar sort of mystic exaltation and peace, but whether it passes away soon or endures the whole of of life, it is not gnana, because it did not come through striving to investigate the nature of the external world, it came only through meditation on the self; that is the yogic reward for such meditation but it is only one half. The gnani not only gets such inner peace but also truth because he has turned outwards also and grasped the truth about matter, which is as much Brahman as his self.

The Yogi and mystics dip into their selves but they do not understand that that is only one half of the truth and that this dipping is also a mental discipline to fit their minds to understand the true nature of the external universe, which understanding they must next get if they are to become Gnanis. Thus in the Gita, Chap.XII Krishna tells Arjuna that knowledge of both matter and mind is the True knowledge. We are living in the body, which is the world, and we have to eat and move and work in the external environment. We cannot get away from it. It is our life. Therefore we ought to know, understand and grasp its meaning. The yogi or mystic who refuses to do so is refusing to face the whole of reality.

Those mystics who say "I have come into contact with the Absolute, with God" merely mean "I think so" or "I feel so" How do they know the ultimate meaning of God?

The Yogis are essentially selfish because they say "I" want Brahman. The ego with them still, they want peace undisturbed for themselves and they do not care for the fate of others.

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.

All those mystics who imagine that they see and touch God, Nature, trees and flowers are wrong. They are only making contact with their own mental construction, and not with God.

The claim of alchemy to turn base metal into gold is usually the snowball circulation of a yarn; nobody actually sees the miracle but they hear it from somebody else and pass it on, probably exaggerating it in the process. The facts are not verified.

The mantra-yoga consisting of repeating the name of God, or even the AUM; thousands of times yields nothing. It can appeal only to mental children, to those whose mind cannot go high. It is mere babble. The real exercise is to think of the meaning of the name or the AUM and then only do you get something.

Pythagoras' system of occultly interpreting numbers is another indication of the primitive mind, miscalled philosophy.

With wider comparative knowledge, the occultism of Indian yogis is found to be the same primitive magic as the African savages, only here mixed with lofty spiritual teachings.

The well known story of the Indian station master who cures snake-bites by mantrams on receipt of a wire, is fit for fools. Nobody remains with him to keep a check on every case, and to follow

up its subsequent history, thus obtaining correct statistics. It would then be found that an enormous percentage of failures occur. Secondly a large number of snakes are not poisonous.

The mystic who says "I have got Ananda" does not know that in the back of his mind, in his consciousness, he has got misery also. Hence the Sat-chit-ananda doctrine is for children only, for those who do not know what they are talking about.

Most mystical gurus are either insane or cheats.

The mystics who are indifferent to the world's fate are unconscious egoists, because having got satisfaction for themselves, they want nothing more. That is, the ego is satisfied.

Even the greatest lama of Tibet has to die; neither Buddha nor Christ could prevent their own deaths. The story of prolonged yogic physical life is nonsense. Never believe such stories.

Mantrams can do nothing. If they really had any power why did not Krishna use one to stop the Mahabharata war? Do not believe all the cock and bull stories about the magical power of mantrams.

Visions and samadhis are illusions from truth point of view. The test is what has it done for India for the common good. In Sutra Bhashya and Mandukya it is given that Samadhi and sleep are identical. Brihad Upanishad does not advocate samadhi. The country is going down, down and down.

In non-duality, contemplation has no meaning.

All mystics who say they have seen Brahman God etc. are insane in this particular respect. Moreover they are cheating themselves, because they have not examined what they have seen. They may be perfectly sane in other respects.

Every mystic can say he has seen and communed with God, for none can refute him. Hence his privileged position in getting away with nonsense.

Where a hypnotic entranced subject describes unvisited scenes he has not traveled in an "astral" body, but is merely re-echoing the thoughts put unconsciously by the hypnotist himself into the subject's head, i.e. the hypnotist has previously seen the place and is suggesting its description unconsciously.

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 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. jnana. Yoga is thus simply a sharpening-stone for the mind to enable it to take up Gnana. But you say that Maharishi lives without thoughts, Impossible. How can he walk from one spot to

another without thought? He does not know the jnamic truth if he says thoughtlessness is the perfect stage of self.

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.

Yoga and samadhi are not the goal but a means to an end, i.e. Gnana. Samadhi in itself is useless, because the mind is withdrawn and there is no memory of it until after it is over and one returns to waking state. This is true of men Like Ramakrishna as well as the humble yogi who attains mind control: it is only sleep.

The great mystic who is said to experience non-duality in his ecstasy must still come back to normal state and see the external world, after his ecstasy. And then he will find that world separates from him because he has ignored it and not tried to understand it. Only the Gnani can say of the external world, "This is Brahman, Mind." and prove his statement, and that it is none other than himself.

The yogis are largely humbugs or self-deluded. Otherwise they would not set themselves up as different from others. They seek influence over others, or money, by thus differentiating themselves. The gnani never does this. The yogis promise blessings etc. to those who surrender their wealth or person to them. Many here live questionable lives with women disciples. Those who wish to deceive others give out yoga and religion.

The easiest thing is physical action. Who is better off--the man that digs the well or the man who calculates? Sitting still is a bodily act. Hence true yoga has been lost through it being in the hands of the mentally weak.

When a yogi says "I feel Bliss" who is having the experience? His 'I' is the ego. Hence that is not the highest gnana.

If one carefully examines the experiences of mystics, we find that they do differ. It is superficial to say that yogis and mystics all have the same experience.

Whatever idea of God you are familiar with through upbringing or teaching, that you will see in your visions i.e. imagination.

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 driak and is therefore unbroken, permanent.

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. See Mandukya P.153 re.this.

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.

The Yogis and Mystics want meditation, sitting still, etc. only because it gives them pleasure: the satisfaction is for their own selves only, not others, hence it is something sought by the ego and cannot get Brahman in consequence.

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.

Man is really the formless: clairvoyants who say they have seen some person or other in the astral world, have not seen the man himself, only what is imagined to be him.

The mind of the mystic must become a constant slave to some line of "thought" or rather imagination, and then he will really see visions confirming his imaginations. Hart's Psychology of Insanity confirms it.

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.

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.

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.

Those who tell you that Brahman is unity, that you can get it only by intuition, that you should not reason, you should not question or argue or inquire, are deluding you. Verification must come by thought.

The world must be seen before you can know its true nature in Gnana. The yogi who shuts it out, thereby deprives himself of the opportunity to achieve Gnan.

The yogi must go to the ashram, some special place, some cave or other. Whoever must sit in a posture is attached to the body.

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. Drik 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 Drik is ever pure, ever free from ignorance, being Knowledge itself, and that even all Gnana-yoga practice is within the realm of drsyam, never Drik.

When anyone talks of liberation, what is he doing? He is forming an idea. What is an idea? Drsyam! Those philosophers who are so confused as to be unable to separate the drik, talk of

gaining liberation. But all such ideas are only drsyams which come and go, the drik needs no liberation.

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

Vedantic bliss is non-dual; there is no enjoyer present to enjoy it, or to distinguish it from misery. The mystic revels only in 'bliss' that is experienced i.e. that comes and goes, but his is not Vedantic.

Your peace will be disturbed only if you recognize a second. Hence the mystic's peace is temporary: the only enduring peace belongs to the sage for it is non-dual.

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."

Pantheism is a step higher than theism.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

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

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.

To know God without any doubts, you have to be identical with him, for how can you know what he has got in his mind? Hence duality must disappear.

Asparsa Yoga gives truth and permanent happiness. The other yogas can only lead to temporary happiness.

Even Ananda, bliss is imagination. Therefore the Upanishads call it a Kosha.

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

Ignorance cannot go through merely knowing the Atman, for it is known in sleep and samadhi. It can go only by knowing Brahman. If you can say that in your yogic samadhi you saw the wall and knew it as Brahman, we could agree that Yoga leads to truth, but in Samadhi you are unaware of the wall and of the universe, and hence of Brahman. To talk of Brahman without knowing the meaning of the word is like talking of Zelloo--utterly meaningless. Nirvikalpa gives only Atma-knowledge. How does the yogi know that what he finds in samadhi is Brahman? Where is the proof? He can know only by inquiring, by Vichara. He may see an ass in his Yoga, but how does he know that an ass is Brahman? Where is the evidence? First of all you must give the meaning of Brahman! Where is the evidence? Thus a mad man can say, "this book case is a horse." So until he defines a horse we cannot say what he means.

It is not enough to see a mere blank, Nirvikalpa. 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.

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.

Do your duty, work to set society right, and do not remain idlers like yogis who are no better than rocks.

Those who sit in a cave will no doubt be happy but it is their personal happiness only, whereas Vedanta seeks welfare of all.

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.

There is no alleviation of sufferings of mankind except Truth. Yoga may alleviate one's personal trouble, but the point is what others are still suffering. The thing is to face the world. It is not by shutting yourself in a cave. The latter leads to insanity and fixed ideas or delusions.

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.

Nothing is to be given up. If you omit anything, if you ignore any knowledge, then you are not a Gnani. The ALL must be known; if you give up the world, what and how can you understand of it?

Weak minds cannot take a comprehensive view and so decry what they cannot understand.

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.

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

The method of asceticism is only for a lower stage where one gives up externally in order to help one get into the internal attitude of freedom from desire. The mental renunciation is higher.

Vedanta says that when another man suffers I must suffer with him. Therefore I must help him. Yoga says nothing of the sort. It is selfish.

There are two stages: 1st - detachment of the Drik, 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.

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.

That the Rishis or Gnanis of ancient days had miraculous occult power and books relate stories of their feats, are fairy tales which were meant for children, women or uneducated men, i.e. those whose minds had not developed. Ramayana contains stories of wonderful men with seven heads etc., which are fables, yet are taken seriously by pundits.

Why does the yogi in samadhi fail to see non-duality? Because he believes there is happiness to come to him from samadhi. That shows he does not know truth, but still seeks bliss as something apart from himself.

The common people draw a wrong inference in thinking a Gnani must ascetically reject the world; this is only for those in the lower rungs of the ladder. Asceticism is to be practiced only until one attains equilibrium of mind; when this is established, the continuance of asceticism is foolish.

The indifference practiced by a seeker is external; the indifference practiced by a gnani is purely internal, in his mind.

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.

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.

The yogi can help his immediate circle to concentrate better, but not the world at large by telepathy. The yogi's claim to influence mankind at a distance is only applicable to fellow yogis who are of the same grade of mind or same temperament. And hence only very few. It is false to say that adepts are influencing humanity en mass. Otherwise one yogi could have saved the world long ago and all mankind changed. Even Buddha could not overcome opposition by his yogic powers. Even Krishna could not destroy the oppositions by powers. The mass of mankind cannot be influenced. If Maharishi has such yogic powers of influencing others by thought waves why did he not influence his brother? Either he is incompetent to do so or a humbug. So do not exaggerate the range and influence of telepathic power, it is restricted. You cannot influence every one unless that person is weaker than yourself and of the same level. The adept's test is how far he is doing something for human welfare, and to remove sufferings and ignorance. All those who talk of silent secret service can affect only those in their Ashram or immediate circle, none else.

Those ascetics whose body becomes weak, thereby render minds weak. Hence Upanishads say a man whose body is feeble cannot find truth. Thinking then becomes hazy and a luxury. The yogi in a cave half-fed has not the strength to make mental efforts. Besides he feels narcotized, lazy, dreamily content.

Sanyasins are enjoined not to accept anything or ask for anything in order to get established in Atman. (Hence Sankara puts strongly that only Sanyasis can have Brahma gnana). That means the mind must be so trained (not Bahiranga, external, but mentally too) to give up all imaginings.

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.

The general impression is that the world disappears to a gnani, that he sees nothing in samadhi. This is wrong and believed only by deluded persons. Nothing is destroyed or rejected. How can the world disappear: It is there always. If it's mere disappearance in samadhi is Brahman then you would get it in deep sleep.

The mystic says "I have got peace." The religionist says "My soul shall go to heaven." But the philosopher asks "What good is it to the rest of humanity if you are at peace or are going to heaven?" What of the millions who are suffering or starving? How will your personal peace or samadhi relieve them?" That is, the mystic is looking only at himself.

BEYOND YOGA: FALLACIES OF RELIGIONS: & REASON CHAPTERS

Until the doubt comes to you that what you know or believe is true, then you must accept scriptures blindly and follow God without question.

In practical life, authorities are needed. In philosophical inquiry they are to be regarded only as giving opinions, which may be consulted out of curiosity, but are of no value as proof.

A professor in London said to me "What are you talking about?" Ultimate truth cannot be known. Let us drop the subject." So I at once became silent and dropped it. That is how we

Vedantins must behave in the company of those who believe they know (See 208 Ashtavakra). Every man thinks he knows the truth.

"What I know is right, what another man knows is wrong." This unfortunate vanity is common to all men and prevents realization. A man must begin by doubting his own knowledge, therefore. Only when doubts begin to arise does a man start in quest of Truth. And such doubts usually first take the shape of asking why God sends or permits plague, earthquake, war etc?

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

How are we to know that our estimate of life is a correct one?

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.

You must go to the very fundamentals, to the root of thinking, to "gresp the principles and not merely repeat the words of Vedanta.

How do I know what he says is true? This question must come to your mind whenever a doctrine is presented to you whether by Smith or Krishna.

Radhakrishnan in his book "Eastern Religion and Western Thought" says that truth is known only by intuition. This is wrong: let us not be afraid to use the word: it is known by Reason.

"How do you know that what you have seen by the intuition which you praise as the highest faculty, is true?" I asked Bergson 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.

When Arjuna says in Verse 63, Chap.18, Gita, that all his doubts are cleared, he means his doubts on every question. But this happy state could not have been reached if he had not begun by having doubts and asking questions and demanding proofs.

When Krishna tells Arjuna to overcome doubt by the sword of wisdom, he does not mean that Arjuna should give up his doubt and believe, as the Pundits interpret it, but that he should keep on thinking about his doubts until they are solved; that he should not stop until this point is reached.

Epistemology is the enemy, the devil of yogis, mystics and religious teachers because it pries into the truth, the source and the validity of the knowledge they claim. Therefore it is the most difficult part of the study of philosophy.

The 'I' is supreme among men, and lies at the bottom of all their ignorance, mistakes and misunderstanding. Every man thinks "I know". He does not stop to ask first "What is the meaning of what I believe I know?"

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.

People have got the child mentality, the slavish mentality, and accept statements as merely because they are uttered by famous men. They lack the scientific method of inquiry.

In ancient times people simply sought some knowledge of the sun and stars; in modern times, if they have brains, they say, "I have some knowledge of these things. But is this true?" hence they begin with a doubt.

In the confusing multiplicity of doctrines, each has his own theory, he does not have time to think and inquire if it be true. Yet doubt is the first step to knowledge for the thoughtful. On the other hand, as Gita says, never be satisfied with mere skepticism, have the hope that your doubt will be solved, and go forward.

Reason tells you what is good and what is bad, what should be followed and what let alone.

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

If God is to be Almighty he must be free to change his mind. If he is changeable, He cannot be Truth, as per our definition.

Swami Sri Keskar's statement that world was created 18,000 times in cyclic order, means that he himself was present before he was created at each of these 18,000 times, otherwise it is mere imagination. It is mere assumption without proof. To say he saw it by yogic vision won't do, as it affords no proof. Why did not the yogis of Nalanda in the 12th century foresee their entire massacre by the Turks? There is no evidence in this kind of clairvoyance.

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

Mayavadin 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.

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?"

Illustrations in Vedanta should be used only as illustrations, and nothing more. Thus if I say "He is like a lion" I do not mean that he must have four legs, tail, etc. but merely that he has the courage of a lion.

To talk of seeking God is as meaningless as saying "seeking dog". It is only a hollow word.

Mystics talk of universal consciousness. How do they know it in this iron post, or in that stone? Mere guess!

Those who talk of developing God-Consciousness are meaningless, because they merely find their own idea of hallucination of God. They do not know what God is.

What do you know? means, "What do you know as a fact?"

How do you know there is an Absolute or a God? The onus of proof is on the one who makes this assertion.

Vedanta says without proof we should not accept any doctrine.

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.

Is there a God? What is his nature? Let there be proof. Such questions must arise. Gita says every man knows God according to his like and dislikes. That he must know him as Truth. We must have proof of what God has done and what he is doing.

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?

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.

Those who pray to God for something occasionally get what they ask for. They then declare it to be a miracle to be placed to the credit of God! But when they fail to get what they pray for they do not attribute these failures to God, and thus the obvious fact that the failures far out number the successes, as for instance hundreds and thousands of Jews in Germany who prayed to God to protect them, but the prayers remained unheard.

The dawn of wisdom is to say "Let me examine it." Let me think of what it is. That is to inquire. Hence our critics are of the greatest value to us.

There is no secret silent mental invisible service of mankind by occult power. Where are the visible tangible signs in the world? Where are the signs of benefit of Aurobindo in the district of Pondicherry? There is no proof of this service, says Vedanta. It must be shown otherwise do not believe it.

All predictions as to what these yogis will do in the future are unacceptable because verification is not immediately possible. Who can take them as having any worth? Therefore they belong to the world of imagination.

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.

If you give me the proof, I will call you sane; if you do not I will call you a child.

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

Hold your judgment in suspense, and say meanwhile I can't accept your claims. This is the reply to yogi's claims of marvelous healing power: Ask for the list of failures, and refuse to be guided by success only.

Thus only can you get at the stage of truth. If you say it may be true, then you are only imagining. Go as far as you can, never stop at a doubt, do not get disheartened by it. Have doubts, but try to overcome them. Do not kill it by keeping quiet. Let the doubts come, but try to overcome them fearlessly until you reach truth.

I have not see Jesus' face. If I say that he did this or went there, it will only be my imagination. This applies to all learned theorists.

How do you know that a Yogi has reached Brahman? He must first find out that what he has reached is Brahman. We must know that it is real Brahman, otherwise we cannot rely on it. We need verification.

Meher Baba's declaration "I am God", who can disprove it? Similarly with all other yogis who assert they know Brahman in Samadhi. There is no possibility of proof or disproof. Hence these yogis can cheat themselves or others. When a man like Meher Baba declares he is a perfect yogi, you must ask, How am I to know that you are? I merely echo your statement, unproved.

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.

The purified intellect (Buddhi) is the Reason.

To reason is the opposite of insanity. Indians admire the insane "holy" men, unfortunately. This leads to delusion.

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 give up reason. Life does not consist only of waking state. We must take all three.

Doubt is the beginning of knowledge. You must verify your own ideas and concepts. You must put your imagination aside, and let the truth be verifiable by others.

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.

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.

Vedanta is the philosophy of verification.

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.

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.

What you know must be tested, to see if it be true or not. Experience must be taken, checked, analyzed and corrected. It is the characteristic of all human beings to believe they understand, even when they do not. Otherwise you may be merely imagining as you like.

Reasoning is interpretable in two ways. The defective interpretation is to apply it only to waking state. The correct interpretation is to apply it to the three states. The latter leads to final settlement of the problems because it takes all data into consideration.

We have one key from Sankara and to be applied to every statement or assertion or speculations: It is "Is this true?" "Where is the proof?"

Opinions belong to scholasticism, not to philosophy. Vedanta has no use for opinions.

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.

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?

Nearly all people want their own imagination, not truth.

The Karma doctrine is acceptable but when a yogi says, "In your last birth you had the desire to find a guru and now you come to see me" he is merely telling a lie, for how can he see into the mind of the last birth? It is imagination, unprovable.

We ask Jeans "Did you see a divine architect, did you see him placing the objects there for man to see?" No. Jeans' own mind has constructed (i.e. imagined) the divine architect.

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.

Indian philosophy does not separate the inductive from the deductive methods of thinking, whereas Europe follows the inductive almost alone. The West pours contempt on our doctrines as being based on primitive deductive logic, but we claim that the two are separated only at a loss and that the combination is needed for correct inferences to find truth. You must combine analysis with synthesis to attain Brahman. It is only the Pundits and yogis in India who are so lazy that they won't take this trouble. West has used induction together with reduction for science but not for philosophy, which we do in Vedanta. The use of this combined method is why we say science is the best introduction.

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.

You have to begin with your awareness of your ignorance before you can even doubt.

Scientific critics often say, "We don't want metaphysics because it deals with unverifiable things." Vedanta replies "If it deals with unverifiable things, then it is only theology or bad metaphysics. Vedanta deals with what can be verified." If you use imagination without the aid of reason, you get only poetry, art or religion. But used in conjunction with full reason, it becomes valuable aid to science, in the forming of hypothesis and theories.

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.

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?

When mystics say that reason and intellect should be subordinated to the soul, or intuition, or ecstasy, we ask them "What is it that tells you so? It can only be thinking power, i.e. reason itself. You are unconsciously using reason to decide what shall be subordinated to what! Therefore reason is supreme in value as an epistemological source of truth over and above mysticism and yoga.

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.

“Experiences” in religion or mysticism are really feelings, thoughts, 'visions.' That you may have them is not questioned by the philosopher, but that they are truth is questioned.

Science demands caution, examination of all the facts before jumping to conclusions, and hence cautiousness is a necessary quality for truth seekers.

In purely religious matters we need only believe or merely imagine, but in scientific matters we must test first.

A man may speak the truth, as when a mystic he saw a vision of Sri Krishna, but whether what he saw was really Krishna, is quite another question. We grant the mystic, the yogi and the spiritistic medium the fact that he saw a vision but we do not stop there, as he does, but go on to inquire scientifically into the validity of it. We want to know what it really was.

A man who goes on worshipping God all the 24 hours is greatly revered by common people whereas to the scientist he illustrates a case of unbalanced obsession by exaggerating a single thought, and therefore he is insane.

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.

The majority of people lack the patience and perseverance to labor in investigating and collecting all the facts before judging: hence they assume that a man is great because others say so, or that he is wise because he himself says so, or that what he teaches is true because it attracts them. The scientific attitude rejects such easy assumptions and requires some trouble to put into effect.

There is complete resemblance between the interior voices and clairvoyant visions of mystics and the auditory and visual hallucinations of lunatics, hysterical women patients and other mentally deranged persons. The yogis who hear the Aum sounds internally or smell unaccountable perfumes are suffering from sense-hallucinations as much as the insane. The man of brains however rejects the truth of both these types of subjective experience although he accepts the fact that they were really experienced.

There are various grades of insanity. It develops gradually. Spiritual belief is a mild form which may grow into yogic hallucination and finish up in complete mystic lunacy!

The division of mind into water-tight compartments, one of which is excellent, sharp and balanced, the other dealing with other subjects or activities, being poor dull and deranged, is a phenomenon of Disassociation of Mind. There is a justice of High Court, (Sundaram Chetty of Salem) who is quite good in legal matters but quite insane when he comes to deal with yogis and mystics.

People are duped by the fact that a man is doing his ordinary duty quite effectively into regarding him as completely sane, when the truth is another part of his mind may be quite unbalanced. Insanity can be localized in some parts of the mind as it were.

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.

In ancient days men were primitive in their thought, so that a man having little knowledge was considered a genius. Now-a-days our knowledge is so advanced that the genius of those days would be an ordinary man of today. Therefore if you find truth, free yourself from the tyranny of environment and tradition, not by condemning them but by examining and testing them by the standards of modern science whether they be true or not. Accept nothing on the authority of famous men of the past or present but only if it prove true after examination. Ancient Indian astronomy says Rahu swallowed the sun, but today science has taught us to reject such nonsense.

The philosopher is not unwilling to listen to what others say, but he is determined to judge for himself. Anyone--whether mystic, religionist, yogi etc. may obtain a hearing from him, he will not reject anyone in advance by saying, "He is only a fourth-rate thinker"--but he will then question and inquire if it be true.

Philosophy does not reject tradition because it does not reject anything, but it asks "We want to know what there is of truth in tradition and then investigate it?"

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.

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.

The theoretical knowledge of logical rules will not prevent men from making mistakes.

How can a virgin produce a child? It is impossible. Yet that Mary gave birth to Jesus without a father is firmly believed by millions of Catholics, some of whom would die for this belief. This is because they take their feelings or so-called intuitions as criteria of truth. That is why we must go to nature and not to religion if we want facts.

Our method is to test what Shankara says and then only if we find it true, to say it is true. Doubt must precede acceptance.

When you say that intuitions are above reason, then why do you want to reason about it, to prove it by means of writing books? This is the question I ask Bergson and Radhakrishnan.

Wherever you find two doctrines contradicting each other, it is a certain sign and warning that there is a logical fallacy somewhere.

Exaggerated claims like Meher Baba's that he will stop the war or improve the world are cock and bull stories which appeal to the common people because they have primitive minds, the

hallmarks of which are credulousness, ignorance of scientific facts and belief in miracles. Such a mind has no capacity to see through these men.

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

The fallacy of logic in "All men are mortal, A is a man, A is mortal" is the assumption that you have seen all men who lived in the past who live now, and who will live in future. But this is impossible. Therefore you start with something you do not know. Hence logic is defective. It can give truth only under limited conditions; it can't give ultimate truth.

I repeat a thousand times Faraday's quotation: "A philosopher is one who is no respecter of persons, but of facts." If Lord Balfour and Robert Browning write in favor of God's existence that is worthless to us. But people are impressed by the gorgeous cloak of a Pope, by the yellow robe of a swami, and they say, "How dare you question their knowledge?"

If Gandhi says he communes daily with God, we reply "How do you know that the source of your communion really is God?"

Merely logical methods are insufficient for inquiry because they will not yield absolute certainty. We need scientific methods still more.

Poets may say all men are one; but they have yet to learn how to prove it. It is not enough to say it on the strength of an intuition which has come to the poet, or a thought which strikes him, he and we must know it. That knowledge can only follow after inquiry.

The study of psychology will teach you that about 75% of people are insane, and hence incompetent to perceive the truth about their own lives. They falsify the plainest facts by dragging in God and religion; they ignore the obvious things of life in our world which touch the closest in order to satisfy themselves with imaginary things of the next world. That is why we must start with doubt.

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.

How do you know that intuition is true? In your own life you have so many intuitive thoughts strike you, or that a certain road leads to a place you seek, and yet these thoughts were wrong. All you can say of intuition is that it may or may not be true.

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.

Yogins and mystics make no use of Buddhi. "What we have seen is true. Don't ask questions." That is their attitude. It never occurs to them to doubt their knowledge.

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.

In a court of law lawyers also use reason in presenting their case and arguments. But as they are aiming at winning their case rather than finding truth, we call such reason Visuddha buddhi= vitiated impure reasoning in contrast to purified Buddhi.

Epistemology is to question whether what you know is truth. If you desert reason and fall back on revelation, there is then the difficulty of conflicting interpretations of the one and the same revelation.

The mystic says "I know." What does he know when he replies it must be properly tested to see if it is truth.

Yogis and mystics do not study what is the proper criterion of truth, hence they are incompetent to know whether their experience is truth or not.

You ask why I do not give feeling a high value in truth pursuit, and hence refuse to accept the mystic's experiences as a truth test? Well the newspaper reported the other day that a Muslim in Malabar felt or had an intuitive feeling, which he believed to be from God, to kill a Christian. So he murdered the other man and was arrested. He felt sure that God had guided him to do the crime. So how can feeling be a universal and highest guide to truth?

Intuitions, that is, thoughts, are worthless unless they are checked by reason.

One should always ask for proof and verification of any statement. The jnani is always willing and able to give this; the mystic, religionist and yogi are not.

You must find proof first and quote authorities second, and then merely to support proof. Otherwise you have slave mentality.

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.

The mystic, the poet, or the theologian, often possess no test for truth, being satisfied to accept that which they feel to be true. We must ask them, how do you know that your feeling is truth? A mystic might say; my intuition tells me to have 36 wives. How does he know that his intuition is the voice of truth? Hence we must find out first what we mean by intuition; what we mean by feeling and what we mean by thoughts before we accept any of them. Discrimination will then be

needed in its strictest sense to check the imaginations of the mind. No vision, intuition, feeling, revelation is worth anything at all unless it is prepared to be tested by discrimination; by the proper tests which are universally and eternally applicable for truth.

Reason is not to use merely the intellectual processes of logic, for the latter works in the waking state alone and hence cannot be perfect, because Nature has given us all three states.

Truth takes things as they are. If there is any uncertainty it is not truth. It does not deal with imaginations, such as "this world is illusion," "the next world is around us" etc. Men have not the scientific attitude because they take things as presented to them. They have rather the emotional attitude. The right attitude is to collect all the facts, to see a problem in them, something to investigate and inquire into them.

Truth must be verifiable; it is no use saying "I have intuitively seen this." It must be possible for everyone or for as many as possible to see also. Unless it is verifiable it is of no value.

Those who lack the capacity to doubt are not fit for Vedanta.

Analogical, inductive and deductive reasoning are good only within their limits; none are absolutely and universally infallible because they must work under certain conditions.

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

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.

If the Western inquirers come to India they should always demand proof of every teacher, pundit or yogi for his statements.

If the mystics tell you that you can know spirit, higher truth, reality, etc. only by intuition and not by intellect, I reply: You know everything by mind alone; when you are asleep can you know anything by intuition, No: Why not? Because mind is then inoperative. This proves that if there be such a faculty as intuition it must be a lesser part of, or included in the Mind, and when Aurobindo Ghose talks of discovering the supra-mental consciousness, who or what is there, to discover it because the mind is not there? It is an absurd statement.

The psychological writings of mystics and the pseudo-scientific explanations of yogis like Aurobindo Ghose, are not inferences from the facts of their mystic experiences but mere imaginations.

The mystic who says he has cosmic consciousness implies that he has gone to the sun and seen that this consciousness was also there; he has gone to the sun and to the moon, the stars, and seen it there, too. Is this so? What nonsense!

Even to this day many people believe in the biblical story of Adam and Eve; that is because they have not got Buddhi.

Until a doctrine or claim is proved to be to be true it is of no value. Until then we must not accept it. But as 99% of people are fools, they are easily duped by prophets, seers and mystics who claim to know God. They are deceived by the fallacy of authority, whether it be outer or inner, and do not judge for themselves as to what is true or not. This shows that human mentality is still primitive or childlike.

Logic leads to practical truth; it cannot lead you to ultimate truth. Here reason alone can guide you. When logic is applied beyond its proper limits, i.e. practical life, it becomes absurd. The Ramanujists are examples of this absurdity, when they say you cannot have a watch without a watchmaker and hence a world without a creator. It is a misapplication of such logic to apply it to matters outside its proper sphere of use.

It is impossible to have a mind which is non-logical, i.e. without some kind of logic. Even insane men try to draw inferences, only they are illogical, i.e. draw them wrongly. Every human being thinks logically or illogically, never non-logically. But the West often confounds logic with reason.

The credulity of the human mind, the tendency to believe in the supernatural, belongs to its weaknesses.

Nobody denies that mystics have their mystical experiences. That is quite right. But the question of their validity then arises. What does Brihad Upanishad say: "Every man says "I know." What does he know?"

Vedanta deals with fact, truth and reality, not with religion, poetry and imagination. Hence it does not trouble itself with unseen heavens beyond this world but rather with this seen world and everything that is in it. Dualistic cults ask you to imagine, we ask you to prove.

Whoever goes on telling of unseen planes which he has never seen, who goes on merely imagining and is unable to prove it when questioned, is really telling lies. He is a liar.

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.

We have to ask the question of everybody, "How do you know that your view is true? This is the most tremendous argument in all philosophy, whether Indian or European.

Intuition when used by mystics and yogis, means mere blab--nothing more.

I do not say Yogic exercises are useless. If done in the proper way they have their own value for those whose brains cannot understand more. If done in the wrong way, then they are misleading. The point is that they are only a stage, a step. When they are regarded as an end, not a means then they become hindrances and errors for they cannot give truth.

There are two classes of yogis but both cannot get near truth because both believe in causality. The best class are those who took up yoga to seek Truth, have had mystic experiences, and believe that by intuition or by practice, Truth would be realized; but this is a belief dependent on

causality. The lower class took to yoga to compensate for disappointment for finding peace, not Truth, and they have lower intelligence.

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.

I insist so much on criticizing yoga only because there is such immense confusion between yoga and gnana.

To make personal, mystic, yogic or religious experience the test of their validity is insanity.

The advance of science both in influence and discovery, will go on and cannot be stopped. Therefore any ancient philosophy which ignores it or refuses to harmonize with it, will perish.

The meaning of the injunction to sharpen reason is: your buddhi must be made clearer and clearer.

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

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.

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.

Few philosophers, not even Radhakrishnan know the distinction between reason and intellect. Reason is so troublesome to use! That is why they misunderstand Vedanta.

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.

Mind has different functions; when active it is called intellect; when judging it is called reason.

From the highest standpoint, Reason is none other than the Self itself.

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.

The word Reason bears a different definition in India to that which it bears in Europe. People who translate the word buddhi as "intuition" or "intellect" are wrong. It is the highest Reason, that which discriminates between truth and falsehood.

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

The intuitive person is unable to do without thinking, anyway, intuitive thoughts are still as much thoughts as reasoned ones, only they are blind and unconscious. Similarly everyone reasons, even the pundit, the distinction being that the pundit does not trouble to get all the facts and verify his truth. Everyone thinks.

What is it that tells you we have intuition? Reason! Therefore Reason is the final and highest faculty of mind.

Reason cannot do away with instinct but it can direct it into proper channels.

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.

Intellect deals with logic and is not to be confused with reason, which is a superior faculty.

CHAPTER 6 (and 2 and 1 mixed)

The intellectual development, which is being forced on mankind by Nature, is illustrated by the change in warfare. Recruits with intelligence are preferred over others nowadays because they have to learn to use mechanized weapons.

We have been taught since childhood only to imagine and to believe in religious fables and cock and bull stories, not to look at facts, at the world in which we live. Science takes things which are before you and is the spirit of the higher portions of the Upanishads.

There is no philosophy in any sense unless it is based upon science. Those who try to philosophize without it, remain ignorant and cannot get truth. It is the scientific method, which I mean when I say that there is no philosophy without science. It is an attitude of mind, a mood, but not a memorization of facts.

We need science for getting on in life as well as in philosophy.

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

Philosophy penetrates into regions beyond the reach of science, otherwise there would be a difference between them.

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.

Science is the knowledge of the world. Truth without science is an error.

Conviction of the Truth comes only by adequate reasoning and by the counsel of the wise. Even mere reading of Vedanta books is not enough. There must be reasoning on them.

Science must now be the essential basis upon which to build philosophy. Formerly religion was the basis but not in this modern age; scholasticism is replaced by scientific philosophy.

I am watching and reading the works of only the best thinkers in science, the most authoritative leaders of thought. I am not interested in the work of third rate men. I want science to ask "What is an idea?"

The clairvoyant describes various unseen worlds and invisible beings which he perceives. So does a madman. There is no difference in the madness of one and the insanity of the other. People respect and believe the one while they despise and disbelieve the other, merely because they are not philosophic inquirers.

Science is an essential part of true education because it trains the boys to observe facts, and to investigate before passing judgment.

Philosophy must be based on science, or it is mere word spinning.

It is not science in detail but science as whole that the seeker needs to know. Vivekananda was handicapped because the science of his day was ignorant when compared with the science of today.

Without science, pundits and philosophers are mere bubbles of empty words. To study of history of philosophy is not necessarily to be philosopher. Objectors say "I feel the wall exists, hence it is real." Had they studied and understood Jeans, Eddington and Russell they would know by scientific proof that it is only an idea. (see page 348 of Paulsen.)

Yogi, priests and clergymen must study science or they must disappear. Such is the modern trend. The pursuit of Truth is passing through science today.

We need to THINK. Truth will not come by itself.

All things which we do in this world are emotional and personal. The only exceptions are science and philosophy, which in this respect are opposed to them, but which in other respects are complementary.

Indian philosophy is more scientific than the science of the West because it is more thorough, seeks fuller data.

Mystics who denounce science as being a mere catalogue of facts should be asked if they can understand a steam engine. This cannot be done without the use of brains. Why do they take the advice of doctors? Because doctors possess scientific knowledge. Thus mystics even unconsciously use science because of its value. Such value could not have been achieved without brains.

I am taking students through the mode of scientific method course because after that I will show how ancient Indian philosophy was thoroughly scientific. Unfortunately this scientific attitude has been lost in India through the course of time.

The religio-mystic attitude is one of intellectual stagnation. It ignores science and thus perpetuates idiocy instead of taking advantage of modern investigation to remove it. We must

bring science to bear upon our mystic experiences. Because Dr. P.B. has tried to take this higher view, those Indians who formerly praised him, now say he has fallen from his angelship and that he is writing rubbish! Thus they oppose progress. Gandhi tells India to spin Chakras and ignore science and thus she will become great: Scientifically India is where Europe was in the middle ages: Stagnant: Brains are missing or unused.

When you use a pencil, travel in a train or steamship, sew with a needle, read a printed book, you are unconsciously endorsing the value and truth of science. Thus Pandits who consciously reject it and mystics who consciously despise it, are not aware that they prove its truth every time they do one of the above things. Even the Swamis who ignore science in their Vedantic studies nevertheless do not walk on foot for six months when going on pilgrimage to Benares, as in old days, but ride in a train--which is the product of science.

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.

Both science and religion offer hypotheses and theories but there is one vital difference--science starts with facts which it collects; religion starts with fancies. Science evolves its hypotheses from such facts, religion from fancies.

Science tells you that oxygen combines with hydrogen to give water. Ask it what oxygen is and it will tell you it is protons or electrons. But philosophy asks "What are protons?" and to whatever element science pushes back protons philosophy will always alone be able to deal with its ultimate nature. Hence science must ultimately surrender to philosophy when it wants to push its quest deeply enough.

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.

It is impossible to have a mind which is non-logical i.e. without some kind of logic. Even insane men try to draw inferences, only they are illogical i.e. draw them wrongly. Every human being thinks logically or illogically never non-logically. But the West often confounds logic with reason.

Reason is the highest faculty of man: hence it must be our guide because it will last when other things go. We should not merely imagine things but check them by exercise of reasoned judgment.

Thinking power is essential, whether in philosophy, politics, or business. Who is it who gets on in this world? It is the man with intelligence and reason. Similarly in the pursuit of truth the same capacity brings success.

Philosophy which has no basis in science is usually religion or a mere catalogue of ignorant opinions; people prefer it because it can be got more easily. Yet such a pseudo-philosophy is worthless from the standpoint of truth.

Science is incomplete and inaccurate without philosophy; and vice versa. Science means certain and exact knowledge. Those who limit it to its practical applications such as making railway engines, are wrong because that is only one aspect of science. 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.

The naive people who assume without any proof, have untrained minds.

There are different degrees of development of Reason. A child's reason is feebler than a youth's; a youth's reason is feebler than a mature man's; while sometimes an old man's is again feeble. Reason to the highest degree sees the whole of humanity in you; among mature men, some are sharp-minded others less rational. The difference is a matter of degree. Therefore all people have some growth of reason.

You may dislike science but you will have to seek it and avail yourself of its knowledge. When you want a light, you get a match -- science, switch on electricity -- science; or when you are sick you go to a doctor trained in medical science. On the other hand, religion has no such universal necessity. You can do without it if you like. It is a matter of majority of opinion or propaganda by sword.

Yoga sharpens intelligence only when it is immediately followed by a practice of inquiry, that is by calm thinking. If the yoga practice is not followed by such inquiry then a man will only become a duffer, because his Yoga will kill his intelligence.

Science as I use the term is not applied science, but the method of getting knowledge in a particular way. (see p. 336 Gita 1st para)

Human reason finds its highest level only when it inquires into Truth. Human reason alone leads to truth. Ultimate truth can be known and is known in this world by human reason, nothing divine, or mystic is needed for that.

For those who are mentally so constituted that they must rely on some authority, who cannot think for themselves, who cannot stand on their own legs, who must quote some man or other, we prescribe scriptures. But for those who have brains, we appeal to reason and so "Do what you like with the Vedas, Korans, burn them if you wish."

Reasoning is the function of the exercise of the attitude of mind which rejects what is not true, which says, "this is not truth, that is not truth."

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

"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.

Philosophy must be based on science, because that occupies the largest portion of human life, cooking, travelling, lighting etc. all embrace science and are all being used today. Therefore although philosophy is based on the whole (synthetically) in all departments, still we make science the principal item and base everything else on it, because of its importance.

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

Although philosophy must include all the departments of human experience and life such as ethics, religion, politics and aesthetics, nevertheless it bases its primary doctrines on science because that is the leading item of human life and because that alone insists on universal verification.

All life shows that there is an evolution of reason, that we need it at every stage. Therefore those who teach, "Let us rise above reason," are fools.

Unless you get an idea of the whole as well as the parts you do not get genuine reason. People want the part only because it is simpler to grasp, but reason demands a complete knowledge.

The true philosopher deals with facts, not imaginations, hence necessity of science for him.

Without bringing in science, you can have only scholasticism but not philosophy.

People adopt the attitude that "Whatever I know is Truth."

We need to be rational, not merely logical. Logic is not enough.

As man advances he sees the logic underlying experience and becomes more rational. His reasoning is two-fold--implicit and explicit.

The difference between backward-thinking of the ancients and the modern thinking is that we want the facts of experience as proof, whereas in the old days it was sufficient to believe. "What do the facts reveal?" is our scientific attitude today, And philosophy - based on this, is worthwhile; without it we have something else, not philosophy.

Most scientists refuse to venture into philosophy; only Jeans, Eddington, Heisenberg, etc. have been forced into it; the others want to stop short because they do not want to go into the root of things.

The beginning of philosophy is the study of science, because latter is absolutely honest in its truth-seeking as far as it goes.

For the proper study of Advaita the pupil really needs to know a little science and a little Sanskrit.

Science means never taking anything to be true without proper proof. It does not mean an accumulation of certain external observations of objects. It is an attitude, an outlook, a method. That is what I mean when I say that philosophy must be based on science. I mean on scientific results following inquiry, of course, the scientific knowledge available in Sankara's day was less

than in ours, but the attitude of demanding proof, of using reason, was as available then as now. Philosophy takes the results and tries to understand them.

Science rules the world. It offers something of practical value.

To stick to what you consider good, and not because it is true, is perversity. Our position is that unless it is proved to be true, we do not want it.

I am grateful to the West for having given me science and particularly for that scientific work, Hart's "Psychology of Insanity."

If religious faith and mystic yoga alone are to be practiced then God wants you to be a fool. Why then did he give you intelligence?

He who knows that infinite X... which can be grasped by reason, study, he moves not from truth, says Gita. See also Gita chap.18 verse 37 regarding Reason as means to reality.

Some conceited philosophers say reason cannot grasp the Self: he is formless. True it is unattainable to those who have not got the traditional knowledge, who have not studied the Vedanta, but for those who have been through Chap. 18 of Gita, duly initiated, it is quite possible.

In chap. 10 of Gita, Krishna says, I cannot save you, but I can give you Buddhi. Verse 63 of Chap. 18 says "I have given you the most secret teaching, now reflect over it all" Krishna plainly says reflect, think.

"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.

The greatest weakness of the yogi is to think what has given me peace is true. When he gets the same madness for truth that he has for peace he must go on.

Most of what mystics conceived to be true is merely your imagination.

The yogi lulls the senses into blissful slumber, renders truth impossible. He has to be awakened! Page 234 of Mandukya says both states are harmful and take you away from the path of inquiry into truth.

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.

Science is the highest teaching in the world of duality. Philosophy has its roots in the same world, but ultimately leads to non-duality.

Men who have not become firm in their own reasoning powers, quote someone else as authority to support their reasoning because they have not got fullest confidence in their own powers. When you are certain, you do not need another person to support or confirm you. Why should

you want it? To appeal to another, or try to get him share your views so as as to feel stronger, indicates your own reasoning is incomplete.

The first principle of Vedanta is “you must not tell a lie.” What you like for practical life it is not concerned with. Keep your intuitions and instincts at a distance. Stick to known fact.

To inquire means to go to the very end of things.

It is not the absence of buddhi that can grasp Advaita but the man who possesses the highest intellect. Brains are necessary. Such a man, by merely hearing the truth mentioned will know it. (page 224 of Ashtavakra Gita).

Allow the mind to analyze the whole thing; think consistently on it. Exercise your thinking faculty and inquire continually; discrimination is essential; this practice is the only way to understand Advaita.

Every man has a complex "I know". Unless you give up the 'I' you can't get rid of the ideas "which are full of contradictions" to the Truth seeker. But those who do not want the truth, do not see the contradictions and are satisfied.

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.

Many people quote Vedanta without understanding it really in its highest aspect. Say to one who calls himself a Vedantin, but whose philosophy is really mysticism: "How do you KNOW that what Sankara says is true? I read such conflicting teachings by Jesus, Plato etc. I am confused as to which are true?" He will be unable to prove because he does not know the proper test of truth.

There is no hope for those who call themselves realists because they are unwilling to make inquiry into what is real. The true scientist analyses and inquires, not relying on first impressions, and hence he is fit for truth; this is vichara.

The yogi should understand that sitting quiet will bring him peace and not truth, for he starts his quest without even knowing the meaning of truth. How then can he find it.

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.

Verification, the testing and proving of truth, is absolutely necessary in Vedanta, “the end of Veda” whereas in the Vedas the truth is merely assumed.

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.

"Knowing which everything else is known" is our goal and ideal in Vedanta, whereas Western philosophers say truth is unattainable, that God an insoluble mystery and that we can never penetrate into the heart of things. When scientists turn to religion and God through fear or awe or puzzlement, it is because they stop in their quest and are satisfied with what they have got. They do not care to go deeper into truth.

The obscurity of so many philosophers is due to their doctrine being not based on fact and experience of life but on mere imagination.

Unless we go deeply into the root of the matter, our talk is vain and shallow.

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.

The fundamental position of Vedanta is: "We are not going to make any statement recording anything we do not see or know."

There are degrees of truth, most doctrines are partially correct in coming gradually nearer to truth and thus pointing towards it, but Advaita alone cannot be contradicted, all others are contradictable. No European philosophy has this idea of Non-duality as contributing the criterion of truth: the nearest they have got to it is Monism.

If there is contradiction; if another man doubts your definition, then we can't say if it is truth. We can neither deny nor affirm, but we cannot accept what is contradicted.

"I know it" is criterion of the yogi or mystic. "As revealed in the scriptures" is a criterion of religionists. But the scriptures are themselves revealed by men! But nothing personal will give you truth. How do you know they saw the truth? Unless truth is defined and it is shown that it is beyond contradictions and present in experience.

Science gives you a truth which is least contradictory.

Every man has an opinion about truth. I criticize Meher Baba. He criticizes me. Even a child gives an opinion. So where are we to stand? This is the business of philosophy--to find out what is true.

Why do you start with assuming that anything you know is true? Many things your mind unconsciously regards as true because you enjoy them or are pleased or satisfied by them. Vedanta demands proof first.

The criterion of truth = the grounds or facts upon which you base your definition of truth.

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).

Every man has an opinion about truth. A universal test of truth will yield same result always for experiment if done at N and S poles, Europe, India etc.

Vedantic or highest truth is our aim, which is quite different from the opinions of the schools. All the various views are mere opinions, and have nothing to do with the ascertainment of the truth.

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.

Those who say the poet's intuition or artist's inspiration gives a higher truth than the scientists reasoning, do not know the definition of truth. They are on the same plane as the lover and lunatic, who take, with them, their emotions as guides to truth. It is simply talking nonsense, talking what pleases you most as true.

Philosophy in India goes to the very root of things. It rejects everything untrue by the principle of "Not this, Not this."

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.

Vedantin's position is "I want only uncontradicted knowledge. Everyone else says something which is opposed to those of another school of faith or thought. I show that their positions are therefore contradictable being opinions. I shall reveal and negate all contradictions to reach unassailable truth to rise above all doubts."

If one man says anything, find out if there is anything to contradict him, if so, leave him for he dwells in opinion, not truth. This is the fundamental principle of Vedanta. They contradict each other. Vedanta truth must be where there is no contradiction at all.

So long as the fact, the object is before them, scientists are alright, but when it is taken away and they have to deal with abstract ideas they lose themselves in the wilderness.

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.

Every man thinks that what he believes is truth. The Christian thinks Christ is truth. This is because every man is seeking truth.

To know the truth is not to imagine it, but to have inquired into it, to have inquired into what I think is truth, and into what all these authorities regard as truth. You must ever ask the question "How is this opinion of others and myself true?" Thus, not what gives me satisfaction but what survives inquiry, reason and argument. Otherwise religions and theories multiply each saying my view is correct.

Opinion or View = Matam in Sanskrit. To this belongs religionist, whose view is "I cannot be happy unless I believe in a God. So let me believe. I do not want to give up what I like." Tattvam = Truth, and is the position of the philosopher, who says, "I want nothing but the Truth."

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

If I tell you something which agrees with your belief, you exclaim "Yes, that is true." You do not pause to ask, "Is that true?" Religion gives you satisfaction, but does satisfaction give you truth?

The tendency for all human beings is to think that what we know is truth. That Truth is independent of the human mind, they do not know.

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.

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.

All the examples, such as mathematical truths, are approximations of the highest truths but only the highest is the only truth. For all these examples are taken from the practical world, whereas the ideal is in the ultimate truth.

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

When we are dealing with truth we attach no importance to the names of any great men or personalities as authorities for any statements, even if they be Ramakrishna, Sankara or God himself. For even from them we must ask "Where is the evidence." We cannot go to the root of the matter and not let the mind work.

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.

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

I am seeking that experiences or that object in which there is no doubt, no contradiction, and possibility of either. That is Truth. I must keep on thinking until all doubts vanish. Truth does not

belong to any single cult or name, but to all. It is better not to call Truth, God, call it X, if you wish.

Truth is a concept in the mind in which there is no contradiction. If it is in the mind then of what nature is it?

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.

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

H.H. the late Yuvaraja's addiction to excessive music to the point of asserting that it lifts him to heaven means that music has become truth for him merely because it yields him the highest satisfaction. Most men regard what gives satisfaction--such as sex, power, religion etc--as truth, varying with individuals.

We Vedantins are wedded to this: we shall think and speak only the truth. We cannot accept imaginations, lies. We have as it were taken a pledge to honor truth.

Each thinker may have his own opinion, such as Kant, Descartes, Spinoza, but that is only speculation. It must be shown that it is Truth or leads to truth, which the same aim of philosophy.

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.

Individual results have no value. Tests in a thousand cases must show same results before they are acceptable.

Nature of truth must be such that all minds can find agreement therein.

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.

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

What is the test of truth? How do you know that a man has realized the self? First we must define self.

Tests of truth are quite different from the meaning of truth. Those who say that Ramakrishna appeals to them are still in the sphere of religion not philosophy. For that is no test of Truth.

The mind takes for granted that whatever it is attached to must necessarily be real. You feel certain things therefore you take your feelings to be real. Jesus felt God to be within Him. He did not inquire if it be real or imagined. "I felt it, therefore it is a reality" is the general attitude of all

people. But their feeling of God within is only imagination. They assume the reality of their feelings because they are attached to them.

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.

The old school of innate ideas which says all knowledge is inborn, is partly true and partly wrong. We also do get knowledge from outside experience, as asserted by the empirical school.

Merely imagining things without looking at the facts of life will not do for us.

"Is my judgement correct?" Reason creates this little doubt, and if you have got this, you have gained fifty percent of the battle for truth.

Look at the facts of the world. What do you care what Vedantins say. We don't appeal to their interpretations of words.

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

The mystic or religious man who says he feels or intuits that this man is an adept or that doctrine is true depends upon (a) his ego, and (b) his body, as a guide to truth because feeling is associated with both the I and the body.

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?"

You must have the patience to doubt. Only the fool believes at once. You must inquire first, "Is this truth?" Is this yogi deluded or humbug? How does he know this is true? This attitude is not only needed in science, but also in the study of Hindu Philosophy, for it is laid down in the Upanishads where you are told to "overcome doubt." This is achieved only by inquiry, not belief. Gandhi is a great man in the political world but he is a small man in the philosophic world because he is the enemy of science.

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.

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?"

Cautiousness, distrustfulness is the most important characteristic of both scientific and Vedantic method.

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.

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.

Logic cannot give you truth.

You must not say "Yes, I have satisfaction in this belief," but "Is this belief truth?" Drinking makes me happy, but is that happiness the highest truth? Dying for religion gives me delight, but is that the delight of dying for truth?

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.

Where is the proof that praise or prayers to the dead has reached them? No proof! It is all Aesop's fables!

Logic and inference can be used elsewhere but not in Vedanta. The sun has risen countless times; you may say it will rise again tomorrow, but is that absolute truth? No. You infer it. It is merely logical and suited for adoption for practical purposes; but there is no certainty possible in any prediction.

Doubt is valuable because it leads to asking questions and thus to inquiry. Existence of doubt makes you seek Gnan; if you kill all thoughts and all doubts, as mystic does you will never seek or find truth as the question will not arise.

The advaitin is ready to admit anything provided you can prove it to be a fact.

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.

Mind's tendency is to be lazy, whereas thinker wants proof because he realizes his own ideas may be false. 99% of the people want their previous notions to be confirmed and unaffected.

Man innately believes in the reality of the external wall, the physical body and the I. All this is based on belief. But in this world belief is often shown to be unreliable and false. Advaitins do not believe in Atman. You may have a belief, but you should show that it is true.

Vedanta uses grammar, logic, rhetoric etc. only to help, never to rely on.

Logic deals only with the practical world, it is insufficient and too shallow for philosophic inquiry.

When I say that Vedanta clears all doubts I include in this word all questions for a question implies a doubt.

Certainty, nothing hidden from you, can be got only from inquiry, not from yoga.

This philosophy of Vedanta takes the world as it is, and epistemology is the beginning of philosophy; but arrival at truth is the end of philosophy (Re: Panchadeshi).

Every man thinks that he has no doubts; but every one must examine himself whether he has doubts or not, and if any conflicting ideas exists he must (which is inevitable with the sense of duality) he must get over them.

Without reasoning, direct cognition is impossible. The Rishis too got at it through Reason: we only rely upon Reasoning.

Meditation will be determined by the nature of the meditator i.e. upon his own kalpanas or imaginations.

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.

An adherent of Vedanta may say "Vedantic philosophy teaches so and so", another man may object "No, Islamic philosophy teaches such and such." Thus they may go on uttering contradictions in the name of philosophy. True philosophy deals only with the appeal to facts not theories.

Where scriptures and authorities do not agree with experience and reason, we reject them.

When I use the word "doubt" I apply it to every case where a person goes to a teacher, visits ashrams, asks questions or seeks in books. If he did not have doubts, he would not do any of these things, for they would then be unnecessary.

Vedanta can meet the arguments of the hairsplitting logician, and overcome them as easily as it overcomes all other kinds of arguments.

How do we know that such a thing as Brahman exists? There must be proof.

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."

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.

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.

An assumption is something that is not in itself true, but is assumed to be true.

How do I know that my idea of God corresponds to God?

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.

Every dream and vision must be tested if it be true.

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?

When there is a desire for final truth, when doubts comes to a man, it indicates that he has begun thinking.

We do not worry about Sankara. A philosopher is no respecter of persons. We are concerned with "Is it true?"

Easy philosophy is false philosophy. It may be true religion. The man who exploits the Indian peasant or European workers justifies himself and gets submission by saying to them, it is Karma. Thus the abuse of Karma is justified by the appeal to "intuition". People do not want reason, to think.

Rationalization means to justify myths and religious fancies. Reasoning means strict thinking on facts. The distinction between both can be observed in the circles of the insane.

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.

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).

Mandukya: P.334 line 9 from the bottom. So called spiritual pundits and learned are called children because a child takes whatever it thinks as truth. The question never occurs to children "Is what I have seen or thought really truth?"

CHAPTER 12: DOCTRINE OF MENTALISM.

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.

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

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.

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.

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.

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

Philosophy is verified knowledge or Truth. That is why all the Upanishads say "Don't teach Upanishads to every one." Unless one is able to eliminate the external world, it is no good teaching the Upanishads to him.

Sanyas is necessary in some form as a discipline during the period of training, so as to get rid of attachments to reality of body and world and help you to know them as idea.

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." 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."

The senses are the mind's servants.

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

Before we can arrive at a knowledge that the external world is really an idea, we must study, investigate, face and then know the external world. Hence insufficiency of yoga as source of truth.

Mind can influence other minds because all minds are ultimately one. Because you cannot say that matter is independent of mind you can influence matter. Scientists say now that matter is mind-body. Vedantins say that matter is only mind. Even subtle and gross bodies exist, but they exist as mind.

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

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.

Imaginations--mental presentations—mental constructions--ideas.

12. The Doctrine of Mentalism

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.

Objective Idealism asserts there is a wall outside, but I can know it only through the mind. Subjective Idealism says I do not know anything outside my mind. I cannot assert that any wall is there. Question arises, how do I get the idea of a wall. Berkeley's subjectivism says God produced the ideas. Objectivism says there is an object outside from which my idea is formed. Both these theories accept the idea of causality, however, and stop there. Only Hume and Kant among the early idealists began to question causality but did not go to its root.

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.

Objective Idealists fail to see that the external objects are also ideas, the failure being due to inability to think deeply and sharply into it.

They tell us that the idea is but an image of an external object, that it merely duplicates that object and that the latter somehow produces it. They are wrong.

They think the object is outside and the corresponding idea is inside, hence the gap between both is uncrossable. This is erroneous. All objects are inside the mind as ideas. Therefore I rate Berkeley and subjective idealism as more advanced than Bradley, who confessed he could not see how the real became appearance, i.e. external became idea.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Christian Science and other spiritual healings may get marvellous results but they are the results of using higher mental powers and the ideas of Christ, etc. have been transferred to the healing power which really has nothing to do with it.

An idea is a mental creation.

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.

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.

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.

Vedanta begins by inquiring into the nature of the Mind and then only it proceeds further.

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.

Psychology in Europe does not go sufficiently deep. The leading psychologists cannot see the self as separated from the contents of the mind, but eventually they will have to come to Vedantic view.

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.

When Swami Yogananda visited Mysore he successfully hypnotised most people in an audience, but he failed to hypnotise me. Because all these other persons possessed weaker minds than the Swami while mine was stronger than his.

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 mountain.

The terms "superconsciousness" "overmind" etc. belong to irrational mysticism. We cannot measure awareness (which is consciousness) and say where it stops, therefore mind is called limitless; hence to talk of something beyond it is sheer imagination. We appeal only to the facts of experience.

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.

The case of the little French girl who during her illness, forgot her own language and began to speak in a dozen different foreign languages which she never before heard is explicable by the fact that they must have been stored somehow in the mind from previous lives; what is in the mind may emerge. Moreover we do not know what the real limitations of the mind are.

(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.

"The Unconscious" is so named because it is part of the mind where all these changes take place and hence all intuitions and dreams emerge, whilst we are not aware.

The psychoanalytic term "the unconscious" may be used instead of "Pure Consciousness" when latter is used in Vedantic sense of awareness without an object, provided you make clear it is not unconsciousness but that out of which consciousness arises.

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

Through study of the working of the mind you gradually come to see that it is what West calls "The Unconscious" which is at the back of it all, and what we call the Atman.

Europe has yet to learn that we cannot look into the mind of another nor into that of animals. Hence those scientists who describe how ants think, for instance, are merely drawing inferences, not ascertaining proved facts.

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.

Mind and its nature, Mind and its working, are two different subjects.

Mind does not depend on mere size of the physical brain. The elephant has the largest animal brain, yet it is no more intelligent than man, who has a much smaller brain.

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.

We know mind only by its activity, by what it does and by what it is capable of doing. We do not know it in itself. European philosophers who regard mind as only a power or as an activity do

not really say what it is when appearing to define it, even though they use a million words. This study is correct up to a certain stage, but they have not gone so far as Indian.

You may think of the mind as you like, but you get only a thought, i.e. you get words, more words. You do not get mind itself. That is Vedantic position. Philosophers in Europe go on spinning yarns about the mind, but have never seen it. Their words are only imaginations. Punditry is not philosophy. Much of what they say may be true but true only as thoughts, but they have to inquire what a thought is; and then they have to go beyond it. What about the mind which observes all this, knows all thoughts?

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

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.

The materialistic Aristotelian theory which asserts mind to be a mere byproduct of the body, places it on a level with such obvious byproducts as the saliva and perspiration. It reduces the sublime to the ridiculous. If the materialists had seen the body first, before seeing the mind, and had then observed mind appearing as its byproduct, we could find their doctrine acceptable. But nobody has even seen this. It is only an imagination which passes off for philosophy. The mind could never have appeared after the body as its byproduct because mind alone first asserts the existence of the body.

All these numerous theories of psychology are after all, only ideas and imaginations and you die confessing that you do not know whether they are true or not; you have merely accepted the opinion that you preferred, not verified. For preference implies ego, and there can be no truth unless the I goes.

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.

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

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.

The rope trick was done by a more powerful mind who hypnotized the crowd. This proves idealistic position, as does the frightening of a child to see a bogey which does not exist except in its mind. The camera showing a blank when photographing the rope trick is proof of this.

A mind can stretch out to the farthest points in space, so telepathy can result. But there must be tuning-in between two persons. Yogis who talk of sending out high thoughts into space talk rubbish, except in case of ripe persons receiving their thoughts.

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.

The old mechanical-chemical physics and physiology which separated mind from body has been invalidated.

The category of mechanism, i.e. that everything can be reduced to measurement and calculation, is insufficient; it does not hold true of mind.

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.

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

You cannot think of the mind itself. Only when an object is there can you say your mind tells you of it, or that mind is present. When no objects are there, you can say nothing about mind.

Mind is everywhere. Bose has shown that even plants possess awareness.

Just as space cannot really be cut up, so the drik cannot be cut off by your body. Hence we say drik is unlimited like space.

Cosmic mind, Lake Manosowar, Hiranyagarbha, common mind, are all one and the same.

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

Western Evolution deals only with matter. One material form changes into another. Hindu evolution deals with soul. But nobody has seen a soul. It is an assumption. You cannot distinguish soul from body. Man is mind-body, not a soul alone nor a body alone. It is impossible to show where consciousness starts in universe.

Trines "In Tune with Infinite" gives a key to telepathic, occult etc. powers. The minds must be in tune with each other, otherwise it is impossible. Weaker minds may be read, if both are in tune. Physical, spiritualistic phenomena are mere mass hypnotism. All the people present see a table rising. Even photographs showing the table rising or boy climbing a rope in Indian rope trick are possible. Cameras are hypnotized, because matter is also a part of mind.

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.

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.

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.

Where a man cures scorpion-bite or other illness by so-called psychic healing, it is simply the illustration of the power of stronger mind over a weaker one. Majority of people who go to occultists are mentally weak and hence easily affected; if a strong mind goes he is unaffected.

Mediumship can be scientifically explained without dragging in the "spirits of the dead."

No scientist has yet been able to find out fully the exact relation between mind (the immaterial) and brain (the physical substance).

An idea = what is present in the mind.

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

We cannot say when consciousness began. It is unborn. If you want to see Mind born, your mind must already be present to note it; which is an impossibility. Hence the question when Mind began should never be raised. This is not grasped by Huxley. We know only one consciousness really. You can only imagine another person's consciousness hence the minds of others cannot be taken into account. Vedanta wants only truthfulness, not imagination.

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.

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.

Who can say where mind begins or where it ends?

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.

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.

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

European thinkers have not yet risen to the level of understanding "objectless consciousness." Only deep sleep can help them here. However they are groping their way to it with notions of "the unconsciousness", the "subconscious" etc.

How far does mind extend? We do not know. You know only that you have got consciousness, that he has it, etc. You are thus certain it exists. Hence in the language of Gita, "Consciousness is" --beyond that we can say nothing provable.

How do we know that there is a mind? That which makes you think or aware of anything—A thought is what we become aware of. We use the word 'mind' when we are aware of a thought.

There is no agreement among psychologists about the nature of mind. They have different theories about it. Hence it is only ordinary or superficial persons who have the conceit to say that they know what mind is. But what mind is in itself none can tell us in Europe without contradiction. Only when they can get an idea of Drg-Drasya can they get out of their troubles and begin to understand mind.

Mental means that which has no length, breadth or thickness, for you cannot measure mind.

It is impossible for any one to understand Vedantic view of consciousness unless he has previously given long and patient thought and inquiry along right lines into his own mind. Therefore it is useless to give a public lecture on it to people totally unprepared.

It is absurd to hold with materialists that the mind is entirely dependent on the body, is a part of it, is born and dies with it. For how do you know that you have a body? Not before the mind itself tells you. Your mind, therefore is the principal factor here, and the body is really dependent on the mind, not vice versa.

The materialists who say mind comes into being with the body must answer (1) who knows what mind is? (2) Does a man know when his own mind comes into existence? (3) Does he know when he himself (let alone his mind) came to birth? He never saw these happen. He can only guess. Who saw all this to tell him so. Even those who say that mind grows with body can only know that it acquires more knowledge as time passes, the rest is guess work. To say and know that there is a body, you must have a mind, therefore mind must be a preexisting condition before you can have any thought or awareness of a body, or make any statement about it.

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.

Consciousness is not as Westerners uphold, only that which has an object; it may exist without any object at all. Therefore we disagree with the Freudians in accepting an Unconsciousness. From Vedantic view their theory is unnecessary, as consciousness does not change into unconsciousness: it is always the same, whether with an object or not, whether with personality or not. The analysis of mind made by psychoanalysis is incorrect. The Europeans have not been able to separate the contents of the mind from the mind itself, the Drsyam from the Drik. Hence their confusion in psychology and incompleteness in philosophy.

The fallacy of the doctrine that mind is a byproduct of matter lies in the fact that it is mind itself which tells you that matter exists. Mind is absolutely necessary as a precondition to inform you of matter's own existence. Therefore you must have the mind first, before matter. Hence it could never be a byproduct of matter, as materialist philosophers assert. We may start for argument's sake with the assumption that mind and body are two separately existing things but the one thing whose existence is unquestionable is mind, for through it we know everything else.

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.

The Upanishads began with the truth that mind is dimensionless, you cannot measure it. Descartes made the same discovery and placed mind outside the limits of space-measurement.

Many bodily diseases can be cured, or their cure considerably hastened, by the power of the mind. This proves that the mind interacts with the body. But the exact relation between both and the manner of this interaction is very difficult to know, say the Western psychologists. Descartes avoided the difficulty by running away: he said the mind works according to its own special lines, and the body according to others. But this dualism solves nothing. Never having seen one of the objects - mind - his words can have no adequate meaning.

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.

It is not possible to see whether your idea is an exact copy of the material object. Therefore the "correspondence theory" of truth is rejected. It is only through the mind itself that we have to check this correspondence and we can't say that the external object is separate from the mind.

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.

Names, and forms, Matter and Energy are mere concepts i.e. words.

You see everything always in the mind. Even when you see an external object, it is only the mental information about it that you have. You have never seen such an object at any moment, nor can you see an object independently of the mind. You see a wall outside the body, not outside the mind for who has measured the length of the mind. Who has measured the width and length of body? Great philosophers still talk stupidly of the external object thus assuming it is outside mind. Body is idea, hence in mind, and to talk of object being outside body is tantamount to saying it is outside mind--an impossibility. Hence the existence of things as external is unproven: they exist, but not externally.

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.

The first point to be brought home to inquirers into our system is the analysis of the nature of the world. Let them study Science, and follow the analysis of matter as far as electrons, protons etc. Then when they ask what these are, the leading scientists like Lord Russell, Whitehead, Eddington, etc. will confess that ultimately matter and energy drop out entirely and all that is left is a kind of mathematical symbol, i.e. a mental concept. Thus through science alone the inquirer arrive to the principle of idealism. Of course it will be so much stronger for him to supplement this with the metaphysical inquiry made by Berkeley and the other philosophers.

Our knowledge is confined to your mind or whatever your mind tells you.

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.

You, Neo-realist say you see an object and you reject idealism. But who is this I who sees the object? That you must go into. Is it the eye? Or is it the mind?

When you speak of "external" objects you really mean external to the body. That means you are attached to the body, you identify yourself with it. You must get over this identification, for when the thought of the body and of the I goes, you get truth. Don't think your mind is imprisoned in the head. For everything which is seen is only the Mind, i.e. the self. Duality means you are thinking of other things than the self.

This world is made up endless kalpanas (mental constructions). One determines the other and so it goes on in an endless series.

Such is the power of the human mind, as distinguished from animal mind, that it can encompass the whole world.

We Indians use word unreal not ideal because we regard ideas as being physically visible under certain conditions, whereas the West says no.

Objector who says because I have idea of a table, there must be an external object of which I have formed the idea is beginning with a preconceived dogma, is imprisoned by a false conception, which must first be unlearned like child before he can see the true aspect of this problem. He must not assume anything.

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

When there is no proof that matter is insentient, how can you postulate it? It is best to adopt agnostic position. We must question all, even Patanjali, etc.

How do you know that the external world corresponds to your idea of it? You cannot take it and separate it from the mental impression. The retina gives only a small picture, the hill outside is large. Where is the comparison? They are different. Hence you cannot prove that the hill corresponds to your idea of it. This refutes correspondence theory.

Hume went one step further than this, approximating the Buddhist position. We know things as sensations first. We feel it through our senses. We can't know the object independently of the sensation. Therefore I really infer the existence of the object. The mind passes so quickly through these three processes that we do not understand what has happened. Therefore Hume concludes all the external world is an inference.

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.)

Telepathy depends on the other person being of the same mind as you. We must bring keenness of mind to bear upon these subjects.

The usual criticism of Idealism is correct. I am conscious both of the wall and the idea of it. It is wrong to say everything is an idea, then all other persons are ideas, and my ego is the only existence. This is absurd. Yet this is Idealism.

Vedanta is not such Idealism. We go beyond it. It is only a stage. We teach "Atman-ism." Through Avastatraya we avoid these difficulties.

Suppose I had never seen U.S.A. That does not prove it does not exist. This objection is admitted by Vedanta. Others may have seen U.S.A. If it is true that I cannot know unexperienced things, it does not follow that they do not exist. The independent external world postulated by science and common sense, however is not there as we think it.

We took it for granted that the world existed before you knew that there was a world. How do you know? Where is the proof? Only by looking at other children and saying I was a child like them. Is this direct knowledge? No, it is inference. Inference will do for practical life, where it is needed, not for philosophy. But for absolute certainty inferential logic will not suffice. Supposition is not enough for Vedanta, for absolute truth.

There is no proof of the existence of a separate external world. It is impossible to verify there is an object outside. The only evidence of something external is your feeling. That is an unreliable guide. Berkeley, Jeans and Eddington see this. But they won't go and see further into it, as Vedanta does.

Reply to Dr. Johnson re: Berkeley "What is it that made you aware that ground you stamped is there? "The mind!" For without mind you could not have known the ground. Enough! Only the mind is known first and last.

(?? Out of place) L. ADAMS BECK: GARDEN OF VISION: "He is a master who has realized the whole universe in its mind-essence." This means one who knows the world to be idea, mind.

CHAPTER 13: THE ILLUSION OF WORLD EXPERIENCE

We begin to discriminate first with our words; then with our ideas; then with our outlook; then with our lives and lastly with our consciousness.

By doing we do not get at Brahman. You have to think hard to remove the ignorance. The rope does not give birth to the snake. The rope is that which causes apprehension of the snake. That is all. Objects of kalpanas (imagination) alone have birth and death and not Atman which is not an object of imagination.

Those who lack the intelligence to discriminate between Drik and Drsyam have to be given Yoga.

Both Drik and Drsyam are Brahman, not Drik alone.

Can truth ever change? The nature of truth is this: It can never be changed under any circumstances. It may be misrepresented. It must apply to the whole of existence, to the whole of the universe. It is in the world of the seen alone that you have all changes, as Drg Drsyam Viveka points out. The seer remains unchanged. The Seer, as such remains immortal. It can never die for it never changes. The body is seen, and goes, but the seer or knower of the body, can never go. Take this principle as your guiding thread and Vedanta becomes easy. The seer can never be subject to the changes of the seen; it is unchanged. The mistake usually made is that seer becomes seen, or that seen is seer.

If you want to have absence of contradictions, absence of duality, there must be one entity, one being. If you have a thought, an idea, there is contradiction between Drik and Drsyam, for "thought" is drsyam. Why should distinction imply contradiction, you ask. What does distinction mean? It implies that two things are not the same, hence duality exists there.

What is the soul as different from mind? Soul is only a mental picture. Even if you say that you are immortal and exist eternally, it the mind that must tell you this, i.e. to the mind that it is only an idea.

Ideas never reach Atman. The mind never knows it. He who says he has a vision of the highest or describes it as supra-mental etc. does not understand Atman, because it is free from imaginations.

Vedanta says ordinarily knowledge arises from experience of object by a subject; that all knowledge of objects will only lead to more thinking but never give you ultimate reality. European position is "Let us try and get more and still more objective experience and then when we have enough we may get reality." Vedanta says the West can never get at ultimate truth that way because it leads to endless thoughts and because it ignores the seer, West must make the inquiry into Drik to find reality. We do not say it should give up its investigations into objects; they are useful empirically; but only that it should not delude itself that this is the correct path to final reality.

Who ever saw the awakening of consciousness? Whoever saw the first man or the first animal? Such talk is not philosophy but hypothesis.

When the yogi sits down to meditate, he is thinking first of sitting, i.e. his body; next he says "I do not want such and such thoughts," i.e. he is already thinking of those thoughts. Thus his mind is filled with two drsyams, never drik. Hence Ashtavakra says "This is your bondage, that you practice Samadhi (meditation or trance)"

Let us put aside the imagination and have the thinker-- what do you get with thinking-- you can get only a thought. Meditation is only an effort of the mind; it is kalpanas, an idea; the mind remaining the same with or without ideas.

When your attention is riveted to an object, you forget the subject, Atman. This is true whether an external object or an internal (one) idea. When you are absorbed in thinking of anything, you forget the subject, yourself, that which sees all these subjects. You may think for ten thousand years but it is all thoughts, hence not Atman. But when you ask who is the thinker of the thoughts, you do get Atman, the knower, the seer of the thoughts. He is the eternal.

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 jivas. 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.

Yoga can yield only drsyams because everything that you can do or practice becomes a vanishing 'known.' It yields relative truth, i.e. true from a particular viewpoint, not ultimate truth.

All the objects which you see are Drsyam, passing away every moment, hence unreal.

All that Science has discovered only gives you an idea of something that is ever passing away; hence if scientists understand this and ask "Is there a Remnant, a Real?" they will come to Vedantic Truth through such philosophic inquiry. Everything in this world will go and die.

Hence we ought not to get attached to it. Not only we individuals will change and die, but empires and mountains have been known to disappear.

We start with mind and matter. We analyze mind and taking away from it all those portions which are ever changing or passing, we get at Atman.

When a man is able to make the distinction between Seer and Seen he will understand that every living creature, even animals possess the seer. In this sense only, he will come to understand that God is present everywhere, provided God is taken to mean the Drik.

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 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.

When you are distinguishing between knower and known, you use the word Mind. When these disappear we use the word Atman just to show that there is something which has not disappeared, as thoughts and objects are seen to disappear. Nobody can see Atman appearing or disappearing. We can say only that it must have been there.

It is not body alone that constitutes man, but body plus mind, i.e. consciousness. This you find from your study of Drg Drsyā Viveka.

Everything that you have in mind, every thought, feeling, and emotion is only "a seen" and will pass away; it is only the "known"--as Drg Drsyā Viveka shows. Hence Sruti says "Neti, Neti", "not thing, not this" when examining the contents of mind and says these are passing phenomena and not the Atman--Seer.

I am seeing or knowing the changes, not that I am changing. The word change is not applicable to me. Therefore we use the word "immortal" regarding the Atman. I am seeing the mortal; in this sense we call Atman-- Seer immortal. There cannot be two Atmans. It is impossible. Change can have a meaning only when there is more than one. Atman being unchanging must be only One.

You know that changes occur because of the existence of something unchanging. The changing and the unchanging are always present. We value experience because but for the world and its changes, man could not possibly think of the Unchangeable or realize it. Why attach yourself to all that changes which constitutes the world? The very fact that you are constantly thinking shows that world is always changing.

People do not distinguish between Drg and Drsyā. If they knew that everything seen, even the gods, is only an idea they might perceive truth, not otherwise.

When you think of the individuality, you know it also is only consciousness, mind.

The Drik= thinker. The Drsyā= the thought.

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.

Anything seen, observed, cannot be the Atman or the Witness.

The first division of the world is into Matter and Mind, or as Drg Drsya Viveka calls it, the known and that which knows. We analyze world (known) and knower (mind). We conclude that the world is only mental. Thereby further analysis we discover that both world and mind are only one substance.

Mind is only another name for self. The mind does not change; its contents change, and the mind knows the changes.

The first step in Vedanta is to distinguish between the knower and the known, that which thinks and the thoughts.

You never see your own mind coming or going much less the self. You see many thoughts come and go but the unitary substance or organ Mind, is always there. Mountains may multiply in your dream, but the mind itself does not therefore increase or gain. Yet the mountains are none other than the Mind-Stuff itself.

When you regard objects and thoughts as Drsya, then you must know that there is something which sees or knows them. In this sense only do we think of the Drg. Hence Drsya is a necessity in order to point to the existence of the Drg. When we do not regard objects as drsyam we lose the knowledge that there is a Drik.

Europe cannot think of the Mind without some object, thought etc. contained in it; it cannot believe in consciousness apart from the contents of consciousness. Europe regards objects only as material, whereas Vedanta regards thought also as being objective as material things.

The ignorant have no idea of a subject and hence never seek for it.

One of Sankara's four qualifications is discrimination between real and unreal. It means separating subject from object. Drg Drsya Viveka analysis.

Being means a thing is. How do you know this table exists? How do you know that there is a thought in your mind? It is the witness that gives you the idea of being and you extend it to Drsya-objects. Apart from the Drik you never realize that there is such a thing as being.

Scientists think only of the drsyam world; the thought that such a thing as the drg also exists never strikes them.

Whatever object, idea or thought you have, give that up and you have Brahman. When you give up the 'I' you get Brahman. Detach yourself one by one.

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.

The Westerner's investigation into drsyam is infinite; it will always go on and yet never come to an end. For however many things may be known, there will always be more waiting to be known. They must be told, as some like Jeans are beginning to learn, that the true nature of all drsyams is only idea, no matter how many new drsyams they discover they will only discover more ideas. Realizing this, they will have to turn to the Drik.

When you deny Atman, you deny only a drsyam, a thought; Atman is the secret support of your denial.

The Drik alone is permanent, the drsyam goes. Those who cannot understand and analyze all experience into Drik and Drsyam will always have trouble.

All the drsyams may be imagined, but you cannot speak of them unless you have a drik which is unimagined. It is there always, hence it is impossible to be aware of any drsyam without it.

There can be no such thing as a drsyam unless you have a drik.

Nobody can see the limitations of the Witness i.e. himself. If he sees his limitations, then he is seeking those of the drsyam, not of himself.

Ideas are only objects, things seen, hence we try to transcend them. Even Brahman is only an idea to you. The mind and the meaning is the idea. We want the subject as well as the object.

Western psychologists commit the error of defining consciousness as a duality of Mind plus the object! Unless both are together there is no awareness of experience. They deny that consciousness can exist apart from objects. We reply that deep sleep is given as a valuable warning against such an erroneous position.

European philosophy does not go into the question "What is meant by mental?" or what is beyond mind? That is, because it is ignorant of Drg Drsyam Viveka.

Psychology in the West has nothing to do with the Drik, with that which is aware of all these things and ideas and processes and reactions which psychology discusses.

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.

You can never know what the mind really is; all you can study is what it does, its effects. The European philosophers do not know this, that if you want to study Drik, you must make it drsyam; and if it becomes a drsyam, it is no longer Drik, no longer the mind; if you want the drik as it really is, then it is absolutely impossible to study it. What the Westerners are really studying, even though it be 5000 different branches of psychology and philosophy, can all be summed up in one word - Drsyam. Then they say mind studies itself!

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

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

Once you really understand that all imaginations are drsyams, you may hope to understand Vedanta but without it you never will.

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

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.

Drik/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.

Before the act of thinking there must be the consciousness, the Witness as such by itself. Thought is impossible unless you are aware of it. Psychologists are trying an impossible problem in analyzing thinking and yet leaving out the seer of the thoughts. Only India has this secret; the West does not understand it.

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 Drik because it often disappears even during waking as in reverie when you are lost in thought.

It is the drsyam that is ever-changing we reply to Bergson, Vijnanavadins etc. but never the Drik. 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 Drik 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, Drik. We only rely on the Drik, and none has seen the birth or change of Drik.

Consciousness seems the antithesis of material objects and unable to touch them. Thus the subject is set up in opposition to the object.

Western psychologists cannot think of consciousness apart from the subject-object relation because they cannot separate Drik from Drsyam. To them mind must have a thought or object related to it.

Unless one goes to the root of the matter and seeks to catch the Drik, intellection will go on without end, giving you one thought after another, but only thoughts.

The Drik is always there, otherwise you would not know when a thing appears or goes; the Drik must be present to enable you to know these things.

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.

Imagination is what is meant by Drsya. Imagination is also chaitanya ultimately. When there is no duality, how can beginning and end occur. When you have Drik alone how can you think of imagination?

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.

There is an internal drsyam i.e. mental constructions, as well as an external objective one. All are ideas.

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 its but appears to change and be different from it.

Those who do not know the distinction between Drik and Drsya, will never understand Advaita.

All ideas are drsyam, objects, and never the Drik.

Drsyam also means not-self. The first not-self-idea to be got rid of is the ego, the second is the body, the third is the world.

The Witness-self reveals or illumines simultaneously the seeing ego, the act of seeing through eyes, and the external object; i.e. three different kinds of things. Seeing implies a seer, and we say that there is a Witness of both seer and seeing; whereas European psychology admits only the last two. The witness is like a lamp which lights up a theatre and reveals both a dancer and a stage. (See Panchadeshi P.467/468).

Anything in your mind may do (even thinking of Brahman), even then you know it is only a thought, being aware of it, and you i.e. the real 'I' or Drik is unaffected by it. This is the higher point of view. The Atman always is unrelated. The mind is the drsyam; I am the looker on. From the higher point of view, it makes no difference between a thought of Brahman, or Vishnu, or ink bottle. But from the lower point of view, thinking on Vishnu is a million times better than thinking of woman and gold.

We are concerned with that which is aware of or awareness, consciousness, Drik; any word would do and no word would be sufficient. If you become aware of awareness itself, the awareness becomes an object, a drsyam. The I goes and comes and it is the mind that is aware of

the going and coming. This 'I' is disappearing so often. The 'I' knows it disappears in Susupti. If you see the mind, it becomes drsyam. Universe includes all the drsyam, jagrat, swapna, sushupti, and it cannot go or cease to exist. c.f. dream. When the Prapancha is before you, it is Brahman, it is ignorance. Appearance or Maya is also Brahman. When you are imagining appearance or Maya as different from mind or Brahman, it is ignorance. The Mind is not different from 'you.' The 'I' and the 'you' is in the mind itself.

Experience consists of two parts or factors: (1) Drik, one which cannot be given by anybody else--Consciousness is consciousness per se. It is direct perception. (2) Drsyam, One which can be given by somebody else, an object; constantly changing. Things of which you are conscious.

If you want to speak of consciousness alone, Atman alone, you are to eliminate all the objects which change, which are going by themselves.

When the mind is not on the body for time being, you may not feel a pain. Awareness can therefore be separated from that which is the object of awareness. Drik is that which can never become the object of any thought. Drik is something regarding which you can never say anything because when you make a statement you make the Drik as an object of existence. No statement can be made without assuming or positing a Thinker. Even when you say the Drik cannot make a statement during deep sleep, does the word Drik have a meaning? Yes: then it is a thought, which means it is then an object. Western psychologists cannot accept Vedanta because they want to drag the subject down to an object.

Not one philosopher in Europe knows the proper meaning of the term objective. For although they apply it to things, ideas are no less objective. This is because they are ignorant of Drg Drsyā Viveka. Joad talks of 'objective realists', but these are known by the mind, are really ideas. Hence thoughts are no less real and objective than things.

We Vedantins say that whether the objects are there or not, consciousness will always be there, even in deep sleep; whereas Western psychologists say that if the object is not there to draw your attention, there is no consciousness. The latter, therefore insist on consciousness being a relation between one who is aware and an object of which he is aware. It is obvious that we differ in the meaning of the term consciousness. For Advaita means non-relation, and relation is the highest state in Western psychology as well as in Indian religious or pseudo-Vedanta.

Consciousness is only Witnessing.

Western psychologists have analysed much as far as subject-object relation i.e. mind plus object equals consciousness and then stopped. Let them analyze still further in the direction of noting that all objects are constantly changing, Maya, which implies that there is a constant standard of reference, something that notes the changes because it keeps unchanged itself. That something is Consciousness.

The idea of change presupposes existence of something unchanging, I told Bergson. How do you distinguish this change from changelessness? By what means do you know that change has occurred? There is, there must be a changeless knower of the ever-changing; whilst all changes the Atman remains unchanged.

Thoughts pass away every moment. Each object is an idea. Hence every object has no more value than that of a thought.

Bergson was right in saying there is continuous change but wrong in saying he could see no permanence anywhere. What about the seer of all this change, the Drik? That never changes.

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.

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.

It is only the Drsyam which is born and reborn, dies and changes. The Drik has never been reborn. Hence when you identify yourself with the Drik, when you realize "I am not the body" there is no more reincarnation for you.

That which sees the constant changing of the body, which can know this as a fact by observation and reflection is yourself, the Drik, the eternal witness. It is One and the same witness, present and common in all men, and sees the death of objects but not its own death.

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.

We get the idea of reality from the Atman, which is real, unchanging element of our experience. "Drg Drsyā Viveka" shows that. Atman, or seer, or Drg, or knower is permanent by nature, but can have no meaning apart from the changeful from which it is distinguished. We can never form an idea of it without the contact with the world of multiplicity. Latter is thus useful to help us to think, to form concept of unity, of the Paramatman, (not Jiva but the highest common self) which is the same everywhere.

Bergson's great mistake is not to see that if the subject were not unchanging then it would never know that world is ever-changing.

Drtsyam = object of perception i.e. an idea, a thought.

Science says that in every sensation there are two elements: subject and object, mind and matter. The former performs a creative act in bringing the object into awareness. The realists say that the interaction of both brings this about, that object is the cause of the idea of it; but when you ask them what the object is, they cannot explain it. This is where Vedanta can step in and declare that there is no proof of this causality, only inference and that non-causality is the only valid truth.

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.

Both body and the world are changing every moment. Food has been taken, it has become part of your new body. So your body is new. Who is the seer of these changes? That is our concern.

Theory of evolution deals only with world of known and seen: it does not deal with seer.

Drg Drsya Viveka gives an idea of what the mind does, is, what the thinking instrument is. But who is the thinking agent, what is knowledge and who a thinker is?

The characteristic of this world is constant change. The only thing which is not changing is the Drg, that which sees the changes. In this doctrine we rely on no authority but only on observation. We have no experience of anything which does not continue to change. Hence Bergson said the ultimate truth is change. He is correct regarding the world, but not regarding the seer of the world. We have never seen the seer change.

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

Drsyam = not merely objects you see outside but also objects seen inside the mind. Both are called "objects". They are all objects of cognition and cannot form properties of the cognizer. For instance, you see an object in the light, remove the object. Does that mean the lamp is not there? Similarly if objects are taken away, seer still remains. Just as you cannot get rid of the heat in a hot object, until it turns cold so the ability to "see" comes and goes like heat. Yet the object remains. Therefore we conclude that the Atman, which is never seen, but always seeing, is beginningless and qualityless.

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.

Scriptures also are ideas. Ideas pass away. Therefore they are of no value compared with Atman, that which sees an idea is always an internal object, something known, never the knower. Scriptures are objects and cannot tell us anything of the subject. Scriptures are words, which are meanings; which are ideas, which pass away. The value of thinking is for one idea to show the worthlessness of all ideas.

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.

Electricity, etc. are side shows of the primal unitary universal power.

Your statement in "Secret Path": Sankara taught that it is impossible for the ordinary man to stop his thoughts, but that it occurs in Nirvikalpa samadhi, which however is a rare state.

We do not say that ideas are real; therefore Vedanta does not end in idealism. If everything is Brahman, then can you say Brahman is an idea?

The Gnani takes things as they are in the external world and then analyses them into mind. This analysis needs science. Otherwise you fall into religion. The Yogi ignores the world and hence never solves its problem.

What is Drsyam? It comes and goes, i.e. there is no reality in it. It is no existing thing-- it is only the mind working. Everything is in the mind, not outside it. The whole world is in the mind. Only ego prevents you understanding this. If you think that the body is in the mind, you will grasp more easily.

We have only ideas of things, which we take to be real. Consciousness has the ideas of external things: they are there: but we ought not to take them as independent realities.

What appears to be real at one moment, may not seem the real the next day.

The West reduces matter to electrons. But what is the nature of electrons? Energy. But what is energy? Scientists admit they do not know. They confess that electrons, energy, are but words they are using, i.e. concepts, i.e. ideas.

This common idea is that the laws of the universe exist outside in the universe itself independently of the mind.

Every minute the world appears and disappears. Vedanta declares it; Science proves it.

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.

All ideas, whether internal as thoughts of fear, or external as seen objects, are unreal.

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.

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.

Not only is everything seen is an idea but also everything that is known, whether it is known to be outside or inside.

Scientists talk of force, energy, as the ultimate of matter. But what is energy? Take a paralyzed man. He possesses all the muscles, organs, body etc. which an active man has; nothing is missing. Yet he is unable to express energy. We can say only that all we truly know of this mysterious energy is only our idea in the mind: And even those who say world is real are unconsciously idealists because they too are merely having a thought of the world; nothing more! The rest is imagined.

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.

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.

Whenever there is misery, sorrow or suffering in this world, the gnani will not cry over what he knows will go as it came, but he will rejoice because its transient characteristic will remind him of that which is permanent, the Atman. He knows also that there is nothing lost. All disappears into the immortal Atman. He values the fleeting world because without the perception of its transiency he would not think of permanent. That is where the yogi is so foolish, for by refusing to look at the world he misses this perception.

When you inquire into the meaning of "permanent," "eternal" you discover that it is not possible to find anything permanent in our existence. The "born" can never be permanent.

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).

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.

If you lack the sharpness of mind (buddhi) are unable to understand that the whole world, that all religious rites, occult practices and yogic experiences, are ideas, coming and going, then you cannot study and grasp truth. And if you cannot distinguish between that which sees and that which is seen, then you must be satisfied with yoga or religion and leave philosophy alone. Unfortunately this is the case with majority of people.

It is impossible to get to the knower, the Drik, before it is understood that the world is an idea.

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).

The dualists at least will say these objects remain for years; whereas vijnanavadins wrongly say that Mind is momentary. Nihilists, however, are still more foolish in saying nothing exists; if so we ask how did you know? There must be a perceiver. Mind tells you! Therefore mind exists.

When Prof. G.E.Moore said to me: "Do you mean to tell me that this table at which I am sitting here is unreal?" No. I retorted, "We must first go into the question of what is meant by real, and by unreal."

The first thing to learn, after one has grasped that the world is an idea, is that one's physical body, is also an idea because it is part of the world. It seems so real to one because we know it through the senses, nevertheless it too is but an idea. That must be cogitated on constantly until it becomes a fixed attitude.

The dead have utterly gone: you may imagine that they are living somewhere, but there is and can be no proof.

The man who is constantly quoting scriptures knows only religion, not true Vedanta. He is only getting more thoughts i.e. drsyam.

The smothering of face or body with ashes by sadhus originated in the need of reminding them that the body would go, would vanish in death: hence the ashes were collected from a cremation ground.

Experiment and observations i.e. sciences deal with drsyam. The latter is always changing. You want to reach the unchanging, the Drik. Here Science cannot help you. You must then rise to philosophy.

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, for getting the knowledge of Atman.

Feeling implies Drsyam. (intuition, mysticism). Feelings come and go. Indian philosophy does not worry about feelings.

There was only one Veda at first, then came another, and later still others. This proves that scriptures are ever changing. Which are you to take as true? They are drsyam only.

By shutting your eyes in Yoga you cannot know the world is Maya, you can only say "I know it is Maya" i.e. believe it.

Even if you think of God you cannot get Truth. For what is the meaning of God? A meaning is an idea in your mind, i.e. it belongs to the Drsyam, the seen and cannot give you the Drik, the seer.

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 Drik is endless in the sense that we cannot truthfully speak of its appearing and disappearing.

You must know that the world, your thoughts, this body, is passing every moment. It is only an idea. But if you can't understand this, you should take to Yoga for you won't be able to understand Vedanta.

Only when you are unable to inquire into the nature of the body then you must get rid of attachments to externals by renunciation through yoga, through practice of Nirvikalpa samadhi. This means that even if when you philosophize, you cannot get rid of the feeling that the world to real, then it will help you to practice yoga-nidra, yoga sleep. But it is only a stage.

Do not believe the tales and gossip of yogis in the Himalayas living for thousands of years. Rama, Jesus, Buddha are all dead. Death is certain.

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 every thing exists as it does in truth, i.e. as Unity, the One.

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.

Death is only for the "seen" which is dying every minute. This is plain and yet look at the foolishness, or perversity of the human mind, which does not take the trouble to know it, but simply believe in Heaven, Siva and Parvathi and all future existences!

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.

The snake is only an idea: it disappears on inquiry. But the further question will arise; How are we to know whether the rope is also not an idea and will not also disappear?

The unreal is that which is known to the five senses but is not there: it appears to exist visibly but the next moment it may be gone. There is no such thing as anything existing even for one millionth of a second. Bergson has shown this. He has pointed out that change alone exists. Time does not stop for this minute period. Hence Bergson says change is the only real thing. This is his greatness. There is no visible thing that exists even for a moment. Kant has also revealed that all time, even the millionth of a second is merely an idea. That an object exists is only your idea, imagination. Unreality and change both mean the same. We think that things exist.

All talk of death can apply only to the Drsyam world. The Drik is always there. Hence you say, if the body goes, let it go. Why? Because you know that it is only an idea.

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.

Whether ideas come or not, whether drsyam appears or not, I am What I am! The bodies of men appeared during life but did not appear before birth or after death. Where were they then? Mere appearances, mere presentation to the senses is no proof of an object's permanence or a form's reality. The world appears but it is unreal and changes every moment. That which is non-existent is always non-existent even though we see it. cf. illusions and dreams.

ARTHUR MASSY: "VISION" (Magazine) "Life at its longest on this earth is alarmingly brief. If people were sane they would realize its brevity."

CHAPTER 14. THE ILLUSION OF EGO EXPERIENCE.

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.

Man is obliged to think because he wants to get rid of ignorance. The root of all ignorance is Ego. It is not possible to prescribe anything for the knowledge of Brahman. Any prescription can only help the destruction of ignorance. Causality is only a fib.

Unless you give up your attachment to the body and know that the body is in your mind (like everything else) and not vice versa, you cannot understand the Vedantic truth. Here comes the need of discipline. If you have the 'ego' there is no Vedanta. cf. Vivekachudamani; When there is Aham, there is no gnanam. cf. Gita: Prostration means get rid of your ego, the thought of I.

When men are not fit for separating the I from Atman, when they cannot see the unreality of the ego, and that everyone is I, they are unripe to study Vedanta; this is because they suffer from the mental disorder known as "identification", here identifying themselves with the ego to such an extent that no reasoning can dislodge them. The identifications found in lunatics are not basically different.

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

We do not say there is no God if by God it means the Drg, our own selves.

That which knows the negation of the whole world is itself not negated, the Drg.

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.

When you are thinking you are thinking of an object--whether internal such as feelings and thoughts or external, such as things and creatures. When you cease such thoughts, the mind as ordinarily known ceases and is then said to be Atman. Brahman when known becomes an object. Brahman when realized, then you become Brahman. This is the Indian distinction between knowing and realizing. Where does the mind go? We can only say it has merged back in Brahman.

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.

Those who believe they will really die can not understand the fundamental distinction between drg and drsyam. If they did, they would know they cannot die.

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.

Did you ever see your knower changing? The seen is ever-changing, but not the Drg. Birth, death, knower etc. are ideas characteristic of the Seen-world only. Where is the proof that the knower is subject to them? Should the pseudo-proof exist then the Drg becomes only an object of thought, and is thus no more the Drg. You never see the birth or death of the knower. Senility

and death you perceive only where there is an object. The Atman's senility or death is never seen: Hence we believe it immortal.

The second point to be learnt in Drg Drsyā Viveka is what becomes of the 'I', the ego? Is it the seer or the seen? If it is the seen, I have no interest in its fate.

If you understand Atman you must first understand Mind. Europeans mistake mind as being separate from Atman. This is only true in preliminary of inquiry. In philosophy we know and begin with only two things--mind and matter. When we reach the stage of unity of things, then the Mind becomes the Self. European distinction between mind and matter is incorrect. We go further and say ideas, notions, thoughts and feelings are objective as Matter, and we separate the knower or the seer from them. Drg Drsyā. The point is that all these are ultimately Atman.

We have never seen the birth of the Drg, the seer or Atman as we see the birth of all ideas, so it is not possible to say that it is mortal, it is birthless and deathless so far as we know.

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 Drsyā, the seen. The duality of Drg and Drsyā 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 drsyā 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 Drsyā. 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?

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.

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.

The Western illusion that there is a separate soul or mind in each person ignores that I am only the seer of the ideas; take only the knowing aspect, and how does anyone differ therein from another person? You may see separate bodies but that does not prove that they contain separate seers.

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 mind Atman, the Mind.

Intelligence=knowing something=awareness=that which becomes aware of things. It always combines with what it sees. When it sees ego, it mixes itself up with it, and says, I. This is the cause of confusion, ignorance. Separate the knowing capacity from the ego which is mixed with it, and you will be free from grief and transiency.

Everyone can know that he is the Drik, if he will think. Mysticism is not necessary.

The Aham 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.

You can see form only in the drsyam, never the Drik. Hence we say the Atman is formless.

Everything reduces itself finally to consciousness. Consciousness is the one thing certainly known to you which enables all else to be known. What is the I? We go further to ask. I is an idea which you perceive in consciousness, known to it, therefore the consciousness is higher than the ego i.e. Gnan is higher than Aham. Descartes stopped at the I, Vedanta goes further and shows the I to be only an idea, a part of consciousness. West does not want to separate the I, the ego, from consciousness whereas Vedanta does. It says the ego must exist somewhere during deep sleep. That is only inference not proof. Your I is yourself, plus your consciousness.

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.

Proof that no separate self exists in each person is that you cannot measure the height and width of each self, cannot determine therefore where it begins or ends. For they do not truly exist, hence cannot be located. Individuality is therefore only an inference. Of course you can take a tape and measure the body but it is impossible to measure each man's mind.

That which knows there are changes must itself be changeless. At no time can it be shown that the knower has ever changed.

You may say that the doer and enjoyer is the ego, but the ego itself comes and disappears as in deep sleep. Only the Drg remains.

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 Drik, 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.

You may be attached to ego and say constantly, "I am Iyer" but where does the Iyer have to go eventually? He vanishes into sleep.

No philosopher in Europe or America has reached the understanding the Drg, seer, is the Witness or looker-on. Even Descartes, father of modern philosophy, based it all on the I, on the Self as the I. Vedanta on the contrary is based on That which sees the I.

That which perceives, is aware of, the ego must be its antithesis, i.e. impersonal. When you mention or talk of ego, you have an idea, a drsyam, whereas the Witness is not the ego because Witness is not in the realm of seen.

The drik is the substance of the mind which objectifies as particular ideas, as the mind substance in dream objectifies as persons and world.

The 'I' that sees Paul Brunton is the real 'I'.

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.

No European philosopher has discovered that the Ego is an illusion; hence their systems have not risen above it. The key to Vedanta is ego and non-ego.

The Western philosophers have hardly gone beyond Descartes. "I see, I think" etc. which means they cannot go beyond the ego. This is their great handicap. For they do not know that this very I they make so much of, is itself a seen, a thought, an imagination. Hence their inability to find Truth. Here Vedanta alone can help them to progress.

West has not distinguished between ego and Atman. Their "selfish" is of ego. Hence English word Self must be used carefully.

I am never separate from what I see. It arises and disappears in me. There can be no seer without a seen.

The existence of the individual is denied by Buddha as by Vedanta.

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

Descartes was wrong. Russell was right in criticism of his "I think therefore I am" is fallacious, because you start by assuming the I. The I itself is merely a thought. There is no individual self in the thoughts. Even Sankara does not agree with Descartes. Huxley too pointed out the fallacy of Descartes. Thought is the same as the mind itself in substance or essence because it appears and disappears with mind in sleep etc.

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.

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.

The ego itself is an object of which the Sakshin is the subject.

When you analyze you find the I is only a bundle of your feelings thoughts and sensations which you include together. But this I itself is only a thought, something about which you are thinking. It is a drsyam. A child thinks only of the I as its body; later as memory develops it thinks of the I as the mental picture of the body. As an adult it thinks, in addition, of the I as all its past personal autobiographical experience, its knowledge, aspirations etc. But That which is aware of all this is the Atman. Gita, 2.18 points this out; that the permanent is always there, only the transient I comes and goes. Really there is no such thing as I for the thinker. Western psychologists are beginning to suspect that the ego is apart from consciousness, but what the latter is they do not know.

The West has yet to explore into the meaning of the word "I". But this is so difficult because I is the dearest thing on the earth and hardest to give up.

To whom are all these mental states known? To I. But this ego also comes and goes. Hume saw this point.

We start with ego, as being the knower, as does the West, then we ask what is the object, and this leads to discovery that ego itself is an object.

The West does not know the meaning of the word "self." Therefore it is better not to speak of self-realization, but of truth-realization. The Hindus often understood "Self-realization" wrongly too, because they take it on a yogic not philosophic sense.

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

There is really no 'I'. It dies nightly in sleep. But the notion of its unreality will gradually enter the head of the scientists. Individuality is illusory.

Dualists like Ramanuja have written big volumes about the soul. Yet they are quite ignorant of the fact that the I about which they write itself comes and goes and has no permanent existence, is only an idea after all.

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.

Feelings, passions, mental pictures, thoughts, ideas comprise the internal world, with which the external world is called Anatman.

There must be a perceiver which knows that all these are illusions. All ideas rest on a substratum--mind. Imaginations are in oneself. Even when you say you do not exist you are thinking, and the mind is revealing itself.

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.

If the knower also had been changing along with the changes, how could he ever have known of the changes? It is only that which is known which is changing, otherwise it could not have been known. Those who say the self is also changing are uttering words without meaning. How could I know whether anything is changing unless there were something which itself did not change and could thus note the changes?

We know of no changes in the Atman; we know only the changes in what is perceived by the Atman. When you realize the nature of Atman you know the Real can never change, hence never die. Death is only in the region of the "seen."

That of which you are aware and which is nearer to you is the drik. Yet no statement can be made about it. All words will concern ideas about it, i.e. drsyams--never the Drik.

Without the individual self you could never think. Through such thinking you are able to prove the existence of Atman, for the individual is finally identical with the Atman.

If the unchanging had also been changing, then the fact of change would never be perceptible to us. The drik never alters and is thus the true witness.

Why is the drik immortal? Reply: where do you see change? It is always in drsyam. You never see it in drik because you never see drik. Hence we cannot ascribe mortality to drik as we can to drsyam. We can only remain silent about it.

Everything of which you are aware is an idea. As the ego is something of which one is aware under certain conditions, it too is an idea.

Whatever you say about Brahman, it is only an idea, i.e. a drsyam. Reason when applied to drsyam you can grasp it; but it can never grasp the drg. Reason can tell you the drg is there, but it cannot grasp it. This is the limit of reason. But the drg is always there; it cannot be known, or understood because knowing implies a second thing. But in all acts of knowledge, the drg is there when you are thinking, you are therefore seeking Brahman. Hence Brahman is known only in idealessness. It is impossible to be free from Brahman, for it is impossible for any thought to arise without it. This is the distinctive feature of Indian philosophy. You must analyze yourself and see that whenever there is it drsyam, there must be That (the drik) which is aware of it. When you see this, you know the Atman. Hence Drg-Drsyam analysis is so fundamental and so difficult.

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

When you inquire deeply enough the jiva disappears you find there are no separate individuals at all, there is no variety of beings, all are really the undivided Atman.

What is meant by birth, appearance or arising? It can only be applied to drsyam. That to which such words cannot be applied is the Drik. 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 Drik, therefore all things are really unborn, uncreated.

Look within, think deeply, and you find that the Drik, the knower is really myself, and that what I regard as my mortal jiva is ultimately the unborn drik.

That which blocks the way of acceptance of Vedantic truth even on the part of great thinkers like Jeans is the ego. If Jeans will only give up the ego I can make him see the truth in five minutes, but the reason why ego prevents such understanding is that it causes a person to be strongly attached in the belief that consciousness is the support of the individual.

Which is the true ego? Your egos are always changing. As a boy you had different ideas to what you have now. The I then was not the same as the I now. Psychologists glibly use the word personality but they do not see it is a term to be used with the greatest difficulty, because which of all the changing personalities of a man can be ascertained to be his real one? The truth is that a number of other things or thoughts have combined with the Atman, the Drik, and must be separated from it.

Dualists say I shall go to Heaven or I shall attain Brahman: we ask, What is that I? It is an imagination. Buddha was partly right in teaching that it was an illusion.

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

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

There is no such thing as I or you, the ego is only a projection or concoction of the mind. Therefore the understanding of the ego and its nonexistence is of vital importance.

There, in this sphere of discussion and book study, we have Drik and Drsyam; when you use the word "drik" in talking you imply a duality. When however you do not talk about it is seen for what it really is--non-dual.

If a book has no reference to the ego, it cannot understand philosophy. For until that is understood there will be no attempt at self-elimination to get at Truth.

Many Vedantic logical books are vitiated in value because they do not inquire into the aham.

In the imagination is the ego, which appears and disappears every night in sleep. The 'I' is always changing as any other part of the world.

If you have one idea--say I or ego, you cannot have Brahman, one idea leads to several. The treasure of Brahman is coiled by the black-serpent "I"--with its three strings of three gunas. Give up immediately the 'I' identification.

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 any where. No idea is permanent, not even the God idea.

Thinking is impossible if there is no Sakshin, no Witness. This consciousness is exactly the same as Turiya; the names only are different. Those who advocate Sunya, nihilism are talking impossible nonsense, because if there were no seer to say so we would be blocks of wood, incapable of thought.

The ego is the thing we are attached to most, our attachment to the body is less.

How does the dualist know that the consciousness in me is different from the mind in him? You cannot measure consciousness, cannot say that it is confined to this or that body, or that it starts here and stops there. Therefore dualists who say our souls are different talk unprovable nonsense, mere words.

Why I criticize the dualistic schools who teach the reality of the individual soul, is because they cling to this I, because they lack the humility to give up the ego, because they don't understand that the Aham is not a permanent thing: everyday the I dies in sleep.

Ramanuja could not distinguish between 'I' and 'Drik.' The 'I' was the Drik. His highest was the Jiva. You are so much attached to the 'I' that you do not want to think that 'I' does not exist. Again you are unable to detach the 'I' from the Real Drik.

If everything else is false, your statement that you are Brahman is itself false, the objectionist says. But when you say Advaita is false, there must be the awareness, consciousness, behind the very statement. You will also go, die. Rely upon that which is permanent. Drik alone is permanent. Anything that you say is a drsyam, but there is the Drik there before any statement could be made.

Again as a step leading to Drik, the arguments, the drsyam avails. But if you know the Drik, nothing else remains to be known. Even Vedas are unreal for the Advaitin, being Drsyam; but they are helpful discipline in getting at the Drik. Thought is Drsyam and thinker is the Kutashta and Brahman. Atman sees all experiences--the three states. Everyone thinks that he is the 'jiva'; this is ignorance, he enjoys and suffers consequently. Kutashta means the unchanging Drik.

How could there be a seer different from the ego, body? People couldn't understand. Europe too says that there is nothing higher than 'I', ego. To convince them by argument is a difficult thing. The individuals, or jivas may be likened to reflections in different mirrors. Similarly you may imagine different reflected jivas but the jiva appears to think because of the thinker, the illuminer, the Sun, the Drik (c.f. Dream discussions, only one mind). Really that which works out these differences are kalpanas; which are non-different from mind itself with its so many 'I's and egos. Mind takes the form it imagines as is experienced in dream.

Brahmic Consciousness and Chidabhasic Consciousness. Drik is a notion and Drsyam is a notion. "I know the pot" means that there is something that sees or knows "I know the pot." It implies there is a higher seer of I.

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.

There is no such thing as internal and external with reference to the Witness. We cannot say where it is not, we cannot even say that it is not in Drsyam. We begin by separating Drik from Drsyam in our studies, it is true, but this is tentative, for afterwards, we take them both together in the end because everything is Brahman.

Consciousness is bliss in the sense that it is aware of all. What is it that prevents me from knowing things as such? It is the superimposition of non-existence and non-luminousness on Consciousness or Awareness. It is because you are imagining, thinking. 'I' is only a thought, an idea, which you don't know. The 'I' and the object ever come together.

We can never know mind by itself; we can know only the states of mind. Western psychology has yet to discover this. Similarly it is impossible to define mind. For the deeper you go you come ultimately to the witness and you can say nothing about its nature. For if you describe or know it, it becomes an object and is no longer the true Witness! West can only learn this from Vedanta. It will eventually have to come to this knowledge. Use any word you like for mind, the moment you define it you are defining only an idea. The secret is to know that there is a Drik. Drik is the Atman. Atman cannot be defined: all you can say of it is "Neti, Neti!" When William James became skeptical of the existence of consciousness, we ask how do you know there is no consciousness? For it cannot be known ever; Drg is the knower, never the known. How at any time can you get rid of consciousness? The moment you are thinking of it, it is there: Every thing exists for us only through consciousness.

Western psychologists regard consciousness as something which appears and disappears, as relational to something. Vedantic position is the exact opposite, for we regard it as that which does not vanish, that which sees all this. Therefore we do not regard it as self-consciousness (in European sense)-- that is entirely different. Hence the term Atman, when meant for pure consciousness is not self on the personal limited European sense.

Those who cannot understand Drg Drsyā Viveka cannot rise to philosophy. They should practice yoga until they can succeed in separating mind from its thoughts; then alone may they come to philosophy; until then, like European psychologists, they combine Drik with Drsyam and all the combinations as "consciousness." We separate them and call Drik only as "Consciousness."

It is not settled by psychologists what the mind is. Professors of psychology often do not define what it is because they find it so difficult. It is impossible to know what the mind is, because the more you think about it you get only thoughts: you can't ordinarily detach yourself from them, the drsyam, and be the Witness (Drik). They can go on thinking about mind for a century but all that will come will be more thoughts. First they must analyze the Seer, probe into the I as such before they can hope to separate it from thoughts, but this they will not do. They will not go so far as to inquire and thus discover that there is a knower apart from the known thoughts.

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.

Think of your body at the age of 5. What is that to you now? Think of it again at the age of 20. What has happened to it now? Think finally of your body at age of 40. Where is it now? You will see that you had so many different bodies. None can be identified as particularly and permanently yours.

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.

Europe does not want truth because it is afraid when the ego must disappear.

SOLIPSISM makes the ego the center of everything by reducing everything and everyone to mere ideas. Berkeley finds himself in danger of falling into this ego-centric predicament. So he avoids it by saying that God creates other minds, persons who really exist in a different way from material objects, which are merely perceived. How do you know that there are other minds? Berkeley does not answer that. Even these others are only ideas. He took other minds as really existing. His argument there can help the Ramanujists only as they believe in reality of individuals, but not the truth-seeker. Realists who refute Solipsists say that if other individual minds are concoctions of my imagination, why should they oppose my will, why do they compel me to yield to them by argument or conflict?

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.

Critics of Ego-centric Solipsism say also that even if all things are merely my ideas, they may still be existent in relation to other things or minds. In short, because you do not see a separate wall, you ought not to say that it does not exist for others. They urge that because years ago bullock carts were the only means of locomotion, other means were not possible. Our reply is your ego is itself idea. This objection is similar to the great and powerful argument of religionists that because you have not seen God, that does not prove He does not exist; Similarly if you have not seen Brahman how can you know that Sri Aurobindo has not seen it? (The agnostic cannot be attached, for he confesses, "I do not know"). Reply: Through Avastatraya you discover that the ultimate entity is non-dual, a unity: there is no room for a second thing God. Without going to the bitter end of philosophy, religious riddles cannot be solved.

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 Drik, the Atman, itself. No other explanation is rational. But this explanation is only a preli-

minary stop and is dropped ultimately (with the dropping of the Drik, Drsya relation) when non-causality is studied and the question itself falls to the ground.

Planck, Jeans and Eddington have been driven to see Mind is only reality: Russell is very near it. Other scientists who do not accept this are hindered by attachment to the ego.

Apart from things 'thought' by the ego many other things, and events exist--such as train incidents(accidents?)--which arise independently. Hence world does not depend on your finite ego alone.

European idealism says "I am real, but the world is an idea." Vedanta says, "No. You are an idea as well as the world."

Even those other people (even millions) who are still seeing the object as real are themselves only creatures of the mind. Hence we have to take this ego as having been created by the mind.

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.

If my mind is sleeping I do not know that there is a wall confronting me; therefore my mind must first tell me this. If you reply that other people who are awake see the wall, I reply that these people are themselves only ideas, that here again it is my mind which must tell me of their existence. I know all physical objects through my mind. I admit that my eye sees them; that is not denied.

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.

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.

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.

The mind which creates the world we see is not the Aham, nor the individual mind, nor the ego. If it imagines a horse nobody else sees this horse. No, it is the Universal unindividualized mind which creates (imagines) the world. Drg Drsya Viveka tries to show this truth. Berkeley was right in seeing that man did not produce his own ideas of the world, and so he thought God created them and put them before man's mind.

Don't think anything is outside; everything is an idea--know that 'I' is an idea.

All religions are based on the illusion of the reality of the I. What does a man want such a religion for? To get something for his aham, whether it be to get ecstasy now or heaven after death.

The yogi seeks to realize the Atman in himself, the advaitin seeks to realize it everywhere and in everyone. Thus you see the selfishness of the yogi.

All descriptions of after-death experience belong to religion, a low level of understanding.

Logic depends on drsyam, but all drsyam disappear. Verification depends upon Drik. I is universal; without this awareness, nothing is possible. Logic is always related to objects and Brahman is no object.

Heaven and Hell are all nonsense.

Let us examine the question of heaven practically. Have you ever seen it? No. You have read various descriptions, i.e. you have imagined it.

Suppose you are sent to heaven and told "You will be permanently here." But how are you to know it will be permanent? No proof and no certainty is possible.

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.

The Yogi and the religious man are extremely selfish people. They pray to God for their wants or for their peace of mind. What is at the root of these requests? The Ego. But I may be happy, I may be saved, but what about the millions who are suffering? He does not identify himself with their sufferings, their ignorance.

The ordinary yogi follows Patanjali-yoga, wants to sit in a place and think "I am shutting my eyes, I am sitting in a room, I am meditating." This egoistic yoga has nothing to do with Brahman, as Mandukya points out (p.229-30) The yogi mystic is always thinking in terms of me and I for he thinks of what he is to get from his practice; whereas in Vedanta we first examine and get rid of this I by inquiry for we want truth, not something for the self. "I want to gain samadhi" says the Yogi. The Vedantin wants to gain nothing for he knows, "I am the whole universe."

Suppose you do see a spirit. What is it but a creation of your own mind? What is the soul but a conception of the mind?

Yoga and religion are selfish because they are only for the sake of the ego. "I get Ananda" says the mystic. "What reward shall I get from God?" says the pious man.

Yoga dearly loves the ego and does not kill it. The Gnani alone can conquer the ego which he does by penetrating to the understanding of its illusory nature.

All ecstasy, exalted feeling, is something known. What is the known? It is an internal object. It is still an object.

The serpent of ego must be killed. It is the 'I'.

It is the 'I' that will get powers, 'I' will get fame etc. Nor is it correct to say, I will get Truth. Because the truth is already there, it is only necessary for "the finite ego to give up and then you see truth. If you have the 'I', disinterested thinking is impossible and without disinterested thinking no philosophy is possible. What is the use of philosophy for feeding empty stomachs? Critics object. This means they do not want disinterested thought.

The body is an idea in the mind. The finite ego is an idea in the mind. Its ecstasies and peace are ideas with only fugitive value. See page 297 (middle para) of Mandukya re: Fear of annihilation by those who are unprepared, who are told ego is an idea.

When you speak of your being guided by intuition it is nothing but Aham, the ego. I have seen God by intuition: I am being intuitively guided by God. In all this, there is sheer egoism.

Religion is based on the personal self, on getting personal satisfaction, i.e. on the ego. Hence its falsity.

If you say Matter and Mind can be separated, then take away the mind and show us each one separately. If you say soul exists apart from the body, then do the same. You can show different bodies, but not different souls.

All religions are based on the Aham, the I. They promise heaven, God, bliss etc. to you the ego. But the ego does not exist really, or it will surely go, so these promises are absurd. Similarly yoga's promise of Ananda is for the ego, too.

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.

CHAPTER 16. THE ULTIMATE AS TRUTH.

Vedantic Sadhana (discipline) can only remove your own ignorance; it does not bring a new thing, for Brahman is here and now.

Imagine an earthen pot with a number of holes bored in it. Then put a lamp inside. The light will shine through the holes. Then block up the holes. This is equivalent to the death of one sage. The one Self (one light) will continue to shine through all the holes.

If you tell people to get rid of ignorance for its own sake, they are not impressed; but if you tell them to get rid of the constant cycle of births and deaths with their recurring miseries, you can achieve the same end.

We tell people that Brahman is like anandam, only in order to add a little sugar coating, for then it will attract them.

He who talks of "I have to reach truth" is still in the world of ignorance and duality.

The mind does not go, but it is kept quiescent, not agitated. This Asparsa Yoga is the highest and is referred to in Mandukya, pages 238-241, 246, 247, and 229. 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.

The test of truth is to be able to see the whole world in you, not excluding even an ant from your sympathies.

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.

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.

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 jnani 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 jnani 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.

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 Drik, 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.

Negation of all thought, i.e. "Neti, Neti," not this, not this. Every word you utter is an idea, an object, it will go.

The way of negating "It is not this, not that" is also a way of defining, of conveying the meaning of Reality as much as any positive definition. When you distinguish one thought from another in your mind, you create a mental form in order to get a meaning. You have to see that the same mental form is reproduced in the mind of the other person to whom you are trying to convey this thought. So Sankara says when I use the word reality, go on negating; in this sense only do we use it in Vedanta.

The Vedantic method of finding truth is to eliminate everything by saying "this is not Brahman, that is not Brahman, this is also not Brahman. See page 217 Mandukya note 2.

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 Upanisad 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.

That only which is permanent, unchanging in the changing world is reality.

Every one hears of Brahman. People can only imagine it.

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.

Intellectually knowing the truth is only an imagination, whereas realizing the truth is knowing it as such.

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.

The yogi who wants to go to Himalayas or an ashram for Brahman has not risen above thinking of his body, and will not get Brahman. For he wants to take his body from one place to another in the belief this will bring Brahman.

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.

Knowledge means to know something and this implies duality. Inquiry begins in duality. Thus we make use of duality and ask "What is this?" Thus we eventually arrive at truth by help of illusion.

All knowledge is imagination. Take one thorn to remove another and then throw both away. Use mind to remove mind illusions and dispense with both.

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.

If you see another thing, a second, how can you possibly know the whole of that thing? It is impossible to become wholly one with it. Therefore it is impossible ever to know any God other than your own self.

When you think, where is the thought? It is in your mind, i.e. it is in you. Now whenever you talk of God what do you refer it to? Only an idea. Hence any idea of God which you form, is entirely in you and has no reality apart from you. Hence every religionist is unable to give proof of his God and is merely telling lies.

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.

The yogi cannot know the self; all he knows is the mind calmed, and that is an idea, not self. Even if he feels the bliss of ecstasy it is something which comes and must go, and hence is idea, not self. It is something known, not the knower,--subject. Only the Gnani can know self. Yogis and all others can only know external world and internal mind or idea.

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.

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.

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 Gnan does imply an object. Brahman knows the ego as an object. The knowing powers, the Drik, 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.

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.

The meaning of consciousness has not been found. So how can you know that divine consciousness is infinite? When you are conscious you see a thing, a second thing. The latter is a finite idea; where is the infinity of it?

Atman is thus beyond the known and the unknown. Nothing can come near this Atman.

The sage knows that the drsyam is only Brahman, after all, but this is the final position.

Bondage is something which you have imagined. Hence if you wish to force yourself from it, you need only free yourself from your imagination.

The English word "awareness" always implies duality. Hence we cannot use it for the highest consciousness.

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.

It is impossible to see any differences or distinctions in the drik.

Suppose you live in the sun. Try your best you cannot get darkness. Such is the nature of Brahman. It is always Gnanam, knowing, whether in death or life, sleep or waking. But to understand this knowledge is hard because the world-objects worry you. So get rid of this worry which prevents your insight, you must analyze the mind, for the ego must go. If you cannot do that, then practice yoga.

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.

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.

The Drik can be realized wherever you are, whereas if you go to Himalayas etc. in search of Brahman you find only Drsyam. It is within rather than without.

He who knows the Drik 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.

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.

That which is changing is Avidya, Maya, unreal. That which does not change is real.

The arguments advanced against Vedanta show the critics have not understood it, but merely imagined what they think we teach. They try to refute their own imaginations, not facts. They attribute various qualities to Brahman which he does not possess.

The grandest truth is "In the Universe there is no room for two."

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 to 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.

The self as size of thumb, or of grain, or of seed in the heart, is given in Upanishads only for beginners: later they are told it is infinite and unimaginable. It is useful to give such size in heart to practicing yogis, but it has no philosophical truth.

Katha Upanishad Chap.4 V.12: actually says "Atman is meditated upon as the size of thumb in heart" i.e. for yogis who cannot concentrate without concrete picture, such an idea is useful. Ancient Indian primitive thought first said Atman was in the heart, later with Patanjali in the lotus in the head. If in the head it showed ignorance of relation between mind and brain; for can you localize mind? Is it not immeasurable? Then how can you place it (much less Atman) in head or heart as Maharishi does? All these statements must not be believed but tested by scientific knowledge.

The world exists in Me; it is made of Me; it is Me therefore. Only ignorance makes it seem separate, something different.

Man creates God in his own image. He imagines God possessing all sorts of qualities which he (man) himself would like to possess.

The performance of religious rites implies that the worshipper believes that God (Brahman) is other than himself. Hence he can never get the truth directly from religion; he can only get his own imagination back again.

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.

Every Yogi has to come out of Nirvikalpa Samadhi and immediately duality confronts him again. His peace goes, for it depended on the non-duality of samadhi-sleep. Hence no yogi attains true peace, but imagines it.

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.

If you understand non-duality then it is impossible to have any doubt. And doubt is the essence of error, mistake and delusion. Those who are not established in non-duality have to guess, or imagine, i.e. doubt.

Everything is Brahman says the yogi, but cannot prove it. The gnani says the same thing; even this table is Brahman, but he can prove it.

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.

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.

In gnan only the erroneous knowledge disappears.

All distinctions are due to ideas.

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.

Emancipation can occur without yoga. What can be done by yoga can be done by Gnana. Yoga alone leads to samadhi, but gnana also liberates you.

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.

Those mystics who talk of experiencing the supreme reality, do not know that the word experience implies something else, a second to be experienced, i.e. duality, i.e. non-reality, and those who talk of "direct knowledge" of reality again do not perceive that knowledge implies a second thing to be known; i.e. duality exists. i.e. no reality here! In Vedanta, however, to know the supreme reality means to know the complete negating of all that is not this reality. Hence you do not make an object of it.

The notion of attaining Nirvikalpa Samadhi, complete blankness, non-seeing the world, is for children. It is rubbish. The world must be seen but known for what it is, mental.

Contradictions are inherent in ordinary knowledge because it is dualistic and causal-based. The possibilities of argument on both sides of a question are endless. You may say one thing and your opponent will say another. Each will have some ground for his statement.

The teacher of true advaita proves that the position taken by all others is inconsistent, because he cannot say "This is Brahman" in positive terms.

That alone is called Truth which is a fact that can never never be changed under any circumstances.

Yogis do not know they are working under a complex that nothingness, nirvikalpa, is Brahman; they do not know this complex is a kind of insanity.

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?

There are three things in reference to truth; its meaning, its nature and its test.

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.

Gnana yoga of the true kind is Asparsa Yoga, that where there is no second thing. It is mentioned in Mandukya page 229 verse 39. There is only One thing, the beginning and the end of all.

What are these words of the man who claims to be an Advaitin? Ideas! What are ideas? Imaginations. Finished. They are not truth. The very fact that there are hundreds of doctrines in the world shows that they are all imaginations. All doctrines which need words for their exposition of truth are ideas and imaginations.

If you say that you have knowledge of Atman, it is only an idea; ideas come and go; thus your claim is refuted.

Some yogis teach that Brahman is in the top chakra of the skull; that therefore we have to ascend there. This is childish.

Nirvikalpa Samadhi helps one to renounce attachments, it is a corrective medicine to remove this disease; hence it is for seekers only who are still on the disciplinary level. For peace of mind does not necessarily indicate truth; I can get it by taking opium or hemp.

How do you know that God is everywhere? It is impossible unless you yourself are everywhere. People thoughtlessly tell lies, or cheat themselves or deceive others with such statements.

Panchadeshi: "The Atma remains as the sole factor--and not the absence of the cognition of the world" is another confirmation.

If you are convinced of truth of non-duality how can you talk of practicing anything or attaining anything in order to reach truth?

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.

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.

Man is not the creation of God; God is the creation of Man.

No Hindu Sastric text says that Nirvikalpa Samadhi can get you gnan. It comes only after samadhi, using the latter as a preparation. Hence Patanjali's claim for realization thro' 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.

Yoga cannot enable you to see the unity of the self, the Brahman, but it prepares the way.

Those texts in Upanishads which assert that the soul returns to Brahman in samadhi are another form, a different standpoint. When you see all the three states, that is one standpoint, but when you are in waking state and take your stand on that, the view is lower and different. If opponent says world is real from waking state, then a different argument is given him from one who can understand Mandukya and see it as idea. Mandukya alone gives the ultimate truth basis. The other Upanishads treat from a lower standpoint to help beginners.

How can a man in samadhi know that this wall is Brahman? Yoga therefore cannot give you this knowledge. In Nirvikalpa Samadhi he knows nothing, sees no wall; so if there be nothing whatever, how can yogi know that the world which is something is Brahman? The wall is not seen in samadhi. Why are Atman and Brahman used? To show that the whole universe is one and the same Brahman. If you cannot understand Brahman you can understand Atman. It is easier. So you look within yourself in yoga and find Atman. Then you inquire into Brahman, the universal Brahman is the Atman in the end. Yoga enables you to know what Atma is. Nirvikalpa Samadhi gives you that. But to know Brahman is totally different as the statement that all these objects are Brahman must be proved.

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.

Yoga must be evaluated, its true value is a discipline of the mind. Gita says after Dhyana yoga, i.e. cave-sitting while stilling the mind and steadying the mind, you should pass into Vijnana yoga i.e. inquiry into world. Hence there are different meanings of Yoga which fits a man for inquiry.

If there is no second in Samadhi, then how can he see Brahman, which is another. After Dhyana yoga, there must come Gnana yoga.

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.

The completion of the course of Yoga, whether Raja or Dhyana leads as Patanjali rightly says in sloka 1 to stopping of all ideation. When this is attained, only one thing can then occur--the yogi will enter a condition like sleep. "Like," because he will have done it by set effort and voluntarily, whereas ordinary man falls into sleep involuntarily and when Patanjali lists sleep as one of the five hindrances, he means that while a practitioner is still struggling and has not yet attained his goal of concentration, naturally to fall asleep prematurely is a sign of failure.

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.

You can't shut your eye to the world as in samadhi of yoga and see supreme reality. You can know it only by keeping the mind clear and open. The yogi must add discrimination to his quest, says Shankara.

Philosophy--the analysis of knowledge--says that Nirvikalpa samadhi and deep sleep are the same from the point of view of nonduality the absence of the known. The knower was there. How does samadhi give gnana? Only by preparing the mind to see that the world disappears and re-appears, and, that non-duality is here and duality there, to convince the man that in non-duality you won't disappear as you don't disappear in samadhi or sleep. Another advantage of samadhi is you get the capacity to forget the external world and to treat it as an idea.

Yoga can never give you the fundamental thing, that the world is an idea. Only Vedanta can give it. Nirvikalpa Samadhi is unquestionably the same as deep sleep, and all ideas are refunded back there too. For you must learn what ideas are, when all the ideas of the world-existence go back into your mind through Yoga. Then you learn this. How are you to learn that all this world is Brahman if you stop at Nirvikalpa samadhi? Without perceiving the world, and having a duality before you, it is impossible.

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.

The man emerging from deep sleep does not regard you as himself but as a second person. Hence he feels duality. Similarly with the yogi. The man who does not see duality, can have no gnana. He sees, says all this, is made of Mind, then he says it is Atman. Hence duality leads to unity, but the yogi who enters sleep has none to start with.

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 page 640,641 and verse 132,133 of Tattireya Upanishad and Panchadeshi regarding this.

How can you worship the Absolute? That implies two--the worshipper and the worshipped, whereas the Absolute is nondual. You can worship your idea of the Absolute only or realize your unity with it, when you can't worship it as apart.

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.

What do you do with the mystic who says, "I see Brahman?" He may see, feel it and believe it, (Or I have got self-realization?) He need not be a liar, nevertheless what he says is an error.

The Upanishads say in effect that if you believe that you are one and God is another you cannot understand Truth.

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.

The mystic who wants to be one with the infinite is living in an imaginary world, for we do not see the infinite.

We are not opposed to God, we are not atheists, but we want God free from our or others' 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.

Only the insane have seen a God separate from their own Self. Others have seen their imaginations as God. For Reality is the Witness-self and it cannot see itself.

Even when you think of God, the thinker, the Drik must be there. So what is God without the seer--only a non-entity! God, Brahma is but an idea--doomed to disappear. But my own Self remains.

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.

Swami Yogananda, of Los Angeles visited me. He kept on saying "I am Brahman. All this is Brahman," I smiled but kept silent. I ought to have asked him, "How can you prove that you are Brahman?" He would have replied, "I know, practice my method of yoga and you too shall

know. To that I would have said, "How can you prove that your method is the correct one?" Such mystics will not reason.

If you give God a meaning he becomes an Idea. Ideas come and go: hence your God is not eternal and unchanging.

Every word which you can use about God denotes a human attribute. It is better to keep quiet than caricature God anthropomorphically.

"Non-duality" means "the absence of two."

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.

Brahman can be realized as it is. Otherwise all this teaching would not have been given in Mandukya.

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.

It is an exercise I have given the swamis to say repeatedly at each meal, as they take food, to pronounce it to be Brahman!

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.

All dualists, having the idea of difference, even the least notion of the I, can never get realization.

Those who say we can become like Brahman, or one with Brahman, or approach Brahman, or walk with Brahman, or come near Brahman or realize Brahman--all these are dualistic errors.

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.

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."

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."

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.

I differentiate between a philosophical system and a philosophical truth. The former can evolve or change; the latter is ultimate and final.

Everyone uses the term "The One" or "The Unity," but do they know what they mean? "The One" is only an idea.

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.

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.

When I say "I do not know" what are the implications of these words? They imply that your mind has thought that there is something that exists to be known. This something we are seeking when we say it has to be realized.

When you say Drik as witness is related to Drsyam, it is a knowledge you have, and that which sees both is the real Drik, the true Atman, wherein no relation is possible.

We call non-duality the highest truth because it is impossible to contradict it. So long as there are two, one seeing another, man seeing something other than himself, there is duality and not finality.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Ultimate truth can be known only as the Drik, the subject. It cannot be known as such for then it becomes an object.

The value of intellectual reasonings and arguments is only where they are to put down all other arguments and abuse the intellect

ETHICS CHAPTER 17.

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.

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.

First a man takes unselfish interest in his wife, then his family, then his neighbors, then his city, then his nation, and finally when he becomes a Gnani in whole world. The sage is completely cosmopolitan in outlook and desire to benefit others.

Marriage should be arranged on Brahminical principles of heredity for the sake of bringing forth the best children. Animal instinct draws you to marry any woman merely because she is of the opposite sex. But when you use reason you will control the sex instinct, look in the pedigree of the woman, take time to examine her character and capacities, and then only marry her, if these are satisfactory. Thus an intellectual man should marry a woman who is not merely pretty, but also possessed of some intellectual capacity. Then he may be assured of the same high capacity as well as satisfying his own intellect and not his body-instinct alone.

Indian philosophy has the fullest reference to practical life; it seeks to make all men happy.

It is true that ideals exist in every country and class, but they are all imagined, varying with different people. There is such a conflict of ideas that they are mutually contradictory. Philosophy alone can get true ideas because it seeks to interpret life as a whole.

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.

Most of the philosophical divisions of values are based on obtaining individual satisfactions only. This is because they have no correct idea of the meaning of the ego. They do not know that the I is only an idea.

The whole of ethics is based on the ego and its denial.

Sin is private crime; crime is public sin. Sin may be merely mental whereas crime is active.

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.

Nature has given man more intelligence than the animals and we ought to take a wider view of things, than they do.

The theory of morals and ethics is full of men's opinions as to what is right or wrong, there is no absolute principle. Philosophy shows the relativity of these opinions, whereas religion upholds one particular set as right and all other wrong. The theory of (broken off)

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.

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.

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.

Vedanta teaches you to help others, not because their pains must necessarily be felt inside your own mind too, but because you are your neighbour--Tat Twam Asi, just as the tiger seen in dream is still your own mind.

Truth can indicate that which is for the good of all living creatures, and not merely for human beings alone.

When you engage in worldly affairs, do so thinking that you are the whole world, one with all existence; don't identify yourself alone with wife, children etc.

Even if you think of sex, think of the Paramatman as all powerful, think of Him and act; not that you should commit rape and adultery.

I am interested a thousand times more in spreading the ethics of looking upon others as oneself and helping them accordingly, than spreading Indian philosophy as such. The latter is merely a means for the former. Consequently I do not care if you give it some other name and India is not mentioned.

Love and compassion for all mankind is the result of finding truth.

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. All the rest are lies. The Gnani sees every object and person as of the same essence as himself, the Atman.

Had the teaching that the whole world is only Brahman and Atman and that by harming others you harm yourself been sent abroad, the best doctrine would have gone from India instead of mysticism and yoga.

Vedanta affects every aspect of life and is to be applied practically throughout the realm of ethics.

The more a man understands this teaching the more he will work for the common good.

When you examine a man you should weigh the good things in his character along with the bad; if you shut your eyes to his defects, you cannot arrive at the truth about him.

When we are faced by the sufferings of others, there are various answers given. The pseudo-Vedantin mutters "Maya" and laments "Karma". None of them does anything to remove the sorrows except the true Vedantin. Look at the effect on the world, if you want to test the value of a doctrine. Vedanta advocates activity in services, the others indifference.

Keeping the mind always on Brahman is not unbalanced and therefore insanity, when it is also accompanied by the awareness that you should behave quite normally and attend to all normal duties, which is done in Gnana yoga, but not by ordinary yogis.

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. P.332, v.82). 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.

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.

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.

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. which is the unity behind life.

The Gnani who can change the outlook of rulers can thus change history.

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.

Contrary to the ascetics I advocate marriage and the sharing of life with a partner.

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.

Institutionalism as a guide to right and wrong in the matter of morality, duty, good etc. right and wrong is fallacious. It amounts to this: "I feel, therefore I do." But this man feels one way and that man feels another way: therefore we assert you must bring in your reason to decide. In ancient India the priests offered human sacrifice, firmly believing God demanded them; their intuition told them so. Wherever religion has been a guide men have erred: you must make the final appeal to Reason.

Ego is at the bottom of and makes effective emotional appeals. Why am I interested in my own Brahmin community, in my own family, or in the independence of India? Only through ego. If you negate ego, you get altruism, you think of the wide group of humanity rather than your petty group. This growth of altruism is gradual like a spreading ripple. It slowly moves in wider and wider circles. When you are in the company of those who have strong group tendency, give them anti-ego injection after finding out how much and what sort they can take in! Thus you may encourage them to serve their municipality, if that is the highest they can see.

Europe needs two more steps in ethics: (1) to know that all humanity is one; (2) to know that all beings and creatures--even the dog and tiger are Brahman and therefore to identify yourself with them also. This is to apply Vedanta practically to see yourself in others.

West does not know what the ego really is.

Ego does not exist. West has a false idea about it, that is why egotism is an evil. They have not seen that looking upon the whole as One is the only solution for their egotistic troubles. It is not internationalism, but universalism which must come, the looking upon mankind as one body. Until that stage is reached, evil will not go from this world. If we only think of the good of ALL the creatures then the evils will disappear.

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.

We need a cosmopolitan and not a compartmental or local ethics.

There is a distinction between worth and value. What is value? I value medicine most when I am in ill-health. I value most sweets when I am in good health, which when sick they are repugnant to me. They have not decided in the West what is worth and what is value. Dear to the heart of the Pragmatist is what is useful to me has value! How does nature form a uniform standard?

The best way to check over-population is to raise the intelligence and self-discipline of men, i.e. to lift them up into philosophy. The West however has tried artificial birth control and although this has checked population, a new evil has arisen,--the wider spread of venereal disease through abuse of birth control.

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.

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.

Vedanta takes in all aspects and deals with the whole and cannot ignore crime even. It will inquire into the reasons why criminals arise, why crimes are committed. It says here is prosperity, there is poverty, here is pleasure, there is misery, and it inquires into the meaning of all these.

For the practical world every man must live and therefore the professional writing of philosophical books is quite correct; but in the world of truth most of these books are such rubbish, such mere spates of meaningless words, that their existence is unjustified. It is false philosophy to refrain from earning money: on the contrary, we should earn as much as we can and then help those who are less fortunate. Work and earn freely, and then use part of your money to assist poor, helpless and ill people.

People set up their moral standards according to their capacity, their intelligence; thus they are relative.

Suppose I am born in a cannibalistic society, should I be punished for eating human beings according to our tribal society? Circumstances determine the morality of a man's actions to a certain extent, therefore. Nevertheless there is also freedom of choice to some extent.

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.

The greatest man is he who does something for the good of all. The great man is he who does it for many. The good man is he who does it for the few. Do service to remove sorrows of the world. For that purpose we are born.

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. Western people do not understand this distinction.

(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.

Had the teaching that the whole world is only Brahman and Atman and that by harming others you harm yourself been sent abroad, the best doctrine would have gone from India instead of mysticism and yoga.

The goal of knowledge is harmony throughout the universe. This means not my harmony, not your harmony, but the harmony of all.

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.

We must test the value of theories of life, whether religious, philosophic etc. by the practical results seen in life itself.

Apply this test to find if you know True Brahman. The test is whether you feel for all, whether a dog's suffering is also yours.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Right action is really a matter of right understanding.

The Gnani is not uneasy when things do not come his way: neither is he so eager to pursue them or to be elated at their arrival. He keeps his freedom by regarding both experiences as Brahman.

The division of people into men of action and men of thought is artificial. In nature you find that nobody gives himself only to thinking or to activity. Even the philosopher does not sit still like a stone but has to eat etc. The truth is some men think more while others act more.

Every man who reaches the highest point in (philosophy?) must become a practical man. The dreamers and do-nothings are to be found only among those on lower levels, who are still striving to scale the heights of philosophy.

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."

When we say Vedanta seeks the welfare of all, that also includes myself. I also should be happy as much as other people.

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.

Vedanta teaches the truth of the whole life, therefore it is not incongruous with practical existence. It teaches also the highest self-reliance.

Vedanta aims at the welfare of all beings, not only human beings.

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, Page 247) 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.

The object of philosophy is to make all humanity happy, and the juggling of words which passes as philosophy is speculation or rubbish.

Yogis who flee to Himalayas are selfish; Vedantins wish to see all other beings made happy and hence do not run away from them.

Every worldly happiness is something experienced; is a seen (Drisyam). 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.

Freud's teaching that the instincts of war and hatred arise out of the babe suckling mother's breast and resenting sharing it with the father whom it thus begins to hate, is superficial and absurd.

The Hindu Gnani who finds himself in a foreign country, may resignedly eat the infidel's food, knowing he is not the body.

Body, actions and speech alone of another being are hated, never the One-self.

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."

(?)right and wrong depends entirely upon the standpoint you take. The Muslim who murders a Hindu and says Allah wished him to do so, has in his own eyes, a perfectly defensible standpoint. Philosophy however accepts none of these ethical principles, opinions but also questions about them and weighs their values and human behavior.

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.

We study Vedanta philosophy for practical not academic purposes. University students study philosophy in order to pass examinations or get degrees.

The highest good, according to Vedanta, is not the well-being of a particular group but of the whole, the welfare of all. One man is working for Brahmins, another for the Muslims, another for the lowest classes: all these seek to serve a group at the expense of the others, none view the totality of all groups as the wider goal of their service.

We do not say the world is worse or better than before. It is as it is. There are improvements in living but also deteriorations. Man's gnan, knowledge, thinking, is advancing and in that way we are getting better. Our knowledge has increased. When we shall get perfect knowledge we shall consider the world as perfect.

People who have sufficient money are usually much more optimistic in life and outlook than those who have not enough. Indian pessimism is partly due to Indian poverty: American optimism is partly due to American wealth. Philosophy teaches neither pessimism nor optimism, but tells you to take both wealth and poverty as they come. Sorrow or joy depends partly on your emotional attitude towards the world, partly on your circumstances. Vedanta is pessimistic or optimistic according to the way in which you view it. It has both aspects and people emphasize either as they are enjoying good fortune or misfortune. Vedanta is really the synthesis of both these views and level-headedly sees life as it is.

Suttee--widow-burning--was regarded as a high virtue in old days in India; now it is recognized as an evil. Thus ideas of right and wrong change from time to time.

Whatever you have to attain for your own ends, there is no harm in it, it is right, provided it is consistent with the common good. But if you simply act on impulse and do not use your rational judgment, then you are on a level with animals.

Vedanta rates as the highest morality that which is for the welfare of all beings.

The highest good of all humanity we set up as the first goal because the I does not exist, but of course, it is only a stage toward the still higher goal of the benefit of all giving creatures.

Philosophy means the evaluation of everything in life. Nothing can be outside philosophy--even roguery.

KARMA CHAPTER 17.

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.

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.

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.

Certain things in life are absolutely predetermined. Do your best as a black Indian to look like a white European, but you cannot change the color of your skin. Thus to a certain extent our life in unalterably pre-determined.

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.

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.

Those who assert, like James and Bergson, only the freedom of man, see only one side, emphasize only one fact out of two; what they say is true only as far as it goes. But a true philosopher will look for the equilibrium of facts by examining both sides. He will then see that determinism is just as true as freewill and that there is scope for both facts, for both are visible in Nature.

The doctrine of Karma coordinates the two facts of freewill and determinism both of which are present in the world. Man is the product of many biological circumstances; Nature determines his constitution, physique and bodily heredity. These things compel to a greater or less degree the man to act or live in certain ways. Therefore in 19th century best thinkers said everything is predetermined, by the law of Causality. Therefore his moral choice even is determined to a certain extent and is free also to a certain extent.

When you see grains of sand in the Ganges which you know have come from Himalayas, then you are entitled to infer that 10,000 years ago the same process occurred. This is analogical reasoning and often employed in dealing with the past.

It is highly important to reintroduce and emphasize Reincarnation to Western thought and as Karma is inseparable from it, the two must be dealt with together.

You create your sufferings and your chains, your world and that is Karma.

Philosophy tells us that the world is imagined, your body is idea. Therefore you create the world. This creation is Karma.

So use a higher definition of Karma than mere ethical retribution. The above definition offers you a bridge to philosophy from religion. Hence your chapter on Karma is of vital importance.

Where you cannot see the causes of an event, you may infer Karma to account for it. Where however you know the causes, as the carelessness of a signalman causing an accident, then it can not be ascribed to Karma. In this accident the cause of it is obvious viz. the carelessness of the signalman, and this carelessness is not Karma. The death of each individual killed, may however be rightly inferred as his karma; we must not let every thief, for instance, say "I could not help stealing, it is my karma." It is not Karma but choice.

In the course of time the religious faith in Karma will go with the going of religion. Therefore it will have to be proved, as it can be by science.

It can be proved by present life. Each day you reap what you sowed the day before, do you not?

The last thoughts and subconscious tendencies of the dying will help to determine the nature of next body.

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. This the West does not know. Absolute freewill, for ordinary individuals is an illusion.

Whatever you do here you will usually see the fruit of your labors. Sometimes however you fail to realize that fruit immediately and then you must wait until another incarnation, but it will

come. Both experience and science prove this. The impact of science upon religion is to show how rational is Karma doctrine. "Science does teach that every action carries with it a consequence." writes Sir Richard Gregory in his new book Religion and Science, "not in another but in this--to be felt either by ourselves or others in our own time or the generations to come. Those who have similar Karma are born together.

Karma is just as much applicable to mental as to physical acts, to thoughts as to deeds.

Karma theory says that according to the tendency of your nature, you will be born in a family of similar tendencies. Impulsive, passionate people will be attracted towards impulsive passionate parents.

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.

Karma analogy is a form of scientific proof. To refuse help to others is (1) to prove that you have never understood Karma (2) is to mutilate the doctrine. This is what yogis, who have dull intellects do and say. You should teach that the sight of another man suffering is an opportunity provided by your own good karma to purify your selfishness by helping him.

Hindu religion is far in advance of all others because its doctrine of Karma has shifted the burden of mankind's sufferings on to his own shoulders, whereas other religions such as Christianity talk of God being all-Merciful despite the pain and sorrow everywhere.

The doctrine of karma must come to the forefront very soon in Western thought, as men become more intelligent, because they will see it explains human life without the need of bringing God in. The Western thinkers will have no escape: karma will surely be recognized, as much as they have to recognize that the effect of putting your finger into a fire is to burn it. Everything depends upon yourselves, not upon prayers to God: this is what Europe is coming to. Vedanta regards prayer as useful only to purify the mind.

The Karmic law is more effective deterrent than religion against evil for it says "whether God exists or not you will suffer for your evil deeds."

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.

When the West sees as it is now being forced to, by the present troubles, that God does not answer its prayers, it will naturally be much more ready to accept Karma. They are now coming to see it will not do to rely on God, but that self-reliance must be practiced. Moreover the Karma theory harmonizes with its own theory of evolution.

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.

The chapter on "Pessimism" in Patrick's book is one long unconscious argument for the karma doctrine.

The karma theory is based on human experience, not ultimate truth. If you cook food, you find it eatable. If you lay under a motor car, you get crushed. This cause and effect theory is based on what we see around us. Karma is the most scientific way of explaining the good and evil fortune in human life.

The historical meaning of Karma. You suffer for the past. You can build up the future. Certainly there is hope. Karma never completely kills initiative.

The pressing need of the world is the light of doctrine of Karma, a doctrine which even science cannot refute, a doctrine which brings tremendous ethical implications in its train.

So long as we believe in cause and effect, the doctrines of Karma and rebirth are of inestimable value and high importance.

You can often see the effects of Karma work out even in the same life, without waiting for future lives.

Karma analogy is a recognized form of scientific proof. So you can prove Karma by analogy.

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 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.

I have seen the great Indian famine of 1876. The people say to themselves: It is Karma and they endure it. But Western people would be greatly discontented and become revolutionary and pull down Government. That is because the West has not the karma doctrine.

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.

The notion that God created evil in order to discipline man is untenable. The Hindu doctrine of Karma which makes man responsible for his own suffering is much more reasonable.

The West has urgent need of learning doctrine of Karma. Therefore you may well mention it in final chapter. But the doctrine must be based on science, not on religion. It must not give any room for thinking that God is sending the karma as punishment or reward, or that he is sending people to this world to fulfil their karma. It must leave God out. Next, Karma is the logical fruit of the doctrine of Idealism. When man has learnt that the world is a thought, it is rational to accept that he is building his environment by his thoughts, i.e. making his future karma. Just as an architect thinks a house first or Hitler thinks out his strategic moves, in both cases the materialization follows later, so man's thought is sooner or later materialized accordingly. Hence the need of learning right thinking to get a right world. Teach Karma.

It is not only the body which we have inherited but also the mind. This means that mind must have existed before. Thus India gives a wider and deeper meaning to heredity. For it is impossible to prove that mind came into existence with the body.

We see reincarnation even in the present life. The body you had as a child has gone: you, as an adult have a different body: i.e. you have a new incarnation!

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.

Science must admit that your body must have had some kind of existence before birth. Similarly your mind must have had some form of existence. What that kind of existence was, it cannot prove but we Hindus say it was a former birth.

If evolution and heredity were the sole explanation then all the sons of an intelligent father should be intelligent also. But experience proves this false. Hence we look elsewhere for pre-existence and find the most satisfactory explanation in rebirth and karma. There must be a revival of belief in this ancient doctrine of re-embodiment and its corollary, the law of compensation.

The ego begins by imagining some objects. Then there arises a memory of those objects in its mind. This memory becomes a vasana and tends to reappear. But originally the objects were concocted by the ego in the mind. This is the basis of the karma doctrine and of the transmigration doctrine, and this explains why they are facts.

POLITICS: CHAPTER 17.

Nature is equalizing the selfishness of the rich by depriving them of money. Thus Russia did not repay England's L.1,000,000,000 investments. Thus Karma forcibly readjusts wealth and poverty everywhere.

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.

The collapse of national morale and deterioration of character means absence of identifying yourself with others: egoism is predominant to the point of ruining the common interest.

Selfishness is the cause of the fear of a declining birthrate. What if a nation does die out? Others will come up and get on. We must always use our reason in such matters. We must always think.

Education is to some purpose. We should acquire philosophically what we are going to do with the human beings who come for education.

The world is going to dogs because there is no wisdom in those that guide it, those that govern, rule and lead it. This is the world's misfortune. The Head of a State should be enlightened.

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.

Education should include the fundamental principle of brotherhood in its curriculum and the schools should have students of different religions sitting side by side. Religious Education can be given elsewhere or at home. Otherwise the sectarian difference will be perpetuated and sectarian strife will never come to an end.

Based on a knowledge of truth, which (Philosophy)Vedanta alone can give we perceive everywhere that world is tending to oneness not only culturally but economically, and must do so.

England should grant India Dominion Status, but is quite right in demanding safeguards.

Political and economic progress should be gradual, not sudden, evolutionary, not revolutionary. Then it corresponds to Vedantic principle of leading men slowly upward through what is best in religion, to what is best in mysticism and then finally into the Ultimate Truth.

The hatred and persecution of Jews who are innocent and have done nothing wrong, will inevitably recoil one day and cause suffering to those who have hated and persecuted them.

Governments are successful when you get at the top the men with best brains, with the first rate intelligence; but when you get third and fourth rate minds, then they go down in failure.

Communism is an attempt to equalize, to bring unity of external possessions among the masses; and thus is approaching the Vedantic ideal of unity of well-being. But we do not approve of its methods of hate and bloodshed. We prefer educative persuasion. But when a people's sufferings become unbearable then revolution may karmically come.

America's refusal to support the League of Nations, her refusal to mingle with European politics and to help Europe achieve the same Federal form of government, is due to one thing alone--her separative ego, selfishness.

In judging the respective claims of ancient customs and modern innovations we should not be prejudiced either way, but use reason and consider what is most sensible to do now.

If the political leaders of the West know a little Vedanta, they would not seek European welfare alone, but that of Oriental nations also because everything is Brahman. Upanishads say Brahman is strength. This does not mean bodily strength but that power which derives from union of peoples, that strength that lies in units; a house divided against itself falls. Mankind is such a house.

When I was a young man and read about communism, I was enchanted by it. Now that I have read about its working results in Russia, I am disenchanted. But it took 50 years for me to test the value of communism. Social theories are tested by practical results. The right test is the test of life because philosophy deals with the whole of life.

Hitler has still egoism, because he identified himself with the German people only. The ego gradually expands to family and nation and whole of mankind, but there are different degrees of

this expansion. Thus Hitler is still in the I of his country, even if he has personal egoism. Still this national egoism of his renders him indifferent to the sufferings of non-Germans.

The war in Europe should be settled by both sides coming together and using level-headed thinking to discuss their disputes and solve them reasonably. Instead, both sides are carried away by passion, the Germans, of course, much more than the English, and so the war goes on and people suffer.

The Government should have nipped the Khaksars' aggressiveness in the bud. They should have said "Practice your religion by all means in your house or mosque but if you attempt to interfere with others outside, then we shall crush you. And we will not permit you dutting with spaces." Instead the Government permitted this Nazi-minded movement to grow with result it must now send police and fight them with clashes, resulting in deaths.

Why are the Europeans fighting and quarrelling. Because there is difference of opinion. Germany says one thing and France the opposite. Italy says "we need more land from you" and France says "No, we shall not give you any land." Thus there is conflict and contradiction because there is no truth as the governing principle of either country, but merely opinion. If European nations knew truth they could not contradict each other because it is the unity that holds. They could not quarrel with one another nor fight.

Nazism is the idea of unity on a lower stage. It seeks the common welfare of the state. But it cannot last. It is directed for worldly welfare. But it is wrong because we should be interested in each others' mutual welfare, Jews, as well as Germans. It seeks artificial unity.

Vedanta wants to trace out the interwoven and united character of all life. Hitler's mining of the British seas has raised the cost of British Medicines threefold to the poor peasant in Mysore. Thus all the world is interrelated and interconnected. We cannot really separate ourselves from others. Science has now perceived this.

Vedanta's fundamental principle is that because there is no such thing as the 'I', you cannot live for yourself, whether 'you' are an individual, a family, a community, a nation or a race. It is not truth and therefore such separatism will go, even though it will take a long time. Strife, conflicts war, clash, theft and bolshevism are all the efforts at readjustment by those who have been kept "out of the fold" by someone or some nation.

It is only religion that dreams of changing the world, or of converting others. This futile impossible notion is rejected by philosophy for it knows that mankind stands at varying levels of capacity to understand or of ethical age. They can only be helped from above, not miraculously converted. They will grow up in course of time.

The leaders of a nation should be men of judgment reason and character. It does not matter that the masses cannot rise to this standard so long as their leaders possess it, for the foolish masses follow by nature or at least can be helped by wise leaders where helpless themselves.

America was led away by her prosperity to imagine she had achieved happiness. Then the financial slump came and disillusioned her. She did not see that she had been carried away by the prosperity of the few into forgetting the misery of the many. There are more suicides in U.S.A. than elsewhere.

British Empire's tendency is to Vedantic Ideal of unity, but wrongly brought about by force. It must come by education and evolution of rulers if it is to last.

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.

When Russia turned Communist I wrote an article predicting that the Government's forcible expropriation and confiscation of agricultural produce would lead to failure of its agricultural policy. Now time has proved this. The peasants have little incentive to work.

The intense nationalisms which have appeared are also stages in this development or growth. Even aggressive invasion is an effort to reach a unity but it is done in a perverse way wrongly through groping in dark on account of not knowing Vedantic truth.

Communism will spread. It tends to external oneness. Artificial divisions of society and wealth must go. Socialism is distorted: It is the Vedantic ideal of unity tyrannically applied. But such forced outer unity cannot endure and is no true solution.

East and West must balance, and both understand that they are one. Until then there will be war and fighting.

The horrors which menace present day Europe abound out of the selfishness of parties, not of entire nations. In every nation, there will be some party which will be extremely selfish, but all in the nation will not be so.

The West has got to learn to look upon other peoples as they look upon their own and to find out what will be the common good for both West and East. Otherwise their power in Asia is infallibly doomed.

The French Revolution broke into the selfish complacency of the Feudalistic Ages with its motto of "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity." This ideas was correct; but was misunderstood and the excesses which the French went to in attempting to apply this ideal are regrettable.

The West must evolve a common ethical doctrine. The highest is to treat humanity, white or brown, rich or poor, Aryan or non-Aryan, as one great human family. We are only children of God. The British Empire must devise and maintain a consistent ethical view which must be practiced not only in England but also in India. It should try to lift up those who are lower down in the scale of civilization and culture.

The problem of giving a worthwhile life to the poor cannot be solved so easily as the socialists and other reformers think.

Unless the nations care for and study Truth, and thus discover their essential unity, they will always be troubled and wars will go on.

If those at the head of affairs could only get a glimpse of truth, how much good they could do for humanity?

People do not recognize that hundreds of years have passed and that changes have occurred in the circumstances and mind of nations. We must be flexible and alter our systems accordingly. This applies to politics as much as to religion.

The oneness of humanity being the truth, is the unconscious driving factor which is causing men to pull down all kinds of barriers everywhere.

What right have I to take another man's food unless I render some service, some work in exchange? This thought must pierce the hearts of the rich.

ETHICS

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.

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.

KARMA If a man persistently eats sheep, he will have to be reborn as a sheep, if he eats goats he will be reborn as a goat. So teach the ancient Hindu Sastras and so I believe. The proof of its possibility lies in my dreams. When sheep and goats appear therein, what are they but rebirths of my own mind, i.e. my own self?

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.

One universal language, preferably English is needed to help to unify mankind.

Advice to European Countries; Get hold of your wisest men and listen to them. Think of the future, realize how war will weaken you all and cause untold misery. He that hath, must give to those who have not. The wealthier British and French Empires should surrender something to the poorer Germans and Italians. In each country some men should be educated in the principle of Vedanta, viz. there is only one family, and they must go about and teach the people. The same lessons can be taught in the Universities. There must be self-sacrifice on the part of the wealthier classes. Socialism will spread. Its removal to extremes is justified but our Indian remedy is for each man to work to acquire as much wealth as possible and then give it away to help others. The British nation as the most prosperous should practice this helping of poorer nations.

How can we revert back to a life of 1000 years ago? Yet Gandhi-ites want us to go back to medieval ways of living. The psychology of it, is that they are opposed to change, they want to stick to what is old, not knowing that the old custom was once the new innovation. If we follow their advice, we ought to throw away our fountain pens, because these were not used in middle ages. Nevertheless these advocates use pens, which is the best refutation of their argument.

Sudden changes in social life are not successful and are not desirable.

Sudden changes, as introducing communism abruptly or granting independence to India, lead only to ruin and misery and unnecessary suffering. Idealists who advocate these revolutions are carried away by their emotions. They are usually highly emotional people.

The conflict between England and Hitler and Russia will run its course according to the amount of intelligence and reason used by them. The leaders who use Buddhi most, will win. Some leaders do use reason but only to the extent of their selfish interest and therefore not fully. Thus Hitler's mind was bent only on victory when he invaded Poland. Did his heart feel for the sorrows of the thousands of Polish families whose men he killed or wounded? No.

Until you improve the character of the people, no amount of political reforms will avail.

If the Polish people had intelligence they would have said to Hitler. "We yield on Danzig etc." For they are a small people and Germany is a giant: there is no reason in fighting unbeatable odds. Surrender would have been the path of wisdom. Now thousands of Poles, have been killed and the country ruined.

In dealing with movements like Nazism, Khaksars, etc. which advocate brute force and tyrannous totalitarianism there is some good sense in the old proverb "Nip a thing in the bud." This is my advice to the Government.

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.

The war conditions in Europe today will repeat themselves eternally even after a period of subsequent peace, unless and until Europeans rise to the Vedantic ideal of unity. This is the only

radical cure. And since it is impossible to expect the masses to grasp Vedanta, our only alternative is to teach it to the rulers and leaders. By influencing them to accept Vedantic unity, we may establish lasting peace, not otherwise.

The correct time for the British to relinquish their hold on India is when Hindus and Muslims can cooperate harmoniously. As they cannot do so now, it would be suicidal for India if British are sent away, for the latter would be followed by civil war. Emotional idealists want full freedom, but thoughtful reasoning men know that India is not ready for it. Liberty must come by degrees, then it is Vedantic, peaceful and successful.

Vedanta helps the poor by permitting them the hopes and comforts of religion; and reminding the rich that death is approaching, that they ought to share their wealth with the poor. Vedanta does not approve of the method of forcible revolution, but when however people are starving then a forcible rebellion may be justified, as in the French Revolution. Selfish interest is the root of the trouble.

In the struggle for existence it is the nation with brains which will succeed, the others will go to the wall and disappear. Whoever exercises reason and intellect conquers the less intelligent and more superstitious races. Prayers, religion and yoga are signs of this primitive unreason.

INDIAN SOCIOLOGY

Had MEHER BABA really been happy in realization of Brahman, he would not have troubled to publish replies to the attacks on him; he would not have needed to engage in the controversy because there was nothing to be gained or lost by one who is content with Brahman, which contains all in itself.

MARARISHI'S teaching that no service to humanity should be undertaken because it is subtle egoism and vanity and that one should wait until one becomes a gnani first, is wrong. For it is through such service that the ego is expanded to include others until finally it embraces all mankind.

India merely imitates her own dead past, clings to old lifeless forms.

There is no sacredness per se in our socio-religious laws: A few Brahmins joined together and formulated them: hence they are man-made. We should not hesitate to break them if necessary.

We Hindus who sin against the Panchamas (outcastes) are no better than Hitler who has declared that it is "a sin against God to regard all men as equal because the Negroes are an inferior race."

From standpoint of Vedanta the use of a single language like English throughout India tends to assist the ideal of unification within India and interconnectedness of India with foreign countries where English is either spoken or to some extent understood. It will help break down barriers of misunderstanding between East and West when they speak the some language. Finally from the economic standpoint business and trade is helped to thrive by the spread of English in India.

If the present political representation in India had not been made on a communal religious basis, we should have been much nearer to Hindu-Muslim unity. It is folly to elect people to govern us merely because of their religious belief; it will perpetuate the differences between Indians.

The coming of the English was a blessing to India. They gave scientific culture to us. Before them under the Mohammedans, Urdu was the official language. What useful culture, what enlightening books were written in Urdu? Few! The knowledge of English ought to be made the first compulsory language in all schools, with the vernaculars second or subordinate.

If the English in India has said all people are alike to us; we shall treat them as we treat our own people; making no distinctions between you, we shall make all in India equally happy; then they would have avoided many evils which have arisen.

India has been enslaved for centuries because there was no work for the welfare of others, for the poor and the masses. Religion, caste, yoga and philosophy were misused for selfishness; and people were kept in superstitious ignorance.

Indian merely imitates her own dead past, clings to old lifeless forms.

There is no sacredness per se in our socio-religious laws.

India had the conception of the highest kind of ideal--the unity of mankind--when it was absent from all other countries. Even if India has failed to practice it, still I give her credit for having originated the conception.

When Bose says he will retire to spend his life in peace at Ramanasram and let India go to dogs, he means "I am thinking only of the ego, the Aham: I do not identify myself with the rest of the world." Hence he is an egoist and as such will remain far from truth, whereas the right attitude is to serve others and thus diminish the ego.

Let foreigners live with us, but let them not treat us like slaves. They should treat them all like human beings. English is best for India as it will help foreign contacts also.

I cannot support Dr. Moonje's plan for an all-Hindu army in India: why not include Muslims and Christians and work for Indian unity?

Gandhi does not understand Ahimsa. It is indeed intended to prove that the witness, the drik, is the one thing common to all men; hence the one self, hence the man who harms you, really harms himself because he is one with the other man. This is the true Ahimsa which he ought to teach, but instead he teaches weakness. This oneness of mankind is not known in Europe, hence race hatreds.

TILAK advocated the Gita gospel of action. I wrote to him saying that action is alright only if it is in the right direction.

The only cure for India's misery is right education, that which will teach the pupils how to live well as well as how to earn a livelihood. The turning out of graduates to swell unemployed is useless. Village children must be taught first the elementary principles of hygiene, cleanliness, decent home keeping etc. Town children should be trained to a useful vocation. These should be parts of general education.

India is wiser because she has suffered. Europe must suffer more before she will listen to philosophy of truth.

England will naturally renounce her subjugation of the colonies when she reaches this Vedantic ideal, but it would be foolish and dangerous if she suddenly ran away from India. She ought to first help and teach the Indians to defend themselves and until then, her karmic duty is to protect India. Moreover, the fanatic militant selfishness of the Muslims, renders England's presence necessary in India until the Hindus have become powerful enough militarily to defend themselves.

Although I advocate constitutional gradualism as path for India's journey to freedom, still the Congress should keep up agitating as thus they move the selfish interest of Great Britain to make necessary advances, which would otherwise not be made voluntarily.

I want Englishmen to settle down and live permanently in India. They should share our life and thus promote unity. It would help us in many ways, including industrial and technical development and it would help them spiritually. They would learn our philosophy.

I say to the Muslims, you are citizens of India. We Hindus are citizens of India too. Do not claim more than your proper share of rights. Let us not emphasize the difference of religion, but live like brethren, for we have to occupy the same land.

If the Government of India when it becomes a Dominion is going to be shared out among Hindus and Muslims, it will ruin the country by leading to internal strife and division. The religious basis of classifying political power will never bring peace to India; it would never occur if arguments are made from a philosophical viewpoint. The fundamental principle of this viewpoint is that all humanity is one, and therefore all should be treated alike, not as divided up into sects or castes.

THE INDIAN POLITICAL PROBLEM.

There will be bloodshed if British leave India. We need them owing to Muslim-Hindu trouble.

The selfishness of the British led them to keep India a disarmed nation. Now we are defenseless and helpless against invaders. If we are conquered, the loss of India will be the bad karma created by England through this selfishness.

The Labor Party's ideal is more Vedantic than Chamberlain's because yesterday they told him "Why should you concern yourself with democracy for the Poles and Czechs, (i.e. for Europe) alone; why do you ignore other subject peoples like Indians?"

The Indian Political problem can be solved only by the Indians becoming a unity, and then demanding their liberty--not before. The British are right in demanding this, but they are not right in exploiting the country for their own benefit. Both Indians and Europeans should cooperate mutually. Britain in the past followed the old Roman divide and rule policy, taking advantage of our religious antagonisms. However let us forget the past and their errors, forgive them, but let them do the right thing now. If they had the courage what they ought to do is to say: "Stop this nonsensical religious squabbling and division. We shall regard you all as Indians and ignore differences." If they do not want to give dominion status then they ought to keep silent and put off Congress with a few vague words only, not confess it and thus increase enmity of Congress. This from the point of view of strategy.

Hindus are taught to feed the poor and look upon them as the Lord: This is to teach you that the Atman is everywhere present. You are told to perform ceremonies for the dead: all this is to teach you that the spirit is always there, ever-living. So these religious practices inculcate the beginnings of Vedantic truth.

Gandhi is a man of religion, not of philosophy.

Advise India not to sever the British connection. Advise England to distribute Dominion Status to India. Warn India of the danger of Japanese invasion through Tibet. Advise India to keep European officials wherever advisable, but warn the latter they must be prepared to accept the lowest scale of remuneration for a poor country.

England should give India Dominion status only if at the same time she makes all men---Hindus, Brahmins, Europeans and Muslims—equal in the eyes of law. England is needed to preserve communal peace in India, but she must realize the truth of her unity with Indian people. Otherwise she will certainly suffer.

MAHARISHI: If Maharishi were a Gnani he would not be content with sitting idle nor would permit the frequent injustices and misconduct which goes on under his nose. He is a yogi and a mystic, no doubt, and one of the purest type, but had he realized truth his feeling of pity for humanity will not have permitted him to live quietly.

People mistake the student for the professor. Because they see a yogi like Maharishi quite indifferent to worldly attraction, they mistake this disciplinary stage for Gnana.

CHAPTER 18. SAGEHOOD AS AN IDEAL.

There can be no correct exposition of Indian philosophical texts like the Upanishads unless the guru has had experience of the truth. Otherwise it is merely adding words to words.

The sage will not do immoral things, that is impossible.

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.

The Gnani who does not go with the masses to church or temple is misleading others; or who does not go with the yogis to their caves and ashrams; for they cannot understand him while he understands them. He must accept the fact and help them on their appropriate level. His duty however is to make known that the higher stages exist and that the others are but steps. Hence he need not discourage them.

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.

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.

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.

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.

The Gnani will teach according to their capacity to understand. With an audience of Ramanujists he will interpret the scriptures in a dualist way; he will keep truth at a distance there: with an audience of Vedantins he will give the non-dualistic interpretations. He will not murder children because they cannot understand, but give them fables.

Gnanis are not opposed to any doctrine, although the adherents of all doctrines may consider (i.e. imagine) us as their enemies.

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.

The Gnani makes no voluntary effort, but does what has to be done; therefore he will practice both activity and abstention at different times.

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.

A gnani will not deliver public lectures for giving out truth; we can only lecture for giving out falsehood, the illusions that appeal to the taste of the audience. For a crowd at a hall will contain men of varying capacities to understand, of whom only one or two might be seekers for truth or ripe for truth. Similarly, if two persons come for an interview to a Gnani, and one is ripe for truth but the other unready, the sage will refuse to see both together and say he can only see them individually. This applies to husband and wife, a couple of friends, etc. Otherwise the sage will confuse the unready mind by going over its head, or he will be withholding truth from the worthy person. Gita says "Don't unsettle the minds of ignorant by revealing the esoteric truth."

A gnani may certainly stay in one place and not travel provided he is actively engaged there in helping others.

For the benefit of those who think from lower standpoint of the world of duality, the Guru takes up a relative standpoint.

The Gnani does not belong to the Sanyasi Ashram. He is above all stages. He is "Adi-Varnasram". "One above all ashrams."

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.

A true Gnani can never renounce anything. It is impossible. He has only renounced the idea of a separate universe.

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.

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.

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.

Why do not gnanis perform miracles to attract attention to truth? To whom are they to perform when there are none different from them?

Even whilst in the stage of imagined experience of objects the Gnani has his realization of Brahman. No separation of one from the other is necessary for him, nor indeed is it possible.

A sanyasi who has become a gnani has the right to throw off his yellow robe and live as he wishes. A householder who becomes a gnani will go on with his usual avocation, plus this differences he will try to teach those with whom he comes in contact. If he is a palanquin bearer, he will teach the Truth to other bearers etc. Whatever society he be in, he tries to uplift morally.

The seekers need a guide i.e. a guru, in order to force them to go to the very end in their thinking; otherwise they stop half-way (usually in mysticism) and wrongly believe "I know."

When a man meets with doubt or confusion on his quest, he then needs a guru. How else is he to know in which direction to turn? And the guru too is needed to point out pitfalls. When a man has made an error how is he to ever be aware of it, unless guru shows it to him?

There is no such thing as personal salvation. It is selfishness of the worst kind. No gnani can attain it unless all other people attain it too. Those who talk of finding moksha for themselves are dualists who harbor the false notion that the individual ego is real and who are deceiving themselves.

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.

A rational man like a gnani will not be so foolish as to argue with an irrational man; the latter will put great warmth of feeling into his words, whereas the other will remain cool and calm headed, not wasting his time in attempting to reason with someone who is incapable of reasoning calmly, but can only rationalize his emotions.

The gnani of the highest order will always adapt himself to the needs of others who are suffering; he will limit himself outwardly and come down to their level. Thus if only yoga is their highest understanding, he will teach them yoga and nothing more. He will not refuse to help them because they cannot understand Vedanta, and thus leave them in their sufferings he will not do as the yogi who says "I am happy." "Everything is Bliss, let them suffer."

Those who imagine a sage must be ever absorbed in thinking only of Brahman, hence wrapt 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?

Through reading many books on Vedanta the mind gets confounded. It is here that a guru is most important.

Experience has taught me that publication of essays or articles cannot truly teach Vedanta, and that the only fit way is that described in the Upanishads, the way of discussions, of personal tuition face to face. After I die people will argue about my writings, one saying I meant this, another I meant that, even as interpretations of the old Rishis multiply now.

The false gnanis, when in company of inferior persons, boast and bluff of their greatness, when conscious of being among superior persons, they assume inordinate humility and abjectness. Both are manifestations of one and the same inferiority complex.

Gnani must set an example to others by showing them the right way of conduct, and by telling them: "This is a better way."

The man who claims to be a gnani but must advertise it by wearing a yellow robe, or sitting in a cave or staying always in one spot, or remains nude, is thereby proving that he is thinking of the body, is attached to it; he is no true gnani. The latter has no need to distinguish himself when he knows all is One. Those distinctions mentioned are for one who is practicing yoga only.

The gnani knows that all things and actions are only Brahman and therefore he does not need to shut himself in a cave. The ignorant man thinks that everything is different from everything else, including himself. This is the only difference between them. A gnani is not meant to be known outwardly. You can never detect him by outward behavior. A false gnani is merely advertising his physical body as being different from others. There is positively no means of detection or distinguishing a true gnani by the ignorant. He sees and knows the world just as others do but he also knows it to be Brahman. Both separate form and Brahman go together in his hand.

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.

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.)

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.

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.

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.

Radhakumud Mukerji's guru's teaching that a Mahatma has bodily marks, such as abnormally long hands, which are required for certain yogic postures in meditation, is rubbish. It proves that his guru does not attach sufficient importance to the truth that the body is only an idea, or else that he does not know it. This is materialism.

Whoever praises a yogi, gurus or swami is thinking of the man's body and therefore takes the body for reality. What is the body? Only an idea. Therefore the who, who praises has never understood philosophy, but merely believed in the reality of what he saw. The Tantriks say they achieve self-realization through having intercourse with women. The tantrik's realization is completely illusory because it is based on the feelings of notion of the reality of the body. Similarly those who revere Swamis who sit and display themselves are also doing so by false assumption.

The yogi has dull intellect, hence inferiority complex, hence he tries to appear, according to known psychopathological tendencies, as a superior being. On the contrary the gnani will not make any such attempt because he has no inferiority complex.

It is impossible to look into a man's mind, how much more is it impossible to look into his Gnana? It is not possible. Only by the external sign that he is forever working for the world's welfare can we know.

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 Rishis emphasize that the guru must show the pupil now what he has to give him.

People who wish to confine themselves to the study and interpretation of any particular school or creed cannot be sages.

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.

Ignorance in the form of, "I am separate from you" is nonsense. The sage does not really come into conflict with others because he does not regard them as separate.

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.

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?

If Vedanta leads to sympathetic union with all mankind, how is Gnani's life to be a cessation of misery? Reply: He seeks to remove the miseries of others not his own. He is so identified with others that he is non-dual, he is only them and never himself as a separate unit. As the world is full of troubles, he is perpetually occupied with removing them.

War is much worse, more fiendish today with its bombs, torpedoes and poison gas. It is spread also over a much wider territory. Yet this is in spite of the appearance of Avatars like Krishna and Christ. It is clear, if we think that they have not made the world better.

The Mahatma makes the miseries of others his own, hence he will always be rendering service to others.

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.

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.

The gnani recognizes that most people are childish in intellectual and spiritual outlook but he loves them all the same. Hatred belongs to the world of religion, not Gnani for religion keeps up the sense that others are different from you by labeling them, whereas Gnan brings feeling of non-difference.

What does humility mean? When you know everything is Atman, you will not think either of your supremacy or inferiority. You will be naturally above such things. The Gnani is characteristically humble because he does not make a show of true greatness. The ornate couch, the prostrations on floor, the Mother's enthroned receptions at Sri Aurobindo Ashram, are the

opposite of humility, In the political world that kind of show is necessary, but in the spiritual world it indicates lack of true humility of Gnani, who do not want to appear superior to you, nor does he even think so himself. That thought of having Gnan in contrast to your not having it, does not occur to him. It belongs to the world of learned pundits, not Gnani.

The minds of those who judge a gnani act on the consistency theory. Hence they judge him incorrectly.

By constantly thinking of the Guru, he reminds you of truth of Brahman; you should associate him with that in your mind, not with his body, hairs, noses etc.

The adept should devote himself to ceaseless service and must go out to teach and serve. It is quite alright for a yogi to sit quiet and do nothing to serve, as he does not like to be disturbed in his peace. But a gnani is undisturbed even in activity.

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.

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.

Even if you pray or seek for all your karma to be wiped off, still you are thinking only of yourself. The Gnani on the other hands prays or seeks for all to have their karma wiped off, he wants all to possess peace.

CHAPTER 18:

It takes three to six months for me to give the merest outline of Vedanta and the student will also have to study various books which I shall recommend and with which he may fill in the outline.

If you want to test a man (teacher) simply ask the question "Have you read science thoroughly" If not, he is an empty babblers of words. Philosophy cannot exist without science and science cannot exist without philosophy. What science wants is proof, not imagination.

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.

A guru is needed to show the seeker the path, to indicate where he is going wrong, to sharpen his Buddhi.

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.

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.

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.

The Guru will only point out the truth to the seeker.

Service, service to the whole, is the test of the Gnani.

Most people judge a teacher by his wearing a yellow robe, his perpetual silences, his holding his nose in pranayanam, his eating little, etc. they do not judge by asking "Is what he says true?"

The Vedantic method is discussion between teacher and pupils not dogmatic laying down by his authority.

Many swamis suffer from the insanity of the exaggerated Aham. "I want to distinguish myself from others" is their idea, and so they go about naked or else travel gorgeously on elephants or sit in a tiger skin. All this indicates lack of mental balance.

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.

People give titles to mystics "Gnani, Maharishi, Avatars, Sadguru etc. merely because they do not know what these terms mean, so they just imagine. We must test all such claims rationally.

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.

When you know Atman you know at what stage a man is, why he acts in a certain ways what are his capacities for imagination, his motives etc.

(u) PROTOGORAS: "Man is really measured not by what he appears to be nor by what he does, not even by what he says, but by what he thinks in his mind."

(v) EMERSON: "It is easy in solitude to live after one's own, but the great man is he who in the midst of the crowd can keep with perfect sweetness the independence of solitude."

(a) BRIHADARANYAKOPANISHAD. "The knower of Brahmin wears no signs."

(b) MANDUKYOPANISHAD. "The track of the men of knowledge is as invisible as that of the birds in the sky."

- (c) "The very Gods are stupefied in their attempts to find out the man that has realized the All and is engaged in doing good to all creatures, seeking the final refuge.
(Brahman)...MAHABARATA.
- (d) MAHABARATA: "Of whom the many have no chance to even hear, whom many cannot know, though they have heard or seen."
- (e) ASHTAVAKRA SAMHITA. "The man of knowledge, though living like an ordinary man, is contrary to him and only those like him understand his state.."
- (f) BHARTRIHARI: "A chandala, a twice-born, a sudra, an ascetic, a man of intelligence, a Gnani (philosopher) a lord of yogins, thus described at the height of thoughtless prattle by men conceiving each his own fancy, sages harmonized in the self wend their way in the world."
- (g) SRI RAMAKRISHNA "Men but know the body or the clothes or the words of a man and are influenced by them. But men never know his Gnan or knowledge. Neither can he show it nor can they see it. They can but fancy it as they choose."
- (h) 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.)"
- (i) THE MAHABARATA The man of knowledge always looks upon all other creatures as he looks upon himself."
- (j) SANKARA: COMMENTARY ON GITA: "He regards the pleasure and pain of all creatures equally with his own."
- (k) BHAGAVAD GITA: "He (the knower), should make them (the ignorant) do all actions, himself fulfilling them with devotion (for the welfare of the world)...Ever seeking to do whatever is good for all creatures."
- (l) VIVEKACHUDAMANI. "It is the very nature of the Great Souls (knowers) to be always exerting themselves of their own accord towards removing others troubles."
- (m) VASISTARAMAYANA: "Though taking part in all intercourse of every kind like all ordinary men, he (the knower) constantly soars above all beings...Though acting after every feeling such as love, hate, fear and the like he stands unaffected within."
- (n) PANCHADASI. "A knower of truth may be freely engaged in worldly concerns such as ruling a country."
- (o) MAHABARATA: "He remains unaffected though his body engages in action and his mind in thoughts."
- (p) MAHABARATA: "Janaka, the Emperor addressed himself without the least attachment to the results, to whatever came up in the course of duty even like the sun running his diurnal course. He lived the present out with a smiling heart. So also did Jada Bharata the palanquin bearer (a menial) live."

(q) Quoted in SANKARA'S SUTRA BASHYA: "Quietly devoted to his duty let the wise man pass thro' life unknown. Let him step on this earth as if he were blind, (i.e. uninfluenced by self interest) and deaf (i.e. unaffected by praises and curses)."

(r) EMERSON: "He is great who is what he is from nature and who never reminds us of others."

(s) CARLYLE: "Great men are too often unknown."

(t) BACON: "The philosopher is no believer in the idols of the theatre and the cave."

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.

The sage will not hide himself in the cave or forest or on the top of Himalayas far from the people who need help, because he knows that he must go amongst them in order to remove their ignorance and set an example to place higher ideals before them and to work for their material welfare. Those who say that the sages can give this help by telepathic or by spiritual thought-waves from a distance are refuted by the evidence of all history.

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.

The Gnani will not work or strive for mere material necessities than are absolutely needed for his own support, he will be content with the little needed for simple life, but he may be tremendously ambitious and get much money if it is to help others.

No action of the Gnani can be prejudicial to the world. Therefore he is given perfect liberty to act as he wishes. But for all others rules are necessary, ethical injunctions must be obeyed as they are to discipline themselves.

Not even the Gods can tell who is a genuine Gnani, because nobody can see into another man's mind. Therefore if anyone says he can recognize a Gnani at a glance, tell him he is talking nonsense.

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.

A Gnani is of no special use to the ordinary ignorant man as the latter cannot understand him nor grasp his doctrine. Hence such men do not need gnanis to teach them. Only those seekers who have doubts and questions of the highest order, should become pupils of Gnanis.

The guru tells the candidate that his knowledge is only that of names, i.e. mere words. Then if he asks to be taught of anything greater than words, the Guru responds--but not before. If however the aspirant is satisfied with his illusive knowledge or says: "I know," then the guru rejects him or keeps quiet. Otherwise it is impossible to teach philosophy.

It is an utter impossibility for any avatar to change the whole world. All claims to the contrary are signs of insanity. Where Christ, Buddha and Mohamed have failed, others also will fail.

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.

The gnani will be indifferent if he is abused, because he regards his critics as knowing nothing about the subject.

Vedanta must be taught by personal talks and discussions with a Guru: books cannot convey it satisfactorily.

If the word gnani has a meaning it is only an idea, then it is only an imagined gnani. This is the only one the world knows, for it observes from outside and from ego-separate standpoint. But from the real gnani's own standpoint, there is no separateness, he sees all is Brahman, and he tries not to appear different from others, except to set good example. Hence the world can never recognize the gnani, and that is why it is often duped.

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.

One reason why even true gnanis withdrew to Himalayas or to hill-tops or forests was those places were cooler and in hot plains their students found it difficult to study with sharp attention. Thus it was for their students' benefit, not their own.

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.

The Gnani will suffer less from physical pain than the ordinary man, because he will not identify himself with the body. This is a rational test of Gnan. c.f. Sri Ramakrishna and his throat cancer, and VSI with his stomach-ache.

The gnani should keep his gnani-hood a secret. He should not advertise it to the world. For the ignorant will misunderstand it.

The true sage sees misery everywhere and therefore wants to help humanity.

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.

The Gnani sees the contradictions of being, of self and not-self, but he is able to keep quiet in the face of them whereas the yogi can keep quiet only by shutting off the world outside.

The gnani must show the right way to the rest of the world. He must set an example to guide others.

A sadhu said to one of V.S.I's Swami-pupils, when asked where a certain Sankara place was, "What business have I with Sankara? I am Sankara myself!" This indicates the man is not a Gnani as he poses, but an egoist for he shows the I strongly. Had he been a gnani he would not have raised the question of his own ego, but simply said "Everything is Sankara!" He merely repeated like a parrot what he had read or heard.

Brahmins were originally forbidden to take paid posts or offices or employment. This was because they were bidden to speak out the truth. Only post permitted was adviser to the King. His living was gained through gifts and begging. Otherwise they kept their independence.

Gnani does not want to think of the ego, therefore he does not do or say anything to make himself appear superior to others, or to pretend to know more than others.

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.

Why should you have a guru? Because your mind will be troubled by doubts, by even doubt of the possibility of attaining the ultimate goal. The Western philosophy says the Absolute is unrealizable, whereas the Indian sage says it is attainable. Therefore his guidance, encouragement and knowledge are necessary to a seeker.

You need a guru because you do not know which road to take. He cannot give you Gnan, that is an impossibility. But he can point out the correct direction to proceed in, and warn you against the wrong roads.

If any man sits constantly in one place, he is only a yogi, not a gnani. The gnani is as alert and awake to what is happening to him externally as all other men: he is not a stone, or yogi in trance. He (yogi) does not know Brahman, Truth. The gnani will go wherever there is ignorance, suffering or trouble to relieve.

The gnani must adapt his teaching and conduct to his environment. When seekers come to him, he must question them and ask them what they seek. If they say truth, he must ask "What do you mean or understand by truth?" Then the seeker will reply "I mean a great sense of peace." Thus the definition given will bring out the stage of fitness of the seeker, and the guru will prescribe yoga only. If however he finds a seeker who defines truth in a higher way and shows signs of brains, he will teach Vedanta. He will instill doubts or encouragements according to what he perceives by the answers to his questions so as to shake a seeker free of an outworn stage or to help him up to a higher view.

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 is really possible to attain higher levels.

The gnani will neither talk too volubly like shallow persons nor keep complete silence like Gandhi on Monday or Maher Baba. He will talk as much as is necessary but no more. Thus he follows Gita's advice to follow a middle path.

When a father sees a child running away towards a well it is his duty to warn the child against falling into the well, for the child is ignorant. Similarly the Gnani, knowing the truth about the dangers of this world, the sufferings which it can bring warns and guides and teaches the ignorant mankind. Otherwise they fall into great suffering through ignorance of truth.

The gnani does not run after attractive things; but neither does he reject them when they come his way. He lets the idea be prominent in his mind that all conditions are Brahman, whether possessed or not possessed, and thus he achieves happiness.

The Gnani chooses no particular work, dress, thing, speech, actions, vocation or posture to show off that he is a gnani, that he is different from others. That would indicate distinctness or separateness.

This realization in its fullness brings absolute harmony between thought and action and makes the Gnani.

The Hindu desire to have a son rather than a daughter born, was originally intended to be a means of a Brahmin, knower of Brahman, communicating his knowledge to at least one person before he dies and thus keeping it alive in the world. It was naturally easier to teach a son who grew up around the teacher.

He alone can be a true teacher in whom there is no ego.

The Gnani sees the sameness in all; this means he sees them all without exception as ideas.

Your peace will be disturbed only if you recognize a second. Hence mystic's peace is temporary; the only enduring peace belongs to the sage for it is non-dual.

The teacher who knows reality interprets everything according to its light.

The gnani has the world, acts and lives normally in it, but does not regard it as a separate thing.

The test of the gnani is one who not merely believes or says he is Brahman, but who treats all beings alike, as they are all Brahman. This is universal sympathy.

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.

The gnani is always aware of the Atman, and though he sees a thousand things, will not forget IT.

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 or 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 travelling on a journey to learn or teach Truth.

It is not enough to teach by writing letters or books in order to bring people into the realization of Vedanta, Satsang is also necessary, i.e. personal contact by guru with the seekers.

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.

Gnani will not show off nor boast; for he wants to appear a normal man, not an extra-ordinary one.

The ordinary person thinks "this is a wall"; "that is a man" etc. whereas the Gnani thinks "this is Brahman, he is Brahman." etc.

The Gnani is free to practice action or inaction as he wishes, but he will be concerned with world-welfare in either case.

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.

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.

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.

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.

The Gnani cannot have the idea of giving up, renouncing the world or some object or person in the world, because that would connote the idea of duality. Knowing no second thing at all there remains nothing to be given up.

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.

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.

A man with ego cannot understand another who is egoless. That is why only one gnani knows another.

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.

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.

Sri Krishna himself says that he can do nothing to make a man intelligent straight away. The adepts give prasada, 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.

The teachers leave their experience behind in scriptures and books, as a legacy to posterity. They know that books are illusory, but they also know they will be useful as a means of progress from lower to higher ideas of truth.

Sahaja-samadhi is for the gnani, yoga-samadhi is for the mystic.

CHAPTER 19: DOCTRINE OF NON-CAUSALITY.

Yogi Pranavananda's letter about the timely help of "the Lord" in sending him fuel to his Tibetan monastery shows that he does not know what he is talking about. His inference that God helped him is baseless. People conveniently ascribe such things to God; will they also ascribe the horrible misfortunes which come to them? Five thousand women were led by Afghan invaders through the Khyber pass as captives, torn from their Indian homes. These women prayed to God for help, but it did not avail them. During the Behar earthquakes a Hindu who prayed got killed, a Mohammedan who prayed was saved. So the latter said. "My God is the real God for He hears my prayers." All this talk about God is nonsense. Has anybody seen God? Can anyone say who he is? Herbert Spencer grasped this point well. Define God? You say the Author of the Universe! But it is illogical to talk of an Author whose creation can be seen but himself not. When I see a book, I know I can see its author. Then you call Him the First Cause. But who created the Cause? Who was God's father? You cannot answer. Now Kant wisely says that causality was a condition of the mind, that in reality causality had no external existence outside the mind. He was right. That is Vedanta. Hence we do not seek for a Creator or Cause of the Universe; it simply does not matter to us, it is irrelevant to Vedanta. We deal with the knowable, i.e. with truth whereas this God of whom you speak is unknowable. We neither deny nor assert his existence; the question is meaningless to us. The onus of proof is on those who assert Him. Again each man has a different idea of God. A low Hindu thinks of his lingam-worship, a Mohammedan of a glorified man, etc. Vedanta simply leaves this meaningless God out of its reckonings.

Unless you know the meaning of non-causality, you cannot understand the meaning of non-creation of the world. But they must develop intelligence first to understand this.

Modern psychology labors under delusion of causality, and hence cannot get ultimate truth.

One thing becoming another is an impossibility. It remains the same forever. That is proved by Chapter 4, Mandukya.

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 Drik-Drisyam theory, as a preliminary step, until you reach the doctrine of non-causality, but once the latter is grasped then even the Mayavada doctrine is given up.

Logic is mere intellectual reasoning. It says, you see this shoe, it must have had a cause—a shoe-maker. You see this world. It must have had a cause--a Creator. That is logic, not reason.

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.

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 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. Avidya disappears when causality is given up.

Evolution entirely depends on causality, you know also there cannot be an evolution of the universe.

Unless the truth about causal relation be made clear to you, you cannot possibly understand how Brahman is non-dual, immortal, undifferentiated etc.

When causality is demolished, the whole edifice of religion crashes to the ground. For God will have to go.

Causal relation is an impossibility and absurdity. Unless one understands non-causality you may be sure he does not understand Vedanta. To cope with lesser intellects, however, we have given them the idea of Maya as an inscrutable power which is responsible for world creation.

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.

Causality is only an idea. If you go on asking for a cause of things, fully and finally, it will lead you to idealism in the end.

Religion means causality; hence you cannot bring philosophy into harmony with it.

Work implies causality, and hence not through Karma. Granting God or Brahman has absolute power, we are attributing to Him creation, production, change--a second has come. This is Vivartha. As long as you want to keep duality, causality holds good. Ultimately there is Brahman. This Brahman can only be an idea!

"Causality and Science" by Nalinikanta Brahma is a very good book as a step. It goes up to Vivartha. It does not bring us to the end.

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.

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.

Drik does not produce the Drysam. Ajatavada 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.

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.

So many ramifications are involved in the seemingly simple thing called "cause" that eventually they extend over countless other things throughout the world until finally everything contained in the world is included; such is the interdependence of the universe. But this means the ultimate unity of world; hence no duality remains, no cause and effect.

To explain cause and effect you must go to external world and show something there. It is in the objective world. If God were the cause of anything he should be in the external world also. Similarly, if they say the individual is the cause, it is not so. They mean the body by "I", but it is the seer who is the real "I". Kant did not, or could not analyze further on this point. He who knows Self knows it is distinct from cause and effect. If you know meaning of causality, no karma will affect you. If you think that you are untouched by cause and effect, then they don't affect you. For instance, if you are given a spoken command, and you do not hear it, they you are unaffected by it. Your mind is not there in it because you don't think it. The Self is quite unconnected with causes and effects. The body has to be left behind; the soul is something unconnected with the body. Then the thought of cause and effect is left with the body.

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 have been people ignorant that causation does not 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.

Causality is absolutely needed for scientific experiments, but for scientific concepts, (such as matter, proton etc.) causality is proving not so indispensable, or breaking down even. Hence we must differentiate between experimental science and theoretical science.

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.

In the study of truth, there is no Karma and no causality. In practical world they hold true.

If you want to go to the ultimate truth where there is only one entity, you have to dismiss causality, but in the practical world it still holds good.

Cosmic mind idea of a chair is not necessary, as Kant etc. show that causation is not needed. Hence it is not incumbent on us to show that our ideas are caused by something else.

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.

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.

If you suppose the mind to be sitting in the skull, whatever the senses tell it, it must believe. It does not possess the independence to go and verify what is told by the senses. Hume says everything is coming and going. We know only detached sense of ideas. Buddha took the same position, but did not say whether there is anything beyond the idea. He kept silent.

Pandits say Maya is a sakti of God, which is almost the same as Berkeley’s doctrine that objects are ideas created by God.

The fourth Chapter of Mandukya shows cause is only an idea of the mind. Max Planck has undermined causality. In dream do you know that you are creating a dream world, are you aware of it at that time? No. Are you the cause of it? Similarly you are not aware of the waking world. Planck understood this truth, when I talked to Bergson who also understood.

The Advaitin says there is no causality. That is not the end of matter for him. Time, space and cause are known only in the realm of the seen. Where are they in the seer? They are not there.

The scientific laws of causation still hold good in the sphere of practical truth, but Max Planck and Heisinger have begun the path (completed by Vedanta), which shows that they no longer hold good in the sphere of ultimate truth. Kant was unable to prove the existence of the noumenon: that was because he was ignorant of Vedanta.

Cause and effect: Mango seed giving effect to mango tree. Parinamavada school (i.e. Sankhya) says that the sweetness of the mango fruit, its color, flavor etc. was in the seed in the seed-form; it only manifested. The effect was already in the cause, in the seed-form. An existent entity changes into all these change of forms. (Mark: Noncausality: Brahman is the only existent. All apparent forms and change are it. Ideas are transformations or appearances within the mind, made of Mind, known by mind, Mind is what’s Real)

Christianity said: In the beginning there was only God, who created world out of nothing; Hinduism said: In the beginning there was both God and Prakriti. This shows that religions merely imagine things: theirs is no truth in them. That is why there are so many books on religion, people go on imagining and spinning cock and bull stories.

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.

Why should God start creating? Does it not imply that he is not satisfied with keeping quiet. By his activity he brings misery and disease to others. The theory of Karma removes the guilt from God and places it on the human beings themselves. But this may also be just as imaginary, for who knows? Vedanta deals with what is beyond dispute with known facts.

All other questions depend on the problem of Causality--even the most unlikely. If you say that by going to Tiruvannamalai and practising meditation there, a certain effect will be produced, you are talking rubbish, according to Mandukya Chapter 4.

Whoever distinguishes between a cause and an effect is a dualist, even whether he says world came from nothing or from something. (Mand.p.251) 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.(M.p.252). But the common herd (average 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)

The nature of a thing cannot really change. If any part of God can change where is the certainty that he will not altogether die like other mortals (i.e. changeable things). For to say that he created the world like web spun out of idea, is to say that a part of him has changed. How can such a God be changeless, immortal, eternal.

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 (Mandukya, p.252). 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 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.

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 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.

Sankara's commentary on "Vedanta Sutras" is based on the law of causality for it says: "That from which this is produced." Hence this book belongs to religion and it is a fable for children, for brainless, for those who are guided by faith rather than reason. c.f. Gita "I am the

Unmanifested, yet people regard me (i.e. think or imagine) as the Manifested. This is Krishna's statement of non-causality.

"The existent cannot pass into birth" (Mand.P.249) 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.

Kant proved human mind is so constituted as to accept no second thing apart from the latter.

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.

Vedanta does not lead to solipsism but may appear to do so. This understanding arises because European language has no correct idea or terminology of Mind, because it always associates it with individual mind, with my mind, his mind, etc. that is in terms of ego, whereas Indian thought and language has the correct idea and terminology for Mind as an impersonal principle, that which is aware of this I, this ego. So long as Europeans identify mind with the personality, will necessarily think we Vedantins are Solipsists, but we are not really for Mind is one and universal to us. The Europeans have not philosophized enough, they need to go deeper.

Vivartavada's theory of world creation is not the highest, nor 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 Ajatavada, where there is no causation at all. There can be no Moksha if you believe in Causation. (p.249,251 Mandukya).

All notions of causality are only thoughts: they strike you and you take them for practical purposes, without serious attempt to get at their truth.

If you say that what is in the cause is also in the effect then both must exist at the same time. How then can the Samkhya's say that the effect follows afterwards in time? One of the two positions must be taken but both are self-contradictory anyway. 99% of human beings never think of the meaning of the words they use. Moreover every man has the conceit that he knows, that things are as simple as their face value. What is meant by the words cause and effect? You will then see how difficult it is to define them properly. People are naturally averse to taking the trouble of ascertaining meanings which is part of philosophy. They have enough troubles in life

to voluntarily add this trouble! You can not think of cause without thinking also of effect: for each word has no meaning without the other; both ideas are really there in the mind, simultaneously. How can causal relation exist where both co-exist? You can't have one and get rid of the other; it is just like the Drg and Drsyam. In the practical world, cause and effect obviously appear to hold sway, of course; but we are now in the world of truth, where we want to know the essence, the ultimate reality of things. The practical world will go, but we want the world which will not pass away--Reality. To the practical man, our position quite rightly seems absurd, but he is content with practical fleeting use only, not with inquiry into the enduring truth behind appearances.

Thus however, you may define cause and effect you cannot get away from contradictions in human thought which we do not take the trouble to find out; and which is that causality is not really established. When you go to the root of the matter, you cannot speak. When you do speak you become involved in contradictions. However you may eliminate them step by step and come at last to Truth. Impatient minds dismiss the inquiry into causality as hairsplitting, mere words, and as something which everybody knows and for which no inquiry is needed.

See the absurdity of the bible's account of creation. Genesis says: "In the beginning". What is meant by beginning? There to an implication of something coming after; and before: the causal relation is again proposed and no beginning is thus really visible. You must imagine an effect in order to hold the idea of cause, otherwise it is meaningless. Only in Advaita or Non-duality is there no such thing as causal relation.

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.

Suppose you use the word effect. Immediately you think of a cause. Both come together in your mind. You can't separate them. Both therefore are first or both are second; there is no real succession. Hence which therefore can truly be called effect when it does not follow after the other? Thus there can be no distinction between them, and the whole notion of causality breaks down.

Scientists do not even now understand their own theory of Indeterminacy. So Russell and Planck say "perhaps in the future causality will be reestablished as we develop our knowledge." This proves that India is ahead of them in understanding indeterminacy, for we know that when Western scientists go deeper they will find non-causality completely confirmed, and not destroyed; that causal relation exists only in the human mind.

Arambha Vada: (Nayyayikas), another school says that the effect was now existent in the cause, i.e. the effect sweetness of the mango etc. in the mango is not in the seed. Everything comes out of nothing. This is Arambhavada. As long as there is duality, you have to explain by cause and effect. When there is only one entity called Brahman, Atman or Mind, how can the question of cause and effect arise.

Those who know the words need not necessarily know the truth. The most difficult question of causality is being taken up. For the ordinary mind it is impossible to know that there is no causality--so long as you are in the world of causality--i.e. one thing producing another effect.

What is the meaning of cause? A cause has no meaning without effect. The question is how the cause is connected with the effect. c.f. Mango seed. Sakhya School: (1) The sweetness was there in the bitterness of the seed. (Parinamavada) Something cannot come out of nothing. Nayyayaka Schools (2) The sweetness came into existence from non-existence; the seed was there to begin with, that is all. Sankhyas say God himself became the world (c.f. Pantheist: God and Prakriti = World.)

So long as you are in the realm of duality, you have to explain how or why one thing came from another; and contradictory views are expressed. But when the Advaitin shows there is no second, there is no production, and the contradictions do not arise at all, when the ultimate thing is Brahman alone.

Arguments to show the weakness of the position of Sankhya and Nayyayikas (i.e. dualists). Both are at their wits end to explain. So is science itself confounded. Hence the Quantum theory and indeterminacy.

Existent cannot be a cause and effect at the same time, either from the point of view of Sankhya or the Nayyayika, but the Advaitin shows the Existent is no-two, and causality can't rise at all. Sankhyas say that whatever was in the cause was also in the effect. They say that the iron bar, the iron hook, the iron pan--are in the seed--the iron.

Refutation: If cause and effect are one what is the difference between the two?

Nayyayikas say the effect is produced from nonentity. Refutation: Produce something out of nothing. It is an impossibility. Why do you want a seed to produce a tree? How exactly the seed becomes the tree is inexplicable even to science. That the cause and effect are there we see--(the mind and its ideas or imaginings) but how we do not know. In the dream we dream of mountains, tigers etc. But who has seen the processes of the mind producing the mountain etc. Both are Sankhya and Nyaya schools take causality as a reality but the Advaitin says that causality to also another idea and there is no use of inquiring into its cause and so on. c.f. Kant's view that causality (time, space and causality) are mental. Hume's position was more or less that of the Buddhists, nihilistic.

There is no proof to show that the seer produces the seen. We do not know. There is no causality as proved by science and taught by Vedanta. In this world it is impossible to get at a final cause. The human mind is thinking in this way of cause and effect, which are imagined by the mind as Kant and Hume saw. The mind imagines there is a first cause, and then looks for effects. If everything is Atman, you can never have a cause--this is Vedanta's last position.

It is only religion which teaches that God is an unborn cause; experience denies its possibility and shows that every cause is the effect of something else. It is like talking of the son of a barren woman--using meaningless words.

99% of those who write on Indian Philosophy have misunderstood the meaning of word unreal. It has two meanings (1) impossibility, like son of a barren woman. Sankhyas say matter existed along with God, who took it and made it into world like potter with clay. But when you go deep into it, you must ask how do you know that these two things existed together and who created God? Reason gives no ultimate causation; therefore we drop God, First Matter, etc. Kant saw this difficulty and said, as we can't know let us use faith from this point onwards. Vedanta has solved the difficulty.

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.)

Ignorance is the cause of duality with its hold on cause and effect.

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.

There is a bird called the kahoo in India which usually cries in a peculiar way on the approach of rain. During drought ignorant peasants, assuming that the bird's call was a magic cause of the rain, imitate its call.

Whoever speaks of creation is telling lies.

There is no such production of a universe according to Ultimate Truth.

What do you do when you wish to define the meaning of the word creation? You only imagine, form ideas.

Every relation is imagined, that which is beyond causal relation is beyond imagination for human mind thinks only in terms of cause.

The Nayyayikas are fond of the illustration of the pot and his pot-making to prove God created the world. Similarly in the West there are those who use the illustration of the watchmaker.

Whenever you have a duality as in waking and dream, you will have a relation of cause and effect. But when everything is Turiya, causality is impossible.

When you think of the 'I' there is always the causal idea or relation. Both 'I' and cause go together. But "cause" itself is an idea as the "Aham."

Imagination weaves all into a causal connection. Things accidentally may cure you of some disease and illogical brains connect it causally. All sorts of things happen in this world. Maybe, by taking the name of Narayana one gets cured, but it is not proved--the causal connection between the two!

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.

You can never prove that God created the universe because no one was present at the time.

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.

There is no such thing as a causal relation when you deal with ultimate reality. That is why you cannot get at the origin of Maya, for it disappears when you uncover its real nature.

We do not know who produced the world therefore because such a question is meaningless. Whoever knows thoroughly the meaning of cause would not ask such a question in relation to the ultimate cause of Maya. When the manifold of Maya is gone, there is only Atman. However for ignorant persons who are fond of causality because in our practical life we say Maya is a power causing the world which is not highest truth.

When you try to trace back a "regressus infinitum" as the cause of God, the cause of that cause of God, we are unable to proceed and have to stop. Causality breaks down there. Hence we say that causality cannot explain things when sufficiently probed.

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.

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.

Where everything is mind, it is only the brainless who will use the word "cause" and say Mind is the cause of all the mental objects, i.e. ideas (whether 'material' or otherwise).

The truth is that there is absolutely no change, the world has not been produced, there is only non-dual Atman.

Maya is dissolved only after you know the nature of causality. Until then you have to talk of God, higher power, etc. But the meaning of cause is the most difficult part of philosophy.

Science is coming near to our doctrine that there is no creation at all, for it is losing faith in causality.

When we say that ignorance is the cause of the manifold we are admitting causality and thus betraying our ignorance.

An uncaused first cause is a scientific impossibility.

Causation depends on taking your stand on the ego as real. Know that ego is but an idea, let it go and think of it as the unlimited Mind, and your causation notions will drop off because there is no-two and hence no cause-effect relation possible. Shift standpoint from ego to that Mind (which is Brahman) and no question about what caused is possible. To understand this see dream illustration.

When you know that the world has not been created by you, and yet that it is existent in you, you are forced to come to the conclusion that world is non-different from yourself, that no causal relation can exist between it (and therefore any object in it) and you. Whatever appears is still Atman. Duality goes when causality goes.

Vivartavada is based on change, i.e. causality, on one substance appearing in different changing forms without becoming changed itself. Its fallacy is saying that it says Brahman is the cause of the experiences, i.e. duality, whereas Ajativada is changelessness. The various appearances are no doubt regarded as unreal but still they are regarded as there, i.e. as a second object. Hence we say Vivartavada fails to rise to non-duality although it comes closest to it. We say that when there appears to be two there is really only one, hence the question of unreality does not come up in Advaita. This is best proved by dream. Modern science will tell you that it is the working of your mind, imagination, that produces snake in rope. Advaita says, even when you produce the snake, even then you are non-dual.

First step, learn you are ever present. Second step that causal relation does not exist between you and any object: what you see is yourself because you have not produced it. Third step: Nothing is different from you.

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.

We do not deny that a succession of ideas, objects appear before us; what we deny is that there is causal relation between them.

Rope trick analogy used by Sankara re: causality is that the magician and body do not really move. Only other people see them move.

Gnani knows that the so-called causal relation is merely one idea succeeding each other, and that we can never find an answer to the question why such succession should occur. What is the last link in the chain of ideas, the final cause and effect? People thinking of that will see it is impossible to arrive at it: Hence Gnani rejects the supposed or imagined, sticks to known.

Astrology is based on causality, on the theory that because planets are in certain positions, human fortune is thereby affected.

It is only for the sake of those who are unable to understand truth that we teach causality and creation, but these are for religious people only.

When you think there is cause and effect, it is there; when you do not think of it, it is not there. Go to dream. When you think of the dream-mountain as such, you have to think of causality, but when you think of it as mind, there is only oneness, non-causality. Similarly when you regard the world as Brahman, you cannot think of it in terms of causality, cause and effect are a duality, Brahman is unity.

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.

From practical standpoint causality seems to exist and we may take it so for working purposes. But that means from standpoint of non-inquiry, i.e. ignorance. The printing machine, ink and workman appear to be causes of the printed sheet. But if you go to the root of the matter you will find that all is not known about the causes. How does the ink get its color. What is the cause of color? Thus you go on regressing and find it necessary to confess ignorance at the end. Some of the factors only are known; others can never be known. Therefore it is impossible to say any one thing is the cause of the printed sheet because it stretches back in an endless chain of previous links, like the problem of a First Cause, a regress which reveals the ultimate inter-dependence of all things. Hence philosophy analyses causation in order to show it is only our imagination after all, because there is no certain knowledge.

Page 133-134 of Thomson's "Introduction to Science" admits that "we do not know how water results from oxygen and hydrogen. We do not understand this result." Put the word "effect" in place of "result" and you get our doctrine of non-causality. Thomson also admits later than the question of causes is most difficult and dangerous territory.

When you are seeking the cause of any mental objective phenomena, mind is itself the cause, for it is through mind alone that you know them.

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 dreams 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.

Can you give any instance at any time of Drg producing the Drsyam? No, it is unknown. All, without exception producing anything causally is in the world of Seen. Hence we cannot say that mind produces the world; it produces nothing at any time.

It is better to answer questions when doubts concerning them arise, than when they have not yet arisen. For then the mind gets fixed, definite and cleared up.

When you know that causality does not exist in reality, you know that mind imagines it.

We think that if causal relation exists between two things they must be real. Vedanta shows (M.P.287) that even when this relation seems to exist, things are unreal, imagined.

When you know the whole world to be an idea, it is then impossible to ask for a cause of the world, as it is in the mind itself, it is the mind and not other than it. The mind has imagined causality and thus wants a cause for its own existence, which is madness. World is not born, produced or caused, because it is only mind. Try to find out your own birth. Did you know it? Only what your parents told you. You yourself cannot know your birth. It is impossible for you to say you came into existence at birth or in your mother's womb. You can only imagine a birth.

We rely on causality only for purposes of the world and do not deny it there. But when you inquire deeply into the matter all you can say is "this experience has come" "that experience has come" and so on, but we can never prove that they are the cause of each other. Modern science says, there is succession but we do not know whether one fact is the cause of another. It is unproved, unshown. This goes to the root of scientific knowledge. There is only one thing, the Drg, regarding which we can say we have not seen as coming and passing away. You will see that ideas are in the Drg, in the Atman and finally are the Atman. Unless you get rid of the idea of change, you do not seek for causes.

Bergson knew the world is continuous change, so he said change is ultimate reality. He failed to discriminate between the Seer and the Seen for he forgot that the changes are all in the seen. He was struck by the characteristics of change which marks the world.

If you can establish a connection between cause and effect, we would accept causality, but you cannot prove it in the realm of absolute truth: this has nothing to do with practical truth, which is for getting on in the world.

Karma is but a stepping stone to truth, because it relieves God of responsibilities for miseries of man; and thus Idea of God need not be introduced for this purpose.

There is no proof that Brahman produced this world. There is no causal relation between Drg and Drsyam, the fallacy, the absurdity of saying this is to make Drg into Drsyam, because there must then be another Drg which sees all this. The Drg escapes all such statements.

Most scientists believe in causality. Only the few great ones have dropped it. Others believe in it, but with doubts.

For the sake of world's morality, progress, happiness, Gnani supports the teaching of causality, to help the less evolved. It involves prayer, ambition, work, faith, conduct, etc. The wise man encourages others to go on following religion, until people get a doubt. Then only will he begin to enlighten them. Intellectual children, those with little brains must necessarily believe in causal relation. Grown-ups shake their mind free of this belief.

Creation stories in Upanishads and Bibles and Koran are for children who can believe fully; but for those who doubt them the higher truth may be taught; i.e. non-creation because of non-causality.

If you want to realize immortality you must understand non-causality, then you will know you can never change, i.e. never die.

Remove your imagination and then you shall be what you always were, are and shall be. Then you shall be happy, for all fears and sorrows, and desires are your own unreal concoctions. (M.329). The two great distresses are desire and fear: both imply a second thing. Get rid of notion of duality and the distresses disappear, and the only way to get rid of this false notion is to study truth about causality and drop faith in it. Gaudapada's Karika tries to prepare the way for this realization of truth by giving you a clear understanding of causality.

Kant independently strengthens our position in proving that causality is an idea of the mind, but he did not pursue the question further. For such further pursuit demands negation of the ego, the

dropping of the 'I', and both Europe and India are not prepared to do this. Europe because it wants things and possessions, India because it wants yoga or religion.

Ajati is the central position of Vedanta, the most important principle of Advaita. Unless you thoroughly grasp it you merely repeat like parrots "I am Brahman," but never knowing it. All Vedanta depends on Ajati, or non-causation. It is your attachment to causality that makes you think that because you see the world it must necessarily be real.

You can never realize Brahman so long as causation is not understood, for you will be still thinking that God is somehow imagining the illusory world, that of course is a higher standpoint than God creating world out of nothing or out of some matter which always existed. But, if so, why does He imagine plagues? How do you know that God is imagining this world? It is only your own imagination to say so. No proof exists. For the Advaitin no question of cause or creation can ever arise.

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.

Neither ordinary science (i.e. science not carried to its highest degree) nor yoga nor religion can destroy faith in causality. The world ceases to exist when this faith goes, and it is seen to be only Brahman. (M.P.310). "cease to exist" here means not yogic samadhi or unconsciousness but rather ceasing as a separate thing, as different from Atman, just as the figure 8 ceases to exist as separate from the whirling torch when you know truth about it after inquiring into it.

No other portion of Vedanta can compare with doctrine of non-causality in value and importance. The problem of indeterminacy of cause and effect relation, is now exercising the greatest scientists.

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.

Whatever you have in your mind, that you will find everywhere. Kant says "It is my mind that superimposes causal relation upon phenomena." Gaudapada anticipated him thousands of years ago. So long as you have causality strongly impressed on your mind, you will see cause and effect at work wherever you look in the world. Kant did not even think however of how to detach one's mind from the causal relation. Fichte tried to do it, but did not succeed.

So long as you believe in religion you will never understand Ajati. For you will always be thinking that God made this, God caused that, God wishes this, God is behind that--i.e. causality. My prayer is a cause which God may answer as an affect. Take away causality and all religion disappears. Birth and death chastise us: Plato said death makes man philosophic. It frightens him to think seriously and thus prepare way for inquiry.

Ignorance, avidya, is when you do not inquire; when you do inquire, causality drops away. The very persons who advocated indeterminism--Planck and Russell--now say that they cannot get on without causality; hence latter theory may return later. Our position is that what science has

now discovered is true and will not be given up. i.e. indeterminacy is not a temporary theory or guess, but will be confirmed later instead of being dropped. But both Planck and Russell are held back by fear of it, such is the strength of causal notion in human mind.

When the mind is thinking of the individual mountain, river, etc. i.e. the duality; when it thinks that everything it sees is mind, then you cannot have a notion of a cause of the mountain, i.e. non-duality. When you concentrate on the picture you are dual, i.e. you and mountain, or mind and mountain. "When you concentrate more deeply, you hold only mind itself, although still seeing the mountain.

If you say that Drg is the cause of the world as magician is cause of his illusions, then what is the cause of this Drg? Where will this end? There will always be a Drg behind such a causal Drg. No Drg is beyond cause and effect.

The human mind wants causes and thus produces them in imagination. That God created the world is such an imaginative fable.

You cannot use the word "beginninglessness" because your very idea of a series comes from individual instance which imply prior cause.

Kant pointed out that causality is not in the objects we see but in our mind.

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 (M.276) 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.

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.

If matter was the cause of this world, you cannot say matter was without beginning, i.e. eternal. For the world itself is produced, has a beginning; its cause cannot be birthless either if related to it. Similarly if God was the cause, than He stands in the same relation and is either non-eternal or non-existent. Duffers will not dare think so far, hence they try to browbeat thinkers into accepting nonsense in the name of religion or say "you must not ask such questions." We have never seen a beginningless cause. Cause and effect is only an idea of yours; it is not the thing itself.

The mind is really identical with these objects which appear as external. Hence there cannot be a causal relation between them and mind.

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.

At the beginning of Mandukya's Karika it is said mind produces the objects; at the end of karika it says that mind has not produced anything. This appears contradictory. It is so, only because Gaudapada takes a lower standpoint at the first stage and a higher one at the final stage, when he has disposed of the notion of causality and consequently shown that nothing is caused or produced. Everything is then always the mind.

We are slaves to the thought of causality.

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.

The mind is possessed by the devil of causality; therefore you have trouble and difficulties. Give up causality, and you shall have the One.

So long so you are under causality you will have false idea that the Drg becomes Drsyam.

Unless the mind thinks, no objects can be seen. Why should the mind think? This question implies existence of causality: that has been proved a delusion, so the question falls to ground. Yet people ask why trouble yourself to think deeply! Without such deep thought we should be forever puzzling over this and similar questions, which in the light of truth, totally vanish.

Vast number of arguments, religious and metaphysical and scientific, collapse when you know the truth of non-causality. Proofs based on causality are suited to intellectual children.

Determinism in classical physics: We can measure the energy in a cause and in an effect, i.e. that a certain thing produces a particular effect. Newton said that all happenings are completely determined and with certainty. This means that man's will is not free, that materialism is true. The quantum theory has upset this theory of determinism and says that certainty has vanished, and probability, or averages has replaced it. This weakens or demolishes the law of causality. Science can now describe only, not explain. Explanation depends on causality, on the "how." Description merely says what happens during the process.

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.

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.

We know that certain sense-impressions are there. We call them laws, or indicate them by the term "law" which is used to describe relation or connection between one thing and another.

Causality can never be established as a law because we cannot know the whole of the process, which follow each other; therefore you cannot know the truth about causation.

In the world of practical things you have causality, but not in the world of ultimate truth.

Those who say we pray and get rain, have yet to prove the connection between both.

The Vedantins first resolve is not to tell a lie. Therefore when he knows that nobody has seen God create a world, he will not agree and regards it as a falsehood. He knows moreover that the idea of a cause is an assumption. Any Vedantic school which introduces God or Brahman as causal is talking rubbish, and not Vedanta.

Some people who come into prosperity, attribute it to God's blessing: others to their own effort or mere chance. Therefore the ascription is purely a matter of mentality. Philosophically we can trace no causal relation between God and good fortune: It is entirely a creation of the human mind, mere speculation.

The human mind is so strongly attached to causality that even sensible authors like G. Patrick fights for it and says it is likely to come back in science! The reason is that he cannot understand the non-causal theory.

If you say there must be a cause for human moral progress we ask, what is it that makes you think or will this progress? If God, why did He get such an idea? This leads to unanswerable questions ad infinitum.

Belief in causality belongs to mental childhood. As you grow out of it you begin to see that there is no question of a God as creator, because there is no such thing as creation.

99.9% of people believe in the truth of causality merely because such belief is necessary for practical life. Only one person in a million can keep his mind steady on the level of highest philosophical thought and dispel the illusion of cause. Hence 99% of books on Vedanta close with Vivartavada, there is no discussion of Ajativada.

Who saw God creating? Not a single witness. Therefore the honest man will say, "I do not know" whereas those who are not really honest thinkers will believe in His creation of the universe.

Why should there be a First Cause. That is the philosophical position. Why did God create this world? No satisfactory answer is given. If God produced the world, who produced Him? The truth is we have merely imagined Gods according to our likings. And if you introduce Satan as the cause of evil and suffering, we ask "Who created Satan?" If God, He is wicked, if not, then God is impotent and powerless and we had better pray to Satan, not to God.

Everything in this world is the result of cause and effect, but when you try to trace any cause to its ultimate cause, you find that to be impossible.

Only he who has the intellect to grasp the meaning of what is termed causal relation can realize the highest philosophical truths. And in that philosophy--not theology--cause is a fiction from the standpoint of pure truth, though a fact in the merely practical world. How many in the West are prepared to admit it, in spite of their advanced knowledge of science? Just now, a few are making guesses at it.

Vedanta asks "What in the end, is the difference between cause and effect? It answers, "None, Causality is an illusion."

Man unconsciously superimposes his own imagination on reality. This he does this when he says "God willed this or willed that." He is accustomed to willing in order to do anything because he is a human being, and imagines God also must needs will in order to bring about effects. This is what we called anthropomorphism.

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.

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.

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.

Whether things are causally connected or not is an assumption.

Ultimate causes, first beginnings, nobody knows: how did the first rose-tree come into existence? Nobody can answer. All we can know are effective causes i.e. those which are immediately responsible.

Science acknowledges that it does not really know how the seed becomes a plant, how the union of oxygen and hydrogen become water; it can only describe what happens i.e. a succession of events, "a collocation of antecedents and consequents," in J.A. Thomson's phrase, not a series of causes and effects.

The laws of science have only temporary and partial validity, after all. The universe will 'run down' and enter pralaya: where will then be the scientific 'foretelling' of what will happen to comets, planets and stars? That is why Vedanta philosophy alone can give permanent solutions, because it goes the whole way in inquiry.

Those who want to know the beginning of things of the universe must go only to religion and mysticism, where you can imagine as you like. Both science and philosophy know that such knowledge is impossible. There can be no creation out of nothing.

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.

Scientists are questioning causation nowadays. But we admit that without it there would be no practical life. So we make it clear that the principle of non-causality does not belong there but only to the realm where we seek ultimate truth.

You seek a cause for what appears in the conscious world, because you live in the causal world, and so have to place it in the unconscious. But the philosopher goes beyond the world of causes, knowing that however far the psychologist goes in his inquiry he will never arrive at any ultimate cause, and having unveiled the very desire of cause as a preexisting tendency of the mind.

What is the meaning of causality, How does one thing produce another? These are questions which philosophy raises but science is not compelled to touch.

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.

The objects produced by the mind can be seen, but the mind itself cannot be seen. Thus the mind, which imposes the snake on rope can never be seen. If you see any world, there must be an Atman. If you see thoughts there must be a thinker, there must be something on which ideas rest, something permanent and unchanging as their-support. In dream the substratum of your dream universe is the Mind so long as you have objects perceived there must be a perceiver. Suppose nothing, not even Atman existed, how would you see the world? Buddhist Nihilists say only ideas exist; but while they say it, there is a thinker or a knower who makes the statement. Ideas cannot exist without the cause of ideas.

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.

In scholastic philosophy there is the doctrine of Final Cause which puts the ultimate intention of God as the cause of all previous work done by him. Like a father chastising his son to produce the final cause of the son's later virtue. This puts effect before cause. It means that God, like an architect, has a plan for life and the final fulfillment of this plan is the real cause of the incidents and events which earlier form a part of it.

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 (Man.259). 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.

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 nonduality is there escape from this infinite and inexplicable regress.

The Samkhya school says everything you find in the effect is already pre-existent in the cause. But you get the contradiction that the same cause forever remains a cause, as no new effect is produced. You can only say "What is, is." No. It is your imagination which is responsible for such a theory of causality, not the thing itself. And who produced the first cause to account for this cause? There is no end to this series, to this kind of argument, which must therefore be wrong. If God has (created) caused all other things who caused (created) God? This problem can never be solved satisfactorily because the doctrine is wrong.

As the whole human mind thinks only in terms of causality as practical life wholly deals in relations of cause and effect it would be impossible for anyone to understand Vedanta, without understanding its most important principle of Causelessness. Hitherto it was most difficult for us

to teach it and others to learn, but fortunately now science has come to our aid and is hinting at the same thing.

Science is now coming near to the Vivartavada theory; that God created apparent world like magician creating rope trick, whilst remaining unchanged himself.

All you can say is that "I noticed this thing previously," You dare not say it is therefore a cause."

We do not know that the world is progressing; we only say or believe so. It may be retrogressing.

Causality operates only in the drsyam, not in the drik. But when the drsyam is fully inquired into, it becomes the Drg. Max Planck is Europe's greatest scientist because he has inquired more fully than others and seen this point is true of substance, Unity and is thus approaching the drik. The truth revealed by full inquiry is ajati.

Every moment causality faces us; how to reconcile this with Ajati? Reply: Inquire: when you know Atman you are everywhere. Hence there is no motion. Again, a Gnani will not see a second thing as separate from him.

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.

Production, birth, arisal, creation, changes have meaning only in the realm of drsyam.

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.

Whatever you see is only a drsyam, a drsyam is an idea, ideas come and go, and you can say that one idea is the cause of another, but cause never appears in the Atman.

Is the cause the same as the effect? Is the seed the same as its effect, the tree? No--you must admit there is a difference between them. This is one view. It is followed by the Nayyayika and Vaiseshika schools. But another school says, nothing now is produced, the effect is the same as the cause, all this in the tree must have existed previously in the seed. This view is similar to the Vivartavada theory but is the Sankhya position. We say both views admit causality and are based on it. Thus both views succeed in refuting each other and unconsciously support our view, that there is no causality at all.

The most important question in science and philosophy, started by Hume, is dealt with and answered by Advaita. It is the question of causality, Advaita shows that causality is only your imagination: it is only in the drsyam but it will never affect the drik. This is irrefutable, Kant says that causality was in the mind and not in the thing-in-itself. This is not a question which appeals to ordinary minds because they are deep-rooted in causal belief and never dream that it is other than true and real. Even Eddington who sees that causality may be doubtful, still wavers.

We say causality is true of drsyam but not of the drik, whereas the causal views of Sankhya and Vaiseshika are not only mutually refutable but latter apply causality both to drsyam and to the Drik.

The fullest semantic investigation is most necessary to uncover the delusiveness of causality. The most acute thinking is needed for this, however, and hence the difficulty of getting people to understand that causal vocabulary will not bear philosophic analysis. Nor is it enough to think half-way; the thinking must also be sufficient, go to the end. Thus HUME, MILL AND KANT saw the fallacies and absurdity of causality but did not pursue the investigation to the bitter end.

Western Science view that water is only hydrogen and oxygen in another form is the same as the Sankhya school view in India.

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)?

The meaning of Sanyas is that you are asked to give up all the nonsense based on causality, the false ideas that through religious, ritual or yogic practice you can attain Brahman.

Give us the meaning of cause. What is meant by creation? How can production occur out of nothing? These questions must be asked so that people may discover the tyranny of words and illusiveness of the word "causality." Ordinary people never inquire into these statements; if they did they would find that the words had no meaning.

Neither those who say what is in the cause is produced in the effect nor those who say what is not in the cause is produced in the effect, is correct. Both are wrong. When you take the trouble to analyze the meaning of production (causation) deeply, you find it is without meaning at all.

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.

We begin by saying Drik and Drsyam are different. We end by saying they are the same, i.e. non-duality. Similarly we begin by allowing causality in the Drsyam but not in the Drik, but ultimately we show that every thing is Brahman, the Drsyam is merged into Drik and therefore there is no causality anywhere.

The Sankhya view that cause and effect are really the same, that latter exists in former, we answer: Why do you use a different word if the effect is non-different? Why not call tree a seed? Again, if they say that the effect was somehow present in the cause, then we reply that it was already different. You ought to use the same name. To the Nayyayika and Vaiseshika views that something new has come we reply: "From where has it come: the implication is that it came out of nothing! How can anything be born out of nothing? It is absurd. (The Nayyayika and Vaiseshika schools imply that the effect is different from cause).

If something new has been produced by sowing a seed then this is equal to producing something out of nothing. But this is impossible. Therefore this Nyaya and Vaiseshika view collapses.

No botanist can ever tell you at which moment a seed became a tree or at which moment an embryo became conscious. Therefore the word "birth" is delusive because such a moment of birth cannot be found, so we say whatever exists, exists always. The Mind exists always, whether it becomes a lion, a sheep, a lion eating a sheep, etc, there is no real birth of lion and sheep.

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.

Mahabharata says that Brahman is uncreated: this means it is (a) uncaused, and (b) without any causal relation with anything such as the world.

There can be no meaning to the word "cause" if there be not an effect beside it, either before or after. It can't be taken alone. It is one of the two horns of a dilemma.

If you use the seed and plant argument, we reply: Show which came first, i.e. which is the real cause? You say, we cannot! For the relation is without beginning, seed-plant-seed, again plant ad infinitum. But Vedanta replies the tree is different from the seed and must have had a beginning. Similarly the seed too must have had a beginning as it is different from the plant that preceded it. On the other hand, the seed cannot be separated from the plant which is found attached to it in early stages. So that you cannot prove either way that there is a beginningless cause or that there is a beginningless effect; how then can you prove a Creator as First Cause? Therefore Vedanta says all evolution or creation is unproved; we know only Ajati.

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. (M. 268) 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.

Science deals only with immediate causes, not the ultimate cause. Such process is on the vyavaharika plane, good for practical philosophy.

Our position is not that we have established non-causality, it is that there is no proof of causality. There is a difference here. Similarly science now says we do not know whether there is causality or not.

All those religionists, mystics and metaphysicians who start with the assumption of an unborn uncreated First Cause or of a similar element which has emanated or created the world, enunciate

something which exists nowhere in anyone's experience--the birth of an effect from an unborn cause.

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.

Causation exists for those who go on imagining about creation and who have no idea of truth. For religion is dependent on imagination.

FINAL CAUSE is the purpose or motive for which you build a house, i.e. for living in a shelter and using the rooms appropriately.

The mind being identical with its constructs which are the objects, there is really no causal relation with them.

Science sees the great difficulty involved in accepting causality and hesitates uncertainly between acceptance and non-acceptance. Hume and Kant as philosophers went further and showed causality to be but framework of the Mind.

If you can use the word "cause" only after the effect is born, the latter must come into existence first. The word "cause" cannot be used in the absence of an effect. So you must inquire deeply as to what you mean when you use the word "effect." But few will undertake this troublesome task.

It is not possible to have any meaning for the term "cause" unless you have an effect also present; and vice versa. They have no consistent meanings in themselves. Therefore it is impossible to say they are beginningless. This has special reference to doctrine of Atman, karma and rebirth, (Mandukya P.259) if applied by Sankhya school, when it becomes fallacious.

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.

You won't think of a potter unless you have pots before you. Therefore the effect is there before any cause. How can you think of a cause of the world when no world was there (before creation). Therefore if you think of God as cause, as creator, then he is non-existent. Until the world comes into existence God is not a cause. You may have a God but you cannot have a "cause" as God. Those who do not want to trouble to think about causation delude themselves with imaginations about creation.

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!

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.

The realist position is that a cause, an external object, produces the effect, an idea of the object in my mind. But analysis shows that a cause cannot be defined as outside the effect. Let realist show something that is the cause of the external object, for it is only the mind again that tells us of it. Such a further cause he cannot show. Always the idea of the object is on the same level as the object itself, because we know the latter only through mind also. Hence no cause can be found for the object (unless the mind be named as cause). Every external thing is seen by your mind. Other than mind you have no cause for it, but through ignorance you infer, i.e. imagine, a cause.

Everybody wants an explanation to be given subject to his own complexes and predilections; so he demands explanations based on a delusion, viz. causality.

Vedanta is not concerned with "What is the history of the world?" It is concerned with, "What is the truth of the world?"

If God is the universe's creator, we reply, Why should He not keep quiet? Why should He take all this trouble to make a universe? No.--you construct God and His plans according to your imagination.

All creation stories are fables. They depend upon faith. What man could have seen what was before human race started?

The notion that the stars drive you to do this or that is a cock and bull story. Such astrology is fit for primitive men.

The argument that every table implies a carpenter, hence every world a creator is fallacious. All tables we have seen made have been made by visible carpenters. Hence we may infer that a new table was made by a carpenter: but nobody has ever seen a world made by a visible creator.

These religionists, dualists, Ramanujists, etc. start with the presumption that God must have a material to work with, out of which to make the universe.

Vedanta supports all the stages of doctrine about world creation according to the capacity of man. But for the intelligent we give the highest stage--pure Advaita. Those who can't grasp this may take the nearest which is Vivartavada theory. Thus if a man knows only Marati language, you use Marati in speaking to him; if a man understands only French, you converse or teach him in French too. The Vedantin adapts his speech or writing according to the stage of his audience. But left to himself the Vedantin thinks everything is non-dual Brahman, adopts Ajativada, and deserts dualistic Vivartavada. So long as there is an idea of causation, the highest you can reach is Vivartavada which says the Drik produces the drsyam. When this idea disappears as you perceive there is no causation, you can reach Advaita.

Vedanta does not say that God did not create; it simply says there is no proof that there is a creation; show me. We can see none.

The Vivartavada theory is given for those who cannot rise to Ajativada, because they believe in objective world, God and causation.

PANCHADESI:

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.

Panchadeshi 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!

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).

Panchadeshi says: "If a person cannot undertake the study into the nature of Brahman, either through a dull intellect or through want of accessories for such inquiry, he must be constantly engaged in the meditation on Brahman." The term accessories here means "Teacher who knows Brahman, i.e. Guru.

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.

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."

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.

Page 141:v.12-13 deals with the uselessness of Samadhi.

P.232: last line "The difference between an ignorant man and a wise man is the existence of a doubt in the former and its destruction in the latter."

P.233: As regards bodily and sensual activity, there is no difference between the gnani and the ignorant man. You cannot distinguish former from latter because he does not permit such distinctions to appear. Only pretenders show such external works or claims. People who do not understand the spirit of Vedanta generally misinterpret all Upanishadic, Gita's etc. references to the 'indifference' of the sage as meaning sitting idle, remote from worldly concerns.

P.289.V.97: "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.

P.293: The seeker should after acquiring proper knowledge should fix his attention. At every moment seek opportunity to train the mind into this new way of thinking (Gnana Yoga). Otherwise it is impossible to realize.

P.297: 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.

P.299 says "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.

P.302 v.131 shows that Gnani acts and works in the world like others. V.132; You ought not to judge gnanis by conventional or supernatural morality.

P.355 V.285: Whilst misunderstanding the doctrine, people must not know that the gnani differs from them or various troubles will arise. So he tries to be one with them. Moreover it encourages seekers to believe that attainment is not so difficult after all.

P.411.V.20 shows reason is essential. It means that you keep and use scriptures until you are able to inquire and think for yourself.

P.414, v.119: The point here is that even wicked men and brutes are regarded as included in unity of mankind.

P.415. v.30: Inquiry (Vichara)= Reflective thought, in philosophy.

P.416 V.32; 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.

P.418: v.43: Obstacles to realization are inherent in defective mental capacity, in attachment to worldly objects, in strength of egoism. All obstacles must be overcome to gain realization, not only one or two. Logic is true when it knows its limits, which are being confined to (a) drsyam (i.e. from one thing you can infer another) (b) waking state. False logic is when it tries to deal with (1) the three states, and (2) the Drik. In this latter field, we must use a faculty higher than logic, which is reason. Non-Aristotelian logic is a glimpse of the limitations of ordinary logic and an attempt to escape from it. However the attempt is only partial because it ignores avastatraya.

P.430: The difference between knowledge and meditation is that former depends on what is seen (drsyam) and inquired into, whereas the latter depends on the yogi's own feelings and thoughts.

P.435: V.91: It is only the yogi who is striving to control his mind, who refrains from worldly duties, through fear of being distracted from inner life.

P.436: V.94: 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.

P.511: v.113: The idealistic nature of world was usually kept secret because people cannot understand it and therefore they will regard its advocates as partly insane.

P.580 V.81: 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.

P.94: Everything perceptible to the senses can be given up as not Atman, in the world of Drsyam--(going is the characteristic of Drsyam); but the Drik is always there. If you think of the body, you are thinking of yourself as Jiva, if you think of yourself as the entire universe, then you are Iswara. If you are not thinking of objects you are Brahman. You are thinking of yourself as limited. Everyone with thought can see that he is not limited. Birth and death are seen only in the objective world; you cannot say in truth that they are characteristic of the subject I or you.

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 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.

Page 141, Verse 12: without inquiry into the universe it is impossible to get Truth.

P.320 v.180: You may see the world as unreal without destroying it.

Panchadesi belongs to the fifteenth century.

Page.214, verse 216: Lokayatas = materialists.

P.179: By an investigation into their value you may convince yourself of the illusions of the external objects.

V.108: re: occult powers. v.116 re. mystical or religious meditation as form of suggestion. This is simply being asked by so called guru to imagine you are Brahman.

Page 449 V.132 points out that Yoga (original Sanskrit term in text) is for those whose minds are too distracted to study Brahman; i.e. philosophy.

P.234 V. 270-71 forcibly points out that Gnani does not remain indifferent ascetic and inactive.

Page 511, 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.

P.448 Verse 131: The meaning is that not only those yogis are deluded who meditate on a personal God (Saguna Brahman) but even those who meditate on impersonal God (Nirguna Brahman) when they regard it as apart from or outside of themselves.

P.142 V.14: After you know the unreality (ideality) of the world through yoga-trained perception, the world can then be lived in as an householder.

Vidyaranya who wrote Panchadesi was a Gnani. He did something. He inspired and made a king who founded the Vijayanagar empire. Ramdas did the same as Shivaji's guru. A Gnani must act

in some way for the benefit of the world. That is of high importance. That is what the Upanishads inculcate.

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.

One who names himself an Advaitin is not the same as one who knows the truth of Advaita, non-duality.

SRIMAD BHAGAVATAM (continued)

Where Srimad Bhagavatham, says "He should not take pupils" applies only to him who is still undergoing discipline, not to him who has finished it.

“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.

“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.

SANSKRIT TERMS :

ADVAITA: Non-duality. This word has been wrongly translated as Monism or as Oneness. But you can think of a unity that is a sum of many parts or you can think of it as partless. Which is correct? Moreover as any word used has a meaning, and a meaning is an imagination, this is not the truth of Advaita. Hence numberless misconceptions have arisen about this term.

AJATI: Non-causality.

AJATAVADA: the causelessness of things.

AJNANA: Doubt, hence ignorance: Those who do not know Truth go on imagining as they like, about God, creation etc. This is real meaning of ignorance.

ANANDA: the highest satisfaction, hence it is often called bliss.

ANUBHAVA: has two meanings. The first is unVedantic, and is used in the sense of "my anubhava is this" meaning my experience or realization. This is ruin of Vedanta, being mystic and egoistic. If you feel or say you know Brahman, you are self-deceived. The I cannot know it. c.f. Lao-Tse. The true anubhava is universal. Hence nowhere is Upanishads you find "I know." Instead they write "It is said." Whoever talks of his knowledge knows only names i.e. words. Philosophically it means to be Atman but practically it means experience.

ASANA: (philosophical meaning) keeping the mind steady in Brahman.

ASPARSA: Literally non-touching. Everything is related to or in contact with something else, i.e. "in touch with" whereas in this Asparsa state there is no such possibility of a second, no contact, because everything is Brahman. Hence its rational meaning is "non-dual" because when there is nothing to touch, there is then no second. Moreover when the individual soul does not exist separately, there is nobody who is to touch. Pundits and other people can only interpret difficult Sanskrit words, like this according to the light of their own experience, which is usually most limited.

Not in touch with any second thing, untouched by duality.

Literally that which does not come into touch with anything. Free translation--that which is uncontradicted by anything.

AHAM: 'I' (not I am)

AHIMSA: It originally meant "Do not be aggressive to others. Do not be violent to others. Do not go out of your way to harm men or animals." This has been misinterpreted by Gandhi. He has turned this into non-fighting under all conditions. It is quite right to fight in self-defense or to protect others who are being attacked, however, so he is wrong.

AVASTHA: state.

AVIDYA - Ignorance: means I do not know. It is a fact, not a mystic power (in one sense Maya is Avidya)

ATMAN; This word has no true equivalent in English language, because the idea of it has not risen. The West has the idea of the self or soul, but these are individual whereas Atman is that which sees the self or soul, where you understand that Atman is also Brahman, the difference of names does not matter; but where the student his not yet grasped this point, the difference should be kept up.

AHAMKARA: Egoism.

ANTAHKARANA: Minor organ of mind.

BRAHMAN: Brahman has no equivalent whatever in English as it has never been thought of in the West. Do not confuse the word "Absolute" with Brahman. "Absolute" is opposed to "relative", whereas Brahman is opposed to nothing, to no second thing. The Absolute, says Hegel becomes the universe. This is ignorance from our standpoint. Brahman has not become anything that would involve change. The best translation therefore is "non-duality". It also means the 'non-limited' or the 'indescribable.' Brahman is that of which we can form no idea whatever, to which we can ascribe no meaning and which therefore is beyond the reach of thinking. Hence there is no Western equivalent word.

Just as all names, i.e. sounds are indicated by the single word Aum, because it is based on the natural mouth formations, so all imaginable things, objects, themselves rather than their names, as well as that which is beyond them, are indicated by the word Brahman, are symbolized or comprehended by it.

In Sanskrit literature the word Brahman is philosophically used in neuter gender as "It." But when the language comes down to religion the Brahman is referred to as "Him."

BUDDHI: includes the exercise of careful and critical examination of facts, exposing error.

Reason should not be interpreted to mean intellect. Reason is that which finally distinguishes between real and unreal, false and true, and therefore it takes all the three states into account. Until that is attained people generally use only intellect (manas) which is confined

to waking state only. Intellect (manas) evolves into Reason (Buddhi) as man realizes that study of the waking world is not enough, and that study of all the phenomena of mind, consciousness is required. Such study must embrace dream and sleep; hence there is no perfection of reason without Avastatraya study.

Buddhi literally means 'that which distinguishes the ultimate reality from the rest.' When such discrimination between truth and falsehood by the method of reasoning is confined to the empirical plane, it is intellect, logic, but when extended to the philosophic plane it is reason.

Buddhi is that which enables you to distinguish the real from the unreal, true from false. The West does not clearly know the difference between intellect and reason: consequently the Indian translators of "manas" and "buddhi" are confused and give erroneous interpretations. CHITTA (and Manas) both refer to different functions of the Self for the time being. When you are talking or when you are dreaming, then you are thinking. That is why I prefer to use the term Manas in such connection rather than Atman, although ultimately it is Atman.

CHITTA is memory function.

DRIK: Witness (same as Sakshin).

GNANA. Knowledge which is contentless, whereas Vidya is the ordinary dualistic knowledge. Europe has no idea of the first definition of it as yet. "Intellect" is a dangerous word to use as a translation of Gnan. For instance Einstein has a tremendous intellect; I can follow his mathematical equations, yet does it mean Einstein possesses Gnan? Certainly not. Gnan is usually translated as "knowledge" but that is because there is no European equivalent. It is more accurately "contentless consciousness" or "awareness" or "mind". Consciousness usually implies something, thoughts or things, but in India we give it in addition the meaning of consciousness per se or awareness without an object, as in deep sleep.

HIRANYAGHARBA: is the name given to Brahman by Vedantic theological philosophy when It is regarded as creator of universe.

The old Hindus imagined that there was a Hiranyagarbha-being who himself imagined the whole universe-thought in his mind. All these--Hiranyagarbas, God, Architect, are themselves the products of human imagination quite unproved and unprovable.

JATI: causality.

KALPANA: the Sanskrit meaning is imagination. But in the word imagination comes a flavor levity and superficiality: hence it is not quite suitable as translation of kalpana. It is more correct to say "mental construction."

KOSHA: sheath, body, really means standpoints or degrees through which one passes and drops on the way to truth. Thus anandakosha is not a "vehicle" or "body" of bliss but the standpoint of seeking satisfaction, which eventually you drop and then pass to seeking truth, the higher standpoint.

KSHETRA: Matter.

KSHETRAJNA: That which sees Kshetra, matter.

MAHATMA: (lit) Great soul, but freely it means "he who sees that the Atman is everywhere."

MAYA: Imagination: You have maya so long as you have the idea of cause, so long as you do not know there is no such thing as change in ultimate reality. When you go into the root of the matter, when you inquire, you find there is only one substance, the Mind! then Maya disappears from view. You ask questions "Why is this" or "What is that" only through your ignorance, i.e. through Maya. When you know that nothing is different from your own mind, then your ignorance goes. The notion that Maya is matter or a magic spell is nonsense.

Maya or Mithya is that which appears to exist but on inquiry, disappears. It is therefore real at first but unreal afterwards, hence we cannot say what it really is, because so paradoxical. Thus Maya is called by the ignorant "mysterious" but it merely means that what we see is our idea.

Maya (avidya) as ignorance means "I do not know." It is a fact, not a mystic power.

Maya does not mean illusion so much as that the world is not what it appears to be; it implies Reality is that which lies behind appearances.

MANAS: is that which thinks, which knows, which becomes aware of: in this sense it is the same as Atman. But its translation is often misleading and leads to confusion with Chitta. Both refer to different functions of the Self for the time being. When you are talking or when you are dreaming then you are thinking. That is why I prefer to use the term manas in such connection rather than Atman, although ultimately it is Atman.

MANDUKYA is the personal name of the sage who wrote the Upanishad.

MUNDAKA: the shaven; implying that this Upanishad is for the study of the shaven-headed, i.e. monks.

MATAM: opinion.

MOKSHA: means truth, but religious people take it erroneously as heaven or as freedom from birth and death.

MOWNA: really means keep quiet in controversial discussions because you do not know what anyone has in his mind and without semantic analysis it is all useless, so silence is better. Philosophically it means thinking constantly of the Drik as against drsyam. Word and thought always imply drsyam, the object, whereas the subject, drik is beyond both word and thought.

MUKTI: putting an end to ignorance, getting knowledge. Emancipation from Ignorance, i.e. knowledge, the absence of doubt. It does not mean emancipation from rebirth.

NIRVANA. (Nir= nothing, ana= else) nothing else, or extinguished.

NIYAMA: Thinking of nothing but Brahman (this is the philosophic interpretation of yogic practice)

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.

PRANAYAMA: in-going breath is "I am Brahman" outgoing breath is negating universe. This is the philosophic interpretation of yogic practice.

SAKSHIN: Drik, the witness.

SAMADHI: seeing sameness of Brahman everywhere. This is philosophic interpretation of yogic practice.

SAMSKARA: tendencies and capacities derived from previous birth.

SAMA-GNANA= that which knows the whole of world as one element in constant change. It is often mistranslated as intuition.

MAYA: is derived from YA, MA, meaning "that which does not exist." For world is self-contradictory, when you try to catch it, it is not there; it has already passed away, it is not the same thing. We cannot say this is the thing I saw before.

MAYA means (1) knowledge derived, through the senses, or (2) as in Gita Shakti, creative energy.

AVIDYA simply means if you do not inquire into the meaning of the world, nothing more, nothing less, nothing mystical.

NIRVIKALPA - without ideas.

KALPANA - idea.

VEDANTA - end or Vedas i.e. after man has gone through all scriptures, he starts the ultimate path to truth at the end.

AVIDYA - to know by analysis that whole world is Mind. Not to know this is Avidya.

PARAMATMAN: that self which is everywhere.

SANKHYA has got two meanings (a) The Sankhya system of metaphysics. (b) speculative inquiry into various metaphysics.

AVIDYA - Ignorance of the fact that the phenomenal world is only an idea.

ATMAN - Most Indian Pundits wrongly use the term Atman in a religious sense, making of it an individual Soul.

ATMAN. The word "mind" has been translated as "manas". Europe has no idea of Atman. Therefore the West uses word "mind" for Atman. All this causes confusion when Westerners study Indian thought.

PRAKRITI - Matter.

MAYA - appearance.

DRSYAM : object. Indian philosophy sets up two classes of objects (a) objects of the senses (b) objects of mind. The first are called external and the second internal.

SHRADDHA: desire to seek truth.

MAYA : mental concept : value of a dream.

GNAN: essence of thought.

SAT: - "existence" or "reality"; both these lead to confusion in translations. In snake-rope story, a thing may be perceived and yet not exist.

ASAT: - "mirage" or "barren woman's son": two different meanings but translated by one English word 'illusion.'

VEDANTA: Veda originally meant knowledge; hence Vedanta means end of knowledge. What is that? To live a perfect life in this world.

BRAHMAN -The English use of the word real as applied to material world, whereas we Indians use it as applied to unseen Brahman. Hence much errors have arisen in translations from the Sanskrit.

BRAHMAN- The word Brahman or Sat has no proper equivalent in English. The nearest is ultimate reality. The Europeans however apply reality to individual objects or to the multiplicity of them all: whereas we apply it to the non-duality. Brahman is called "That" because it is something not known yet by the seeker.

DRIK: - The perceiving mind; something which knows, which says there is or is not consciousness; so long as you think there must be a thinker; something which is aware of.

AJNAN: is 'doubt' in the sense of "I do not know the meaning of this world." and "I wonder at the grandeur of Nature." The primitive removal of doubt is either by superstition or faith. How did this world sun and moon come? Through spirits or God; how did small-pox come? Through a goddess or God?

SARVAM is much misunderstood. The mystics and pandits interpret it as meaning everything in life is maya, whereas we say it is that everything is to be interpreted, explained, known.

SAT: is usually mistranslated by the word truth, which is a gross error, it means reality. The two are not to be confused.

SATYAM: Truth.

SATYA-SATYAM - Highest truth.

SHRADDRA means perseverance whilst you are working on the path rather than mere faith.

Shraddha may mean faith in religion to a pious person or firm conviction to a philosopher. Both are correct, according to context.

SIDDHA - (perfect man) - whose mind is absorbed in Brahman.

TAT TVAM ASI: is the greatest formula given in Upanishads. It refers to the common I in all beings, the one Self. Everyone uses the term I. It is nearer than anything else. Only ego stops its perception.

"That" refers to the universe: it means that Brahman which is everywhere is everything.

TRAYA : three

TRATAKA: whatever is seen, is regarded as perfect Brahman.

TAIJASA: is the Atman of dream experience, mental objects or forms conceived internally.

TURIYA means not only that which sees the three but also all three put together, making a fourth. It is Turiya that appears as sleep etc. All these three ideas of different states appear and disappear in you: you are the fourth or the whole.

Turiya means "Always-seeing" or "always-knowing." It is not a stage, except for ignorant Pundits.

VEDANTA: I claim the right to interpret the word Veda not alone as "scripture" but also to include other nonreligious learning. Hence Vedanta means not the end of scriptures but "the end of knowledge."

VICHARA: is translated by Mystics as "pondering over the truth of revealed scriptures" This is religious rubbish. Buddhi is translated by them sometimes as "conscience" which is equally rubbish.

UPASANA: translated as practice of meditation, in the text means fixing the mind on one line of thought and keeping off all other thoughts. It is concentrated reflection. It means the practice of yoga to gain this concentration, and then attend to the thought of truth. It does not mean emptying mind of all thoughts, for you keep one thought.

BUDDHI:=Discrimination power to think acutely.

AVIDYA: You are said to be in ignorance so long as you do not want to think, so long as you are content with accepting appearances and believing what you read or hear. For such persons the fanciful creation-stories or religion are given. In Avidya you do not know the truth and have the fears which go with ignorance.

VEDANTA: means that which comes at the end of religion, because at the beginning you have rites, prayers and sacrifices to an imagined God; philosophy comes after you have finished with all that.

ATMAN= when mind does not run after objects.

MANAS= when mind goes out to objects. But objects are ideas.

So many persons have wrongly translated "Buddhi" as intellect. It is not. It is reason, which is higher than that. Similarly "manas" should not be translated as mind, because to Europeans, the latter means all the functions of the mind, whereas to Indian philosophy manas is only that function of the mind which co-ordinates all the sensations, and no more.

SRIMAD BHAGAVATAM: and "LAST MESSAGE OF KRISHNA"

The object of the author of Bhagavatam, let us try to understand. We have to hear him to the end. Why has he introduced the story of the Gopis in a book which is intended to teach the truth about Atman or Paramatman? The motive or aim of the author is revealed by a complete reading only. Krishna with Gopis--his revealing his qualities to his Gopala friends. Krishna exercised his supreme yogic powers and chose to sport, which itself gives a hint that there was something extraordinary or unreal. "Unperceived by one another" (Gopis) in their attempt to meet Krishna: the very thought of Krishna was so entrancing to each of the Gopis. Suddenly the thought of Krishna came (while milking, serving food, suckling child,--all dropped, eschewed their own food). Look at the thought. What is the meaning of all this? If they could not go to Krishna's presence they simply "closed their eyes in contemplation." This indicates there was at least the thought of a person--"a surrendering of mundane bondage, the body of the three gunas was left behind, though under the notion of a paramour." All this is explained in Dasama Skanda, 47th chapter, in terms of Avastatraya, c.f. Chap. 33 Verse 36 and 37: "The men of Vraja never found fault with them (their wives) because they were always with them, although they were with Sri Krishna himself. The motives of Rasa Leela is to emphasize that intense devotion to God leads you to the highest c.f. "sugar-coating" a pill just to camouflage the bitterness. If you talk of Paramatman being everywhere, people cannot understand.

Suka adopts the method: Kiss Sri Krishna thinking that He is the Paramatman. He wants to emphasize the fact that the highest thing is get rid of this Ahamkara. "Get rid of Aham and enjoy everything." But when the ego goes, who wants to enjoy? (c.f. Chaitanya embracing earth and drinking wine of tears). If you simply say that Aham should go, you would not understand it;

but when it is added that you will get everything, supreme happiness, you will give up Aham, you will follow it.

"If you get rid of Aham, you abide in the Gopis, in their husband's and in all creatures." --where sexual intercourse becomes meaningless. When you think that you are in everything you can, you have only dual sense, where under alone any sex idea can exist?

Skanda 11 Chap.24: When Krishna tells you to prostrate before an ass daily, it is to get rid of your ego.

"I do not seek from the Supreme Lord Moksha attended with the attainment of eight powers or even the absolute release. I would like to be present in all beings and undergo the sufferings for them, so that they may become free from misery. "--Rantideva.

Page numbered refs. to LAST MESSAGE OF KRISHNA:

21. MIND: i.e. the world is an idea. Realism is nonsense.

25. REALITY: the objective world is only an idea.

28. AVADBUTA: They wear no outward clothes and are naked ascetics. The meaning is that true gnani does not distinguish himself externally. Neither nakedness nor showy robes are used by him, but they are used by Swamis to attract the ignorant masses.

46: EXERTION: The man who cannot control his eating desires should discipline himself by taking whatever he gets and not exert him self to go out of his way to get them satisfied. (notes on pp.194-96 added at end).

72: WORK: Karma-(here) religious rituals.

205. BEINGS: Unless a man sees both the manifold and the One he is not a gnani. Do not be misled by the yogis who say gnan is not to see anything at all, which they call Nirvikalpa. Gnan is to see everything yet simultaneously to know it as one substance. It is like seeing table, shelf, door, as such individual entities yet at the same time also knowing they are wood.

207: PHILOSOPHY: Yoga method. Original word "yoga". Note how the translator has falsified the text by failing to understand the meaning of philosophy or by imperfect knowledge of English. This has occurred in other paras also.

210. RELIGION: Original word "Dharma" here meaning right conduct for course of life.

218: KNOWLEDGE: Note that in the ancient times the word "yoga" was given the broadest meaning, for it included gnana-yoga, the way of reason.

WORK original word "karma" here meaning "ritualistic actions or ceremonies." How can any man ever stop work activity? Even opening his eyes is an act. Hence mistranslated.

220. WORLD: realization is only obtainable here, and not in other worlds.

221: BOAT: Hence we never teach people to weaken the body by fasting. A weak body will only give a weak minds yielding foolish talk or else render the pupils more idiotic and more subject to the suggestive or hypnotic power of their pseudo guru.

226: KNOT: the ego, that which prevents Gnana.

DESTROYED: Suppose in dream you kill a man, what is this karma? Only a thought, mind itself. When you know this, what is the difference between an action and the idea of an action? None. Thus you learn that karma is only an idea, all ideas are unreal, and henceforth the gnani need not trouble himself about karma.

240: SACRIFICES: Even today we find Brahmins wasting their time collecting money from other people in order to hold grand sacrifices of sheep or goats with religious rites--mere barbarity.

241. ONLY: All religions that talk of the next world talk nonsense, for such worlds are imaginary.

247. CATEGORIES: There are so many systems of world-explanation that the seeker will get confused for all contradict each other. Here the original word for category is "tattra", which is used differently by Advaita to its common use. For Advaita uses the word to sum up the whole of existence whereas other schools use it to indicate one particular element out of many.

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.

MAYA: When you know the nature of Maya you will not be surprised if people spin out a new theory or new explanation or new system every day.

249. END: The removal of these complexes reveals truth.

EXPONENT: Not according to the matter as it is in itself but according to the imagination of the expounder.

EFFECT: So long as the causal notion persists, so long as we seek for the creator or creative element, we can never hope to grasp advaita. One man says my view is that earth is the first cause, another says, water is the first cause, and so on for 9 to 24 categories or tattvas. Thus they argue because blinded by belief in creation, cause.

250. HOLD: All these various views that here follow are true from their own limited standpoints but are not ultimately true.

261. SELF-FORGETFULNESS: It is the ego that must be forgotten, not Atman.

262. EXTERIOR: Interior and exterior are both constructions of the mind which is well illustrated by dream.

266. THEM: because he identifies himself with his body, not that Atman dances.

273. LEUCODERITA: white leprosy

274. WEALTH: excessive addiction to wealth, too fond of it.

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.

278. KNOTS: Doubts and obstacles.

282. DESIRE: Mind itself is the cause of all its ideas and desires.

290. PERFECTLY: Do not be carried away by what your imaginations suggest. All things are ideas: remain in unity.

PHANTASM: an imagination.

310. SATTVIKA: Sattva prepares and fits a man for philosophy but it does not yield gnan. Sattvik stage is not the highest but a discipline leading to the highest.

320. HOLY: Satsang is useful because the example of a good and wise man tempts one to imitate him.

"MINE": To the extent to which the ego goes down to that extent the man comes nearer the goal.

GIFTS: If they are to be used by yourself, but you may take them if to be used solely for the benefit of others.

348. STATES, GUNAS: both states and gunas see mental, concoctions of the mind.

349. REASONS: reasoning is the most effective way to remove doubts.

353. ILLUMINED: The gnani continues to see things normally but sees them as Atman.

354 YOGA: (Hatha Yoga): useless to get Gnan.

365. Verses 16 and 19 summarize the whole of practical Vedanta, to feel with all other beings, to identify yourself with them.

368. ATHEISTIC: Nastika literally means one who does not believe in Atman; who is prejudiced against the doctrine.

POLITICS: You will know that all these--money, status, etc. are ideas, and as Brahman they will be yours.

194. REGARDLESS: He need not distinguish himself by outward marks.

MOVE: not having merely personal plans referring only to an egoistic life inconsiderate of others, attached: otherwise ego will be there.

195: ENMITY: The object of being born is to know truth, realize Atman. Hatred, enmity, perpetuates duality. Hence he must give it up.

NATURE: As in a dream it is the same Mind that makes all the figures appear, talk and move, so there is only one unchanging Atman appearing as so many individuals.

196. FREE: You are born to know the truth and therefore the body is needed as a means of getting this higher thing, not as a means to mere enjoyment. Suicide is unpardonable. Even those in great physical agony should not kill themselves for it is teaching them every moment not to be attached to the body. Hence although they are not able consciously to reflect on truth they are doing so unconsciously. Moreover it will drive them to seek That which is above body and its pains.

That the duality will not come to an end until man gets the grasp that world is an idea, and that this must be a firm conviction definitely known is plainly told in Srimad Bhagavatam, 7,12,10. Here the word illusion means idea.(Continued)

BUDDHISM:

Buddha was a Gnani, but his interpreters are not.

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.

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 Drik, 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 Drik. How is it that Skandas come together and compose the ego? Who sees them come and go? It is the Drik, the Atman, and this lack Vedanta supplies in the Drg Drsya 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 P.281). The truth of a single reality within or underlying the illusory ego is all-important and without it Buddhism becomes fallacious.

Vedanta admits the transitoriness and evanescence of thoughts just like Buddhism, but not of the Mind which observes this transitoriness and knows it.

Buddhists borrowed from Upanishads because they were Indians. The Vedantins did not need to borrow from Buddhism therefore (see P.396 v.99 of Mandukya Up)

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

Drik, and if you say this Drik itself may be illusory, coming and going, still there must be something non-transient i.e. permanent, to tell you this.

The ZEN Buddhist "Koan" exercises are known and taught in India; only privately and individually.

We disagree with Buddhists (Vijnanavadin) only on the Ultimate question, but we agree with their idealism fully.

Even when you say "I am not" you are thinking. Hence every thought means positing some existence. To exist is to be thought of hence our criticism of Sunyavada which says there is nothing. In saying "There is nothing" they are unconsciously positing something. The thought of nothing is an existence itself. Hence only by refraining from thought can they state their case. The thought itself is an object. The negation of existence is a thought. The presence of an object means duality. Hence this proves that the Sunyavadins never understood non-duality, ie. Brahman.

Buddhism and Bergson agree in thinking that the ego sees itself; they do not admit there is anything that sees the ego: they say there is no proof that any witness exists. When thoughts are there, thoughts become conscious of themselves. Our criticism is that these skandhas which appear and disappear, are drsyam only. Drg Drsyā Viveka must be brought in here.

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.

Ignorant commentators say Sankara and Gaudapada borrowed their ideas from Buddhism. But in Mandukya (page 281) 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.

Sunyavadins say there is nothing, neither matter nor mind: they are nihilists. How do they know mind ceases to exist? Where is the proof. When you know everything is mind, both the changing forms and the underlying substances how can you posit its real change into nothingness? Mind, Brahman always remains really itself because of its nature. We see change every minute but by inquiry into nature of change and cause, we see that it is only when we imagine that there is cause and change.

The distinction between Sankara's Advaita and Vijnanavadin Buddhism is that the former is mentalism i.e. mind is the real, whereas the latter is idealism, i.e. ideas are real. We follow the former.

Buddhism did not graduate its teaching to suit people of varying grades; hence its failure to affect society in Asia.

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.

Buddhists say that a thing exists only for a moment, and if that thing has still got some of the substance from which it was produced how then can they deny that its cause is continuing in the effect; hence its existence is more than a moment. Vedanta is concerned with whether it is one and the same thing which has come into being, or has it come out of nothing.

Even the Sunyavada ultimate of the "void" is really a breath, and therefore an imagination and not truth.

Buddha as a constructive worker committed an error in failing to give the masses a religion, something tangible they could grasp, something materialistic, if symbolic that their limited intellect could take hold of, in addition to his ethics and philosophy. Here Sri Ramakrishna was wiser and gave religion; such as Kirtan, puja etc.--to the ignorant masses, as well as Advaita to those like Vivekananda.

Buddha gave as the central feature of his doctrine the great law of Karma in order to reiterate its ethical meaning. He did more good in this to uplift the people than the ritualists.

I am anxious to visit Japan and see Suzuki and inquire why he has failed to influence the Japanese in practicing Zen, whether it is because Zen Buddhism has degenerated into religion instead of philosophy.

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.

A U M (continued)

states is the cause of the variety of objects in world. Though the sound is one there is variety. As all the sounds can be unified in Aum so the whole of the objects can be unified in Turiya.

A student of philosophy should meditate on the AUM, understanding it to be representing the totality of experience, and all the three states and also knowing that the sound AUM disappears into the soundless.

Why is the lotus flower associated with AUM? The mantra means "All that exists." From all things whatever the sage takes the honey of Brahman, seeing Brahman in each object.

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."

Mandukya. P.90. AUM IF MEDITATED UPON BECOMES A GREAT HELP means that yoga is useful to detach worldly people, to discipline them into making leisure for thought of things higher than more personal worldliness and to foster concentration, thus leading later to higher stage.

AUM has been given a multitude of different meanings by pundits and sastras, so that immense confusion reigns. A learned English knowing Sanskrit Indian scholar has published a book, which devotes many pages of the introductory essay to collecting the thirty to forty various meanings assigned by the scripture to this term by the ancient authorities. His name is Pundit Vihan Lala Mitra, book is his edition of "Yoga Vasista Maha Ramayana." (end insert section on AUM)

Buddhism did not take people to final truth but showed them worthlessness of desire-filled worldly life. It is good as far as it went, but this led to overemphasis on outward renunciation, so here we differ from Buddha. It did not show that Brahman is also in the world.

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.

Buddhist Idealism: speaks only of ideas. What about the knower of these ideas? Buddhist Nihilism does not ask "What is meant by Nihilism? It is a thought. There must be a thinker of this thought.

Buddha kept silent, refusing to answer questions on the ultimate. Therefore he was the wisest man in refusing to commit himself.

Zen is quite alright in mentioning non-duality: it is the nearest doctrine to true Vedanta outside India, but nevertheless it is still inferior because (a) it fails to prove non-duality, (b) it illogically gives koan exercises as a means of attaining That which is beyond attainment, because always here, (c) it talks of insight or intuition to see Reality when sight involves a second thing, duality.

When you say "Nothing is" what is the meaning of "is"? "Sunya" is something which exists: you cannot prove that consciousness does not exist.

I admit that Zen Buddhism gives a high important place to meditation practice, but then so does our Vedanta. The truth is that Zen advocates the necessity of meditation for those of its adherents who cannot grasp the absolute truth.

ZEN BUDDHISM is also on this lower stage of Yoga, because it depends on flashes of Intuition gained by meditation, not by reasoning.

ZEN: My reading of Suzuki's "Zen Contributions to Japanese History" now causes me to revise unfavorably my former good estimate of Zen. It is presented there as largely mysticism, while the present day life in Japan plus China war reveals no trace of Zen influence.

Has the Void a meaning? If so then it is only your imagination.

Buddha gave up yoga after practicing it for six years. He saw it could not yield truth.

Page.70/71 "Buddhism In Translation" by Warren quoted as showing how Buddha gave up his austerities of yoga as impossible and useless. Thus Buddha got enlightenment only after he gave up Yoga. Unless you exercise your Buddhi--reason--there is no chance of getting truth.

Buddhism has not proved the truth of Nonduality. Buddha pointed out unreality of world, we agree. He told people they were foolish to cling to it. But he stopped there. He came nearest to Vedanta in speech but not to Vedanta fully.

ZEN Buddhism Satori is not our highest Gnan, because it comes as flashes, it does not depend on seeing the world, and does not depend upon mental sharpness so much as intuition. Zen Buddhists are only mystics--they do not offer proof. How is their main method different from that of Christian mystics, Hindu mystics, all of whom do not seek to prove by reason, but by "I know," intuition?

NIHILISM, the 'Void' of Sunyavada Buddhism is only a stage. It cannot be ultimate. It says there is really nothing.

The mistake of Hinayana Buddhism is to jump to assumptions where Buddha kept silent.

SELECT WORKS OF SRI SANKARACHARYA.

Hymn to Dakshinamurti: This chapter is a mixture of theology, mysticism, scholasticism and genuine philosophy.

The object of this paper is to show that Maya does reside in the Self and not apart from it.

Mahadeva Shastri's translation of this chapter in his small volume "The Vedanta Doctrine" is far better than this one, and also contains a lengthy commentary by Sureavaracharya.

1).Dakshinamurti: Lord of the south.

read residing as "appearing to exist"

Mirror - The substance of a mirror is quite unaffected by its pictures, even if a large city appears in it, still it is unchanging. So too Mind is unaffected by its idea-pictures.

Bow - bow is symbol of elimination of ego, which is price of truth.

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.

(2) Manifests - This is hypnotism, the suggestion being put into the mind of weaker subjects and the latter taking it up uncritically, seeing the imagined thing to be a reality.

seed - All ideas must have previously existed in the Mind, although latently.

time - This is a clear anticipation of Kant's finding that mind sees world under framework of time and space, i.e. are only ideas.

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.

(3) resemble non-entities: should read as "appear as realities."

Ocean - it is more difficult to cross ocean than land, for you must swim.

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.

(4) hole - each hole symbolizes the knowing capacity of a man or creature individually, but all are animated by the same Mind, i.e. "light of knowledge." If one hole is stopped up, the light remains unaffected, so too One self is immortal even if personality dies. The One will go on living in other persons.

"I know" - The thinking awareness capacity is present in every creature because it is the One mind in them.

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.

(5) Women - because women are emotional and prefer 'intuition' to reason.

"knowledge" should read as "thoughts."

Ignorance: When you know that there is no duality, ignorance goes. And when you do not know what maya is, there is ignorance. And when you imagine time space and cause, there is maya.

"You may recognize a fool by the fact that he talks too freely" ...Sunyavadin Buddhists who say everything is non-existence, we reply: then how do we see, hear, think? ...All these differences, all this multiplicity, all this ignorance which regards the multiplicity as real, is caused by your own thinking.

(6) eclipsed: just as the eclipsed sun is unchanged, although apparently bereft of power and light, so Mind, inner self, is unchanged in the unconsciousness of sleep, although it has withdrawn the 'I' in which it functions.

That which connects all these dream things, that which remembers the dream, that which is not necessarily the ego-I, that is Atman.

7) "I" - The unchanging common self of all, not ego, but pure consciousness.

Symbol:- the Jnana-mudra, also called Chin-mudra. It appears on the paintings of Sri Sankara sitting with his four chelas: also on the monogram of V.S.I.

That which has witnessed my youth, maturity and old age, itself remaining unchanged amid these changes, is the Drik.

(8) All these experiences as father, son, owner, pupil were one and the same Mind appearing differently. All these distinctions disappear in the ultimate truth.

(9) In dream the mountain which is apparently insentient and material, is nevertheless still your mind alone. Whether living or dead, conscious or unconscious thought or matter, all things are appearances of one and the same Mind.

All these distinctions are seen by Gnani as only the Atman.

(10) meaning - The vast importance of Semantics is thus referred to in the final verse.

It is important to question yourself constantly, "What is this wall?." etc. Teaching others helps you to learn because you will have to face their doubts, make these doubts your own and then conquer them for both the pupil and yourself.

APAROKSHANUBHUTI: 'DIRECT REALIZATION'

Verse 96: universe-vanishes as a separate entity.

101. Brahman which is without name or form, is to be reflected on constantly.

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.

105. Whatever thought or thing comes before the mind, and latter wants to be busy and cannot rest, let it come but then practice relating it to the Atman.

106: Tyaga= renunciation.

Every object is regarded as being only mind, thus renouncing the individual form.

107. Mouna= not talking. Think of mind, not objects, as it is in deep sleep. For mind that is active i.e. talking, appears as objects, imagines things, words and thoughts.

108. What can be said when you are asleep? What can be thought when everything is nondual mind?

109. The physical silence practiced by yogis, is a sign of their ignorance. Why? Because they are thinking of tongue and lips, i.e. body and not of Atman. However it is useful to the unphilosophic as a discipline. This verse proves that Hatha yoga was intended only for the ignorant, who are unfit for philosophy.

110. When you have no idea of being separated from the universe, then there is no idea of space.

111. You know the creatures exist only because you think them. But suppose that the mind is not thinking (as in sleep) then there will be no individual creatures at all.
112. Asana= sitting. Philosophically it means sitting, i.e. being fixed in Brahman.
113. Siddhasana signifies the thinking of Brahman as unchangeable.
114. The word 'yogi' was used in old India for various grades, even the highest gnani. The object was to show that even the inferior yogas may lead to gnan.
115. When mind is perfectly balanced, i.e. when it is known as Brahman, it is symbolized by the physical steadiness and spine straight enjoined by Hatha yoga.
116. 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.
117. All are only Mind. Thought should be concentrated on pure Mind alone.
119. Think that all these things are in Me, and I am the Mind. The ignorant Hatha Yogis think of the body, the wiser yogis think of the mind.
122. If you see a pen, think that it is Mind, and keep this practice up.
124. "Samadhi" originally samatva, equal mindedness, hence everything is equally thought of as being Mind.
125. All these 15 practices are meant to be practiced at different stages until they become unnecessary.
129. "Fullness" here means knowing everything is Brahman, not denying its existence or shunning it like yogis.
- 131 to 133 read knowledge for consciousness.
135. Effect. If you take away from the effect all that is new in it, you get the cause left, i.e. if you search for the essence it is always the same--Brahman.
138. Itself -Inquire into what is common to both cause and effect. This is done by eliminating both names and forms.
139. effect - i.e. names and forms.

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.

142. The visible world can be turned into the invisible in one way alone. This is done by turning it into idea.

144. The guru cannot change you; he can direct you.

"DASASLOKEE" OR The Ten-Versed Hymn.

1. Sleep. Both ideas and matter vanish in sleep, which is thus good analogy of drik, but sleep and drik are not the same, even though both are devoid of objects.

uncontradictable - secondless.

2. Society - because these are only drsyam.

yoga - because yoga implies duality.

I and mine - both I and mine are only drsyam.

3. non-existence - sleep is not equivalent to Buddhist Sunya.

4. Pure - secondless as in sleep.

Special realization- all-embracing realization.

6. formless - "formless" is inseparable from form": like all thoughts it belongs to duality.

7. read texts for science.

8. Bliss. - freedom from miseries.

9. Unreal - Drsyam alone suffers whereas drik is free from trouble; but he who thinks non-egoistically can drop this preliminary view and see both are Brahman.

Self-dependent - proof can only be given in the world of duality, not where there is no second thing.

"KNOWLEDGE OF SELF"

verse 52: all - This does not mean encyclopedic knowledge.

wander - this is not to be taken literally.

verses 17,18 &20: read Buddhi instead of consciousness.

SWATMANIRUPANA: or Definition of One's own Self.

1. That master who teaches me what is beyond duality, I salute.
2. That master who teaches the truth which destroys doubts, I salute.
5. This is a lesson of Drg Drsyam. Even when you say "I am not" what is it that says so? It is awareness, the final consciousness.
14. If you insist on using a descriptive word about the indescribable, then the best is "bliss."
43. So long as you have thoughts about truth, so long will you have doubts: so long will you need a Master to clear them.
46. Those that want to prove existence of drik; 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 Drik!
54. read knowledge in place of reasoning.
- established - Philosophy is not needed to know there is duality.
60. You will get back your individual sorrows etc. for there is no such thing as moksha for them, according to such imperfect teaching.
69. ritual - religion. c.f. Gita. Karma does not give knowledge.
93. He who knows each individual object is Brahman asks no more questions about IT.
97. When you feel that you do not know that is Avidya, nescience.
98. anything - even maya, even drsyam, even duality.
101. The sage gains nothing by doing and gains nothing by refraining from doing.
103. Uncontradictably - Only because they support the truth not because they are scriptures.
104. The term 'I' in all the following verses does not refer to body or ego, but to that I which is present in all bodies, all egos, the one Self.
115. ways - Every desire got or granted is still only Brahman that is got or granted.
118. as proved by dream which is devoured by sleep.
119. wicked - The wicked are those who injure others in any way.
121. Kalpa - all these are only ideas.
122. forms. Mind and matter are the same stuff.
124. Disease and death are seen only in the drsyam.
126. All three are seen combined in dream (I am knowledge, known and knower).
129. wrong - Use of thorn right to take out thorn of wrong, then throw both away.
- himself. - Because God is only an idea which is born in me.
136. How are you to know these things? Look at dream. Mind was all the different dream persons.
139. Sentence: meaning=words=ideas. Ideas= mind, Mind= Brahman.
140. sorts - Non-duality is the only state that is free from doubt.
147. It is impossible to learn anything higher than unity, Brahman.
148. desired- If you know Brahman, then every desire is satisfied.

150. The universe has no permanence.

152. Reality - independent of myself.

wonderful - The moment you think everything seen in dream is mind then the whole experience is lit up in a flash.

154. Kaivalya - No second thing.

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?

SRI SANKARA: (27)

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 chela 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.

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.

Biographical anecdotes about his persecution of Jains and Buddhists or of his challenges to self-immolation for the loser of a debate, are all foolish tales invented after his lifetime either by his own followers who took him to be a religious propagator (and not a philosopher) or by his enemies like Ramanujists and Dwaitas.

The Advaitin pundits relate boastfully pseudo-historic stories of how Sankara's school put down, persecuted and exterminated the Buddhists, as though this was something to be proud of. This is because those pundits are mere followers of religion, never having understood our philosophy. However, these stories are either exaggerations or false fairy tales.

Sri Sankara pokes fun at ascetics and points out that all their austerities do not cause desires to go in his "Altar Flowers" Page 205, v.2 P.207 v.4.

Sankara gave religion and scholasticism and yoga no less than philosophy, to India. He was great enough to be able to do so. His commentary on Mandukya is pure philosophy, but many of his other books are presented from a religious standpoint to help those who cannot rise up to philosophy.

North India is the home of mysticism and deification. South India of keen rational truth.

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.

Sankara always traveled. He never lived in a monastery. He simply told others "Build one here" and then left because he was busy spreading his doctrines. I know the other living Sankaras-Kumbakonam, Dr. Kurtkoti, etc. but none of them are Gnanis or have grasped the Gnana-truth. They are religionists.

I do not care where Sankara dies. We are thirsting for his teachings. This is all that matters.

Sankara says you must first know what is before you. If you cannot know that, what else can you know or understand? If you give up the external world in your inquiry, you cannot get the whole truth.

Nearly all Bengal thinkers hold views of Maya which are entirely incorrect and untenable. They do not know Sankara's Upanishad Bashyas, but only the Brahma Sutra Bashya. Sankara wrote his Mandukya commentary on a beautifully situated island called Omkaresvar, border of Indore State, where Cauvery and Narbadha rivers meet. On this island there is also a tomb of Govinda, his guru.

The followers of Sankara nowadays have constituted a religious sect. Thus all movements ultimately degenerate.

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.

Sankara was extremely precise and careful in his choice of words. He was no fool in writing.

Sankara did more than write books or initiate Sanyasins: He brought India into a unity as a nation. He told men: Worship what you wish, remain in your particular religion, but remember also you are part of a larger whole.

Few Pundits have caught the spirit, they are merely fond of his words. For his spirit is that of an appeal to reason, with scripture dragged in as a second and lesser support afterwards.

So many years have passed since Sankara appeared; yet it is very hard to find his true teachings understood anywhere in India today. Why? Because so few could rise to his level. Hence Ramanuja, Madva and others came to supply the common demand.

The story in Sankara's life of going to Benares and occupying the body of another man and then having sex intercourse with his wife, is a cock and bull story hiding the real fact. He had the scientific spirit and when told by Saraswathi the woman that he was talking emptily about sex, being a Sanyasi, he at once went to learn the truth by having actual intercourse himself and thus learning by experiment and observation.

Sankara has used the phrase "the jungle of words." This is his acknowledgment of the need of Semantics.

SUNDARALAHARI: is a sexual poem which has been attributed to Sankara but judging by the style and contents I do not believe this.

Sankara stressed the great importance of freeing our use of words from all ambiguity.

Sankara's work has got two aspects: the vyavakarika and the paramarthika. He gave religious, ritual or dogmatic instruction to the populace but pure philosophy only to the few who could rise to it. Hence the interpretation of his writings by commentators is often confusing because they mix up the two viewpoints. Thus they may assert that ritual is a means of realizing Brahman, which is absurd.

Sankara is the teacher whom I regard as the greatest in India's history because (a) he sought to unify the country by placing his institutions and teaching from North to South and East to West, impressing oneness as a nation on all the people. This oneness is not to be restricted by you to religion for it includes its practical application to life such as politics and sociology; and (b) he accepted and encouraged all the prevailing religions but merely purified them of their immoralities. It is false to say he attacked or persecuted Buddhism. This was an interpretation by pundit-followers who came afterwards and never understood his message. He has never said that a certain caste or community or that Sanyas only could attain Brahman; he always taught universality.

UPADESA SAHASRI which is attributed by some to Sankara may not have been written by him as there is no proof either way. It is of doubtful authenticity.

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.

Sankara himself has warned us not to use ambiguous words, and to practice semantic analysis in his book "Definition of one's own Self." Page 199, v.24 of "Sankara's Selected Works"

Buddha found religion in such a putrid state, with so many vile animal sacrifices, that he attacked religion. Sankara did not seek to destroy religion like Buddha but said "Keep religion, but purify it." He did this because he saw that the masses had to have some form of religion as they were not ripe intellectually for truth.

UNKNOWN AUTHOR "SANKARA ON REASON AND LOGIC."

"Sankara makes a distinction between these two towards the end of his commentary on the Sutra "Drishyate Tu." The words used are "Kevalatarka" and "Sushka Tarka" for logic and "Tarka

anubhavgatvena" for Reason. The efficiency of logic to give Atmalabha is admitted by the denial of the claim of the other. It is interesting to note that the anubhavas cited, on which reasoning is to be conducted, are not yogic experience but the avastatraya given in the experience of all humanity. And he particularly points out that what he seeks to refute in the commentary on "Tarka apratishtanat" is Keval Tarka as an efficient means to realize truth. And if Sankara insists on reasoning based on Sruti it is because the conclusions of Sruti have been arrived at by reasoning on anubhava.

Sankara occasionally uses the word Tarka and Nyaya to mean Reason, sometimes, 'Upapathi'; 'upapathya cha' is used in so many places in the commentary on Mandukya Karika when the reference is to actual facts of observed data, what happens in actual experience, mental phenomena etc.

In a footnote in my book to the Sutra II,1,4, the distinction between logic and reason has been stated thus: "The pramana based on upapathi is yukti. Yukti is therefore the word used for reason. The word Buddhi stands for the mind when it reasons and Yukti for the function of Buddhi. So I think it is better to use the word Yukti for reason or else upapathi."

"Select Works of Sankara" also his commentary on Brihad: "Though I wear these robes of a Sanyasin, it is only for the sake of bread."

Buddhists and Jains did not believe in the Vedic positions, did not accept the scriptures. Hence Sankara had to meet their objections also.

Sankara's Karikas deal with Brahman.

Sankara writes in his commentary to "Brahma Sutras." (Sacred Books of East Series) page 298 Vol.1.) "The highest beatitude is not to be attained by Yoga." Also p.312 he says Samadhi is the same as sleep.

Chap.3.4.50; Sankara's commentary (to Brahma Sutras) shows that the Gnani "should pass through life", not run away from life and should take a middle course between seeking worldly honor and worldly abasement.

BRAHMA SUTRAS:

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.

The doctrine of causality taught in Brahma Sutra is not the same as our highest Advaitic non-causality. It is only a beginning towards that; it says that you do not find in the effect what is not already present in the cause.

The Sutra-Bhashya of Sankara principally deals with the principle of superimposition yet the pundits have not grasped its higher semantic value.

Brahma Sutras begin with the dogma of Brahman but who has seen Brahman? It is a mere empty word like 'x'. Hence it is called a book of religion, not philosophy. It is for beginners who have not yet unfolded discrimination, who believe in creation (i.e. causality) and who have to be raised as Anandagiri the commentator himself writes.

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.

The Brahma Sutras together with Sri Sankara's commentary thereon do not contain higher Vedanta. They are intended for duffers.

Sankara's commentary on Brahma Sutras is not on philosophical basis, but on a religio-mystic one, with appeal to Vedas as final authority. In Brahma Sutra Sankara takes the position that there is another entity outside us, i.e. the wall really exists separately from the mind. This was because Sankara explains in Mandukya that those who study the Sutras are religious minds, intellectual children, hence his popular view point to assist them. These people are afraid to go deeper because it means being heroic enough to refuse to accept Sruti, and God's authority, in case they mean punishment by God. But we say: Keep the scriptures for children, but throw them on the fire for wise seekers.

In Brahma Sutras Sankara takes for granted, assumes that a world was created: He there mixes dogmatic theology with philosophy.

That God created the world is an absolute lie, nevertheless you will find Sankara (in his commentary on Vedanta Sutras) clearly says this! He has to adapt his teachings to his audience, reserving the highest for philosophical minds.

The text of Brahma Sutras is based on religion, dogmatism but in the commentary Sankara cleverly introduced some philosophy. If it is objected that a number of Upanishads are equally dogmatic because they also begin by assuming Brahman, I reply that a few Upanishads do not, but prove Brahman at the end of a train of proof.

Dr. Thibaut's translation of Brahma Sutras in Sacred Books of East must be read cautiously as he has not understood its highest sense, e.g. for Advaita he wrongly puts "Unity" instead of "Non-duality."

BRAHMA SUTRAS: II ADHYAYA, 1 Pada, 3. reads:

"Thereby the Yoga (Smriti) is refuted." Sankara's Commentary: "This Sutra extends the application of the preceding argumentation, and remarks that by the refutation of the Sankhya-smriti the Yoga-smriti also is to be considered as refuted; for the latter also assumes, in opposition to Scripture, a pradhana as the independent cause of the world, and the 'great principle', etc. as its effects, although neither the Veda nor common experience favor these views.--But, if the same reasoning applies to the Yoga also, the latter system is already disposed of by the previous arguments; of what use then is it formally to extend them to the Yoga? (as the Sutra does)-- We reply that here an additional cause of doubt presents itself, the practice of Yoga being enjoined in the Veda as a means of obtaining perfect knowledge; so, for instance, Brihadaranyaka Upanishad II, 4,5, (The Self) is to be heard, to be thought, to be meditated upon.' In the Svetasvatara Upanishad, more over, we find various injunctions of Yoga practice

connected with the assumption of different positions of the body, etc.; so, for instance, "Holding his body with its three erect parts even" etc. (II,8).

Further, we find very many passages in the Veda which (without expressly enjoining it) points to the Yoga, as, for instances Ka. Up. II.6,11, "This, the firm holding back of the senses, is what is called Yoga;" "Having received this knowledge and the whole rule of Yoga" (Ka. Up. II,6,18); and so on. And in the Yoga-sastra itself the passage, "Now then Yoga, the means of the knowledge of truth," etc. defines the yoga as a means of reaching perfect knowledge. As thus one topic of the sastra at least (viz. the practice of Yoga) is shown to be authoritative, the entire Yoga-smriti will have to be accepted as unobjectionable, just as the Smriti referring to the ashtakas.--To this we reply that the formal extension (to the Yoga, of the arguments primarily directed against the Sankhya) has the purpose of removing the additional doubt stated in the above lines; for in spite of a part of the Yoga-smriti being authoritative, the disagreement (between Smriti and Sruti) on other topics remains as shown above. --Although there are many Smritis treating of the soul, we have singled out for refutation the Sankhya and Yoga because they are widely known as offering the means for accomplishing the highest end of man and have found favor with many competent persons. Moreover, their position is strengthened by a Vedic passage referring to them. "He who has shown that cause which is to be apprehended by Sankhya, and Yoga he is freed from all fetters. (Sve. Up. VI. 13). (The claims which on the ground of this last passage might be set up for the Sankhya and Yoga-smritis in their entirety) we refute by the remark that the highest beatitude (the highest aim of man) is not to be attained by the knowledge of the Sankhya-smriti irrespective of the Veda, not by the road of Yoga-practice. For Scripture itself declares that there is no other means of obtaining the highest beatitude but the knowledge of the unitary of the Self which is conveyed by the Veda, 'Over death passes only the man who knows him; there is no other path to go' (Sve.Up II,8). And the Sankhya and Yoga systems maintain duality, do not discern the unity of the Self. In the passage quoted (That cause which is to be apprehended by Sankhya and Yoga) the terms "Sankhya" and "Yoga" denote Vedic knowledge and meditation, as we infer from proximity."

Nonsensical historical statements that Sankara persecuted or murdered some of those who differed from him, have been written by some of his successors. No evidence, no proof has ever been found for this.

Neither Sankara nor any other great men have understood Gnan or True Philosophy as mere speculation or yogic practices or running to the forests etc. They know that the aim of philosophy was - Sarwa Hite Ratah, the happiness for all.

SANKARA lays it down that Vedanta should never be taught for money: only living and travelling expenses may be accepted by the Guru. This is to prevent the mind straying from Atma by desire to hoard wealth through the teaching.

SANKARA says in Mand.P.351 and also in Vivekachudamani, that even women can realize truth if they persist.

"The mind is verily the Atman" says Sankara's commentary on Mandukya, p.322. Whilst in his Brahma Sutra commentary Ad.2.3.32 he says that mind is called by different names, whilst in the same book 2,4,6 he says that by the word Atman we have to understand the internal organ-Antakarana.i.e. mind. And Manas is Brahman, "From Manas are born these things," says Taitreya Upanishad last chap. P.745 (part 2).

"All these become one in the highest spirit, called Mind" says p.137 Prasno Upanisad. Again p.744 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 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.

We do not advocate extreme asceticism. Everything is alright within limits. Even Sankara when challenged that he knew nothing about sexual intercourse, went and had intercourse with a widow. The story of his soul temporarily occupying the body of somebody else whilst doing that, is only sheer nonsense imagined by his followers.

It is impossible for any human being to challenge successfully the Advaitic position, as Sankara says.

Sankara asks his opponents "How do you know there are separate individual souls? Have you seen the soul of a man? You can only say that you have seen different bodies. To say more is to misuse language. Therefore I call you liars unless you give proof, which is impossible.

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.

VIVECKACHUDAMANI SUPPLIMENT

V.483: 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.

Swami Madhavananda's translation of Vivekachudamani is sometimes most misleading to Western readers because of his defective knowledge of both philosophy and English. Thus he translates "karma" where it means "religious rituals" as "work."

A U M.

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.

A: When you think of yourself as seeing the waking state; but when you think of yourself apart from that you are Atman.

U: you regard yourself as being in the dream state. This is a higher idea, because you know that the world is an idea.

M: When you understand that through deep sleep you are able to measure all else, that all other things (and the sounds A and U symbolizing them) merge back into Sushupti, are all found in it, and re-appear from it. This is a still higher degree.

Take any language you like, you find that A involves the opening of the mouth whereas M involves shutting it. Now all sound implies soundlessness, because it begins from that and

ends with that. Hence the two always go together. Similarly the Drik and Drisyam go together to form Brahman, are always present together although we do not usually recognize it.

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.

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.

Aum therefore is the whole of existence, the universe. But why is this specific word Aum chosen for such high office? Take the first letter "AH". It is the sound phonetically uttered by the mouth when it first opens. "UM" is the sound it utters when at last it closes. Hence all sounds, without a single exception must be comprised between the opening and shutting of the lips, i.e. between "AH" and "UM" and as Brahman is silence, so ultimately the AUM disappears with the sounding of "UM" into silence, because the mouth must then shut. You have to use words to denote things, objects. You have to use letters to form words. The word AUM summarizes all other words. Finally even this word disappears when the sound of it goes. So the letting go of AUM is to make you drop the whole world and make you think of Brahman. Thus the mystery of AUM is wrapped in the meaning of words. Semantics aim at clarifying meanings but AUM ultimately shows you that all words are futile because they cannot express the ultimate nature of anything: Silence alone does this.

We cannot produce any sound without opening the mouth and the first sound we utter while opening the mouth is A. Thus A is said to pervade all sounds. A is considered to be the symbol of the universe because all objects are indicated by ideas, and all ideas are indicated by sounds and all sounds are pervaded by the letter A.

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.

AUM is conceived as the whole universe, which has got four quarters. How can I know that the universe and myself are identical? The answer is "Look into yourself--the Atman." This Atman

has also four corresponding quarters. When you utter the word AUM, the waking comes before you: when you think of dream, the dream states come before you; and so also with sleep. Thus every time you utter the word AUM the three states come before you.

Meditation on symbols is meant for dull and mediocre intellects. When we utter the word AUM we must think of the three states and also of the Amatra.

Aum is a sound, how can it be an elephant? "All sounds" means all objects, or entire Brahman.

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.

The sound has for its substratum or substance your own self. It comes from and disappears into your own self.

Aum is the substance of all the languages and even the sounds produced by birds etc. It is used here in that sense. Has speech any meaning? Yes. Has the bird's cooing any meaning? Yes. Every sound which we hear has got a meaning for us. Hence Aum stands for not only speech but also all the sounds.

Aum stands for all sounds. It indicates all the sounds as well as their meaning. If you open your lips, the first sound produced is A. This is the case with even birds etc. When you close the lips the sound produced is M. This is the final sound. Thus M indicates the last sound. Again the longest sound uttered by us is U. Hence A plus U plus M stands for all the sounds and thus for all ideas and objects.

We are going to prove that this word AUM and the thing signified by it (i.e. the whole of existence) are identical. The whole of existence is divided into four quarters. The sound AUM also is divided into four quarters. A,U,M are the three quarters, that from which this sound comes, i.e. Turiya is the fourth quarter. That into which they disappear is the fourth, Turiya. The difference in sound makes the variety in the objects signified, so also the difference in the (continued at no.25)

SWAMI VIVEKANANDA & SRI RAMAKRISHNA

Swami Vivekananda often used the word religion when he meant pure philosophy. This was partly because in those days the West was much more religious and could be more easily reached--by a pioneer propagandist like him--through religious terms and partly because of this difficulty of translating abstract Sanskrit words into English.

Sri Ramakrishna and Swami Vivekananda lived the life of realized beings; their knowledge of things was so profound, that they could express grand truths in such simple ways drawing common illustrations from the life around. "Here and hereafter are words to frighten children."..Vivekananda.

It is a child's talk that a man goes to Heaven." ..do.

"We never come nor go. We are where we are."

"Religion cannot give a better explanation of the universe than through God and Heaven and all that; that is why religion is failing."..do.

"It is better that mankind should become atheists rather than believing blindly in 200 million Gods." ...do.

"No amount of books will purify you. Thinking and thinking correctly (i.e. reason) is of the highest value. The glory of man is that he is a thinking being. I believe in reason, having seen the evils of authority, Vedas etc. Why was reason given us if we are only to believe? Is it not blasphemous to believe against reason?"..do,

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.

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.

Master Mahasaya could not understand philosophy, so Ramakrishna made no attempt to teach him Advaita, but told him to go on practicing religion, thus lifting him up along the only path fitted to him. This shows the practical wisdom of Sri Ramakrishna.

I admire Sri Ramakrishna as the only Gnana yogi because he had this universal sympathy. His samadhis are no test of his Gnan; they were merely a discipline. This is the final test: do I see everything in me?

Sri Ramakrishna when a young man excessively worshipped the Mother, and showed unconscious sex complex in its most innocent form, of course, but that was the lowest stage which he outgrew later. Psychoanalysis is therefore true to a degree.

I admire Ramakrishna because he said to his God, Mother, "Take Yourself away, I want Truth." That showed he placed truth higher than his concept of it, his God higher than his idea.

When Swami Vivekananda uses religion, we use the term Philosophy. Religion is not useless for others.

One day Sri RAMAKRISHNA removed all his clothes and stood before some of his disciples quite naked. The devotees bent their heads in shame. The saint reproved them saying "Which of you thought me a saint? Most of you thought of me as a body. Therefore you are thinking of my private parts, not of my mind. Do you worship my mind or my body?"

SRI RAMAKRISHNA taught "Ashtavakra Gita" only to one person--Vivekananda: he hid the book from all others.

Swami VIVEKANANDA was a true gnani. His ideas were sound, but he had to use words which often belonged to religion. He deliberately called in religion to get a following instead of philosophy.

(In "Discover Yourself" I have used the words of Jesus as mere pegs to hang my own teaching. This follows the example of ancient religion makers. It will thus help thousands of Christians, who might otherwise not have been reached by my words, to a higher concept of Truth. Therefore it does not really matter whether Jesus was a true Guru or only a mystic.---P.B.)

SRI RAMAKRISHNA danced for those who wanted dancing, who could not grasp Vedanta.

I justify Sri RAMAKRISHNA's references to his conversations with Mother, God, etc. as due to his adapting his conversation to people around him. In the earlier stages of his discipline, no doubt he had visions of the Mother, but later they disappeared, but still he found it convenient to refer to her as real because the minds of his hearers could grasp that easily, whereas Non-duality was beyond their brains, except Vivekananda's.

Sri RAMAKRISHNA talked of his visions and conversations with the Mother (Deity). This was because the Mother (Shakti) was worshipped in Bengal. (In fact it has degenerated into Tantrik Sex Worship). He did this in order to help people who came to him, who had to be spoken in an intellectual language they can understand. This does not mean that he really had psychic visions or conversations internally--he was living in a far higher world than that--but that deliberately used association of ideas familiar to his hearers. Had he lived in Western India, he would have spoken of his conversations with Krishna and his visions with Krishna because Krishna was worshipped in that region.

The Upanishads say do not teach many, only a few. Hence Ramakrishna taught only Vivekananda. Do not regard all the other historic disciples as his initiate-disciples. They understood his religion, his yoga, or his dancing, not more. They were merely devotees. The higher philosophy falls flat on those who lack the capacity to understand it.

May a Gnani who is a magistrate or governor hang a criminal? Yes, provided he does it not for his own personal satisfaction. He must do it as duty to teach the murderer not to kill again. Even Ramakrishna killed bugs so that they might not distress others.

It is true that Sri Ramakrishna and Sri Sankara advocated the necessity of taking Sanyas, but they did so in order to make the Sanyasins devote their whole lives to the service of mankind, whereas other advocates of sanyas merely propagate it in order to make selfish ego-centered ascetics who withdraw from society and let it go to the dogs.

The meaning of the universe is of supreme importance. That the world, man and everything is an idea, we have had to arrive at through complicated and arduous efforts, but the great Rishis saw it clearly and taught it in the simplest language. Thus a man came weeping to Ramakrishna saying his son had died. R. said that he himself had dreamt he had four sons and that they all died. He told the man "the son you have lost is just like the dream children I lost. All have same reality." It did not mean that he had no sympathy but he revealed the truth.

MODERN INDIANS:

Datta & Chatterjee's book "Introduction to Indian Philosophy" is like nearly all the books on the subject, merely descriptive. It does not deal with the question "What is Truth?"

Prof. Dasgupta's book on Indian Philosophy is only scholasticism.

GANDHI is called a Mahatma but he knows nothing of Vedanta.

Gandhi fasted for forty days and so got the title of Mahatma. But such things as fasting have only a worldly value: they have nothing to do with Gnan.

K.A.Krishnaswamy Iyer: He had a better acquaintance with Western philosophy than I had. He has omitted science. He does not agree with me that philosophy must be based on science, particularly, physics and chemistry because they are most realistic, whereas the other sciences are trying to follow them, but depend partly on imagination as mathematics (as X equals what you imagine). Hence both he and Y.Subramanya Sharma have not emerged from intuitionism.

His book on "Vedanta, the Science of Reality" is misnamed because he has not based his Avastatraya completely on modern science. And since it was written, science has made enormous strides.

His books does not grasp the notion of non-causality clearly because when he wrote it science had not then come forward with its doubts of causality.

His book uses the term "manifest" regarding the relation between Brahman and the world. This is wrong because it implies causality. The author did not have the advantage of present day scientific knowledge concerning non-duality.

Sir S. Radhakrishnan is a mystic, not a philosopher. When he says that his 'intuition' is same as my term 'reason' he proves that he has never understood me. There is a vast difference between both.

Radhakrishnan teaches social philosophy which is good and needed in India, but he did not stay long enough with me to grasp the highest philosophy.

In his latest book "Eastern Thought and Western Religion", he writes throughout with great warmth of feeling, with deep certainty taking his feelings (here called intuition) instead of calmly and coolly examining the questions. Here he is simply writing as a mystic, without doubting whether his feelings of certitude may be wrong.

Ramana Maharishi: Where is there real vichara in Ramanasram? Is the Maharishi prepared to discuss, and deal with doubts? No. Inquiry is not encouraged only the smothering of doubts by it peace.

Maharishi did not have the advantage of University education like Aurobindo, therefore he keeps silent or explains little where the latter loses himself in a forest of big meaningless words, like "supra-mental", "over-mental", "psychic dynamism", etc.

Vedanta inquires: How do you know that the scriptures reveal the truth? How do you know that Maharishi, who may be a perfectly truthful man, speaks the Ultimate Truth? How do you know that he is not mistaken? "That is the spirit of Vedanta: One must doubt and inquire and then one must be able to judge.

Whoever begins with the question "Who Am I" falls into the same trap that Ramana Maharishi fell into. The point is, how does this question arise at all. You must start with the universe first and then only after the question "What is the world" is answered should you deal with the question "Who am I". This is the natural order of inquiry because unprejudiced minds such as children or coolies always begin with asking about the world first. (See Panchadesi P.141, verse 12)

(continued from page 382)

The fact that Maharishi allows all this crooked business by his brother to go on, despite his own purity of character, is a sign that his mind is somewhat unhinged, like many mystics.

SRI AUROBINDO: The "supra-mental" of Sri Aurobindo. Has the word supra-mental any meaning? Yes: then it is an idea in your mind. Only a thought, after all! It is therefore no more mental than other thoughts. Aurobindo thus deceives himself: it is only his own mental creation: similar are all the yogic experiences.

Sri RAMAKRISHNA's actions and words can only be judged if taken in reference to the context and environment where he was at the time. He danced with emotional religious people.

AUROBINDO's teaching of supra-mental plane is wrong because: What is it that sees? It is the mind itself. You may rise to the highest height of seeing but still it is done by the mind.

Maharishi was taught to imagine he was Brahman by his Guru who was Seshadriswami.

Aurobindo, Maharishi etc fulfil a certain function, to give peace to a certain type of mind, but that is not the highest.

In reply to Maharishi's statement that the Sarvadikari is being used as a whet-stone to rub away the ego of other disciples I reply: "Why has not the Maharishi rubbed away the Sarvadikari's ego all these years?"

MAHARISHI'S influence at Ramanasram works hypnotically, hence temporarily. It gives peace truly but only for the time being. The student must think his way through to Truth, if he wants enduring peace. Quarrels and conflicts at Ramanasram could not arise if the students were led to see others as themselves, a unity with them. But they look only for the selfish satisfaction of peace.

AUROBINDO'S claim that he will transform the world and make all mankind one, is a lie. It is utterly impossible to achieve such unity by yoga.

THE MAHARISHI is a yogi and not a Gnani; otherwise he would not countenance the nonsense which is going at the ashram with Sarvadikari. He would say "Either stop this, or go, or else I shall go." That is what a Gnani would do, because he has to set an example.

MAHARISHI makes statements which are true but he is unable to give proof. I can prove mine every step.

MAHARISHI's "Who Am I?" is theological, and better avoided, whereas "What Am I" is strictly philosophical and to be preferred.

MAHARISHI: He has picked up a number of Sanskrit words here and there, but unfortunately he has not properly learnt Sanskrit. Hence he makes an error when telling Mr. Bose that the realized man has his mind destroyed. The correct meaning is that the activities of the mind are put a stop to; but the mind itself cannot be destroyed.

MAHARISHI: Joy could not exist without sorrow to distinguish it. Hence yogic ecstasies will necessarily exist along-side of pains, never alone permanently. Maharishi's statement in "Who

am I?" that happiness or bliss is the natural state of man, is incorrect. His error arises out of his failure to define the meaning of happiness. You can not find it existing without sorrow. Therefore happiness alone cannot be the nature of Self.

AUROBINDO'S discovery of supra-mental planes is merely his idea, his imagination. We may admit that he has experience of it but he does not see that even his experience is only his imagination.

T. SUBBA RAO SHARMA: His "Mulavidya Nirasa" is a scholastic mystic work, not philosophic and ignorant of non-causality. It is subjective interpretation not appeal to facts, and hence liable to controversial refutations by other interpretations without end.

RAMAKRISHNA MISSION swamis like Turiyananda, etc. may have been excellent administrators of the organization, but that does not mean they knew philosophy or truth; for without inquiry there is no philosophy.

AUROBINDO: When did he see the divine descending from above? This must be inquired into and tested. Let him show it in experience.

GANDHI's great mistake is his opposition to science. For science is here to stay and must be admitted to our lives and those philosophers and mystics who agree to admit it to their practical lives but not to their philosophic ideas are making the great error of divorcing philosophy from action. They do not understand that philosophy is to be expressed in all activities.

RAMANA MAHARISHI: His statement that we have to bring sleep into the waking state, is insane nonsense. It is utterly impossible to do it or to do its opposite. Either you are in deep sleep or you are not.

RAMANA MAHARISHI's refusal to interfere with his Ashram is due to his wanting to be undisturbed to keep his peace, i.e. to thinking first of his ego.

SWAMI SANTINATH's books of criticism of Advaita are fallacious because he does not know any science.

SRI RAMANA MAHARISHI says that all earthly sense pleasure is but a faint ripple actually emanating from the ananda of Atman. First we must inquire what sense pleasure is. Is it something that arises from a second thing? Is the pleasure of realizing Brahman a non-dual one? Ananda or Sukam are words, i.e. having a meaning, are mere ideas and therefore are unreal. Hence if this bliss of Brahman is such, graspable by mind, actually enjoyable, it is unreal, illusory. Brahman is everywhere, in pain also.

RADHAKRISHNAN once delivered a long lecture where I was present. At the end I observed: "This was splendid poetry, but it was not philosophy."

If MAHARISHI had a proper Guru and not the mad Seshadri who was his guru but an incompetent one, he would have been told, "You now realize the world is an idea." "So go about and live amongst others, keeping your insight all the time. It is not necessary to remain in solitude any longer."

YOGI RAMIAH is being celebrated in Ahmedabad etc. because a fool has got greater fools to admire him. Whatever they imagine about him, is real to them.

SRI AUROBINDO is only a yogi, not gnani. A man of highest realization cannot keep so silent. Why should a realized man be so cautious as to shut himself up as a recluse? He has nothing to fear in the world.

AUROBINDO: All the Aurobindo terminology of "transcendental" or "super-mental" etc. is mere imagination--lengthy words which impress those who do not analyze them for their truth.

SWAMI SIVANANDA of Rishikesh has written and published a "Upanishad." He has merely sat down and imagined, and then poured out words. He does see that it requires thinking. How is anyone benefited by his work. It is only for children.

Maharishi's statement that he lives without thoughts is a species of insanity.

If your mind had been purely mystic, you would after the break with the Ramanasram have had fears that you had made a mistake, that Maharishi was divine and you would be punished for leaving him. But I have "spoiled you." Your rationality was too strong and overcame such nonsense.

Sivananda Saraswathi: of Rishikesh is merely a religious mystic and not a philosopher.

Tagore: has frankly confessed to me in a letter that he does not understand philosophy, and that he does not want to, as he is only a mystic.

Krishnamurthi is childish in wanting to burn temples and eliminate religion. What are the common people to do without its comforts and ethical restrictions? His denunciations are so unbalanced because they are violent reactions, or rebellion against his former beliefs.

Thayumanavar: the Tamil saint has written very elevating thoughts and represents the highest type of mysticism, but not Gnan.

Criticism of Ramana Maharishi's "Who Am I?"

Page 4 para. 3: If mind is same as Atman, how can it vanish? How can Atman vanish?

Page 6 (middle) "Whenever any thought leads you outward" etc, says Maharishi. What can you be certain of when you leave the external world? And why leave the world if you say everything is Brahman?

Page 6. "Mind ceases to struggle" Yes, if I commit suicide I shall also cease to struggle! How can you say the world ceases to exist if you don't look at it?

page 6 last para: Who has seen the subtle mind projecting through the brain and the senses? Can you see it? Is not brain also a piece of gross matter? Then how can it come into existence after the world is created, if latter, depends on brain.

Page 7 top. How can you say the world vanishes when you are introspected? The world is still there; whether you see it or not.

Page 7. Line 4. Heart is an idea created by mind, so how can Mind emerge from it?

Page 11, Para 2. "One should unquestioningly follow guru"--This is the very reverse of what Sri Ramakrishna taught. What if the guru happens to be a fool or a rascal? Sri Ramakrishna said "Test me!"

Page 12: middle: "In deep sleep, trance, swoon, mind turns inwards and enjoys atmasukam." Why should any man study or inquire or practice if in sleep he can easily get the Atman? If sleep gives Brahman why trouble with Vedanta?

Page 16 middle: "If this truth is appreciated who can refrain from being good?" This is opposite of real Vedanta. Vedanta says it is not enough to be good, you must serve the world and relieve suffering.

Page 16 last para. Is the vanishing of ego to be the end of life? Aham, I must indeed go but tuham (thou) must come, you must know Brahman is everywhere. It is only half to say ego must vanish. This is only a step, not highest. Gita 4/34 on this point says you must see all in you. Ramana Maharishi's teaching is most useful to those seeking peace, for those whose minds are disturbed, but not for seekers of truth.

I have the highest reverence for the Maharishi as being possibly a unique specimen of absolute purity and unworldliness and desirelessness, but that does not make him a Gnani.

Surendranath Das Gupta teaches mysticism and yoga, not philosophy.

MAHARISHI lacks the brains to become a penetrating thinker, hence he cannot be a gnani. His plea of helplessness regarding his brother is merely a rationalization of his wishes and tendencies.

MAHARISHI once said: "We Indians are satis (continued on page 377)

ANCIENT INDIANS AND THEIR SCHOOLS:

GAUDAPADA: he was the first historic teacher known to us to give a rational exposition of Advaita. He says that whatever is seen, whether external or internal, whether by the ordinary persons or yogis, is unreal.

Non-causality is of the highest importance; that is why Gaudapada puts it at the end of his book and devotes 100 slokas to it whereas the other subjects get less than 50 slokas.

MAHABHARATA: "It is men having Buddhi for their eyes that succeed in reaching Brahman." (Moksha Dharma Parva).

Buddhi is defined in several scriptures as that which distinguishes error from truth. I say that is reason, not intuition.

The sage is defined as "The knower of Brahman wears no signs. His signs are not manifest, nor his behavior."

THE NYAYA SCHOOL: The theory that in sense-perception mind goes out of body, takes shapes of the objects, and returns with the form, belongs to the Nyaya school. It is nonsense.

PATANJALI: his first sloka that yoga is suppression of modifications of thinking principle is absolutely incorrect. His statement would however become correct if he had inserted, the word "partial" before "suppression." Total suppression is quite impossible outside of sleep or drugs. Thinking, however subdued, must always go on during yoga so long as mind is there, and when mind ceases to function there will necessarily be deep sleep.

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.

RAMANUJA: Ramanuja who was a Brahmin, wrote that only the Brahmin-born could attain liberation. This therefore rules out all Europeans! Sankara on the contrary taught that anyone could attain.

SANKHYA: To start with statement that Prakriti is co-existent with Purusha is mere assumption suited to brainless. Everyone seems to know "matter" (prakriti). Every pundit uses the words but none really knows what he is talking about; modern physics is much humbler and admits it cannot define matter. You may analyze matter into electrons, the latter into something finer still and yet you do not arrive at the ultimate and hence do not really know what matter is. The Sankhya must finally admit avidya, ajnan, ignorance. The latter is to be overcome, not by mistaking Sankhyan assumptions, but by philosophical inquiry.

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.

On Sage: "Having realized identity with Atman he lives like other people here"

SWARGYASSIDDI: On The Sage: "Some in childlike innocence, some in indifference; others find delight: lover, reveler, ascetic, to no one grade of life the Knower confines his choice."

SANKHYA: This so-called philosophy does not believe in a single Supreme Atman, but in a multitude of Atmans called Purushas. This is mere imagination and Sankhya is really scholasticism.

The theory of Atman belonging to the Sankhya and Vaiseshika (logical) schools is different from advaitic Atman because former has permanent qualities and attributes, whereas ours has none. Moreover theirs is ultimately based on scriptures, but ours, is based on reason.

The Sankhya school, as well as the Nyaya and Vaiseshika schools are realists. They do not teach that the world is idea.

NIMBARKA'S brand of Vedanta is not Advaitic, but still higher than Ramanuja's.

VISISHTADWAITINS: They teach us that God has two attributes, Mind and Matter. They are dualists.

YOGA VASISTA: The greatest gnani: "His state is indescribable yet he will move in the world like any body else," ..."Though acting after every feeling such as love, hate, fear and the like, he who stands unaffected within is said to be real jivanmukta." Sankara's commentary.

Being fixed in Gnana: "Frequent remembrance of essence through any means whatsoever is all that should make up his effort."

"Yoga and gnosis are the two paths to dissolution of intellect. Gnosis is the proper viewing of things, judging aright differentiation between subject and object.

Yoga Vasista says of the Gnani: "He is a great worker." It also so says, that he keeps his body healthy, does not starve it.

B.L. Atreya has no idea of non-causality and is ignorant therefore of the highest advaita.

THE SACRED 4: The meaning of four faces of Brahma is that God is gazing at all sides and thus views the whole world simultaneously.

SANKHYA system of philosophy will give you learning but not truth. It merely makes statements. Our position is that we want proof, which Sankhya cannot offer.

At Nalanda University both Brahministic Hinduism and Buddhism were taught side by side, the choice being left to the students, and harmony prevailed between both. So learning and tolerance were encouraged in ancient India.

PATANJALI has described various samadhis. We pay no heed even to Patanjali in as much as "they all run counter to Vedanta" and emancipation.

The old Sanskrit learning must be combined with modern learning. The old Sanskrit pundits must let their pupils learn useful professions in addition to Sanskrit. Punditry leads to poverty.

SANKYA: Who saw "in the beginning there was Prakriti and Purusha?" It is mere deductive logic which gives the premise imaginatively.

NYAYA: The term Reasoning" was usually applied in the ancient days to the arguments of Tarka and Nyaya schools which were logical and scholastic, not the Buddhi-reasoning.

The PURANAS, including Vishnu Purana and Siva Purana, are based on false idea of personal God, because the writers have thought of Him as glorified man and woman.

The translations made till now of Indian philosophical works have represented religion and mythology, not philosophy. The greatest pundits do not understand it, for they do not understand science. What has this mythological teaching done for India? Look at its state today. Look at the conversions. Imagining that God has ashes on his forehead or blazing like the sun-- that is all poetry and depends only on faith.

The Saiva Siddanta sect is dualistic, unphilosophical religion like Ramanuja's sect.

Why did not Ramanuja and Madhva write commentaries on the Upanishads (as Sankara did to establish Brahman) but stop, content with writing commentary on Vysa Sutras, and culling some paras only from the Upanishads with convenient vagueness to establish their God and Theology?

We, Indians are more religious than other people.

The six systems of Indian Philosophy are really six systems of Indian speculation. For there is only one Truth.

The ancient Hindu tenet borrowed by theosophists of universe appearing and dissolving, days and nights of Brahma, entering into pralaya etc. is intended for mediocre intellects who cannot rise to truth. It is a convenient fable representing the philosophic truth that the whole universe dissolves in your mind in deep sleep, thus entering pralaya, and rises again next morning, i.e. it is all imagination, idea. The Brahma-God has nothing to do with it.

JAINISM was good as being the first protest against the primitive and childish custom of animal sacrifices.

Although Sankara puts the mystic goal highest in his mystical books, he is careful to say that this goal leads to Brahman, not that it is realization.

Who has ever seen the three gunas as entities or powers. They are only ideas, imagination and what is the meaning of Prakriti? Nobody has seen that either. Both guna and prakriti are mere words. Hence the Sankhya and Ramanujistic schools which teach these things are systems of mere imaginations.

RAMANUJA believed in a plurality of minds or selves and also in prakriti matter. The latter he thought ultimately existed in the form of particles similar to our atomic theory. But recent science has killed the atomic theory and matter has vanished with it. Hence modern Ramanujists fear science and try to avoid it.

NIMBARKA holds the dream phenomena are absolutely real and are created by God, and put into your mind. "My view is that and that is the end of the matter."

V.S.I. PERSONAL

At the 13th day ceremony after Maharaja's death, one Pundit kept on weeping loudly. Every one admired him. I, on the contrary, thought him insane for not controlling himself, as modern science (psychology) would show.

Why should a man study philosophy? Vedanta explains the importance of its value. I selected this theme, rather than a discussion of any philosophic tenet for my contributed essay to "Contemporary Indian Philosophy."

People who want religion waste their time and money in coming to Mysore. They could not profit by my philosophy. They could only see sights. It is "the theatre" that is fit for them.

When I went to the Sringeri Guru it was to learn more about yoga. Instead, he told me I was fitted for something higher--Vedanta—and so I joined his ashram and became Vedantin. Unfortunately there was no one fitted to be trained to become his successor among those around him, hence the unfortunate state of present Sringeri Swami, who was quite inferior to the original guru.

I wrote to the Nobel Prize authorities to encourage philosophy and truth, and not to restrict their awards to science and literature and pacifism. I pointed out that we should seek truth because it

enables us to do the greatest good to humanity. But they ignored my letter. They must suffer therefore.

The Jnana-Mudra symbol which I adopted forty years ago and which is printed on my note-paper expresses the whole teaching of Mandukya. It means: we begin by saying there is God. When examining self we find the four parts--avastatraya plus Turiya. This is symbolized by the four fingers. If you free yourself from the three states by not attaching yourself to any of them separately, then only the forefinger (Turiya) is left: it is joined in circle with the thumb to symbolize that when you know you are Brahman.

V.S.I. showed me a large personal photograph dated 1928 presented to him by H.H. the late Maharaja of Mysore. It portrayed H.H. with palms uplifted and touching each other in attitude of reverence. It was signed in Kanarese and at the top H.H. had personally written in Kanarese the following quotation from a Upanishad. "I bow to that Guru, the Supreme Lord, who has dispelled all my doubts and enabled to realize the Unity." The story behind this presentation is that one day H.H. said to me he was confused and worried by all the contradictory opinions, tenets and doctrines he had heard during his lifetime and did not know what to believe. This was the crucial moment when I judged him fit for initiation into the ultimate path. Hitherto I had played the Pandit and merely explaining the Upanishads in terms of Scholasticism quoting authorities. But the utterance of these doubts revealed that the time had come to give him something higher. These doubts and the mention of truth rather than authority or experience show that a man is beginning to think for himself. It is in this way that we judge whether a man is fit for philosophy.

The following is a better translation of the quotation: "I bow my head to my preceptor who shows me the secret truth, destroying all kinds of doubts and who makes me perceive Oneness directly. I bow my head to such guru who is really the Lord of all."

His Highness the Yuvaraja of Mysore told P.B. once: "I realize greatly how much my brother (H.H. the Maharaja) owes to V.S.I. for forming his character and molding his outlook on life."

Mr. V.S.I is the greatest Indian thinker today, a direct disciple of the late Nrismha Bharat of Sringeri. His is the rational position of Vedanta, which includes and assimilates all the possible conclusions of science, religion and philosophy." ..C.R.Srinivasan, Lecturer in Philosophy, Annamalai University.

Only a few Swamis have really understood my doctrine. They are Siddhesvarananda, Nikhilananda and Devatmananda. Nikhilananda did not finish his course for he did not stay the whole period requisite for a complete course of study, which is two years minimum. Siddhesvarananda has strong emotional trends especially towards art singing and mysticism. Hence his partiality for Maharishi and his enthusiasm for medieval saints like Francis of Assisi. He has studied with me for ten years. He is a philosophy graduate and a student of modern western psychology. Nikhilananda is now in New York and he is very sharp and picked up the truth more quickly than Siddhesvarananda. Finally Devatmananda is in Oregon, and he is also a fair pupil but he did not complete his course and mixes some mysticism with Vedanta.

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?

I was born in 1869.

I went twice to Europe chiefly because of the Western scientific glimmering that causality is delusive. It is advaita's greatest contribution. Max Planck, when I told him of this doctrine in Mandukya, got up from his chair and said "I bow down to India." He was the most advanced I met in Europe, the most honest mind.

In 1916 V.S.I. was "Personal assistant to the Inspector-General of Education, Mysore State."

He was once Private Secretary to Sir M. Visvesvariah, Dewan of Mysore and his task partly was to read all scientific journals, and make cuttings of useful matters.

He has made an attempt to incorporate science with Vedanta.

V.S.I. would always refuse to publish his views in book form, or even to let us collect his scattered articles together in a single volume. I believe his reasons for this were two-fold: (1) to protect H.H. Maharaja of Mysore's reputation as a highly religious and moral king; any avowal by V.S.I. that he is an atheist would shock the Indian religious world because of his position as guru to H.H. (2) his personal fear which is common to all initiated Brahmins of unsettling the mind of the masses.

Many years ago I was tempted to settle in one place as a Sanyasi and have people come and make offerings to me, but my guru advised me against it and so I am glad I came to this; a life of activity and service and movement. Thus one can help many more people.

I was present when one of the leading disciples of Sri Meher Baba came into V.S.I.'s study and requested him to arrange a series of lectures to be given by the disciples upon Meher Baba. V.S.I. treated him very courteously and promised to endeavor to do something in the matter. After the disciple had departed I strongly rebuked V.S.I. for thus assisting to propagate the work on behalf of a charlatan. V.S.I. argued, however, that first of all it was his duty to deal with every man courteously and secondly he did not want to show that he was in any way superior to the other man but rather behave as though he were quite ignorant of spiritual matters.

When I was a young man I was wavering in my belief in Re-birth, until I read Huxley's advocacy of it and coming is it did from such a great man that convinced me.

If I were asked to contribute to it symposium on "My religion" I would have answered "I have no religion." This would have freed me from the necessity of imagining all kinds of things.

I want to be known to the public only as a seeker after truth. Whoever wishes may come and have discussions about truth with me.

My daughter was mentally ill. She was said to be possessed by an evil spirit. My family called in priests who performed ceremonies of various kinds to drive away the demon. However I did not believe that nonsense. I told my daughter to sit down and addressed her thus; "You are not ill. You are quite sane. There is no demon in you." Thus I repeatedly gave her frequent suggestion treatment and in 8 days she was cured.

The Indian Institute of Philosophy invited me to become a professor there. I refused because they are teaching Vedanta without science, which will not do at all nowadays. I know that the principal Mr. G.R. Malkani writes in a book that he agrees with me that Vedanta should be based on reason, not revelation, yet he does not see the need of scientific method in this study! It is another illustration of fact that every man thinks he is quite reasonable. Anyway look at the best by the results; some rich man gave a few lakhs to start the institute several years ago, but there are only 3 or 4 students in the institute now which shows that its teaching without science is not wanted.

Mr. V.S.I. was once headmaster of Tumkur High School, Mysore State.

Mr. K.A.K's ideas are similar to mine, philosophically, but he did not emphasize that we ought to rise above yoga and mysticism.

They want me to write a book on my philosophy. But what will that produce? Only more words! What do the readers get by thinking? Only another thought. You have to see inside the words.

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.

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."

When I was on the University board for philosophy, I suggested that Bradly's book "Logic of the Unconscious" should be included in the course study. All the others protested. Prof. Hiriyana said "Indian Philosophy is high above such a book." So they rejected my advice and I decided to keep quiet in future. Yet this book is essential to eliminate wrong reasoning.

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.

At the Mysore examination Board, we were setting papers on philosophy. The other examiners based questions on mere flights of fancy, not on fact. If there was a chance of correcting them, I would have ventured to do so at the risk of being called mad or fool, but there was none. So I remained quiet.

His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore received over 20 letters denouncing and vilifying V.S.Iyer. The Maharaja would hand them over to him, with an amused smile saying "That is what people think of you."

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 drik 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.

When I had to go to Agra to earn my livelihood there as a professor of Science, the late Maharaja of Mysore came there whilst on a north Indian tour. He visited our college and seeing me among the staff asked "Who is this young man wearing a Mysore-pattern turban? They informed him. As soon as he returned to Mysore he told the Government to issue orders appointing me in Mysore Government Educational service. I therefore owe my real start in life to him.

We traveled together to the International Congress of Philosophy in 1937. V.S.I. achieved little in the way of influencing European thinkers towards Vedanta. Later he said ruefully; They thought I was a black man and therefore could know nothing. They looked down upon me--although very kindly--as a primitive man who could not possibly have anything to teach them." H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore once suggested to V.S.I. that he take sanyas and join the Kugli Mutt (a branch mutt of Sringeri) with a view to being appointed Head of the Mutt when the opportunity arose. But V.S.I. refused. He did not need Sanyas and he did not value the position of a religious chief.

Thrice I asked my Guru to give me Sanyas, but he refused. He said it was impracticable to be true Sanyassin nowadays. It was better to stay where I was and do some work for the good of others.

I was a keen theosophist when I was a young man, read Blavatsky and knew Annie Besant very well. It belonged to my mystic phase.

Thomas Huxley's books were among those which I liked most when I was a young man. I have a great reverence for him, because he had a passion for truth.

I was the founder of the Scout Movement in Mysore when I was Secretary to Education Dept.

V.S.I. marked the margins of his own books with numerous questions, most chorusing the refrain "How do you know?"

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."

V.S.Iyer gets no fees for teaching the Swamis in the Mysore class. Moreover he refuses to accept any fee from His Highness for acting as his "Reader." Once the Maharaja sent Rs.10,000- through the Dewan to Iyer, but he refused to take it. He is thus following our ancient Indian tradition of teaching free.

V.S.I. invigorated my mind and gave me the courage to question the interpretation which, in accordance with Indian tradition, I had hitherto put upon my mystical experiences.

The New Head of Mysore Hospital had been told that I was Maharaja's teacher and guru, so he evidently expected some impressive-looking yellow-robed Swami to enter when I came as a patient. What a shock of disappointment the poor man must have had! For everybody looks for outward signs.

H.H. Maharaja sent me sums of money on various occasions. I always returned them to him. Once he got offended. So I said: "If your Highness will reinstate me as University Registrar I will be willing to take millions of rupees from you. But if you want me to remain as your teacher of Vedanta, I cannot accept money for it."

V.S.I. Essay "Man's Interest In Philosophy" contains numerous quotations from Upanishads and other old texts, embodied in the article unacknowledged so as not to trouble Westerners with Sanskrit names.

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 Philos. 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.

When Maharaja of Mysore died V.S.I. was not present. His disciples bemoaned this fact but said that perhaps the Maharaja concentrated on the mental picture of V.S.I. before dying and this was just as good. V.S.I. replied: You have fallen into error. You still think the idea is one thing and the object is a second, as shown by your use of the word "present." When the whole world is an idea how can you say any part of it is not present? It is all present as idea in the mind. Hence I too was present in H.H.'s mind. The notion of a separate outside external object and an inside idea is quite incorrect."

A few years ago Maharaja wanted me to take Sanyas, as I was old and it would give me prestige. I refused because I said I wanted to show that householders also could get truth and thus I would render more service to them.

I wanted to go with you to the journey to Nepal principally because I wanted to search for a lost biography of Sankara.

When I first visited my Guru, the Sringeri Swami, I went to him to inquire not about Vedanta, but to get advice for the practice of yoga. After half-an-hour's conversation he told me to give up

yoga as I had passed beyond the stage of its usefulness and advised me to study Mandukya Upanishad instead.

When I was a young man I passed through various stages of mental development, first I was rigidly orthodox and religious, carried out all the duties in the belief that they were really efficacious, then I went in for the practice of Hatha Yoga postures, breathing exercises etc. Then I took up meditation practicing always daily. I became a theosophist, and was for several years in the clutches of Annie Besant. So you see I know the limitations of all these phases of development and I know what I am talking about when I criticize yoga, mysticism and religion.

Ramiah reveals that the ego is still with him by his vanity. There are only three men I have ever known who had the truth: My Sringeri Guru, and a Sanyasi who came from Baluchistan who talked Mandukya and who kept on moving from place to place. When I wanted to take him to the Maharaja of Mysore, he refused saying "He is not different from myself. It is the same Atman. Why should I specially single him out from the Harijan?"

I was Registrar of Mysore University from 1919 to 1926.

Desikananda said to me, V.S.I. is unable to apply his philosophy to his personal life. He has failed to show the practical bearing of it in his own life. This we must recognize that he is a failure outside the class room.

I was President of the Mysore Sanskrit College for a number of years and found the Pundits there constantly arguing and discussing whether God was like this or like that.

It was equivalent to arguing and discussing whether God has moustaches or not. They called this philosophy but it was only religion. Their fallacy was logic, i.e. lack of science.

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.

I have written dozens of letters to propagate truth to individuals in the West and in India and to the Press during the past quarter of a century, but with little or no effect. So I have given it up.

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.

When His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore was worried by family and state troubles, I advised him "Look upon them all as ideas. Know that the whole world is an idea, and therefore within yourself. Ideas are transitory. So why worry about them? Just know they are mere ideas, and thus you can be at peace."

When they tried to persuade H.H. to have Kanarese as the medium of instruction in Mysore University, I strongly opposed it. Similarly the introduction of Hindi as Lingua Franca, instead of English, closes much Western culture to India. What value lies in the Kanarese literature? Only some religious and poetical value, but none of scientific or modern.

Regarding scavenger child at Hassan town abandoned for seven days under a tree, what we have been doing in the class is Pundit's Vedanta; this practical help of child is Vedanta in truth.

COUNSEL: GENERAL.

In your book devote some space to yoga and the rest to Vedanta, because the Western people must have some yoga practice at their present stage of development. But even then you may throw in doubts and reservations at places hinting that there is a higher truth to which yoga leads up. If the latter is made perfectly clear then the lower stages of yoga, occultism and psychism etc. may be included.

Only about ½% of students are ready to study Vedanta directly. So yoga must go on. Teach yoga but here and there throw in a few doubts, as also hints that it is not the end (Vedanta--end of the scriptures) and that there is an ultimate truth to which you will be able to direct the student when he has qualified himself by yoga practice. Create a desire by these hints and doubts in the student's mind to seek Ultimate Truth and to want it: then only when it has become a thirst should you show the delusion of yoga and teach Vedanta. Don't forsake writing on yoga and mysticism because you have got to live, because yoga books will sell as they appeal to 99% of readers whereas Vedanta will not sell to more than a very few. How are you going to live? So continue yoga writing on the line laid down even though you may write a special book for the sake of these few who are ready for truth. This is not hypocrisy; it is recognition that there are gradual stages of development of the mind and acceptance of the fact. You may teach individuals who are ripe at any time. Moreover I know your yoga books are doing much good. They render invaluable services.

Avoid yogis. Do not henceforth associate with them or lend your name to be mingled with theirs, as you have now built up which you must protect. Besides you will be regarded as superficial if you lend your name without deep investigation. Stick to the Highest Truth and let yogis go.

One cannot expect wide appeal from Vedanta, so one need only look for a few in each land who will be ripe enough to absorb it; this few will themselves act as seeds, to grow in the future.

Although you ought not to confuse people by mixing Vedanta in your books on yoga, you should put in such hints or phrases as will strengthen their desire to clear their doubts.

You have a very great and important work before you in introducing Vedanta to the West. I want to prepare you to do this, so that my life may bear some fruit. You grasp my explanations almost instantly, whereas even Sir S. Radhakrishnan whom I knew when he was here in Mysore as a Professor could not grasp things so quickly as you. Moreover your work in yoga and meditation has prepared you for the higher truth, and your mind is ready and concentrated.

It is essential for you to announce in new manuscripts and all other writings that your earlier books (on yogis etc) were on the preliminary steps and stages, stepping stones on the path only, that now and hence forth you are going into the deeper parts of the Quest for really serious students who want truth, to find Truth at all costs. This will protect you against misunderstanding.

You should now give the best thought of India to the world. Train a few ripe students in different countries in this higher Vedanta. Make an Indian Hill Station like Ooty your base. It is centrally located for reading both the Eastern and Western hemispheres. Spend part of each year in

America principally as you may expect more there than in Europe. Do not start a new journal until you have earned a permanent assistant or collaborators as secretary or wife.

An author who presents Vedantic teaching in a book without making due acknowledgment to the teacher who gave him this knowledge and as though it were his own knowledge is telling lies.

Re Yogic authors: say you differ from them and ask "Where is the proof of all this?" or "I do not for one minute deny that Aurobindo had these experiences. But where is the proof that they are Brahman as he imagines?" But don't denounce them violently.

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.

Yes, it will be an excellent safeguard to call Advaita, Gnana yoga, and thus link up your new book with the old ones because name yoga will still be there. c.f. Sir Jogendra Singh episode.

If you get the feeling that you are hypocritical or deceiving by writing further mystic, literary or journalistic matter, then you will fall into the same error as Swami Nikhilananda, who wrote that he felt he was leading a double life. For the people who ask for such reading are mentally incapable of grasping higher philosophy, they are intellectual children, and so they need mystic writings and teachings; it helps them. Why then think you are doing wrong? The Vedantic Ideal is to give people what suits them; to do so is no error.

Profit by V.S.I.'s example. When he prepared the paper "Six steps from Religion to Philosophy" he revised and rewrote and altered and improved it no less than one dozen times. Such was his effort to make it as true, as correct and as perfect as possible. Hence constant revision of manuscript and waiting to keep it some time in order to think of improvements and corrections, is advisable. He told me: "I do this because I want to take extreme care to use only words which will not be ambiguous, not have two or three meanings. Thus in you writing you have used the words "intellectual quest" where you meant "rational quest."

Do not use the word "Advaita" in your writing, as every other school or cult will refuse to read further, setting themselves up in opposition.

I want your magazine to emphasize the practicality of philosophy. People should not think, as they do, that it is divorced from everyday existence.

I told Swami Siddheswarananda many times that if he wants to teach the truth in Europe, he should begin with Brihad's demolition of the 'I know' complex.

Be careful in writing not to wax artistic or poetic in style at the expense of causing ambiguity or harming accuracy. Aim at precision of statement and beautify only when it does not detract from

truth. Avoid carrying your readers' emotions away, appeal to their reason rather than feeling, remember that similes and metaphors involve danger of ambiguity because they can always be interpreted variously.

Be careful when writing criticisms of religion or mysticism not to give impression you are an enemy, and always reserve such criticisms for the middle or end of your article or book. To place them early leads to hostility. Leave them for the end where you deal with practical bearing of philosophy and with contemporary troubles. Make it a standing rule to place criticisms towards end, otherwise readers may form notion you are prejudiced against these subjects, if placed at beginning.

Secure lieutenants to teach and train your followers in mysticism, and yoga and thus reserving your own time, energy and efforts to coach a few leaders like professors who can influence many others.

The value of journalistic articles on philosophy is to make people inquire.

You have to be fair in your criticism of yogis or ashrams, because there may be in Himalayas some genuine ashrams with sincere yogis, So do not criticize generally or indiscriminately but allude to "certain ashrams" etc.

Learn this important principle in writing: When you attack, criticize or condemn anything like ashrams, yoga, etc. let the single mention suffice and don't repeat constantly. When however you deal positively affirmatively or flatteringly with anything then you may if necessary reiterate your points. This is Vedantic understanding that all things have their place and that all serve their purpose for some people.

You made a mistake in not showing me the manuscript of your article on Yoga in the Statesman. I would have cut out and modified the parts attacking yogis and yoga which aroused unnecessary antagonism. Sri Sankara once warned his advanced disciples not to go near or have anything to do with religious mystic peoples because they would only abuse you if you speak the truth or attempt to reason with them.

Sex desires will be there. The mistake is to take them as real; take them rather as ideas and they will be alright.

"Is this true?" is the beginning of philosophy. Doubt is the beginning of knowledge.

The failure of R.K. Swamis to put philosophic Vedanta over in the West is partly due to the fact that they have limited their appeal to religious old women; they ought also to go and lecture in the universities and discuss with professors, the intellectual classes.

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.

Do not in conversation denounce yoga but say there are other things beside it, i.e. do not give people impression that your earlier books are wrong or erroneous, or that yoga is worthless.

If you are asked which system of Indian philosophy you are studying, never answer that it is Sankara's; say that you are studying all the systems and taking what is true in each. Otherwise you will get wrongly labeled as a follower of Sankara, for to day it has degenerated into such, or else you will get quarrels only opposed by the questioner if he belongs to a rival school and if he asks you what you regard as truth reply it is that which is for the good of all.

It will never be possible to teach Advaita to the many. It will always be only for the few metaphysically minded who are and always will be rare. Hence to preserve the written tradition, the Upanishads, the Gita and Sankara's works all deliberately mixed up the esoteric and the exoteric between the same covers. You once disagreed with me when I advised you to devote the magazine to both mysticism and philosophy, otherwise hardly any one will buy it. Now I show you that the greatest Gnanis of the past have mixed the two together in order to keep the highest teaching in circulation in order to benefit the largest number of people. For truth really means not the definitions of its uncontradictibility--which is necessary but is only an elementary stage--but the practical seeking for the welfare of the All.

Dr. P.B. is in the best position to judge as to what is the value and what is not of value in Asiatic and Western life. His advice on mysticism, philosophy, social life, yoga, etc. is valuable because it is based on wide travel and research on the spot no less than on books. You made one very wrong remark today when you were visiting the R.K. Ashram. In the presence of many, you said your Egypt book was no good, all psychic rot, etc. Don't do that! These psychic or lower things have their place for many people. This remark will confuse the minds of such people and not help them at all. Keep the higher Vedanta secret and reveal it only to those who are ripe. Don't depreciate the lower truths, because they are necessary stages.

When you meet a man who is of a temperament to run after mystics and marvels, be shrewd and do not get into hot waters by trying to criticize him. He is insane on this point and therefore impervious to reason. He is fit only for such stuff.

When people come to you for interviews let them reveal themselves first by their answers to their questions as to what they are seeking. Then act as a doctor and prescribe what they are ready for but no more. If they want peace, send them to a good mystic, if body-postures to a Hatha yogi, if union with God to a religious mystic; and initiate only those rare individuals who say they want the highest truth.

Do not condemn or criticize yogis and mystics; they have their place of usefulness for those who are unable to grasp philosophy. But when they set up yoga or mysticism as the highest, the end, then it is legitimate to criticize this error.

The course of reading-study in V.S.I.'s Class is usually in the following order: (1) J.A. Thomson's "Introduction of Science" (2) "Clear Thinking" by A.E. Mander, (3) "Clear Thinking" by Jepson (Publisher Longmans)(3-a) J. Jastrow's "Effective thinking" (3-b) Bradby: "Logic of the Unconscious," (3-c) Jeans "Mysterious Universe," (4) Vivekachudamani, (5) Paulsen's "Introduction to Philosophy" (6) Patrick's Introduction to Philosophy, (7) Hart's Psychology of Insanity, (8) Panchadesi, (9) Jivan Mukta Viveka, (10) Mandukya (11) Wildon Carr's "Problem of Truth", (12) Sankara's Selected Works. No.1 to 9 are gone through quickly, but No.10 very slowly.

At the beginning and at the ending of your philosophic books you ought to acknowledge your personal debt to the ancient Rishis for this teaching, because it is not yours and because this practice puts down the ego.

50% of your Sciatic pain will be forgotten if you divert your attention to philosophic studies.

To my disciples who complain that I require them to live a double life keeping our philosophy secret and giving out mysticism still, I reply: Yes, your objection is correct if you think only of yourselves, but it is invalid if you live for others and want to help all, not merely the one in a million who is fit for our philosophy.

Do not expose that Samadhi is sleep nor even the bliss is after sleep in the first volume. It will be a premature revelation and do harm to those who are not ripe for it. Reserve it for the second volume but mention that the criticisms show there is a case for further investigation.

From a letter to the editor of proposed Journal "Indian Philosophical Review," 1917:- "I believe the proposal has not come even a day too soon. It is a great pity that in the land of Vedanta, the land which has been called the cradle of philosophy, such an organization was not thought of earlier. The delay has only made the need more keenly felt."

When writing about our teaching it is inadvisable to call it philosophy as nowadays everybody has a philosophy. Better call it Truth or Philosophic Truth.

Do not reveal that the Brahman is beyond words until you reach the end of writing an article or book because critics will rightly object why then waste time writing about it? Then only you may say that your writing is one thorn to pick out another thorn.

If you use any label whatsoever you become a sect and thus by implication deny the non-dual Atman. Hence keep away from labels.

To form an association or society of students is inevitably to form a sect. A journal independent of any school may be published but forming an organization at once separates you into a group, which degenerates into sectarianism, and in any case, expresses duality, evoking opposition from others who differ.

Those who write about Advaita and use the word I in their writing, show thereby they have not understood.

The term philosophy was once defined as "Search after Truth." and I want now gradually to restore that meaning to it.

Be careful not to write positive statements about Truth or reality. You may do so about all else but not this. For no thought can grasp or express it.

What is the use of editors writing leaders advocating the solution of economic-social problems by offering the panacea of abstract words like "If justice prevails" etc, but without explaining how these things are to be brought about? The problem is a practical one and hence practical solutions should be suggested, not useless "ifs." Vedanta is practical.

P.B. has been criticized for his change of views. But it is only the religious and mystic people who have so criticized and said he should be despised. But why should he not change his views if he finds some that are better? He is honest and truthful and so confesses the imperfection of his old views when he perceives this.

Use sub-titles instead of § sections-mark throughout book. It helps readers.

When meeting persons or granting interviews always refrain from committing yourself in speech by first asking a question like "What do you seek most apart from material things?" in order to get the measure of their level of understanding and aspiration. Then speak down to their level only.

Point out that the truth of idealism can become clear only by eliminating the ego; otherwise people will ask "Why can't I create a world by thought," thus falling into solipsism. Don't go into this at length but merely hint at it because you will not deal with ego until next volume.

Show that philosophy points to oneness but don't try to prove it merely mentioning that it will be dealt with fully in next volume.

Do not write about Hitler when referring to present chaos. You may however say Europe is suffering retribution for being unbalanced, for overdoing earthly attachment; although there is nothing wrong with it in proper place.

The person who sent Swami Vivekananda to America and Europe paying all the expenses, was the Maharaja of Mysore, and to him the Mandukya is dedicated, because he paid for its printing. Look at the debt of gratitude which India owes to the H.H. for making its best wisdom known to the world and look at the debt of gratitude which West owes to H.H. for giving the best man available in India to teach it! And look at the opportunities H.H. has afforded you to learn the highest Vedanta 50 years after Vivekananda's time in order to teach the new generations of the West. We all ought to be most grateful to the Mysore Royal Family.

It is a tradition in Vedantic authors to state at the beginning of their books the object or the aim which the work hopes to attain or the purpose it has in view: to reveal the use of its study.

Poets and literary men write principally for pleasure or for money, but Vedantic-authors must write primarily for the sake of giving out truth.

Examine each word of your writing. See if it is exactly what you mean, if it is precisely correct.

Do not start a journal as it will only become another sect. Besides personal tuition is essential for doubts and questions will arise which can be dealt with only by personal tuition. School, class, and individual work is the only way to teach Vedanta.

You may throw out suggestions to inquirers to test if they have any doubts, such as "Have you read this?" and note their reactions. Only if they show doubts should one reveal Vedanta: otherwise give yoga.

Open your writings of articles or books by mentioning after a reference to science philosophy, etc, "By science I mean so and so." etc.

I advise you when meeting persons for interviews to let them do the preliminary speaking. Keep quiet and let them reveal their mental position; after that only should you give them what they can grasp and no more. If mysticism is their goal, then talk only about mysticism.

In your new book do not denounce your or any yogic experiences as auto-suggestion or figment of imagination. It will do much harm to (a) readers of your other books, (b) to yourself by stopping income from those books and by bringing many personal attacks on you. Just hint at this only, and prepare to lead a little way to it. Reserve it for later works.

Do not use the word 'I' frequently in your writing. It will sound and be egoistic. Better omit it as much as possible and keep to impersonal style.

You must relate your teaching to what is going on in the world of modern thoughts thus showing it to be of up-to-date value.

Praise yoga in your writings by all means, but show its limitations also and expose the error of yogis claiming to be Gnani. Show difference between both that yogi fails to discriminate between real and unreal. The yogis are still in the realm of duality, whereas Gnani is always in non-duality. The yogi controls a second thing, thought.

Your rejoinder to Sir Jogendra Singh in Indian Review (entitled "My views on Yoga") is excellent. It expresses the right line to take when writing your book. Do not attack yoga, do not criticize yogis save where they are cheats like the Meher Baba's or where they claim ultimate realization like Aurobindo. Proclaim that yoga is good in its right place. This is not mere tact, it is based on truth. For yoga does have a valuable place on the path, and besides it represents the highest to those who take to it can aspire to; they are fit for nothing better, so why deprive them of it? When writing of yogic authors, it is better not to denounce them.

LITERARY COUNSEL

Where you do not to commit yourself but only wish to quote religious doctrines, preface them by the remark "It is said."

Readers may stop here and not read further. If however, they want to inquire deeper and are willing to ask what is this world, this soul, God, etc. to ultimates and they are prepared to face the consequences, they may take up this new book.

In preface of new manuscript dissociate yourself from yogis and mystics. Thus make public your change of view. But do it tactfully and say yoga and mysticism are useful for certain classes. If you do not publish this severance instructed people will sooner or later denounce you as a rogue who is cheating others by exaggerating the attainment of yogis, or as a fool, who has been cheated by them.

When writing your books take away the spirit of egoism: Do not write "I want to do this", or "I did that." Otherwise it will only beget the same spirit of egoism in others. Don't be arrogant in literary style; omit the term 'I'. Write impersonally.

Point out that you have not been dealing with the ultimate reality--Brahman--in certain books but only with the higher conception of Asiatic religion.

It is better to familiarize yourself with Western ideas of Mind and then complement them by the Indian. Make a combination between both expositions for your manuscript.

Use the word "knowledge" when writing with some qualification. For in the West it means true knowledge whereas in India there are two kinds of knowledge erroneous and true.

Words like "actual", "true", "actually," "truly" in a scientific (non-philosophic) sense without some qualifying phrase like "it is said or termed by science" or "what are said to be" are not to be used in your book, since you are writing a book on philosophy. These qualifying phrases will put readers on guard.

State what you mean by terms like (a) sensation, apprehension, perception, experience, (b) use technical terms as little as possible, (c) make clear your definitions as to how you are using the words--in body, not in foot notes.

Do not labor what is already known to the West in your book, but bring forward what is new.

Your duty is never to use ambiguous words when writing.

Do not use the word welfare as goal of Vedanta but well-being because former is limited to material side only.

People naturally like that which gives them the least trouble. Hence they prefer philosophical books expressed in easy non-technical language.

Put references to latest science at the beginning of a chapter or article so that even if a scientist should read your work he will see that you are up to date in scientific knowledge; not merely repeating what has been known for centuries.

Say only that the object is the thought itself. It is not advisable at this stage to say it is only an inference or non-existent as people will not be convinced until you have shown ego is illusion, so it should follow later (in volume 2). What you can say is that the external object if known must itself be also an idea, second thought of the same thing as we cannot go beyond ideas in awareness. If you say anything more that will raise the whole question of non-causality for you will be asked for the cause of the idea itself.

Do not publish the fact that you are writing at my request because critics will then say that you are guided by others and have no judgment of your own.

Do not oppose science to religion because critics will retort that they are incommensurable.

Remember the word "belief" has two meanings: you can have a belief based on scientific fact or it can be based on mere opinion.

Similarly be careful in your use of the word revelation, because this term also has various meanings.

Be careful in saying that I reject inferences because there are various kinds of inferences. I reject the logical inferences only.

Do not create the doubt whether God exists. It must come of its own accord to others.

Do not write that we must renounce yogic experiences and mystical teachings but rather write that we must take a higher view than this.

Do not repudiate your previous books but declare them to be perfectly correct from their respective standpoints and therefore of definite value to all those people who are still looking at life from those standpoints.

Do not write that you have given up research into yoga; say I don't identify myself with Ashrams.

Say I only criticize those who say Raja Yoga is the end; it is not; Gnana yoga is the end.

Instead of saying "Let us argue and discuss his statements and see if they be true," Dr. Brunton's courage in speaking out about Yoga has brought many personal attacks on him. This is because his words disturb personal interests.

Start your writings only with what is known, i.e. the Atman, and never with the Unknown, i.e. the Brahman. After examination and inquiry you may then lead the reader to discover that Atman in its purest undifferentiated state is Brahman. It is wrong to translate the word Brahman as Mind or even "Absolute Mind" as that is sure to be misunderstood; various people have their own different definitions of the 'mind' and hence it is dangerous to use. Mind as they usually interpret it is Brahman active or in manifestation. It would be more correct to translate Brahman as "Reality" or as "Consciousness (devoid of subject-object relation.)"

Deleted paras from your magazine articles on yoga may go into the new book. Delete all paras likely to go above the heads of general level of mental culture through taking the highest standpoint in criticizing yoga. People cannot understand you; so they will misunderstand you and abuse you.

Point out that the failure of religion compels us to go to Indian philosophy for guidance. Opening chapters to expose "cavism" from the viewpoint of truth; also the defects of yoga, mysticism and religion (b) to expatiate on the world crisis, its meaning and lessons (c) analyze yoga etc. Say it is necessary on way and a preparation. Watertight compartmentalism. Great yogi may not know truth.

The Tyranny of Words. Right and wrong use of words. Take 'God' as an illustration.

The two points of view. Show that the Paramarthic man is not cut off from Vyvaharika experience because Vedanta is neither realism nor idealism; it is beyond both these.

The Drg Drsya Analysis.

The Ego. Devote a whole chapter to this separately. Need of non-attachment. Man's true being is nearest to mental.

The world as idea, including Space and Time as Idea. Maya as ever-changing Perception.

The practical, social and ethical bearing of Vedanta.

The true sage: Describe his inner attitude, and outer conduct negatively, because such a man cannot be identified by others. Show what he won't do, and thus protect people from being duped by frauds. Expose "cavism" again but now from the point of view of external practical social living and show sages are in the world, not in caves.

We have to find an attractive title. It must not dissatisfy readers so that they complain the book does not deal either with yoga or truth but leaves them suspended in mid-air between both.

In chapter 1, do not talk of mere yoga alone, but of mind disciplined by yoga practice, because the West will know what is meant by mind.

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.

If possible recommend that West adopt non-meat diet. Use science to support and illustrate your thesis wherever possible. Say that all your past teachings (in preface) are concerned with illusory phenomena, that they were necessary preliminaries but those who seek ultimates must go higher now.

It is more correct to say that ideas subsist in mind than to say they exist in the mind.

At the very opening of the new book give readers a wide glimpse of the practical bearing and immediate benefits of philosophy. This need only take a few pages. Otherwise your old readers will say "What is the use of this metaphysics? At least we got peace from mysticism and comfort, but this seems useless hair-splitting." The opening is an important position of the book and gives the first impression. Point out therein that you have given yoga to the West under the impression it was the best India offered, but that you found something higher later and so are now giving that also to help the West. Don't let people get the idea that philosophy is vain controversy. Show that it has a value for a world in sorrow. Hence put this at the beginning, thus promising at the start what is to be attained at the end.

Maharishi: Don't give the impression you learnt nothing from him but admit he confirmed and deepened your meditation and mystical views. Say it is because you earlier practiced meditation in West that you developed a taste for it, that if you had not done so then you would not have come to India to further it and would not have been attracted to Maharishi if you had not already had mystic experiences. Subsequently however you asked yourself how could this serve humanity at large, and you found that yoga served the individual only. Do not say you were dissatisfied with yoga, as critics will then retort that your judgments are thus proved worthless, but say rather you wanted something higher, after a time, than being satisfied like Indians with living in retreat or trance or peace, something that would help mankind in these terrible times.

Sensation chapter: Analyze sensations first as physical, then resolve it into mental and after that prove mental character: deal with illusion in same chapter. Give the modern examples of illusion but say Indian analysis is fuller.

Re new manuscript: Your arguments go as far as Berkeley, hence antiquated you must know that Stebbing and Moore have refuted Jeans, Eddington and Berkeley. So you must write something new so as to attract attention, and yourself refute Stebbing and G.E. Moore who are realists. Analyze the meaning of their arguments.

You may go as far and include Drg Drsya Viveka in the new book but stop there.

Your book should show the relation between Vedanta on one hand and mysticism, yoga on other.

The chapters 7 and 8 in "The Hidden Teaching Beyond Yoga" reveal a capacity for presenting philosophy intelligibly and attractively such as I have never before seen in print. There is no doubt that you have an inborn gift for grasping and teaching philosophy.

Do not use the term I in your writings. For it merely means, to the philosophic reader that you are giving a personal opinion. State what you think in impersonal terms, then it will have a value for the truth-seeker. Moreover it means that you are offering a statement which is acceptable to personal admirers not what is true of itself. This leads to dividing people into sections, because it means appealing to followers, forming groups. Write in the third person always, about what it is; otherwise you only give what you think.

Re: Your book "Indian Philosophy and Modern Culture," two errors are there: Monism should be labeled as the "Monistic Stage" while "Idealism" is labeled the "Idealistic stage in Indian Philosophy." We go beyond both these stages, but you have not dealt with further stage. Hence the book should be called "Indian Thought and Modern Culture" as it does not contain a complete system of philosophy.

The "Madras Mail" reviewer of your book "Indian Philosophy and Modern Culture" is a child and obviously a dualist. He is quite wrong in his criticisms. You had every right to introduce as a philosophic tenet the scientific concept of one primary substance, because philosophy is not to be limited to speculation but must embrace science, and indeed everything and this particular scientific tenet is a fact, not theory.

The peoples suffer through war etc. and suffer blindly. Your book should show them why they suffer.

Do not label yourself. If you say Hinduism, opponents will rise up and say Christianity. If you say Vedanta philosophy they will oppose it with Western philosophy. Vivekananda's Vedanta was welcome and triumphant at the Chicago World's Fair of 1893. But New York World's Fair 1938 no exhibit or lecture by the Vedanta or Hindu Faith (or indeed any non-Christian or non-Judaic faith) was allowed. Thus the R.K. Mission being labeled like a sect aroused opposition and enmity. Therefore form no cult, tie no label. Be forewarned and thus be fore-armed.

A man wrote me that "I have mastered Ashtavakra Gita." If so, what does he mean by using the term 'I'. That proves he has not mastered it.

Mind is best referred to in writing as "an existence" or "an entity," but, not as a "thing" or as a "substance."

If you set up one thing for public esteem it will surely rouse the opposition to set up something of their own or to attack it. If you label yourself as Advaitin you will rouse the opposite feeling and critics will set up as Dualist. If you put P.B. on a pedestal others will put x.y. as a reaction. If you start a Shankara day of celebration then the Madhvites will start Madhva day. It is therefore best to keep quiet and not to start a sect, cult or movement or personality or following.

ON JOURNAL COUNSEL

I would prefer to have both the "SPHINX" and "PHILOSOPHIC LIFE" combined into a single publication for the reason that (a) to reserve the higher teachings will create a wrong impression that you are cutting yourself away from mankind if you drop the mystic section altogether and publish only a philosophic journal. (b) I particularly want the mystic-minded readers impressed with the fact that there is a higher level (c) Critics may object that you are keeping truth back from them. (d) that if you publish only a philosophical review the critics may say your judgment is worthless and you may give up philosophy as you would then have appeared to have given up mysticism. (e) However if you insist on having two separate journals then adopt the following plan. Always include in each issue of SPHINX one article which will act as a bridge between mysticism and philosophy which will point out to mystics that a higher teaching exists which will act as a liaison officer between both, which will destroy the belief that mysticism is the final goal and supplant it by the idea that it is only a step. For the former belief is bad for mankind the second is good. This article should seek to arouse interest in philosophy and even to create it. Some among the mystics may read it and turn to PHILOSOPHIC LIFE out of curiosity and find it helpful and thus they are led slowly upward to a new viewpoint. The necessity of including such an article is the need of giving them a chance to rise higher if they want to. It can and should plainly confess that the mystic journal is a preparatory to the other one. (Note by P.B.--Always place a small advertisement in box at end of the 'liaison' article and giving particulars of the philosophic journal.

Let "SPHINX" liaison article make it quite clear that mysticism has not exhausted all the possibilities.)

Do not use the word "philosophy" in title of second review as it will lead to belief that we are teaching another speculative system. For same reason do not use the word "oriental".

You may certainly comment on world happenings but take great care to deal only with facts not with news got from newspapers because the latter often exaggerate and often give only one-sided. Never comment unless sure that it is a fact. Otherwise refrain. Always point out both sides, good features as well as bad. This feature can be suitably dealt with in the philosophic journal also, whilst they can be commented on purely ethically in the mystic journal.

The monastic ideal may be kept in mystic journal by contributors, if they wish.

"Philosophic Life" should be dignified in tone, whereas "SPHINX" may be popular and even sensational because wide circulation must be obtained for the latter; you ought to make a business success of this latter, because its publication should also be in America. Try and get your swami contributors to avoid the word Vedanta. Similarly the word "mysticism" should be avoided, if possible in SPHINX because it is used variously and derogatorily even. Substitute something like 'inner peace' for it.

The title SPHINX is quite suitable for the journal as no doubt exists but that Egypt shows Indian influence.

PHILOSOPHIC LIFE must be published in America because (a) that will give it better standing than if it is published in India, out of which the West does not think real philosophy can come. (b) because the Americans of all people are most ready for Vedanta (c) there are thoughtful

professors in American universities who will give it a hearing. (d) almost no circulation can be got in India.

Use the lesson of war to show how disregard of Oneness led to suffering and point out Vedanta's great message is Oneness.

SPHINX is too poetic a title for the philosophic journal and should be kept for the mystic one. We do not want people to be carried away by emotion or poetry.

Indian University Professors will not care for your magazine because they all lack science and would have to confess their ignorance of it; for same reason they ignored my essay in Contemporary Indian Philosophy; if they admitted their unfitness for real philosophy they would lose their posts!

Your magazine will yield no satisfaction to most people and they will say, "We get nothing from this paper." That will be because they are not resolved to find truth, but want to be satisfied.

Say the magazine is not representing any particular school of thought but seeks truth everywhere it may be found. The magazine is unique, different.

Even though you drop the mystic journal take care not to give the impression in your writings elsewhere that you have deserted mysticism etc. because that will hurt those who are unfit for higher studies.

We do not want to start a new philosophic sect. Therefore you may welcome Prof. Narasimhia's articles for the magazine because our standpoint is the independent search for truth. But do not accept his offer to become Indian Associate editor. Only say that you will consult him occasionally about such matters.

Make your leading or first article in each issue deal with the practical bearing of philosophy to remove initial prejudice that it is remote from life. It is good also to include in each issue as you suggest an article on semantics and idealism and philosophic gems of Orient.

Just as Yoga Vasista, Bhagavad Gita and other books have presented fragments of truth imbedded in covering of stories, histories and picturesque touches of mysticism, so your modern writing on Advaita should follow this example. Your magazine should have touches of mysticism to make it more attractive, thereby you will not only reach larger numbers of people but also few who care for truth alone. Thus you will serve both classes. If you present only a dry statement of ideas alone you will only get 500 subscribers.

What is philosophy? It has to deal with life, not mere words, not this man's or that man's interpretation. The key to it is, as Mandukya p.351 says, for the philosopher to be "ever the same." This means he sees and knows only one thing, the self. Those who say that your journal will become an arena of conflicting interpretations of V.S.I.'s teachings are replied thus: Whoever thinks he is interpreting me is still dealing with words, not truth. It proves that he has not understood my teaching. There is no two persons in Gnan, both gnanis become inwardly identical and atoned in perfect understanding and agreement of the same truth. Criticism can only arise, disagreement can only happen, contradictory interpretation can only occur when men have failed to grasp what I have taught them. Had they the capacity to grasp they would be above words and above "interpretation." So do not worry about this stupid objection. Remember

that only a tiny few of those who studied with me have ever understood my teaching; they only understood my words. Find those few. Then the question of contradictory interpretations will never arise. There will be no-two among them, only one. The only test of the correctness of any interpretation of my thought is whether it tends towards non-duality or not, whether its writer has non-duality in his heart or not.

KANT

It is an impossibility for anyone to prove that there is a causal relation between the universe and some mysterious producing agent. It has never struck the ancient or modern philosophers, except Gaudapada to inquire into the meaning of cause! Kant got confused on the point by placing cause in the mind and then contradicting it by making the "thing in itself" as the cause of his phenomenal world. Therefore Hegel rejected Kant's doctrine on this point.

Kant said that time space and cause are contributed by the mind, whilst the "thing in itself" contributed the cause of the phenomenon or appearance. Kant has never proved that there is a thing in itself. He and Berkeley stopped half-way. There he differed from Berkeley who did not admit any noumenon or "thing in itself" substance. Berkeley however fell into the error of making God the cause of the ideas, as He puts these ideas into human minds. Kant rejected Berkeley as absurd, but Berkeley was perfectly correct as a first step only, but absurd as a complete system. Similarly Kant himself made some mistakes and his complete system is faulty; he is useful for further steps only.

Kant's Critique of Pure Reason proves that God does not exist. On the other hand his Critique of Practical Reason proves that God exists. These two positions are exactly like our Vedantic Paramartik and Vyavaharik view points, the former being based on philosophy and the latter on practical experience.

Kant had a leaning toward religion which he expressed in his "Critique of Practical Reason" thus weakening his philosophy but making his work more popular. Hume, on the other hand, was strict in his reasoning and declared God even to be no more than an idea.

Kant comes nearest to Indian Philosophy because he has got the doubt "Is my knowledge true or false?"

Kant need not have written a book of arguments for intuitional duty, consciences, which he calls "Categorical Imperative" if it was perfectly clear to every man; the fact is men are often confused as to what is the true dictate of conscience. The very fact that he feels the need of arguing his case, proves it is not of universal intuition.

But Kant assumes that every man has an intuitive notion of what is right and wrong; how does he know that others will come to the same 'conscience' that he has? If intuition or conscience were common to all, there would be universal cooperation today. Krishna excelled Kant by saying you will know your duty by appealing to reason.

Kant was the one man in West who worried himself a little about truth: he saw the difference between "theoretical reason" (philosophic view point) and "practical reason" (popular standpoint) but he was not patient enough to go through to the bitter end. So he brought in God.

Kant showed that time, space and causation are ideas: beyond that he did not go.

Kant has shown excellently how we think always within the framework of times space and cause, and that we cannot go away from it.

Kant was the greatest because the most scientific of Western thinkers; all the other philosophers including Hegel, Fichte, Schelling etc. mixed imagination with their reasoning. Even today the living philosophers of the West spin webs of imagination.

Kant said that external things do exist. When asked what they were, he was unable to answer.

Herbert Spencer made same mistake as Kant in teaching that the real essences the noumenon of the world was unknowable. The correct doctrine is that world is knowable because it is Drsyam, object, but the Drik, the Witness is never knowable.

Kant's "Categorical Imperative" is nothing but intuition, unproved.

Kant and Hegel did not understand that when "existence" is predicated of the Absolute, they were talking nonsense. For to define it you can only go to Drsyam.

"There is something which may not be a tiger but my mind pictures it as tiger. This thing in itself is what I do not know."--- Kant.

Kant said that it is only through consciousness of world of objects that self-consciousness is possible at all. This is not correct, because he never made the ego an object, a drsyam.

Objective Idealism says that there is something independent and outside the body, a thing-in-itself but we only have ideas of it. The criticism against this is that body is in the mind. Subjective idealism denies that there is any object outside.

KANT's query "What is the Nature of Knowledge" is equivalent to What is Gnan? His inability to account for the phenomena led him to postulate a thing-in-itself but Gaudapada anticipated this difficulty and met it.

Kant's Moral Imperative is nonsense. It merely means "I feel therefore it must be true." There is no infallible criterion in feeling, conscience.

KANT improved upon Berkeley. However his statement that there is an object-in-itself which is the cause of our idea of it is mere assumption. There is no such thing except in imagination. When Kant says that causality was a fiction still he could not apply this to ideas and objects. This is his weakness.

How do you know there is an object except through the mind? Can you know anything existing except through the mind? This was the refutation of Kant's Objective Idealism. How do you know there is anything other than mind?

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.

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 Drik, then he would have been right: but instead he said it was outside the mind.

Even if Kant's thing-in-itself existed, it could be none other than mental still.

How can Kant know that the thing-in-itself can never be perceived as it really is? For this implies that he knows it to be different, which contradicts his statement that it cannot be known.

Before you can reasonably discuss Kant's noumenon the real thing-in-itself, you have to know what reality is. Otherwise how are you to recognize it when you see it? If a man appears before you and says "I am Hitler" and you have never seen Hitler or his picture before how can you be sure he is Hitler or an Impostor? Therefore Kant had no right to say there was a reality beyond phenomena when he did not know what real means.

ANCIENT EUROPEANS:

ARISTOTLE could not get beyond causality, hence he never got at truth.

PARMENIDES is the Greek philosopher nearest to my teaching.

PLATO: The Greeks got their best ideas in philosophy from India, some of their thinkers like Pythagoras having traveled to India. Plato mixed some of those Indian ideas with his own. Who has seen that substance called the "soul"? The Platonic dualism of soul and body is speculative, not philosophic. It is like Ramanujism.

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.

The Greeks must have got their higher philosophical ideas from India in some way or other.

PYTHAGORAS: I admire him because he traveled to India and learnt some things here and because he made Mathematics a condition of entry into his academy, thus training the mind into truth-search, but he was not a Jnani.

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.

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.

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.

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.

DIONYSIUS. The Christian philosophy of Dionysius the Areopagite contains Vedantic ideas, but he is unable to prove them, like all mystics. He merely dogmatizes on them. Our method on the contrary is to prove every point by reasoning. In this respect he is no better than Sri Aurobindo. Moreover the fundamental error of Dionysius is he thinks of something being

produced. There is not one syllable about non-causality in his book. He does not see that whatever is produced cannot last.

PLATO was right in saying that we turn our minds towards shadows but how did he know there was any reality? For he never inquired into this. Therefore he could only answer, like a mystic "I experience it." He may however have meant that we do not know anything beyond our ideas, i.e. shadows; we do not know reality.

PLATO grasped the truth of idealism like Berkeley. My belief is that he learnt this indirectly from India.

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.

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.

ZENO The Indian argument that it is impossible to show the particular moment when a cause becomes an effect is similar to Zeno's famous paradox that it is impossible to show any motion.

MODERN WESTERNERS :

BERGSON: European philosophers have no idea of Reason purified based on the three states as we have in India. They have only the idea of reason based on one state--waking. This kind of reason is intellectualism and cannot lead to truth. It is this kind of barren intellectualism which Bergson showed to be unsatisfactory in his quest of reality.

What is it that told Bergson that such intellect cannot be relied on? That faculty was none other than purified reason. He did not know that there was this higher faculty and so wrongly sought refuge in mystic intuition.

This is the weakness or defect of Bergson's philosophy, that intuition is made the supreme arbiter of right knowledge and truth. Such spontaneous thoughts of the future do come and are verified, but that does not justify setting them up as judges of the major question of "What is Truth." But Bergson is quite correct in pointing out that everything seen or known is constantly changing. He has yet to learn about the Seer who sees these changes. This he could get from Avastratraya.

Intuition is a thought, which comes of its own accord without preparatory reflection; whereas all other thoughts are voluntary and deliberate. Bergson is incorrect in making intuition the medium of knowing reality. There he is a mystic.

Bergson had no idea of the drik; he was quite right as regards the ever-changing drsyam. His error was to assert changelessness as being behind or within the drsyam.

Bergson says that this unending world-change is permanent. This is a contradiction in terms. Only that which sees the change, is ever-present.

Bergson was the only man I found in Europe who showed some understanding of my Vedantic position about the meaning of truth, and he had the keenest subtle buddhi: Planck came second after him in understanding.

BLAVATSKY; I believe Blavatsky suffered from hallucinations. All her adepts are imagined. She wrote her books under delusions. Her (precipitated letters) from adepts were unproved. I gave up theosophy because there was no proof.

Her definition of Buddhi as "spiritual soul" is nonsense.

BRADLEY: He did not define what reality was, nor how you knew that there was a reality. Hence he did not go far enough. He went beyond Hegel but he could never see how appearance came out of reality: it was unaccountable. Our position is that appearance is reality and the I is the Mind, but this cannot be grasped without Avastatraya. However Bradley came very near our teaching.

Bradley, Wildomlan and Joachim have seen the vital importance of the question of Truth, but all have concluded that it is unattainable.

DESCARTES; Nothing is more certain than "I think, therefore I am." Vedanta says this I is only temporary, it appears and disappears. When I wrote a paper embodying this statement and declaring that therefore we cannot be certain about such an I, one of the leading English philosophers said the paper went against all European thought and would bring discredit to me! Descartes and Spinoza were among the first to question seriously the basis of knowledge. But even they did not have the Vedantic principle of testing it by defining truth. What my eyes see--is it true? had yet to occur to them.

Descartes did the same, i.e. came nearest to Indian Philosophy because he had the doubt, "Is my knowledge true or false?" but he did not advance so far as Kant.

W.K. CLIFFORD'S theory that everything is mind-stuff is the nearest of Western theories to Vedanta.

LEIBNIZ's monads have each a window through which they look on an independent material world. It is like Ramanuja's and Madhva's belief in multiplicity of souls.

MEINONG is one of the most outstanding modern German thinkers for he began the philosophic movement which asks the questions "What is the meaning of meaning?" For this leads to the further inquiry, "What is the mind doing when it is thinking?" i.e. what is its fundamental process? And this leads to the discovery that the mind's fundamental process is to imagine things, whether they be a beautiful woman or the highest truth. All are ultimately its imaginations, drsyam that pass away.

BERGSON: Our reply to Bergson's doctrine is that all his change is only an idea, all his cinema show of duration is drsyam, his unending duration is itself a drsyam, an idea that will pass and hence not reality.

BERGSON saw the world as an ever-changing cinema show, but he did not rise to the next step of understanding this to be drsyam, which is purely Indian idea: he did not see that world could not be known as changing unless there was an unchanging element which enabled us to recognize the change as such; hence he thought there was only change, that it was the only reality, and the fundamental notion of Drik-Drisyam did not occur to him until I told him of it in Paris when he welcomed it joyfully. But it was too late.

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.

H.G. WELL's Plan of a world university to organize and apply knowledge to save mankind will only end in constant friction and mutual disagreement among the members, because of difference of opinions and because every man thinks "I know!" Unless this plan admitted Indian philosophers to give its members an impetus towards truth, it would hardly succeed.

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.

H.P. BLAVATSKY practiced tricks as phenomena. She mixed magic, mysticism with the philosophy. She may certainly have had gurus in Tibet, but that does not mean they know Truth, for there are gurus of different grades. However she did much to bring India forward to the West and after her, you have done the most in this way for India. You may avoid her mistakes by pointing out the difference clearly and by presenting mysticism only for those who want and are fit for nothing better.

HEGEL says that part of the Absolute is changing: similar theory is held in India by Visishtadvaitins. Such schools hold as the highest ideal, a man who sits in a cave, kills thinking and become more or less mad.

HEGEL: Prof. Wadia's Hegelian-Bergsonian doctrine that the Absolute is ever-changing is wrong because he does not know Indian philosophical position that both change and changelessness are ideas, imaginations.

HEGEL cannot show that his laws of thought are true: they are imagined. For his ideal goal in art, religion and philosophy is refuted by the facts that these three are merely a matter of personal or racial taste. Who is to set up the goals? The goals portrayed by Hegel are merely Hegel's own taste, no matter how logically he establishes it: People are deceived by the show of logic and do not see it covers mere personal satisfaction.

HEGEL did not see that the whole universe could be taken up into the Self and that man was ultimately that Self.

HEGEL'S philosophy was not based on scientifically ascertained facts but on mere logic, argument.

SPINOZA'S doctrine of mind and body being two aspects of the same unknown reality, substance, is the equivalent doctrine of Ramanuja's Visishtadvaita.

JOHN DEWEY'S theory of knowledge is only a theory: it does not get at what knowledge is in itself. For it starts unconsciously with duality of mind interacting with body or world and naturally finishes with duality.

JOHN LOCKE was still dreaming in the world of causality; hence he said there is a material source of our ideas of the qualities of things. Further, his division into primary and secondary qualities is quite arbitrary, and this was overthrown by Berkeley.

JOHN LOCKE. How does he know there are two things, an object and an idea of it? Moreover his "agreement" between both is itself mentally known, i.e. idea.

BRADLEY'S work is splendid but it does not attain the goal partly because some speculation is mixed in and partly because it is not based on science. The latter could not be fully helped because in his day science had not advanced to valuable position it now occupies.

WILLIAM JAMES book "VARIETIES OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE" is equal to collecting a large number of cases of people who go to Church or Temple and drawing the inference that there must be something in it! What if other people have felt "God" or "Spirit?" That does not prove latter's existence. Lunatics have felt they were kings. Moreover James' test of "Private and personal experience" is useless because every madman has such experience. James' work has given an impetus to mystic charlatanism.

PAUL DEUSSEN'S "SYSTEM OF VEDANTA" is an excellent book. It is a critical analysis of the Brahma Sutras.

ANNIE BESANT was nothing more than a mystic.

SCHOPENHAUER did not see that Will is what you find in the ego. However his doctrine of will is useful as a support for the doctrine of reincarnation.

Patrick's "Introduction to Philosophy" is an excellent presentation of latest Western thought but as the author has not studied Indian Philosophy, the book contains several mistakes. Thus he does not know the meaning and place of religion. He is a realist but writes impartially.

The chapter "What Can We Know?" in the latest edition of his book is the most important part. (It is chap.20 "Theories of Knowledge" in the first edition).

BERTRAND RUSSELL: is an objective idealist of a Kantian kind, whereas Jeans is out and out Berkelian.

SPINOZA: is nearer to Ramanuja than Sankara. He gave reality to an attribute or "mode" as he terms it--Substance of the One, just as Vasistadvaitins do. Also he believes in causality. Yet many mistake him for an equivalent to Advaitin.

He said that God was the whole of things in the world. Thus he was a Pantheist.

STEBBING: His refutation of Eddington's idealism is done by the appeal to logic only, not by appeal to facts of experience. Hence I attach little importance.

J. ARTHUR THOMSON: is quite reliable in his book "Introduction to Science" when dealing with science alone, but he weakens when he tackles religion and makes concession to religious sentiment. The Vedantin must be strict and merciless and denounce as useless, on the quest of truth what is really untrue. Science cannot explain fully the mystery of the universe, and so leading men like Thomson and Jeans weakly admit "the divine architect" to explain this mystery, instead of resisting religion as unproved.

WHITEHEAD: "Philosophy is like Poetry," says Whitehead in "Modes of Thought." "The purpose of philosophy is to rationalize mysticism which is direct insight." he says also. In Europe philosophy is imagination, speculation, but to us philosophy is truth, and not speculation. Vedanta wants to go beyond the world of ideas, (Drisyam) to the Drik, while Whitehead wants only an adventure into the world of new ideas.

He admits a mind and an object--and both somehow interrelated.

BRADBY's "Logic of Unconscious Mind" deals with the ordinary normal mind which has got prejudices, motives etc. in its undercurrent whereas Hart's book deals with the abnormal insane man. Bradby's book must be studied to understand what is meant by "reason."

SCHOPENHAUER was very perceptive, but his doctrine of will is shakti. He could not see that Brahman was behind the will. None of the Western philosophers has realized the true position which Sankara's Vedanta alone can supply us.

THE MENTALISTS: Paulson's "Introduction to Philosophy" is excellent. He is a semi-idealist. He is the chief supporter of the Mentalists which school of Western philosophy teaches there is only one universal substance - Mind.

EDDINGTON may have advanced to seeing all world in consciousness but he has not advanced to our position that he himself, the ego, is also an idea.

JEANS and Eddington both accept the world is an idea theory, but they do not go further. Russell has approached midway to the Idealist position, he too accepts the world is an idea.

PROF MACMURRAY is very intelligent and sympathetic towards Indian Idealism; I discussed with him for three hours.

Emerson; (con't from 450)

to India and thus did not have the opportunity to know what Indian philosophy really was.

Emerson often falls into poetry and mysticism.

I regard as the greatest American born till now.

FREUD: His discovery of the unconscious is self-contradictory. When he speaks of the Unconscious, how does he know it exists except through being conscious at the time? At no

moment can we be able to make a statement about the Unconscious and yet be in an unconscious state. Similarly Freud saying that the irrational is more important than the rational, is to imagine that in making such a statement he is using a rational process, thus unconsciously giving more importance to the rational. Freud has not gone deep enough inside to seek the ultimate truth about this subject. The Freudians say that mind is a wider term than consciousness. But we reply that both being unmeasurable, their length, height and depth being unknown, who dare say which is wider or narrower? When they say that impulses, desires and appetites are more important than reason, they are correct from the standpoint of psychology, but incorrect from standpoint of philosophical truth.

His notion of sex worship in primitive people is partly correct. But his mistake is to think that they worshipped sex for its own sake. They worshipped it as a symbol of divine creative power.

HEGEL: Hegel failed to see that the ego is an idea. He merely took Fichte's ego and expanded it into the universal ego. He taught Absolutism, i.e. that everything is only thought. Hegel's doctrine is not Advaita; it is more like vivartavada. It is based on causality, on an endless causal chain. His Absolute includes its parts, and is ever-evolving, whereas Vedantic Brahman is non-dual. Therefore they are different.

The Absolute of Hegel and Bradley's is constantly active in the world, therefore always changing, never taking rest, always creating, whereas Vedanta say: No: Nothing is ever born, nothing changes, in the Ultimate Reality.

Hegel says there is an Absolute. But how does he know? He is unable to explain how the Many came into existence. Then how can doubt cease? And whilst doubt remains there can be no gnan.

HEISENBERG AND PLANCK. Determinism can be represented in an irrefutable way because it is based on law of cause and effect.

It is the cause that has been determined in any state of affairs. Science said every effect was determined by a cause; hence everything has been pre-determined. But when Heisenberg put forward the theory of indeterminacy, even science had to prepare to abandon its former unqualified faith in causality and with that, faith in free-will grew stronger.

Similarly, Mandukya, Chap.4 disposes of all this by disposing of causality altogether.

Heisenberg said: Take the smallest particle in the atom; we cannot predict in which way it will turn, whether it will take a path to the right or left. Max Planck, however, added that as we do not know all the causes, it might be possible to predict the path of a particle if we were in possession of the causes. I reply, how and when is it possible to know all the causes? We can only rely upon the facts known to us already.

Heisenberg does not have courage to come out boldly for non-causality, so he calls it indeterminacy, meaning we do not know what is going to happen later on, perhaps cause may reappear.

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; analysed 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 Drik. 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.

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.

WILLIAM JAMES. He says that God calls men to cooperate with Him. We reply: How do you know (a) that there is a God? (b) that He is calling us? These matters which have yet to be proved, i.e. they are acceptable only on faith not knowledge.

W. James although so much in advance of other thinkers was content to take his feeling of spiritual ecstasy as reality. This was because he did not make the Drg Drsya Viveka analysis. (He would then have discovered that his feelings, however spiritual, come and go like all thoughts, and are therefore not the Drik. P.B). We agree however with James when he says there is something more, higher, than what we ordinarily know. He calls it, "the divine more" but he confuses this personal emotion with ultimate reality.

JEANS: Jeans receives my admiration. He is married; why not? Let him enjoy life for he is doing great work. His "divine Architect" is only imagination.

JOAD: is merely a libertine who mixes imagination with thought; is a realist.

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.

Leibnitz and Spinoza have been refuted by Kant, who has shown that their time and space are not there "outside."

LOCKE: It is impossible to take color out of anything. You cannot take the color apart from the cloth. Therefore it is said by Locke that sensations of color, smell taste and smell are secondary qualities which exist inside the mind and not in things. It's said these things are put together with the impressions made on the senses to produce the final perception.

Locke's book "Essay Concerning Human Understanding" deals with epistemology and starts with doubt.

PATRICK: He should have started his book "Introduction to Philosophy" with the question or proposition "What is truth?" instead he leaves this question for the closing chapters and even then he puts it as a subsidiary chapter on Pragmatism. Thus his book is rendered almost useless for practical guidance in life, for ascertainment of philosophic truth & becomes a collection of mere opinions & quotes.

MAX PLANCK: I took the trouble to send Mandukya to some of the leading scientists of Europe, and later to meet them personally. But with a single exception they dismissed it and myself either as a Hindu religion or with the superiority complex of white race which assumes

nothing good can come out of inferior India, or from a colored race. That exception was Max Planck who acknowledged the worth of our philosophy but regretted his lack of time to inquire into it. Mandukya is beyond the highest science, yet scientists won't even look at it. Such an attitude merely makes more long-drawn their own quest of truth.

JOAD: On "Philosophical Aspects of Modern Science." Joad from Vedantic standpoint, would be treated as a religionist, or scholastic, not as a philosopher, because throughout this book he gives no definition of Truth or Reality. Frequently he writes "I do not agree with that" or "I don't think so" or "I don't see that". What does it matter what he thinks or feels? That is merely egoistic individual opinion, personal speculation. When I look at a book I first see if it starts with a definition of Truth or Reality. If it does not, then I do not regard it as a philosophical work, but as mysticism or fiction: Moreover, in his book, Joad advocates addition of aesthetic and mystic attitudes of that of agnostic, in order to reach reality: This is sheer mysticism, which has nothing to do with truth. Yet Joad is called a great philosopher. Unless the 'I' disappears there is no chance of discovering truth, says Vedanta. Yet Joad introduces his personal imaginings as philosophy. Real philosophy of truth must begin with definition.

BERTRAND RUSSELL'S Idealism is splendid because it is scientific. However he goes to the threshold and leaves us there.

LOCKE'S school which says the external world corresponds to our ideas are wrong. How can you know there is an external world except through the mind. Thus you get only mental pictures.

G.E. MOORE'S refutation of Idealism is based on what he regards as real, what his senses tell him i.e. what he feels to be real.

STEBBING thinks she has refuted idealism but she has not because she cannot get rid of her attachment to the body.

MRS. BESANT was a mystic, not a Gnani.

WHITEHEAD. The greatest scientists of Europe will not go beyond a certain limit: that is their weakness and why they do not enter Vedanta. Thus Whitehead talks of God's activity. How does he know that God is creating? He dare not make such a tremendous assumption in his own scientific work. Those who say the world must have a maker are assuming so, for there is no proof of it at all. We in Vedanta want proof only and will accept not even a single assumption. I told Jeans and Eddington they must take up Yoga, inquire "What is an Idea?" and find an answer in Indian Philosophy.

JUNG is in dispute with me. Therefore he says psychology is enough, I say that you must go deeper. You must ask what to the meaning of mind, subconsciousness etc.

LOCKE'S philosophy was a reaction against scholasticism. It led through latter thinkers to the exposure of religious falsities in England and France.

SPINOZA was greatest Pantheist. He viewed it from theological point only. Vedantins do not say everything is God, we say everything is Atman. If individual soul be also God, then who is God? Spinoza's theological weakness makes his teaching different: otherwise it would have been the same as Vedanta.

HEGEL: How can we know the Absolute as the whole, with all its parts made to harmonize? This can only be an idea, not reality. Advaita rises above this Hegelian notion of the Absolute. It is inconsistent and impossible to realize. Yet ignorant modern Indian writers use this notion of the Absolute as though it were equivalent to Brahman.

The reason why even the most advanced European philosophers have not grasped Indian Truth is because they do not know Avastatraya.

J.W. DUNNE'S book "Nothing Dies" is an advance toward Vedantic views but when he says that behind the ego there is an infinite regressus of other selves he is wrong. For what is it that sees the regressus? That it self must be the unchanging Self.

FRANCIS BACON: was one of the most intelligent man of his time. He began with the right Vedantic attitude, i.e. the desire to find truth, but whether he became a successful Vedantin to a different matter. A man's right philosophical attitude is one thing but his success in philosophy is another.

RUDOLF STEINER: His criticism of idealism in his book "Philosophy of Spiritual Activity" page.79 and Chapter IV: Steiner is merely uttering a dogmatic opinion which he does not prove. Do not ideas act upon one another in dream? Again, he does not see that eye and hand are mental, the same as mind stuff as in dream. He sets mind in opposition to matter, assuming reality of matter.

MAC DOUGALL: Our reply to him is, Do we see mind first or body first? Therefore when he says they are two independent orders, he is wrong. Mind is the fundamental. This is the lesson of the book Drg Drsya Viveka.

SPINOZA came near to Vedanta with his "substance" but he did not stop to ask what is the meaning of substance. Had he done so he might have gone further. Similarly idealism is only a stage, and you must go farther to get at truth.

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.

FREUD is right in ascribing religion to sex, Jung's denial may be correct now, but in it is unrefuted that antiquity religion began with phallic worship.

BERTRAND RUSSELL. The latest scientific view on Idealism is well stated by Bertrand Russell, who admits the idealistic account of perception but who refuses to go so far as Jeans and Berkeley for he says although we may not know the external object still the future might one day reveal it to us. Anything may be found out tomorrow. That matter will ultimately be found to be mind, science will not accept but that it is an objective ultimate reality is no longer held.

LOCKE failed because he did not know Avastatraya. He quite rightly said "How can I deny there is a wall outside?" Vedanta alone removes this difficulty.

HEGEL: The notion that the Absolute is static held by Hegel and the Eleatics, is mistaken because such descriptive words as "static", "dynamic" etc. cannot apply to it.

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 analysed '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 Drsya Viveka task. Hence Hume was right it 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.

The ego does not tell us anything about that which knows there is an ego. Hence we must ask what is meant by "experience" which may lead to confusion because it can be used in more than one sense. For the ego's experience of things as changing is joined by the fact that the ego is itself changing. Hence must also be defined. West has not yet made Drg Drsya analysis and has not seen that if all objects known to me go, what is this me? It also is an object which goes. But people like the I and hence criticized Hume because they want a soul, which can go to a next world after death.

DESCARTES was right in realizing that unless there is such a thing as certainty, we could not get truth.

DESCARTES: His I "I think, therefore, I exist." is only the ego.

JEANS in his "Mysterious Universe" writes favorably of indeterminacy and yet poses the theory of a Universal Mind which creates picture, ideas of objects. But the latter is based on causality whereas the former denies causality. The explanation of Jean's inconsistency is to be found in the wavering quality of his mind, thus leading to "compartmentalism." Hence Gita says truth-seeker must keep his mind steady.

JEANS AND EDDINGTON: The fact that many scientists criticize the idealistic views of Jeans and Eddington merely indicates that the former do not want to go beyond laboratory works do not want to venture from science into philosophy. They lack the mental capacity or intellectual courage to go deeper.

HEISENBERG derived the principle of indeterminacy from the quantum theory earlier formulated by Planck.

At my personal interviews with JEANS AND EDDINGTON I found the former would not venture into Advaita because he was afraid to desert religion whilst the latter would not do it because he found it too abstruse.

BERGSON has scientifically shown there is no "substance" in the universe and that it is just like a cinema show, yet Dravya (substance) and bhuta (element as earth, air) still occupies the discussion of our Pundits who take its existence for granted; They are 500 years behind the times. Or as Jeans likens it, it is a soap bubble which is nothing in itself but appears in time space etc.

Let us not accept things as they strike us, but examine them with reason was the aim of the Rationalists such as Descartes, Spinoza and Wolff. They also said let us be exact, and to be exact we must be mathematical. So they made mathematics the test because it is based on universally self-evident truths as 1 plus 1 equals two. Logic, however had to start with certain axioms, of whose truths we cannot be certain.

Descartes was the first great modern philosopher. He started a process of enlightenment, because he broke away from theology, then comes Kant, the greatest of them all, who carried it a further step.

Descartes and Spinoza were among the very few Europeans who realized the need of defining truth before constructing philosophy, but the vast majority has failed to do so and thus shown a most serious defect.

EINSTEIN: You ask whether Drik-Drsya-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 Drik, 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.

Einstein teaches (a) Every man sees from his own standpoint and (b) from his capacity to see. His impression of a table is relative. Mandukya has taught this too, but more profoundly.

EDDINGTON is a great thinker. His reference to "pointer-readings" are imaginations, arising out of the belief of causality. Similarly Jeans' reference to divine architect arises from same source.

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.

Eddington has got so far as to say that the relation between cause and effect cannot be proved, but he lapses into the causal complex by adding that nevertheless causality must exist.

Eddington is still wavering about causality. He admits in his latest book that we cannot see the causal relation and yet he will not give it up. Clearly he and the other scientists have got a complex in favor of causality which prevents them from getting truth about it. The reason for this vacillation is presence of ego.

EMERSON: could not assimilate Indian Philosophy fully, though he had a powerful intellect. He found European philosophy and religion unsatisfactory; he read the Indian books with

satisfaction but he sat on the fence between Eastern and Western views, as he had not come (con't on page 439)

MODERN WESTERN SCHOOLS:

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE: The Atman is always the same, no change can come over it. It cannot age or sicken or die. Christian Science, however takes these great truths and wrongly applies them to the body, about which it is really thinking.

PRAGMATISM: If this doctrine leads to truth, then Hitler's invasion of Poland is a fruit of truth, because it gave him satisfaction and it was profitable to him!

Pragmatism seeks individual benefit as its ideal of truth, whereas Vedanta seeks universal benefit as its ideal. The difference is immense. We look to see whether truth will do good to humanity as a whole, not merely one ego.

Pragmatism is meant for adolescent stage of mental development. It is a crude realism directed towards mere utility and satisfaction. It is not worth our study.

Pragmatism's weakest point is its acceptance of satisfaction and utility as the test of truth, for each man may have a different definition of what satisfies and what is most useful. Hence it involves contradiction. It looks for truth only in the realm of its fruits. Pragmatism is only partially correct, because Vedantic truth also shows good fruits, but Vedanta tests both theory and practice, whereas pragmatism asks practice only.

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."

OBJECTIVE IDEALISM is the first step. As seeker inquires more deeply he learns that subjective idealism is nearer truth, but it is more difficult to grasp.

THEOSOPHY: Those who say you must join their sects or cults as the only means to salvation talk nonsense. The Theosophical Society is an instance of this. It failed because it became a sect. If its failure was rapid that was because it appealed to the few not the masses.

THEOSOPHY: The mere say-so of theosophists that Mahatmas of Tibet were hundreds of years old, we do not believe without proof. And no proof can be given.

THEOSOPHY: it is another kind of religion. They do not go into the question of truth. That does not worry them.

THEOSOPHY. Those who say that every new faith, cult, system or religion is a partial aspect of truth are merely using their imagination. There is no proof that these myths lead to a common

center in ultimate truth, because you have never seen truth. You have no means of proving that different systems and faiths are glimpses of it.

THEOSOPHY: It is futile to follow Theosophy's dream of synthesizing the common features of all religions as truth; because most religions worship God whilst Buddhism and Jainism have no God at all. Where is the common feature here? Where is unity of all religions possible? Vedanta alone seeks a truth which will be the same for a Christian, Muhammedan or an atheist for it rises above all contradictions and which will do good to all, not merely to one cult. How can they lead to universal unity when they differ and quarrel so much?

THEOSOPHY. Most Pundits are like mystics and theosophists when dealing with ancient Indian texts. They let their imaginations run riot, in fanciful interpretation. The greater their foolishness, the more they will imagine.

SPIRITISM. Dissociation of mind is responsible for most cases of mediumship; one part of the mind functions quite separately from the rest; no judgment being allowed on it; all criticism is paralyzed; and this is the mediumistic function. The compartmentalized attitude toward religion of men like Gladstone involves a similar principle of dissociation, but applied differently. Anger too is a dissociation of the mind. When you get more Buddhi you automatically begin to drop such primitive beliefs as spirits of the dead interfering in human life, supernatural phenomena automatic writing as due to the departed and seances.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE: The fallacy of Christian Science is that it regards the material world as illusory. Why then do they seek illusory bodily benefits?

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE: The body may be affected by pains and diseases, but they are all in the drsyam world: you are their witness, let them come and go, you may remain unaffected when you realize you are the Drik. The Drik knows that it is the body which is suffering. It is the nature of the body to suffer these defects and its nature cannot be changed; Christian Science is for those who still imagine they are a body, but inconsistently say they are not! and their imagination is self-deception.

PANPSYCHISM. If the West studies psychology and pursues its studies of the mind, it will gradually come nearer to our Indian teaching. The doctrine called Pan-psychism which is held by Paulsen, Clifford, Strong and Ward is the closest theory of mind to ours. Paulsen, Fechner and others are partly products of Indian thought, which has already invaded Germany and came down through Schopenhauer etc. It is a good preparation for Indian thought, I like Paulsen very much because he starts his book by appealing to science and because he grasps that mind is the origin, the prior element that is before matter.

PRAGMATISM: We reply to the Pragmatists: "How do you know that what works is necessarily true?" Yoga works, gives interior experience or vision, but does not yield truth?"

PRAGMATISM examines only the value of truth and not its meaning, the usefulness of things and not their reality. Even a liar and a thief may rightly say that their lying and theft possess value.

BEHAVIOURISM is fallacious philosophically because it is only making inferences, i.e. guesses about the mind of another from his actions. The inference is based on the observer's own experience, i.e. mind, introspection. It is useful for practical purposes however. The West can

never get rid of introspection do what they will; it is rubbish to say they can discard it. The truth is that both introspection and observation are needed.

PERSONALISM is an American equivalent of Ramanujaism. Its God who struggles to overcome evil in us, is a childish imperfect God.

GESTALT PSYCHOLOGY is the doctrine that changes in the body, brain produce corresponding mental or conscious changes.

GENETIC PSYCHOLOGY deals with the knowledge that strikes us first and foremost, i.e. response to a stimulus.

MANDUKYA UPANISHAD.

PREFACE

Mandukya is a most difficult book. Therefore, even the greatest Sanyassins were not taught this book by my guru; its truth would have demolished their belief in Gods, a loss they could not bear. This book cannot be understood from the text alone: the commentary by Sankara and the Karika by Gaudapada are absolutely essential to the comprehensible reading of the text. Mandukya takes for granted that you have read the Gita and other works which are preparatory to it. It's outstanding feature is new-- Avastatraya.

Mandukya takes up what Thomson calls "the difficult and dangerous territory of the meaning of cause" and devotes a hundred slokas to it until the question is finally and fully solved. Kant and Hume opened an inquiry into cause but stopped part of the way.

Look at the opinion of the Rishies themselves upon the value of this book, see the quotation from Muktikopanishad printed on its fly leaf. Note that it recommends the book only if you want the highest truth. It is for those who want the very best.

The essence of Mandukya's lesson is: Do not be satisfied with rituals, yoga etc. which are good in their own way, but inquire. Into what? Brahman and Atman are things you can never see. So do not inquire into them. Inquire into the world around you, which you can see. Science tells you it is passing away every second. Everything is dying repeatedly. Where is it going? Thus you follow up your inquiry into what you can lay hands on. How can you inquire into Atma which you cannot see? So first we deal with the known and seen, this inquiry leads up to the unknown in the end.

Mediocre minds waste their time on such unimportant matters as whether the Karikas are copies from Buddhism. This is the danger of too much scholarship. They ought to be occupied with "Are the Karikas true?"

Gaudapada wrote his Mandukya Karika to establish the truth of Non-duality by sheer reasoning alone. He begins by defining "What is real?" "What is unreal?" etc, because that is the right way to discuss or teach. People must first know what they are talking about.

I have been asked twenty times to give a lecture on Mandukya to the Mysore University Professors, but I refused. For I know that these men had never studied science and without such a study they will not see that Mandukya is proved correct by present day scientific knowledge; they will merely assume that I am offering an interpretation of the book, and they will say "Why

should we (agree to) Iyer's meaning; why not our own?" Only those who have thoroughly grasped the teaching of Mandukya will see that I am offering no new interpretation of Vedanta, invented by me as critics say, but I am really giving out the genuine ancient truth.

When you have thoroughly completed Mandukya, it will be impossible to defeat you in argument.

The actual text of the Upanishad ends on page 92 each verse of the 12 verses constituting it being numbered in Roman numerals; all other verses are by Gaudapada and are numbered in Arabic numerals; they are the "Karikas."

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 nonduality, 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.

COMMENTARY.

Chapter I deals with the truth taught on a basis of faith, i.e. Upanishadic scriptures. Agama is a scripture, prakarana is chapter.

Other chapters are reasoned.

Page 13. Pratyaksha: is immediate perception, generally of external objects:

Aparoksha: is direct perception by uniting with the thing. But both pratyaksha and aparoksha are used synonymously by some writers.

Page 291 All-pervading: because he sees all the world.

Page 30: consciousness: the atman in whom every thing is dissolved and from whom everything emanates.

Page 31. eye - with the senses: Taijasa – dream experience, with forms Prajna- formless consciousness.

Page 32. eye: This is scientifically incorrect, but was believed by ancient Hindu physiology. seer--that which you call the seer in the waking state becomes indistinguishable during sleep.

Page 33: creations from the waking standpoint only.

Page 39: Naiyayikas: the doctrines of the Naiyayikas are irrational and imagined; they will not bear deep inquiry.

Page 47: Avidya- Because you do not know you ask the question "Why did God create the world?"

Thus it is only ignorance which assumes purposive causation.

Page 58: Meditated; thought.(see end for page 77 itself)

Page 82. superiority- because he knows the world to be mental or because only the U comes after the A. Alike- they are all ideas to him. Brahman- He tries to teach his son the Truth.

Page 83: him- This is put in to induce people to take to the truth search.

Page 89: In deep sleep we can't say Self does not exist, but that we can't see the self.

When you see the self appearing in the waking state and disappearing in deep sleep you ask the question "Where did the self go during deep sleep?" It did not disappear forever. That into which all disappears and from which it appears, is where the self went. That is called the greater SELF.

There is no proof of anything other than what I have experienced. Hence we call the Absolute the Self. I have not noticed it as a separate entity, whether it be God, Absolute etc. I did not see it go into this other entity. So I generally refer it to myself, which alone I know.

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.

ATMAN: Big self: JIVA: Little self.

Buddha referred to the big self as "where thinking fails to attain", where words fail.

All that you can say is "Not two" (see page 186 Suzuki's Essays Vol.1)

AUM is here the symbol for all sounds in the world, each letter represents one of the three states. Sleep gives an idea of what death is like. In sleep all the world disappears.

Page 90: reappear- as a reality.

If you meditate on Aum as the totality of experience-everything is there, and this Aum disappears in the soundless. If you understand the meaning and then meditate upon it, it will be a great help. To sound the mantra Aum is for beginners or children.

Sunyavadins (Buddhists) say that Buddha taught void, and because Buddha went through Idealism, he is called Idealist. Not so. Buddha cannot be pinned down. Buddha himself does not commit himself but says it is beyond words. Those who use the word Monism for Vedanta are wrong. All names are sounds, not reality. IT is nameless, soundless.

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.

Any thought you have will take you back to one of the three states, even if it be a thought, a sight, or ecstasy, or vision of God himself in a mystic state. Hence all thoughts are to be avoided when you wish to merge in Brahman. Otherwise you remain in the world of seer, seen subject and object, i.e. duality. Even if you see God he becomes an idea.

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?

The Swami who fought a law suit regarding property and title of Ashram shows egoism, hence he has not attained liberation, no matter what claims of his having been able to go in Samadhi. Root of all ignorance is egoism.

Any thought, if you analyze it, ego is present. Nescience and egoism go together. You cannot understand you are ignorant but you can be aware you are thinking. You may ask "Is ego present in your thoughts?"

The ultimate meditation is on the totality, the all. Fear implies a second thing (duality) When there is no second thing there is no fear, i.e. Brahman- Knower.

This world is not known to be Brahman because inquiry is not made.

The idea of cause and effect implies two things - duality. But when all the ideas themselves are no longer present, then causation cannot exist. It is the idea of causation which disappears and causation with it.

If you omit any particle from Brahman you are wrong. "Yourself" sustains your words, your Aum. Therefore so long as you talk, you the self, are the support of the sound the Aum.

Page 91. duality: -as a reality: Manifold:- will not see others as different from self.

Page 94: When you inquire, What is this table, What is this ink-pot, you find eventually it is all Brahman. You have got the idea, that it is a table, an inkpot (symbolized by "sounds" in text) you are still thinking of names and forms. It is only the name and form, not reality. Suppose my enemy dies, his body is gradually converted into protons etc. of carbons as other dead bodies. How then will you be able to distinguish him from another body after both have been turned into carbon, which in turn is absorbed by the trees whose fruit you eat? So it is only the name and form which we hate or love. The nearer forms get their original condition the less will be the distinction you can make. When they arrive at their ultimate condition you will be unable to make any distinction. Then all is Brahman.

The idea of meditating upon Aum is to understand it is the ALL, the whole existence, Vedanta does not deal with parts. If you want to realize Atman you must rise above hatred or attraction. A - beginning of All. M -end of all existence, U.-protrude the lips and make them longest. The longest sound. You can only think of Aum as that into which all universe disappears.

P.94. Verse 27. If you want to bring them all together there is only one way, to put them in one word--MIND. The whole world is the creation of my mind. This is fundamental. The creation is dissolved in the mind. Unless you know and do this you can't know Brahman. Next you have to see that the Atman to be the essence of the mind. Thereupon you get realization unified with Atman.

Page 95. (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 give 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.

Mussolini invading Albania is merely one idea invading another idea to the Gnani. If you place them on a different level then you are ignorant, that is, Mussolini himself as real and Albania as idea.

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.

Page 96. Whatever is manifested is only of the same substance, of the same thing, as that into which it disappears. Hence non-duality is the Truth.

Philosophy must begin with Vichara and then Viveka.

Ananta - endless: Matra Measure.

You can only measure by having a thought of the measure. You do not get peace by getting your desires satisfied. What you gain may be lost the next day. You may be in the presence of God and still have no peace because you may want some power which God has. Further, you have the idea that you want to possess. Besides suppose you are in heaven, how can you be certain that you can remain there eternally? For if God has full power omnipotence, he may send you away again one day, if he changes his mind. If God is a perfect Being, all-powerful, he must be free to send you away at his whim. It will always be a possibility.

Ever-peaceful - means, you do not want anything, not even God or Heaven, because you know that even Heaven and God are in you.

Where words stop, where sounds end, there is Reality,

Page 98: Chapter II = Inquiry into the nature of the object the drsyam, resulting in the discovery that the external world is unreal, is everchanging, and is only an idea along with the first of all ideas, that is, the ego.

ILLUSION: The definition of the term demands your referring to something objective, something in the physical world, for you must take a material object and use it to illustrate an illusion.

Europe thinks it must see objects only in the waking state. Hence its inability to rise to Vedanta.

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.

Sankara's Comment: You have got to have independence of mind, if the scripture agrees with pure reasoning, it has a value, but if it does not, then it has no value. The same treatment must be accorded to yoga and visions and revelations. We have no objections to the latter, but we say: "Show us the proof that it is true" If any man says: "I have seen in my yoga or ecstasy so and so," put him down as insane. There is no difference between a lunatic's visions and beliefs and those of yogis and mystics.

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.

I do not say that Vedas are stupid for they teach the same truths as myself to the ripe minds. But we do not make Vedas last authority. There is both religion and philosophy in the Vedas and Buddhism to suit different minds. Metaphysics is not strictly the same as philosophy.

For proof of God's creation of the world you have to go back to a time when there was no world. Since this is impossible, there is no proof of creation. Hence Buddha kept silent. Hence four schools of Buddhism sprang up later which varied from realism to emptiness claiming to interpret his silence.

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.

Yoga is easier than philosophic doubt, which involves intellectual difficulty and thinking. When people say that it is said by so and so in scripture or authority, that is because they are intellectually lazy, they do not want to think, their mind wants rest. Mandukya points out that it

is the man who thinks who alone can understand it. Mandukya goes to the very root of the matter. It deals with Truth.

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 so hardly compatible with the idea of a beneficent creator. The wise course is to suspend judgment and not to admit or deny creation.

You have not got enough data to say whether the thing is real or unreal, to know what Truth is, unless you use the three states.

Europe has not got complete data without Avastratraya. Even Indians who rely on Rishis, yogis, revelations etc. are getting incomplete datum again. It is the fundamental principle of science to get all the facts. Who can deny that man has got all the three states. Mandukya deals with the three states. Hence it is a most thoroughly scientific work.

Yogis who think that there is something higher than yoga are great men who will do wonders, but if they stop at Yoga as the highest, they are selfish and ignorant.

Causality is the basic principle dealt with in Mandukya. Even Jeans talks of a "Universal Architect." This implies producing. How can it be so? Hindus say God did it, or if they want to leave out God, they create Shakti for him and say his Shakti did it. They do not want to think.

Philosophy deals with the whole of experience. Science may give the scientific answers, religion the religious answers, but philosophy absorbs all views.

Snake and coiled rope example means that you saw the snake in your mind and thought it was outside of you. Here we are dealing with the question of reality, which deals with the existence of a thing. It is different from truth. Truth means your idea or conception of its existence. Existence, things and realities: Many Sanskrit translators use these words interchangeably in error. They are different. This table is real. What you call real is unreal. Truth question comes after the question of reality. Illusion is opposite of reality, and means a thing is not what you believe it to be. Does it exist--reality. After this comes the question of one's conception of it.

To distinguish between appearance and reality take the case of a block of ice and water. Solid ice can hit and kill you, yet it is only gas (steam) in another form. Vedanta says do not stop at gas but get at the ultimate reality.

(page 98 cont'd). If you examine dream carefully you will find that there you have got both internality and externality, just as in the waking state. There is no difference between them. Space, time and cause--the three aspects of the world must be studied. Space is the first thing that strikes you.

While I am asleep in dream, yet another person is seeing the external world quite alright. We do not give that reason we say rather your dream mountain is not in the skull. Sloka No.1 therefore deals with space; sloka No.2 deals with time; both these slokas anticipate Immanuel Kant's conclusions.

Page 100. You dream you go to Calcutta. Your dream is for one minute. Hence the time is in the mind.

Inquire: Vedanta does not like the yogin's, mystic's start with the mind. We begin with the external objects, with the world that faces you. This is like science.

From the point of view of space and time we find dream experiences inconsistent with physical facts and therefore unreal. They are not in the same time series. Your body is here and how could you have gone to England and back in a single night?

There is a school in India which teaches that you actually travel in your dream to the place visited. This is wrong. It is only imaginary. Those who go to Krishna etc. in dream have unreal experiences because it is only your mind which has concocted the experience.

Coincidences of dreams with facts: even then they are only your imagination. i.e. you want to connect the two together, this causality is also your imagination.

Scripture must follow after reason, not vice versa. When we are told waking state objects are unreal, that time and space cannot explain the world, no object remains the same for even one second as science teaches, this is helped to understand by being told that in dream the objects are unreal.

If the scriptures do not agree with reason they should be rejected. If you do not want to reject them you must give them an interpretation that agrees with reason.

Page 102. Self-luminosity means the Atman is to see in the dream. After self-luminosity add "and self-creativity".

Page 103. Sankara's commentary on this sloka: This argument is purely logical to suit the mentality of professional logicians.

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.

You can call up ideas voluntarily and know they are idea, but in dream you think for the time being that they are real.

This sloka requires an understanding of both Indian and European logic. Otherwise it cannot be grasped.

"ground of resemblance"- common feature as matter both in all and in my body. "proposition taken"- that conclusion applied to that which has to be established or proved. What are you going to prove? Here it is that the objects seen in the waking state are unreal.

Logically it shows that dream and waking are on the same level. Logic consists of two parts, induction and deduction. There is a limit to logic; in the pursuit of truth, we do not recognize it. We can then only base an inference on it; it only presumes to know, but that is only a presumption. (Indian logic (taika) puts induction and deduction together, whereas Western logic separates them).

If you grant a certain thing to be true you can grant that another thing is true also. But if you say we do not know, and cannot presume, then this logic cannot be applied. However even on the basis of logic we can show that objects seen in the waking state are the same as objects seen in dream.

Because there is some resemblance between the two states we can apply logic here. Objects in dream and in the waking state are perceived in both the states.

"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.

Confusion arises in this illustration because you do not draw a distinction between the state and the objects seen in the state.

This sloka (4 on page 103) deals with the question of objects and not of states. Do not think of the state but only of objects. The states will be dealt with later. This is the analysis of the objects. Science has proceeded in a slightly different way, but it is also concluding that objects are only ideas. Here is the logical way. In other words all objects share the same fate.

Listening to every man is the business of a philosopher. "We are such stuff as dreams are made of!"---Shakespeare: This shows he was an idealist.

Page 104: First the book gave the logical reasoning, the dream was compared to the waking states and now the waking state alone is taken, when all objects which are seen there are delusive in appearance such as mirages, a straight stick put in a tumbler of water looks bent. Thus even waking appearances are not real. Moreover the most advanced scientists agree with our contention that these objects are our ideas.

Page 104: sloka 6: Merely because a thing is seen, you can't say it is real. The word "existent" in the translation is misleading, for there is both real and unreal existence. "Being seen is not the test of being existent."

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 more 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.

Page 105: "Know Atman" means "know truth". Bergson said, the world is like a cinema because it is constantly changing, yet it produces the impression that it is a solid substantial thing. See Chapter on Modern Science, page 348/349 in Bergson's "Creative Evolution". He says, if

Science sees, it sees only at a particular moment. There is no permanent fixed matter but it produces impression of fixidity.

“as real” in para 2 means as permanent, as unchanging. Realists say everything which is seen is fixed; they are like religionists working by faith, not by inquiry.

"drig" in the last line--So long as the man does not inquire, the ego remains the perceiver.

Page 106: The very greatest discovery of Western philosophy is Kant's doctrine that time and space and causality are the characteristics of the perceptible world.

Objection is here made that I cook food, eat and get satisfied. Hence there is causal connection between them. How can you say that they are unreal? If you compare dream and say that the objects are real like waking objects, but I can't dream of money and pay it for waking debts. Hence your comparison, is worthless, says sloka. The dream money serves no purpose in waking world. Thus is a criticism often made. Sankara replies: If you had had real hunger then you should have had the same feeling in dream. But dream state may give you an opposite feeling to what you had by day. Hence eating did not have any reality in it other than what the mind gave it. What is the difference between the two states then? Real in the sense of permanence should have continued the waking satisfaction into sleep, but you dreamt hunger.

Science will-prove the idea-nature of the world without our Vedantic arguments but both combined are irresistible. See verse 484 of Vivekachudamani. Everything is passing every second. Where is its reality? See Panchadeshi verse No.583.

From the point of view of appearing and disappearing, both dream and waking objects are unreal.

To objection that waking state is cause of freedom why do we have experiences in dream which never occur in waking such as flying in the air, without an aeroplane?

Page 107: Arthakriyakaryavadins - ancient Indian pragmatists.

Stanza 8 anticipates Einstein's doctrine of Relativity of viewpoint in observers. Each imagines the other man has seen the table in the same way as himself which is a great mistake. How am I to know that the impression in my mind is the same as yours. It is an assumption.

Page 108: Sankara: The point is both views appear to be real. It is absurd to say only waking is real. You view dream objects from the viewpoint of the dream body; waking objects from that of the waking body. You may believe that you are flying in the air; in the waking body you refuse to believe. Really it is only your mind which has created the distinction between the two and which does not really exist. The dream conditions, however real they may appear, are only imaginations. Here also in the waking world which appears so real, you are dealing only with your own imagination. They are real for the time being only. Sankara says you may consider a streak of water; you may imagine what you like and you see that only. Einstein gives the greatest support to this doctrine. He says that observers at different points will not see an object in the same way, i.e. they will not see the same object.

Those who cannot exert their brains will say Philosophy is useless and they won't study these explanations. It is their excuse for mental incapacity. They may take to religion or Yoga. Page 111. It is merely the state of the mind at the time, whether dreaming or waking; the mind imagines that to be real which it happens to be perceiving at the time.

Yoga will detach the mind from its imaginations. The greatest imaginations are religious. People who cannot renounce the world, wealth, wife etc. do so because they take these things to be real. You are likely to go astray if you have got strong attachment to anything. Your personal bias must go.

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.0

The first discipline in Vedanta is to prostrate oneself in humility and admit "I don't know", crushing egoism and vanity. Those who start by thinking they know everything cannot learn Vedanta. There is the "Aham" the ego in the way.

You see pots outside you in a dream just as in waking state.

The Western scientist says it is childish to compare dream with waking. That is because he is prejudiced in favor of the latter. He must become like a child and put aside this prejudice, if he is to learn the ultimate truth.

Do you mean to say my chair is unreal? asked a realist Professor. This was an assumption that he knew the meaning of reality. He does not know that dream also manufactures reality. It requires the greatest concentration to perceive this.

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.

Vijnanavada means idealism: Satyavada- realism.

Page 112. 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.

Illusory- that which is constantly changing but appears permanent.

We have no proof that God imagines these universe ideas. Who perceives all these ideas? If you open your mouth to make any statement or ask any question then the questioner must be there, the affirmer must be there, the Seer must be there, the knower must be there. What is it? If there is none to make the statement or ask the question, self does not exist. Hence one cannot deny the existence of the self.

In Sloka 2 it is said "This Atman has four quarters". It means "That which sees is a certainty beyond all doubt. The word this is used because this world which is shown and this self which is known, are certain regarding which there can be no doubt. As Sankara says, "That which appears divided in four quarters is pointed out as the inner self."

If you say there is no experience at all, then experience won't exist, but there is an experience and hence the self.

Page 113: 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 Jnani 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 jnani 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.

Religion has caused the greatest misery, bloodshed. Hence people are getting tired of it. The merest inkling of philosophy causes a man not to hate or exploit others; for instance, let the British live here, if they wish, but as brothers, sharing our life, not hating us or exploiting us. The Vedantin knows an Englishman is as much his own self as the negro. He will treat both he himself. From the religious standpoint it is a matter of karma.

Page 113: If you cannot understand stanza 12, refer to dream. The point is that an imagination can be seen outside, as in dream.

The Buddhists who say that there is ultimately nothing are wrong. The philosophy of Buddhism is different from the religion of Buddhism.

Atman imagines everything in himself. We have no proof of the existence of anything except the mind and its ideas.

Page 114: Atman is (add)"evident from dream experience and" predicated etc.

Page 115: "After I see an object, I get the idea" is the realist criticism. Before seeing an object, I had no idea of it. Reply: True; but even that thing which you call an external entity has been imagined by you and seeing this imagination comes after the first one. The mind created the external mountain first, and afterwards formed its idea of it.

We do not say there is no external world. Its created idea came first, then the other idea of it. The external thing is an idea, the thought it is a second idea.

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.

Our ignorance from the past, our old vasanas are so strong, that we are tempted to go back to the common view that external world is real.

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.

Page 115: Psychologists are now sounding depths of the unconscious. All these things exist in the unconsciousness and then they come up i.e. they appear as ideas. All these are in the mind, of the self, as in deep sleep; when they go into the unconscious, exist there as vasanas and later emerge again. You imagine your ideas, and also you imagine the external objects. Thus in dream you imagine your ideas as feelings and the external world as mountains.

Unless the 'I' goes, doubts about this truth will always come.

Page 116. If Jeans and Eddington had gone two steps further they would have got the whole truth. But they fall into religion, by making the ideas exist in Divine Mind. The trouble is their 'I'. The only cure is Yoga. How long does our idea last? Not even one second. This idea of wall you call real merely because it lasts a longer time, whereas my inner ideas are fleeting, is objection.

"Idealism" is the wrong term; "Unrealism" is correct.

The word "unreal" would be better translated in this sloka than imagination

Page 117: "I was asleep but the wall still existed outside" is objected. You also see the external objects in dream. Other people see them too. How do you make the distinction. Only that I show it today and yesterday, therefore it is real, is objected.

There is nothing outside mind. Hence "outside" must be defined.

Everything is idea too, comes and goes. Jeans has shown that every second they come and go.

This is the definition of unreal.

Page 118: in time. (add) The cow may exist independently of whether it be milked by a man or not.

Page 119: Even when you say that the wall exists separately from mind, even that is your idea, for it is the mind that says so. Idealism is not grasped because the 'I' is the obstacle, the root of their ignorance.

This morning, what has it become to you now? It is gone forever. Why? Because it is an idea, an imagination. What is it now for you. A 1000 people may say they saw you this morning, but still your morning's existence is now only an idea; and was so then. Why has the morning life gone? Because it is a transitory thought. All thoughts are fugitive.

The events and things, being really thoughts, have gone.

Page 118 (con't) When you are not seeing a table, although others see it, is also their imagination. No realist can understand idealism because he cannot get rid of his belief in the body's reality and in the ego.

Page 119 (con't). Those things which are said to be outside; and those which are imagined deliberately such as an elephant pictured in mind; in both cases you have imaginations. In dream, you see objects with your senses for you smell, see and taste things and hear voices. Your own thoughts as well as objects outside, are imagination.

When the sense organs the instruments are also imagined; "manifested" means here "seen outside." Europeans have made this mistake of regarding the senses as real; hence their inability to grasp idealism.

Page 120: 1st para should read "the sense organs which are also the creations of the mind."

The first to come, is idea of 'I', the last to go is the idea of 'I'.

Page 121-122: 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.

Cause and effect are but imaginations. Who imagines the Jiva? It is the Atman (see Sloka 13) Where is the idea? In the mind. The mind without the imagination is the Atman. Do not look to God as the Creator of Jiva. That is the weakness of human nature.

When you see everything as Atman, then there will be no question of ascribing the world-imagination to the Atman. But until then it is better to say the Atman imagined than to say God imagined the world. For the first is the final stage.

The memory of your body, its environments houses friends etc, causes you to ascribe reality to them all, but really they are not the same as those you saw yesterday.

Suppose you say Atman is the cause, even that is an imagination, and even if you say Atman is imagination, that is O.K. provided you find a substratum for it. The substratum is needed because I find the imagination is within me. The Atman (not the I) is one thing eternal which I know as real. It is that which knows any and all statements I may make and that which sees anything I may see.

Page 122: At no time even when you think there is an object outside such as food, is it other than a construction of the mind? Take away the mind and you can't prove the existence of a single thing.

Some Western philosophers say the wall produces an impression on the retina of my eyes, and is then communicated to the brain. The idealists say the wall is an idea inside the mind and not outside it. What is the first information your mind gets? The old Hindu doctrine of the logicians that mind goes out to the object and takes its form, is unproved and wrong. But that which first sees the thing is the mind. Both realists and idealists viewpoints are equally fallacious; in this argument.

There is something outside, we cannot deny it, as idealists do, but we Vedantins say it is also only an idea. Thus we solve the realist-idealist controversy.

Page 123: S1.17-21: The world is not what you think it to be. It is only an idea. The mind of man has to get all its information from its five servants, the senses. They tell there is a snake before you, but if you want truth, you must verify what the sense organs, the sensations tell you. The mind can never get at any external object except through the senses. Why suspect them? Why should sensation mislead you? This is the attitude of the ordinary man. He says: "I see the snake." But he sees it only through the senses. A thoughtful man who inquires has reason to suspect sense reports.

Science is necessary to support this attitude. After he inquires he finds it is not a snake but only a rope. All this shows that you cannot rely on your senses. Then if your senses are unreliable how do you know that there is a wall there before you or that you have a body? And when you can't rely on your senses (for truth) in your external world how can you rely on your imaginations and feelings in your internal world? This lack of certitude anywhere forces you to inquire into both the worlds and thus you take the steps to truth.

All the senses give you imagination only. Those who say the wall is there are accepting their imagination only. Hence they are liars. Sensations are but imaginations.

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.

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.

When you know the world is an idea, and that all ideas at last submerge in you, then you understand that the whole world is ultimately in you i.e. in Atman. Hence Vedanta tests and sees and thus satisfies itself with truth, not supposition. Vedanta says, "Do not rely on theories. There are no such things. They are imaginations."

Page 125: Atman is imagined (add) by the ignorant.

Page 132: It means that the pupil's mind is so weak that you see whatever a religious teacher or yogi or guru suggests to you.

effort - because all these Gods are only imagined.

illusory - because their number can be limitless.

inquirer - makes him happy.

Page 133. truth - or the teacher may be as great a fool as the learner and know no better.

Such student - (add) and such a teacher.

Page 135. Vedas - He grades the interpretation to suit the mental capacity of his hearers. scriptures = Upanishads.

Page 136: dissolution - (add) of the world.

liberated - things are as they are.

Page 145. empirical standpoint - the belief that ideas are different from the Mind (or Atman) is false, and due to our want of inquiry i.e. ignorance.

plane -even in the state of imagination.

Page 146: bliss - not emotional bliss but the absence of all fear.

Page 148: meaning - the truth of the Vedas, not their chanting.

Page 149: such - continually reflect, think, inquire until your advaitic knowledge becomes your whole outlook.

Fix - Knowing Atman is mastering its theory; fixing knowledge to repeated practice of it until realization is completed.

object - this does not mean becoming a motionless ascetic.

Page 150: become - because he has not the idea of ego and has risen above thinking of himself as body.

salutation - he should not expect prostration.

chances - he should not be dissatisfied with what comes but rest content.

Page 151: shelter - never relies on them.

chance - this does not mean he need starve, but do only enough to support body and not make getting of material things main ambition. However, to help others he may seek unlimited cash.

Page 152: exist - as different from Atman.

Real - Never ceases for a moment from thinking of Brahman, from perceiving whole world as Brahman. Once established in this truth it is impossible for him to leave it.

Page 155: Chapter III = Inquiry into the nature of the seer, the drik, the individual self or subject, resulting in the discovery that it is not separate from the world, i.e. non-dual.

Devotion - whether religious worship or yogic meditation.

Reality- Advaita has no reference to religion.

blissful - the absence of fear, misery, suffering--nothing more.

Page 156: (line 2) realm of - differences

intellect - because he thought Brahman changed into the world or evolved it.

unchanging - those that know Truth.

here/adore - here imagine and adore.

Page 157: describe (that Atman)

Page 158: small-minded - dull intellects.

Page 159: read "space" for other.

Page 162: Sankara's com. All these objections represent scholasticism or philosophical theology, which has been miscalled 'philosophy' in India.

Page 163: Samkhyas: Here Sankara descends from reasoning to interpretation in order to meet his critics on their own ground.

Page 164: Vaiseshikas: The logicians, who are the support of all the dualists and scholastic pundits.

Page 167: There - if you admit there is one Atman in all bodies.

Page 174: perceiver: when the drik imagines, it sees all things, but when it is not imagining (as in sleep), there is nothing to be seen.

Page 189: as real: but do not trouble about theories of creation.

low intellect - intellectual children.

causal plane - intellectual youths.

Page 190: Jina - founder of Jainism.

understanding - mental adults.

Page 192: Maya- ultimately all things are one.

enlightened - we know the truth.

mind - also in drugged states, therefore this is not realization.

Page 193: at all: from standpoint of Brahman.

Page 194: Stanza 19 - Here the book takes the reader a step higher than last verse; giving a truer view.

to the deluded - one who has not inquired, i.e. the ignorant.

Page 195: perceiver: as in dream.

Page 197: nature. - this is the reply to Pantheism and to Bergson.

Page 202: Vivartavada: is the theory that God created world out of his own substance (see page 212.)

Page 208: Atman: - when regarded as different from Atman.

Page 209: always: because it is impossible to think or do anything without Atman.

Page 210:, end: each cause must be preceded by another cause, and so on ad infinitum.

incomprehensible - because we say it cannot be reached by mind or senses.

Page 211: Illusion – ignorance.

But the disputant read "but to that disputant"

Page 212: vivarta - Vivarta is the cause producing an effect without the cause being changed itself, as a magician producing effects without himself altering.

universe - as an entity.

Page 214: Sloka 30: Max Planck fully understands this point, while Bergson half-understands it, whereas Jeans and Eddington misunderstand it by dragging God in.

Page 215: state - i.e. when you inquire.

Page 216. Mechanical method - such as Yoga.

Page 218. from all -"ideas including" to be added knowledge - everything known is an idea. An idea is mind. Mind is Brahman. Therefore Brahman is what we always know.

Page 219: imaginations - ideas.

external - the sage does not regard any objects as external to his mind.

Page 221: illumination - whatever he sees, whether waking dream or sleep, he sees as Brahman.

Page 222 darkness - the thought that world is real lies latent (like a seed) in the mind of ordinary sleepers whereas such a thought is absent from the mind of Gnani.

ether - you see everything in Me.

Page 224: destroyed - as separate entities different from Brahman, such a delusion is destroyed, albeit they still exist for us as Brahman.

come back - words can only tell about drsyam, never the drik.

effulgence ; aware of objects presented.

Page 225: action - such as yoga practice.

duty - practice.

Page 227: sense organs - organs which are external.

Samadhi - the Atman is perfect homogeneity; it is in this sense only that the word "samadhi" is used here.

Page 229: desires - when everything that you do or want is known to be Brahman, you have attained fulfillment.

anything: all yogas other than Asparsa yoga refer to a second, either body or mind; asparsa alone is non-dual.

Page 230: prescribed - indicated;

efforts - of inquiry.

mechanical means - involving a duality.

Page 231. No duty - there is nothing to be done by Gnani.

Yogis - such as Raja yogis.

this class can - imagine they experience etc.

destruction - this is from yogi's stand point only; it is not a real destruction of misery or fear, but a temporary one.

Page 232: related: the word 'related' can be used only in reference to two separate things. Those who deem Mind to be apart from Atman are ignorant.

mind - knowledge of self, i.e. atman consciousness is already present even before yogic practice.

Hence to say that yoga creates it, is untrue.

Page 233: S1.41: It is only possible to drive out some thoughts by yoga, but it is utterly impossible to drive out all thoughts whilst the mind is present (except by entering sleep).

oblivion - yoga-nidra or yoga laya.

Page 235: pleasures- the mind may be in pleasures but it should not regard them as other than Brahman. Vedanta would be senseless if it meant that one should not enjoy the pleasurable side of life.

Page 236: desires- this does not mean withdrawing from world and sitting like stone. Understand that Brahman may appear as dual and thus in desired objects also. It is impossible to detach oneself from the world.

detachment - non-attachment.

again- you will get Gnan only when you see duality and know it to be Brahman, not in sleep or trance.

do not disturb it again - don't fall back to lower stage of attachments again.

Page 237. mind: keep mind uninfluenced by either extreme of sloth or of desire, be balanced. It should not run hither and thither, nor remain utterly inactive.

throughout: this occurs in sleep etc.

realization - attainment.

Page 238: Samadhi: c.f. Ashtavakra, 1:1 which is identical in meaning.

Atman - practice thinking that every object seen is Atman.

false: as apart from Brahman it is.

Page 239: quiescent: undisturbed by temptation or trial.

object: as other than itself or as different from Brahman.

Page 240.bliss: this term to used metaphorically; only by comparison with ordinary values is it called 'bliss'. It is not ecstasy.

unborn - the only thing known as not-born is the drik.

P.241:happiness - taken literally this term is misleading; here it is used relatively.

Jiva - that which is called Jiva is found on analysis to be Drik.

cause - because Cause exists only in the drsyam.

as means - at certain stage.

Page 243: Chapter IV = inquiry into other philosophic views and demonstration of their falsity, chiefly because they are based on causality.

Akasa - means Space. It is not the nihilistic Void, but the Unlimited, Uncharacterisable, Indescribable Undifferentiated and Illimitable

Knowledge--all these being like space.

distinction - between waking and dream.

Page 245: Narayana - space is Narayana, Atman, guru, truth.

I bow - This is merely to show his respect for the Guru for only a Gnani can make you realize Truth.

can be known - becomes in similitude only.

Page 246: Badarikasrama - same as Badrinath.

Himalayas - in the latter years of his life.

"and there worshipped etc." -this is an imagined concoction.

Page 247 Supreme – personal happiness – not the happiness of Brahman.

and which/is - state

Page 248 external - other

dualists - It is only dualists who quarrel, not real Advaitins, Pseudo-advaitins who merely use advaitic language, also quarrel, with others.

Page 249: In sloka 4 begins the inquiry into causality.

Page 250: Non-ens means non-entity.

Page 253: Prakriti - This is not to be confused with its other meaning (used by Sankhyas) as 'root-matter'. Here it means 'self-nature'. The capitalization here is wrong.

reversal - Thus a horse does not become a cat even in this empirical world.

Yogis who – thinks he --

Yogis - they believe.

Page 254: nature - as atman.

Page 255: imagination - no more real than a similar imagination during dream.

prakriti- here prakriti means 'inherent nature' not 'root-matter.'

Page 256: disputant - the Sankhyas. Pradana - Pradhana is matter, Purusha is mind.

Page 260: cause - this refers to Final cause.

son - The mango fruit contains a new seed, hence both cause and effect. Use of word 'cause' here is dangerous and ambiguous.

Page 261: Stated - c.f. J.S.Mill's "antecedent and consequent"

Page 264: (Ajati) - Vedantins say: "We do not know that there is any causality. We do not want to cheat ourselves by accepting it on faith. So we leave it as unproved."

Page 272: Ajati - It is not a theory. Nobody has proved jati; hence we are forced to hold to a-jati.

Page 273 - illumination i.e. being aware.

Page 274 – reality of external - causes for the impressions which we have in mind.

Page 277: as such as external to the mind.

Page 278: infers - to infer is to imagine.

ideas- mental constructs

unreal - as external realities.

external i.e. external to the mind.

Page 279 external objects - external to the dream body.

Exists - as a reality

cause - no second thing

Page 282: Nihilists - Sunyavadins.

Page 284: If the world--if our experience of the world.

Substance - anything that can be gained positively.

Page 288 Verse 35 is to be reversed and its arguments applied to waking states to show latter as unreal.

Page 291. the same to all - they are only imagined to be common to all, as in dream.

Mind: This has nothing to do with mind individual, but it refers to Mind Universal; not the ego but the common Mind.

Page 292: creation or evolution - i.e.causality.

Page 294: S1.40- This analysis means that there is no proof of causality.

standpoint - of those that have not inquired.

Page 295: described - like snake superimposed on rope.

Condition - of ignorance.

Page 296: determined - before inquiry, the snake is real: after inquiry it is unreal: hence it is paradoxical, indeterminate, but after all only an idea.

non-manifestation - non-causality.

Page 297: exist - are real

disciplines - inquiry, preliminary qualifications, purification and preparation of mind.

Page 298: verse 43: Those who cannot grasp non-causality but are obeying high ideals, are getting on satisfactorily anyway.

Page 299: said to exist - by the ignorant,

Page 300: the elephant - Shankara could have replied by the illustration of dream, but as the objection is made from point of view of waking state he gives an illustration from waking only. It is however antiquated now, like the rope trick. So we must turn to science for a more effective argument.

Page 301: knowledge: Those who are gnans are never subject to doubts, questions or arguments, which are always symptoms of not-knowing, error.

Page 302: sense - the plural is used only to help, explain in teaching, not as a statement of fact.

Avidya - error, mistake, doubt, ignorance.

Page 303: Perceiver, perceived - both are in consciousness and are also consciousness.

moved - especially in making the figure of 8. Science now explains that the impression made on the retina is retained for some time,(i.e. philosophically) by the mind longer than the retina-impression itself.

Page 304. The purpose of this commentary on verse 48 is to show that all the appearances are only Mind; they come out of it, they go back into it. In this sense deep sleep is the cause of the other two states. Dream shows that a thing can be in motion and not really be so simultaneously elsewhere- the figure is seen in one place although the hand has moved elsewhere. Why?

Because-the mind sticks to its sense-impression to which it is attached, thinking it to be real.

Page 305: Motionless: nobody has proof that the figure 8 entered into or emerged from the brand. We can only say that it appeared with the motion of the brand. Similarly we see the world with the activity of mind, but we can't say that it was either put in mind or put out by mind.

substance - The brand is a substance, the appearance of the '8' is not of the same nature, hence unreal. A thing may be seen but this is not enough to make it real. The appearance should have some fundamental characteristic of the reality.

Page 306: unthinkable - cannot be expressed in terms of causal relation. Thinking is carried to its farthest point and then only dropped. We cannot say rope has produced the snake: hence it is called unthinkable.

nonexistent - as a separate entity, as separate from Mind.

Page 307: 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.

Seer and seen are of same substance.

Consciousness- as Berkeley says, Mind is measureless. Everything known is known within the mind.

unreal - even when they are seen, the objects are non-separate from the Atman, as yourself.

Substance may be -- That which does not change in a thing, which is apart from its attributes, or qualities.

not substance - attribute cannot cause substance, but only attributes again.

their real nature - through words or thoughts, when they are all Mind for there is then nobody to act, seek, think and distinguish.

Page 308: mind - Mind is used ambiguously here, for here it means Atman and not its usual Western sense as that which knows.

Page 309: belief - the complex working in your mind forces you to see world accordingly.

Page 310: "I" ego presupposes duality, so long as you think there is a second thing the belief in causality is likely to remain. It can only disappear by understanding non-duality as truth.

there - with all their attendant sufferings.

Page 311: Destruction - those pundits and yogis who believe Brahman is world-disappearance in Nirvikalpa samadhi talk nonsense, insanity, ignorance. The world is there in Brahman and is one with it.

exist - as an independent entity: it is still Mind only.

born - you think all this is produced.

Page 312: Reality - Paramartha: Relative standpoint - viyayaharika

Page 313: exists in the sense that it is the same thing; so too the world being the same as Atman, may be said to be non-existent (as a second)

not exist - other than as itself.

Page 314: Illusory fruits - such illustrations are too antiquated, but science can supply good ones. birthless - Jivas to which you cannot attribute births which belongs only to drsyam.

homogeneous - where there is no variety.

Page 315: Whence words - because words imply thought, drsyams and they can yield only another thoughts not IT.

Maya - Maya here means ignorance of the truth.

duality - It is not caused, as a seed produces a tree, but it is the Mind itself and nothing else; no second thing is produced.

Page 316: mind - they are not other than his mind.

Mind(in sloka 64, last line) - as separate from it.

mind (in last but one line) -chitta

Page 317:himself: In the dream, the mind is a part of the dream and neither is separate from each other. Nor is the dreamer himself other than his mind.

dreamer only. : When you talk of individual I or you, the mind is treated as an object, but within yourself you may drop such provision.

Page 318: mind: Berkeley discovered this; Kant based half his philosophy on it, that mind can only know what is of same nature.

Page 319: the other - when do you use the words drik, perceiver, consciousness? Only when you have a drsyam, a correlative and vice versa.

Therefore they go together always. This implies that they are one and the same thing. They have never been seen separate from each other. That which enables you to know both is Atman.

existent: apart from each other.

knowledge: you cannot really separate the mind from what it knows. Theoreticians may do so, but try it!

Page 320: making condition - As Bergson and science shows the body is constantly changing.

We may go further and say not only the body but also the Jiva passes away every moment.

Jiva - apparently a reference to rope trick where man appears and vanishes.

artificial jiva - mesmerism, where the mesmerized person assumes different personalities.

Page 321: born - because there is only one substance - not two.

cause - causality is impossible in unity; whatever seems to be produced is really the same thing.

Page 322: object - outside. (in sl.72) any object (in com). any second thing. Causality depends on the unconscious assumption that there are two i.e. relation.

external object - nothing is outside it.

Page 323: relation - as in dream, dualistic relation between them is not there.

scripture - scripture is useful with vyavaharic world. But what is it? only words, i.e. thoughts.

schools of thought - They can only yield more thoughts. Thus Kant may give you 1000 more thoughts, Hegel may give you a million thoughts, and so on; all this is not truth. For all the other schools posit a second thing.

Page 324: Not even unborn - Advaita calls Atman 'unborn' only to refute those who say it is born, i.e. created, produced. So we say it is "uncreated" in reply. For 'birthless' is only a word, i.e. a thought, i.e. a drsyam, i.e. not the truth. It is a thorn to pick out the thorn of causal-grounded ideas.

Page 325: Reality - the Drik.

Page 326: attachment - the root of attachment is ego.

birth - when causality goes, the idea of birth goes with it.

Page 327: unborn - when you know that everything else is the Mind, not-different, so they too are uncreated.

mind - as in dream.

Page 329: objects (in last line) - the mind makes the objects: it is of the same substance as these.

Page 330: Objects - you must also give up internal objects.

birthless, non-dual etc. Note that all these descriptive words are negative ones.

withdrawn - seeing the same thing in all duality.

Page 331: known- realized as a fact.

ultimate Reality - as such.

The mind - not to be confused with Nirvikalpa.

Page 332: Concealed - Brahman is not absent but ever-present.

misery - We have to be thankful for the existence of misery, as without it people would never think of searching for truth.

Page 333: Bliss: not to be taken as a positive attribute, but only as thorn to remove thorn of ignorance and then itself be discarded.

Page 330: (verse 80) "actually realized" – not imagined as being this or that.

331: (81) FREE FROM BIRTH - not produced, not caused.

EVER-LUMINOUS: - in all three states the turiya is always there.

FREE FROM SLEEP: this rebukes those who regard sleep alone as Brahman.

332: (82) SINGLE OBJECTS - so long as the mind has idea of separateness, it cannot realize Brahman.

333: NON-EXISTENCE - world came into existence but no longer exists.

ABSOLUTE NON-EXISTENCE: sunyavada: nothing has ever existed.

337: BRAHMANA: not the Brahmin, but the true sage.

HUMILITY: is the first characteristic of gnani, because the ego is absent in him.

336: WITHOUT BEGINNING, MIDDLE OR END: this implies change and a state liable to change at any moment is not worth having.

337: NOTHING TO GAIN BY ACTIVITIES: this is not to be taken as meaning he sits idle; that is false interpretation. He will no longer work for himself, but he will do so for others.

338: (bottom) NON-EXISTENT: not to be interpreted literally: it has a different meaning for Advaita to the common one.

342: note 3 should read: "In deep sleep there exists the real self" (not 'realizes')

343: MERGES: the external world is converted into idea by inquiry.

verse 89 and also 4th line from bottom 'intellect' should read 'Reason.'

345:(top para) FREE FROM SUBJECT OBJECT-RELATION those who do not know jump to false belief this means nirvikalpa: on the contrary all the objects must be there.

(last para) alter "avoided" to "not to be relied on as permanent."

346: 5th line: alter Wisdom to Intelligence.

347: note 8 HIS SPIRITUAL PROGRESS – knowing truth.

349: (v.93) UNBORN is used only to show it is not of the same characteristic as drsyam.

351: line 2. NATURAL PURITY:- undifferentiated.

v.95: FIRM - who are unshakably loyal to the guru, after having tested him for who are not satisfied with mere glimpses of truth but want unchangeably stable conviction.

356: (99) UNTOUCHED; never really enters into relations with. Thus the mind in dream does not really have a relation with the dream-mountain.

358: (v.100) SALUTE words are useless here, so I make a sign, bow or prostrate as the one thing to be done.

358: DEVOID OF DISCRIMINATION: - whose minds are not razor sharp.

BIRTHLESS - the idea of time is in the drsyam world.

ADORE - to impress on readers that it is beyond speech.

358: RELATIVE STANDPOINT: when the author is dealing with others, with pupils.

355:(V 98) KNOWING: The guru has to use the language of men, i.e. the language of duality, and suggest truth is to be known but in fact the word is inapplicable for the pupil is already truth, Brahman, the second thing he deludes himself he is seeking.

356 (99) ALL LIGHT - he has within himself the awakened capacity to know everything is Brahman; all gnanam.

360; para 1. All these mean that man has got the idea of cause and effect yet, though I see these things appearing in the world, I see only non-causality because I see only nonduality; hence I have no fear, (b) the meaning of this and all true salutation is to show "I am effacing my I" (last but one line) NECTAR: poetical term only, not literal.

ALL: Vedanta is not for the cave but to help all men: For I am the all: how then can I leave mankind alone to suffer without trying to help them?

BIRTHS AND DEATHS: are only in drsyam world.

361: 1st line: CHURNING - you must use your reason, think hard; truth will not come without such hard labor.

ILLUMINED: every man has some reason, but this is reason where it has developed to the stage where it can know truth.

3rd line from bottom: ALL: In the 4th Chapter Mandukya emphasizes the word all. For truth desires the benefit of all mankind, nay of all existence. Note also that last chapter verse 54 of Gita stresses the same point. Vedanta wants people to be happy here in this world, whereas religion seeks their welfare in a purely hypothetical next world.

PEACE: Perfect peace can come only where there is no second entity with whom to quarrel, hence it can come only in the state of non-duality.

361: (3rd line from bottom) ALL OTHERS: - the Guru cannot limit his aid to disciples only, cannot give up others, for he feels his identity with all and must work for the good of as many as he can.

(MISCELLANEOUS NOTES):

Page 73: There is non-apprehension in sleep, i.e. non-apprehension in dream. There is misapprehension, i.e. taking (1) that which is unreal to be real, (2) They are momentary.

Cause and effect: when you see only one thing or other, you take it as an effect and assume a cause. You know only when you know the absence of cause and effect.

In Turiya, it is not the absence of the knowledge of the duality that you get; but the erroneous knowledge of duality disappears. c.f. Gita 18 :50, We see the waves, but we know it in only water.

Everyone wants to please himself: Who is this himself? We need no more effort. The Brahman is so self-evident. You have just to turn your self away from the erroneous knowledge.

Non-apprehension of reality or Turiya goes with misapprehension.

Page 74: People think that you realize Brahman only after you see the disappearance of the perceived manifold. How can you say that Brahman exists or there is non-duality when you see the world outside.

But the manifold world is not real. You have taken it for granted that the world exists, body exists.

Appearance, dream, disappearance: Can we use the word real, can we know that one appearance to equal to another appearance, the same as other? Varying mental conditions are formed from moment to moment. What is lost is lost and does not come back. The ordinary worldly concerns should not be looked upon similarly.

Advaitism never proves oneness, but absence of duality. The notion of the world being real should be abandoned. c.f. Vivekachudamani.483.

Science tells you everything seen is changing. Philosophy=Truth; verification=experiences of the states. That real is that which is permanent, unchanging. Existence means (1) appearance--changing--illusion, it gives you the idea that it is permanent, but it is going. (2) Permanent.

This is Existence: What you considered at one time real or permanent is not real or permanent; or what you considered existing apart from you, is not real, e.g., the dream mountain was real and permanent, but it was my mind alone. The world is changing every second--observation and science show it. Take a plant flowering. But we cannot say whom it changes or how it changes. Hence the word i.e. inexplicable. Bergson: "Change is continuous": But the seer of the change is different from the change. Change is what you have imagined. It is your imagination. c.f. You can't say the snake is gone. My mind only imagined. It is not the disappearance of objects that wanted by the knowledge that it is your own mind or Brahman that was there.

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).

We cannot rely upon words, but only facts. Words are used for appearances.

Page 75: Though you see the manifold, if you know that it is only your imagination, the same as yourself, you realize Brahman, when you are in the midst of the manifold. There is no going or coming--no appearance and disappearance, which are mind itself. That which is aware, that which knows, that which is, that which is Atman, is Mind. The thoughts are in the mind and of the mind.

Yoga vs. Veda vs. Bibles. Contradictory truths in each. In the old stage we believed everything. Now it is different. Where is the proof, we don't believe in Sruti. We here appeal to facts of existence-duality.

Non-duality is not what is taken on trust or on theory or Vedas: analyze the world, inquire into the truth of the matter, the whole is in mind. It is a question of fact. c.f. dream illustration. All that you see cannot be taken as something apart from the mind or Atman or Turiya. As there, it is mind, with appearance of object or without objects. c.f. Gita chap. 18 verse 30.

The dead body is your mind. You are afraid because you do not know its nature. Destruction is impossibility. c.f. Indestructibility of matter in Science.

If you always want to take prostrations, you will become oum mandalis.

The difference between prostrating before an ass and before a man is that the ass does not say "I bless you" which is humbug.

Do not wait till the world is destroyed. The world is only Mind and Atman. This sloka appeals only to the facts.

One European definition of truth is "that which agrees with your view." c.f. Ramanuja's, and Madhva's views.

For the waking state you see the wood. For the dream state, you see the Chamundy (hill). It is the mind here too.

In knowledge you see of course everything, but you see only Brahman; and you feel for all and are impelled to serve all. Get rid of ignorance. c.f. Gita 12-16. In all matters he is capable of right decision. It makes the mind sharpest. That is what it means.

MANDUKYA UPANISAD: (Supplement)

Each Upanishad gives the truth according to the stages of understanding of a man, but in their essence they agree on the highest. According to the standard of inquiry of a questioner, the reply is given in the Upanishads.

Page 361: OBEISANCE-the meaning of all salutation is, "I am effacing my 'I'."

P.343: MADADHIH: highest buddhi.

P.345: v.90: Avoided means negated.

P.348: ILLUMINED: means capacity to know.

P.316: v.63: "ten directions" means: North South, East West, North-east, South-west, North-west, South-east, Up and Down, thus covering the whole world.

P.358: "We salute it as best as we can" means there is really no second thing to salute, for that would falsify the final conclusion, but salutation, prostration, means getting rid of the ego, hence it is practiced here, at the very end of Mandukya.

Gaudapada was perhaps the first to give hints or indications of the double stand-points (1) practical (2) ultimate, but Sankara was the first who made it definite and familiar.

Gaudapada was perhaps the first to discuss causal relation; it is not even in Upanishads.

The Karika to the Mandukya Upanishad points out that there are men of different temperaments and different capacities and therefore the Guru should make his teaching suitable to their tastes. The test will be for the Guru to explain to the prospective pupil that the world is an idea. If the pupil can grasp this point, then he may be initiated into the higher truth. If he is unable to grasp it he should be put only on to the practice of meditation and yoga, because these practices will train him to appreciate later the idealistic nature of the Universe.

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.

Page.322: 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.

Page 343 (last line) Once you know that the whole of experience is only Gnan, knowledge, idea, it can never disappear.

Page 230. Para 1. Ref. to Yogi's: 5th line and p.231 9th line from bottom. Yogi does not know that after you get control of mind you have to get the distinguishing power between the true and

the false, then only can you get knowledge of the universal self. That which reveals Brahman is knowledge only. Because Yogi Ramaiya has given you peace or comfort, that does not mean he has given you truth.

Mandukya, the highest of all Upanishads declares that deep sleep and yogic samadhi are one and the same. See page 229 to 233.

Mandukya quotes scriptures only after reasoning has been given, and it does so only to confirm reasoning.

Verse 1. "All this is Brahman." We must inquire into the meaning of this, which is before me. This world must be known. You must know the meaning of matter.

The key to Asparsha yoga is given in Mandukya page 219 verse 34. Mandukya is an epitome of the following Upanishads: Brihad, Katha, Mundaka & Chandogya.

MANDUKYA UPANISHAD.

Page 51. ATMAN is the highest Reality and its opposite: Note the word "and". Reality and illusion together make Brahman: nothing can be left out.

Page 65: v.10. Brahman must be realized in the waking state when all objects are present to consciousness, otherwise it is nonsense.

Page 69. "Sleep does not exist In Turiya": This emphatically disproves the mystic use of sleep as analogy for Brahman.

Page 74. v. 17: This means that objects do not disappear, they are there, and yet they are non-dual. Disillusionment is not the same as appearance.

The essential message of Mandukya is that the whole world, that whatever is seen is only imagined.

Page 351 points out that even though it is harder for them, still women can attain Brahman just as men.

Page 333. V. 83: "From their notion": Every body has his own imagination about facts and starts from that, instead of discarding his personal idea and looking at the fact.

Page 96. v. 29: "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.

Mandukya shows how one opinion may be used to contradict another, so that both may be thrown away. Opinions are not for philosophy; they are merely, as Ashtavakra says, mere thoughts; it wants truth.

P.219: 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 gnanis.

P.300. V.45. Existence means existence in the sense of the Drik. When you reduce every thing to consciousness, Drik, Gnanam, or even Mind, giving up all imaginations in truth it is unborn. You see a man's body come and go, but that is not the same as seeing him come and go, which you can never do.

Gaudapada's third chapter is devoted to proving existence of Atman in order to distinguish it from the changeable objects in this world, but in final 4th chapter P.33, verse 83, he discards that position and rejects even the idea of Atmanic existence. He then declares we may assert nothing about it. Not even existence or nonexistence i.e. silence alone is demanded by truth.

MANDUKYA does not deal with things not seen by the human eye. Religion on the other hand does. Mandukya ignores God, who does not arise for it for he is unseen, but bows down to what it has seen i.e. men and to the best of men who is the Guru.

Page 297; The Gnani will not unsettle the minds of ignorant yogis or religionists by denouncing their attachment to causality. On the contrary, he will encourage their belief that they will get nearer God by their efforts. He can do nothing also with such minds, and so he improves them gradually; only afterwards when they are able to ask questions "Is this truth?" not till then will he initiate them into non-causality.

P.217. 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 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.

MANDUKYA, Chandogya and Brihad Upanishads give the Avastatraya. But the credit of Gaudapada is that he brought it up-to-date by dealing with the objects of the schools and religions current in his time. He analysed the whole situation. Knowledge had advanced by his time and criticisms had been raised.

Waking, dream and sleep constitute the "three fold" knowledge of Mandukya p.343. All these states come and go, the Drik alone remains: we find in the end that all these states are nothing but the Atman.

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.

Ordinary men cannot understand the ways of a Gnani. Even the Gods feel puzzled in regard to the gnanis says the Mandukya, p.352 and he is like fish swimming in the water or tracks of birds in the air. He must behave as one not knowing Truth. Let not others know what you are and what

you have become. He does not broadcast his knowledge. He does not assume the role of a knower.

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.

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.

Page 214; 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.

The fourth chapter of Gaudapada is the most important because it deals with non-causality, and it must be studied a number of times before it can be digested.

Page 308: A quality cannot stand without a substance; can you have the yellow color alone without the cloth? (a) Ramanuja says God cannot exist without attributes. Reply: Then you make God a drsyam, similar to this wall, because qualities can only be seen in objective world (b) Causality appears in the drsyam, but when you go deeply into the matter even there the causality disappears.

This Upanishad is only an explanation of Gita Ch.4.35:

In chapter 2 we got the explanation of illusion. And chapter 3 deals with the rational demonstration of the truth of non-dualism. Chapter 4 deals with the rational refutation of the other schools of thoughts showing that they are self-contradictory, while Chapter 1 condenses the Vedas into their essence.

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.

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.

Chap.4. Up to verse 60 the arguments are based on waking only. But from 61 they are based on dream. This shows that proof of Advaita must be drawn from both waking and dream. Those Advaitins like T. Subba Rao Sarma, and B.L. Atreya who ignore science and want only avastatraya are children. They will tell you that it is so because it is in Mandukya, but they are unable to prove scientifically.

Page 87: Even Maharishees show difference of opinion, let alone lesser folks what are we to do? We must cease wasting time on useless argument based on authorities and we must first find out the meaning of truth and go to facts and then only judge the various authorities.

Page 10: "All this" This phrase proves that Vedanta deals with the world we know, not with some remote plane of existence. The word "All" shows that nothing in life need be left out of study, no part may be ignored, if truth is to be found. The word "this" shows that it deals with the material world that confronts us.

Page 10: "That which is beyond": Not only does Advaita show that the world we know is Brahman, but even that which is now unknown, that which may be discovered in the future, and even that which is at present unknowable, cannot be other than Brahman. It is impossible to think of anything that exists that is not Brahman, just as it is impossible to think of that which is beyond thought as not being Brahman. Therefore Mandukya covers everything comprehensively in its field of examination. That is why it gives truth, because if anything is not known; there will be doubt, hence not complete truth.

Page 77: How are the pundits better or different from lawyers--interpreting sections in different ways?

When you ask me I am obliged to reply. We have to take for granted the duality.

78: Why should you teach at all? Ask and it shall be given. When you ask it means ignorance. You think you know but really you don't know. The world of facts, man does not want.

Artistic mentality wants imagination. Philosophic mentality wants facts. Philosophy is concerned with the estimation of values.

79: AUM: It stands for four quarters, and it indicates the whole universe. Only in this sense can you use the word. These three letters or sounds--(1) The combination is possible in Brahman. (2) If you leave anything it is not Brahman. If you embrace all, it is alright; it is wrong when you think of any particular body.

Sri Ramakrishna recognized Narayana in Swamiji, equally so in the dog, grass, scavenger, etc.

He who sits quiet is no gnani, unless he is ill.

What will dignify and exalt knowledge is contemplation and action. c.f. 'Introduction to Science' last chapter.

AUM represents the three states and everything that exists. True knowledge has only one consequence of making one firmly believe in the unreality of this world, if you know them.

It only teaches the unreality but does not destroy. If a true knowledge of the self were able to destroy all the world, then it would also put an end to the fructification of past deeds. But it only teaches the unreality and does not destroy it.

If you say you get gnan in Nirvikalpa samadhi, then why not admit it in deep sleep?

If it be said that there is direct cognition the 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 profound sleep?

Knowledge of Atman is Gnan, but not the absence of duality.

Moksha means getting rid of ignorance and not heaven or other Aesop's fables.

82: Tejasa is U, the second letter, it comes higher than A as symbolical parallel. M corresponds to the closing of the mouth--the closing of the sound and with it the ideas in Sushupti.

What is the relation between Gnani and renunciation?

"Intellect": It operates and functions only in waking. Doubt arises only where there are two things: doubt about what, when there is no second thing? --in the ultimate resolution from objects to the ideas and to mind. Waves are in the ocean, the ocean knows the waves are water as much as ocean. You know that others are your own mind, you begin to feel for them. "Sarva Drik Sada"-- you are always the Drik.

Thousands of day dreams you ignore, worldly concerns you ignore.

P.98: How is the worldly object better than the mental creations?

P. 99: With Gnanam will all difficulty vanish. If you know that you are knower, it is the Truth. Then everything is Brahman. They see action in inaction and inaction in action. Sitting quiet is not Gnan nor is acting Gnan. Go to dream and verify. You can prevent everything else but not prevent from attaining Gnan. Even the devas cannot prevent you.

Verse 105: Ponder over the unreality of the world.

Youth, age: the day that is past never comes back.

Idea of action goes with the idea of body, but if you look upon action and body as ideas, everything is mind and mind alone. Advaiti occupies an "impregnable fortress."

If you act it must be for the sake of others. Yagnavalkya and Maitrayi: "I will give you my wealth and let me go." that is the attitude.

(1) God appears in your dream and he will do everything -- good for the unthinking.

(2) Relying completely on Karma is much better.

(3) We do not believe in what may have happened in the last birth or what will happen in the next. There is no proof. Now here let us do some good and help others.

The same thing does not come and go. There is no proof. It is only similar things. Days never come back. Ordinary worldly concerns should be considered similarly. This is "true Gnan." Everything connected with me is similar only and not the same. Yesterday, the food in me was outside.

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.

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.

Mandukya has no assumptions whatever. It is an honest and bold inquiry into truth. It rises above scripture.

Mandukya Upanishad is not meant for all, as it is based entirely on reasoning. Hence my Sringeri Guru would teach it only to a few.

VIVEKACHUDAMANI OF SANKARACHARYA.

In Vivekachudamani or The Crest-Jewel of Wisdom, Sri Sankaracharya deals with Vedanta in his direct incisive way different from the dialectic method which he had to adopt in writing his more famous Bhashyas or Commentaries.

What is the aim of Vedanta, what are we going to get from it? This book "Vivekachudamani" will tell you. It will give you two things, peace of mind and the truth of the world.

Vivekachudamani is based on Scripture, is meant for one who relies on Sruti, whereas Mandukya is based on rationality.

Verse 1: Govinda is God, but the God within, the light of Reason, Buddhi, in your own Self. Govinda also means the being who is the master of your Reason. No human being can give you entrance to the Seer, the Knower, as he can never be the Seen, the Known. Mental efforts are used only to get understanding that all minds, works are illusions. Your thoughts are helpful in Vedanta only to point out that all other thoughts are imagination, as one thorn is used to pick out another.

Viveka means to find out which is truth and which is not truth. Mind must be made very active and quick and sharp. If the guru makes you know truth, he must be treated as God.

2: Man has got Reason, Mind. Hence man is so great in comparison with other kingdoms. Man has more time to devote to such thoughts because woman has to devote herself to children.

Brahmin is one who devotes his life to truth, not birth by caste. Everything seen is only an idea, that is the not-self. One must pass through immense number of births otherwise the mind can't get fixed in truth. We know that no one is to be despised, for all will come to truth in time.

3: Value of human incarnation is its special possession of Buddhi, Reason. That which enables him to distinguish between real and unreal.

the grace of God - previous good Karma.

4-5: Only where men have retrograded into animal bodies, can later attain realization because the Reason is still with them. Extra-intelligent animals which can count, spell, etc. are merely retrograded human souls.

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.

The mind: The mind grows by knowledge, which in turn you communicate to others. Nothing else is mind. Hence you have no mind of your own. Make use of your intelligence to discover these things; it is that which is most valuable in you, and by such examination you discover that in you disappears and what is really permanent. Seek that which is permanent, says the Veda; and the human birth is our opportunity to do so. Science is now coming to the confirmation of Upanishadic truth, about self. We cling foolishly to the physical body merely because we delude ourselves that it is "I". Scientifically we see everywhere that everything is impermanent. Hence we seek the permanent, which is Liberation and real satisfaction. "Longing for liberation"- to get rid of ignorance and know Truth. These three things--male birth, longing, guru--do not often happen together and the woman, being more preoccupied, having double load of duties--household and children, has less thought to spare for this quest than man. Things are not what they appear to be: - that is what we mean when we say world is unreal, illusory. Those

who find no inspiration to action in this doctrine overlook that the One who has lost the inspiration is ignored. That One is everything. Who is this I who has no inspiration? That question must be asked. Its nature must next be inquired into.

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.

6: All things other than inquiry into the nature of Reality, having nothing to do with Truth, such as rituals and scriptures, but latter are necessary for religious beginners, according to kind of mind they have and the stage where they are.

7: The very fact that everyone is overtaken by death, that no one can prevent it, is coupled with everything which one gets from the worldly life. Only realization is immortal.

8: The experiences enshrined by gurus in books may be availed of. You must have the idea that nothing that the world can give you is equal to Truth. It must be sought above the sense-objects. You must have guru because life is like a sea and on a ship you need a captain who knows how to find direction and to guide you.

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.

9: Yoga means fixed. "I want to get at Truth" but when the mind is flying in one hundred directions it is impossible to get at Truth. Concentration must come first because only then the mind can see clearly. The same in working for an examination. If the mind is thinking of desires, it can't keep fixed in pursuit of truth. That is yoga-maha state. Discrimination is between truth and falsity, fact and appearance. You must inquire into the true nature of your body, of that (world) which is before and around you.

10: The knowledge which fills an encyclopedia is not what is meant by 'wisdom and erudition.'

11: Truth you will get only by inquiry, discrimination. Troubles and worries are useful to make people serious and only after they are serious will they seek Truth, that philosophy will come.

12: The world appears like a snake when it is really a rope. Modern sciences greatest achievement is this discrimination, this discovery that matter is not what it seems to be. Vedanta starts with Vichara, inquiry, in order to discover this too, and did so thousands of years ago.

13: The brain has to be used. Everything has not the capacity to think, so they are put on to lesser modes such as religion, pilgrimage, breath-control etc. until they get a thought strike them. The wise may tell you a good truth a thousand times but unless you reason upon it, it is of little use.

14: Aspirant means one who has the capacity to understand as well as the desire to know the truth. Unless you can inquire how can you know that sand contains silicon or clay aluminum? They had to pry under appearances.

15: Guru must be merciful and patient, just as disciple must be patient, as sometimes it is so difficult to grasp truth.

16: "skilled in arguing" means able to show convincingly that Truth will give most satisfaction. "Unreal" means passing away, ever changing.

17: 'longing for liberation' means 'longing to know truth'

19: 'Real' - permanent.

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.

20: BRAHMAN,- reality, Self, permanence, all mean Truth.

21. Seeker must hold attitude of firm determination to seek Truth above all changing world by attraction or trials. If you see Thomson's "Introduction to Science" you will see how eminent scientists must train themselves in concentration of purpose, not to be diverted from goal.
- 22: 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.
- 23: The thought "I want that which is permanent" is predominant.
- 24: 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.
- 26: MERE INTELLECTUAL means not 'curiosity satisfying' but determination to realize Brahman.
27. The greatest obstacle to understanding Truth is the 'I'. Ahamkara with all its attachments, opinions, prejudices etc. with come (as obstacles). Hence confirmation by others is required, checking by their opinions and examinations and observation. This is scientific method which demands verification by others and not letting truth depend on one ego alone. If 'I' predominates, your individual opinions, convictions and prejudices will predominate over Truth.
- 28: The teacher is required to direct you to the goal.
- 29,30,31: "Who am I?", "Devotion to Lord", Inquiry into Truth, are all as good as each other if your mind is directed to this one point Truth-quest the other things naturally follow.
32. The steps are, first to be devoted to God, second to inquire into yourself (as God will make you understand Self), third Guru points out the highest.
- 33: Guru's characteristics are described.
34. Prostration before Guru to forget the "Ego" for a while so as to know Truth. "I" prevents one knowing truth. c.f. Gita IV.34.
- 35 & 36: Merely requests Guru "I want Truth"
37. Guru's characteristic is to help others to attain truth.
- 38-44 Guru should not teach for the sake of money, or any other object but to help attainment.
45. Reason, judgment must be exercised on what scriptures and science says: that is the beginning. When you say 'I want knowledge' you feel you are ignorant. Hence our business is to free ourselves from ignorance. Even if you say I want God, it is really to get God is remove your ignorance. Ignorance to cause of all troubles.
Truth removes it and them.
- 46-49. Non-self, world and body.
Brahmahood simply means free from ignorance.
- 50-54. Unless you understand the truth for yourself your ignorance will not go. Others cannot make you see: You have to use your own eyes to see physically.
55. Truth can come only by reflection in yourself, reasoning "Is this true?" i.e. inquiry. Reading alone will not do it unless it is joined to spirit to inquire.
57. A play on words as 'rajan' the Sanskrit word king is derived from the root 'raj'=please.
- 56-58 - Thinking power alone will bring truth.
- 59-60 Too much reading will confuse mind.
- 61-62. Mind must be made clear to show truth; it must be exercised.
63. How to get truth: First step is to study world which you see, objective universe. If you cannot examine things in front of you, how can you examine what is not seen--the Self? Unless you understand the chair before you, how can you understand what is hidden from you--the internal world. So that is the first step.

64. Ignorance is of the subject before you, to begin with in the external world first. So must you know world first.

65. Arguments which lead you away from Truth, are perverted. Till you know in which direction Truth lies one should take the advice of the Guru.

66. No step can be given up on the path; all are required. You, (Jiva) are like a wave on the ocean (Brahman) when you become the sea, you will still exist but as the ocean, and after that even if you become a wave again you will know that you are also the ocean. This is the position of Jnani. Even if you rise as a wave you know the ocean is in you. You become the whole by identifying yourself as the Brahman; this is the wave merging with the ocean, body in the mind will function as Brahman.

67-69: Your mind must be turned to the permanent. "Aversion" means to know things to be perishable. Rituals, religious or magical are given up because they are done for return, for reward.

70. Muni - one who can think well.

The waves (we) appear and fall back. That ocean into which we fall back is Brahman.

71-73. What is the I? Body comes and goes, thoughts go and come; all these are outside 'I'. 'I' is the perceiver.

74. These things are useful as instruments, these limbs, but they are not you, although they are servants of you. It is a common mistake to confuse not-self with self so long as you do not inquire into it.

75. It is not easy to free ourselves from this attachment, but they will pass away, and it is foolish to be attached to them.

76. Caught by sense-objects, we become mind, as deers and elephants are caught. A female elephant is sent amongst the wild-male elephants whose skin touch each other and she decoys them. Thus, five senses are five deceivers or entrappers.

Ancient Indian hunters trapped deer by playing soft music; elephants by the pleasure the latter got from rubbing foreheads against pine trees; moths by showing lights, fish by tasty bait and bees by scent.

77. Yoga is only for learning method of self-control of mastery over the body and five senses. It is a useful stage to prepare oneself for inquiry so that the mind is free and is not enslaved to things preventing inquiry.

78-79. Practice of control, a little is necessary to discipline oneself, not to be drawn away by pleasures.

87. When body is analysed it is found to be offensive. Hence be indifferent to it.

88. Body which we have now is the body which we fashioned by our thoughts in previous lives; hence we say, have good thoughts and you will have a good body. Mind is the maker of the body. Mind makes it for the purpose of experiencing and realizing its thoughts and desires. Science is now showing that body is created by mind, and thus demonstrate the truth of Hindu teachings. Children born in China of British parents have Chinese features.

89. You know that these things are true only in the waking state. Then only you are certain of them. In dream you are not conscious of body.

90. In dream you are dealing with the internal world.

91. Because one identifies himself with the body he feels annoyed, flattered, etc. This is false because Science established that every seven years all body is renewed. You merely think you are the same person. Indian thought goes further and says body changes every second. For all practical purposes, however, you may say this body is a house in which I live.

93. Manas is the part of mind which is intellect, thinking, dealing with pros and cons of a case, it analyses and places things before you. Buddhi determines the truth; it is the higher part of the mind. Ego prevents the knowing of truth.

95. Analysis of breath.

96-97. The part of the body which cannot be seen by the five senses is the subtle body: It is attached to the physical, nevertheless.

98. The extra mundane spirit - the extra-mental self. Advanced science confirms this position. In verse 89 the word 'woman' appears in the Sanskrit text after 'sandal-paste'.

91. According to the Hindus the body passes through six stages: birth existence growth change decline and death.

103. The bodily eye itself is incapable of seeing, otherwise it would not cease to see at the death of the body. In reality the eye sees by reason of its connection with the self through egoism, 'I am the seer.'

104. When I become conscious of a book there are two distinct branches into which that consciousness resolves itself. I am conscious of the book. This latter branch of consciousness or reflection, is ego.

127. "Sees" in the sense of providing the power of cognition; this does not mean seeing objects.

137 the word "ignorance" is hardly strong enough. "Avidya" is the original and it means the antithesis of knowledge, i.e. error more than its negation.

344. The veiling power is that which makes one thing appear as another.

396. His 'enemies' are the six passions: lust anger greed delusion pride jealousy.

Verse 63 says the object must go entirely, but drsyam does not only mean the external world, it also means internal thought. Where is the laya to where it goes? It must go back into Mind itself, where all ideas dissolve themselves. Hence yogis who interpret this verse as meaning Nirvikalpa samadhi, are wrong. Further the same page says, "it becomes only an effort of speech." This means world becomes a thought, nothing more.

In all the objections to idealism which the supposed opponent raises, you will find anticipations of the same objections which have been raised in our modern times by the various well-known schools and philosophers.

I myself went through a cloudy mystic stage, practiced yoga, until I read Mandukya. After that all the mists were dispelled and I gave up mysticism.

Verse 170 says plainly that world is Mind. He mentions waking world to emphasize it. About a dozen of the verses dealing with Maya as a separate entity have probably been interpolated and are not Sankara's (see also No. 27)

DRG DRSYA VIVIKA

A piece of wood or stone has no experience and is unable to think. Animals have experience but have no power to reflect upon it. Above the animals you have man who has powers to think, to evaluate his experiences and to choose what is the highest objective life. Hence man has the gift of knowledge available to him as the reward of reflection upon his experiences. The object of Drg Drsyā Viveka is this: to weigh the whole of life's experience and know its object.

Drg Drsyā Viveka cannot be understood unless you first understand what the mind is doing when it thinks, when it seeks for the meaning of a word, i.e. semantics. The general principle is that whatever the mind tells you is subject to revision; its thoughts are ever changing.

Drg Drsyā Viveka is the only single book on its subject. Various other books touch on it but among other subjects. The awareness, Drik, is real but the other things, the known is always changing, hence unreal.

Knowledge in the West implies the known, in India it implies both the known and the knower. This distinction is not known to Westerners. This is the chief point of Drg Drsyā

Viveka. The knower is entirely different from the knowable or known. This analysis is unknown to Europe.

You can distinguish between one known thing and another but you cannot distinguish between one knower, one awareness, from another. Everyone has got awareness. But how is it possible to distinguish one awareness--apart from known thing--from another? This is important but European thinkers do not know it.

Let the Western thinkers begin with study of Drg Drsyā Viveka. If they have the capacity to understand the book they do not need yoga. But if they cannot grasp that the Drg is not the Drsyā, they must have recourse to yoga practices. Yoga will give them this understanding. But it is only a preliminary stage for beginners.

Know the distinction between the Drik and Drsyā and you need never be frightened by 20,000 authorities, Pandits, Professors or famous men. Ask then in your mind: "Are you dealing with the Drik or the Drsyā?" They unite millions of words in books or lectures but dismiss them all as mere thoughts i.e. imaginings. There is not one philosopher in the West who knows this distinction. They do not want to go so far in analysis. All their doctrines are finally their own ideas, which means their own imagination, which means only drsyā, not reality. Thus you have a valuable key and it shows the great importance of studying Drg Drsyā Viveka, which arms you with a powerful weapon.

Unless the West studies Drg Drsyā Viveka it cannot understand what reality is. This is the first book Europe needs to study, for it must first discover the ego to be but an idea which appears and disappears.

Ninety-nine percent of people do not want Gnana, truth; they want something for their ego; "I want peace", "I want this doctrine", "I want Nirvana" etc.

The Drik translated, means "That which sees" but we use the term, "see" only metaphorically. Drik conveys something that is aware without being aware of any object in particular. The drik is objectless consciousness. We prefer to use the word "see" rather than "know" because the latter demands an object to be known, whereas it is obvious that the other word is used in connection with a physical organ, the eye, concerning a non-material subject, and therefore must be metaphysical and symbolic only.

The Drsyā is that which passes away and therefore does not exist.

There are two things, Drg and Drsyā. The whole world is drsyā; and drsyā is what my mind constructs. The West has yet to learn this but refuses because it adopts the attitude "We have not known ultimate truth: therefore it can't be found.

Whoever knows the Drg Drsyā Viveka analysis can easily evaluate all yogic phenomena, all occult and spiritistic "wonders". Let us analyze the meaning of "inner psychic mystic or clairaudient voices." Whatever should you hear, where is it? In the mind. If it is in the mind it is only an idea, and an idea is something seen, a drsyā, and hence not reality.

This book is the most important one to teach you (1) that even if you see Krishna, it is only your imagination, (2) to ascertain the true meaning of personality, (3) that things are coming and going and hence are mere appearances.

This is a fundamental book for students, yet the Ramakrishna Mission magazines never advertise it but only mystic religious books! They do not know what is important.

The chief aim of Drg Drsyā Viveka is to show that the second thing, the seen is only a mental construction.

European psychology has not gone beyond personality, has not reached the Witness. This is because unless one's mind is sufficiently sharp the notion of the Sakshin cannot be seen. One must perceive that the I itself comes and goes, as in sleep for instance. What is it that perceives this? It is the Witness. The I is an object, the Witness is the subject. This position is the next step ahead of Western psychology. It must be reached, mastered and then dropped for the next higher step, the understanding of the Atman. The Witness-self is not an individuality, it is universal, but

still it is only a temporary stage, not the ultimate truth. It is for beginners and here Maharishi's "Who Am I?" analysis is most useful as it shows beginners that the I comes and goes, and that they must look beyond it to the principle of Awareness which tells you of these appearances and disappearances of the I. But beyond that point of the Witness self, the Sakshin, the Maharishi's teaching does not go. Higher than his is the doctrine of Atman. The notion of Witness arises only when you consider the objects from this standpoint which assumes the real (not ideal) existence of all objects; the antithesis of a subject, a Witness must arise. But there is a loftier standpoint wherein the objects are dismissed from consideration entirely through the use of avastatraya and thus non-dual Atman is reached. We have to give Indian beginners or Western psychologists the DRG DRSYA VIVEKA analysis or the WHO AM I? doctrine as a start. Maharishi has rendered excellent service in this respect. He lead to the knowledge of the illusoriness of the I: only after this is mastered do we drop that as a lower view and teach the final truth of non-duality, but that is not the end. We have to know all the world, and we have to know the real I.

If critics object that the principle of awareness also disappears in sleep, we reply No: it is only the objects and thoughts which go; awareness must remain in order to tell you that you slept and woke and that the objects came and went.

The notion of Atman as the Witness or knower, of the three states is not the ultimate position. But we are forced to adopt it as a preliminary step, because we cannot leap into the ultimate view at once. From that view there are no separate states because the ego which knows them is itself as transient and illusory, itself known and seen like other drsyams. Unless you know the true position of the ego, Vedanta cannot be grasped.

The ego is an object, a drsyam, like all others. This discovery the West hardly knows. But once known, we can remain indifferent to its desires and unaffected by its experiences.

Atman is not an entity or a material object; it is only the knowingness, the awareness capacity. All your awareness, even the thought I, are only objects, drsyams, not the seer. Their changes, coming and going do not change the seer, because if they did, then you would never be able to note the changes.

Atman is not the accumulation of knowledge--whether you know a thousand or a single book it remains the same--but the property of knowing in itself. The capacity to become aware of is the same in all, but the number of objects known, varies.

Drg Drsyas Viveka is a book of psychological analysis, dealing also with Yoga from page 28. Its essential teaching is: "Look into your consciousness. Note that everything within it comes and goes, appears and disappears. But this book does not go so far as to show that the drsyams are ultimately Drik.

Stanza 1.(a) We see objects and it is the eye which views them. This stanza deals with what is called "subject-object" relation. But objects and the body are the same, as the body is an object to the mind. How do we know that we have an eye? It is through the mind, which is subject to the eye as object. So far, the Western psychologists have already traveled. Next, the objects are also internal, as in the form of ideas, thoughts and mental impressions which are known by the mind and hence must be objects to the mind. Now we know the mind only when it has contents, i.e. thoughts. In swoon or sleep when there are no thoughts, no mind-contents, we do not know the mind. Hence mind and thoughts are identical. But who is it that knows the absence or presence of thoughts? It is the witness. There is something which is able to be aware of mind, of thoughts coming and going (even if not at the actual moment). That exists and must be postulated. It is the Witness (sasya) and here Western psychologists have been unable to arrive so far. This witness is the final subject; it cannot be the object to any other thing. When regarded apart from its object or objects it is the Atman, and when considered in relation to mind or objects, it is Witness, but both are same. Of it we may postulate nothing, only that It IS. No

qualification may be added. Such an analysis of the SEER is a basis for the commencement of Vedanta study.

(b) Drg Drsyā Viveka deal's with analytical knowledge of the thing seen and that of the seer. It is an analysis of experience. Experience consists of subject object relation. Everything seen has a form. I close my eye and I cannot see the object. The eye is thus the perceiver. That which makes this statement is the mind. So there is something higher than the eye. The mind's capacity and incapacity is observed by another entity called the witness, which is not perceived by any one else. This alone is Drik. All other things are the objects. Witness is the last. Whatever is known to the mind is Drsyam. There is something (Witness) which sees the mind's activities. The ultimate perceiver cannot be perceived. All perceived things internal and external are Jada (matter or drsyam objects). Whatever is seen or known to the mind is all. Even 'I' is an object because it is perceived by Drik which sees all activities of the mind. This true perceiver can not become the perceived.

(c) Experience gives you two things: something that is known and something that knows. We analyze knowledge and find that the simplest form is that got by the five senses. Suppose you are blind, you cannot see, therefore the eye is capable of seeing or not seeing. Therefore the eye is the first seer. But whether the eye sees or is blind is something known only to the mind. Still again the capacity or incapacity of the Mind is in its turn known to the Witness or the Subject, which itself is not seen by anything else but knows all else. This "all else" is the drsyam. Drsyam means not only this wall but also the eyes which perceive it, and the states of mind, thoughts, feelings: everything in fact except the witness, which itself never becomes a drsyam. In Sanskrit the word "subject" means only that which can never become an object, in English it merely means that which is within as "subjective expressions." Hence in English its meaning varies and the subject may therefore be an object; but in Sanskrit it is unvarying.

Stanza 2.(a) The aim of this and succeeding stanzas is to lead one to seek ultimate Unity, to discover the real Seer and to know that the latter is consciousness. Hence the subject-object relation is explored, first between objects and eye, former being multiple and latter unit, second between eye and mind, former having various changes or qualities and latter unit mind, third between consciousness and mental states, former being unit and latter changing. Western philosophers boggle over consciousness and will not go so far. They will not acknowledge that it has a separate existence. Hence they are confused and puzzled. The West says mind cannot know itself ever, and then they use the word "mind" to cover everything! (even including Witness Consciousness). It is Consciousness, says Vedanta, which makes all the objects to be known, whether external (material forms) or internal (mental ideas). Hence it is said to illumine everything.

(b) You see the horse and then the house and so on. The eye which sees all those remains changeless. If the eye also changes it could not distinguish between the house and the horse. If the eye which sees the horse and the eye which sees the house are different it cannot distinguish the two. The change of forms you are able to see because there is one thing which does not change and which perceives it. This perceiver is present always ready to perceive anything presented to it by the mind. Even thoughts in the mind are also objects. The word subject is misleading. That which perceives the changes cannot itself change (at least for the time being).

(c) You can't see difference unless the Seer is also one. If the eye could not always remain the same, with reference to outside objects only, it would not notice the variety amongst these objects, for its own singleness enables it to have a standard, a criterion of vision to differentiate one object from another. Of course, in reference to itself the eye may change by becoming diseased etc. Therefore the principle is drawn that to know that things are changing, you must have an Unchanging one to witness them.

3(a) When the mind sees the defects of the eyes (long sight, short sight etc) the mind is then the subject and the sense-organ of sight is the object. Here the mind remains the same for the time being and therefore is able to perceive the activities of the senses, their dullness, sharpness, defects etc. Again when it perceives the changes of internal different states as emotions feelings etc. it must remain the same for the time being as the witness or Consciousness—both mean the same. Suppose consciousness had a defect. Who is to see it? If something else perceives it, consciousness becomes and the consciousness or the perceiver would be Witness.

(b) The changes of the eyes, occasioned by defect or disease, in their turn, may be noted by the Mind which is the subject to it.

4(a) 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.

(b) The words "by another" do not mean "another man's mind." This is impossible. They mean by "the witness." The mind sees its own changes, says European philosophy. We deny that. It is unable to rise the concept of the Witness which is subject to the mind, the latter being an object in relation to the witness. This witness is the Ultimate subject, all other subjects are merely temporary or relative. Mind is able to cognize during the period it sees differences, because it is itself a unity. Consciousness (chit) illumines the different mental states.

5(a) This final consciousness never sets or rises. For to rise means to come to existence in time. We can never go beyond it. Growth and destruction are only related to objects and not to the subject. Unity = something enduring.

(b) The rising and setting of consciousness is not known to another. If you speak of its rising and setting then there must exist another consciousness which notes the changes and therefore that second consciousness must be the ultimate and unchanging Witness-Consciousness. It is absolutely necessary for you to think and reason this point carefully, as the Western psychology does not see it. You must understand that somewhere there must be an Unchanging Mind which notes and knows all the changes of the changing mind. The Western psychologist will say, we make a man unconscious by drugs: they think it is possible to have unconsciousness: they think consciousness means awareness of a thing. We go a step further and say that which sees the changing things, but does not change, is consciousness. Thus in Vedanta we use the word 'consciousness' in a different sense. The West uses it only with reference to an object, whereas we use it for both reference to an object and absence of it. Really we ought to use a different word to bring out our idea of Witness-consciousness.

6(a) Buddhi, intelligent reason and judgment is the superior faculty of the mind. Egoism is also a faculty of the mind. Both are lit up by reflection from Consciousness and cannot function without it. Egoity comes and goes like objects.

(b) Here begins a new section of the book, that of analysis. Smell is not due to nose alone, but to the co-operation of mind and nose, whilst through the mind works the Witness. When I see a wall, the Witness is directing its attention to the eye, for it is the real knowing thing, the others are mere instruments. The knower, the Witness, may be associated with a dull or sharp kind of mind but it will not itself be affected by the condition of the mind. The Atman working through the mind, yet remaining unaffected, like the mirror unaffected by the image, is here called "a reflection of Consciousness." When the mind is tired and you say "I can't read today, the I is looking at the mental condition, and even appears to be identical with the mind, but when you analyze, you discover that the Atman can never get tired because it cannot change. The perceiver is always there and is only waiting to see the mind present something to it. According to the

function of the mind performs at different times it is given a particular name. Sometimes it is interested in enjoying, another time in analyzing, another in understanding truth. So its name changes with the respective functions, as chitta, manas, buddhi ahankara, etc. All these are different names of the same thing functioning in different ways at different times. The later Vedantins give one collective name to the mind--Antakarana---meaning that which is inside, the internal organ. Therefore do not get confused by the use of these varying terms in Vedantic books. All are but words applied to one and the same thing - Mind, in opposition to matter. Mind is not what you see inside, matter (not) what you see outside. It is like a man who performs at different occasions the varying functions of king, father, husband, brother etc.

7(a) The fire remains fire even though it heats the ball. Similarly Consciousness remains over the same, unaltered and untainted even tho' reflected into the ego and body identified therewith. Consciousness when looking out at the objects becomes the subject, called Witness. When not doing so it is as named. When reflected into the body, the latter passed as a conscious entity, but in reality it is like the fire in the heated iron ball.

(b) "I see it, I smell it. etc" Why do you say so. For the time being the 'I' identifies himself with the body. i.e. the consciousness is identifying itself with objects. How do you know? You are different from nose, or eye or their functions. Consciousness is that which knows that which says that there is an 'I'. The elimination of consciousness or Atman, you cannot see. The Atman is shining in the organ. It is working through it. The Atman becomes part and parcel of that in which or through which it works. Consciousness is everywhere i.e. we cannot limit it. It is no object. You say you enjoy a sight. What is it that enjoys? You feel happy and you are satisfied. We do not say that our mind is happy. We identify ourselves with the mind for the time being. Manas appears to be luminous. Really luminosity belongs to the Atman, the subject. In deep sleep the 'I' disappears. When you say that "I understand" your Buddhi identifies itself with the I. The mind and the ego are insentient. When we say "I see this" the intelligence identifies itself for the time being with the eye. We do not say "my eye sees it," Even then there is the "my." Consciousness is that which knows that there is the 'I', which comes and goes. Consciousness identifies itself with mind for the time being and works through it. All these, mind, etc. are eliminated naturally in deep sleep. Material body can't be separated from consciousness which enables you to see. Man conditions himself through identification with the body. We cannot separate the Atman from the objects (body etc.) just as we cannot separate the heat from the heated iron ball. We cannot explain the Atman (which is not an external object) in the language which is used to explain external objects.

(c) When the consciousness thinks only of the eye, it is working there and apparently limited to the eyes alone, but in reality it is unlimited and unaffected by the experience. When absent minded, as looking at a book but thinking of music being heard he mind is then not with the eye but with the ear. The internal organ is capable of doing only one thing at a time, but it can change its function of attention with such great rapidity that this fact may be obscured. Only when the mind is with the body, will the body be body-conscious. When the Witness is withdrawn from the mind in its turn there is mental unconsciousness.

8(a) All this wrong identification arises out of ignorance, which in its turn is due to past Karma and to the operations of nature (prakriti). Hence value of analysis and inquiry to disidentify oneself: meditation alone is not able to do so. "Natural" = identification with ego arises naturally.

(b) I identify myself with this body owing to past karma. The "I" changes every moment but consciousness never changes. The Gnani knows that he is the Drik and identifies himself with consciousness. Why this identification with the body? It is due to ignorance. The mind can detach itself from the objects which come and go and it knows that it is the subject. As soon as you analyze yourself you see that you are only the Witness and not the body. Therefore try to treat your body as an object as you do any other object. I see the death of my body only and therefore "I" am relatively immortal if I know the truth of the Atman.

(c) If you have a previous idea in your mind, the mind works along this line. The mind habitually moves along the line of previous thought. i.e. something which already exists. If you eat fish for the first time, you may say "this is like brinjal" because your preconception drawn from previous experience determines the thought, i.e. to karma. You cannot go to ultimate causes in every case. The seed and the tree, which came first, for instance? The first man, how did he originate? Hence we can only say it is karma, which is but an inference. Modern philosophy says we cannot say definitely what first cause is. The idea of 'cause' is in our mind and it is the mind which looks for causes therefore.

9(a) Wrong identification does not cease so long as it is taken as real. Inquiry by reason reveals the truth.

(b) The object of Sanyas is (a) to dissociate yourself from the body. (b) at a later stage you dissociate yourself from even the thoughts in the mind and (c) lastly you dissociate yourself, even from the 'I' the ego. Then you know that you are only the seer. This verse explains why you like objects.

What is absolutely needed is a desire to know the truth, "eager to know the truth". Ch.5 Verse 4 and 6: "The last teachings of Krishna. Freedom from identification comes only through knowing the truth.

Who is your best Guru? Ch.4 25 (1) My body is my best Guru? What is this body, what is it going to be? With the help of 'I' adequately think of the five principles or elements, then inquire further into the ultimate principles. Know "I am not the body" teaches me that it does not belong to me. Look upon it as a part of the universe which is now seen and the next moment gone. Till a man's notion of multiplicity in the world is reasoned out and understood, he won't get Gnana. Chap.8.30.

(c) This stanza leads to the question of highest reality and must be deferred to later on in our inquiry, not here.

10.(a) The word "half manifestation" is incorrect, as ego persists in dream also. In deep sleep Consciousness withdraws from the ego, and hence the latter also seems to become unconscious. Everyone is fond of his I, yet it disappears daily.

(b) Stanza 10 & 11. The three states cover the whole of human existence and therefore must be referred to if we seek the fullest knowledge. This is only an introductory book and the reference to Avastatraya is merely tentative: it will be dealt in detail with fully in Mandukya study. Hence we defer it now.

11. The word modification is really 'object' as the mind is an object to Consciousness. Body is a mental creation.

(b) The first mistake we make is in identifying ourselves (witness) in dream with the concocted personality which senses a tiger in dream. What is really happening is that the concocted personality is afraid of its own self-created object. This personality is concocted by the mind i.e. the subject. Subject should be separated from the object. This must be the first task in Vedanta. What is material world; everything except the Drik is material. But all the matter is constantly moving and it teaches you the lesson that you cannot depend on any concocted thing; for it will not have any vitality in itself but only so long as you imagine and identify yourself with the seen itself. What gives vitality to it is identification.

12(a) 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. Wrong means same substance as mind-cause. Egoism is also an idea like subtle body.

(b) When you are in the dream, you identify yourself with the created things and you suffer or are happy. The imagined personality has no life in itself. Subtle body is similarly made.

(c) One man attracts you, another repels; therefore the I in you is changing according to circumstances. That I is the ego, ahamkara; whereas that which notes the changes is the Saksin.

13.(a) Maya = thinking power, but as Maya is difficult to understand it has been wrongly defined as magical illusion, but it is only thought power, i.e, world is idea.

(b) Is the idea of the wall different from the wall itself? Vedanta exonerates God from creation. Maya is responsible for it. Maya--real existence seems to be at one moment, like cinema, fading flower etc.

Bergson the greatest of modern philosophers and compares the intellect with the cinematograph. Every minute the universe changes its being. The point is this: if the whole of the causality relates itself only to objects, it cannot be related to subject.

Scripture which assumes Maya creates ought to interpret it as ignorance, not Shakti. Maya ultimately makes you think, doubt and question. The more you think, the more you get thought. That is all. So many are in the realm of thinking in a circle. When the mind is completely engrossed in the drsyam the subject is concealed by the object which covers or makes you forget. This is the veiling power of Maya. Gnan i.e. discrimination-yoga is necessary to get at the Drik. Maya is like a dancing girl. Your mind is always dancing busy with either internal or external objects.

The ego is like a concocted something with which the consciousness is identifying itself who has seen God creating. Who has seen the mind creating a dream. But the mind wants a cause, and we call it Maya. But can Shakti be predicated of Brahman?

Vichara is that which enables you to know what Drik is and what Drsyam is; how to free yourself from these two. It enables you to see that Maya is only a function of the mind. Avidya is that which hides, and is the same as Maya. Because of ignorance you begin to think and ask.

(c) Here we come to the dogmatic statements of Vedanta. The book now begins to talk of a Brahman which creates. We know nothing of this.

Then it talks of Maya as a power which is used in creation. Why should Brahman or God create a universe?

Why does He create war, children which get diseased and die? People cannot answer this. Therefore they say "Do not ask such questions or you will be punished by God." To prevent you from asking the questions they warn you of the dangers of hell. As moment you bring in God there is evil, which cannot be explained so they drop the word evil and use the word "Maya" as though it explained everything. They use Maya as a minister of God and put the blame for evil on it, not on God. Such Vedanta like real religion says, Let us not attribute anything to God. That is not based on inquiry but on what pleases you. Others fall back on Karma theory to avoid making God a rascal, instead of unjust. Others take up the Lila theory which is worse still, for it gives God sport out of suffering. It is imaginary. Truth is, we do not know, only imagine, as imagined as Maya.

Maya is that tendency which makes you think more and more of the world, and which is constantly projecting or creating new things, changes etc. Thus we had bullock carts at first, then man made coaches, then trains, then motor-cars --always creating something new in the world. The other quality of Maya --the veiling--means that despite this tendency he does not know what it all means and the real nature of his life and activity is veiled from him. This tendency never to keep quiet but to be always doing something--projecting--applies equally to thoughts and feelings, of which a stream of new thoughts, new feelings, is always being created by man. All this is Maya. The object of this verse is to show that Maya creates all these changing things whereas Atman is the unchanging Witness or seer of the created things.

14 (a) 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.

(b) You find the multitude of phenomena. Relativity, Brahman is the cause of this universe, but causality is merely an imagination. The human mind always thinks that causal way. Maya hypothesis is a necessity for intellectual satisfaction of those who think in the ordinary way. Space, time and cause are the characteristics of the human mind. The mind cannot work without these three things qualifying or modifying thought. Causal relation is only a function of the mind itself. We do not find it in the thing itself.

The fact is that the mystics and yogis are of neurotic temperament and working upon the unduly credulous. Yoga is not a means of attaining Moksha (knowledge) liberation. Even for permanently controlling the mind there is no other means than the knowledge of self (cf. Brih. Up. page 132).

(c) 1. We have to cook and eat, to sow seeds and reap, we have to do certain deeds to attain certain ends: everything we do implies a cause and therefore an effect. From this standpoint which is called the relative or the empiric, it has been said that Brahman is the cause of the universe. But this has never been proved. Children believe in God created the world, but intellectual adults say, "We do not know any such thing." It needs courage to do away with the God-idea, we must be heroes to deny God, but it is the only step for the man of brains who seeks truth. The other and lower vivaharic standpoint is for men who do not inquire but take things as they seem to be.

2. 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.

That substance in the world which ultimately exists in singleness is called Sat, which again is ultimately only Brahman, what we call creation, therefore is only like foam on water. Water is the essence although it appears milky and not transparent. Similarly the essence of cloths however they differ in texture and appearance, is thread. Creation is, when analysed really nothing more than Names and Forms applied to one thing, the ultimate single substance of the world. P.B. eats rice, cows eat rice, I eat rice, dogs eat rice, yet this element of rice appears as white skin in P.B.'s case, and as brown hair in the dog's case. What is the real difference here? None for it is all rice, the difference is only one of Name and Form. This is the illusion; the Maya of creation. Ultimately all these forms disappear back into their primal element, Brahman, re-appearing again later in another form.

3. The wood is called the material cause of the table, the carpenter is the efficient cause. This is in the realm of empiric world. Similarly some schools say God is the efficient cause and Prakriti (matter) the material cause; others say Brahman produced the world out of himself like a spider; thus being himself both the efficient and material causes. But nobody has seen God creating; both these schools are based on the causal standpoint. Both are false suppositions, dogmatic assertions created by the ego, the Aham, not resulting from inquiring into truth.

15 (a). The phenomenal universe is brought into existence by the mind. When one identifies oneself with thoughts, or the body, one is not thinking of the real self.

(b) Maya is creating both the external world and the internal world. The moment you drop the object you are in subject. Awareness (mental) is only possible in the world of objects only. How do you understand the subject? Has it a meaning? What is it?

(c) The Drk, the Perceiver is without any relation to the changing perceived. This body was soft and semi-fluid at first, then pulpy, then flesh, then hard bone, then body!, then youth, then man, then very old and decaying: each body was therefore different from the other. Yet always I had the vanity to call it the same I. How could it have been so when the old bodies are dead and gone many times over? This idea that I have had the same body is an illusion; the real I is the drik, which has remained unchanged, through all these body-transformations. Why did I think myself

to be and remain this body? Because of ignorance! People who do not care to inquire, who like best what they imagine, who know these truths, and remain most ignorant when they think they are most wise, i.e. in samadhi.

16 (a) Veiling here means occupied with extraneous thoughts, which are outside the Universal Self. They keep the mind busy with one thought after another and not with the Self. We have infinite capacity for thinking and when we enter sleep, it merely keeps quiet. The word "projecting power" here means simply imagining power: every minute our thoughts are changing but the whole world is being imagined.

(b) When the mind is thinking of objects it forgets the Drik. If you don't think of the object, you will be identifying yourself with the subject only. Ask who is it that knows? And you become the subject. Till you ask that question you are only a body.

(c) 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.

17 (a) The mind takes the form of its ideas. When I say "stick" I get an idea of a wooden stick. That is, my mind takes the form of such a stick. Similarly when you say spiritual self what do you think? You cannot possibly form any idea of it. Why? Because it is itself the subject. The mind being an object to the Spiritual Self can only be known, never the Knower. However, there are two standpoints: "I am conscious of the pain in my body" It means that you have strayed from the truth and identified yourself with the body, but its the ultimate subject, the Self is never in contact with matter and therefore never identified with the body. If it is objected that the illustration of the fire in the poker can only mean the self being identified with the body, the reply is that this illustration is given to beginners only, to help them grasp the first part of truth. After they have mastered this stage, they must be led to the highest viewpoint of all, which is and which can be none other than that the Self has never at any time identified itself with the material world. This, of course, blots out the whole story of creation and evolution. By the highest view is meant simply persistent inquiry. Novices handicap themselves by the false belief that this highest view is something which they cannot understand, for they ask how can mortal man conceive that an absolute Reality should become a relative phenomenon. Such a question could never arise if they had inquired into the nature of the world and self fully, for then they would discover that the Self has never become the world. But they do not inquire to the fullest possible extent, only partially and hence share the universal delusion that it has. For instance by going on with inquiry we find that the mind is not to be confined to the body alone.

(b) If the subject is different from object where is the need for any inquiry? It is this: Now you are thinking that subject is mixed up with the object; by inquiry you free yourself from ignorance and misery. The seer is always untouched. It remains untainted. When you feel or say or saying that you are suffering you are identifying yourself with the objects and you become a jiva forgetting the subject. When Jiva-hood goes you get freedom. Then you free yourself from bondage of all imagined things, Maya. Superimposition=identification with body.

18 (a) The word "appearance" here simply means that we think something to be so. When the Universal Self appears to be involving and evolving as the universe, we merely superimpose such an idea upon it. If you are thinking of the body, then you are identifying yourself with the body for the time being. When you lose your witnesshood, the fact that you are only a witness of the body. If you think that the self is always observing, at that moment, you leave the body and the 'I': but that standpoint is passed the moment you think of the body and yet forget that you are the Witness. That is the difficulty. ONE HAS TO WATCH VIGILANTLY EVERY MOMENT to retain one's witness-hood.

19. If you know that thought hides reality, then you know that the use of thought is only at its highest when it shows how it itself hides reality. But if thought can never find the universal self, the discriminative faculty can for it shows the uselessness of thinking when one seeks to cross

the frontier of that Self. The word "change" in this sloka indicates something that is known. Therefore it cannot be the knower, the Subject, the Self.

(b) Change is only in the imagination. Here is a mistake: you attribute the changes to yourself. What is imagined in Brahman? You can never make the knower known. The knower is only one.

(c) When you know that ignorance is, the truth becomes clear. The more you inquire into the nature of the world the more you get rid of ignorance. If the mind is not sharp enough to make the inquiry, then you may first have to have recourse to other things in order to make it sharper. Just as the peasant does not know that the water he uses is really consisting of oxygen and hydrogen, because he has not analysed, inquired into it, so by sitting idle and quiet, or by yoga you cannot learn the true nature of the world. You may criticize the scientists for not having benefited the world when scientifically waged war is around us now, but Vedanta says that the scientists have not gone far enough: they ought to push their pursuit of truth to the furthest limit: then the world will be greatly benefited.

False notions about Brahman disappears as we inquire. Its enduring character in contrast with the changing phenomenal life is revealed by analysis. Change dominates the world. Life would be impossible without its characteristic of change or motion. Unless you take food--an act involving change or motion--you will die. Unless you lie in bed at night and rest--another change--you cannot live. Even your mind is constantly opening to freshing thoughts--change again--it cannot keep quiet except in death or sleep.

20 (a) The word "cognizability" simply means consciousness. Entities must have existence in order to be seen. That which draws your attention is the reality, which if it were not there would mean that you could never notice any object.

(b) Whatever exists has got these five characteristics. That which underlies the changes is Brahman. If it had no existence it would not be perceived. Here 'entity' = 'object'.

(c) This book being merely the A B C of Vedanta gives elementary steps only here. Hence the three qualities of existence cognizability or knowledge, and attraction or bliss (Sat Chit Ananda) here ascribed to Brahman is purely a relative and tentative position which will have to be dropped in the advanced and final stages. These three qualities are temporarily attached to Brahman purely to help the beginner, for if he is told that Brahman is unknowable, intangible and colorless, he feels there is Void, an empty negation, and its pursuit is not worthwhile. Hence he is lured by the bait of Brahman with the three qualities of Sat Chit Ananda, and later he is firmly embarked on his quest, he is taught to drop this incorrect view and given the higher definition of Brahman as being qualityless.

21 (a) Objects must exist or you would never know of them. How then do they derive this characteristic of existence? It is through the universal reality which is present in them. You cannot limit Consciousness because you can never know its limit. Everything exists in space. Consciousness is as limitless as space. Therefore everything must be contained in consciousness. Consciousness and Peace are inseparable. What is it that gives one satisfaction? Only from ideas. Material objects give one satisfaction because one thinks that they exist. But they exist only as ideas. Hence in the end it is idea that gives one peace, satisfaction or bliss.

(b) This verse still belongs to the semi-religious stage and is not true Vedantic view. It is purely temporary and to be given up later. Name and form are characteristic of all objects.

22 (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 Drik is different from Drisyam 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.

But this you will never get so long as you remember the I, and so long as you keep the idea of the body as being permanent. For so long as you regard body as unchanging you will also regard the world as unchanging. Therefore nature has blessed you with the gift of death--the final awakener--to show you that your body is subject to inexorable change and to make you inquire into its true nature.

Analyze yourself, "In this thought am I thinking of the ego?" Do this every minute of the day and get rid of the false notion of separateness.

23. Nirvikalpa means "idealess and thoughtless". A state in which there is no feeling and no thought. Savikalpa is meditation with a form. Samadhi is when the mind is absolutely steady.

24.(a) Any content of consciousness must be treated as an object in this analysis, in fact anything of which you are conscious. But that which is conscious of the object is Consciousness.

Ordinarily, man thinks only of the objects. When he links to this the thought of that consciousness he is practicing savikalpa.

(b) The object of Savikalpa of ideas is only to concentrate the mind. After this, the mind is fit to concentrate on Nirvikalpa.

25. Concentration upon a sound is usually more successful than upon objects seen by the eyes, because objects are more distracting, more multiple. A fixed sound--a steady sound--is more helpful. A fixed sound..AUM is the best of all sounds. "I AM" refers to the self which is consciousness.

26. When you do not see anything, not even death then it is Nirvikalpa. If you know what has become of the whole of the external world, then your Nirvikalpa takes you to the highest concentration but not Samadhi itself. Sleep may be given as an illustration of its existence.

Nirvikalpa Samadhi (brought in by your own effort) are the same. Sleep teaches you the absence of objects. Samadhi is a discipline to steady the mind. It gives bliss, not knowledge.

26 (b) Nirvikalpa is the highest trance state, wherein there is no object upon which concentration is practiced, whereas Savikalpa is lower, because it possesses an object of concentration.

Knowledge of a second thing is not true knowledge Gnana means knowing no second thing.

27. The aim of this meditation is to separate name and form of the object from its true existence in ultimate reality.

28. The word "entity" is used here in opposition to a once prevalent school of Buddhism which strongly said that the ultimate is but a void, with nothing existent, not even the Self.

(b) Without causing the subjective universe to vanish and without knowing the truth of the Self, how is one to achieve liberation by the mere utterance of the word Brahman? It would result merely in an effort of speech. "I" appearing and disappearing (after sleep and in dream). What is this I. Therefore 'I' has no existence; it is only a piece of imagination. If and when you know it, at once Brahman alone is.

29. When one can attain Nirvikalpa, it is not necessary to practice lower samadhis.

30. 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.

31. "Fetters of the heart" means "desires". These desires include religious desire of heaven, yogic desire for bliss or peace. "All his karmas" means all concern for results of his action will disappear. He who thinks of the reward for activity has still got the aham, ego. Karma yoga is a preliminary stage to help a man get rid of ego by service of mankind.

32 (a) The word Prana here indicates the body. The word "represented" here means as you yourself think of it.

(b) Different schools quarrel about the nature of the individual. The Sankhyas provide a dancing girl in the form of Prakriti (Matter) to dance before the Purusha (individual human soul). There is no proof and no desire for verified truth here. Various Vedanta schools also imagine what the Jiva is like. The truth is, there is only Brahman and you may imagine the individual to be what you like, just as you do during dream and therein appear to yourself as king, servant etc. In higher Vedanta when a man asks "How did the Brahman become the Jiva," we ask him "What do you mean by how?" Until you know the meaning of this how, it is an absurdity. For you begin with the prejudice that Brahman did become Jiva. This is mere assumption. If you imagine yourself to be Jiva, you are jiva, but if you imagine Brahman you are that. This is like the legal question "When did you give up beating your wife?" But impatient people say "Don't waste our time asking what how means." They run to yoga to convert their imagined jivas back to Brahman. The moment you admit that Brahman became Jiva or created jiva, you will have unanswerable questions to deal with.

33. The limitation of the body may be illusory, but it is imposed upon something which is absolutely real.

Limitation Theory; When Brahman limits himself you have the Jiva. But we reply, "Why should Brahman thus limit himself?" He then has to satisfy all kinds of wants and tastes. This doctrine is on a plane with the Bible's doctrine that God was lonely and created woman to keep him company. This limitation of Brahman in the form of Jivas theory is pure guesswork, and not Vedanta. Yet dualists swear by this theory and will even die for it!

34. This simply means that if you think you are limited then you are. Reflected consciousness is a kind of imagining.

(b) The logicians make much of the Theory of Limitation. Its solution? Analyze yourself and you find that limitation is only an idea. i.e. limitation is found only in the drsyam, and not in the drik. Every man uses the word 'I'. What have different men to use the same word? Scientists, Religionists, Politicians? There is no such thing as individual 'I'?

(c) The dualistic theory described in this verse is fabricated by the imagination to suit the taste of the believer.

35. In the dream state you do not think of the self. Just as in dream the mind takes varied forms, so in the waking state mind creatively projects, as Jeans and Eddington are beginning to see. You imagine yourself to be bound by your own imaginings. That is what Maya does.

(b) Maya is here when you do not know the meaning of 'I'. Till you know the meaning of 'I', you will be born and born again. Where there is no proof it is religion, where there is proof it is Vedanta.

(c) Why ask "Why should Brahman permit himself to be concealed by Maya?" It is absurd. It is like God creating a woman and then permitting himself to be entirely ruled by her.

36. The consciousness wants to enjoy the pleasures in the body through unreal projection. It is fond of its ideas of externals.

(b). What is the nature of the universe? It is mind.

(c) The individual self (jiva) has various tastes and desires and wants to do various things. It operates in Jagrat, the world, which is supposed to consist of five elements. This is an elementary view. How do you know there are only five elements? Further inquiry will reveal a different result.

37. When you see the world, then there is ego, for both appear and disappear together.

Empirical=when you don't inquire into the ultimate truth of a thing.

(b) We reply "Why should Brahman create a Maya and then have the Maya create both individuals and a world? Why should not Brahman not directly create the world? No, we reject both theories as imaginary. The advocates of this theory have to say we do not know when Jiva and Jagrat were created, hence they are beginningless. Our view is, that they were never created.

38. In deep sleep, all imaginations including ego and thoughts cease, but in dream they reappear and here you take thoughts or perceptions or ego to be real, although they are not so.

39. Illusory is the incorrect term. Better to say they appear to exist.

40. The individual seen in dream is termed illusory. The word empirical here simply means the waking individual.

(b) 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 Drik. 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.

40,41 & 42. There are three grades of intelligence among individuals. The lowest take the world and body to be alone real. The intermediate type take them to be unreal i.e. constantly changing. He who has risen to the highest level knows them to be illusory, and including the ego, but also known their identity with Brahman.

42. The Witness does not see the other individual even if he does see the body and mind functioning.

(b) Sat Sanga, company of the wise, is the best remedy to grasp it because you will constantly be thinking and talking of truth. Practice. Discrimination: Knowing the distinction and studying the nature of the real as opposed to the unreal. We see only death and disappearance of objects alone. Drik is the only permanent thing. Science says that even the sun and moon are not permanent.

If mind is too powerful, control of prana is suggested as an alternative. The mind has endless modifications, because it is thinking constantly of objects. Hence old thoughts come back. Then comes action without attachment, which will not cause any ignorance (avidya). Drik has this advantage: it can constantly be with me anywhere. It is the nearest thing to the Jiva.

Neither teachers nor any men can help that poor thing which has no control over the mind. The characteristics of a Gnani are: (a) taking thy own self as a measure, feel compassion

for every being. (b) as the eye sees and feels not attached, so should the gnani work without attachment, Ever thing is seen in him.

Mind continually produces sense objects. "I am in all beings, and all beings are in me." "I" always accompanies 'thought.' The Jivahood of the Atman has been superimposed on Brahman, because as an idea it comes and goes.

The mind is the only cause for bondage or liberation as in dream. Doing good to the world is the highest trait of the Gnani. Truth means the proper knowledge of things as they are and not as they appear to be.

Yoga in general equals a line of action to which you persevere.

43. The ego changes as when you are husband or father alternatively, but if you sit quiet and carefully watch the changes then this ego merges in the Witness.

(b)Whatever you see in the objects is seen in the dream or waking, all these are only the same thing or substance. As in dream war, the men you killed, the shots you fired, the gun you held were all only one and the same mind, so with the waking world. Dream-jiva is of mind-substances.

Beginners in Vedanta are frightened by its doctrine of unreality of world and of a characterless Brahman, so to sugarcoat the pill, we tell that Brahman is Sat Chit Ananda, infinite bliss, knowledge, existence, and use it as a bait to lure them in its quest. But in a higher stage of the inquiry when their desire for pure truth is aroused they are given the truth and Sat Chit Ananda doctrine is dropped.

44. 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.

45. In dream you see many persons but in fact you yourself were different persons. If you inquire why you feel sympathy with another, you will find that it is because you happen to be the Witness. Being affected by desire,--the desire in the body--makes you forget another. When you help another, you will be for the time being the witness of the other.

45 & 46. 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 drik, not to change. This distinction must be firmly kept in view.

46. Pantheism is not equal to Vedanta. A word will have a meaning only when it is distinguished. If you have only God everywhere, then self too is God, and God has no meaning, because there is no distinction. I am the eater, I am the food. Trance means only the internal calm. Again only you have no attachment, if the fire of desires is entirely cooled down, then nothing can touch you.

DRG DRSYA VIVEKA analyzes the mind and shows the whole of the mind is only an object.

SUMMARY OF VERSES: 1. to 30: DRG DRSYA VIVEKA.

Drस्या means not only what you see with five senses, but also your thoughts and feelings, even your own ego, which appears and disappears in deep sleep: therefore drsyam means not only what is seen outside but also what is seen inside. The Drik is only knowing or awareness.

The question arises "What is this which is seen?" The answer is dogmatically given on scripture authority that it is Atman. Verification can be obtained by a discipline: becoming indifferent to name and form, practice the distinction, this distinction, yogic practices cannot lead to the truth. Thus you will finally arrive at a stage known here as samadhi. If the latter is taken to

mean as usual, the absence of all things, then it is useless: on the contrary, it means really "everything being the same" .i.e. objects are seen but however different they be, the gnani sees them all as the same Brahman.

Henceforth the gnani will act for the benefit of others. He knows there is only one being, one entity, and no karma can touch him through his actions.

Unless you know what Drik and Drsyam are you will never know what is true about life. And such inquiry is never made by yogis and mystics.

In the higher stages of Vedanta, not mentioned here, when you are able to drop the Aham (ego) with its preconceptions and assumptions, more easily, you arrive at the truth of non-causality. This will dispose finally of all creation-theories for you, of all "purposes" by a supposed God in making this Universe.

Ninety-nine percent of humanity take what suits them in the matter of outlook, but whoever has brains or common sense will doubt and say "When all these famous men differ in their views, what is the use of being led or misled by others?" At this point a man is ready to leave the world of religious metaphysics and enter that of philosophy.

I say that Drg Drsyam Viveka, Vivekachudamani and Panchadesi are elementary books only in the sense that they do not deal with the proof, which is the most difficult part of Vedanta. The Upanishads, especially Mandukya are the most advanced books.

The trees, towns people are all the seen. You forget the seer. Drg Drsyam Viveka alone makes this analysis which is overlooked by the Western psychologists.

After you have studied this book you will know that all yogic experiences are imagination.

Feelings change. I love a person this year. Next year there is a reaction. All feelings are only modifications or the mind says Drg Drsyam Viveka, our most elementary primer of Vedanta.

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.

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.

The Drik is only another name for the Mind after all.

ASHTAVAKRA SAMHITA.

PREFACE

This book is meant for those who want to realize truth. It teaches this great lesson: Any term you use, you get only a thought, you never get an ultimate truth or reality. Gita means song; Samhita means treatise; you may call Ashtavakra by either term. It is a teaching given to King Janaka by the sage Ashtavakra. It is said in Puranas that he learnt this knowledge in his mother's womb. This is symbolical and means that a man may grasp it at any time, any age, if he has the capacity; .i.e. it really depends on his inborn natural capacity to understand. It opens by asking how can

knowledge be acquired. This shows it is not for those who want anything less than that. It is not a book for those who want cock-and-bull stories, who want to be promised liberation in the next world and not in this one, who want liberation merely by bathing in Ganges or going to Kailas.

Ashtavakra Gita does not give details so much as hints regarding the path and goal of attainment. This is a book which is formulated as a kind of self-examiner, to test oneself to discover how near to Gnana one has approached and to know what progress has already been made on the path and what still remains to be done. It sets up a criterion for self-judgment.

Ashtavakra Gita's latter chapters emphasize that the Gnani does work, is ever active and does not sit still in Ashrams, forests, etc. The sage, the man of knowledge though living like an ordinary man, is contrary to him.

Ashtavakra went to the Himalayas for a period. This book deals only with the last stage, the highest view. Ashtavakra himself was a married man.

COMMENTARY

Page 1: "Nothing like knowledge etc." --Ch,4:38 of Gita. How can knowledge be acquired? Gnanam is the last thing. How is Gnana to be acquired is the last question to be asked. Karma, Bhakti, Gnan, each is called Yoga whereas real gnana is no a yoga as such as there is no two. c.f. Asparsa yoga. But everyone will use the word Gnana. (Anything you do, you get yoga and in this sense connection). That Gnana was also called yoga whereas in real Gnana, there is no yoga, as there is no two. Gnana is impossible without a knowledge or science, Kshetra and Kshetragna. Study, analysis, scientific knowledge or Nature or Prakriti before knowledge or Purusha or Kshetragna could be had. The mind is so weak. It cannot think of or combine the knowledge of Kshetra and Kshetragna which is Gnan. The whole Gita is an inquiry into the nature of Gnanam--Astvam, Brahma.

As a step to knowledge, renunciation is required, and what is Vairagya? It consists in the desire to know the Truth.

Page 2: 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.

nectar - This book is only for those who seek the truth as though it were nectar.

Page 3. The thought of the seer comes only when you inquire into the seen. I see these things. Where are they? Why did I not see them till now? Seeing depends on the seen. Subject-object relation, the Drik Drsya Viveka is the first thing. Sakshi has no meaning unless you have sakshyam (the seen); "knower" is an idea to get rid of another idea "known"; then knower will completely disappear when Gnan alone is left. (Gnan per se).

"Consciousness" means that which is aware--'knowing' is the last.

Page 4. You can never set aside the body from the mind. You can't say this is my mind and this is my body. It can only be done mentally. The mind must be so trained as to detach the body. There is no such thing as separating it. c.f. verse 15. "This indeed is your bondage that you

practice Samadhi." c.f. Katho. Up. "I do not want Halva (sweetmeat) or any satisfactions but only truth.

Love of truth alone characterizes Ramakrishna: If you mentally say that body is an object, it is something seen, then it is detachment.

Bondage - Thinking that you are the body, and thus suffering with it.

Page 5. This is a tremendous sloka. Cease to think that you are a Sanyasin. Have no cloth--complex: rise above cloth, body, and I-complexes.

Athivarnashrami (above caste), varna and ashrama is truth; invisible to the eyes; witness of all; otherwise you will not have the idea of Atman. "Truth" and other things don't go together. All religions take you to me; but they don't know me in Truth." (Gita). My 'I' is gone to myself and to others also: I have seen the death of many.

Happiness comes only when you will feel detached from the Drsyam.

Page 6. Virtue and vice are all seen and known. All-pervading one - When you are witnessing all. The ego is the doer and the enjoyer: and my 'I' - the Atman. You are all pervading. All pain is object to you. My pain comes to me when I am attached to my body. Keep away from your ego and then you realize that you are all-pervading, everywhere.

That witness is untouched, and yet pervading? How. In that state you, the witness is not confined to any particular 'I' or body "Vibhu" means pervading i.e. not limited to anything, not even to space.

Page 7: You are only 'One.' Why or How? The word seer is got at by eliminating the seen. Man has never seen two seers; if there be two one becomes the drsyam to the other.

You think you are other than the seer and this is bondage. You think the seer is the Ego; you are mistaking Atman, Sakshin, for the Ego which appears and disappears. This is the great stumbling block of the West. They think that when ego is not, nothing remains. But when you are thinking of the 'I' or ego there must be the thinker, Atman, Sakshin. This is directly opposed to all other systems. How do you talk of Jiva unless there is somebody which sees it as known?

Analyze the whole of mental experience or psychic experience. Psychology does not go beyond what is seen. But who sees this analysis? That which is conscious or aware of the relation between subject and object is the Atman. It is that of which each one is absolutely certain and yet it cannot be proved. It is swatapramana - Self-evident.

The seer can never be something known. The Jiva, being known, cannot be the seer. Whatever is seen or known is taken to be real. It may be God himself. That is the error. Therefore you can't say any object or idea is real, since they appear and disappear--even the idea of God. It is certain Christ appears, what becomes of Him when you see Him disappear; how can he be Permanent. If Christ disappears even for a second, how can he be permanent? When angels differ, what are we poor mortals to do!

"I am right and you are wrong" is a wrong, unfair attitude.

Page 8.i. The real is with the ego. Have you eliminated the I is the question. The 'I' is the fallacy behind "I have seen God." Your I becomes the authority and therein lies the error.

ii. Aham (ego) is error, Naham (non-ego) is truth. Why should you rely on Aham, for Aham appears and disappears--c.f. Sushupti--deep sleep.

iii. "I am the doer" How do you know you are the doer? Look at the impertinence of man. How did the mind or will lift this veil. Prove that. How did the will move the hand? Prove. Science cannot prove it. None does, and therefore it is not the truth. Be honest. Are you the doer of anything? No. Not at all; you are only the knower in truth.

What is the relation between mind and matter? Who can answer it. There is the difficulty. Do not assert anything for which there is no proof. Don't say "I am the doer"; inquire, do vichara, whether the idea of your being the doer is true and you find that you can't in truth. Say that you do or do not do. See the absurdity of the ego's position. This is Maya. Hence we say

“not this”, “not this” ego. I am only the Drik. Note the distinction between Vyvahaarika (relative) and Paramarthika (absolute). Ashtavakra deals with the ultimate truth.

This is what is meant by removing one idea (thorn) by another, when you find contradiction, (1) even from the point of view of Vyvahaarika -Naham Kartha, -I am not the doer. (2) Even from the point of view of the Ultimate Naham Kartha "I am not the doer" holds true. This is what is meant by removing one idea (thorn) by another idea (thorn)--the doer idea to be removed by the "non-doer" idea--and all ideas to be given up ultimately.

Page.9. Knowledge tells you "I am the one." The ego 'I' with which you start, why is there this 'I' if it is not real, but Mithya (unreal)? Here i.e. a difficulty in thinking, c.f. You see the serpent in the rope. How did the wrong impression (that snake exists) come to the existence of snake? It is because of the ego, I, the unreal Aham which is mistaken for the Permanent Self.

Why does the snake appear to be existing for the time being. You can't say snake does not exist unless you see it is only a rope.

This 'I' is also part of the 'self', 'I and not I' both are Brahman; Existence and non-existence are only in Brahman and Reality. This verse goes to the root of the matter. Even Avidya, Maya, Agnana are only Brahman. c.f. dream mountain. There is the existence of the mountain, because it is all Manas (mind).

You are that 'I'. Burn the lower I, and then you know sarvam kalvidam Brahma, -all is Brahman-. All this is Brahman 'I'. Everything is Brahman is the last stage. Man is Brahman. Brahman does not change. Hence I am the one pure Intelligence, and then alone you can be free of grief and be happy.

Be happy" --is also Brahman; grief is also Brahman. Why should not we have grief? When we understand this there is no difference between happiness and grief and both are thrown out. Happiness means getting rid of grief. Get rid of grief and get rid of happiness too! c.f. (illustration). In deep sleep we don't want happiness or grief. Why, you don't have any second thing. To know that everything is Brahman in the waking state is the end of Vedanta. For this, get rid of duality. c.f. This is Gnan etc. p.70/71. When all the forms are taken away you get the idea of Brahman and when you again get the forms you know they are all Brahman. All the objects are of one substance. (c.f. in waking, charcoal diamond, carbon and sugar) c.f. You experience non-duality in sushupti (deep sleep) and if you know it, even when you come to the waking, the duality--the non-dual knowledge will become permanent..Ojas. "Everything emanates from consciousness and goes back to consciousness."..Max Planck.

Science or inquiry means to eliminate name and form. There is no question of destruction of snake or rope, from the point of view of Truth. If you see anything in waking it is Brahman. If you see anything in dream it is Brahman. If you don't see anything in deep sleep, it is Brahman. i.e. Mind with or without ideas is Brahman. You mention Sat-chit-ananda when you are talking of religion, not philosophy. "It cannot be touched by tongue." and hence beyond happiness and misery.

Interpretation means 'I' and I am right or you are wrong and hence the unreliability and error in opinion and interpretation.

The stage in which you think that what you imagine is truth, is ignorance; it is the wilderness of ignorance, and you are caught in the wilderness of thought--where to go, which thought to follow up; ignorance means "do not know the way out."

Hence "burn down the wilderness," lest you should get into it again, to burn down all thoughts, ideas, that cause confusion and ignorance; ignorance is always a wilderness to be burnt down by Gnan fire.

Any fool can say it is his karma. But prove. How are the people the better for it.

Let the thoughts come and go and don't worry about them since they are not Truth.

Page 10. Ashtavakra is not a systematic course, but he occasionally takes jumps. The dream illustration where you have the whole universe is reduced to ideas and the ideas are in the mind only.

The whole world is in Me not anywhere else, and then what will you feel sorry for?

Page 11. When you have reached the stage where the thought of your bondage comes to you, you are bound. This is what is meant by Bandha (bondage). Bondage is an idea, and if you are bound to that idea, you are bound; but bondage idea too goes. Bondage and freedom are only imaginations. It is my kalpana or thought that binds or releases me; which comes and goes, when you say "I am free."

Why should you be attached to a thought? It makes you bound only. Why should a thought have rule over me?

If you identify yourself with any gneyam (drsyam) you go astray, you seem bound or free, you will think yourself otherwise than the Drik.

"Aham Brahma Asmi". Repeat. I, the Drik is not, (that which makes you) think you are so and so. Even here the Seer is ONE.

The One is more important than the Aham in Aham Brahma Asmi. Unless you are the One there is no end to misery, jealousy and so on. So says Vedanta.

Page 12: If you want to be desireless there must be one only. Duality in any form means presence of desire. Perfect = no want. All-pervading = no limit.

Chit = intelligence. Actionless - Because action brings satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Unattached is possible only when there is One only.

If you have two, there will always be attachment. "Get attached"; Why should I be detached? Let us ask that question to the dualists. They will simply say: "If you are attached, you will be punished by God."

Why should not the European conquer the whole world.

But dualism is pleasant, where you can get what satisfies you; but when you get dissatisfaction you would want to go beyond.

"through illusion" - through your imagination.

Meditate = persevere to think that any thought is duality.

13. Give up the illusion that you are the Atman, ego. All this world is a modification of yourself, external or internal, hence self-modifications, "Having given up" means "detach yourself"; if there are two it is impossible to give up attachment.

(Individual Soul) Jiva is only reflected self, i.e. that which has been produced by your thought. Reflection brings on Jivahood. Mental modifications, internal and external is "self modifications." Ahbhasu means thought only.

Page 14: You can't understand all this, if you have Dhehabimana (body-consciousness); Cut asunder this body-idea even if it be for a second, you get at truth immediately. You think you are within the body,--i.e. the mind is within body.

In deep sleep there is no body consciousness, but there is no great virtue by going to sleep but it gives a sure clue to analysis.

"I" by itself is only imagined and hence unreal. To give up body consciousness is a step to realize truth. That is all, c.f. Drik Drsyā Devrbhimane etc.

1. Ego is dying every moment. 2. External body is dying every moment. 3. Who or what sees it is the Truth (Chit).

At no moment can we free ourselves from the thought of the world. You are caught in it, tied up in it. Sever it. "I" is Mind or Chit in Reality; and repeat "I am Intelligence." That is the first discipline. c.f. Kshehe, etc. Panchadeshi page 5 verse 9.

At no time can you say, "there is no change." How can you rely on this constantly changing body and nature. Intelligence sees the changes. Intelligence is thus the more permanent thing. Anything connected with body will make you unhappy. Don't rely on body.

We see death everywhere, and knowing that we are dying everywhere (why be attached to body).

Nothing is continuing for ever. Everything known is changing. "Death and life both exist in the body" says the Upanishad, how are you to separate them is the problem.

Page 15. Verse 15, means "This is your ignorance, that you expect to get Brahman thro' yoga." Had the yogi practiced Samadhi only for discipline, and had he known that he must go beyond it for Truth then it would have been alright.

c.f. Gita 12-19 "He who has no dwelling place, he whose mind and buddhi is steady, I am beloved of him, he is my devotee."

Anitheyā - homeless and steady-minded. "I" and "me" must go and sannyas is a discipline. Ripe sanyasi has no fixed abode.

Thoughtful Hindus were not idiotic. We positively say that Buddha was right so far as he went. Sankara said "I agree with Buddha so far." That everything (seen) is changing.

When you are not bound at all, you think you are bound, and you practice Samadhi; this indeed is bondage.

If you analyze, you understand that you are intelligence--chit, you are not the ego, and you are not the body. Both body and ego are Drsyam (the seen) only. How can Drsyam come near you. "near" has no meaning in relation to drik. Near has meaning only in reference to things seen, the Drsyam alone.

Man knows only One mind, not my mind, or your mind.

Even in projecting, that is Adhyasa or Aropa. Why are you fond of telling lies? And thus you are fond of Samadhis! Yoga Nidra i.e. artificially created Sleep."

"Practice" is an action in reference to a second thing, Drsyam, when there is no second thing at all in Truth.

Page 16. "You think you are confined within this body, when you pervade this universe and this universe exists in you."

Next world, you want only to enjoy the eternal Sabbath. It is desire that makes you want worlds; but all worlds are as ephemeral as the desires. How do you know that you pervade the universe and that the universe is dream.

(1) We can understand it from the dream experience, where the Seen objects are all mind, the seer only.

(2) And in the waking state, systematic inquiry is necessary.

(3) Though everything exists in you, you are pure. How do you know that you are pure?

(4) Do not be small-minded, (small-mindedness is falsehood and a lie but go to truth) that you are the body. Do not say "I am five feet." You are Chit, Mind. How can you measure it. How big is your mind? Can you show? No. Science says "prove."

How far my mind goes, and how far your mind goes none can tell. And hence it is small-mindedness, false, untrue, a lie, give it up and betake yourself to truth--that you are "pure and conscious." And here the negative way of proving is adopted.

Hitler is as much Brahman as Englishmen.

Page 17: "unimpassioned" because there is no thought, no second thing.

"unperturbed" - there is no measurer.

The Ego is making all differences.

Page 18: The unreal is that which is constantly going away. There is no permanent entity as unreal. Whatever is perceived is an entity and it is changing.

Changing means what you thought was existing has ceased to exist. Form = External forms, internal forms = ideas, imagination. That which has form = both internal and external which constitute Drsyam.

The Formless means the Witness, Drik.

Page 19: Body is a reflection in the mirror (chit). The body is in you. The real you is in the Atman--the Supreme Lord, the Witness and not the ego. (This is only an illustration - c.f. Prahladha, seeing Brahman in the pillar). Prove that the Supreme Lord is in this paper. How do you know Atman is everywhere? This is philosophy.

In the waking state my mind sees the paper, I do not see my mind in the paper. Herein comes the need for science and we have the 13th Chapter of the Gita: The knowledge of Kshetra and Kshetragna is knowledge. Have a knowledge of matter, external world its changes, how changes in matter or nature occur, whence is what and what is the essence of Kshetra, the paper, what are its properties, what effects arise from what causes and then afterwards you ask who is Kshetragna, the knower. Then you will know that Kshetragna is in this paper. This is what is meant by Akritva drisyā vilāyam, Drg Drsyā Viveka, etc.

Existence is only possible to be proved in the Drsyam world. We have to start with Drsyam: start with Kshetra and again, "any causality" has reference only to Kshetra. No one can prove that God exists outside from the point of view of Truth; from the point of view of religion it is alright. If Supreme Lord is everywhere, you must see Him everywhere. Why don't you see it. You start 'I' or 'you' and go to the imprisoned "Supreme Lord"--In sloka 15, 'you' was used.

I You Supreme Lord Brahman

Page 20: Kshetra if duly analysed is found to be Atman. The first step is science. Fundamental characteristics of every entity: Asthi - reality, can be arrived at by Reasoning. Existence is a fundamental attribute of awareness. 'is' (1) in external word (2) in mind as in 'I have an idea'. When you think of an object, it becomes an idea, a thought, which is known.

"Bhathi" = I apprehend = become aware of; shines; entities come into your notice.

Why does your mind think? Nama, rupa (name and form) may change, and yet you know gold exists.

Priyam = want to know, what a thing is. Hence Asthi Bhati Priyam is the first step, and it is only in reference to the Ego- Aham.

Beyond the ego, Asthi, Bhati Priyam cannot be applied to that which sees all, which is in everything, which is not an object, the Atman. Asthi bhati priyam is another form of Sat-chit-anandam. That which is beyond Sat is Atman or Brahman.

To make, you, drawn towards, attached to Brahman, such terms as Asthi Bhati priyam, Sat-chit-ananda are used in place of relativity when the mind is at the stage of running after something pleasing, satisfying. The reason is human mind is always craving for something. And he is promised Anandam. Note the words Avidya, Ajnanam in regard to these all mean this. This sloka says "Brahman" pervades everything. Brahman is the highest truth; even the term "Supreme Lord". Brahman-word is first used in 20. Brahman is Atman, ego body etc. Different pillow covers -- contents the same cotton. Even the cover is cotton. If you have got doubts test you may. "Brahman exists in all things." The material of the jar, the contents of the jar, the environment of the jar--everything is in Brahman. Lose the idea of separateness, distinctions.

How are you to do it is said in the next chapter. To understand 'in', science is needed. With science alone can there be philosophy; without science only religion.

The easiest in the world is to see God: c.f. Bala Yogi--of three years old! We don't decry them. They have their uses. Millions find solace in them. Let them. But their point is not truth.

CHAPTER II

Page 21: I was thinking I was Ego, body, mind, but I am only that which is conscious of all these.

'I' is used here because you are most interested in that 'I' but it is shown that 'I' Aham comes and goes and that which is permanent is I-consciousness; beyond Prakriti-para or अपरा - physical and mental Prakriti (nature): (Study both psychology and physics and chemistry.)

"All this time" because I have been duped that I am the ego, body, mind etc. which comes and goes.

Page 22: mine - because everything is myself.

What is it that makes the body exist for you? It is awareness. Likewise with mind and universe. "Mine is all this Universe." The whole universe is mental; it is in mind; world is a concept, and the idea is in "me!"

Daily the 'I' is thought to be confined to the body; but know that the mind can't be confined to body etc. Think of it and then you come to know Mind is all this Universe.

"Verily nothing is mine" If you have universe in the mind, in Brahman; what is there to say that this is mine when there is nothing beside Brahman; when whatever is, is myself. c.f. deep sleep illustration, when everything is converted into mind.

Hence "All is mine" meaning: "nothing is mine". If God is everything, how can there be anything other than God. Hence Mounam (silence) is explained as Shantoyam Atman--Silence is this Name.

Therefore if God is everything, then there is nothing else than God. Lectures limit God: If you want to avoid conditioning God, either "keep quiet" or admit "non-duality." There is no room for two in this world; so death comes. God can't tolerate two persons hence death.

Page 23: Universe - as something separate. "Give up the idea of difference" That is what is meant by "Renounce" That is the value of Sanyas.

Renunciation must be the renunciation of the idea of separateness or difference.

Now what about the body? Body too is Brahman, for the Gnani, as the Universe, is equally Brahman. i.e. renounce the body as separate from Brahman.

Heaven and hell are side by side. Separation is agnan. Hence you have been asked to eat Brahman, drink Brahman, if you think you are eating payasam (pudding) you are in hell, in ignorance, in Agyan.

"Through wisdom" --i.e. wisdom consists in knowing Truth, that "All is Brahman," nondual. Mukti is always there and yet you don't know it, c.f. Gita 13-50. Sankara's commentary, "But to those whose reason, Buddhi, has turned away from external phenomena, who have secured the grace of the Guru and attained the serenity of the self (manas), there is nothing else so blissful, so well-known, so easily knowable, and quite so near as Brahman. Accordingly, the knowledge Brahman is said to be immediately comprehended and unopposed to Dharma. (Opposition is only duality.)

To think one's own body is an idea is a very difficult matter, and unless this is realized, you can't have any glimpse of truth. Hence Dehabhimana galithe etc. When the body is felt to be an idea, the whole universe naturally becomes an idea. Men of faith have so much of faith, that they will say that mountain is walking. Of course, faith is necessary at a certain stage. But faith is like poison at another stage.

Page 24: deals with the question of causality. "Universe emanating from the Atman" means universe being the effect from the Atman is not different from it. Analysis shows it. Analysis needs thinking. Wave has form; but where is the form in water? Where did the form come from? All that we can say is that the water (sea) is not different from the 'wave'. The world is the same as Atman, as sea produces waves, so Atman produces the world.

How are we to know this. Refer to V.5.

Page 25: analysed - there must be scientific analysis in the modern way.

this - not the world seen in dream or samadhi but this external world.

The method of analysis is the essence of scientific method, meaning 'inquiry.' Science tells you ultimately matter is a concept, and further we go, it is only an idea, a thought of the mind or Atman (in philosophy.)

When you do not fully inquire, you can't know that this world is nothing but Atman. And those who do not want science, inquiry, advise people to resort to caves. Sarvan Khalvidam

Brahma. If everything is Brahman, how can you give up anything? Can you give up anything? We ask (when we are talking of truth). (We admit retirement makes the mind calm. Do those who live in caves understand that the whole world is Atman?)

Brahmagyanam is quite different from Sadhanas and practices. That is the point.

Talking of the highest Brahman and then opining that you need not inquire is meaningless nonsense. Even as a method to get at Brahman analyze the universe. Talking is different from realization.

Page 26: This can be understood only through the illustration of Jagrath, Swapna, Sushupti (waking, dream and deep sleep). The body is Pancha Bhouthikam, constituted of five elements. The elements become the body, the body becomes the five elements. All that is in dream, the body, ego, other objects etc. are in me, they are pervaded by me, through and through.

In waking all the five elements are pervading this body of mine just as they pervade the whole universe.

“Through and through” jug in water inside, outside, in and through the jug too. You have the mind only in dream.

Every day you have a taste, and you have a religion! There it is!!

Page 27: appears - as different from yourself.

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.

Page 28: "Light is my very nature" means "I am of the nature of knowing"

Existence of God means my mind is thinking of God. God depends on Me thus.

Why should sloka 5 speak of "this universe" if it is of no consequence? It is the essence of philosophy--that is the relevancy. It is this Universe that bothers you, and so stand on this universe with a firm foot and inquire; Don't fly to Atman, kicking this universe behind! That is not the way to Brahmagyanam, to truth.

Till we know Atman, we have only the mind and its ideas. If you do not go even to ideas, it is Realism. If you stop at ideas, it is only vijnanavada or Idealism or Hegelianism.

If you go beyond ideas and mind, it is nothing but Atman. 13th chapter of Gita says only this: “inside and outside Prakriti (Nature) everywhere is only Atman.”

Page 28. (cont'd) Light - Knowledge, the capacity to know, the mind itself lights up, i.e, makes you aware, of any thought, idea or object.

“When this universe manifests itself, verily it is I that shine. I am the seer, and what appears is myself. c.f. dream experience.

Analyze the universe in the waking state and then you will understand this.

We mistake body to be matter and everything else as mind. Johnson thinks his body is matter; he could not understand that his body is an idea. Everything else is Brahman except you woman and me, says Lekraj! If everything is Brahman why do you want anything.

Page 29. You see water when there is a reflection of the light on the sand. Mirage. In dream everything is in me, because the universe of dream is in my mind, and yet different, likewise in the waking state, the whole universe only appears in me only--use your commonsense in the waking state. Because we are attached to body we think the Universe to be real and not an appearance is in dream.

Vikalpitham - idea, imagined.

The little insanity which is ever present in all imaginations is what Vedanta calls Agnan. Be truthful with a vengeance! That is the only condition for Vedanta. Otherwise, have anything you like and be happy, but don't mislead others. “Rupyam Sukthow,” the point here is that what you have (in this universe) is only an appearance, since it changes every second, at no time is it unchanging; then where has it gone? Science is more powerful than theories. One bomb thrown

will convince you most than anything else. Rupyam sukthow - as silver appears in the Mother of pearl for the time being.

Science wants to know how the changes happen. How do you know this is a mirage, this is only a silvery appearance in the pearl except through science, inquiry.

Is body Mithya (illusion)? Is eating illusion? To say so is easy but to know it is difficult. Page 30: into me - just as in dream.

This is absolutely avastatraya. Dissolution of the universe, daily, in sleep, in me, as it has emanated from and in Me, in the making. c.f. 4 padas illustration of the Upanishads. The waking is converted into dream state and the dream is converted into sleep. We do not know this because we do not know that matter is an idea and again we are afraid that our body will go, our ego will go. How can we tolerate it. Death is the cure for it.

In 10 there is an appeal to your personal experience. Ideas become realities--that is the doctrine. c.f. The engineers conceived the idea first and then they take the form of the building. You have some ideas, and you go on thinking birth after birth, you get them realized or concretized. Thought becomes actuality. That is Karma. As you think so shall you reap.

Page 31. The wonder consists in the disappearance of the Universe in Me. It starts with the Universe. I survive even the destruction of the world, because I witness the death of other things. Hence "wonderful am I". All religion is swallowed up by me and all religion equally emanates from me. And hence "I must be worthy of adoration." I have not seen my death. I see only the death of others.

Page 32. I am the One witness neither going or coming--going and coming are ideas only in Me.

If you confine yourself to waking state only, science is necessary to understand that ultimately everything is idea, imagination only.

"Pervading the universe" i.e. wherever the ideas go; the ideas do not go anywhere; they are only in your mind only. Thus you pervade the universe. This verse too ends with the term "universe". The universe is the hinge.

There is no part of the universe in which you are not, the mind is not. Then how can you speak of the universe at all?

Imagination itself is Mind, Brahman; and where Brahman alone is in mind and ideas and universe. Where is the universe then?

"Philosophy is not, as the naturalist is inclined to think, mere word-spinning, nor verbal acrobatics but an intellectual necessity." F.R. Thompson.

"We have had enough of authority. Realization comes from thinking. The glory of man is that he is the thinking being."

"Have something to say for yourself. Do not cling to old superstition. Be ever ready for new truths. Each man is perfect by his nature. Prove that God is living."

"Gnan teaches that the world should be renounced but not abandoned. Sympathize with those who cannot follow reason. Great dangers lie in authoritarianism. Vedanta teaches that realization consists 'here and now.' Make your children strong, from their very childhood, let them stand on their own legs, bold all-conquering and let them learn the glory of the soul which Vedanta alone teaches.

"There is no such thing as cause and effect."

"I cannot take belief as a basis. That is atheism."

"Where no bondage (Agnam) there is no cause and effect." -Europe cannot understand this.

It has become a part of our nature to quote authorities.

The free never became bound. No bondage, no liberation.

"It is illogical to ask how the free became the bound." How did Maya come?

Science and religion are both helps to get us out of bondage."(Swami Vivekananda) i.e. Kshetra and Kshetragna "only religion is the more ancient and we have the superstition that religion is holy."

"In nature there is no such division as internal and external." ..Swami Vivekananda
c.f. Gita 13-30. Science is to show the oneness.
c.f. page 25 - As cloth when analysed etc.

"Be steady in the pursuit of Truth"--then alone is this possible - c.f. Those who are not strong cannot have it. says Katha Up.

The disentangling of cause and effect is a huge problem in mental thinking. Buddhi functions only where there is duality. Briha.Up. is the greatest book in the world. Mandukya is sarva vedanta sara samgraham (the essence of the epitome of all Vedas). c.f. How Vedanta is taught in the Chandogya Upanishad.

The first thing a child thinks, What is it?

It is based on genuine psychology. What is the first thought of the child? Even when the child is three years old, it does not think of "I or me." They talk as third persons, pointing out with their fingers. What is it they point out to? They point to the body only. The external or the objects of Drsyam first attracts the mind.

It is our surroundings, environments, objects again seen, which tell you that you are awake, i.e. object produces a reaction in you.

Without Mithya or Maya or Drsyam, Drik is very difficult to explain. If you think any thought, you are obliged to think in terms of objects, or Drsyam. This is Maya.

The value of Maya--this drsya reaction consists in making you think of Atman or Brahman. Thus Maya serves as a stepping stone toward truth.

Thus Maya or Drsyam is the point with which we are to start. What is it that sees, that wants, that sees, etc--the chain of inquiry proceeds till you come to the Drik. What is it that derives satisfaction?

When you get disappointed with body you go to the seer of the body. Science can't go further. It is based on genuine psychology. Kshetra is the first thing for Gnan.

"The end and aim of all sciences is to find unity." Swami Vivekananda (though science does not find it). Science forces you to attain unity. This is best illustrated in Brihadaranyaka.

Then we come to the Brihadaranyaka position. "What is that One?" How do I get the idea of unity, when we are in and fond of variety, manifoldness? How do we come to unity idea.

Supposing there is only one thing, we have; or suppose we have only "whiteness"--could you have an idea of unity or whiteness? When there is one whiteness, Vedanta asks "Could you have any sense of the idea of the color itself?"

Every idea implies a contradiction and your idea of variety too. Color is understood as contrasted with colorlessness. Variety is understood in contradiction to unity.

Hence analyze the world as a piece of cloth is analysed and is found to be cotton--so do with the universe, drsyam, Maya, and then you arrive at the conclusion that it is all mind, Atman, non-dual Brahman.

Hence don't take anything for granted. A guru is needed to direct you, to tell you whether you have gone to the truth, real Benares, and Kailas. We don't depend on intuition.

And Ashtavakra and its scientific, analytic method, which seeks only Tatvam and not matam or intuitions.

The Truth is found only in the Unity of Experience--Kshetra and Kshetragna, that Kshetra is from Kshetragna; when you know Kshetra and Kshetragna together, you have "gnana." You must have the sraddha to get to the very root of the matter; don't say "I know, I know" c.f. Gita 13th chap. verse 15 and 30. Sraddha is preparation for such and hence its importance.

It is necessary and natural for the human mind to proceed from Kshetra, Drsyam, objects, body; but go ahead. No use of starting with Soul, God etc. in philosophy. It is all religion, intuition, imagination, non-scientific. c.f. Upanishads, how Indra taught. Water is Brahman etc. Fire is Brahman, till you come to whatever you see is Brahman.

Kshetragna is not to be imagined, but proved, realized. Do not assume Kshetragna, as the Dwaitins hold. If you give up Kshetra, you will have religion. If you have Kshetra, you will get truth.

Panchadeshi and Vivekachudamani also insist on the study, and analysis of Drsyam i.e. science has utmost value. c.f. Ashtavakra, page 20-33 which deals with Kshetra the universe. If you give up Kshetra, you will have only religion, if you have Kshetra, it is philosophy. Only after 33, have you 'I' -- "Glorious am I, Salutations unto me" the Drik, the Atman--non-dual--Unity in Brahman.

Always ask for proof if you want to know Vedanta. The strength of all religions is that you can't disprove their dogmatic statements. But Vedanta wants you not to believe anything without proof.

c.f. Madhu Vidya of Brih.Up. "Show here." Proof is possible in Drsyam. Page 396-404. This is "Madhu" for that etc. that all are interdependent i.e. even in drsyam ultimately, there is one substance.

How to verify or prove. Ashtavakra deals with it.—"As cloth when analysed...so when Drsyam is analysed it resolves into Drik. The Universe idea must be there, before 'I' can come in--i.e. Only in Kshetra does the ego exist.

Kshetragna is derived from the Kshetra or Drsyam or body. Know Kshetra, and then know the knower of Kshetra. Give up Universe and there is no philosophy.

Page 33: "for all eternity" - in contrast to the ephemerality of objects seen, the Seer ever remains there.

Who are you? I who am bearing the Universe, without touching it with the body. Does the snake touch the rope in the "rope/snake"? It is only your imagination--or mirage-water in the sandy plain or just like a dream.

Page 34: All that is thought of and spoken of (i) I am imagining a body. I have created a God and am doing Namaskar. i.e. Jivatma and Paramatma (Soul and God). (ii) The whole world is my creation i.e. Prakriti. All three--Jiva, Paramatman and Prakriti,--all are Prakriti, Maya, drsyam. c.f. In dream everything is Kshetra.

The Kshetra is to be converted into Kshetragna, and then the adoration to "Myself".

Page 35: Gnanam. (i) Consciousness or knowledge of an idea or object, Drsyam (ii) That which is gna (essence of Kshetra) or the essence of knower, essence of your dream--is mind. e.g. lion, running, and your fear, all are mind or Gna swarup only.

"Knowledge, knower and knowable"--do not really exist in truth; for all the Triputi, i.e. knower knowledge and known, disappear in deep sleep.

How do you know reality? All are thoughts, ideas, you have to know and secondly that all ideas disappear in sleep; hence they are not the reality.

Page 37: intelligence - i.e. knowing, awareness this way - this is given as a practical exercise to achieve Gnana.

Page 38: in me -in the atman as in a dream.
in reality - but as an appearance, an idea.

Page 39: Nothing - not realities (this does not mean non-existent!)

Intelligence - undifferentiated mental, i.e. cannot be perceived even internally as an object. possible - How can ideas be superimposed when there is no basis for them, when there is no second thing to receive them? As in a dream the superimposition of world is not real because Atman is everywhere.

Page 40: Body - materialism; hell- religion; fear - of death; Imagination i.e. ideas, mental constructions, which come and go, unreal.

Chit - i.e. their seer, their knower, Mind.

Page 41. beings - this includes himself.

become - only when he thinks about it.(not suddenly).

Wilderness: where there are no signs or paths and only confusion arises.

Better translation of verse 21 (p.41):

Even when I am in the midst of a multitude of human beings, even then I do not find any duality for I know all these bodies to be only mind ultimately.

Page 42: Jiva - the personality.

Chit - The seer of the personality; or consciousness, without reference to object.

thirst for life - i.e. the life of the ego and the body of which the seed is the I.

Page 43: Mind - as soon as thoughts come.

wind of the mind - that which moves the mind, or that which produces worlds as in dream.

Page 44: trader - sea-traveling merchant. destruction: i.e. the ego disappears, (as in sleep)

The ego and its world of objects are created by the mind, as in dream, and must vanish when mind is still.

Page 45. Strike - the movement, conflict and changes among individuals constantly occurring.

Similarly ideas in dream are created and dissolved after being active for a while. disappear - individuals are daily being born and daily dying like ideas in the mind; nature - there is immense variety in Nature.

Page 46: Self - You know intellectually what are the characteristics of Self but you have yet to consistently realize them. There are two stages or knowing it, first forming an idea, second, becoming identified with it.

wealth - It is not enough to read books, not enough to interpret scriptures, one must fearlessly apply one's knowledge.

Page 47: silver: the ignorance arises from twofold cause, first, the silver is regarded as a second thing, second, you have the desire for silver.

Page 48: That - Brahman is indescribable by any other word than That.

appears - Though the waves appear to be different from the sea, in essence they are the same.

The men appear different from each other, in essence they are not: they are one.

being - Just as the waves are still water, whether they sink and disappear or rise and are active, so everything is Brahman whether it is seen or not, kept or lost, gained or not gained.

Page 49: beautiful - no flaw, no defect exists there, hence it is the most attractive of all.

lust - lust is connected with that part of the body that is most unclean.

unclean - fall into ignorance and duality?

Ashtavakra himself when a student once had some thoughts of a woman being beautiful and suddenly awakened asking himself, "I am a seeker after Brahman above all else. Why then am I making more of sex?" He analysed himself and thus checked the beginning of lust. He then decided to marry so as to confine his sex thoughts to one person only, and from that point to strive for gnana and final conquest of sex.

Page 50: Sage - This refers to the so-called sages, who are really yogis and mystics, who are the heads of ashrams and institutions or organizations, who pretend to be indifferent to money, world etc. but through agents or sarvadikaris continue to own possessions.

Self: He has not gained the highest realization, but is trying to get it. Hence he is occasionally troubled by lapses into regarding possessions and women not as ideas, but as realities. He knows the truth intellectually and has only partially realized it. He is still in the stage of a seeker. He is not a Gnani.

Page 51: abiding: One who is still a seeker, but knows truth intellectually.

Unsettled: unsettled mentally.

Pastimes : Indian sastras say there are seven kinds of sex intercourse, even looking at a woman for instance, or merely thinking of her, just as modern psycho-analysis declares. Even smiling at her is a kind, even memory of sex intercourse is a kind.

Page 52: enjoyments: Lust is so difficult to overcome that mere intellectual knowledge of Vedanta is not enough; you must practice every day the Oneness, the non-duality wherein sex, as a second thing vanishes, otherwise lust won't go.

Page 53: itself, - (add) because he will lose his ego. Gaudapada also brings out this point. He wants pseudo-emancipation where the I is satisfied, like the dualists.

Page 54: tormented: all these things are only the mind's picture. It is the Mind that has appeared in these forms. The sage recognizes all of them as being only Brahman.

serene - highly intelligent one.

angry - both these emotions are based on duality.

Page 55: another's: This is the universal gnana-yoga practice exercise given to all beginners to get rid of body-idea. The other exercise to see all bodies as Mind, as Self, is much more advanced. In dream we may have different appearing bodies, such as king, etc. thus showing us our bodies objectively. So we have to regard our body as somebody else's, that we are looking at it as an outsider. Vedantically, the body is a drsyam as much as anything else.

Page 56: illusion - appearing to be real. Maya such understanding can come only when you know world to be mental, otherwise it is impossible.

steady - A seeker may occasionally feel the world is idea, unreal, etc. but he often lapses therefrom: this is not enough. He must steadily, permanently, regard the world for what it is.

Page 58: nothing: nothing real, nothing other than Brahman

rejected: It is impossible to reject anything, as all is Brahman; we can get rid of Brahman.

However the seeker may get up such a code, whilst he has not attained, for practical but not philosophical purposes.

Page 59: in his mind: renunciation should be mental, otherwise it indicates that you are deluded into believing the body to be real, not an idea.

pairs of opposites: If you have duality, you will always be faced by pairs of opposites. Only in non-duality is one exempt from them.

desire- because desire means duality.

course - does not seek them out or run after them.

Page 60: 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.

Page 61: Yogi- He does not get carried away by extremes, nor jubilating if he becomes a king and not feeling depressed if he does not, because he knows everything to be Brahman. Hence he remains even, calm.

Page 62: virtue - Virtue implies vice, when you think of one you have to think of the other, hence duality. Virtue is the thorn to pull out another thorn of vice. But both are Brahman to the sage who has risen to the level of non-duality.

Page 63: alone: The sage identifies himself with everything.

pleases - He will not live in such a way as to show that he has changed or to distinguish himself from the rest. Doing "as he pleases" means he takes the greatest pleasure in doing good and in making others happy. He does not want anyone to recognize that he is a gnani. The word here given as 'pleases' in the Sanskrit is passing, not active, so it means not deliberate purpose but acceptance calmly.

Page 64: kinds: The four kinds of origin, seed, eggs, etc, indicating the four groups of plants, insects, animals and man.

aversion: Because such differences indicate belief in duality. How can the sage give anything up when he knows all to be Brahman? He is always equal-minded.

Page 65: second: like himself.

Universe: The two things--self and universe--must be there and yet you must see the oneness only. He identifies himself with both God and world, he is both God and world.

knows: He acts according to his knowledge of external matters, or as he feels inclined to do. The meaning of the first sentence (of verse 6) is: "The non-dual atman is the same as the universe."

Page 66: contact - as pure mind, as drik, you have no relation with drsyam, you are non-dual. 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.

Complex: of material things, the totality of the world; have no relation with drsyam, you are non-dual.

Page 67: universe - The philosopher has to deal with the universe and explain it, not refusing to see it. Here it is explained.

bubbles. - dream world rises out of deep sleep, and the waking world out of dream, just as bubbles rise from water; hence universe is like a bubble (but even the bubbles are Brahman, never forget).

Dissolution:- The next stage is to know the essence of all ideas, Atman. Here you find yourself in the universe and vice versa. World is Brahman hence indissoluble, so it is your ideas of it that dissolve, not the universe in itself.

Page 68: senses : like the snake in the rope, it has an appearance and is therefore not to be denied.

unreal - laya. Science has proved world is maya: it is a fact, not belief.

dissolution (add) of all forms into their primal element, of the idea of the reality of the world's form.

Page 69: death - These are the inseparable dualities of life but when you see yourself in them and then in yourself you keep your equanimity.

Dissolution (add) in the universe and not away from it, as in samadhi or the next world.

Page 70. space - The self is indescribable but as an illustration only, it is likened to space.

jar - This is to show that the I is greater than the world, if you think in terms of space: but note that the world is not ignored all the same.

renounced - as different from Me.

dissolved - because it is yourself.

Page 71: Phenomenal : "the world of nature" in original.

This verse thinks in terms not of space, as previous one, but of substance. Of what stuff am I made? This can be learnt by knowing, analyzing the phenomenal world, and finding it to be the same stuff as yourself.

Page 72: 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.

Page 73: in me - similar sentence in Gita. This is the last stage which is beyond all religion, all yoga.

accepted: acceptance can only occur when a second thing is recognized.

Page 74: thither: i.e. appears and disappears daily as I sleep or wake.

nature - The same substance appears in various forms, according to the combinations it passes through.

impatient - knowing he is the changeless Brahman he is ever calm.

Page 75: itself. the gnani does not mind this because he knows that everything which comes and goes is still himself, Brahman, he never loses sight of this fact.

thereby - My mind does not grow when it becomes the Himalayas in dream nor does it diminish when it becomes a seed seen in dream. Similarly in waking: there is the indestructibility of atoms energy, etc.

thereby - The gnani does not mind this because he knows that everything which comes and goes is still himself, Brahman, he never loses sight of this fact.

Page 76: Abide: - on the atman, which is immortal, do I rely.

imagination: either in the sense that scientific analysis of sense-perception shows or in the sense that dream experience reveals; i.e. a construction of the mind.

Page 77: objects: when you think only of their forms, you are on an inferior viewpoint; there is no separate object in reality.

THAT - when you think of them as being non-separate from That.

attachment, desire, - Those are dependent on duality.

Page 78: Show - those that do not know the truth, think it is real.

Intelligence - pure awareness, devoid of all objects.

Page 79: bondage - to ideas, its own imagined creations

anything - because such action implies belief in duality.

Page 80: angry - i.e. when it is in oneness.

This verse can be interpreted in two ways, first yogic, ethical, or mystic; second philosophic or truth. In the latter, giving up desire is giving up a second thing.

Page 81: bondage: i.e. to a second thing.

attached, - through the aham, the I.

senses - i.e. sense-objects, whether internal imaginations or external objects. Thus the senses operate both internally and externally.

Page 82: liberation: this word is interpreted by religious men as after-death heaven, mystics interpret it as samadhi, but in Vedanta "liberation" means Gnanam.

anything - Every kind of like or dislike is based on the ego, for it means "I like this" or "I dislike that."

Page 83: indifference - The yogis misinterpret this to be running away, but philosophic interpretation is keeping the idea of the I out of life.

Page 84: men (add) and their worthlessness.

He rates life at its proper value by having seen its transiency, etc.

Page 85: quiet - because no effort is needed for attainment as it is not a second thing.

Where there is only One you may remain inwardly quiet but outwardly active in service, that is helpful to others. This is not to be confused with Yogic quietism.

threefold: - mental, physical and cosmic, (beyond man's control such as earthquakes)

unsubstantial - only an idea: as the mango eaten yesterday has no more 'substance' for you, being only a memory-idea.

contemptible - the uglinesses in life arouse disgust.

Page 86: men - Only when you know the truth which can happen at any age do these opposites get transcended. Man gets tired of the dualities of life, discovering them to be ideas only,

appearances which come and go and rests satisfied with Atman.

of itself - He is contented with the rewards which come for his work, whether they are insufficient or not.

perfection:- He does not run away from men and the world. That is the first ascetic stage. He accepts them, in this second stage, but remains indifferent.

Page 87: seers - Even Muhammad, Jesus and Buddha's teachings show diversity of opinion.

yogis - all these are mistaken by popular belief for gnani, whereas they are only holders of opinions. (Matams)

quietude: He no longer wants to trouble himself with these contradictions and thus gets peace of mind.

Page 87: verse 5 is one of the most important verses in the book and indeed in all Indian philosophy.

None of these see the Truth, so it is useless to quarrel with them, better to sit quietly in their presence and not to argue; better still, to stay at a distance and join no party.

Page 88: indifference: when the mind remains the same at all times, you thus help to get rid of ego, when there is no worldly attachment, you are less attached to the I.

Page 89: better translation:- "Look upon the modification of the elements as well as the primary elements as nothing in reality but Brahman. Immediately you will abide in the true self."
elements - the five elements: earth, water, air, fire and space.

bondage - body is nothing but the elements, and these ultimately are but ideas of the Atman.

Self - all the elements--light, water, sun, etc. can be found in dream. So what are they? Ideas. What are ideas? Mind itself. What is mind? Self.

Page 90: Desire - Original word is Vasana, desires of previous lives continued into the present: parental instinctive propensities: tendencies as a result of past attachments.

renunciation: - knowing the world is imagination.

Desire - It is enough to renounce desires inwardly: this is equivalent to ascetic running away from the world.

desire depends upon egoism; it implies I.

Page 91: indifferent - do not get attached.

mischief - which prevent one from attaining the goal; also which bring suffering in the reaction later.

Dharma- religious duty also.

Page 92: days - even the happiest men must die; all is short-lived.

show - The knower of the truth is never duped by good fortune, but others are; he realizes that it is passing away but they never think of it.

Page 93: desire: getting attachment: attachment - believing the world to be real, or incapacity to see it is idea.

non-attachment - my house, my wife, etc. is the egoistic attachment to be got rid of. You have to attain the stage where the world, your possessions and properties, are all seen as idea.

happy - Even though you realize world to be dream, idea, do not make yourself miserable on that account.

Page 94: Bondage: - when you think there is a second thing, you are in bondage for belief in the presence of other things causes desire for them.

Joy - satisfaction - absence of illusion and the troubles bred by it.

Page 95: non-existent: It is disappearing every moment. It is seen, just as a mirage is seen, that is undesirable, but it is changing and going every flash of a second.

Ignorance: - Till you know that world is self, there is duality. Once you know this, then even the word know loses its meaning, for there is no second thing to be known. Hence its opposite, ignorance, becomes just as meaningless.

you - when you know that there is nothing different from you.

Page 96: Hence understand that what you possess or enjoy in this birth will also go; hence be detached from them and be attached to Atman only. But even those who don't believe in rebirth, can understand that dream possessions seemed quite real, but where is that reality now? And as life is but a dream, i.e. idea, the same argument remains.

Page 97: deeds: done with the hope of reaching heaven, or even taking sanyas.

world - so long as it had a desire for anything for there can be no peace so long as there is duality.

Page 98: work- Alternative reading - Although you have so many births and performed so many duties, still you are not satisfied.

Speech - And yet you have no peace: And even in this birth you find the same lack of repose.

For nobody ever has perfect satisfaction in a world of duality, because the second thing is impermanent, it will go on changing. Hence desire is never fulfilled perfectly.

Page 99: things: necessarily unpreventable and uncontrollable when you regard the world as a world of multiplicity and duality. The mind must work in this way when it takes up such a standpoint. But when it views all as Brahman only, then all these things disappear.

pain - because pain is caused by having the idea of two.

Page 100: all - This is put in for those of religious temperament only. That it refers to Ishvara as Brahman is indicated by the qualifying words "there is no other here."

certain - Many mystics feel these things intermittently, but retain no permanent attitude because gnana is absent. Certitude comes only from knowledge. The first step in Vedanta is to make sure that what you know is truth. Hence this means knowing so that you can prove it to others.

whatsoever - because there is no second thing for him.

Page 101: come - they come and go because they are only ideas, and it is the nature of ideas to appear and disappear. They are Maya, because Nature is Maya.

fate - i.e. whether you, the ego, like it or not; through the nature of things beyond your control.

control -- because the senses give the wrong idea of the reality of objects. Hence sense control is an attitude which treats them with indifference, as though they were unreal.

Page 102: certain - see sloka 100(2nd line of this page)

Page 103: care - keeping the I as the root, instead of treating it as idea, of action.

Keep the ego out of activity-root by understanding its illusoriness.

Page 104: done - he looks on I as fleeting, appearing and disappearing, in the midst of activity: he regards all his actions as ideas, also.

Absoluteness : non-dual truth or uncontradictable calm.

Page 105: conflict : contradictions inherent in untruth.

Page 106: Intelligence - mind, awareness.

as if - not that the world disappears for him. He sees the world exists but by inquiry discovers that it really appears to exist. The mirage which is known for what it really is, still appears to you. Only you are no longer deceived.

Page 107: intolerant: detach myself from: it is the getting rid of the sense of physical reality.

speech - semantic self-restraint in words, owing to their ambiguity and incompleteness.

thought - because they are all drsyam, I do not allow them to interfere with my knowledge of the existence of the Drik.

Here Janaka as the student, begins to review the progressive stages of his development, first through yoga, then philosophy.

Page 108: one-pointed - in the Drik.

This verse is for the lower stage which makes yogic concentration the highest goal.

Page 109: 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.

Page 110: sense - being devoid of the sense of I, which causes likes and dislikes

acceptable - Because I think of everything as being Brahman.

Page 111: life: Whether one is a householder or a sanyassin.

Meditation - At set fixed times for discipline.

these - they concern the body only.

Page 112: action - this is proper at the earlier stages only, for disciplinary purpose.

performance: Nothing must be done by the Gnani(specially) because all acts are the same to him--Brahman.

The key to understand that whatever is done to the ego, whether it be action or its cessation, is ignorance. The presence or absence of I makes the difference.

Page 113: thought. - The mind can only yield ideas, which are imaginations. This applies both to God and objects, all being drsyam.

Page 114: Blessed: Nothing more is to be achieved by him, hence perfect satisfaction. accomplished - after having passed through the various stages of development in the course of time.

nature - who has made it a natural state or alternatively, who are born so and manifest it at an early age.

Page 115: Mind - egolessness, resulting in not being influenced by one thing or another.

loin cloth - even Sanyassis who have given up everything may lack the permanent serenity that knowledge alone gives so long as the I is present. Everything external may be sincerely renounced and yet the ego may not leave a man.

Page. 116: body - physical illness.

tongue - words spoken for which you are sorry later or alternatively words spoken against you in criticism.

mind - mental anxieties.

happily - the only thing to be relied on is the drik because it is permanent. There is no special happiness: only the absence of misery, cares and anxieties.

tongue -(alternative meaning) Hence look upon all speech as Drsyam. What has become of all the words? They vanished somewhere.

page 117: Self - because I am only the witness.

Page 118: Action - set in one place, go to Kailas, build an ashram etc.

inaction : refusal to do anything for the world.

dissociation - the I and its preference or dislikes.

Page 119: sleeping: because the ego is absent.

Page 120: striving : because both are Brahman to the Gnani, so he preserves mental poise amid loss or gain.

Page 121: fluctuations- even millionaires are subject to changes of fortune.

evil - given up the I. Good is a drsyam which disappears like other ideas.

happy - untouched by ego

Page 122: life - Thinking the phenomena to be real, for even the Gnani has worldly thoughts only he knows them to be unreal.

thoughts ---inadvertence - even gnani has thoughts but he regards them as drsyam; they come of their own accord, so he lets them come.

asleep: he does not see drsyam as real, hence is asleep to their reality.

Page 123: away - When ego has vanished

robbers - sense-objects take away the mind, awareness, from the Real.

scripture - all scriptures are but ideas.

knowledge (add) implying knower and known!

Page 124: bondage - the thought of bondage arises when you still think of the I.

Liberation : the thought of liberation only arises when the thought of bondage has been.

Knowing the truth, both thoughts disappear.

Page 125: conditions : different thoughts, moods.

Pleasure: has no fixed restrictions or rules governing his life.

Person - other people will think he does not possess Gnana. It certainly does not mean that he acts like a fool.

doubts - when there is no second, there is nothing for the Gnani to doubt.

Only Gnanis can know other Gnanis for they alone possess the experience to enable them to do so.

page 126: intellect - Buddhi sharpened and purified of ego.

imparted - his sharpened intelligence catches at once the ideas and truths expounded by guru for the first time to him.

other - The man who is mentally unfit for Vedanta may have to prepare himself slowly by stages because his mind is too dull or too egoistic, if he spends a lifetime he may not understand his studies, but may wrongly think he does.

Page 127: please - The Gnani has perfect freedom. Nevertheless he will not do immoral things because he feels that he is living for the benefit of others.

Page 128 : mute - because other people can't understand if he talks highest truth, he generally keeps quiet about it: similarly it is often dangerous. (c.f. Socrates)

Page 129: - body - because, as Drik Drsyam Viveka explains, it is a drsyam which is going and you are noting its changes.

Page 130: mind - Because they appear together in pairs.

yours - because you are witnessing its various conditions.

Page 131: all - sympathetic feeling with all other human beings.

Page 132: itself - the whole world is appearing and disappearing in the mind.

unhappiness - produced by ignorance.

Page 133: faith: this does not mean faith in religion or God: it would be better translated as "conviction." It does not also mean faith in Ashtavakra.

this - make sure by doubt or inquiry.

Lord - do not think there is any other God than yourself.

Self - That which is not changing, the Witness

Page 134: goes - you never see it changing.

Page 135. You remain the same, the looker-on, whatever happens to the body.

Page 136: You are really immutable, no increase or decrease is possible to Brahman, know there can be no gain or loss, no change in it. Hence neither run after anything nor renounce it.

Go to Avastaraya to understand this verse.

Suppose you found a diamond mine in dream: what is the loss or gain to you after you awake and know the truth? When it appeared it was mind, i.e. in you; even when it disappeared, it went back into Mind i.e. into you. Hence it is there always. The essence of things is ever there.

Page 137: itself - when you analyze everything and yourself to the utmost and you find, just as you can analyze cloth into cotton, both to be mind.

you - everything is one and the same - Brahman.

reject : when there is no such thing as reality.

where - what is the use of hiding in an ashram.

how - how can you divide the atman? How can you say this is Brahman and that is not?

Page 138: birth - all is occurring in Brahman;

Everything is Mind.

Intelligence - You cannot deny you are intelligence, because if you do it is intelligence (mind) itself that enables you to do so.

pure- unmixed even with qualities: purity is possible only in non-duality. There is no such thing as a pure God. It is impossible.

Page 139: alone - you do not perceive a second thing. This refutes the dualistic teaching that God puts the universe into your mind.

appear - because everything is a manifestation of your consciousness, hence yourself.

gold - after you have inquired into their nature.

Page 140: he - as a separate person, for this implies duality. The ego is only an appearance and when analysed, is only the one Mind.

desireless - because there are no two.

happy - because misery comes from duality.

Page 141: Ignorance : imagination. It is your mind that makes you think there is a universe different from yourself. But the word 'ignorance' is used in order to induce you to make efforts to get at truth.

Jiva: No such thing as separate souls, which continue after death: this is illusory.

Ishvara: God as creator or ruler or as imagined by Man. This does not mean there is no supreme reality.

Page 142: illusion: an idea.

nothing - not real; this is not a denial of existence for the words "this universe" admits its presence: it is an assertion of its nature.

as if - it does not mean that you are not talking, eating, waking, working, sensing the world.

All that goes on with the ignorant but you know it for idea.

nothing exists - nothing other than he.

Page 143: ocean - ocean implies diversity (of waves) always appearing and disappearing yet its water is one, was one, will be one.

was - the absence of a second thing as reality.

Live - live in this world like all men and yet find contentment.

happy: you need give nothing up and whatever happens you know there is no gain or loss. Hence if you know that pleasures are also Brahman, what need for renouncing them? On the other hand, what need for hankering after anything, when all is in yourself?

Page 144: wrong : - this means don't trouble yourself with affirmation of wants or negation of loss, with decisions about this or that.

Page 145: anything - Give up even meditation, for that implies a second thing. But there is no second to gain:

heart - But in Sanskrit and English the force of this word is "hold nothing in your mind."

thinking - This applies to Gnani only, not to the seeker. What avail to the man who knows everything to be Brahman, to go on analyzing it.

Page 146: scriptures: all these are more preliminary steps for mere children and slave mentalities.

established: getting certainty, irrefutable proof , not dogmatic assertion - even of Brahman--is our attitude.

self - in the truth.

all: - all scriptures and texts are drsyam: you have to begin by studying them but at this advanced stage they must be dropped, as you must be now thinking always of the Atman as everywhere; the drik rather than the drsyam.

Page 147: concentration - desires may still be left even though you practice yoga.

objects - beyond all drsyam, all imagination and all thinking.

extinguished: because what is the subconscious goal of their search. It can only be Non-duality.

page 148: Themselves - including even the yogis. This does not mean sitting still in samadhi.-- For exertion implies duality, the recognition of a second thing to be desired. They make an effort to get a thing which is attractive or to get rid of a thing which is unpleasant. But both the gnani and ignorant will be outwardly exerting and acting, the difference being entirely inward for the gnani will regard the second thing as unreal whereas the ignorant will be captivated by its reality: exertion means seeking the many, seeking the many and not as One.

instruction - that non-duality is truth: he who grasps this at once attains freedom. Blessed is he who understands all is Brahman as soon as guru explains, but most chelas have to struggle a long time.

Page 149: indifference - who has the conviction that there is no duality. The indifference of Ramana Maharishi--who does not care what happens to his devotees or ashram, is emphatically not meant.

eyelids - not to be mistaken for yogis, closing their eyes in Samadhi. This implies their mind is on their eye-lids, i.e. the body.

affliction - this eye-lid-movement is natural to man, so that he has become quite indifferent, unobservant of it: his ego does not have to think about it, does not have to make an effort to do

it: similarly the seeker has some actual indifference, and does not feel there is something foreign which he has to control. Man does not regard his own eyes as separate from himself; so gnani.

Page 150: merit - that which is laid down as duty by scriptures, It is banned because you think you will get something, whether spiritual or material, in return, hence egoism!

liberation: - because these imply duality.

Page 151: reject : because he regards both as Brahman; to accept or reject as real is to be in the world of duality.

Page 152: indiscrimination: between real and unreal, a discrimination which can only arise after you know for certain world to be idea, that the second thing is only an idea.

Page 153: attachment - this does not mean, that 'cavism' is the cure, for then there is attachment to the cave!

child - (a) he does what Nature compels him to do. (b) psychology proves that the ego comes later in life than birth, hence it means here having the mind free from egoism, allowing it freedom.

established - in equilibrium

Page 154: world - who regards world as real.

Hence the source of sanyas is attachment!

There - in the world. He is in the world but not of it.

Page 155: feeling - this is the test,

Page 156: Hara - Siva : Hari - Vishnu:

forget: You must master the teaching for yourself, by your own thinking you own experiences and thus satisfy your mind, but not the I.

all- get rid of drsyam. Gods are thoughts, idea, drsyam

self - you may learn the doctrines but you will not realize them, i.e. for certain, not by hearsay.

Page 157: Yoga - Yoga-practice and knowledge may go together; the two are not inimical.

"Being alone", in original, meaning that he is the whole universe alone; there being no second.

Page 158: miserable - because misery comes from duality.

world - in which world he remains, he does not leave it.

alone - he knows all mankind to be his own self and feels for all.

Page 159: (margosa) - these are very bitter tasting.

Sallaki - very sweet taste leaf.

Page 161: liberation - for himself, as the mystic does.

not desirous of liberation - Because he is not conscious of bondage, he does not seek freedom, which is merely an idea and he wishes to be above thoughts.

liberation - unless it be liberation for all.

Page 162: broad-minded - his mind is universal enough to include the whole in its feeling of Oneness.

Page 163: dissolution - as in yogic laya or mystic trance.

Itself - whatever comes rightly, without injuring others to get it.

Page 164: - fulfilled - leaving him without anymore desires or wants.

eating - The Gnani lives like other men, making use of his bodily senses and doing nothing peculiar to distinguish him, is doing all that has to be done. He does not indulge in the childish practice of samadhi.

Page 165: non-attachment - When there is no second object or person (seen as separate reality) there is nothing like non-attachment to it: non-attachment is then meaningless.

dried up - as in dream, so this world is seen to be in himself.

vacant - he does not see a second object as a reality; it is not the blankness of Samadhi.

inoperative - The objects are known to be ideas, unreal: this is not nirvikalpa coma.

Page 166: sleeps - conditions make no difference to him; presence or absence of objective world is of no account because everything is Brahman to him and whether he loses consciousness of the universe in sleep or recovers it in wakefulness, he still knows that he is Brahman.

eyes - he does not see the world as a second separate thing; hence he does not need to open his eyes to see it, or close them to banish it.

sleeps - he does not have to remain awake to keep his gnan; or to remain asleep either.

anywhere: he does not see the world as he is happy in solitude or society.

Page 167: liberated - from ignorance

everywhere - whether he witnesses the wonders of foreign cities or not, his happiness remains desire-free: it does not depend on travel.

self - the mind is everywhere.

pure - without attributes, for they imply a second thing.

Page 168: walking - gnani performs no miracles, behaves normally just like ordinary human beings.

efforts - as in dream, everything is mind, so the efforts of walking etc. are seen by sage as One with himself. non-efforts - he prescribes no prohibitions for his life, he is free from the opposites of duality.

Page 169: - praises - both are on the same level to him. Therefore he may indulge in criticism or praise, because he taken no personal interest in them. It does not mean he keeps quiet, lethargic.

Angry - this does not mean he should be passive, inactive, he may have to get angry provided it is in the interests of others, not himself.

attachment - he has no ego, no I, hence identifies himself with the All.

The gnani may do all these things but he the ego is absent from his motives; such acts are for the benefit of others. "What has he done this for?" should be our inquiry.

Page 170: That which is most attractive in this world (woman in love with you) and that which is most repulsive (death) equally do not disturb the Gnani's mind.

liberated - i.e. he remains unaffected because of the absence of the I.

love - which in others arouses the man's ego, making him think of embracing her.

Page 171: everywhere - because he sees all things as ideas

misery - because he knows both to be ideas.

No other reason (other than that everything is idea) is effective.

woman - such discipline is needed by ascetics, but useless to Gnani.

Page 172: man - who no longer has the sense of body and of I.

mercy: This does not forbid you to be compassionate, but it means you do it without the ego, impersonally.

humility - behave towards people without distinction along with the environment, and not for egoistic motives.

wonder - at the marvelous happenings, just as men who have awakened from sleep no longer wonder at miracles seen in dream!

Page 173: senses - this is correct for the Sanyassin stage as discipline.

them - his mind is at peace.

mind - detached from the ego.

enjoys - he appreciates attractive things, but remains inwardly unattached, when they come his way of their own accord.

unattained - what he imagines as attractive is equal to that which is obtained because both are regarded as Drsyam.

Page 174: contentless - without I, universal, vacant of the individuality; (nothing to do with samadhi or yoga)

were - although variety in present, he will know it not to be so in reality.

evil - evil is Brahman to him.

conflict - because he does not see a second thing

Page 175: I-ness - knowing them to be unreal.

certain - because he knows the meaning of truth.

within - others cannot see more than his body, that which matters is what he has experienced within, in mind. Hence he is to be found in the world.

though he may be acting - nothing is given up; he does what is good for the world. Their suffering is his.

176: MIND - i.e. the mind which is acting with the ego: hence mind in which the ego has disappeared, "melted."

DISPLAY OF THE MIND- the whole world in an idea to him.

DULLNESS - not lethargic but active, not stupid but astute, not foolish but keen-witted.

The dull are those who take world as real.

177: NATURE - it is not something to be acquired by effort: and its characteristic is to be free from misery: and happiness is inseparable from it.

CALMNESS: - calmness is lost when you admit a second thing, which may irritate you, cause pain or disturb you.

EFFULGENCE : - that which knows or is. There can be no darkness i.e. no ignorance in it.

DELUSION: Taking a thing for what it is not.

DREAM : just as a dream lasts only a short time so with gnan the delusion of world-reality disappears. i.e. world is seen as no reality but as appearance.

178: ENJOYMENT: All worldly enjoyment depends upon the existence of a second thing; whereas true happiness is only in non-duality.

Who gets enjoyment? The 'I'! Whoever is overfond of anything should renounce it until he achieves equilibrium. This is for disciplinary stage. Renunciation of any desire is the thorn whereby you pick out the thorn of that desire, but both are to be thrown away thereafter.

181: ATTAINED : because the moment you think, there is always the drik.

183: ETERNAL : the time-characteristic is found only in the drsyam world, not in the drik who looks on.

184: DESIRE ; desire is at the root of the other three activities.

SAY - whatever is said, has a meaning, is an idea i.e. a drsyam.

DO - action implies duality.

185: YOGI: who has passed through the yoga stage, disciplined himself, risen into the path of inquiry and finally got rid of the 'I': hence general reference the yogi who has reached to the stage of gnani.

186: YOGI; the yoga stage must be passed through and the yogi who follows up his practice by inquiry will also attain gnan just as anyone else: but if there is no inquiry he remains in the lower stage.

187: HEAVEN: fulfillment of all desire.

SOLITUDE: implies duality, "I have not got any other" He who seeks solitude has the idea of two (i.e. many) in his mind.

CONDITIONS : unlimited, thought-free: i.e who has become a gnani.

188: SENSUAL (add) "and all other"

189 : YOGI (add)"who has risen to gnana"

190: UNIVERSE - as separate from him?

MEDITATION: - Yoga

DESIRES - drsyam or duality.

191: SEES THE UNIVERSE - as a second thing. This applies to yogis who want to banish the world in samadhi. They do not know that in non-duality there is no need to deny the universe.

SEES - as something different from himself. Those who cannot grasp this position, misunderstand it, and wrongly hold it to be nirvikalpa samadhi where no world is seen.
 THE UNIVERSE: the presence of the world is no obstacle to gnani's realization; he does not need samadhi.

192: SEEN - he has imagined Brahman and is still in duality. His Brahman is but a thought.
 'I' - note the ego here. It is mere quotation from a scripture.

THOUGHT: there are no thoughts in Brahman.

The yogi who wrongly thinks there is a Brahman to be got, may attempt to do so, and may think he sees it, but all the time he is under the delusion of duality, thinking Brahman to be something different.

When you say that all the different thoughts are only Mind, then you have transcended thinking.

193: HIMSELF: His mind being disturbed by troubles, he has to practice yoga.

194: ORDINARY: He follows his vocation outwardly because he is not interested in showing off as a gnani. Others cannot detect it merely by his appearance. He does not want to show he is different. He does not care to make bodily advertisements to distinguish himself. This also encourages ordinary people to take to the path, for they see a gnani is like one(self).

CONTRARY - in his knowledge, i.e. in his mind.

195: NON-EXISTENCE: Both 'existence' and 'non-existence' are merely words, and belong to duality, words cannot reach Brahman.

ACTING - He knows it is only the mind at work, (as in dream) appearing in various ways; hence it is still Brahman, unchanged whatever actions (ideas) it seems to indulge in.

196: DOING WHAT COMES TO HIM TO BE DONE: He does not run away from the world but does what circumstances allot him, without the sense of "I am doing it" and always keeping the happiness of others in view.

INACTIVITY: Both are same to him and both will be practiced at the appropriate times.

197: SAMSKARAS: instincts which are the result of previous thoughts. You act in a particular way because of a previous line of thought.

LEAF: lives without desires, indifferent inwardly.

198: EXISTENCE: no longer thinks the world is real.

BODY: He is not always thinking of his body: his interest in it will be the same as though it were somebody else's body. It is no longer "my body."

200: PLEASURES: There is nothing external to compel him to right action: he knows what is right and does it spontaneously, freely. He follows his own tendencies rather than the dictation of others.

201: ACTING: It is a common error to think the sage is he who sits inactive, silent and still.

(201) DOES NOT ACT: (add) because he has detached the Drik from the Drsyam.

202: SO: The I is not there.

FOOL: his egolessness is not foolishness in worldly matters.

203: (REASONINGS) INQUIRIES: he knows they are merely thoughts; ideas, and as such cannot get at the Drik.

REPOSE: the rest that comes after work.

SEES - He knows these are all Brahman and has removed the I from such sense-actions; hence he neither thinks nor knows etc. a second thing.

204: SAMADHI: This effectually disposes of mystic claim that samadhi gives the highest.

DISTRACTION - Samadhi here is the same as deep sleep, distraction means having thought or performing acts: the sage is in non-duality and thus knows both these to be Brahman.

LIBERATION: When he knows that the whole world is Brahman, he has no need to seek liberation.

205: ACT: If the ego says “I shall not act but renounce world” what is it that it is still thinking of? The ego itself of course! So his renunciation is delusion.

DEED: does not really act. Just as in a dream you may climb a mountain, but you are not doing so in reality.

206: LIBERATED: from ignorance

DOUBTS: Whatever thoughts arise he lets them come and go because he knows they are but thoughts; it does not mean yogic blankness.

207: MOTIVE; without the ego.

208: HIMSELF: remains silent, non-argumentative, otherwise the opponents of truth will seek to embroil him into quarrelsome disputes which have no other value than to assert the I, or he pretends to know nothing for he knows it is impossible to convince a man of truth when he lacks the capacity to grasp it.

209: MIND - Patanjali's yoga is for the ignorant, who have first to prepare themselves: they lack the power to understand philosophy.

WISE: those who have brains

SLEEP: where multiplicity is absent, so gnani sees unity only.

210: INACTION: It is utterly impossible to remain happy by mere inaction or fasting or meditation: for ultimately the body demands food and whilst the mind must think.

MERELY: nothing else needs to be done for that brings in duality.

ASCERTAINING: making certain.

Page 211: (BELOVED) WHICH HE LOVES BEST: It, the self, is nearest to you and thus most loved.

PERFECT: everything is included in it.

TAINT: Taint likely to make you uneasy, such as doubt: also so long as you look on each thing as only Mind, it will be taintless.

“In this world, men, though taking to diverse religious or yoga practices do not know the Self which is pure, that which is capable of knowing, which he loves best, perfect, devoid of the characteristics of world (of manifoldness) and free from any taint.”

Page 212: ACTIVITIES: as in dream our actions are all done inside us, hence are not really external ones, so the sage sees all his acts in himself, unreal.

213: THAT - he regards Brahman as an object, i.e. an idea: this is his mistake. Brahman is not to be got as a second thing. It is unchangeable.

214: of (FREEDOM)GOD: Those who think they want to become Brahman, as if their real nature could change.

215: IT: because Truth alone confers permanent unchanging tranquility: he ought to seek truth therefore, not peace. He may try to control his mind for years but it is impossible. Outside of sleep, mind is forever active.

216: OBJECT: - If you seek any second thing, you lose self in it. It is an object.

IMMUTABLE: nobody has ever seen it change. Should he do so, then it will not be the Drik but a drsyam.

217: IT; Mind is impossible to still, outside of sleep. Patanjali was mistaken.

NATURAL; Gnani is not disturbed by thoughts.

218: IS: Conflicting opinions fill the world. One statement can always evoke a counter-statement. There is no finality.

CALM: The gnani is raised above all speculations.

219: Think: they have only thought of Atman, i.e. an object, a drsyam, but delude themselves into accepting this thought as the reality. They create an imagined Atman.

SECOND: They merely say so, pour out words, but have not got beyond pundit stage. Their Atman is imagined.

UNHAPPY: because they do not give up ego.

221: They do not inquire what the sense-objects are, but run away to yogic ashrams; the man with brains (buddhi) is not afraid but says "These objects are only ideas in me: why should I run?"

222: FLATTERERS: the Gnani uses these objects

223: DOUBTS: When there is no duality, there is no second thing to be doubted.

LIBERATION: does not adopt asceticism.

224: HEARING: sharp buddhi grasps the truth the very first time it is explained by guru.

INDIFFERENT: like the recluses.

225: EVIL: if he sees a cobra threatening a child, he will kill it and thus act evilly for a good motive. His good or evil code is in reference to others, not I.

CHILD: - free from the ego.

226; SUPREME: You will realize the highest through self-reliance.

227: attenuated: only Atman, Mind is seen in the multiplicity.

REALIZES: through constant practice of correct thinking it becomes natural.

228: INARTIFICIAL: not caring, for public opinion to the extent of being untrue to himself; true thoughts and right living becomes natural to him.

FOOL: the mystic or ascetic who practices formally in caves or ashrams.

229: FREE: from the desire of consolatory imaginings, such as religion.

ENJOYMENTS: they are not afraid to enjoy themselves nor are solely addicted to ascetic solitude: they have nothing external to avoid or run after.

230: GOD: this is most exalted atheism.

PLACE : Neither Kailas nor Benares can attract them.

ONE: relative, such as a son.

231: YOGI: (who has become a gnani after passing through yoga): In the case of 99% of humanity, discipline is necessary: hence the gnani usually emerges from the stage of yogic discipline. Only a rare few become gnanis without yoga, which is quite possible but infrequent.

232: PAIN: Outwardly he behaves like others seeming angry for instance but inwardly not angry. It is a kind of pretense, but it is unavoidable when you have to deal with different kinds of men.

His mental internal attitude is quite different from others, but his external reaction may seem the same as that of ordinary men. This is so wonderful that it cannot be understood by others, who judge by appearances only: here wonderful means rare or remarkable, not mystic.

233: VOID: this is only metaphorical to imply there is no idea, no thought therein: but it is not to be taken literally, like Sunyavada, to imply there is no reality therein.

234: DISTRACTION: therefore it is dull minds that seek repose of yoga.

DUTIES: for they also are Brahman. He is quite ready to do anything, however mean or great, that fate may make him do provided it does not harm others.

235: WELL: He may have sorrows but he keeps equal-minded. Or, he adapts himself to his environment immediately in order to help others, but secretly remains himself inside.

236: SELF-POSSESSION: Because Brahman is calm, he who has realized it is also inwardly calm by nature: Original is Swabhava, nature.

239: DELUDED: the yogi who regards thinking as the enemy of realization.

THINKING: as in Europe.

NOT-THINKING: as among yogis.

(UNCONSCIOUSNESS) THOUGHTLESSNESS: bad translation: That mind wherein all ideas and objects are dissolved and knows nothing outside pure Mind the state where there is no thought.

The Gnani is attached to neither. He cannot get rid of ideas of the world, so he accepts them as Brahman.

241: Desire: the idea of duality.

CONDITIONS: changes in the world do not affect him. This is possible only by taking up the position of non-duality which is non-difference.

242: REFLECTED: The self thought of, spoken about, i.e. imagined, not the real self, for a thought cannot be Atman.

MEANS: In unity even the thought of a technique to produce it, does not arise: there is no production of Brahman.

CHANGELESS: change and time are what you find in the drsyam, not in the drik.

243: NATURAL: effortless (sahaja)

SAMADHI: seeing the sameness (Brahman) everywhere.

Sahaja means coming of its own accord, the world being just as it is and yet he is in samadhi; everything becomes one.

244. ATTACHMENT : to ego: PLACES : take away ego and you experience everywhere.

245: RENOUNCED: renunciation means giving up ego. Sanyas is to be valued only because it is a first step to this, although unfortunately many ascetics have a stronger ego!

NAME: mere ideas, mere thoughts: when you know that all ideas are made of single essence, then you have got Atman.

246: THIS: this world

ILLUSION: you see the world but you know its appearance hides the reality, and also it is the reality as Atman.

PEACE: It comes by itself (sahaja) everywhere in the world.

(Read 'inexpressible' as unrecognizable: and 'expressed' as cognized.)

247: INTELLIGENCE: who knows "I am only the Witness!" these other things are only seen: awareness.

248: RELATIVE EXISTENCE ; independent existence.

249: MAYA: Ignorance which exists prior to investigation.

LIVES: does not run away: after EXISTING add "as duality or separate entity."

250: KNOWLEDGE: What else does he wish to know.

UNIVERSE: The world becomes his own self. The ego must be given up.

251: INTELLECT: He thinks unless he keeps his mind under control, he cannot get Brahman.

So even if he gets desires, he knows them also to be Brahman, his own self.

DESIRE: Gnani does not bother with mind control for all thoughts are Brahman. So even if he gets desires, he knows them also to be Brahman, his own self.

FANCIES: The yogi cannot remain permanently in trance. When he emerges all his own desires return again.

252: EFFORT: he drives it into the unconscious, as modern psychology says, and it will reappear later. Only if it is done alongside of inquiry will it be alright, for then it becomes Sahaja, effortless.

253: DROPPED: not renouncing external activity but not regarding activity as being different from his mind; Brahman, it means seeing inaction in action; just as his actions in a dream are nothing but the mind.

PEOPLE: Ignorant people imagine that a man who is working like others, living quite normally externally, cannot be gnani. But they only see his body, never his mind.

254: IMMUTABLE: The Atman is ever unchangable.

FEARLESS: fears are for the egoistic.

DARKNESS: by day or by night, seeing the world of multiplicity or not; or both darkness and light will no longer be drsyam.

255: DISCRIMINATION: only when he was an ignorant seeker did he heed to discrimination between truth and falsity, knowledge and ignorance.

FEARLESSNESS: there is no second for him to fear.

NATURE: The only thing that cannot be described is Brahman, and he has reached this.

256: HELL: These are still needed for lower stage, religious people, but there is no proof for us.

LIBERATION-IN-LIFE: a man seeks liberation only when he is in ignorance still and thinks he is in bondage. Actually he is Brahman, never bound. Moreover Moksha is only a word, hence an idea.

YOGIC: refers to the yogi of previous sloka, (who has attained gnanic egolessness.)

257: OF IT: because the I is no longer there.

258: WICKED: He has to censure the wicked and praise the good in the eye of the world, in his external life to set an example; but inwardly there are no separate individualities for him to be aware of and consequently to praise or blame or he does not do these things for the sake of self-satisfaction.

259: SELF: because if it seen it becomes a drsyam, a duality; nor even to know the Self for then it becomes an object.

ALIVE: He must be as indifferent to the death of his own body as we are to the deaths of people we have never seen or heard of and living in distant continents.

260: BODY: He will do all that is needed for his body but will know it too is Brahman.

WIFE: Gnan is open to attainment by all, whether householders, sanyasins or butchers. This refers to my wife, my children. The Gnani may have wife and children or not, the difference is in being without I in reference to them.

261: CONTENTMENT: the satisfaction of non-duality which is not to depend on any other person or even any God for your happiness, and not to depend on any external object for happiness. He is never discontented.

WANDERS: If he is old or weak, he will not wander; This means there are no rules nor restrictions on his movements; he is free.

SETS: The gnani is not bound to stay in one place like a yogi. He is free to go anywhere.

262: BEING: the drik, which remains always unaffected: no one has seen its death.

DIES: he does not worry if he is going to die, but this does not mean he is eager to die!

263:FREELY: he does not say "I must remain in this house."

OPPOSITIONS: every word has its opposite, every idea is therefore bound by duality.

ASUNDER: not by belief, the easy way, which is for children, but by clearing it through inquiry.

264: "MINE-NESS": his own ego is as much a thought as any other, and valued accordingly.

RAJAS: the urge to do things because 'I' must do this or 'I' must do that.

TAMAS: Callous indifference or inertia.

265: AT HEART: He may be a king or business man but yet there is no attachment in his heart of hearts.

266: KNOWING: In his heart he knows no second thing.

SEEING: Inside himself he is Brahman always, whether objects are there or not.

SPEAKING: Whether silent or not, his heart inside is in Brahman: the mystic Mouna is not the same; Mouna is not necessary.

The gnani's positionless position arises after he sees the contradictions and paradoxes, and does not want them any more, so he rises to Brahman, where there are no ideas, no words, and hence no position.

When he speaks etc. he knows, realizes simultaneously, that speech etc. (as well as himself) is Brahman. He does both together, whilst outwardly speaking etc. just like others. That is why his realization is so secret that they cannot understand where he is different.

267: KING: hence gnani may be an active man: do not look for him necessarily among ascetics.

External appearance has nothing to do with his gnan.

EVIL: the religious notion of heaven and hell arises out of this "sense" and he rejects it as unverified.

268: WANTONNESS: RESTRAINT: all these suggest duality.

YOGI: this is therefore not for every yogi but only for the rare few who has reached Gnana, which could occur only by adding inquiry to his meditation.

OBJECT: to get Gnan.

ARTLESS: spontaneous; without ulterior motive.

269: WITHIN: You can never detect gnan from the outside appearances or conduct: if you think you do, it is only your own imagination: original word Hrđi=heart. Hence gnani makes no outward show or displays no unusual external characteristic.

DESIRELESS: egoless, non-dual, therefore no desire is there to be expressed nor is there second to whom it could be expressed.

270: The wise one is contented because he knows all three states to be one, Brahman, and does not seek or value one above others; the gnani must use the language of those around him but inside he does not split up the unity of his existence into three states.

271: IN THOUGHT: because he knows, values them as mere thoughts he can engage, contrary to the yogi, in them without harm.

THEM: Knows even senses to be ideas, and hence only Brahman.

IT: He may use the word I but knows it is only an idea and further that ultimately it is only Mind; Atman.

272: UNATTACHED: asceticism is the first stage: this is a higher stage when both attachment and renunciation are seen to be ideas and of the same value.

THAT: Gnan cannot be seen, yet people are attached only to what they can see or imagine.

273: DULLNESS: He keeps quiet rather than argue uselessly, so may be thought stupid.

LEARNING: He does not care to show off to the world that he is learned, by using big words, for example.

DISTRACTED EVEN (add) "when he appears to be"

274: DONE: No regrets for past need be entertained regarding the things wanted to be done but never done; for what are they now? They are only ideas, whether done or undone. The entire past is but an idea now. Gnani knows, he remains same. (Because the I is not there.)

275: ANNOYED: The importance lies in the word feel: he himself is unaffected. These things depend on ego and duality.

276: WILDERNESS: These restrictions are necessary in the earlier stages as a discipline, but the Gnani goes freely where he has to or where is asked. (The state of mind is all important)

277: DISQUISITIONS: The multitude of so many different theories, opinions, fancies, which prevail among men; all are mere ideas. The Gnani takes no position whatever, joins no such separate class or party as Advaitins, for he is in non-duality.

278: NON-DUALITY: non-duality is an idea which is antithetic to the idea of duality: the sage is above all ideas.

There are no conditions for Brahman, the Unconditioned, to be got.

279: FUTURE: the possible happenings are only thoughts in me and ultimately myself.

ETERNITY: all these are interdependent ideas.

280: NOT-SELF: Both Self and not-Self (drik and drsyam) are the same at the highest stage.

281: When all the three states become Brahman to you, where is place for Turiya? All is then Turiya, the essence of them all.

282: No form can exist outside Mind. Within and without apply only to the body. But the body is in the mind. So these terms become meaningless. Refer to the dream experience for illustration of illusory nature of distances: all being in mind.

283: DEATH: death is seen only in the drsyam, objective world. It is not seen in ME.

WORLDS: when you rise to this level of seeing all as Brahman.

ME: I am only the looker on, the Seer of death or life, because I am detached from body.

284: THREE: three for the sake of argument, there may be 30,000 ends! (The three here are Dharma, Kama and Artha.)

YOGA, WISDOM: Note that a clear distinction is here made between Yoga (a discipline) and wisdom, (the highest knowledge).

285: Mind: You say there is mind when you have a thought, but when thoughts are not considered different from you, as Brahman, then where is the division into self, mind, world, etc. VOID: We say Sunya implies duality: no material world may exist but the thought of a second is there. If you know there is sunya, nothingness, then there is something there to be known and to know.

(They are or have become Brahman).

286: SELF-KNOWLEDGE: Only the ignorant man seeks to know himself, or talks of acquiring knowledge.

DUALITY: duality means existence of a second thing as a reality, as independent of yourself.

287: KNOWLEDGE: original word is Vidya (not Gnan)

“THIS” implies something or other in the world variety.

SELF: all these are ideas coming and going; hence meaningless to the Brahman.

KNOWLEDGE: here the reference is not to ultimate knowledge but to limited, subject-object dualistic knowledge. Every second thing known is only myself.

288: Nearest state to understand Atman by itself is to eliminate everything including ego, as in deep sleep. Once this is gasped, you have to understand that everything is Brahman, that everything is yourself.

289: THINKING - Samadhi.

THOUGHT: Gnani is not afraid of thinking, knowing all ideas to be Brahman.

RESULT: the world is only idea.

290: ESSENCE (OF ALL): go to dream. Mountains and people may disappear but when they reappear of what substance are they made? That (mind) whence they emerged is called the essence. This essence is ever-present even in waking and dream state.

291: RETRACTION: Nothing else but the mind's activity, world appearing and merging back into Source.

292: KNOWER, KNOWLEDGE, OBJECT, THING, NOTHING, any such word you may utter is after all only an idea, because it has a meaning. It is therefore subject to change whereas I am changeless Brahman.

EVER: the mind is never absent, nor not known. In some form it is ever-present.

When all knowing, known and knower are simultaneously Mind (as in dream) what else is there to trouble about understanding them? You here have the key.

293: DISTRACTION: the mind may be drawn to observe a 100 things in the external world, but the Gnani is not disturbed thereby because they are all Brahman to him.

DULLNESS: These are qualities which you attribute to yourself wrongly, they belong to the aham, not you: (c.f. Christian Science).

ACTIONLESS: actionlessness cannot be understood without avastatraya.

294: RELATIVE: Original, vyavaharic, i.e. practical, empiric.

ABSOLUTE: If it has a meaning, it is only an idea. Happiness or sorrow are only of the nature of the mind, being idea: their difference is therefore illusory. In original, Paramartha, philosophic or ultimate.

295: JIVA OR BRAHMAN: both are the same ultimately, moreover all argument about Brahman never touch it.

ME: This 'me' does not mean the 'me' in this particular body but the 'me' in everyone: the common-self.

All words have no place, all thoughts' cannot reach 'That' even the thought of Brahman is just as illusory and contradictory, because thought and words belong to world of duality.

296: EVER: under no circumstances is it immutable even if one thinks it so.

INDIVISIBLE: There is no division into nations, races, colors or kinds of men in Gnana.

ESTABLISHED: It is not enough to know and say but one must always see "I am Drik, the Drik in all" always realize and practice it. Some people get glimpses of the truth and lose it; so it must be established. Such fixidity is the goal.

297:INJUNCTION: these are early stages, not for truth seekers.

PRECEPTOR: both are only ideas.

LIFE: These are all within the world of duality, the seen, the ideated. LIMITATION: When there is no second, what is then for you to attain? But when you think the you are body, then there are various things you will want to get and so be troubled by their lack. Hence don't wrongly imagine you are body.

298: NON-EXISTENCE: those who assert world does not exist, because it is maya, are still in elementary stage of preliminary analysis. (b) existence applies only to an object; a word can have no meaning apart from drsyam.

DUALITY: duality implies two separate objects; monism implies duality: Brahman is beyond both.

NOTHING EMANATES FROM ME: because it is non-different from myself. There are no two. Do not mistake 'me' for the ego.

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.

P.70. "This is knowledge: it has neither to be renounced nor accepted nor destroyed" refers to the world. Nothing need be given up. The absence of the world is not Gnan, knowledge. That is merely Yoga or sleep. The world must be seen before knowledge can be got. The world must be seen to be an idea, and to achieve this you must first examine, see the world. Yogi is only a practitioner, is following a useful lower stage, but he can't get knowledge. His flashes of illumination are mere steps, not the Gnan.

Page 209: "The ignorant does not attain truth either by inaction (i.e. shutting himself in cave) or by action." i.e. by religious rites and ceremonies.

Page 212: "An ignorant person does not attain Moksha by repeated practice." For that means he is working with his body, whereas Gnan is the work of the brain, intelligence.

Page 15 points out that those who are trying, who are making the attempt, to get Brahman will not get it. "This is your bondage that you practice samadhi." it says. Hence yoga cannot yield Brahman even if you go on trying a whole lifetime. It will come only by intelligence. Yoga is for preliminaries.

Page 82: People take the 'I' as standard of reference. They feel the external world is there: consequently "Where there the I, there is bondage, when there is no I, there is liberation." Liberation here means knowledge of truth!

Verse 15: In "This is your bondage, that you practice meditation" the original Sanskrit term used here for meditation is samadhi. Bondage means bondage to ignorance. For that is the yogi thinking of when he sits down to meditate? He is thinking of his body because he wants to sit still, sit in a quiet place, etc. and what is he thinking of when he comes back from Samadhi? He has to think of body again, and of the world. Hence he does not reach an unchangeable truth.

ASHTAVAKRA GITA is more advanced than Bhagavad Gita. For it says: "The man of knowledge is devoid of thought even when engaged in thought." Why? Because he has no aham, no egoism, no 'I'.

P.156: 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 p.352 Mandukya para 1).

Page 209: "like persons in sleep" means he is as indifferent (to those yoga practices) as a man who is sleeping, would be.

P.225: Whether good or evil is applied to the Gnani himself. It does not mean evil to others. Evil here means 'causes suffering.'

Page 207. Why did Sri Ramakrishna still spend so much time in yoga-trances after he became a Gnani? Reply: If I am a Gnani with a black body, I know that body is only an idea, but he cannot throw it away even then. Similarly, Ramakrishna had the habit of going into trance, and although he became a gnani he had to continue this habit. It made no difference to him because he knew that his Samadhis also were Brahman. Therefore a Gnani may practice yoga provided he knows its limited value, knows that per se it does not lead to Brahman but rest.

21. YOU CANNOT HAVE THE IDEA OF REALITY WITHOUT HAVING THE COMPLIMENTARY IDEA OF UNREALITY. BOTH RISE AND FALL TOGETHER. THEREFORE BRAHMAN IS NEITHER REAL NOR UNREAL.

UPANISHADS:

The Upanishads were secret books and their publication was forbidden because the highest truth will unsettle those who are unfitted for it, without helping them up higher. Mental children cannot grasp it, and if you kick away their prop of religion they will lose ethical restraint and thieve and murder. Even if fit pupils were found still the Upanishads were only to be read under the guidance of a competent teacher who could properly interpret them. In this democratic age, however, all these books are printed and spread broadcast, with the result that much confusion of thought has occurred through misinterpretation by unqualified readers or by incompetent teachers.

The Upanishads were never taught publicly, because everybody would then give the texts various interpretations to suit his personal taste.

The value of a scientific interpretation of the Upanishads is that it demands verification, not blind belief.

Only the philosophic portions of Vedanta are the highest and should be studied; the other portions which seem primitive are for those of lower stages of development and should be ignored.

The Upanishads contain so much that seems puerile and primitive and non-philosophic because they contain matter for people at different stages of development.

An Upanishad says "According to their taste, people will have a God."

The statement that "One who knows this attains to fulfillment of all desires" means that you will be fully self-satisfied with Atman; it does not mean you will run after women, drink etc.

The Brihad Upanishad is an important and essential text which must be studied in my course of Vedanta.

Brihad Upanishad admits that if you want to make use of men for any ulterior purpose, give them religion.

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.

The Brihad Upanishad is so large that it contains everything we need to study Vedanta.

This Upanishad deals with Advaita in expanded detailed form; whereas Mandukya deals with same subject in condensed compact form; hence the former is easier reading.

Chapter 2 points out that if you believe that you are separate from God, different from God, and that you are forced to do something to propitiate him then you are a fool, and deserve to be treated like an animal. This conclusion is far in advance of Western ideas.

This Upanishad points out truths may strike one man's mind as such at once, whereas others may not perceive them for ages; and that the difference is a matter of grades of intelligence. The higher the truth the higher the kind of intelligence needed to grasp it.

This Upanishad says not by Sanyas can you get Brahman but only by inquiry.

This Upanishad devotes no less than seven chapters to show that this Atman is Brahman, to lead man to examine the world and find it to be the Self. It is not enough merely to quote Vedas and assert yogis have seen that Atman is Brahman; one must inquire into the external world.

In the Mahabharata it is explained that the higher truth should be taught to kings, rulers, statesmen, leaders of thoughts etc. so that they will better know how to guide the destinies of the people entrusted to their charge. But the masses of peoples themselves are given orthodox religion.

Religion values Upanishads because they are scriptures. Vedanta values them because they yield truth. The two reasons are quite opposed.

BRIH. UPANISAD: page 32. "Yoga does not yield truth or liberation."

One may read the Mahabharata for all philosophical, yogic and cosmological teachings but at the end it finally says "All is imaginative."

Brihad Upanishad is next in importance to Mandukya. It too declares Yoga cannot give you truth.

Page 78 bottom of Brihad Up.: To see Him whole mystics may have similar ideas of the "universe in a dew-drop," but Vedanta demands proof.

Take any Upanishad and you will see that it says Atman is known by Buddhi alone, by sharpened and purified intellect. Yet still our people worship Yoga and mysticism as the sole means of attaining Atman.

CHANDOGYA UPANISAD gives the highest sense of Sanyasin: "One who understands Brahman and who knows it," whether or Brahmacharin, householders recluse or Sanyasi ashrams, but ashrams are for discipline.

"If one knows That here, then there is Truth"--this is the most important thing said in the KENO Upanishad. You must see immortality in this birth.

No religious ceremony will bring you Truth, says the Upanishads.

CHANDOGYA UP. Chap.7.1.2 points out futility as mere words of all ordinary human learning in contrast with philosophy.

BRIHAD UP. Page 133 1st para points out that even yoga cannot give perfect concentration and that the only way to gain it is philosophical realization. This confirms Mandukya's statement that yoga can no more succeed than the ocean can be emptied with a blade of grass.

MAHABHARATA: Why is the pilgrimage to Kailas enjoined? Mahabharata teaches that a plunge into Manasovar is the plunge into Manas wherein the whole world is seen, i.e. to perceive the world as idea. It is a difficult feat, as difficult as the pilgrimage itself. Mahabharata also says that when people are told to go there, they are to plunge deep into the mind, the whole world is made of Manas, mind. After that you reach Kailas and understand the truth. The bath comes first, it is the inquiry the arrival at Kailas comes second, it is finding realization.

Says Vasistha Ramyana "Know that to be Maya and enjoy Maya, that is Gnana." Hence we may enjoy human life but be on our guard not to be deceived or destroyed by it.

YOGA VASISTHA "In all actions whatever, whether of commission or omission, there is nothing save the absence of attachment to distinguish the fool from the man of wisdom."

BRIHAD. UPANISHAD: "The knower of Brahman wears no signs."

"UPANISHAD" means sitting near guru, pupil must ask questions, and have his doubts cleared up. Questions were encouraged and answers freely given. Hence Aurobindo's seclusion is cheating students.

The stage of Dakshinamoorthy anecdote and Bhava's story when the Guru is silent and the chela sits before him and understands, is the very highest. For it comes after the course of instruction is ended, when all doubts have been cleared, all discussions ended, nothing more to be said by Guru, hence the silence of the Guru. It does not mean Yogic silent initiation because all the doubts and difficulties of such yogic chela will leap up again after the so-called initiation, as he has not understood by his own personal hard thinking. For this is final.

Anybody can write a commentary on the UPANISHADS and other great philosophic texts, all they need to do to pour out words. It is quite easy to do this even by those who have never understood the Upanishads but think they have. Thus the Madhva people and other dualists, such as Rangaramanujacharya the disciple of Ramanuja, have written commentaries on Mandukya: But all these have written to satisfy themselves, not to get truth.

BRIHAD UPANISHAD. Why is it that nothing is useless, that the excreta of animals is as honey to the flies? Because Brahman is, because of the ultimate oneness, non-difference of the All. This is what it teaches.

Keep the ultimate ideal of philosophy but suggest the immediate course of action. c.f. Brih. Up. starting with horse sacrifices and ending by stating everything is Brahman.

MAHABHARATA points out that if his neighbors are devilish or of fighting tendency then the ruler should arm. Hence England ought to have fully prepared herself for Hitler before the war.

One of the Rishis in Mahabharata explained that the ancient principles of philosophy, duty, politics and sociology have to be reinterpreted and readapted anew to conform to each new age. Therefore it is the duty of leader, statesmen and religious head to keep their policies, principles doctrines and customs flexible, not to fall into hard unchangeable dogmas, and to be ever ready to meet and discuss with the younger dissatisfied generation and bring about needed changes. Reactionary, obstinate, sticking to ideas, methods and teachings that were well suited to former centuries is as mistaken as is revolutionary emotional unbalanced desire to sweep away every vestige of the past and its ideas and customs. We need to be balanced.

"Here alone (otherwise there to no truth)" say the Upanishads, and hence Vedanta looks to no future states or no next worlds for the realization of truth, the finding of immortality, the attainment of happiness. We want here and now.

Any understanding is possible only through a mental picture of ideas. God is an idea: "Everywhere" is an idea. We cannot distinguish between idea and reality. Ananda, bliss is imagination. Hence Upanishads call it a kosha (body).

Indifference is not enjoined anywhere in Upanishads. (Never say that 'this is his karma,' and be heartless)--If one sits quiet, he may be sick, but not a gnani. Gnanis were not indifferent; they did not distinguish themselves with any marks of being exceptional.

The Upanishads tell how a seeker was sent away for 20 years at a time after each instruction, returning and getting taught further only after doubts began to rise in him. The doubt must come first.

P.163 Chandogya Up. The Guru begins his work by asking candidate what knowledge he already possesses. Then the sage may sometimes indirectly create a doubt in order to ascertain if a candidate is fit for higher knowledge.

The Brihad Upanishad: While he, one who is not a knower of Brahman who worships another God, a God different from himself approaches him in a subordinate position, offering him praises, salutations, sacrifices, presents, self-surrender, meditation, etc. thinking, "He is one, different from me, and I am another, his subordinate, and I must serve him like a doubter"--worships him with such ideas, does not know the truth. He, this ignorant man, has not only the evil of ignorance, but is also like an animal to the gods.

Objection: On the strength of scriptural statements, even the meditation based on resemblance may lead to identity: Reply: No, for this meditation is only an idea.

Brih.Up: page 78 bottom: While mystics may have similar ideas of the "universe in the dewdrop", Vedanta demands proof.

Page 345 & 347: 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.

Page 489: "The knower of Brahman wears no signs.

Page 500 asks in effect "Tell us what you know, show it, and let us examine it under the microscope." It means we must bring notions and beliefs out of vagueness into clearness. It also criticizes the mystics who claim superior knowledge but who cannot communicate it for purposes of verification.

On page 482: On Gnani: "The knower of Brahman wears no signs..gives up the insignia of a monk's life,...his signs are not manifest, nor his behavior."...Shankara's commentary.

Page 658 and 659 give the test of decrease of ignorance as being the increasing knowledge that he is the All felt in the dream state no less than waking. This lesson cannot be learnt unless you get rid of causality, because what ever change appears you will still look upon it as yourself. So long as the ignorant looks upon change as produced he cannot identify himself with it. Hitler will take a 100 million births again because he views the Jews as so different from himself.

Page 572 explains how Guru does not accept money or gifts.

The Pandits' commentaries and books written on Indian Philosophy deal with the religion of the Upanishads, not their philosophy. When authors reach something they cannot explain, they appeal to intuition.

The Upanishad, the Puranas, Gitas and all Hindu scriptures contain teachings for different grades of minds within the covers of the same book. Hence the confusion, if they read without a guru. They mean that if you cannot follow the highest philosophical inquiry then they must instruct you in yoga, if you do not want yoga, you are instructed in religion etc. This why most orientalist including Max Muller and even Indian Professors have missed the point and described Vedanta as religion when it is a question of Truth.

Brihadaranyaka Upanishad starts with religious rituals because man must first begin with the external world. In the second chapter, however the book says "now we shall deal with the identity of Jiva and Brahman, that is it takes a higher standard as it progresses. Therefore the book contains teaching for all classes of men.

BHAGAVAD GITA:

Why was Gita written? For the plain purpose avowed in it. There was actual war and a need for action. Gita is intended to urge Arjuna to fight, i.e. to act in the world, i.e. to show that philosophy has a practical bearing on life and duty. Those who give mystic meanings or theosophical interpretations of Gita are merely imagining what suits their taste and fancy.

The aim of the teachings of Gita is said to be Gnana Yoga or knowledge of Truth, extols it by its pedigree, previous tradition. In all the chapters Gnana Yoga is being taught.

Moksha is interpreted in various ways. It means the dispelling of ignorance, delivering from Bandha--all other meanings regarding heaven etc. are all imagination. Moksha only means knowing the Truth. That is why they have coined the word Jivanmukta.

This knowledge handed down through Kshatriyas, in succession. Jnana yoga is pre-eminent in importance to kings who are controllers of human destinies. In time this knowledge got eclipsed or got lost; that is why we have suffered. We have lost this Gnana yoga. Its tradition has been broken, by falling into the hands of the weak with the result that people have not been able to reach the goal of life, getting over ignorance and attaining the Truth.

This Gnana yoga is the supreme secret. That for which you have to make or do all things is to understand the Supreme Truth, this Gnan. If India was weak in Krishna's time how much more now? Which country has not conquered India? You are my friend and so I am teaching you this lost but supreme secret (Note that Arjuna begins with questions. Look at the courage. The questioning spirit is encouraged.) How am I to understand that you taught this gnan in the beginning. If you don't have Dharma and Adharma how can you? I am the drik, I am born by my own Maya, by my own ideating--that which sees the 'I' is common to everyone. I am the witness. Whenever there is decay I manifest myself.

Why am I born? For the protection of the good and destruction of evil, for establishment of and maintenance of Dharma. Likewise with the Gnani, with perfection he should perform action. "Good" means being of service to others.

"With a view to set an example to the world" I have come, for the purpose of preventing people to take to wrong path. "Good action always purifies oneself."

Whatever a great man does, that alone people follow. Examine the result you have got. Look at India. What are the facts? What is the condition of the country? Sri Krishna is born to set an example to others. Arjuna wanted to go to cave of Ramana Maharishi! No. Fight, I will be your coachman!

Even when I have nothing to attain to, I work always for the good and service of others, as an example. The characteristic of the Gnani is to set an example by service. The point is that you have to work for the welfare of the world.

Carte said "Those who have good muscles, must work, those who have not good muscles, if they work it is not waste. It becomes confusion of worth. Let each do work according to his capacities. You must make others do the same kind of work you are doing--make them Exemplars." This is how we are to follow the teacher of Gita.

There is no such thing as 'I' and you are attached to it; whenever you think, the Ego is there. If thou knowest the truth, thou also perform action.

Importance of action lies in this, it can be followed by all. Look at the child, which imitates the elders. I must do the right thing only, and teach what others can understand. Make them do what they are capable of doing. Ask them to tell you what they know. Success comes from Action. Dignity of labor. No deed pollutes gnani.

44: GITA

Chap.13 Verse.13: When you know that the sense of reality arises because everything is the ONE you reach the end of Vedanta.

Chap.4: 49: Most ethical codes are based on securing satisfaction in some form or other, not on the highest which sees all others in yourself.

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.

"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.

With the intention of doing good to the world the Gnani acts. I choose to engage in ways ordained by the scriptures. Whatever you do you are only the Witness. The Jiva or the "I" acts, the Drik is only the Witness.

There are 49 commentaries on Brahma Sutras and hundreds on Gita. You may add to it!

Those "world fellowship of faiths" enthusiasts who quote Gita "All roads lead to Me" do not understand it means they all go in the same direction, but this is not the same goal. They do not all lead directly to truth.

What was Arjuna's "Universal Vision" on the battlefield? It was nothing but something he was made to imagine. Because it is given in the Gita it is not so sacred that it must evade investigation. His vision had a meaning. This means it was thoughts, your ideas of these persons etc. Hence it was drsyam. What did you do when you read it in Gita? You imagined Krishna, the battlefield and Arjuna. In short, the whole thing was nothing but your imagination. (See p.113 of Mandukya). Whatever you may do with your mind, it can give you only a thought. The wall may be there, but you in knowing it you know only a thought.

Substance disappears on deep inquiry: matter vanishes. Both ancient Gita and Modern Science teach this.

The philosopher desires liberation for all, whereas the mystic seeks it for himself. That is why Janaka stayed in the world, in order to serve others and to set an example of right action for them, for others to imitate. That is why Krishna stayed in world to "save it from going to ruin" as he said in Gita. Do thou perform action for the protection of the masses," P.127 Verse 15.

The highest gem is Gita, chap.13. The knowledge of Kshetra and Kshetragna. Gita is an interpretation of Brihad Upanishad. Keep the end in view and adjustment. Apply philosophy to practical life. "Knowing the truth, apply it to life." says Gita. c.f. chap 18.50.

Sri Krishna says, "If I do not act the world will go to ruins." This is Gita's message of inactive action. Mystic gurus do not know the harm they do by turning others away from useful work or service into Ashram life of parasitic do-nothing.

Krishna preached non-violence (ahimsa) only so long as you are a yogi or a sanyasi; but for the Gnani as for the Grihasta he urged fighting, that is, working for the welfare of the world and doing one's duty.

Gita teaches you to learn philosophy of truth while you are still vigorous and not to waste the years while you have that vigor on doing nothing, sitting quiet in yoga, because old age will come and then you will be too weak to do anything worth while.

Gita says, Do your duty, your work with equanimity for sometimes you will meet with failure and sometimes with success.

The freeing of mind from rationalities, complexes, hallucinations and obsessions which is done by study of psychology of insanity today was also done by ancient Vedantic schools when, as in "Gita" chapters up to 12 inclusive, the seeker was taught to keep emotion away from his mind, and only after this was achieved, was he told in Chapter 13 to practice Vichara--inquiry. The method and results of ancient India was as scientific as today, but the pundits and yogis have lost this science.

Gita says the yogi should be indifferent to heat and cold, pleasure and pain, etc. This does not mean that you should sit naked in snow or torture yourself with daggers in the flesh. It means that you should understand the I, see that it is body identification, get rid of that false idea, and identify yourself with that which sees the I or the body, the Drik. Give up the ego is the meaning.

"Seeing action in inaction" and vice versa, means that both are the same. The sage is not afraid of acting because it is a means of doing good to the world.

The constant reiteration of the term I by Krishna has led critics to say he was an egoist. They did not know that he did not refer to the bodily ego but to the common self which is in all. They have not reflected on the deeper meaning of the world I, which is used by all, because it is present in all, the one self.

Europe is reaching the stage which the philosophers of India reached at least five thousand years ago. The Gita embodies the conclusions of some of these despised Indian philosophers; that is why it is fresh enough to be studied today.

Throughout the Gita Krishna repeatedly declares "Unless you know me as I really am" which means not as people imagine Him to be.

In the opening part of the Gita observe that Krishna never says "I know it, do not trouble to inquire into truth, but merely have faith." On the contrary he says, "I will teach you."

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.

Dharma is wrongly translated as religion. It is true that religion constitutes a part of Dharma but it does not constitute the whole of it.

You must distinguish between pantheism and Advaita. Pantheism means all--God. It is quite different from Vedanta. What does God mean? If it means something different from you, then there are two beings.

"Service of the Guru" means forgetting yourself.

"Beyond pairs of opposites" - rising above the duality which is psychologically implied when you seek for a meaning. (It does not refer to duality v.Brahman).

What is the meaning of the statement "He who sees inaction in action"? It means that both are only idea, both are all mental, both are only Mind, hence they are the same to Gnani.

"The contacts of the senses bring pain" means that you regard matter as separate from you, i.e. duality, i.e. you do not see matter is mental, for if you did you would not seek contact with it, as it would be in yourself.

"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 they 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.

Chap.IV.35: You will never commit an error in thinking or arguing if you grasp this verse, that the whole world of external objects is in you. When you are teaching a scripture like Gita do so with reference to the level of understanding of the pupils, i.e. give it a religious or mystical interpretation where people are not fit for philosophy.

Chap IV v.2. Krishna confesses that the oldest wisdom of India (our true Advaita philosophy) has been lost: people misinterpret and falsify it today as they did then. It is not yoga but philosophic truth. But nobody knows it. The teachers of philosophy and leaders of mysticism or religion do not want to inquire into truth and have no time for it.

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."

Chap.IV: "He who achieves perfection in Yoga finds me in time." This means that after his yoga is finished, he begins the inquiry into ultimate truth and in due course this inquiry produces realization of the universal spirit as the result.

Ch.V: "Those who know me in truth." says Krishna. The last two words (tattvataha) are usually ignored by pundits, but they make all the difference between the ordinary concept of God and the truth about God.

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."

Page 329: "Objection" and "Answer" explain why the Pundits do not know the true meaning of our sastras.

Scriptures deal only with the Objects, the Seen, not with the Seer. If you start with the idea that Samsara exists, you can never see Atman, because Samsara is illusion and only ignorant people read it as a reality. Hence Vivekachudamani, V.63 says: "Without knowing and examining the external world, you can't know Truth, as the idea that the external world exists, won't go. It can go only by an inquiry into the nature of the external world.

Page 331: If the blemish, such as transient thoughts, existed in the Self, it would not be seen; (for the Seer is never seen) but really it is a property of the body in the field.

Intimate association means inseparable association. The Atman, being constant and permanent, these thoughts and actions cannot be a part of it because they come and they go. Even ignorance cannot be a part of the self because it also comes and goes. You may be ignorant for a time, but then it is displaced by knowledge.

According to Advaita, it is nobody else but Brahman. Then how to account for ignorance? He who has got ignorance and asks such a question? He alone must answer it. If you will think of ignorance, it is you and not another person who has this thought. The question therefore presupposes your ignorance. One who sees one unity, the Truth, would not ask such a question. Whose is this ignorance? By whomsoever it is seen! The questioner assumes that the sage sees the same ignorance as himself. But it is not so. The burden of answering is on him. The sage sees no second at all, no ignorance. So the questioner must first clear his own mind of his doubts. There is no occasion for such a question to the Sage. You can't see another man's ignorance. You cannot tell whether he has ignorance or not. Unless he tells you, you do not know whether he sees Atman. The ordinary aspect of viewing things in the world is one thing. The philosophical aspect is the higher and quite another.

Do not think the Gita was written or spoken on a battlefield. It, like so many other sacred stories, is imaginary conversation.

Page 24: The inferiority of yoga to knowledge is plainly asserted in the sentence "Yoga consists in the performance--before the rise of the foregoing conviction (of the truth)--- of works as a means to moksha." Works--includes mental as well as physical action, hence it includes meditation and yoga. For the drik is fundamental and is the perceiver of all actions as drsyam, it perceives even meditation as a drsyam, itself being unaffected.

Page 497: v.63. "Reflect"; It is useless to read Gita unless you use buddhi, think long and often over its teaching.

Page 519: v.72 "attentive": listen to the Guru without letting your mind roam away on many other things, otherwise you do not profit by it.

P.520:(last line) The emphasis must be laid not on "naught" but on 'I'. The ego has nothing more to do thenceforth.

The purpose of the whole book is to point out that nobody is able to live without action, even though seemingly inactive, that even the Gnani must work and not keep idle, and that the only difference between his action and the ignorant man's is that the latter works for his own self-interest or for that of a section connected with him whereas former works for the welfare of all, the world at large, for all beings without egoism because he regards them as one. Gita lays down principles applicable not only to battlefields but to daily life. Krishna wants to correct the wrong idea that the gnani spends his life sitting in meditation as a sanyasi.

P.290: If they take body at start as real, they will never see truth about body.

Chap.13 v.12. Kshetra = matter, Kshetragna = Mind. Prakriti is non-existent as Matter is nonexistent.

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).

If everything is reduced to ideas, then the ideas must be in the mind. This explains Gita saying "All things are in Me."

See Gita Chapter 6 which deals with meditation, verse 11 and 12. It says "Yoga is for purification." This means it is not for truth but discipline. Chap.5 deals with renunciation. The Gita says throughout the book, not to rely on Yoga, but to rely on Buddhi (discrimination between real and unreal).

Page 238. Verse 10: "Knowledge" here means "that power by which you can distinguish truth from falsehood. Thus Krishna rewards devotees first by letting him see him, later by giving understanding of what he really is; giving them discrimination.

Page 73, verse 35: "Knowing which thou shalt not again fall into error or doubt, by knowing which thou shalt see all beings as thyself" The commentary chap.4 says that this includes even Brahma (God) is seen in oneself. Does the Yogi see all the beings in himself? Can he see them by shutting himself up in a cave? We must know the whole. We ought not to have to ask the question "What is this?"

Chap.18 verse 54: "Treating all beings alike" even the killing of a living ant is felt by the Gnani with pity. Does the yogi feel like this for others? No, for he shuts himself up like an owl in his cave, saying "I am happy, I have ananda," whilst his adorers admire the cushions and couch on which he sits. The human sympathy which exists to a limited extent already in most men has to be extended to all beings in order to attain Brahman.

Chap.5.26 says in Sankara's comment "Yoga as the proximate means (nearest step) to right knowledge."

Krishna emphasizes that "without doubt you shall find me." He emphasizes that there is no possibility of doubt in Truth. If a man were honest, do you think that even if he sees a God before him, all his doubts will go? No.

Gita tells you that religion is not final. It only gives you satisfaction. The knowledge of the All, it says, is what is wanted for truth.

Why does Krishna use the word "Me" so often? Is this not egoism? He uses it in the true sense, as being your own self which is not different from mine.

Chap.XIII. The whole of Prakriti disappears in Atman and therefore there is no such thing as matter.

"Know Me" as the Individual Lord is only for Baktas who are at an elementary stage whereas "Know Me" as both the unmoving as well as the movable, is for students of Gnana, the higher stage.

The reason why there are so many different yogas in Gita and ultimate truth only given at one place, is because only a few are fit for the latter. There are different grades of men, Krishna did not want to cause them misery by denying their God etc. So he gave the lower yoga to suit them. Hence it is our duty not to utter truth if it is likely to injure or discourage or bewilder those who hear it.

P.329."Objection" etc explains pundits miscomprehend our books. They put a wrong dualistic interpretation on them. They wrongly regard (a) Yoga as the means of realization, (b) the world (including the body) as other than themselves.

Chap.VII 77: The explanation of truth must include the external world, things as they are. This means one must not merely live in the physical world, but get into it, analyze it, and know the truth about it.

Chap.X v.10 God will never give you final liberation. His best reward to His devotees is buddhi--Yoga i.e. discriminative intelligence. When you have first rate intelligence of this sort, only then, says Krishna, can you come to Me.

Chap.XIII: is very important in Gita. The first thing that is known in this world is the body. That is the field, field of actions, karma etc., field in which you reap fruit of your actions.

We study in chap.XIII the objections also, in Sankara's commentary, in order to get rid of all doubts. Those who cannot think must be given revelation, others Reason.

The word "Kshetragna" in chap.XIII does not mean, as pundits say, the soul or the Lord, but it means "that which knows the body or world." ending jna= know. "Kshetra" similarly means "the body or the world."

Chap.XII: v.3-4 is mistranslated: The phrase "intent on the welfare of all beings" should really be "Who will always be engaged in doing something for the welfare of all beings." You will notice that the original meaning has been greatly diluted and weakened, being as different as doing from wishing. The mistake arises over the Sanskrit word under consideration "Rata."

CHAP. XIII 34 Without a knowledge of matter, realization is impossible: for it explains further on page 368 that matter is non-existent apart from mind. It is an idea. What is an idea? It is that which comes and goes out of the mind and disappears into me. Hence it is mind only.

Chap.XIII: "I am beyond Sat and Asat"--this is the paradox for "am": means existence i.e. Sat. It is solved because both existence and nonexistence are ideas, meanings, distinguished from each other, but Brahman is beyond all ideas. The very process of thinking involves these dualities, hence never touches Brahman.

Chap.XIII V.2 What is right knowledge? The knowledge of matter and mind is deemed as The Knowledge (Jnana). "How Gnana of matter is obtained? Through investigation into the real nature of the sense objects and by proper tests of truth." (Sankara's commentary.)

The 13th Chapter is the MOST important: Verses 11,16, IV 26, XIII,2, XVIII 63 are the best in Gita and Sankara's commentary.

Chap.XVIII 58. "Fixing the heart in Me, thou shalt by My Grace, cross over all difficulties, but if from Egotism thou wilt not hear (ME), thou shalt perish. This warning is intended for duffers.

Chap.XVIII 35: means "He who knows Brahman as the truth of himself and the world, automatically becomes it.

Chap.XVIII: 73: says that until Gnan dawns, there must be doubts. Doubt is good because it means that you are thinking. Doubts must come but they do so only after you have had sufficient disappointments in life. Such disappointment cannot arise to children, owing to lack of experience, but to adults who have tried one thing or other to get satisfaction or truth.

XVIII, 52: "Resorting to Buddhi-Yoga" (v.73) Arjuna declares "My mind is firm." Such firmness can only come through initiation into truth. It is unknown in Europe simply because Europe has not found the truth.

XVII.63: means after you get Gnan then you should act in this world. This means that nothing is equal to Truth which is the highest of all religious sacrifices. In ordinary religious sacrifices you merely prostrate the body whereas in Gnan you prostrate ego. Get rid of "I" & you=Brahman

Ignorant people say Vedanta is Indian Pantheism. They are all wrong.

The word "eternal" is meaningless.

The knowledge of Brahman is intended for all men. The man who frees from the world does not need it so much as the man who is in and suffering in the world.

The wise man is afraid of nothing, whereas the ignorant is afraid of death, loss of property, etc.

If you acknowledge a second thing, such as God, as superior to you, you can't get at Truth. Therefore, all religions that worship comes under this damnation. It doesn't mean worship is useless it means that it cannot give Truth.

People are under the false impression that intellect cannot grasp truth. The two things, knowing and becoming, are inseparable, and if you know Brahman (Reality) you must become it.

We need not say, "Why do we want knowledge? Is it of any use?" It is so plain. Why have other nations conquered India? Because they have more sense, more knowledge and reasoning. What enabled them to manufacture of superior arms? Knowledge!

The word Avidya frightens people. It is translated as Ignorance, but it simply means nothing more than that you imagine yourself to be the body. It means hence, "imagining things."

The word spiritual or soul is meaningless. It is only an idea after all. To get at the meaning of such words, there is no other way than this vichara.

All illustrations are taken from the external world, not consciousness. To talk of God making the world like a potter making a pot is children's arguments because you can see the pot and the potters but though you can see the world, no God is visible. It is ignorant to long for results of actions, i.e. possess attachment. We say only "figuratively" that a Sage abstains from action.

Chapter II, 63 shows that however perfectly you practice yoga, unless you add sharp reason--buddhi--you cannot get Gnan. This verse plainly says that Brahman is grasped by Buddhi. This verse explains the cause of all our country's troubles--ruined by lack of reasoning. The term "conscience" is mistranslated. The Sanskrit word is "Buddhi" i.e. Reason. Similarly the author has given 18 different translations of the word Buddhi--all wrong. "Discrimination" is sometimes given, but the proper word is Reason. Buddhi is that which distinguishes truth from falsehood.

Chapter II contains the line of thought that you can never understand what is meant by Maya unless you study external objects because "I show myself in both matter and the knower of matter." You must begin with the external world because it lies before you first. How can you understand the inner self correctly if the world which is in front of you is not correctly understood.

Chapter II Verse 49 says "Seek thou shelter in reason. It enjoins you to fall at the feet of Buddhi, i.e. not to pray to God but to prostrate before reason. Verse 50 says "He who is endowed with buddhi casts off shackles." The translator has wrongly interpreted the word "Buddhi" as meaning "Wisdom."

Chap.III.25 "The Gnani should work for the welfare of others" says Sankara the only difference is that he has no attachment.

In Chap.IV "For a doubter there is neither this world nor next" means once you begin to inquire you must pursue it to the end, never stop, or you will lose what you have and get nothing to replace it.

"I am the seer of all" means Atman is the common factor of all the 'I's.

Chap.IV "By long prostrations" the chela gets truth means constant, i.e. long killing of the ego it is not done in a single stroke, but long continued effort.

If we had not this world of evil, we would not think of overcoming it and making an effort to realize Atman. Gita teaches same lesson: Overcome evil, Arjuna, and help others to overcome; and don't sit quiet in a cave.

Make the world your laboratory and there test all statements by means of your observation and experiment, there verify if they be true or not. Those who do not understand this flee from the world, sit quiet in mystic mediation and delude themselves into belief that they are not acting! But the sage sees action in such pseudo-inaction, as Gita says. Knowledge must be brought to bear upon life in the world and is by the enlightened man.

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. (Note the word used by the translator "when wickedness prevails" is not correct, it should be intolerable.)

The upshot of the whole of the Gita—18 chapters-- is "go and work." Now that you have learnt the Truth or Philosophy "Do it." c.f. Gita 18th chap. verse 63. Nowhere it is said "Go and sit in the cave. Even if you have realized the Truth even then you must act much more, if you are ignorant. "including food, you must renounce --renouncing all."

If you will not recognize your identity with others Nature teaches you by sending you to death in war for others (the nation) and thus in course of times by repeated lives, leads you through suffering to learn to see your non-separateness, your unity. That is why Krishna took the opportunity of a battlefield, a place of intense suffering to give his teaching.

The Gnani can't do any harm. If he harms any, he harms himself. He cannot set a bad example to himself. Everything to be done must be done. Why should Sri Krishna use the word 'all' (Sarvam) always? The only business of the Gnani is to enable others to attain Gnan, to come to his level. There is nothing else for him to do--c.f. Gita. He must do such actions as others would copy and follow, which are likely to help the cognition of Brahman. i.e. "I am Brahman, have nothing to tain or attain, yet I always act, to set a good example." You must avoid such things as would cause harm, if copied by others. Let no wise man cause unsettlement in the minds of the ignorant. That is why a Gnani cannot be distinguished from others; because he would work with those who are ignorant, as if he is one among them.

"He has nothing to gain by activities in the world" does not mean he must sit quiet like Yogis and do nothing. The emphasis must be placed on the word "gain". It means that when you are active, you don't expect anything. Same teaching as Gita.

If you say the being engaged in work is of no use to the Gnani, what is the use of actionlessness to him? Your actions help in the realization of Atman, provided you seek truth. c.f. Gita: "He who sees action in inaction, and inaction in action." As duality may be perceived by the senses; but that does not affect the gnosis of the Gnani c.f. dream. When everything is known to be Brahman, how can the presence or absence of things affect you.

He only has renounced the world who knows that the world as an idea. This is the true teaching of the Gita.

The leaders and rulers must set an example of goodwill towards others: they must treat every one with samatva, equal-mindedness.(V,18)

Gita teaches "Do not go to this or that extreme, keep the mind balanced, (Samatva) and then only begin inquiry into truth through reason."

Each translator may interpret it according to his temperament. I know Mahadeva Sastri who translated your edition of Gita; he was a good man but a pundit who likes to sit quiet and practice meditation. He did not know Gnana and therefore incorrectly put a mystic meaning on many words.

People worship Me in various ways, not knowing the Truth. At different levels, at different epochs, in different lands, people have different conceptions of God. They have quarreled because they did not know the truth about God.

The conflict of opinions among mystics and religionists proves that all are imagining God as they like, not knowing God.

Understanding of this book is not so easy, unless you imagine like Pundits, or go in for your own "intuition-ism."

Why is the word Yoga used in so many different senses in the Gita? Because there are grades and the highest demands concentrated brains, not sitting mindless and imagining you are seeing God.

The earliest part of this book deals with religion, because it is for mentally immature persons, but in the latter part you get philosophy as that is intended for the intellectually evolved. You can't make all men into Bacons and Newtons, and therefore religion is provided for them.

Gita's lesson "Be not attached; then neither the good nor evil in life can affect you."

Gita has been interpreted in a thousand ways, according to the pundit's capacity to understand the test of all these is reason. Only a dozen men in India like Sankara, have understood Gita.

In the statement in Bhagavad Gita which says that the path of the Unmanifest is harder than others, this path means Gnan Yoga.

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."

Where Krishna promises reward to his devotees it means that each finds eventually what he seeks--not that each finds truth. According to their goal and efforts, they get rewards.

What is meant by non-attachment is taught here. That all the world is idea, so do not take it as real.

The Gnani does not rejoice--means that he does not see a second thing; he knows the rejoiced thing is not separate from him.

The Upanishads and Gita do not give detailed explanations because the knowledge of those days was not so advanced as it is nowadays. However there are odd words here and there which give hints. Science fills all these gaps and brings the old Vedanta up-to-date, otherwise it will die out. What was right for antiquity will not suit these scientific days.

Gita gives dualistic worship of "Me" only for the lower minds; it also teaches Advaita for the more evolved.

To see "Brahman in action" he must act. Therefore if he remains inactive in a cave can never see Brahman.

Krishna taught the Karma and Bhakti yogis their own paths only in order to lead them up to the Gnana yoga path, which is the highest and the real object of his teaching.

The true meaning of "kill doubt" is not to refrain from inquiry as Pundits, yogis and religionists say, but to tackle every doubt and to go on until you answer or solve it satisfactorily and thus the doubt disappears.

HIS HIGHNESS'S INTEREST IN LITERATURE

The late Maharaja of Mysore

"Be famous then
By wisdom
So let extend thy mind over all the world,
In knowledge."-----Milton.

Eminent men of acknowledged authority not only in India but also in Europe and America have described in appropriate terms the unique features of greatness in the life and actions of Sri Krishnaraja Wadiyar Bahadur IV of revered memory. Here we turn to those literary and intellectual interests in particular that molded the mind of His Highness, in later years. We shall begin with an event which will help us to get a glimpse of his enlightened mind from that angle. It is an incident which is without a parallel in the annals of the world's princes or kings. This great ruler of Mysore, after his European travels of 1936 seems to have had a fear that, in spite of the noble endeavors of the League of Nations which had at one time raised high hopes in him, civilized mankind might not be moving towards peace and concord. He felt that it was likely to find itself soon in the throes of some great suffering or struggle. Accordingly he took the earliest opportunity to drop a gentle, though indirect, hint to the cultured world at large. In 1937, he sent the following memorable message to the galaxy of thoughtful men and women that had gathered at the ninth International Congress of Philosophy, in Paris, from all parts of the globe.

"...Place before the Congress the goal of Truth of Indian Philosophy, the attainment of happiness of all beings, as enshrined in the great Sanskrit sayings "Sarve janah sukhino bhavantu" (May all human beings be happy) "Sarva Satwa sukho hitah." (which brings about the wellbeing of all that exists.)"

He did so because he believed that it is philosophy that is interested most in Truth, and that "That alone is Truth which is fraught with the greatest benefit to all beings" as is said in the Mahabharata. In a somewhat similar strain sings the Western poet Shelley also.

"There is one road
To peace, and that is Truth..."

And it has to be noted in passing that at that assemblage of the wise, the representative of Great Britain was the Rt.Hon.Viscount Samuel, President of the British Institute of Philosophy,

to whose estimate of the late Maharaja of Mysore, reference was made by the Wewan, Amin Ul Mulk Sir Mirza Mahomed Ismail, in his historical Dasara Address of 1940, after the passing away of His Highness as follows:

"The princes are few" Lord Samuel writes, "either in our day or in past history, who have used the opportunities of their position, as wisely and so well as he, or have conferred such great benefits on so vast a population."

The question now arises: What sort of culture helped to developed a head and heart so exceptional? Though such culture was naturally the outcome of his early studies in general as well as his varied experience in life, yet it is traceable in no small measure to his favorite literary pursuits in maturer years, a subject which specially interests us here. It is the latter that helped to set before him an ideal of human perfection which he ceaselessly strove to approach.

"Small minds inquire, 'Belongs this man
To our own race or class or clan'
But large hearted men embrace
As brothers all the human race."...Manu.

Confining ourselves to his studies in literature bearing on Arts in general, Religion, Science and Philosophy, we have to eschew Administration and Politics, though he kept himself in the closest touch with all modern publications of any importance in these departments also.

He took delight in reading the great classics not only of Sanskrit but also of Kannada and other languages. His Pandits initiated him into the poetry and drama of the past. He showed special fondness for portions of Mahabharata (Santi Parva in particular), Bhagavata, Ramayana and Vishnu Purana, all of which inspired him to emulate, as far as possible ancient emperors like Bali, Janaka and Rantideva, though Rama was an ideal for him. He sometimes ransacked old books and other materials to get a glimpse into medieval history, particularly of Mysore.

In European tongues, his studies were limited mostly to selections from famous men of letters, either in the original or in translations in the case of Greek, Latin, French and German authors. All the same he read a few at some length such for instance as Shakespeare's "Hamlet", Shelley's "Adonais", Wordsworth's "Ode on the Intimations of Immortality," Tennyson's "Morte de Arthur," Browning's "Sonnets." Occasionally he perused Emerson, Wells and Shaw. And just before he departed this world he wished to read in detail Milton's longer poems. But his wish could not be realized.

He was sometimes keen on knowing what historical writers like Macaulay, Gibbon and Lecky said on some important topics. And he could not ignore Wilke and Evans Bell who wrote about his own State.

He enjoyed in translations, the Persian Gulshan-i-raz, Gulistan, Masnavi and Rubaiyat.

In Indian Vernaculars, he found special delight in Anubhamrita, Dasara Pada, Vachanas besides numerous other subjects in Kannada, Jnaneswari and Dasbhodh (Maharatti), Tulsi Ramayan and Vichar Sagar (Hindi), Kural and Thayummanavar Padal (Tamil) Vemana and others Telgu - Sri Ramakrishna's and Sri Chaitanya's teachings (Bengali). He went into all these excepting Kannada, in translations of selected portions.

He sometimes diverted himself with works on Fine Arts also. But the only novel in which I ever found him interested in later years, was "The Garden of Vision" by Adams Beck, because of its references to modern science and Buddhism.

Turning next to religion, we find him devoting great attention to the sacred books not only of the Hindus (including their several sects and cults) but also of the Christians, the Muslims, the Jains, the Buddhists, and the Sikhs which were read by him in the original or in translations. This made him not only most tolerant of but also sincerely respectful to all faiths and creeds. Here I can do no better than quote the world-known Christian authority of Europe, Dr. Rudolf Otto who had visited Mysore and conversed with His Highness. In his book "India's religion of grace and Christianity compared" he says: "His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore..the

impartial protector and patron of all religions, communions, mine own as well, which enjoy undisturbed freedom, the unwearied promoter of science and culture, of economics and spiritual progress, in his glorious land."

Under religion, this royal seeker of wisdom, covered the grounds of theology (of various faiths) scholasticism (of different schools of Punditry), mysticism (of yoga, theosophy, Sufism, Bahaim, Christian Science, Plotinus and Meister Eckhart and others.) He was acquainted even with the thoughts of St. Anselm and St. Ignatius as well as the modern Dean Inge, Evelyn Underhill and Dr. Paul Brunton the well-known authority on Eastern mysticism.

In a word, his wide range only deepened his conviction in respect of the Truth taught by the Lord in the Gita:

"Howsoever men worship Me even so do I reward them. It is my path that men do follow in all ways."

"The same am I to all beings; to Me there is none hateful or dear, but whoso worship me with devotion, they are in me and I am also in them."

Had he been spared a year or two more the world would probably have witnessed this conviction of his being manifested in a material form, which would have served constantly to remind mankind of the need for a "fellowship of all faiths" as well as the need for ascertaining the meaning of life or existence.

His passion for Modern Science is noteworthy. He not only read Jeans, Eddington, Max Planck, Heisenberg, Einstein, Raman, Huxley, Jung, Macdougall, Hart, Thomson, Keith and others, but even wished to meet as many of them as possible. In 1938 Jeans and Eddington visited Mysore. But it must be borne in mind that he loved science not with a view to ascertaining how poison gas or aerial bombs and other lethal weapons could be manufactured, but to see how far and in what way scientific knowledge could help social progress, and harmony, the alleviation of not only the sufferings of the body but also the sorrows of the heart. Nor did he ignore its supreme value as a means "for man's fearless quest of Truth."

He remembered what Jeans said in 1934 "The country which called a halt to scientific progress would soon fall behind in every other respect as well--in its industry, in its economic position, in its naval and military defenses, and not the least important in its culture."

What however made a deep impression on his mind were the words of Goethe:

"Be but contemptuous of reason and science, the highest gifts of man, and you have given over to Satan and must perish."

The reader will be most interested in this connection to know that His Highness, out of love for the Pundits whose worth he highly appreciated, deputed one of them, in 1940, to acquire some elements of scientific knowledge, so that he could spread the same among them. For, he thought that their ignorance in this respect was an obstacle to India's progress. Above all, he keenly felt that that feature of scientific knowledge that made the pursuit of "truth" its highest aim laid the best foundation for philosophy.

His Highness believed that real Philosophy did not consist in mere speculation, in "spinning yarns out of one's own brains" about the unknown or the unknowable, though such yarns or speculations to effectively influence man's life. One could guess what philosophy meant for him, from the observation he made to Swami Siddheswaranandji at Kemmangandi. He said that philosophy is knowledge of the whole of existence, of both "kshethra" and "kshetrajna", matter and mind or spirit, i.e. of Science and Religion with Art combined. His conviction evidently was that there can be no philosophy without science. It is religion and Art that can exist independently of scientific knowledge.

To him a philosopher was not one that sought the aid of the "Theatre, the Cave and the Cot" as Bacon put it, but one whose wisdom enabled him to pursue Truth at any cost and who in the words of the Gita "is most actively engaged in seeking the welfare of all beings." (Sarva Bhuta Hite Ratah) or in the words of Vivekachudamani "who voluntarily seeks to relieve the

sufferings of all living beings" (Parasrama apanoda pravanam) and that here, not in worlds elsewhere after death. Hence, we find him resorting so frequently to the study of philosophy.

Among modern Western writers, he was familiar with Thilly, Paulsen and Patrick. Among ancient philosophers he highly admired Plato, Socrates, Parmenides and Lucretius of Greece. The later thinkers that he liked most were Descartes, Kant, Schopenhauer, Comte, Herbert Spencer, Whitehead and Bergson with some of the views of the last one he was specially charmed and whom he even wished to meet, if possible. His regard was indeed high for Max Muller and Deussen. A marble bust of the latter is to be found at the Jagan Mohan Palace. Viscount Samuel visited Mysore in 1938 and his Highness read with high appreciation his book "Belief and Action" The well-known English philosopher J.S. Mackenzie was not only invited to lecture in Mysore but also to meet his Highness. Mackenzie dedicated his widely known book on "Ultimate Values" to the Maharaja. There he writes about his own "Admiration of His Highness's enlightened policy in diffusing knowledge among his people and his profound interest in philosophy."

His Highness held in great esteem the famous Emperor Marcus Aurelius whose "Meditations" he read and re-read (in translation). The distinguished Indian authority Sir S. Radhakrishnan who knew the Maharaja refers to him as the "philosopher king" by which appellation Marcus Aurelius is often referred to by Western thinkers.

When all this is known, no one would be surprised to learn that this distinguished ruler had developed so great a passion for the study of the philosophy of India itself. He knew by heart the whole of the Bhagavad Gita. The Pundits had explained to him several of its interpretations. He had carefully studied the ten Upanishads, particularly the Brihadaranyaka and the Mandukya with Gaudapada's Karikas and the commentaries of Sankara. The supreme importance of the last will be realized which it is noted that the Muktikopanishad says "If the object be the attainment of the highest truth, the supreme goal of existence the single Upanishad of Mandukya is sufficient." This classical work was translated by Swami Nikhilananda of America who was in Mysore for a time, and who refers in his work to His Highness's "undeviating steadfastness in the pursuit of Truth, wherever found: in Art, Religion, Science, or Philosophy."

Besides these, the Maharaja read Sruti Gita, Anu Gita, Aila Gita, Uddhava's Dialogue. What however he loved most was Ashtavakra Gita or Samhita, the translation of which by Swami Nityaswarupananda was more than once published in Mysore as desired by His Highness, for special distribution. His great regard for it may be best realized from the fact that he had it read even to his revered mother, the Late Maharani Regent.

Among the modern presentations of Ancient Hindu philosophic thoughts, those of Sri Ramakrishna, and particularly of Swami Vivekananda had great attraction for him, as they had for his royal and revered father Sri Chamarajendra Wadiyar.

It is not the mere reading of philosophical literature that gave him satisfaction. Like the great emperors of old, Janaka and Ajata Satru, he occasionally sought the benefit of listening in his own palace to discussions by distinguished scholars. One such was arranged when the Lingayat Swami Dharmanidhi Vedathirtha Viroopaksha Wadiar of Chaudaramput (Bombay) visited Mysore in 1924. Another was held later in the same year when Maha Mahopadhyaya Vedanta Visarada Virupaksha Sastri (subsequently Swami of Kudli) visited His Highness. He was very keen on listening to similar discussions between representatives of all religious systems or schools of thought. But he passed away before they could materialize.

To add to this, his extensive travels gave him numberless opportunities to meet and have talks on such matters with Pundits, Scholars, Professors and men of culture in various parts of India, nay even on board the ship during his European voyage. This made him an expert judge of men and their worth in the world of learning and wisdom. It is not possible to state the names or all the articles, booklets and other publications on various subjects which he read almost everyday. He sometimes diverted himself by means of talks with those near him on topics arising

out of what he studied. The last reference of this kind was made at Kemangandi, his favorite mountain resort, in May 1940, to the following passage from the Mahabharata:

"He is the best of rulers whose conduct is applauded after his death."

And who could have then thought that this had any personal significance?

Above all, the greatest feature of this historical Ruler's culture is that very few know how vast and deep his learning or thinking was. He remained silent and often appeared to be ignorant, unless forced to speak out his mind in regard to any subject. He gave everyone his ear, but few his voice! He was like unto a vessel full to the brim.

Here was

"One who to all heights of learning bred

Read books and men, and practiced what he read." ... Stepney.

And is he dead?

"To live in the hearts we leave behind"

Is not to die." ... Campbell.

WORSHIP OF BALI, ONE OF INDIA'S SEVEN IMMORTALS.

(Published in "Illustrated Weekly "Bombay 1930.)

The day after the new-moon immediately following the well-known Hindu festival of "Deepavali" or "Divali" which generally falls in October is an occasion of much rejoicing in this country. Balipadyami, as the day is called, is sacred to the memory of one of India's king-philosophers of the remote past, who is reckoned among her seven Chiranjeevis, her seven Immortals. In many a Hindu home not a day passes without some thought of all the seven or at least some of them. The custom of making seven dots on the body before a bath, naming the Immortals, still obtains in the south. And the blessings of these great ones are sought in various ways in several parts of India by all classes of Hindus. This illustrious group of seven consists of Hanuman, Vibhishana, Vyasa, Bali, Aswathama, Kripa, and Parasurama.

Of them Hanuman alone enjoys the unique honor of having temples dedicated to him and being worshipped throughout the land, from Kasi to Rameswaram. Vyasa and Bali, however, have each the distinction of a special day of observance in the Hindu calendar. The rest are remembered only as occasion arises. And the practice has grown up of all communities honoring or worshipping the Immortals alike. For the seven are not confined to any particular caste or race. Hanuman was a non-Aryan of the Vanara tribe. Vibhishana belonged to the Rakshasas. Vyasa was the son of a fisher-woman. To the Asuras belonged Bali. The rest were Brahmanas.

The trinity, Hanuman, Vyasa, and Bali have another mark of distinction. Lord Vishnu, according to the Puranas, is said to have declared that they are his own special manifestations. They have, therefore, found a most congenial home in God-fearing Mysore. We are here concerned only with the last, whose annual puja (worship) was performed recently. Beyond what is contained in the Puranas little of historical value is known about Bali Chakravarti (Emperor). Whatever the archaeologists may say, people still persist in pointing to the highly interesting ruins of Mahabalipuram on the East Coast, not very far from Madras, as the sites where once flourished Bali's glorious capital. Though the Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India hold that it is the "local tradition" that is responsible for the ambition of substituting "Mahabali" for "Mamalla" of the Pallavas, to whom the town owes its name, yet later epigraphical investigation seems to point to the fact that the Bana kings, a branch of the Pallavas, who exercised sway over a great part of Mysore besides Southern India, bore as their cognomen the name Bali, or Mahabali, and claimed descent from the great Bali Chakravarti. His kingdom appears to have extended beyond the Peninsula of India; nay, even beyond the seas, as has been guessed by some authorities from the name "Bali" which is a big island in the Eastern or Malaya Archipelago still bears. And it should not be forgotten that at, or before, the time of the Pallavas

the Hindus had, as it is said, carried their civilization to Java, Borneo, Sumatra, and even far-off Mexico. Though the Puranas say that Bali Chakravarti had conquered the whole worlds and that by the most righteous means, it may be fairly presumed that his must have been the most extensive empire of his day. As a ruler he had neither equal nor superior.

VISHNU AS A DWARF. It was believed that there was only one higher than Bali, and that was God Vishnu, who with a view to consoling the ex-Emperor of Swarga (Tibet), which Bali had conquered, had to deprive him of it by what is said to be an "honorable" stratagem. For Bali as the most righteous and the most spiritual of kings was otherwise invincible. The story runs that Vishnu came to him in the guise of a dwarf begging for three feet of land which the king granted as he had vowed that he would not say no to any one that asked a favor of him. Further Bali pressed the beggar to ask for more, as three feet of land was too small a gift for an emperor like him to bestow. But the dwarf would not change his mind. All the same, the instant the grant was made the dwarf grow so big that with one foot he covered the whole of the celestial regions and with another measured the whole of Bali's earthly kingdom, and asked him to show where to plant the third step. Bali undaunted, and despite the persuasions of even Vishnu Himself to retract his promise, bowed pointing to his own head. On it the changed dwarf placed his foot again, pushing him to another region, Sutala. Vishnu, however, in appreciation of Bali's heroic righteousness, blessed him with a vast empire overflowing with wealth in silver and gold, assuring him that he would ever be at his beck and call and that he would, on the retirement of the then ruling Indra, make Bali again the Lord of Swarga.

As the available inscriptions show, Bali's descendants, the Bans kings, ruled over parts of Mysore for nearly a thousand years, from the beginning of the Christian era. Their capital was near Bowringpet, about the region of the famous Kolar Gold Mines. The City of Mysore formed part of their dominions.

A FAIRYLAND OF LIGHTS. It is to honor the memory of such a personality that an annual worship is conducted and a Durbar held in the Palace at Mysore. On Balipadyami, the ceremony commences at about 8 p.m. The whole pile of buildings is aglow with a myriad of brilliant lights. The hall of worship is strewn all over with flowers. The image of Bali is placed on the very Bhadrāsana on which the Maharaja sits during his own Birthday Durbars and on other important occasions. On this occasion, however the Maharaja takes a lowly seat. Select music is played. State officials, royal relations, pandits and priests throng the hall. In their presence the Maharaja standing and arranged appropriately, makes the puja. For by the side of Balindra stands an image of Vishnu, as though in fulfillment of His promise to be ever at the beck and call of the righteous. At the conclusion of the puja, the Maharaja and those present make a bow of homage to this most spiritual of old Hindu emperors.

To His Highness Sri Krishnarajendra Wadiyar IV, however belongs the distinction of having given to this time-honoured Durbar of Balindra a setting of magnificence worthy of an ideal Hindu sovereign. The scene of the grand function is now the hall of the newly constructed Amba Viles, a veritable poem, of gold and silver, of ivory and sandalwood, of glass and steel, which eastern imagination and western art and craftsmanship have striven to produce. Exquisite mosaics from Europe blend in perfect harmony with the choice floral designs by Indian artists. Gazing at the colored rays falling through the fretted vault, one cannot help recalling the famous simile of the poet:

“Life, like a dome of many colored glass
Stains the white radiance of Eternity.”

The ceremony witnessed on this day is a most solemn, inspiring and impressive one. It is best calculated to bring home to lay minds the central fact underlying the Upanishadic verse:

"Isavasyamidam sarvam yat kinch jagatyam jaget, Tena tyaktena bhunjitha magridhah kasya sviddhanam.

"By the Lord (Isa) enveloped must this all be
 Whatever moving thing there is in the moving world.
 With this renounced, thou mayest enjoy.
 Covet not the wealth of any one at all."

As the equally philosophic queen of the immortal Bali put it, his life should remind all men, including the richest and mightiest of emperors like him, that it is the Lord that bestows on all men whatever they possess and that nothing can be called one's own.

(7) RALPH BARTON PERRY:LECTURES:

"Philosophy is opposed to common sense, then, in so far as common sense is habitual and imitative. But there are other characteristics of common sense with which the true genius of philosophy is out of accord. We can discover these best by considering the terms of praise or blame which are employed in behalf of commonsense. When ideas are condemned as contrary to common-sense, what is ordinarily said of them? I find three favorite forms of condemnation; ideas are pronounced "unpractical", "too general" or "intangible." Any man of common sense feels these to be terms of reproach. It is implied, of course, that to be agreeable to common sense, ideas must be "practical", "particular" and "tangible." And it is the office of philosophy, as corrective of common sense, to show that such judgments actual and implied, cannot be accepted as final. It is out of place in the office, or in business hours. What, then, is to be said for it? The answer, of course, is this: It is important not only to be moving, but to be moving in the right direction; not only to be doing something well, but to be doing something worthwhile. This is evidently true, but it is easily forgotten. Hence it becomes the duty of philosophy to remind men of it; to persuade men occasionally to reflect on their ends, and reconsider their whole way of life. To have a philosophy of life, is to have reasons not only for the means you have selected, but for what you propose to accomplish by them.

But the generalizing propensity of mind must be held in restraint; after a certain point it becomes absurd, fantastic, out of touch with fact, "up in the clouds." The man of common senses planted firmly on the solid ground, views such speculations with contempt, amusement, or with blank amazement.

Philosophy offends against common sense then, not because it generalizes, for, after all, no one can think at all without generalizing; but because it does not know when to stop. And the philosopher is bound to offend, because if he is true to his calling, he must not stop. It is his particular business to generalize as far as he can.

In the historic role of philosophy, the scientific factor, the element of correctness, of verifiable applicability, has a place, but it is a negative one. The meanings delivered by confirmed observation experimentation, and calculation, scientific facts and principles, in other words, serve as tests of the values which tradition transmits and for those which emotion suggests. Whatever is not compatible with them must be eliminated in any sincere philosophizing. This fact confers upon scientific knowledge an incalculably important office in philosophy. But the criterion is negative; the exclusion of the inconsistent is far from being identical with a positive test which demands that only which has been scientifically verifiable supply the entire content of philosophy. It is the difference between imagination that acknowledges responsibility to logical compatibility with demands of ascertained facts, and a complete abdication of all imagination in behalf of a prosy literalism."

BASIC HINDU CLASSIFICATION: MATAM & TATVAM	HINDU EQUIVALENTS	WESTERN EQUIVALENTS.	EXPLANATIONS
---	----------------------	-------------------------	--------------

<p>Matam Knowledge Personal or opinion leading to Paroksha Jnan</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>LINK</u></p> <p>Between Matam and Tatvam. Verified knowledge (Sectional or compartmental</p> <p>TATVAM (Verified knowledge: Universal Aparoksha Jnan.</p>	<p>1.Karma,Mantra Yaga, Yajna, Puja Japa (including physical & mental discipline.) Mudha bhakti. 2. Sruti, Pandityam & Thapas.</p> <p>3.Pandityam including ancient Sastras, Tarka, Samkhya disciplines to support Karmas & belief Bhakti</p> <p>4.Yoga: different kinds: Maunam etc. Dhyana, Upasana & Para Bhakti.</p> <p>5.Tatva Vichar (first_stage Prakriti or Kshetra yichar-various Sastras: sectional Tattvas.</p> <p>6.Tatva Vichar. (final stage “Sarve” Vichar. Kevala Tatva Jnan.</p>	<p>Religion. (<u>Creed</u>)</p> <p>Theology & First stages of Mysticism.</p> <p>Scholasticism.</p> <p>"Mysticism at its height</p> <p>Science (Physical, mental, political, ethical, Historical, sociological and so forth</p> <p>Philosophy (Creedlessness)</p>	<p>Beliefs: magical & Spiritual with corresponding actions based on scriptures etc. Worship Ritual Faith etc. which imply certain mental & physical discipline Authority, Revelation or scripture supporting spiritual, belief, faith, creed, ritual etc.</p> <p>Argument & interpretation with help of logic, grammar etc.to support beliefs, revelations, prayers etc. Also dogmas, theological or other based on authorities.</p> <p>Practical, individual or pri- vate realization of beliefs <u>without argument</u> and interpretation by means of "ecstasies", "visions" & "intuitions" Meditation.</p> <p><u>Rational</u> or <u>public</u> inquiry regarding the value of the 4 previous steps, beliefs & opinion & into Truth in particular fields of knowledge Mental, physical or social. Science may begin at any stage.</p> <p>Rational evaluation and explanation of all knowledge, life and experience of all in general with a view to attain the highest truth of all existence.</p>
---	---	--	---

The Above are SIX NATURAL STEPS LEADING TO PHILOSOPHY
 (NON-COMPARTMENTAL TRUTH)
 (Meaning of philosophy based on comparative study or inquiry)

EXPLANATION OF THE FOREGOING TABLE.

All the stages or steps are continuous, each growing out of the preceding one. Since every kind of knowledge or experience is leading to "philosophy" each of the subjects Religion, Theology, Scholasticism, Mysticism, Metaphysics and Science, physical, mental or social, is thought by many to be philosophy. But the fact is that philosophy comprehends all of them and is not confined to or exclusively dependent on any one of them, apart from the rest. The entire life or field of existence is its concern. It seeks the meaning of all that is known.

Stages in the pursuit of Truth: The human mind learns from experience that it is ever liable to err, which leads to disappointment and suffering. It naturally, therefore seeks to avoid a repetition of error. In other words, it is said to make efforts at seeking truth or freedom from error. Even lower animals--the lowest creatures such as worms also,--seem to follow a similar course of trials. Though man is able to exercise his reason, yet he does not get to a stage at which there can be no disappointment or suffering. He has to make his "trials" as often as is necessary.

But the pity of it is that he does not realize that he has not attained truth, unless doubt arises as a result of disappointments or sufferings, of his own or of others. This has led to different attitudes:

First, that whatever one thinks or feels or whatever agrees with what one thinks or feels is truth, and that especially in regard to matters unseen or unknown (as in religion and the like).

Secondly, that truth, as something definite or precise, is unattainable (as in science or speculative philosophy).

In practical life, however most men seem to act on the principle that what "works" or "satisfies" for the time being is truth. But great differences have arisen among those whose brains are active and sharp, as to what is truth, what its tests are, what is meant by verification of truth and whether truth can be changeless and so forth. Into these discussions we shall not enter here. We are concerned now only to note the stages or phases through which human efforts have passed, and do pass even now, in seeking truth, so far as history reveals them. Such stages have been noticed and recorded in the earliest philosophical works such as the Upanishads, particularly the Brihadaranyaka and continued to the latest times by modern thinkers, scientists and philosophers. Only the unthinking or the mentally defective were not and are not worried about such matters, unless repeated suffering woke or awakes them. Here are the stages as indicated in ancient Hindu literature as well as in Modern thought, so far as the pursuit of universal or non-compartmental truth or philosophy, as it is called, is concerned.

Of all the attitudes towards Truth, that which finally relies upon Intuition or Mystic experience, appeals to the largest number, including even some of the most cultured. It eliminates exertion. It wants no rituals, ceremonies or prayers, all of which mean physical effort or money or, both. It dispenses with the exercise of intellect, of study, interpretation, argumentation and taxing invention of long phrases and novel terms. It assures complete relief from the worry of applying rigorous reasoning to dispassionate investigations, which appear to be endless, in as much as fresh inquiries often modify or supersede old pet views. Lastly, this attitude has the supreme advantage of giving every believer in it, the satisfaction that comes from the thought that what is possible to know of truth is what one knows.

It has another attraction. It is most consolatory to all such men and women as have met with disappointments and misfortunes in life, which therefore often becomes even unbearable to them. They want rest or quietness. But the largest number that seek refuge in it are either those whose intelligence is either of a primitive type or though of a high order, yet feels exhausted in

its scientific or speculative adventures. It has therefore been aptly termed "Escapism" by Western thinkers.

Above all, as a professional attitude it is valued by many. Those that have recourse to it could easily pose themselves as the highest authorities or guides and could even claim omniscience as they do in some countries. For it frees one from all fears of refutation. So, it comes in most handy to anyone. As the saying goes "Every fool has greater fools to admire." And it is the crowd that mesmerizes the majority. It brings fame and following as well as gold.

A little thought will show that such Mystics or Intuitionists have proved themselves completely helpless in times--not of individual or private distress out--of public or general suffering or calamities such as wars, pestilences, plagues, earthquakes, floods and the like, when effective deterrents are most needed. It is these that test the truth of the knowledge of such men. And in the absence of such "verificatory" proof no experience or knowledge can be held to be truth. "Self-satisfaction" is no test of Truth. "Plato dissatisfied is better than pig satisfied."

Those that are on the highroad to Truth tire therefore the scientists, for, they seek to "depersonalize" or eliminate the "self" i.e. personal individual considerations, as far as possible. But even they unconsciously lose their way when the "self" asserts itself as, the "ego-complex" unperceived. The few that diligently watch the "self" and keep it completely under control become not the plentiful bogus but the few true philosophers.

In what way the "self" or the "ego" bedims one's vision or beclouds truth, is a matter too long to be pursued in this short paper, though it is the most vital part of philosophic inquiry.

LETTER TO G.R. MAKANI on his book THE PROBLEM OF NOTHING: This is the first piece of evidence that the Institute of Philosophy at Amalner, has given to the public, of its work in the field of Research. You have tackled one of the most interesting problems of metaphysics, which owes its modern importance and prominence chiefly to Bergson. To the student of Hindu philosophy the subject is as old as the hills. But this is first attempt made at a coordination of some of the eastern and western thoughts bearing on the subject. You have displayed considerable ability in showing how Advaitism not only agrees with the views of one or the well-known modern philosophers of the West but also "goes beyond" and you are right when you hold that the problem of "Nothing" is only the problem of "Reality" viewed from another standpoint. You base your arguments upon the central Vedantic doctrine, the one distinguishing feature of Vedanta, viz. the metaphysic of the Three States, to which Europe is yet a perfect stranger. You have therefore rendered no small service by drawing attention to it. But it must be pointed out that your approach to the subject is not likely to carry conviction readily to Western minds or to such Eastern minds as have been trained on Western lines. If you have pointed out the logical basis and the metaphysical value of this Vedantic doctrine before applying it to this particular problem, you would have succeeded much better. Your reflections on "Zero" though thoughtful and original, suffer by being presented in what will certainly be taken to be a dogmatic form.

.....This attempt brings out one of the distinguishing features of Vedanta but also some of its problems dealt with in European philosophy

(17) MAHABHARATA : (a) "Dharma varies from yuga to yuga." (Santi Parva).

(b) "Everything has not been laid down in the Srutis...The examination of the good is also Dharma." (Santi Parva)

(c) "It is only duties that are consistent with reason that are always observed by those that are good and wise." (Moksha Dharma Parva).

(d) "Duties have been laid down for the respective ages according to the capacities of human beings in the respective ages (time). When, therefore, all the declarations of the Vedas do not apply equally to till the ages, the saying that the declaration of the Vedas hold good always (are

true) is only a popular form of speech indulged in for popular satisfaction." (Moksha Dharma Parva).

(e) "That is Dharma that is capable of supporting or prohibiting all creatures." (Santi Parva, Raja Dharma)

(f) "Ranti Deva..who is equal to Mahadeva himself should be named every day." (Anusasina Parva)

(g) "Only such as advance the interests of ALL the people equally should be made to live in the State." (Santi Parva).

(2) JOHN LEWIS "INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY":

"The mystic is a person who sees everything from the standpoint of the Absolute, and is therefore at peace already. He has transcended the illusion of evil. The dangerous thing about this argument is that it is compatible with any set of facts, since it is not an induction from those facts. It is, therefore, the very antithesis of honest reasoning, and a piece of presumptuous dogmatism. It is the theory that underlies Christian Science, Theosophy, Hinduism, and most forms of mysticism. Its popularity is to be explained more by psychological than philosophical reasons. It is designed to reconcile people to evils instead of to encourage them to combat them. It is the escape mechanism of the despairing, the helpless and the lazy. For the tyrant it is the justification of the evils by which he profits and which he does not intend to prove. The theoretical arguments would seem to be more rationalization of a convenient myth than an honest and irresistible train of reasoning."

LETTER TO Mr. HOOPER: According to Vedanta the three most fundamental points to be considered before any such philosophic inquiry is made are: (1) What is meant by truth and what are its tests? If this is not settled every one in this world will hold that what pleases him most is the 'truth' or perfectly valid and discussion becomes useless.(2) How we get at the meaning of the terms, 'real' or 'ideal' sleep, waking and dream (3) In philosophy neither lecturers, nor theses, not even books are of any avail in attaining truth. It is only personal discussions by such as have an irrepressible passion for truth, that can be of value. We want men of Socrates' temperament in this respect. In Europe there are as many philosophies of truth as there are thinkers. We consider all these philosophies to be no more than opinion not truth. In India philosophy seeks the common ground of Truth. In Europe (and also in India) many men have discussed ad infinitum such subjects without defining truth and nowhere have they come nearer to any agreement. I have just read the two articles on Realism in the last issue of "Philosophy". Both of them labor under the disadvantages indicated above. From the letters I have been receiving from England, I infer that Europe is not in a mood to seek Truth now. It seems to think that what it knows is all the Truth that it needs. It does not care for any inquiry regarding Truth. To such a mentality I cannot say anything more than this: More experience and more struggles and wars will positively make Europe seek Truth further, i.e, the higher reaches of Truth. Truth is never in a hurry to reveal itself. Europe does not seem to think that philosophy is not mere intellectual abstraction, but the most vital of all human achievements.

LETTER TO SIR J. JEANS: I want to know satisfaction other than that of seeing your outlook on life, as a result of your invaluable achievements in the world of science, being far more widely accepted than at present. For I am perfectly convinced that Truths of this kind alone and nothing else, can allay the unhappy restlessness so characteristic of Europe at present, and the want of internal peace of mind that men in America and elsewhere are manifesting. I fear that the hostile criticisms of other scientists whose philosophical insight is limited, might be an obstacle. But the experience that India has gained though at least five thousand years old, goes to show that you are nearer than they to the Truth of Perfection which alone can lead to the good of

mankind in general. Europe is under the impression that India has made only some religious or mystical guesses at Truth in as much as her past scientific attainments are of a primitive character. Be that as it may, her method has been, however, as scientifically accurate as you could wish. I am not interested in the technique of science, though I was a Professor of Science when I was young. At 70 I feel interested only in the subject of man's outlook on life from the remarkable point of view of the scientific results you have achieved.

SELECTED AND APPROVED EXCERPTS:

(2) "The Hindu mystic insists that only the Atman (the self) truly exists and all the rest is illusion. But his vehemence in rejecting his critic's view that there is no illusion shows that the reality of illusion as opposed to the Atman is a necessary part of his view. The monism is verbal."--COHEN AND NAGEL: "INTRODUCTION TO LOGIC AND SCIENTIFIC METHOD."

(2) "To have a settled opinion disturbed, pulls up our moorings; we have to start all over again. And so we hate the man who disturbs those settled opinions. If you do not believe it, watch your feelings the next time some one proves to you the theory you have so carefully cultivated in the garden of your mind, watering and weeding it, is rubbish; note how you feel when he tramples on it ruthlessly. He has done you a service; put you on the track of truth. Are you really grateful? Or, do you want to slap him?"--NORMAN ANGELL: "THE UNSEEN ASSASSINS."

(5) "No man can learn what he has not the preparation for learning, however near to his eyes is the object. A chemist may tell his most precious secrets to a carpenter, and he shall be never the wiser--the secrets he would not utter to a chemist for an estate." --EMERSON.

(6) "Mystics, intuitionists, authoritarians, voluntarists, and fictionalists are all trying to undermine respect for the rational methods of science. These attacks have always met with wide acclaim and are bound to continue to do so, for they strike a responsive note in human nature. Unfortunately they do not offer any reliable alternative method for obtaining verifiable knowledge."

Scientific method is the only effective way of strengthening the love of truth. It develops the intellectual courage to face difficulties and to overcome illusions that are pleasant temporarily but destructive ultimately. It settles differences without any external force by appealing to our common rational nature. The way of science, even if it is up a steep mountain, is open to all. Hence, while sectarian and partisan faiths are based on personal choice or temperament and divide men, scientific procedure unites men in something nobly devoid of all pettiness. Because it requires detachment, disinterestedness, it is the finest flower and test of a liberal civilization."--COHEN AND NAGEL: "AN INTRODUCTION TO LOGIC AND SCIENTIFIC METHOD."

(6) "Be ready first to do that which Reason, the king and law-giver, suggests."--MARCUS AURELIUS

(6) "he (Atman) is seen with Buddhi (reason)" --KATHA UPANISHAD.

(6) "Seek thy refuge in buddhi (reason). What is beyond the reach of the senses is Buddhigrahyam (known by reason).

(7) "The philosopher should be a man willing to listen to every suggestion, but determined to judge for himself. He should not be biased by appearances; have no favorite hypothesis; be of no school; and in doctrines have no masters. He should not be a respecter of persons, but of things. Truth should be his primary object. If to these qualities be added industry he may indeed hope to walk within the veil of the temple of Nature." --FARADAY: "DISCOVERY: SPIRIT AND SERVICE OF SCIENCE."

LETTERS TO P.B.

"I am really very sorry to learn from your last letter that Mrs.B's affair has not been as yet settled. Some of the best years of your life are being wasted in connection with such matters. What a pity! You could have turned your hands to most valuable work--work that would have brought peace and solace to thousands of unhappy hearts.

2. The most fundamental point to be dealt with in the book you are about to write is this how do you know that your thoughts, feelings, intuitions, experiences of any kind, lead you to truth or reveal the truth? Till this is answered all that you think or may say is more 'opinion' but not philosophy or true knowledge, which alone is called Jnan. First you must make clear the meaning and then discuss the tests of Truth. These must be universal; otherwise they may be self-delusions. Any man can say that he has seen the truth and that he has intuitively perceived it. Such intuitions have absolutely no value as Truth.

3. One must make sure that one is not carried away by what pleases or satisfies one. If, on the high seas, you are sailing on a dark night, how do you know that you are going east or west, north or south unless you have something to guide you like the pole star or something like it? The pole star in this inquiry, is "Truth." Unless you define it, all that you say will at best be only your opinion, and will have no bearing on jnan or true philosophy or true knowledge.

4. What is called philosophy in Europe is only 'opinion' from the point of view of truth or Jnan. I know only three great men that realized this situation. They are Descartes, Spinoza and Kant. But they could not proceed to the end of their inquiry. India alone has done it. If one appeals to individual experiences, one has to prove that they are not self-delusions, hallucinations or errors of judgment.

Merely because a number of persons of the same temperament agree, it is no proof of the truth character of such experiences. A million drunkards cannot testify to the experiences of a teetotaler.

5. Then the question of the degrees of approach to truth and of universality have to be pointed out and discussed. Please get a copy of Paul Deussen's Elements of Metaphysics published by Messrs. Macmillan & Co. London and go through the last chapter (lecture on Vedanta) first and then the whole book. It is the best book yet written on the subject from the Western standpoint, or read Vivekachudamani and Bhagavad Gita Chapter XIII thoroughly. In the latter you get the true meaning of Jnan.

6. I am really very sorry that the other matter is still undisposed of. Had it been settled that would have helped you to devote the best of your life to the noblest work you have in view in this birth.

7. I am very anxious that you should write and publish something to soften the hearts of men in Europe. It is most painful to see how women and children, not to say men are undergoing in human and indescribable suffering. This is not the time for thoughtful people to enter caves and hide themselves on mountains to seek their own peace or communion with the Reality and confining this bliss to their individual self.

8. I trust that our American brethren will seek that aspect of the Truth of Vedanta which says that each of us is the All. Vide Vivekachudamani stanza 38 or Brih. Up. page 656. This is a fact that can be demonstrated as a proposition in geometry to those that care for Truth. But it cannot be proved to those that seek only self-satisfaction or peace within themselves, for this they have only to go to yoga.

9. My joy knows no bounds to learn that you have been finally set free, so that now you can devote the whole of your thought and all your energies to carrying on your divine mission, that of enlightening humanity at large. May all success be to you!

10. I am exceedingly sorry to learn that matters have taken such an unpleasant and undesirable turn at Tiravannamalai. But you must do your best for that great soul the Maharishi, one of the greatest men of the world,--a true incarnation of Spiritual Purity. It is natural that great men

should be misunderstood and ever persecuted at times. But men like you that understand him, should help to find him a quieter place, where he could be a spiritual guide, to thousands that seek his help.

11. Kindly read "Sayings of Sri Ramakrishna" (The Madras Math Edition) page 291, saying 930. re. yogic samadhi, Bhakti (religious devotion) etc. But this is meant only for the few cultured men like Swami Vivekananda.

12. As for the opinions about your books pray do not pay much attention to them. Sri Ramakrishna says "What does a brinjal (vegetable) seller know of the price of a diamond?" Why should we ask men of religion what they think of philosophy?

13. The Statesman of Calcutta has done no little harm in this matter, in Bengal, particularly. To add to it the people there are more emotional and religious than in other parts of India.

"whomsoever speaketh the truth to the unprepared is a liar in his own despite." says the well known English proverb. It is a mistake to send every book to every journal.

Pray remember Ashtavakra always.

14. As you say in your kind letter of May 20, the news from Europe is bad--rather very bad. The law of Karma can never be evaded by anybody unless one realizes the Truth. But truth--I mean the truth of oneness is not in the least cared for by anybody in power in the world. We must reap what we sow. So long as the faith in duality grips the human mind, so long will there be this hatred and this bloodshed,--not one man nation, and then, another man or nation delighting in the deluges of human blood.

So far as we are concerned, the present situation has disillusioned men's minds about religion and yoga. Hinduism, Christianity, Mahomedanism and Buddhism, have all been tested in our day and they have not been able to prevent or check war jointly or severally. Nor have all the yogis been able to do one iota of good to the suffering humanity anywhere, though individuals here and there, have fallen into the traps of self-delusion, who wants Truth?

15. Let me add that Sankara has repeated a hundred times and so also the previous teachers that Vedanta can never be understood without a teacher. He (Sankara) himself had to go in search of a teacher though he had studied all the books available. Your friend must find a guru, if he wants to understand Vedanta.

16. As for Hitler I must say that he is not such a thoughtless person as people imagine him to be. There must be some other reason for his consulting the fortune-teller. We shall talk about this when we meet.

17. As for yoga, you are again falling into your old trap. It is not useless. There are stages of discipline. Those that are in the yogi stage, need it certainly. That is what Vedanta teaches. Men have to pass through it. You are right when you say that it is a step. But those in that stage, if they feel perfectly satisfied with it, ought to consider it their final "stop." This you have done most valuable service for those that like it—like the devotees of Sri Aurobindo Ghose.

Jnan is intended only for one in 100,000. As the Gita says. You must not talk of jnan to those that have not risen to that level. You will be confounding the unprepared and they will probably think that you are talking nonsense.

LETTER TO DR. E.J. STEINER: I must congratulate you, most warmly on your having left Europe which is full of trouble and turmoil now. The atmosphere there is most unsuited for calm and dispassionate thinking which is indispensable for the momentous work that you have undertaken and for reaching the great goal that you wish to reach in life. No doubt war, sorrow and suffering do teach us valuable lessons, which force us to seek refuge in philosophy--not mere religion, for religion by itself is seen only to promote hatred and difference, nay even war and bloodshed. By philosophy I mean the search for Truth, or Ultimate Truth as European philosophers would have it. If you could write and publish a book on this subject you would be doing the noblest service to humanity, apart from finding the greatest satisfaction yourself for, 'truth' means what negates all differences and distinctions and what makes hatred and ill-feeling

impossible. One so earnest and enlightened as you are is most competent to do it. And I have no doubt you will do it in due course.

Turning to other matters, let me assure you that marriage is no obstacle to the pursuit of Truth. Only you must find a companion that has similar interest and taste for knowledge. If, however, that companion has the means of helping you financially so much the better.

LETTER TO SIR HERBERT SAMUEL: As a student of philosophy in India, I find that the one central problem to tackle with is that of the meaning and tests of Truth or Ultimate Truth. That will necessarily show us how it comprehends the whole of life and existence. Evidently Europe thinks that there can be no philosophies without an inquiry into this problem. Let it please itself, now. It will come to this subject some years hence.

LETTER TO HALLET: (i) Your reference to the distinction between knowledge, opinion and faith without this distinction there is no philosophy whatever, according to the Indian thinkers of the past and the present. (ii) Your reference to the distinction between philosopher and religionist or mystic: These are of supreme value. The first problem in modern philosophy is that of Truth, its meaning and tests.

LETTER To SPALDING. It is not merely the wide extent of knowledge, your book "Civilization in East and West" covers but its rational and judicious evaluation of the facts of life and thought that evoke admiration. The standpoint from which this is done is that of Mysticism, which as the great majority admit, is higher than that of our ordinary every day experience, though Philosophy in India does not stop there. This publication of yours has rendered most signal service to the thoughtful world. Not only old men like me but also the young, with their more alert and more intellectual minds will find in its illuminating pages, valuable ideas that will help them to work for the betterment of our world.

Presumably, you seem to have reserved for a future work what is considered the special feature of the Indian thought whose coping stone is the evaluation of life as a "Whole" from the standpoint of "Truth." For, the question has still to be answered; How do we know that the mystic's experience or intuition is 'Truth?' That is the greatest problem that philosophy, as such, in India attempts to solve.

PHILOSOPHY: METAPHYSICS: EXAMINATION PAPERS:

1. "The term philosophy is a wider term than metaphysics" says Patrick. Explain what he means and state what the attitude of Indian thought is towards each of them.
2. State the different ways in which the origin of evil is explained. Which of them satisfies you and why?
3. "An element of mysticism is an inevitable characteristic of every first-rate modern mind." Discuss.
4. Distinguish monism from monotheism and monadism. Discuss whether monism can be considered to be untenable.
5. Of the three: Philosophic Values, Scientific Values and Religious Values, which do you consider highest and why?
6. What does. "The Ultimate Reality" mean? Does epistemological inquiry lead to it? Give reasons for your answer.
7. Indicate briefly the prevailing attitude towards Humanism. What do you think of its value to mankind in general?
8. Distinguish between personality and individuality, indicating clearly the part played by each of them in practical life.

(Newspaper interview with V.S.I. on return from European visit, 1937).

Philosophy today Mr. Iyer says, is based not on religion or religious texts as contained in the world's sacred literature--the Vedas, the Koran, the Talmud or the Bible--but on the fundamental deductions of science. Analogical reasoning apart philosophy today has to do more with the

exact sciences than on barren disputation founded on the revealed religion or what passes for beliefs based on mutually destructive doctrines. Mr. Iyer states, in answer to the question, "What may be the matter with Europe today? Its attitude towards Truth." That defines, he says, its attitude towards life and all that depends on it, mutual goodwill and well being.

THE USE OF PHILOSOPHY

(sent to "Philosophy" Quarterly, London)

But for the reference recently made by some eminent authorities (1) to Indian thought in the course of their observations on the situation created by the war-ridden world of today, I should not have ventured to write these few pages. Those references seem to call for a few words to make clear the attitude of what is understood by "philosophy" (2) in India, towards the serious problems of life that have now become more prominent than in the past.

A large majority everywhere seems to believe that 'philosophy' is of little use as a remedy or even as a means of finding a remedy for our present ills, social and political, particularly. Every reader of this journal is probably aware of what has been said from the days of Omar Khayyam and Goethe. Following in their wake others have declared that 'philosophy' is 'blab, blab, blab,' 'words, words, words' or 'nothing but angry shoutings,' and so forth. Some think that philosophers are expert producers of fine 'theories' which are of little use in meeting the actual needs and difficulties of practical life. Not a few have therefore turned their backs on 'philosophy.' And sought all the solace and succor in religion uninfluenced by Russia's recent example.

(1) Particularly the Very Reverend Dean Inge and Sir Francis Younghusband & Marquis of Zetland

(2) Reference is made to the book "Contemporary Indian Philosophy" where I have said something on this subject.

Such men, however, seem to tolerate a little philosophy being mixed with it, in as much as they refer to the mixture when they speak of 'The consolations of philosophy.' The reason why philosophy has been judged variously is due largely to the different ways in which the term has been interpreted. And in the philosophical world not a little confusion has been caused by the failure to distinguish between 'Value' and 'Truth'. For instance, what is of value as giving 'satisfaction' is often mistaken for truth. Further, most men seem to believe that what agrees with that which they like or disagrees with what they dislike is truth. Is it then a wonder that there is such great divergence in our beliefs or convictions?

Turning to India, we find that the highest 'philosophy' was taught on the battlefield, in the thickest of fights, as well as in the busiest political courts of kings, not to say in the most peaceful retreats of forests. To the Hindu, philosophy is that which is of use both in seasons demanding intense activity or calm judgment in the midst of the perplexities of daily life, and in times when by means of deep and concentrated thinking serious inquiries are made into the mysteries of the world. It is based on a study of all existence as such. And it is considered the only true guide to, life in all its aspects. "Philosophy" is but an interpretation of the whole of life.

Unfortunately this Indian idea is lost sight of in the modern world. The 'speculations' of philosophy or the 'theories' of science are often mistaken for the knowledge of Truth universal with which philosophy is concerned. What India has held is that though mysticism and religion in one or other of their several aspects, and science have undoubtedly supreme value in certain spheres and at certain stages of individual or group development, yet they cannot bring lasting peace and happiness to humanity, in general.

Why is religion ineffectual in this respect? Religion manifests itself in various forms so as to suit the different degrees of emotion and intellect that men possess. There are those that find satisfaction in rituals, prayers, and pilgrimages and the like. There are others, the

theologians, whose intellect seeks delight in formulating dogmas suited to their emotions. There are others, again, who find the greatest delight in intellectual wrestling. These scholastics have recourse to interpretations based on logic, rhetoric, grammar and especially authority to support their respective beliefs. Last come those who fail to find in any of them the satisfaction they want and who seek refuge in mystic ecstasies, revelations and contacts. All these courses howsoever satisfying and convincing to individuals, have most signally failed to bring peace to the world at large.

Two thousand five hundred years of Buddhism have not softened the Chinese and Japanese hearts. Two thousand years of Christianity have not prevented wars in Europe. One thousand five hundred years of Islam have brought no peace to the world. Nor has Hinduism, or Jainism, with their doctrine of Ahimsa (Non-violence), which boasts of greater antiquity, seen the reign of harmony and calmness among them. On the other hand we find that more social discord, hatred and suffering are caused by religious differences than economic distress and political disagreement. Again, with more of religion, bloodshed on larger scales has been caused and that at shorter intervals, wars involving more and more races of the earth, entailing harrowing destruction, in ever-increasing measure, of innocent women and children.

What is more discouraging is the fact that religion has in it the seed of disintegration and disharmony. The single Christianity has multiplied itself into about three hundred sects. The single Muhamadanism has divided itself into about eighty sects as they say. The one Buddha's teaching has branched off into scores of denominations. Lastly the history of Hinduism reveals the fact that it has at least four hundred different sects. Religion follows the natural process, from "Unity to Multiplicity and Uniformity to Variety." Religion integrates individuals into small groups but disintegrates larger groups.

And its most valuable function of controlling the moral life, declines as men become more and more intellectual. And therefore religious reformers stress more the need for mystic and meditative life, renouncing the world. But we find that though men show regard for morality, within the group, outside it they ignore both morality and humanity. What is worse, different religions have different standards of morality or ethics.

Next, has any religion on earth or any monk or high priest ever stopped a war or cured any social suffering, or averted any human calamity! Nor has mysticism, not to say anything of theology and scholasticism, succeeded in curing or controlling such misfortunes of society in general. The present war in particular has taught the irrefutable truth that no Christian prayers could save the churches and the worshipers in them from bombs. No Mohammedan recitations or observances, no sufism could avert the calamity of earthquakes in Turkey or Rumania. No Hindu rituals or japas of yogis could save the people of Bihar and Peshawar from similar catastrophes a few years ago, not to say anything of the desecrations of numberless temples by non-Hindus.

If mysticism appeals readily to the largest number it does so because it demands not deep inquiry or thinking which is always so taxing even to the most intellectual of men. Mental rest is sought by all, fools and philosophers alike. What however makes mysticism specially attractive seems to be that any man can get all the satisfaction he needs as easily as possible and can boldly declare that what he has known is the Highest or the Absolute, by spying that it is 'indescribable.'

Nevertheless, people still advocate religion in general as a remedy for they jump from the incontestable fact of their personal or individual satisfaction to the false conclusion that it will save society and mankind in general.

Art is closely allied to religion. Like mysticism, it brings inexpressible joy which is an unquestionable fact. This has made many believe that art also helps man to make contact with the Highest Being or the Absolute. This they support by the fact that at the height of enjoyment men become unconscious. All this is true. But has any artist till now cured mankind of the madness of war or averted any calamity in the world? On the other hand it has become the

handmaid of the passion for inflicting cruelties. Music, fanciful dress, charming deportment and postures of body are made accessories to war and bloodshed as religion has been made in all acts of cruelty. Both art and religion act like soporifics paralyzing, for the time being, the exercise of judgment to ascertain the truth.

Metaphysical speculations are no better. They may be seen to follow closely on the heels of religion in being endless and in satisfying the authors and their admirers. Science in having brought emotion to the lowest level possible and stimulated the intellect most is losing its hold on ethical life. Its theories and hypotheses are no more efficacious than the "speculations" of philosophy, with which the modern world is so over-stuffed. The scientist sees intense struggle for existence throughout the animal world. He holds that without war the human race cannot exist and that war in some form is a necessary evil. But the philosopher in India thinks that mankind can actually rise to a higher stage in which war can have no place, so far as the human species is concerned, though he may have to live at the cost of what exists in the subhuman stage.

Whatever religion and the like may do in the world or worlds after death, so far as this world is concerned, creeds and cults, speculations of philosophy and theories of sciences, can bring only individual satisfaction or group-welfare, but not the well-being of humanity in general. Religion and speculation, as well as mysticism or art serve as "escapisms." As such, Universal Religion is a mare's nest, like Universal Art or Universal "Escapism."

The aim of philosophy in India is to attain actually to Truth, not merely to seek or pursue Truth; to verify the truth attained, here in this life, in this world--not after death. This Truth universal, of the whole of experience or existence. It is not satisfied with sectional, compartmental or tentative truths or values of science or art, nor with individual, personal inner realizations, or verifications to which category religious or mystical truths belong. Unlike those thinkers, that are in speculative stages and that hold that ultimate Truth to be unattainable, the philosopher in India does not stop till ultimate truth is actually reached. Religion and mysticism give individual satisfaction, science, politics and art give group satisfaction. Truth teaches that individual well-being, group well-being and general human well-being are dependent upon each other and that the last comprehends the rest.

Truth in Indian philosophy is the same as the "well-being of all mankind," nay, all creatures here. "Sarva Satwa Sukho Hita," "Sarva Bhuta Hita." It starts with the well being of all humanity: "Sarve Janah Sukhino Bhavantu."

No doubt Pontius Pilate put the question: "What is Truth?" some two thousand years ago and it has not been answered yet in the West or in the East by any religion, theology, scholasticism, mysticism, science or even philosophical speculation. But long before he was born, it had been answered by "Philosophy," in India.

It is generally ignored that religion is at bottom only selfishness and mysticism is intense or extreme selfishness. It is true that life is impossible without self-preservation. Religion and the like are a necessity, at that stage. After he contacts God the religious man cares not what becomes of the millions sorrowing and suffering in this world left behind. But before he is merged in the Absolute he does work for the good of those brethren that belong to the same group. He does so only to win the favor of God and to 'escape' His wrath or to 'escape' the sufferings and evils of this world. Truth is unattainable unless the "Self" is completely "eliminated" even in science. Much less so in philosophy. So Pontius Pilate's question could not be answered.

There is no religion or mysticism that does not claim to teach or reveal the highest truth. Nevertheless there is no fact in this world which is more deliberately ignored by every religion than that other religions equally claim to teach the highest truth. And nothing is more common than to see the worst wars waged to assert the supremacy of one religion over another or to undermine another's religion, under cover of proselytization or persuasion. No religionist or

mystic has as yet asked himself the question, "How do I know that my experience or belief, religious or mystical, is Truth?"

Science teaches that "the world is a network of interrelations. Nature is a vast system of linkages. There is a correlation of organisms in Nature comparable to the correlation of organ in our body. There is a "web of life." Philosophy not only attempts to verify or test this doctrine of science, but goes further and sees that the entire universe is an indivisible Unity.

Religion or Art as well as science is indispensable in as much as man seeks first and foremost individual "escapement" or "satisfaction" and then group, satisfaction also. But when he finds that these satisfactions are unstable and unreliable he aspires to philosophy and begins to inquire. He then gradually finds that the whole world's sorrow or joy is inseparable from the individuals.

So long as emotion dominates the mind, religion, art and mysticism rule it. When the intellect dominates the mind, science rules it. When emotion and intellect are balanced and their limitations known, Reason dominates, and Philosophy rules, reason being the faculty that helps to distinguish the true from the false. It must not be forgotten that there are innumerable grades or degrees of emotion and intellect which seeks satisfaction in various kinds of religion, and scientific theories and philosophic speculations. And various are the ways adopted for fighting the evils of the world.

To sum up: Man has many objectives in life, which point to as many different 'values' of which 'satisfaction' is undoubtedly the foremost. But it is the totality of values that is Truth. And Truth, as India has shown, is universal and verifiable in this World, not after death. It is attained provided one loves Truth more than everything else and provided one pursues it purging oneself clean of all preconceptions, prejudices and personal satisfaction. Truth is identical with the well-being of the All (Sarvam). It is identical with beauty and goodness. The highest values social political, economic, aesthetical and ethical are comprehended in Truth. The degree of approach to Truth is tested solely by the extent of the world over which peace and well-being reigns--never by the degree of satisfaction or "escapism" of individuals. Nothing short of truth, the whole truth, can ever bring joy, peace or good to humanity as a whole. Everyone whether a religionist, mystic, scientist, speculator, atheist, agnostic or whatever else naturally finds in himself the notion of truth. Yet very few care to inquire what it is. Everyone thinks "I know, I know" imagining that whatever one knows or likes is Truth. How to get at it is a question with which this paper is not concerned.

Inquiry shows that that alone is truth which brings about the good of All. But in a world containing young and old, undeveloped and developed minds with various degrees of emotion and intellect, it is not to be expected that all can at once attain to philosophic truth. What India looks forward to is that the leaders or controllers of human groups could be made to love truth and to seek it, and this world in which we live could have less suffering as a whole. Till truth is loved and sought, there can be no hope of peace or salvation, in this world: To what extent truth is sought by leaders and approached to that extent will sorrow and suffering decrease. The world is suffering merely because the leaders refuse to look at Truth. No stronger proof is needed for this than that the appeal made about three years ago to the authorities of the Nobel Prize award to encourage the pursuit of 'truth' as such of Philosophy, fell flat on them. They may now have the satisfaction of seeing the condition of the three continents of Europe, Asia and Africa.

I should be ungrateful if I fail, in this connection to refer to the high appreciation expressed of this view of Truth by a great man that has just passed away. When I met him last in Paris in 1937 he pressed me to stay in Paris if I could and to impress on the public this Indian idea of Truth. That noble soul was no other than Henri Bergson.

"The ignoring Of Truth leads to wrath, sorrow, loss of judgment, doing evil to others, jealousy, malice, pride, envy, slander, incapacity to bear the good of others, greed, unkindness,

and fear.....All these disappear when the knowledge of Truth is gained by a survey of the 'whole' world or life..."Mahabharata.

THOMSON'S "INTRODUCTION TO SCIENCE"

"Analogical Reasoning:--The geologist tells us the story of the making of the earth and describes what happened millions of years ago, and in many cases he relies on analogical reasoning. From the consequences of particular happenings today he infers the efficient causes of events that happened in the Devonian Age. He sheds the light of the present on the dark abysses of the past.

When Darwin argued from the particular variations which he observed in his domesticated pigeons and cultivated plants to variations which might have occurred in unthinkably distant aeons, he was trusting to analogical reasoning. Often it is the only alternative, but it could be used with restraint in arguing from the present to remote antiquity, for it is obvious that some important difference between the conditions then and those of today may invalidate the argument."

J.A. THOMSON'S "DARWINISM & HUMAN LIFE."

"What is meant by Darwin's picture of the Web of Life, and where did he paint it? We find it in all his works--a luminous back ground--the idea of linkages in Nature, the idea of the correlation of organisms. No bird falls to the ground without sending a throb through a wide circle, for Darwin rears 80 seedlings from a single clod taken from a bird's foot. Long nutritive chains may bind the bracken on the hillside to the brain of the proprietor--if he is fond of eating trout. The patent-leather shoes on his feet connect him with the melancholy slaughter of seals, while his ivory-backed toilet brushes implicate him in the passing of the elephant. There is a ceaseless circulation of matter and energy. All things flow. Influence passes from A to Z though Z is quite unaware of A. What ripples spread and from the introduction of rabbits into Australia, or of sparrows into the U.States, or of the mongoose into Jamaica? What absolutely essential connections there are between cutting down trees and a plague of insects, between birds and seed scatterings, between sunlight and the catches of mackerel."

LETTER ON REASON AND LOGIC:

Logic, in short, is concerned with correct or valid thinking. Its main concern being non-contradiction, it can lay down the criterion of Truth as non-contradiction, but only with the assumed premises and not with facts. But when facts enter into consideration we have Reason but the same criterion of Truth remains, only the propositions with which we start must square with facts of experience, with observed data. Hence reason includes logic or correct thinking as well as strict fidelity to experience or facts, upapathi. Bad logic or insufficiency of facts or wrong data may lead to untruth. The scientist with a plethora of data may reason illogically and reach false conclusions. Reason avoids both those mistakes. While reason searches for truth, logic insists on valid or correct thinking only.

Intellect is the power or faculty of thinking logically. Reason is the power or faculty of thinking truly or towards truth. By reason we go a step beyond anubhava or experience by making explicit in it. Reason, I would therefore define as that which makes explicit what is implicit in an experience. This will I believe cover the reason of science as well as of Vedanta between which you have in some article of yours, made a distinction. When I read that definition of yours, I felt you have descended to mysticism.

I think it was in "Kalyana Kalpataru" but could not get the reference just now. A distinction has to be drawn between Jada Samadhi and Gnana Samadhi. The former can be brought about by abhyasa, by chitta vritti, Nirodha, by pranayama etc. the latter only through Gnana and Gnana arises only through Vichara or inquiry. Moreover there is a confusion in the current controversies on the subject about the means and the results. It is supposed that it is

Samadhi that gives Gnanam, whereas it is gnanam which brings about samadhi, i.e. Gnana samhadhi and it is this gnanam which is sahaja. Samadhi is a mere byproduct of gnanam. Sankara says that Vichara reduces everything to pure consciousness which is the self and this gnana samadhi. I had a discussion with Rapasyananda about sleep and samadhi and he brought forward Sadananda's passages from Vedanta Sara to show the difference between the two. He ended by confessing that Sadananda's position is self-contradictory but added that Samadhi experience is non-relational and transcends contradictions in spite of the persistence of mind and vrittis even in Nirvikalpa according to Sivananda. I had to tell him that this is nothing but a species of mystery-mongering.

Yogis insist upon anubhava or direct intuition Brahman; reasoning is quite unnecessary to get out this anubhava; samadhi is enough. Here Vedanta makes a distinction between Anubhava and Samyagnana. According to Sankara, Brahman is even now known to every one as one's own self and no effort is needed for knowing the self, but only for the removal of wrong ideas about self. The Self stands ever intuitive; it is intuition itself (jnana Swarupam). Reasoning will remove the adhyasa; its function is negative; it dispels avidya. Adwaitanubhava also is given in everybody's experience in sleep. And yet we have no knowledge in the waking state of this truth. Anubhava does not tantamount to Samyagnana. It is reasoning that gives Samyagnana--reasoning in avastatraya etc. Samadhi is the raw stuff of experience, as in deep sleep. In themselves they do not constitute Samyagnana but only anubhavas, until reasoned upon. In Science too mere experience does not amount to a knowledge of scientific truth. We all see apples falling every day, but only a Newton who reasoned upon it became aware of gravitation. So anubhava is insufficient and reason is required in Brahma Vidya.

REPLY TO W. NICOL REID'S ARTICLE:

1. Truth in Europe is confined to different fields, as truth in biology, truth in history etc. but what is to be taken finally as truth of all life i.e. Truth as such, Europe has not inquired into. Thus also we are told this a pear tree, that an apple tree etc. but I ask what is tree apart from these. The principle of "agreement and difference" is a fundamental one in Europe. This he does not know.
2. I do not say that European mind has not seen the desirability of knowing pure truth, but that it has not taken the trouble to go into it deeply, for it says that ultimate truth is not obtainable.
3. I am not discussing reality in those articles, but what is truth. He has gone off the track.
4. It would be foolish to say that compartmental truths are of no use; that I never said; it is admitted that they are most valuable; and we cannot get on in life without them. I say only we should rise higher and distinguish pure from practical truth.
5. I say Europe must rise to the common truth, that which is the truth in your chemical truth, your biological truth, your historical truth, I do not oppose the compartmental truths in their proper places.
6. If I say pear tree, apple tree, unless you know the meaning of the word tree, how can you really understand what is meant by the former terms? Similarly how can you fully understand terms chemical truth, historic truth etc, when you do not know and inquire into the deep meaning of the word Truth used in the term?
7. When he says, "my consciousness cannot comprehend the whole" he should first try to know the meaning of the "whole" and the "part." He does not see that even if man and the universe co-equals, even then he could not understand it so long as he regards it as different from himself. "I am only a dew drop" he writes. His fundamental fallacy is that he is thinking only of the body; he has mixed up the body, the I and consciousness. How can he say consciousness is only a dew-drop? Has he measured it with a tape? Unless he first knows what is I, what is consciousness, he and all Europeans will remain confused. This clarification is a fundamental

need and it can come only from the study of Drg Drsya Viveka. The first thing is to understand the fuller, deeper meanings of the terms he uses.

8. Re: need of preparatory discipline: Can he convince a child of three of the binomial theorem, or can he convince a peasant of the field of advanced physical truths? To say he has not time for such a discipline, is meaningless evasion. He must be born a hundred times more and become sufficiently intelligent to grasp what we teach.

9. He questions the value of Vedanta: I have not raised the issue of value but of what is truth. He has gone astray in missing the point. If a man does not appreciate pure truth he talks about values.

10. People find it too troublesome too much bother and too difficult to answer questions about the real meanings of words, so they avoid or reject them as unimportant or unnecessary.

11. Re: Graham Wallas: His Indian friend must have been a mystic or religionist, not a philosopher.

12: "Substantiate its claims" We say if there is no proof then there is no philosophy. He has a false impression of Vedanta. One must have much patience to study the whole of Vedanta, otherwise all sorts of misunderstandings will arise and wrong impressions of it formed. Unless the student gets doubts first and then tries to get them cleared, Brahma-Gnana is impossible. He must come and stay with the teacher, get doubts and think, argue and discuss numerous points. This cannot be done by correspondence, it would be too laborious and entail too many points; Neither can it be done by writing a book because each reader will put his own interpretation on it.

13. The departmental truths are never swept aside by Vedanta; we cannot live for one minute without them: Here again he has misunderstood us.

14. Attempts to coordinate the knowledge of the sciences are not being made from the philosophical standpoint, such attempts being thought impracticable or unattainable.

15. The vagueness of ignorance to which he alludes can be found nowhere in any philosophical literature, but on the contrary, it is seen in plenty in religious, theological, scholastic and mystic literature of India, as elsewhere.

16. He is proceeding on the assumption that the mind has spatial limits. If so, has he measured the mind as he would measure the body? Can spatial concepts apply to it? It forms such concepts within itself.

17. Indian philosophy's presentation to the West has hitherto been in the hands of those who were proficient in religion or mysticism and expert in interpretations of its teachings.

18. The alternative is to propagate a love of truth or a pursuit of truth i.e. of a philosophy most useful for setting an example to and leading aright the less cultured, a philosophy starting with no dogmas whatever.

19. Let me wind up this note with a reference to the first step in the pursuit of truth, in India. It is known in Western Science as "depersonalization." or "self-elimination. What this really and ultimately means is what Europe has not taken the pains as yet to ascertain, not having gone deeply enough in its inquiry. Such truth cannot be reached by the seeker in the West till he drops his superiority complex, reared upon his science which has enabled him to invent U-boats, magnetic mines, poison gases and the like, or, in a word, upon his homicidal glory.

ADDRESS TO AYURVEDIC MEDICAL STUDENTS:

The Ayurvedic and Unani systems have at their back hoary traditions. And the great mass of people have been familiar with them and known their worth for ages. But I cannot ignore the fact that the world is ever advancing. The great achievements of modern science have added to our knowledge immensely. The Western allopathic system has opened our eyes to many invaluable remedies and medicines. It is our duty to coordinate the old and the new, Eastern and Western knowledge. It does not however mean that the Ayurvedic and the Unani systems have nothing to

teach the Western Allopathists. In all phases of human experience, there is not only scope but necessity for exchange of thoughts. Thus only wisdom grows. I think I shall be failing in my duty if I do not lay emphasis on the need for encouraging the spirit of research for with our knowledge of thousands of years we are still in the dark as to most things in life. The Ayurvedic and Unani systems will have a great future if only they come more to the light of modern knowledge and are prepared to wrestle with modern thinkers and workers. Mere physical wrestling in college debates is not enough. You must go to the public arenas of other investigators of Nature, of our own day. Nature and circumstances really demand that you should develop your self-reliance and local resources, to a greater degree.

FORWARD TO KANNADA BOOK "OUTLINES OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY" (by H.N. Raghavendacharya)

(1) To the wealth of original thought that many of the Indian vernaculars have naturally developed, they have, as is well-known, added valuable translations, adaptations and summaries of the best works of Poetry and Religion in Sanskrit. But treatises on philosophy proper are rarely to be found in these living languages. What is generally called philosophy in them is mostly Theology or generally called philosophy in them is mostly Theology or mysticism. A rational presentation of the Darsanas, as the systems of Philosophical thought are called, is conspicuous by its absence in the literature of the Vernaculars, though they have been making great strides of progress in recent years.

(2) Translations or epitomes of ancient discussions, however interesting in themselves, would only make the readers live in the India of centuries ago. What would be of real value to the present generation is not merely a knowledge of the past but its bearing on the thought of our own times, especially that outside India. The old Pandits, though possessed of great learning, being ignorant of European languages could not think of producing works of this kind; nor could such modern graduates of the universities as have not made a deep study of Sanskrit, undertake the task.

(3) He has succeeded in giving to his readers an excellent bird's eye view of all the Darsanas with the bearings on them of the Western thought, ancient and modern. His exposition is throughout very clear and his style very simple and singularly unostentatious, so as to be understood even by lay-readers. His criticisms, though only few and far between, and unbiased and suggestive. That he has faithfully represented the different schools is evident from what forms a special feature of his work.

(4) He has brought to bear upon his work not only his knowledge of Western philosophy but also his experiences as lecturer in the University. The method of presentation adopted by him is well-suited both to students in colleges of oriental or occidental learning and to seekers after such knowledge in general. The reader is introduced not only to the great thinkers of India of the past but also to the well known philosophers of the West from Plato to Bergson in an appropriate manner.

(5) It would be found by students in the Universities of India to be a really useful introduction not only to the essential but also to the technique of Indian thought.

(2) MAHABARATA: "He who is competent to support life by his energy he who can support himself by his own exertions, does not live, but really falls away from his duty by the false externals of a life of renunciation. That man only is capable of reading renunciant life or happiness in the woods, who to unable to support sons, grandsons, the deities, rishis, guests and pitris. If, 0 king anybody could obtain siddhi perfection and salvation or moksha from sannyas, renunciation, mountains and trees would surely obtain it. These latter are always seen to lead lives of renunciation. They do not injure anyone. They are, again, always aloof from a life of worldliness and are all brahmacharins. If it is the truth that a person's siddhi depends upon his

own lot in life and not upon that of others, then thou shouldst betake thyself to action. He that is bereft of action, can never have siddhi. If they that fill their own stomachs could attain siddhi, then all the fishes would attain it."

60th BIRTHDAY STUDIES IN PHILOSOPHY FOR RADHAKRISHNAN

by Prof.A.R.Wadia

That Indian philosophy is really theology is denied very stoutly by Rajasevasakta V. Subrahmanya Iyer of Mysore. Born an advaitin and introduced to Advaita philosophy by a great orthodox religious leader, the late Sringeri Swami, he has been trying to show that genuine philosophy must be independent of religion, that in Shankara himself the Saguna Brahman or a personal god is only a part of the phenomenal (if not illusory) world, and the Nirguna Brahman is the only reality and has nothing to do with religion. The main hurdle in his way of thinking is the fact that Shankara did not claim to be an original thinker at all, and his philosophy took the form of commentaries on the generality of Hindu scriptures, particularly the Upanishads and the Gita. Mr. Iyer tries to get over this hurdle by arguing that Samkara was really an independent logical thinker and the object of his commentaries was really to show that his conclusions independently attained are also corroborated by the scriptures. It would be a strange coincidence indeed if every independent conclusion of Samkara could be supported by the chapter and verse of every Upanishad and ever chapter of the Gita. Mr. Iyer's attempt is a bold and brilliant one, but has not been taken seriously by many in India. In fact, there is hardly a Hindu philosopher who does not honestly believe that philosophy has its last word in the Upanishads and in the commentaries of one or the other of the acharyas whom he religiously follows. Thus it is that philosophy in India was for centuries more an exposition of the ancient classics than the independent thought of individual thinkers as in ancient Greece or modern Europe and America. Mr. Iyer's claim for Shankara or his teacher Gaudapada as independent thinkers is not extended by him to other schools of Indian philosophy. In fact, he is fond of dismissing them as mere theologies, thus corroborating the criticism advanced by several European scholars against considering the thought of India as real philosophy. In so far as the ancient are taken to be the last inspired word of ancient rishis and philosophy taken to be just an exposition of these truths philosophy in India cannot escape the charge of dogmatism.

Mr. Subrahmanya Iyer would agree that the word "idealism" with its emphasis on intelligence and thought, is not applicable to Shankara's Advaitism, for his whole philosophy is an attempt to transcend the limitations of intelligence and thought. He prefers to speak of it as realism, though it is a realism far removed from any type of realism known to Western philosophy. But he would not agree with Dr. Heimann in reducing all Indian philosophy to materialism, especially as it has gathered around it odd, and even vulgar associations, in Western philosophy.

End Book 1