
The Eternal Quest

Talks given from 1967 to 1972

Original in Hindi

15 Chapters

Year published: 1980

A selection of discourses from 1967 to 1972

The Eternal Quest

Chapter #1

Chapter title: Religion: The Door of Feeling

Date Unknown

Archive code: 6700000

ShortTitle: QUEST01

Audio: No

Video: No

Question

WHAT IS THE BASIC INDIAN PHILOSOPHY?

As far as I am concerned, I do not see philosophy as Indian or non-Indian. It is not possible. Philosophy is only universal. There can be no geographical division in the human mind. These divisions, these distinctions, are political. Indian, Japanese and German, or eastern and western -- all these divisions are political. They have arisen out of the political mind. In the realm of philosophy we apply them unnecessarily. Not only unnecessarily, but meaninglessly as well. There is no Indian philosophy as such; there cannot be. Philosophy is a universal attitude.

You can see the world through three dimensions. One dimension is science: that is, thinking empirically about reality. The second dimension is philosophy: thinking about reality speculatively. And the third dimension is religion: not thinking about reality at all, but experiencing it.

Science is based on empirical experimentation, observation and objective thinking. Philosophy is based on nonempirical, speculative thinking -- subjectively based. Religion transcends both.

Religion is neither objective nor subjective. Religion conceives of the whole in terms of its wholeness. That is why we use the term 'holy'. Holy means 'that which comprehends the whole'.

When we call a particular type of mind the Indian mind -- when we designate it as such,

when we make this distinction -- it is not a geographical distinction. When we say 'Indian' -- to me it means that the world, the reality, is being seen neither through science nor through philosophy, but through religion. If you like you can say that this land -- this country and the mind that has evolved here has peered into reality through religion -- not through philosophy, not through science. The third dimension, religion, has been the basis for us.

When you think about it, any type of thinking is bound to be nothing more than an acquaintance. When I think about you, I am outside you. I can go around and around you, but whatever I come to know about you will just be an acquaintance. I cannot penetrate you, I cannot know you from within, so it is an acquaintance.

Science is acquaintance: science is not knowledge. It has to change from moment to moment. Every day something new is known, we become acquainted with something new, and science has to change. So science can never be absolute in the sense that philosophy can be. Philosophy is absolute because we are not thinking about the outside, but thinking about the inside of humanity, about the inside of the human being: the innermost, the subjective core of the mind. Philosophy can be absolute, but philosophy cannot be the whole. The outside has been left out of it.

Science is a part. Philosophy, too, is a part. Only religion can be the whole, because in religion we are not dividing reality into the objective and the subjective. We are taking reality as it is, as the whole. This whole cannot be thought about; this whole can only be felt. Religion is knowing, through feeling.

India has been emphasizing feeling rather than thinking. The Indian mind, the eastern mind, has been nonthinking, nonspeculative, nonscientific -- and, religious. All religions were born in the East, even Christianity. The West has not given birth to a single religion. Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, Sikhism -- all these religions were born in the East. The eastern mind has looked through a third dimension. That has been its basic contribution.

I am using the term 'Indian' or 'eastern' just to make the point clear to you. But do not call it 'Indian', call it 'religious', because in the West, too, there have been persons like Eckhart, Bohme, Heidegger, Marcel and Berdayev who were religious. In a way they were eastern, though born in the West.

There have also been persons in the East who were not religious, who have thought in terms of science. In fact, the first glimpses of science came in China. But they could not be developed in the East because the eastern mind has become obsessed with the third dimension: the religious. And the West could not develop a religious tradition because the West became obsessed with the scientific. And of course there have been persons of a philosophical leaning in both the West and the East.

Now a new world is evolving, a new man is emerging out of the historical process -- a man of the future who will be neither of the East nor of the West. A new mind is coming into being: a global mind, a universal mind. So we have to discard our obsessions. The East has to discard its obsession with the third dimension: the religious; and the West has to discard its obsession with the first dimension: the empirical, the scientific. We have to see the world, the reality, through all three dimensions. Only then -- through all the doors that are potentially available to human beings everywhere -- can a synthesized knowledge, knowledge that is total, be gained.

A person becomes whole when he becomes three-dimensional: simultaneously philosophical, religious and scientific. If these three dimensions are in the mind simultaneously, then the mind knows reality through all the doors of perception.

But as you have asked about the basic Indian philosophy, I will have to say that religion, the door of feeling, is the basic attitude in India. We have used feeling as a means of knowing.

Ordinarily knowing and feeling are two distinct things but there are certain feelings through which one comes to know something -- like in love. You can know a person through science, but then you know only the periphery. Then you know only the circumference. Then you know only the physiology or the chemistry or the biology or the history, but you do not know the person as he actually is. You know about him, but you do not know him. But when you love him, you do not know the biology, the physiology, the chemistry of the body or the psychology, but you know him as he is -- the total. In love, you penetrate to the innermost core, you become one with him. So love, *too*, becomes a dimension of knowing.

Feeling has been the basis for knowing by those who have been eastern. In the West, Logos -- logic, the discursive mind and the analytical intellect -- has been the base; while for us in the East, the feeling heart, the synthesized mind, has been the base. I deny the validity of the term 'eastern' or 'western' but, still, religion has been the predominant note in the East.

Question

WHAT IS THE PATH OF RELIGION ALL ABOUT?

Reason is not the path of religion because reason is only partial. Then, too, it is a superficial part of the human personality. Religion needs your whole being, you must be totally involved in it.

Reason creates division. With reason, you can never be total in anything. Religion demands a total involvement, nothing must be left out of it. You must take a jump, with your total being, into the existence. This looks irrational but it is not. Reason is a part of rational thinking, but religion is neither reason nor nonreason. It is the totality of your existential being.

How to be total? That only means: how to be religious *how* to act as an organic totality?

How can a being be religious? Religion is not a ritual; ritual is again a fragment. And you cannot differentiate: if you want to be total you cannot be Hindu, you cannot be Mohammedans, because, again, to be a Hindu or to be a Christian or to be a Mohammedan is to think through reason through conditionings. If you are religious you can only be *man*, nothing else.

A person who wants to be religious must not belong to any religion in particular. Belonging to a particular religion creates an unreligious world. It makes you very rooted. Then you are not open to all the possibilities, to all the dimensions. So be religious but don't be Christian, don't be Hindu, don't be Mohammedan.

When you are just religious, you will be nearer to Mohammed and to Jesus and to Krishna. Sects are not religion; they are, again, a rationalization. Ultimately, religion means a way of life in which your totality is involved.

You cannot be totally involved if you divide the world and existence into two antagonistic blocks. For example many so-called religious people have divided existence into two diametrically opposite poles: God and the world matter and mind, good and evil. These are all rational divisions. A religious being should not allow reason to divide existence into two categories. Existence is one: matter and mind are one body and consciousness are one, the world and the creator are one.

If you divide them into two, your life will be a constant conflict *against* something and *for* something. Then you can never be total. If you divide existence then you yourself are also divided. Then your body will become your enemy and you will be in conflict.

If religion means anything, it means a deep, inner harmony. So I say to you: don't divide; existence is one. Body is nothing but the visible part of your soul and soul is nothing but the invisible part of your body.

God and the world are not two things, are not diametrically opposite. God is the centre; the world is the periphery Or, you can say that the world is the body and God is the soul. You can say that the world is the visible part of the divine, and God is the invisible part.

Take the whole as a whole, as an organic unity. Do not be against the world, against the body. Be life-affirmative.

To me, renunciation doesn't mean renouncing the world. It means renouncing the dividing reason, it means renouncing all divisions. A man or a woman who renounces, who becomes a sannyasin, takes the whole existence as one.

If you begin to feel the existence as one, then you can take a second jump. Then you can merge with this oneness yourself: the drop dropping into the ocean. Or, even the reverse becomes possible: the ocean dropping into the drop.

Through singing, through dancing, an effort is made toward this merger. When you are singing and dancing, you can forget yourself without becoming unconscious. And if you can forget yourself without becoming unconscious, you are nearer to the jump, the merging. If you can consciously forget yourself then you are near the temple of the divine and you can enter. At the entrance, only one condition is to be fulfilled. That is that you must be conscious and, at the same time, 'you' must not be.

That is what is meant by meditation: consciousness without any consciousness of the self, consciousness without any consciousness of the ego. All methods all techniques, are basically concerned with this. Forget the self, but remain aware. Drop the self, but remain conscious. If you can; be conscious without the self, the door is open.

Jesus has said, "Knock, and the door shall be opened unto you." This is the knock. Drop the self, and the doors are open for you.

The Eternal Quest

Chapter #2

Chapter title: Discovering Your Own Path

Date Unknown

Archive code: 6700000

ShortTitle: QUEST02

Audio: No

Video: No

Question

PEOPLE IN THE WEST TODAY ARE CRYING OUT OF THEORETICAL SOLUTIONS TO THEIR PROBLEMS. YOU HAVE OFTEN SPOKEN ABOUT 112 MAJOR TECHNIQUES THAT HAVE BEEN USED TO REACH THE DIVINE. WILL YOU PLEASE TELL US ABOUT SOME OF THOSE METHODS?

No theoretical solutions are ever possible. It appears as though the human problem is a theoretical problem, but the problem is always existential. It is not theoretical, it is not a puzzle to be solved by the intellect. Rather, it is a river that can be crossed only through existential means. Whenever the intellect tries to solve it, it only goes around and around and around the problem. It never arrives anywhere. It never touches the problem.

The problem remains untouched by the intellect. Why? -- primarily because the intellect is the source of the problem. To be more exact, the intellect is the problem. Mind can never solve problems; it can only create them. Just like leaves grow on trees, problems grow in the mind. The intellect always promises to solve them, but each solution only creates more problems.

Somewhere it has been written, "I cannot love a valid inference. A theory may be valid, logical, rational, but still you cannot love it. No validity can inspire love. No matter how rational a particular theory may be, it cannot inspire you to love it. As for as living is concerned, validity is of no significance whatsoever.

So the first thing to be understood that intellect can create problems and it can create solutions to them, but nothing is solved by it. Everything remains continues in its own way, it remains untouched. By 'life' I mean your total being and by 'intellect, I mean that part of your being that speculates.

If you go deeply within, you will see that the thinking part of you is a very nonessential part of your being. Life goes on without any help from your mind. You are born: you grow, you become a youth, you fall in love, you die. Everything happens beyond the mind. The mind is not involved at all in the deeper circumstances of life.

Every problem comes from deep inside you where the mind cannot penetrate. That's why any intellectual approach is irrelevant. Psychologists say that your life comes from sources that are below the mind. Your life is unconscious and your mind is conscious -- and the unconscious part is nine times greater than the conscious part. The conscious part is not functioning for twenty-four hours a day, but the unconscious is. Even when you are asleep, the unconscious is functioning. It is capable of doing everything without you -- and more efficiently than when your conscious mind is present.

That's why sleep is needed so much. The real need is not for sleep itself, but for the absence of your conscious mind. You must be absent for some time so that your nonvoluntary mechanisms can work. 'You' are a hindrance. With your conscious mind, you are not helping the flow of life; you just create obstacles. You need to spend one third of your life totally submerged in the unconscious or you cannot live.

The unconscious can live without the conscious mind, but the conscious mind cannot live without the unconscious. If you are deprived of sleep even for a single week, you will go mad. This madness happens because your conscious mind has been interfering with the natural flow of life constantly for one week, with no gaps in between for the unconscious to move to the very source of life and attain sustenance.

Even when you are not asleep, your conscious mind is not working constantly. It is only there during the moments that you need it, otherwise the unconscious is working. Only in emergency situations is your conscious mind really needed. You may be walking on the

street and you think that an accident is going to happen. For a single moment, your conscious mind works. But only in moments such as that is your conscious mind needed. Otherwise you function unconsciously, your whole behavior pattern is unconscious. You may be able to rationalize what you do, you may be able to justify it, but all justifications are after the fact, once the thing has happened.

I fall in love with you. Then I begin to rationalize why I love you. The phenomenon comes first and the rationalizing process follows. I say, "Because you are beautiful, because you are such and such, I have fallen in love with you." Then afterwards, when I no longer love you, it appears as if you have changed and that is why I no longer love you.

When I think about it afterwards, I can say, "You are this or that. That is why I have fallen in love with you." But the real thing is quite the contrary. I fall in love unconsciously and then I consciously try to rationalize it. It is not because you are beautiful that I have fallen in love with you. Rather on the contrary, you seem to be beautiful, you appear to be beautiful, because I have fallen in love with you. Love comes first; the justification follows.

Even when you are awake, your conscious mind is not really working; the unconscious continues to work. What I am trying to point out is that the conscious mind is only a security measure that you use when there is an emergency when something dangerous is happening around you, something new in the sense that the unconscious cannot comprehend it. Only the conscious mind can deal with something that is totally new because the unconscious comes from the past -- it can only work through the Known. When anything unknown has to be faced, your conscious mind will be needed for a moment. It is an emergency measure.

But this conscious mind tries to solve existential problems. It cannot do that; it is impossible. The conscious mind is not meant for that. Of course it can go on speculating, it can verbalize, it can create systems, it can create logical inferences, it can appear to have solved the problem, but the problem remains the same; it has not even been touched.

The agony of the West is basically rooted in this wrong approach. Life should be tackled through living -- not through speculation, not through intellectual theorizing. Life should be known existentially. And this is the miracle: that if you know life existentially, then there are no problems. It is not that existential living solves your problems but, rather that when you live life totally, there are no problems. I would like to say: not only does intellect hinder solutions -- it creates the problems.

Take any problem. If you are in fear... Fear is a basic problem, more obvious in the West. What can the mind do about it? Fear is there because death is there. What can the mind do? Your problem may be that fear cripples you totally, it destroys you completely. It uproots you; life becomes impossible. You can only vegetate; the fear will not allow you to move. But what can the intellect do about fear? It can only analyze it.

Your intellect can analyze the problem: what fear is. But even if you know what fear is, it makes no difference. You know what the fear is about; that death is there, that you are going to come to an end. You exist always on a volcano; never for a single moment can you be at ease. Death is always there! Analysis cannot do anything at all about it.

You can create theories around the problem, but no theory will solve it for you. At the most it can make you adjusted, you can go on. The fear remains, but somehow -- through some theory -- you train yourself to neglect it. But the fear is still there. It's still working, its poison is continuing to flow in you. It will go on uprooting your life, it will go on poisoning the very source of your life.

There are so many theories to explain what fear is, but even if you can explain it, it is not explained away. It remains where it was. Theories go on accumulating in the memory while

the problem continues at the very roots. The two never meet: theories are accumulated in the memory -- the memory is a storehouse of all your theories -- and the fear is hidden somewhere underground, in the roots. They never come in contact. Memories can never go deep down to the roots, they just accumulate in a corner of the mind. And they are so nonessential that they can be washed away completely and your life will not be affected by it. It will go on unconcerned.

So what can be done? The existential approach is diametrically different. If there is fear, the intellectual approach is to think about it while the existential approach is to live it. Don't think about it. Feel it and live it. Tremble with it. Let your whole being tremble with the fear. Be in it don't escape from it, don't postpone it, don't try to theorize about it.

Don't escape from it. Be in it. That is the best thing that you can do. Everyone has to face death; it is something that has to be faced sooner or later. No one can help you; you have to encounter it. It will not help at all if you close your eyes and go on speculating about it. It will not help at all; it will just create new problems. Fear will still be there because death will still be there but now you will even be afraid to see it. A new fear has crept in.

You will pretend that through your theory you have expelled the fear, but doubts will remain in the mind. The mind will begin to be afraid of whether or not the expulsion has really happened; it will begin to be afraid of whether the theory is correct or not. You will just be pushing the problem back, not getting rid of it.

Live with the fear. The existential approach is to move deeply into the problem, to live it. Be in it! If there is fear, then be fearful. Don't fool yourself by creating some bravery -- don't fool yourself that you are not afraid.

Don't fool yourself that the soul is immortal so there is no death. Death is there. You will never know that the soul is immortal unless you know death. I am not saying that the soul is not immortal. What I am saying is this: that you cannot fool your being like that. You can go on saying that the soul is immortal, you can go on repeating it continuously, but the fear will still be there. Really, you are repeating it *because* of the fear. You don't know that the soul is immortal but you want to believe it so that your fear will be eliminated. "The soul is immortal, so I am not going to die." You can find some explanation, but it is only a temporary solution. Death is there, so the fear will still remain.

If death is there, accept it. It is so; it is going to happen. Disease is there -- it is so. Old age is there -- it is so. It is going to happen and You cannot do anything about it, you cannot prevent it. You will have to face it finally.

The existential approach means to face life's problems. Once you face a problem, it is no longer there. Trying to escape from it is what creates the problem. For example, if you accept that death is there, it is going to happen... It is a certainty. The *only* certainty really. It is going to happen! You were promised death the moment you accepted life. It's the other pole of birth, of the phenomenon of birth.

It is going to happen. In fact, it started to happen at the very moment of your birth. You are bound to die, but if you accept it, there will be no fear. The moment you accept death totally, where is the fear?

The fear comes because of nonacceptance. "I should not die! How can I make certain that death will not come to me? It may come to everyone else, but I have to be an exception." This creates fear. The being knows perfectly well that your explanations will not do, that death will come.

You know it perfectly well, you know it absolutely, you are certain of it. As far as the deeper sources of your life are concerned, you know that death is going to come. It is not

something that is coming to you; it is something that is developing in you, something that is growing in you. Your roots know it well. You are growing towards death, you are constantly growing towards it. Your birth was the first movement toward death. Your being knows well that death is going to happen. You can fool your conscious mind, you can create theories, but the unconscious will know that you are going to die and the fear will still be there.

Don't fight with the unconscious, don't fight with your being. Accept what is in the unconscious. Let your conscious mind cooperate with the unconscious. Don't create a schizoid condition, don't be against yourself. You can't be. No one can be against himself; he can only think he is. In the end, the conscious mind will know that the unconscious has won.

To me, the existential approach is the only approach possible. Once you have begun to accept, mysteries begin to open up to you. For example, if you have begun to accept death as part and parcel of life, you will see that it is not that life ends with death. Death is the flowering of life: the peak, the ripening.

Our minds create the problem. We like youth, but we don't like old age. In fact, youth is nothing but the preparation for old age. We like life and we don't like death, but death is the flowering of life, the peak. The desire for things to be different from what they are is created by the intellect. If you are speculative, intellectual, theoretical, you can fool yourself, but you cannot deceive existence; you cannot deceive your own inner being.

To me -- or to yoga, or as far as the eastern approach is concerned -- the theoretical approach is nonsense. The existential approach is the only way.

As for the techniques are concerned, there are so many techniques. But each technique is essentially the same. The difference is only in details, not in the basic foundation.

We will discuss two or three methods that may appear to be contradictory, but the foundation is the same. One method may be applicable to particular individuals; another may not be. So many techniques exist not because there are so many ways but because there are so many types of individuals. The way is one, it cannot be otherwise, but it has to be applied to so many individuals, and with each individual the details will be different.

Many of the basic techniques are concerned with will. If you can will something absolutely -- with no wavering in the mind, with not a single part of the mind against it -- if you can crystallize your will and be totally one with it, then you can enter the existence. So there are many techniques that are techniques of will. For example, Gurdjieff's techniques for the west were techniques of will. The will must be totally crystallized...

But this is not possible for everyone. The feminine mind cannot understand how to be totally will-oriented. It is impossible in a way. Teachers who say that only techniques of will are possible will deny that women can reach *moksha*, salvation.

For example, Mahavir denied it. He said that women cannot reach *moksha* unless they are first born as men. They cannot enter directly into absolute freedom, into *moksha*. Mahavir had a particular reason for saying this. It is not because women are inferior -- which is what it has been thought that Mahavir was saying. No, it is because they are different. Mahavir's method is basically one of will. It is not the right approach for a woman. If a woman can succeed through Mahavir's methods then she is a woman in name only. Her total personality will be that of a man.

One Jain woman achieved *moksha* and became a great teacher, of the same rank as Mahavir. One woman, Mallibai became a *teerthankara*. Jains have twenty-four *teerthankaras*, teachers, and one of them is Mallibai. But according to tradition, there is no

Mallibai. The tradition says that no woman can enter, no woman can achieve liberation, so they have called her 'Mallinath Mallibai'. She was virtually a man. Only her physical structure was that of a woman; her inner structure was that of a man.

Why is this so, that a woman cannot achieve on the path of will? It is because the whole biological necessity for a woman is that she must surrender. She cannot be aggressive. Biologically, she must be capable of surrendering; she must be able to receive, to be receptive.

There is a joke about the word 'woman'. It says that woman means 'man with a womb'. The capacity to receive is a biological necessity. The whole feminine structure is built for that: the whole body, the whole mind. But that is not so if the body is that of a woman and the mind is that of a man. Then there will be constant conflict, anxiety, anguish.

A woman cannot be fulfilled unless she becomes a mother and she cannot become a mother unless she surrenders. So Mahavir's technique, based on will, cannot be used. The whole technique is such that it is a great fight, a struggle.

That is why Mahavir denied God. He said that there is no God. The male mind cannot conceive that there is a God, because if God exists then he has to surrender; he has to become just like a woman.

The parallel to this is those who have loved Krishna. They have behaved like women. There is a particular sect exactly the opposite of Mahavir. They think of themselves as women, as lovers of the divine. It makes no difference whether they are men or women. They say that there is only one male, and that is Krishna, the Lord. Everyone else is just a woman. This is the way of surrender. No man can enter the divine this way. If he does, it will be because he has been reborn in this very life, as a woman. He has become feminine, receptive.

There is a basic difference between a man and a woman because of the biological and structural differences. When body structure is different, the psychic structure will also be different because the body structure is something that is added on after the psychic structure is there. The psychic structure comes first and the structure of the body follows. It is not that your mind is feminine or not feminine because of your body. Your body is the way it is because of your mind.

Because of these basic, biological differences, all techniques can be divided into two: according to whether they require surrender or require will. If they require surrender, then God will be there. If they require will, then there will be no God.

Mahavir denied God absolutely. The whole system of yoga does not take God seriously. God can be neglected because the whole system is based on will. Yoga will not talk about God, or if it is talked about, it will just be mentioned by and only as an afterthought. The more ancient the yoga book is, the less possibility there is that there will be any reference to God at all. You need God to surrender -- otherwise you don't need Him. In a will-oriented system, your soul becomes the god. You are the god, no one else.

This is the male attitude toward existence. Man (the male attitude) cannot conceive of God as anything other than himself. This is Mahavir's attitude.

Then there is Meera's attitude. It is completely different, absolutely different. Not only different, but categorically opposite. The will has to be surrendered -- that is the method. Rather than becoming totally the will, you are to drop the will completely. 'You' must not be. Only God should be; you should not be. You should be absent, just an absence. Annihilate yourself, surrender.

But I still say that whether the technique is one of will or one of surrender, the foundation is the same. Even with methods that are categorically opposite, the foundation is the same.

The foundation is this: that only one being should exist -- either you or the divine. How you work out which one of the two remains is up to you, but only, one should remain in the end.

Either there is no God, only "*aham brahmasmi*: I am God; there is no other." The will has become universal, cosmic. Now there is no one else -- "I am all. I have become the universe." The other is completely denied.

And when you deny the other completely, you your self cannot remain. If there is absolutely no other, how can you be? So this is the last assertion of your being: *aham brahmasmi*. After that, you will not be who do you exist in opposition to, to whom will you declare that you are all? You have become the total. Now, only silence exists.

You cannot even say 'I' because 'I' is meaningful only in opposition to 'thou.' It is meaningless if there is no 'thou ' When the will has become absolute, the ego commits suicide because it cannot remain without anyone to relate to. It is only in relationship to a thou, or in opposition to a thou, that it can exist.

It cannot exist alone. You have come to a point where only the death of the ego is possible. The 'I' will commit suicide because there is no 'thou.' Against whom can it go on saying 'I'? It is meaningless.

Through the other method -- the method of surrender, which is quite a contrary method -- the same phenomenon happens. You go on denying yourself until a moment comes when you are not. You say, "Only you are, only God is. I am not." This is going to be the last assertion -- that 'I am not' -- because if you are not, then you cannot even say that you are not. To say that 'I am not' is still to believe that 'I am. Otherwise who can assert that 'I am not?' Now you will no longer be able to say it. And when you cannot even say that 'I am not,' you are not.

I will tell you a story. There was a great Sufi, Mulla Nasrudin. He was very afraid of death, as everyone is. One day, he heard that someone had died. He came home trembling. He asked his wife, "Can you tell me how I will know when I am dead? What are the symptoms? How will I be able to know that death has come?"

His wife said, "You are foolish. You will know. You will become cold..."

One day soon after, Mulla was working on his farm. The day was very cold and his hands became cold. He thought to himself, "It looks like I'm dying." He began to think about what he should do. "I must behave like a dead man now. The body is the body. My symptoms tell me that I am dead. What do dead men do? -- I must think about it."

Dead men lie down, so he lay down and closed his eyes. Someone passed by. They thought that Mulla must be dead. He wanted to say, "I am not dead," but dead men don't speak. He thought: "Dead men never speak, I have never heard about a dead man speaking. It will be absolutely unnatural for me to speak."

They decided to carry Mulla to the cemetery. But because they were unfamiliar with that part of the country -- they were foreigners, passing by on the road -- when they came to the crossroad they didn't know in which direction the cemetery was, they didn't know where to go. Of course, Mulla knew where the cemetery was. He wondered if it would be all right to tell them the way so get there, but then he decided that it was impossible. And besides, someone would turn up and then they could ask.

No one turned up. Evening was descending and soon it would be night. The men began to be worried. Mulla thought, "They are so worried. I must help them" -- but of course dead men cannot help.

Finally night had come, it was dark. They thought: "What to do? We cannot leave the dead body here. We don't know where to go: where his house is or where the cemetery is. What are we to do now?"

Mulla said, "If you don't mind -- it's not natural of course: I am a dead man, I should not speak; the rules don't permit it but if you allow me, I can show you the way. And then, I will stop talking."

If you are not, then you cannot even say that you are not. It's not possible. So the last assertion that the technique of surrender will lead to is 'I am not.' That is the last assertion. Then only the divine is. And when you are not how can there be any difference between you and the divine?

When you are not, you *are* divine.

So through the approach of will or the approach of surrender you reach the same point. Through one approach 'the other' is killed, and through the opposite approach 'you' are killed. In both cases, in the end only one remains: the amness remains.

I have talked about 112 techniques. There are so many different techniques, but the only difference between them is one of appearance, of structure. The difference is based not on the techniques themselves but on the particular person who is going to apply them. One example may make it clear to you.

There are people who are intellectuals intellectual in the sense that their intellect is more functioning than their emotions. They cannot directly feel anything. First they think about something and then they can feel it. Even when they love, they think they feel love. Thinking must be there; it cannot be dropped. They cannot feel anything immediately without the mind. The mind is always there.

Then there are people who are emotional. They cannot even think without feeling. First they have to feel something. Even if they are solving a mathematical problem they say "I feel it should be done like this. Do it like this -- I have a feeling about it." No reason is given: "I feel that it is like this." Feeling is foremost.

For those who are intellectually-oriented, emotional methods will not do. The intellect must go through reason, and emotion must go through faith. Emotion cannot doubt; reason cannot trust. Even if reason is able to trust, it trusts only because it has found that there is no reason to disbelieve. The trust is just a logical conclusion: "I should believe there is no reason to disbelieve."

Truth is negative with an intellectual person. It is always negative, it is never positive. It is not that trust has flowered in him; it is just a reasoning process. "Because I cannot disbelieve -- there is no reason to disbelieve -- I believe." It is almost a defeat. For the intellectual person to trust is like a defeat. He feels it like that, so he goes on trying to overcome it in so many ways. He tries to create some doubt again so that he can be at ease. The intellect is always at ease with doubt -- it is never at ease with trust.

The emotional is always at ease with trust. It is never at ease with doubt, to doubt is inconceivable to it. Reason doubts; emotion trusts. So the techniques for the two types of people cannot be the same.

For an intellectual person, a technique must work with doubt, it must use doubt. For example, in the Middle Ages in Europe, Descartes used doubt as a technique to move towards faith. He began thinking, "I must not trust until there is no reason left for any doubt. I must go on doubting unless a point comes where I can no longer doubt."

He began doubting, a very arduous process. You cannot begin with a belief in God; you must begin with not believing. If you try to believe in God of course, you cannot believe, because the very effort shows that you are not an emotional person. You must have proof, evidence, witnesses. You must be able to put God in the witness box -- only then can you

believe in Him. There is no other proof, no eyewitnesses. Even if someone says, "I have known God," there are no witnesses to prove that he has known Him. He alone has known, it may be just a deception. He may be deceiving others, or he may have been deceiving himself. So, God cannot be believed.

Even the reality of the other -- of someone who is with you -- cannot be believed. It may be just a dream. In a dream you see people who are, who absolutely are, and in the morning you discover that they were just part of your dream. While it is happening, who can know that it is just a dream? The night is long, and the dream is lovely. But sooner or later you find that the night is over and the dream is lost.

How can I make a distinction between a dream-you and you as you are to me right this moment? It is impossible. While I am dreaming, I believe that the dream is real, but then every morning I see that it has just been a dream. When I go to sleep again, this knowledge that it has just been a dream is of no use. The dream again deceives me; I take it as reality.

If my mind can be deceived by dreams in the night, then what is the guarantee that when I open my eyes I am not still seeing a dream? Who can make that guarantee? -- that I am not just thinking that you are here. How can I trust that, really, you are here?

So Descartes says that it is impossible to believe in anyone else. It may be just a dream, just a thought creation. In that way, he goes on doubting everything. Until everything is destroyed. What remains in the end is only the doubter. That he cannot doubt. He ends up in the same situation as Mulla Nasrudin. In the end he can only say 'I am.' But this much cannot be doubted, because even to doubt it he will have to be. To doubt whether I am or not, I have to be. The doubter cannot be doubted. So Descartes said, "This is the only fundamental truth. I can trust that I am."

But to go through so much doubt is very arduous. In the end you come to a point where doubt is impossible. Then, you trust.

So the technique if you doubt will be different from the technique if you trust. Krishnamurti's technique (or Buddhist techniques) is to begin with doubt. Don't believe in anything. Go on doubting. If you can take this to the end, finally only you are left.

But even to follow this technique, you have to begin by believing in Krishnamurti. Then right away you have lost the track. It makes no sense. If, even for a single moment, you say, "of course, yes, Krishnamurti is right," you have lost the track; the method is not being followed. You must take it to the very extreme. Not only other gurus have to be thrown, but Krishnamurti also; not only scriptures have to be thrown, but Krishnamurti's writings also. Everything should be destroyed. Then, in the end, there will be only you.

Not a single fragment of reality must be accepted. No God, no guru, no scripture, no world, no stars, no sun -- nobody else, only you. If doubt can be brought to this extreme, then it becomes a spiritual method. Through doubt, you will achieve.

The problem is that scarcely one person in a million can bring doubt to such an extreme. To doubt absolutely is to create absolute trouble. You will go insane, you will have no foothold to stand on. Nowhere can you trust anything. That is why only a giant intellect is capable of going through this method. It is not that this method has not been known before. Krishnamurti is not the first who has propounded it, it has always been known.

But it has never been spoken about before because there is no use in talking about it. One reason is because hardly a single person is capable of such doubt. And secondly, one who is capable of it will not come to listen to you. If he is capable of such doubt he will not come to listen to Krishnamurti -- he himself will be a Krishnamurti!

Someone said to Mozart, "I have heard that you became a great musician without having

had a teacher. Tell me how I can become a great musician without having a teacher."

Mozart said, "It will be impossible for you. I never went to anybody and asked them anything. You have come to me and asked something. If I tell you, I will be your teacher. You are not a person who can become a great musician without a teacher. Those who can, do so without asking anyone for advice. If you are to become a great musician you will have to grow through discipline, you will need guidance, a teacher.

Even this much you cannot understand yourself: how to become a musician without a teacher. You have asked me even this."

So those who hear Krishnamurti go on fooling themselves. They are not the right people to follow his teachings. Had they been, they would never have gone to Krishnamurti. But they have been going to him for forty years! For forty years they have been going to him to learn that there is no guru, that you cannot learn from anyone else. What nonsense!

Doubt is a method that is only for a few -- so few that it need not be talked about. It is unnecessary to talk about it because those few that it can work for already know it. Krishnamurti's effort has been futile. What he says is right, but the fact that he says it is not right. He is right, but it is unnecessary to say it. Those who come to listen to him are not the type of people who can doubt. And those who *are* that type, never come.

The opposite approach, the method of emotion, is absolutely different. Intellect is the outer part: your mind. Emotion is deeper. It is your heart. The approach of emotion is based on a contradictory foundation: trust. The moment you doubt, you are nowhere.

One who cannot doubt absolutely should not doubt at all. If you don't think you can doubt absolutely then don't doubt at all or you will get nowhere.

The contrary, which is also true, may be more easy to understand. If you can't trust absolutely, don't trust at all. No trust can be relative. If you say that you trust with conditions, you don't mean it. Trust is unconditional. If someone comes to me and says, "I believe in you because of this or that," he has no trust. Trust means that there is no cause for it. You trust because you *can* trust. Who or what you trust is not what creates the trust. It is because of you, because your heart can trust, that you trust. It is not me who is significant. The object of trust is not significant, the heart that trusts is significant. If you can trust, trust. If you can doubt, then doubt. Again, the object is meaningless. Go on doubting -- with every object.

But first decide what type of person you are, otherwise your life will be just a waste. Decide whether you can trust absolutely or you can doubt absolutely. If you say, "I can only doubt relatively," you will not get anywhere, the technique of doubt cannot be used. If you say, "I can only trust relatively," then too you will be nowhere because each technique works only in absoluteness.

This must be understood. Each technique works only in absoluteness. That's why every religion has emphasized absoluteness. The reason is not to deny other possibilities to say that other ways are wrong, but only to emphasize absoluteness. If a Mohammedan says that nothing can be added to the Koran, it is only a way of saying that he trusts so absolutely that nothing else is needed. Or if a Jain says that Mahavir is all-knowing, it doesn't mean that in fact he knows all, but only that "I trust him so absolutely. To me, he knows all. Now to me, there is no need to go anywhere else."

Only absoluteness works. Otherwise you go on wavering from this to that. Sometimes you doubt, sometimes you trust. You are just wasting your energies. Not only wasting but creating a contradictory now in yourself. You move one step ahead and go one step back -- and in the end you find that you are right where you have always been. You have not progressed because with each step you took, you negated what you did before. If you have

been trusting and then you begin to doubt, you are negating your own self. If you have been doubting and now you begin to trust, again you are negating yourself.

A person who listens to Krishnamurti... If I speak against Krishnamurti and he says, "Don't speak against him," it shows that he is not a man who can doubt. He is a man who can trust. He even trusts Krishnamurti who doesn't allow any trust, who is not in favor of faith at all. But this man trusts him.

And where trust is needed, the man will doubt. He will go to a temple and say, "How can I believe that this image is God?" There is no question of *how*. There are people who just can. It's a question of your capacity to trust, not a question of *how*. There are people who can trust and there are people who cannot. That, too, is a question of capacity.

No one is higher or lower. One person is capable of trust; another is capable of doubt. So decide for yourself which you are capable of. For each there will be different techniques.

If you go to Gurdjieff, the technique is that of trust. You must trust him. First he will examine you to find out whether you can trust. He will create such fantastic situations that you cannot believe it! He will create situations so that you will try to escape from him. If you are a doubter, then he will give you every opportunity to doubt, he will create situations so that you will doubt. Then he knows that "this person is not capable of trust."

Gurdjieff would tell stories about himself. He would create totally false stories about himself. And he would create such situations that only someone who could trust absolutely, in spite of everything, would be able to trust. Sometimes he would behave in such a rude manner that it would be impossible to stay with him. If you could stay in spite of his rude manner, you would not find a more compassionate, more sympathetic person, but first you would have to pass through the test. He said, "I will not waste my energies on people who cannot be helped by me. First I must know whether a person is capable of trust."

So there are techniques that are based on faith and there are techniques that are based on doubt. Both lead to the same. In the end, a point comes where doubt becomes impossible; you cannot doubt. That means you have come to trust -- even in yourself, but, still, the trust is absolute.

Descartes became a very religious person in the end. He had such deep faith that everything that he had denied before he said was all nonsense. "If I cannot doubt myself, then who am I to doubt the divine?" he said in the end. He doubted everything and denied everything until ultimately he came to himself. This fact could not be denied, it was ultimate. But then he realized, "If I cannot doubt myself, if I am incapable of doubting even myself, who am I to doubt anything?" In the end, doubt fails. He became a religious person -- through doubt.

Krishnamurti or Buddha -- they also became religious persons through doubt. And the same thing happens when you go on trusting. To trust means you annihilate yourself. You cannot assert anything. The teacher may say, "It is night now," and you know it is the day. If you went to Gurdjieff that is what he might say. A person who trusted Gurdjieff would think, "He must know more than I do. I have come to learn from him. If he says it is night, he must mean something."

If there is trust, 'I' cannot remain. It is annihilated. You surrender yourself, you are no more. If you surrender to such an extent that your trust is absolute, then you are no more. There is no one who can trust: the duality -- the truster and the trusted -- explodes. Maslow says that what follows is an *aha* experience. You cannot say anything: *aha!* it is an explosion. There is no one there.

The doubter comes to trust everything in the end and one who trusts reaches nothingness

in the end. In the beginning it appears as though the doubter will come to nothingness in the end and the truster will come to everything in the end; but one who trusts is surrendered so finally only nothingness is there, while one who doubts becomes crystallized -- he becomes the whole.

When there is nothing to doubt, doubt will have to be left. It can exist only in opposition to some belief, it cannot exist in the void. If everything is doubted and nothing is left to believe, you cannot doubt any further. Doubt drops. In the same way, if you have trusted everything, if no doubt is within you, then trust becomes meaningless. It is only meaningful in relationship to doubt. To be absolute is the key. If doubt becomes absolute there will be an explosion. If faith becomes absolute there will be an explosion. There will be nothing left but "Aha!"

I cannot talk about these 112 methods now, but soon we will discuss them. Each method ultimately leads to the same thing: oneness. Each method is for a particular individual. That is the reason for the *satguru*: the right master. The term *satguru* means one who can know the type of individual you are, nothing else.

Every technique is written in the scriptures. You can read them, but that will not help you to be able to know what type of person you are. The *satguru* is needed not to give you the technique -- the technique is written every where; you can find it out for yourself -- but to make you understand what type of person you are. Once your particularity is known, the right technique can be given to you.

To give the right technique is a great science because each individual differs. Really, there are no two individuals who are alike. Each individual differs; each individual's center of emphasis is different. Each individual's body centers are different, each individual's body electricity is different, each individual's capacity is different. Each individual has stopped somewhere on the path, where no other individual has ever stopped. Each one is on the journey, on the path, but each one is somewhere else; no one else is like him. Only a master can know where one is in his spiritual journey.

But for the method of doubt this is not needed. Only doubt is enough. You can deny gurus, you can deny scriptures. It can be relied upon that those who are not capable of the method will not be able to do it.

With the method of trust, many distinctions will have to be made. The kind of trust one has differs from person to person. It may be that one person can trust a living teacher. For that, a deeper trust is needed. Or it may be that someone can only trust a dead teacher. Then much trust is not needed because it is not possible to find faults with the teacher. You cannot find faults with Mahavir now, you cannot find faults with Buddha now. Everything has become absolute.

With a living teacher... if Mahavir was here now, you would find faults with him. When he was alive, people found faults. They will always find them, it is not significant. Even if someone has no faults, if you are a fault-finder you will find them.

To be with a dead teacher doesn't require deep trust. That's why the more ancient the teacher is, the deeper the trust you feel you can give him. But it is not really that you have faith in him, that you trust him. Faith is required only when the person is alive because then every moment he can behave in such a way as to challenge your faith. He can make it almost impossible for you to believe in him.

Alan Watts has written about Gurdjieff that he was a scoundrel saint. And it is so! Sometimes he would behave just like a scoundrel. And in that way, he helped so many

people. He would just cut you off. Then neither your time would be wasted nor his.

One day at Fountainbleu, a journalist came to see him. He never allowed journalists to come to him but somehow the journalist arrived with someone and was introduced as a treat journalist attached to an international paper. Gurdjieff asked the man who was introducing the journalist, "What day is today?"

The man said, "Saturday."

Gurdjieff said, "How can it be? Yesterday was Friday so how can it be that today is Saturday? It is impossible!"

The journalist just fled! He ran away! His friend followed him and asked, "Where are you going?"

"Is he mad? He says, 'How is it that Saturday can follow Friday? Yesterday it was just Friday, so how can it be that today is Saturday?'"!

The friend came back and asked Gurdjieff, "What nonsense were you saying?"

Gurdjieff said, "If he cannot tolerate even that much nonsense, then it is impossible to talk further to him. Whatsoever is meaningful to me will be nonsense to him. There is a realm where sense ends. You may call it supersense, but it is still nonsense. If he could not tolerate even this much, then it is better that he is gone. I am a madman. Soon I will say many things that will appear mad to him. It is better to find out first whether he can tolerate a madman. If he can, then something can be said to him. Otherwise, not."

I myself create so many situations. Those who are really authentic, who are ready to work, will have to pass through them. Otherwise they cannot work. The work is in the unknown. It is in that dimension which transcends reason, which transcends sense, which transcends all your understanding.

If you come to me with your moral attitudes, your traditional-mind attitudes, your so-called knowledge, I will have to shatter it from somewhere. I will have to break it, I will have to make an opening. The opening is always difficult, painful. So I have to create many many situations...

I create situations. I spread rumors about myself just to see what happens to you. Someone says something to you about me. What happens? You may simply drop me. And it is very good! Now you will not be wasting my time and I will not be wasting yours. If you drop me then it is not your path, you must find someone somewhere else. Then it is good that you have dropped me. But if you remain, if you persist in spite of many repulses, then only can something that is beyond, transcendental, be shown to you, indicated to you.

Otherwise it is going to be difficult: A person who is bound to his common sense, his so-called common sense, cannot go deep. And deep are the mysteries. The deeper you go, the deeper the mysteries that will be there. You will have to throw all your common sense, all your knowing and knowledge. Somewhere on the way you will have to be empty. Only in that emptiness is the flowering.

These 112 methods that I am referring to are the most significant ones. It is not that there are only 112. There can be thousands of methods. Each person has to work differently on whatever technique he is using, so there are as many techniques as there are persons. Ultimately they all lead to the same thing, but your uniqueness has to be taken into account.

If you are to move on the path of meditation, then even one technique will do. But if you just want to speculate about it, then even 112 techniques will not be enough. There is a difference between a thinker and a seeker. What I am talking to you about is basically directed toward a seeker it is not for a thinker. For a thinker, things will be different but for a seeker it is meaningless how many methods there are. Only this is meaningful: "What way is

for me?"

It is meaningless what techniques others are working on. The only meaningful thing is whether you are working on the technique that is right for you. A seeker is scientific. He is not just thinking, speculating. He has made his own self an experimental field, a laboratory. He is working on himself.

I was talking for ten years. But then I realized that people were just thinking about what I said. Thinking leads nowhere, it is absurd -- except if the technique of doubt is for you. But then, you will not come to hear me speak!

Now my emphasis is more and more on the seeker. One should be aware of one's particularness, one's individuality. And once, the right technique is known, one should begin to work. When there is a flowering, when there is a realization then you will know that each technique is basically the same. But of course the details are different, absolutely different.

And whatever technique is given to you, only accept its validity through experimenting and experiencing. You will be fulfilled through it, you will become richer through your experimenting. Don't just go on thinking about it. Thinking becomes a bad habit, it becomes an obsession. First you think about this, then you think about that and then you need something else to think about. As soon as you have thought about something you need another object to think about. It becomes obsessive.

With a seeker, this should not be so. That is why when Gurdjieff wrote ALL AND EVERYTHING, a one thousand page book, he left nine hundred pages uncut. There was a note to the reader in the first edition of the book: "Please go through the one hundred page introduction and if you think that you want to read more, only then cut the other pages. Otherwise return the book and get your money back. Don't open the other pages!"

Another note was also there in the first edition: "If you cannot read the one hundred open pages first, before opening the other pages, then you are not a seeker and you will not be profited by the book. Don't become curious. Start with the first hundred pages; don't open the other pages. Read the introduction first. Only then will you find the book of any help."

Mind is so curious. It is so curious that it first wants to read the unopened pages before reading the open pages. It becomes very arduous to go through the first hundred pages. I he mind is constantly thinking about those unopened pages⁴ you go through the initial pages just in order to reach the uncut pages. This is the attitude of the thinker. He is curious, hopping from one thing to the next.

A seeker is not like that. I will tell you a story about Bayazid, a Sufi saint -- when he was at his guru's school. For twenty years Bayazid continued going to his guru for instruction. Twenty years continuously! One day, his teacher said, "In the hall where you are coming from, there is a window. In that window, there are some books. Bring me such and such a book."

Bayazid said, "I don't know where the window is."

His teacher said, "But you have been coming through that hall continuously for twenty years, every day. You don't know the window?"

He said, "I was coming to see you. It was unnecessary to look here and there. So I did not know that the window was there. But I will go and seek it, and search for the book."

The guru said, "The book is not needed. I only asked you to see whether you are a seeker or a thinker. Now I know that you are a seeker."

After twenty years the teacher was still trying to find out whether or not Bayazid was a seeker! Bayazid said, "After twenty years you are giving me this examination? You must have examined me before."

The teacher said, "I couldn't. It would have been too cruel. Even now I was not sure if it was time."

The mind is so curious. It is always wandering here and there, everywhere. But a wandering mind will not do. The mind must be focused -- insistently focused, intensively focused. It must be brought to one particular point. Only then can any work happen.

A technique is nothing but a method of narrowing the mind down. Thousands are the possibilities of techniques, but you must not wander from one to another. The whole point is to narrow the mind down. Otherwise you will not be able to work at all, the possibility will not be there.

The problem is difficult and deep, and your energies are limited. They must not be thrown here and there. They must be pinned down somewhere. Only then is something possible. Thinking throws your energies from one place to the next. Nothing will be produced by it. That's why a technique is used. It is just to pin you down to one particular, narrow path in which all your energies can be channeled. Only then can your limited life, the limited time You have, come to a flowering that is unlimited. Otherwise it is not possible.

So don't go on thinking so much. Think only up to the point where you have decided what type of technique is for you. Then stop thinking and begin to work. If you cannot leave thinking behind, then no -- method is for you. Then your approach is through doubt.

Then, go on doubting. Never think about trust, never think about faith. But one must be decisive about it of one's whole life can be wasted. And we waste. We have wasted so many lives. It is not the first time that we are wasting our lives. It is an old habit.

Think up to the limit where you have come to a decision. Then, throw thinking. Now it is not needed. Jump, move existentially, don't speculate. Allow the momentum to move you along, remain in the flow. The more narrow the passage in which you are working, the nearer will be the realization. The only function of a technique is to narrow you....

The Eternal Quest

Chapter #3

Chapter title: A Psychological Approach

Date Unknown

Archive code: 6700000

ShortTitle: QUEST03

Audio: No

Video: No

Question

WHAT IS THE BASIC DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE MORE FAMILIAR SYSTEMS OF YOGA AND THE SYSTEM THAT YOU HAVE DEVELOPED?

There are as many paths as there are minds. Each mind requires a particular path and each

method is true for a particular person. No method is true as such or false as such. It depends on the person to whom it is to be applied. So yoga is basically individual.

Whenever a society changes, mind changes. I have been developing new methods for the new mind. The old methods were developed for a particular type of mind that no longer exists in the world.

For example, Buddhist methods were developed for the particular type of mind that Buddha was encountering. Now that mind no longer exists and those methods have become useless. A new mind has come into being. The type of mind that Buddha was facing and working with was basically based on faith. The whole training of the Indian mind was based on faith, doubt was never allowed.

Now, all over the world, the modern mind is based on doubt. The scientific approach uses doubt, a mind cannot be scientific unless it can take doubt to the very extreme. We have trained our minds for doubt, so those methods that were based on faith have become useless. For the modern mind, they cannot be used.

We have to devise new methods for the modern mind -- based on doubt; on experimenting, without faith as a basic condition. In each age, new devices are needed. All devices can be used only for a certain time.

My method is more scientific and less religious. It gives you a religious experience, but the method itself is more scientific than religious, more psychological than spiritual. The modern mind only accepts the body and the mind; the spiritual realm is taken as a romantic fallacy. So you cannot begin anything from the spiritual. At the most, you can start from the psychological. So my method is more psychological than spiritual. It leads ultimately to the spiritual dimension but it starts from psychology.

We have been doing much with the human mind, particularly in the West. The religious traditions -- Jewish, Christian Islam and now even Hindu -- have all been suppressive. We have layers and layers of suppressions, and unless they are released, thrown out, exhaled, nothing can be done as far as the inner journey is concerned. So my method works with catharsis. The first basic thing is to go through a catharsis. Unless the repressions in your mind are released, you cannot proceed further. They are the blocks

They were never there before. Particularly in the East they have never before existed. The mind was not so repressed; we accepted things as they are. But now, the whole world lives under a Christian shadow. Everything natural has become condemned. The body, sex -- all these things are condemned. We are in an inner conflict.

Reason has become supreme and it suppressed everything that is not rational. Reason is just a tiny part of the whole being of man, just a small fragment, but this small fragment has become supreme, dictatorial. It has suppressed everything else in the personality. These suppressed layers have to be released first. Unless they are released and one comes to a deep harmony within -- with one's own instincts, nature, body -- nothing further can be done.

All the old methods start with you as you are. For example, Mahesh Yogi's Transcendental Meditation. It starts with you as you are. It gives you a particular technique, a mantra to work with. The mantra will help you to calm down, but it cannot transform you. It can only make you more adjusted to a society that is, itself, ill. It can make you more still, a certain well being will come to you, but no transformation will happen because the repressed layers will remain where they are. They are not even touched by it You by-pass your suppressions and do something with your mind that only gives it a superficial tranquility.

All the old methods -- if used directly, without catharsis -- will not be of much help. So my method starts with catharsis. Only when your tensions, are released can you jump deep

within yourself.

The jump is possible. And I think that for us today, it has become urgent that we move within. But the preparation is bound to be different than it has been in the past, so my method works first as a catharsis. Then, it tries to create a harmony with your body.

We are separated from our bodies. All the old traditions have emphasized that body and mind are two things. That is absolutely wrong. Body and mind are just two poles of one existence. The old traditions have emphasized that you are not the body, but my emphasis is quite the contrary. You *are* the body. You are more than the body, you go beyond the body, but you are also the body. There is no division as such, no conflict.

We have created the conflict, and that conflict has created a gap. The gap has to be bridged. My method is a means to bridge the gap. Only when it is bridged do you become whole. And then, the jump becomes possible.

You cannot jump if you are fragmented. One part of you cannot jump ahead of another part. You have to take the jump as a whole being. To me, 'holy' means whole. This wholeness has to be created. That is what I am trying to do.

If you take it for granted that you are not the body then your body becomes closed: a dead thing hanging over you. Then you are not living in it, just carrying it. So to bring you back to your body is the first thing that must be done. Then you have to be brought back to your mind, you have to become one with the whole mind. Only then can you become one with the spirit. Man must first be rooted in the body and then rooted in his natural mind. Only then can he fall down deep, into his natural depths.

So I am a *yea* sayer; I am against all conflict. I accept nature in its totality, with no condemnation. Only when there is acceptance can there be transformation. That is why I am not very concerned with old traditions of yoga -- not concerned at all.

Question

HOW DO YOU BRING ABOUT THE CATHARSIS THAT YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT?

It takes time, but it is not difficult. How have we become so suppressed? The technique to release the suppression is just the opposite.

The method of repression is to not express. If you feel angry, you don't express it. You suppress it, you don't allow it to come out. My method is quite the contrary. If you are angry, express it. Not to someone, but in a vacuum. If you are angry at me, don't express it to me. Go into a room and express it to the vacuum. If you express it toward someone it creates a chain reaction and you will never be out of it. But if you suppress it within, it becomes poisonous. It will remain in your system and will go on doing many many foolish things to you. Ultimately, you will have to express it somewhere somehow.

My method is to express everything that is inside. If there are special problems, moral problems, don't express it to someone else. Express it in a vacuum. So my method starts with expressing everything that has been suppressed.

In the first step, I insist on chaotic breathing, for ten minutes. Not systematic breathing, but chaotic breathing. Systematic breathing cannot disturb your suppressed being. Chaotic breathing is very meaningful because breath is the link between your body and mind. If you are angry you have a different rhythm of breathing. If you are in love a different rhythm of breathing. If you are sad, again there is a different rhythm of breathing. If you are relaxed, a different rhythm of breathing. When your state of mind changes, your breathing changes

immediately. So if you change your breathing, your state of mind is affected immediately. You cannot breathe rhythmically and be angry simultaneously. It is impossible. You cannot go into the sex act with very silent breathing. Impossible!

So first I insist on chaotic breathing. Just taking the breath in and throwing it out. No yogic method is to be used. Inhale as much as possible and then exhale as much as possible, forgetting everything but the breathing. Just remember to exhale and inhale so forcibly that your whole system is disturbed: every cell of the body is disturbed, every cell of the mind is disturbed. You are trying to disturb the whole set pattern that has been developed in you!

In the second step, when your breathing has disturbed your body/mind completely, I tell you to express whatever is inside you. Whatsoever comes to your mind, for ten minutes you are to express it. If you want to scream, scream madly. If you want to weep, weep madly. If you want to laugh, laugh. If you want to jump, be angry, throw your violence to the sky, then do it. Whatsoever you want to express, express. But not to someone; just in a vacuum.

The second step is expression. You will be surprised to see how many things start coming to you once you start expressing them. It is not only that your mind expressed them. Your *body* expresses them. For the first time, you become aware that your body has many repressions to express. If you are a violent man, your hands will be moving as if you are killing someone or beating someone. Many screams will come out. And through the screams, much will be released.

For this second step to happen totally, takes time. But within three weeks you will be able to express what is within you spontaneously. Then you will feel that something is leaving you and you are being unburdened.

Only then can the third step happen. The third step is a particular sound: *hoo*. Not the word 'who', just the sound *hoo* -- meaningless. For ten minutes you have to repeat it: *hoo, hoo, hoo*. This sound hits the sex center inside. There are different sounds, and every sound reaches a different layer within. If you say *om*, the sound that has been traditionally used, it goes to the heart. If you say *om*, the sound never goes below the heart; but if you say *hoo*, the sound reaches below the navel and hits the sex center.

Modern man -- the modern mind and the modern body -- is so involved with sex that unless that center is hit, nothing can be done with man. The sex center can be hit in two ways: from without or from within. Sex is the only energy in you; it is the source of all energies. If it moves out, it becomes biological reproduction. If it moves in, it becomes spiritual transformation -- a rebirth of yourself.

In the third step, you are to just go on crying, screaming, "HOO!" and hitting the sex center. Soon, within a few weeks, you will begin to feel an uprush of energy starting from the sex center and moving up through your spine. You will feel a warmth, you will feel that a new path has been opened inside you. And once this energy begins to move from your spine toward the head, you will have a different view about yourself, a different outlook, a different dimension. Once this energy reaches the head, it can be released from the head. Normally sex energy is released from the sex center. That is one pole of our being. The opposite pole is the head. If the sex energy can be released from the head, you are transformed; you are a different being.

So these are the three steps to do. The fourth step is simple relaxation -- just falling dead. Not doing anything: no effort, no technique. Just remaining silently with whatsoever is. After doing the first three steps, you are so exhausted that relaxation comes easily. You want to relax, your whole body wants to relax. You fall down and lie there like a dead man. In this deadness, you become a witness. You are simply a witness, not doing anything.

This fourth step is what has been known for ages as meditation. But now these first three steps have to be added to it. Unless these three are done, just telling people to be silent, sit silently, is meaningless. They can sit, they can force themselves to sit, but they cannot be silent because the madness will go around and around inside them. Rather when they are sitting silently, they will become more mad inside.

Question

WHAT ABOUT THE METHOD OF JUST WATCHING THE MIND?

If you just watch the mind, it will take a very long time -- years. And nothing is certain because you are not simply watching: every day, you are creating more mind. And there is a past accumulation in the mind, so it can go on and on; you can go on and on.

I have seen people practicing watching as a method. It is one of the oldest methods: witnessing whatsoever is inside. If you have very little madness inside you then this method will do, but otherwise you can go on watching and it will seem infinite.

Question

ISN'T IT NECESSARY TO DISIDENTIFY YOURSELF WITH THE MIND -- AS IF IT IS OUTSIDE YOU?

No, it is not outside you. It is inside. If you say that it is outside then there is no inside and no outside. Then you are part of the universe. But then again, it is inside.

Whatever is happening in you is happening in you. You have to throw it out. If you just go on watching, it is possible that meditation may result, but it is a very long process. I have seen people watching for thirty years. They become a little bit silent, but basically the mind continues. The mind seems infinite -- you go on creating more of it again and again.

So to me, one must first throw out the accumulation and then watch. That throwing out, that catharsis, is miraculous. Then you can relax very easily, then you can witness very easily. First identifying with your madness, in throwing it, gives you the capacity for nonidentifying. If you cannot identify, you cannot nonidentify.

If you are laughing and you can be totally one with this laugh, you gain the Capacity to be totally removed from it. The laugh continues and you can be a witness. If you have not totally identified yourself with your laugh, or your anger, or anything, you are not capable of disidentifying. So this catharsis helps in watching.

The fourth step of Dynamic Meditation is simply to be silent and be a witness. Then these three steps drop by and by. They are not to be followed forever. When you feel that nothing is coming up, the second step drops. But you are not to drop it; you have to continue it. When you feel that nothing is coming up -- no anger, no violence, no laughing, no crying -- that you have disturbed your bioenergy through fast breathing and still nothing comes up, then okay. Then the second step has dropped.

When you do the third step, sooner or later it drops. When the energy begins to move by itself, there is no need of hammering. If the energy is moving upward and you go on using *hoo*, it disturbs the upward movement. Then you have to drop it. And then you have to drop the first step also, because there is no need. Now, only the fourth step remains.

Now you can move into the fourth step at any moment, at any time. This fourth step is the meditation; the first three steps are just preparations. The fourth step is just like Zen. You are not doing anything. No effort. Just waiting silently.

But it takes time. At least three weeks are needed to get the feel of the technique, and three months are needed before you can begin to move in a different world. But the time it will take is not fixed. It differs from individual to individual. If your intensity is very great, then even in three days it can happen.

Question

IS ANY RELIGIOUS BELIEF REQUIRED, OR CAN THIS TECHNIQUE BE PRACTICED AS A SORT OF PSYCHOTHERAPY?

No religious belief is required. Just practice it as a psychotherapy. As I see it, belief has become impossible. You can only force belief, but you cannot believe. It is not possible now. If you believe it is okay; but for ninety-nine percent of the people, it has become impossible to believe. We can only force belief but that becomes a repression again, so I am against it.

Don't believe. Just take it as an experiment. If something happens, that will become your belief. But no belief is required as a precondition to do it. You can conclude with a belief but you cannot start with a belief. And there is no need. If a thing is scientific, belief is never a requirement.

You are not the body; you are not the mind. You are one. But the old traditions of the past have divided you. They have created a false gap by constantly insisting that the body and you are separate. They have created a gap, a psychological gap. The gap is not real, they cannot create a gap in reality, but they have created the idea in the mind and now the gap exists. So when I say that a bridge has to be created between you and your body, I simply mean that this illusion of separation has to be dissolved. You are already one, but psychologically we think of the body as something separate. A totality has to be attained.

So I don't divide body and mind, matter and mind, the world and *moksha*. I say that the existence is one. Unless you can feel this oneness, you can never be free from anxiety, anguish. All anxiety is basically rooted in this division.

Because of this division, you cannot live in this moment, here and now. The division goes on creating the future. How to achieve *moksha*, liberation, salvation in the future? How to be beyond this body in the future? How to be free from the body, from the material world? Always, in the future.

Right now, because of this division, we cannot be, So first the division has to be dissolved. It is a false division, but it exists. Once the division is dissolved, you are liberated here and now. Then, there is no future.

A person who is future-oriented will be sick. He cannot be healthy. The future will go on creating tensions, anxieties.

There is no future. This moment is enough. If we can be one in this moment, and live this moment in its totality it is liberation. And we cannot live this moment in its totality unless we are total. That's why there are techniques. To help you to be total.

Look at it in this way. Man's whole suffering is because of certain wrong attitudes. Reality does not have to be changed; only these wrong attitudes have to be changed. And this is a wrong attitude: to look at the whole in a divided way. It is one, whole. But the intellect divides; it cannot function without division. Reason divides; it cannot function without division. All meditations are basically to give you a glimpse of an existence where you are not dividing things, where you are taking them in their totality, as they are. I am against any sort of division.

Question

IF YOUR METHOD IS PURELY PSYCHOTHERAPEUTIC, THEN WHY IS THERE AN EMPHASIS ON DRESS, WHY DOES EVERYONE WEAR ORANGE?

Because it is psychotherapeutic. Because of that. Your mind influences your dress, your mind influences your body, your mind influences your food. Everything you do affects the mind.

If the method was simply spiritual, there would be no need to change the clothes. What is the need? But psychotherapy has to deal with every trivial thing, because nothing is trivial for the mind. The moment you change your clothes, your mind becomes different because something basic has changed .

Dress is not just an ordinary phenomenon. For the mind, it is very significant. The Queen of England in her royal dress. Give her the dress of a poor woman to wear and it will not simply be a change of dress. The whole mind is affected by it. When a policeman is standing on the road in his uniform, he is a different man from when he is in civil dress.

The mind is concerned with very ordinary things: food, dress, everything. It changes as these external things change, so I give you a different dress, I give you a different name, just to give you a different identity -- so you can start afresh. They help.

But they are not spiritual. For spirituality, there is no need to change anything. The moment you become spiritual, there is no need to change anything outwardly. But you are not yet spiritual, and everything can help.

If you are wearing very tight clothes, you feel more violent. That is why we do not give soldiers loose clothing. If loose robes, like monks wear, are given to soldiers, they will not be able to fight. Inside, their minds will become loose and free like their robes. If you are wearing very tight clothes you will be more violent, more sexual. Your very way of walking will be different, because the mind is made up of very small things. An ordinary change can be very meaningful for the mind. You cannot stand in the street naked. Why? It is very meaningful. It is not simply a question of dress. You can stand naked only if your mind is different.

Your mind is made up of very small things. If you change These things, you change your mind, your past. You start something new, there is a new nucleus around which something new can be organized.

You eat ordinary food. If you suddenly change your food, your body will have to become readjusted to it. You have a particular rhythm between day and night. You sleep for a few hours, you are up for a few hours. If you do not get your normal night's sleep, the rhythm of your body is changed and your whole being is disturbed by it.

Try this: a very ordinary thing. Put on a clown's costume and go to the market and feel how different you will feel to yourself. Everyone will be looking at you in a different way and because what you think about yourself is nothing but a reflection of others' opinions; if their opinion of you changes, you yourself will change. So changing the clothes is just psychotherapeutic technique. It helps in the beginning.

Question

PEOPLE TRY TO ACHIEVE AWARENESS AND HIGHER STATES OF CONSCIOUSNESS THROUGH DRUGS. WHEN THE DRUG WEARS OFF, THEY LOSE THIS INCREASED AWARENESS. CAN THE AWARENESS THAT ONE ATTAINS THROUGH MEDITATION ALSO BE LOST?

No. Once you attain it, it cannot be lost. If it is lost, then your technique was nothing but a drug. There *are* meditation techniques that are like drugs. The criterion is this: if you achieve something and then it is lost, know well that the technique was a trick, a drug.

Question

EVEN IF YOU DON'T CONTINUALLY PRACTICE THE TECHNIQUE?

Even if you don't practice it. Once you have come to a point in your being, it can never be lost unless it was simply a dream. Only a dream can be lost.

Drugs cannot give you reality. They can only give you very beautiful dreams. Or even horrible dreams -- it depends on you, the dreamer. You can hypnotize yourself into a particular dream; there are hypnotic techniques. If you use them you will be in a state of autohypnosis, you will start feeling things, many things, but once you stop the technique, the whole thing will disappear. It was just a mental trick you were playing: you were dreaming, it was your imagination.

If you really grow into awareness, it cannot be lost. That is the distinction between real methods and false methods. A real method is a growth method; it is not simply a vision. You grow in it; the vision comes because you have grown to a new state of mind.

With drugs, or with a false technique, you never grow. A certain vision comes to you, but you remain the same. When you are not using the drug, or the technique, the vision will disappear. It was produced chemically; it was not coming through your own growth. Remember always, only growth matters. Visions are of no use. Even if you see God, it is meaningless. If you remain the same, then your God is nothing but a by-product of your own imagination. Visions are not meaningful. Christianity has placed too much emphasis on them.

That's why drugs have become so prevalent in the West -- because they can easily create visions. If you are looking for visions, then I will say that meditation is a waste of time; drugs are better. They give you visions easily. But you remain the same. Or, rather, you may even fall down from your ordinary state of mind; you may deteriorate.

With meditation, whatsoever is attained remains with you. If you stop the technique you will not proceed further, but whatever you have attained will remain with you. It cannot be lost; a real growth can never be lost. It is not something added to you that you can lose. It is you who has grown.

For example, if you have become a young man you cannot fall back to your childhood again. It is a growth. But if a child is simply dreaming that he has become a young man, he will fall down. When he awakens from his dream he will be a child again. That is the criterion to judge whether something has been a growth or it is just a dream. If it is a dream, it will be lost. If it has been growth, it will remain with you.

The Eternal Quest

Chapter #4

Chapter title: Hatha Yoga: A Valid Approach?

Date Unknown

Archive code: 6700000

ShortTitle: QUEST04

Audio: No

Video: No

Question

IN TRADITIONAL YOGA, ONE STARTS WITH THE BODY -- THROUGH HATHA YOGA METHODS. WHY IS IT THAT YOU DO NOT TEACH HATHA YOGA .

It is good to start with the body, it is necessary. But it is not sufficient. There are many problems with Hatha Yoga particularly for those in the West, because the system of Hatha Yoga and its related techniques were all developed in a very different milieu -- really, for very differently constituted bodies as well as for different minds.

Not only is the mind different today than it was when these techniques were developed, but the body is also not the same. Everything has become artificial. The whole environment has been so changed by science that you do not have the same kind of body that people had before. Your body is different. Your mind would not be different unless your body had become different.

When you start with a modern body, the same techniques will not do. Something else has to be added. Hatha Yoga can be used beneficially when the body exists in a very natural condition, a very natural, very innocent condition -- childlike. Then these techniques are miraculous. But we do not have such innocent bodies now; we have very complex bodies. They are not natural. Changes in the environment have done much to change our bodies, medicine has done much. The whole chemical milieu in which we live is different; even the air is different.

You have a very unnatural body. It is unnatural not only because it has been conditioned by the outside, but also because of too much mental suppression inside. There are very complex suppressions in your body and unless these body complexes are released, Hatha Yoga will not help -- or, it can help only to a certain extent.

Read the work of the German psychologist Wilhelm Reich. He was a disciple of Freud's. He worked continuously for forty years with the suppressions in the body, not in the mind. For example, he said that if you have suppressed anger than your jaw will be different, it will not be natural. You will have a different jaw; your teeth will be different. Violence is concentrated in the teeth and in the fingers.

When an animal is angry and in a wild mood, his whole energy moves to his teeth and nails. They are his weapons. The same thing happens to man also. If you feel anger and do not express it, the energy does not leave the teeth and the nails. There is no mechanism for it to go back; it is a one-way process. When a dog becomes angry he expresses it, but when a man becomes angry he may not express it. The energy that has moved to the teeth and nails cannot go back where it came from, the chemicals released into the blood cannot go back. They remain where they have moved to and tension begins to be accumulated at these particular points in the body. So the first thing that has to be done is that this accumulation in the body has to be released.

Hatha Yoga does not take this into account because in former times a suppressed mind

and suppressive attitude were not prevalent, particularly in India. In those days India was one of the least suppressive countries. Now that is not so. And in the West, Christianity has caused so much suppression that everybody is crippled inside. These suppressions in the body have to be released first.

Otherwise you start out with a body that is not right, not natural, and many unnecessary problems may be created by it. That is why something totally unknown to Hatha Yoga has to be introduced now: the body must go through a catharsis first. To bring about this catharsis, a totally new science will be needed because this suppression is something new.

For example, if you have suppressed sex a lot, then *kundalini* cannot move up. It is blocked. The whole structure from where the *kundalini* can move up is simply blocked, blocked by the suppressed sex energy. Or, if you have indulged too much in sex, then you have no energy left to move upward. These are the two problems: either you have a suppressed mind and the energy has become blocked or you have indulged too much so that no energy is left to move within you. You are not in a natural state, your energy is not balanced. It is not a natural flow that comes from either suppressing or indulging. With balanced energy, Hatha Yoga can be used very easily, but otherwise it creates problems.

Another thing is that all these hatha yoga techniques were developed for use in monasteries. They are monastic techniques intended for people who are totally involved in them for twenty-four hours a day, not doing anything else. Then too, you have to work with them for a very long period, for years. If hatha yoga is taught to a person who is not totally involved in it, who only comes to do hatha yoga once or twice -- or even for an hour a day, but who is involved for twenty-three hours a day in quite a different world, a work that is quite the contrary -- it is not going to help much. Whatever you have gained is lost every day. The very method is a monastic method. Now we have to develop the methods, nonmonastic methods that will not be undone by the rest of the activities of your life.

This is a problem, this is one of the most significant problems for those whose who are interested in yoga. In India, people just go on in their traditional way. They have tradition so they follow it without thinking of whether something has to be changed or something new has to be added. The whole world has become so different now that hatha yoga techniques are irrelevant in many ways, but they go on being taught because they have because they have become traditional.

India invented many things. But after a certain period the discovering stopped. It happens so many times. Now the same thing is happening in the West, particularly in America. In America, technology has become so developed now that it can change everything. But because the changes are happening so fast, people are beginning to be against technology now. Whenever something comes to a peak it becomes threatening to many of the traditional values and a dialectical process develops in the same society. Many people begin to oppose continued progress. In America, the new generation is moving more and more against technology. If this opposition continues, as it is bound to, technological progress will stop and no further technological discoveries will be made. Then the mind will become static.

The same thing happened in India with yoga. India developed a very subtle technology for inner development. It was an inner science. Once the development came to a peak it became a danger to everything, because if the whole mind of a country becomes concentrated on yoga, everything else is bound to suffer.

India reached a peak of affluence. Then it became poor. This was a logical conclusion because if there is too much concern with the inner world, you are bound to become poor. You are not concerned with outward progress, the whole balance is lost. You become

introverted. And once the whole society becomes introverted, outward conditions begin to deteriorate. Because of this inwardness, the whole progress of the country stopped. Finally, people began to oppose this over-concern with inwardness then.

Since the time of Buddha, India has not discovered anything new in terms of inner growth. Nothing is new since then; it has just been a repetition. And when it comes to bringing these same things to the West, there is a big gap -- a tremendous gap.

For the West, many new things have to be done, many new things have to be conceived of and experimented with. I myself am trying many things. To me, the first thing that is needed is a catharsis. A catharsis releases everything inside you that is wrong, everything that is suppressed inside. You throw out all your suppressions, releasing them. Now, many new things have to be added to the traditional methods -- a 2,000 year gap is there! -- and this catharsis, to me, is the most important thing that has to be added. First, your body must go through a renewal...

When something becomes suppressed in the body, you are not aware of it. It goes into the unconscious, it is never conscious. the body is run by the unconscious mind not the conscious mind. The whole mechanism of the body is nonvoluntary.

You cannot feel whether your fingers have accumulated anger in them because if you could feel it, it would be difficult to live. Your fingers would feel so burdened that they would pull you down to earth. There is a natural mechanism that allows you not to feel the suppressed anger in your fingers. You must not feel it, you must forget it is there. It becomes part of the structure of the body, but the mind has no awareness of it.

The mind becomes aware of something in the body only when something has gone wrong. For example, ordinarily you cannot feel that your blood is moving, but if you break a vein and the blood flows out of it, you can feel the movement of the blood. It has only been three hundred years since man has discovered that blood circulates. Before that we did not know that blood circulates because it could not be felt. Circulation is never felt. It is not a conscious thing; the body simply goes on doing it.

The entire body mechanism works unconsciously. You are not conscious of it. Whenever something moves from the mind to the body, it moves from the conscious to the unconscious. The body is unconscious. If you are angry you are conscious of the anger but not conscious of the chemicals that are released into the body. How can you be conscious of it? Whether you express your anger or you do not express your anger, you do not know what happens to those chemicals that are released into the blood stream or to the particular energy that creates aggression. If you have not used it, it must remain somewhere. You develop a complex: the aroused energy becomes a part of your muscular structure, it becomes a part of your body.

Wilhelm Reich had to arrange for two bodyguards when he was treating his patients because when he would push a particular point in the body, the patient would become wild. Many would become so violent that they would attack him without any reason. Reich would be just pushing a person's teeth and suddenly the person would become angry for no reason. The whole body has so many different points where so many emotions have been suppressed.

In England there was also a man whose techniques are worth reading about. If hatha yoga is to become a modern science now, then the techniques of Wilhelm Reich and this second man, Alexander, will have to be added to it. Alexander worked with the postures of the body. He discovered that someone has a particular posture because he has a particular mind. If the posture is changed, the mind will change. Or if the mind is changed, the posture will change. The two have a deep association.

In the past, people in India never used chairs. Chairs change your body posture in

particular ways. Hatha yoga has no posture to help you if you have been sitting on chairs

It has no techniques to deal with this because chairs were not used in former times. But when you sit in a chair, a certain posture is created and by and by it becomes a fixed part of you. This has to be changed, you have to become more natural, but hatha yoga has no technique to bring about the change.

Western bodies have to be studied in a different way. What you have been doing with your body has to be studied. People in a society that does not prohibit the expression of emotions will have different kinds of postures from people in a suppressive society. In a society where people can weep easily or laugh easily, without inhibitions, the people have a different type of body structure.

When you laugh, it is not simply a laugh. Your whole body changes. If the society you have been brought up in has inhibited laughing, then your abdomen will have a different shape than if you were brought up in a society that encourages laughter. People brought up in certain societies cannot really laugh because laughter has been inhibited. Their speech is affected by it; everything becomes unnatural, a mannerism. Then you cannot breathe deeply, because if you cannot laugh you cannot take a deep breath. And in the same way, if you cannot weep easily, you cannot breathe easily. Everything in the body is interconnected.

Alexander used to give his patients an exercise called the AH Exercise. It was the first exercise he gave to every patient. First one has to relax. Then he has to say, "AH AH!" so many times. If you can say *ah*, the whole system of the breathing changes.

In hatha yoga breathing, more emphasis is given to taking the breath in, but Alexander used to put the emphasis on the exhalation. And he is right because a suppressed mind can easily take breath in but has difficulty in letting go of it, in releasing it.

It is easy for the suppressed mind to take anything in, but to release it is difficult. So a suppressed mind will become constipated in a way. Everything will be taken in and nothing will be thrown out. The body will begin to be greedy it will begin to accumulate. Even the excreta cannot be thrown out. For this type of mind, the breath cannot be thrown out so easily.

Alexander worked for forty years. He developed a certain technique that is not related to yoga. He did not know anything about yoga -- and it is good, because it meant that he had to find out many things through experience and through working with the bodies of westerners.

In the West, much body work has to be done. Alexander and Reich did much to help. Now there are also many sensitivity groups working in America, helping to create more sensitivity in the body. It is needed, because western bodies have become insensitive. You touch and the touch is dead; there is no feeling in it. You can even kiss without kissing, with no inner feeling to it. Sensitivity has been lost, but unless a body is deeply sensitive, it is not alive.

The primary thing that has to be done is to make the body alive. So many different things have to be tried, but hatha yoga is not concerned with these things because it was developed for natural, primitive bodies. Primitive bodies are very alive; cultivated bodies are dead.

To be in the body means to be alive. I can use my hand just as an instrument but then it is dead. I can move my leg as an instrument, but then it is dead. If 'I' am not moving inside my leg, then the leg is dead. More sensitivity is needed now, so different postures have to be developed. And first, much catharsis is needed.

Someone was here, an American boy. He came to learn meditation. He had been wandering in and out of many ashrams in India, and then he came here. I told him, "Meditation cannot be started yet. Between you and meditation, there is a gap. You can go on

learning techniques forever, but it will not help because you are not yet at the point where the journey can begin."

So I gave him an exercise. He sat with me and I gave him a pillow and told him to beat it and to do whatever he liked to the pillow.

He said, "This is nonsense!"

I told him, "Do it! Start!"

The first day, he tried. In the beginning he was not very good at it, but by the end he was feeling much. He told me, "It's absurd. In the beginning I had to act, but for the last ten minutes I have been feeling much."

He continued the technique. Within a week, he was as angry with the pillow as you can imagine. It was so authentic and real. Then on the eighth day, he came with a dagger -- though I had not asked him to. He said, "Now the problem is too much! I want to kill the pillow! Unless I kill it, if the anger is not released, I feel so agitated that I'm afraid I may kill somebody. So let me kill this pillow, murder it."

So he murdered.... On the eighth day he murdered the pillow, he completely destroyed it. Then for at least half an hour, he fell into a deep relaxation.

Finally I asked him, "What is your feeling about the pillow?"

He said, "The pillow remained just a pillow for four days. Later on, it became my father. I have not killed the pillow; I have killed my father. It has been a longing in me for three years. Now finally I can go back to my home, to my father. I'm not angry any more. On the contrary, I feel much pity for my father. The violence has disappeared."

Then I said, "Now you can start meditating." And the very first day, he went into deep meditation. Through catharsis, his anger was released. Only then was he ready for meditation.

Everyone is stuck in certain grooves. First it is necessary to ungroove a person, and for this there are many, many methods.

One of the methods that I give people to do is ten minutes of chaotic breathing -- as chaotically as possible. Just chaotic breathing: in/out, in/out. Just become a bellows. Forget yourself, do not interfere. Whatever movement happens, allow it. If you begin to strike at the air, then strike. If you begin to scream, then scream. If laughter comes to you, if weeping comes to you, if jumping comes to you, do it. Whatever happens to your mind, whatever you feel, *do!*

At my meditation camps, I watch people doing chaotic breathing for ten minutes and then allowing spontaneous movements to happen for ten minutes. At least fifty percent or more of the people make movements that are obviously sexual. Anyone can see that their movements are sexual; that it is sexual energy that is moving. Ten minutes of chaotic breathing disturbs the fixed pattern of your personality. Then the unconscious surges up and takes over.

Question

I AM TOO MUCH IN CONTROL OF MY BODY. MY MIND IS TOO STRONG. IT WOULD NEVER HAPPEN WITH ME.

If you are co-operative, it is very easy. What is the problem? It is the easiest thing in the world if you are co-operative. But if someone is not able to co-operate with his own energy, if he is not able to allow his body suppressions to be released, then he can be hypnotized and under hypnosis he can be told to allow what is in the unconscious to be expressed. Then, he can begin.

Only rarely can someone not be hypnotized. Only someone who is insane or who is

below normal, someone who is not intelligent enough, cannot be hypnotized. You cannot hypnotize a madman; you cannot hypnotize an idiot.

Question

ISN'T THE REVERSE THE CASE? THAT A REALLY INTELLIGENT PERSON CANNOT BE HYPNOTIZED?

A person of lower intelligence cannot be hypnotized; it is impossible. The greater the intelligence, the greater the hypnotizability. The more intelligent you are, the higher your I.Q., the more susceptible you are. A genius can be hypnotized very easily, but an idiot cannot be hypnotized at all. Your conception is wrong, but it's a prevalent mistake. What you are saying is wrong, it is absolutely unfounded, there are no grounds for it, but it is a very prevalent concept -- that people who can be hypnotized are not intelligent. It is absolutely wrong.

Question

ISN'T IT TRUE THAT NO METHOD CAN WORK FOR EVERYONE? I DON'T THINK THAT I COULD ALLOW MYSELF TO LET GO IN THE WAY YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT, NOR DO I BELIEVE I COULD BE HYPNOTIZED.

If one method does not affect you, another method may. There are hundreds of methods. If one does not work for you then another one can be given or something else can be done. If a person is intelligent and co-operative then it is very easy. On the other hand, if he is intelligent and non co-operative, then it is a long process. But it is still not difficult, not impossible.

If a person cannot be hypnotized, then his body can be worked with directly, through touch. If you have suppressed anger in your fingers, you have a very different vibration near the fingers. A person who has felt many, many hands can feel in your hand the different vibration that a suppressed anger gives to the fingers. And in the same way, your spine can be felt, all the centers of your body can be felt, the whole body can be felt. Wherever there is suppression it can be felt. It is very subtle -- a slight warmth or a slight coldness -- but it can be felt.

Wilhelm Reich's method was to feel the body. After you have been feeling many bodies you become aware of these things. It is an art. It comes to you; you begin to feel the subtleties. There are also various esoteric methods. For example, your aura can be studied. It reveals many things about you. Or your dreams can be studied. They also give much information.

Or, certain situations can be created. Through these situations, you can be studied without your knowing it. Gurdjieff used to create many situations. You would come into a room and no one would look at you, no one would pay any attention to you. Twenty persons might be sitting there and they would all behave as if you were not there. You would begin to behave in a certain way which would be studied.

You are here. A situation can be created in which you are forced to be angry. Then you can be studied. Or, you come in and everyone begins to laugh at you. Suddenly you are a different person. These are situational methods. Gurdjieff was a master at creating situations; that was the way he worked.

Study Gurdjieff also. For the last fifty years he has been the most important person in the

West as far as yoga is concerned -- even though he was not directly concerned with yoga at all. Through Sufi methods he was trying to do many things. He would create situations in which your unconscious would be suddenly revealed without your knowing it.

Every moment you are revealing your unconscious. I can say certain things about you right now, or at any given moment, because of the way you sit, the way you walk into a room, the way you talk, the way you look. Everything is connected, everything is deeply related. You say that you cannot be hypnotized. That shows your attitude: a firm, deep attitude. It means much.

Question

BUT EVEN IF I TRY, NOTHING HAPPENS.

Nothing will happen because the very trying will be the barrier. In hypnosis, no active co-operation is needed. Only passive co-operation. If you are actively co-operative, your very activity will become the barrier. Hypnosis needs a deep passivity so if you are too concerned with being hypnotized, that will be the barrier. Your very effort will be the undoing. If a person is actively co-operative, different methods have to be used -- methods that use active co-operation.

That is the problem. Certain methods use nonactive co-operation, passivity, and other methods use active co-operation. First your activity has to be exhausted. You have to be made tired before you can be passive. Then the method works.

But for you, hypnosis can be a deep help, a very deep help.

The Eternal Quest

Chapter #5

Chapter title: Freedom From Suppression

Date Unknown

Archive code: 6700000

ShortTitle: QUEST05

Audio: No

Video: No

Question

ONE DAY -- IT WAS A FRIDAY WHEN ORTHODOX JEWS ARE BUSY PREPARING FOR THE SABBATH -- A MAN WHO DIDN'T LIKE JEWS MET AN ORTHODOX RABBI ON THE STREET. IN AN ATTEMPT TO TORMENT HIM HE ASKED HIM TO EXPRESS THE ENTIRE PHILOSOPHY OF JUDAISM WHILE HE STOOD ON ONE FOOT. THE RABBI STOOD ON ONE FOOT AND SAID, "DO UNTO OTHERS AS YOU WOULD HAVE OTHERS DO UNTO YOU. THAT IS THE LAW. THE REST IS COMMENTARY.

IF I WERE TO BE MET BY A TORMENTOR AND ASKED TO STAND ON ONE FOOT AND EXPLAIN IN ONE SENTENCE WHAT YOUR TEACHING IS WOULD I BE CORRECT IN SAYING THAT IT IS FREEDOM FROM SUPPRESSION?

You would be absolutely right. But only negatively. To be freed from suppressions is the negative part, and to express the hidden, the potential, that which you are meant to be, is the positive part. But you are right, because the negative comes first. Unless you are free from suppression, you will not be able to express yourself; you will not be able to achieve your potential.

Society exists at the cost of the individual. It has existed that way up until now. The individual is not allowed total freedom to express himself. Through this suppression, society creates an image by which you can be exploited.

For example, if individuals become totally expressive, there will not be any war in the world. It is impossible. But if you suppress the individual, then the suppressed energy is there and it can be used for violence. The whole of politics, and the whole history of man, depends on war. The whole society has been based on war, but war is possible only if the individual is not allowed to express himself.

This suppressed energy has been used for many reasons, for many causes, for many purposes: for war, for politics, for exploitation. I am against all suppression. I am for natural growth.

I am not against discipline; I am against suppression. Discipline is a creative thing. It is never *against* something; it is always *for* something. For example, I am for the discipline of *sexual* energy not for the suppression of it. The energy must be allowed to move in a creative direction. It should not be suppressed. If it is suppressed, it becomes perverted. You become less than natural.

Expression means that you must become *more* than natural. If you cannot become more than natural, then it is better to be natural than to be perverted. The whole culture that has existed all over the world is a perverted culture.

That's why it rarely happens that a Buddha or a Jesus is born. Otherwise, Buddha and Jesus would be the normal case. They would not be so exceptional. If the whole society was creative rather than suppressive, then not to be a Buddha would be the exception. To be a Buddha would be a natural, normal thing.

So you are right. Freedom from suppression and freedom for expression. These two cover the whole thing. Then religion becomes a creative psychology. Then it is not a dogma, not a creed, but a creative instrument.

Question

DO YOU RECOMMEND ANY PARTICULAR DISCIPLINE BESIDES DYNAMIC MEDITATION?

Even to move into an undisciplined life you have to follow some discipline. But you must remain the master; it must not become a slavery. The real thing, the end, is always to be spontaneous

As we are, we are really conditioned not to be free. Our whole upbringing, our culture, our civilization, our religion, our parents -- they have all conditioned our minds not to be free, because a free mind is a dangerous mind. Your freedom is really a deception. You are tethered to a pole. It allows you a little freedom -- you can move and say that you are free --

but you are still tethered to the pole, so you can only move in a circle.

This is man's state of mind. To jump from this state directly into the spontaneous is very difficult. Sometimes it happens, but you need much courage. You require the mind of a gambler, of one who can stake everything for the unknown. Then only you can take a jump.

You can jump immediately from rules to no rules, from your deadened life to the electricity of living, but then you need very deep courage, the courage to lose yourself. But that is rare. When it exists, no discipline is needed, but since it is not ordinarily possible, you have to do something before you are able to take a jump.

You can jump in stages. Then the jump is not so big and you are not afraid of it.

At a certain point, one has to take a jump into the unknown, but before that, certain preliminary steps are helpful. Once you reach a certain point the jump can happen, but before that there are degrees. It is just like when you are heating water. At a certain point, at a certain degree, it evaporates. But whether that hundred degree point has come or not, heating is helpful. Of course, you can come back even from ninety-nine degrees. You have to reach a certain point before the jump can happen.

That point differs with each individual. It is not like water: that at a hundred degrees it just evaporates. It is going to be different for each person. It is uncertain. If you could be certain that one particular point was going to be the point from which every individual could take the jump, then mind would be just a machine. But it is not, so the jumping point differs with individuals. For one person it may come on the first step, and for someone else it may come on the hundredth. And for someone else, even the first step may not be needed. Each individual has to grope in the dark, but a certain direction can be given. I cannot tell you how many steps you have to take, but I can show you the direction.

Discipline should not be the end, effort should not be the end. The effortless, the undisciplined, the totally free, must be the end. You should never be a slave to any discipline or you will never come to that certain point from which a jump can happen.

Even in a disciplined way of life you can be free. Really, the discipline should be your choice, not something imposed on you. Then you remain the master. Any moment you can drop the discipline. And with me, there is no condemnation when you drop it. If you drop it, it is okay. You are free to do it or not to do it; you remain the master. Then discipline is not a discipline. It is just a question of your choice.

Question

WHAT MAKES SOMEONE A GURU, A SPIRITUAL MASTER?

When you are not there, when you have completely disappeared, the other becomes an open book to you. The more other-oriented you are, the less you can know what is happening to the other. The more you become self-oriented, the more possibility there is of knowing what is happening within someone else. A moment comes when you are completely dissolved. Then you know the other totally. Then the other is not the other; he is not something separate from you. You don't react him; there is no need. There is a response, not a reaction. Only in this way can one become a guru and help others, otherwise not.

To me, a spiritual master needs this capacity of being totally uninvolved, of being totally unrelated -- just being an absence: with nothing to impose, nothing to project, no need to react. Then he can help you. He cannot come to any conclusions about you; he just responds to you.

That is what being with a guru means: being with a person who doesn't react. Just by

being near him, you become more and more aware of yourself. If you are really a disciple... And by being a disciple, I mean being open to the presence of the master. You may be sitting before a mirror with closed eyes. Then the mirror cannot show you anything. The mirror is a mirror because it does not do anything on its own. It is a non-doer; it is only a presence. It cannot do anything positive.

The moment you begin to do something positive with someone, you become disturbed. You begin to change your form, you become violent. Even to do good is a violence, a subtle violence. If I don't accept you as you are, I have to cut you somewhere: destroy something, change you like a sculpture, break you. Some pieces have to be thrown, something has to be rejected. I will hammer you. It is a violence, a very subtle violence. The violence of good man, the moralist, the religious man.

A real master will not even try to make you good. Only then is he a master. He is mirror-like, just a deep absence. But you cannot be helped by the mirror, by the no one, by the nothingness, if you are closed. You can sit with closed eyes, but then for you there is no mirror at all.

By being a disciple I don't mean being a follower. No. follower, again, is someone violent -- violent against himself. He is in need of someone who can be violent with him. He is a masochist. He wants someone to cut him, to change him, destroy him, transform him. He is a follower. He says, "Give me a discipline, give me the way. Tell me, order me, and I will obey." He's really in search of some slavery.

Question

BUT MAY BE SOME PEOPLE NEED SLAVERY.

No one needs slavery. One may want it, but wants are not always needs. One wants slavery because the moment you become a slave, you are completely without responsibility. You are free in a way, a slave is free in a way. Now he is not responsible.

Even if he does something wrong, the master will be responsible. "I am following you. If I have not reached, you are responsible. I have obeyed you." Now the master is going to be guilty, not him. He says, "I surrender completely." This is not surrender! Really, it is something criminal. He is trying to say, "Now, from this time on, I will never be guilty again. You are going to be guilty. If I do not reach the divine, you are responsible; you will have to answer for it. I have surrendered myself to you." That's why he wants to be a slave.

But it is not a need. You can never be free from responsibility. The more you are freed from it, the less conscious you become. You can become freed from responsibilities only when you become an automate, a machine, a mechanical device. So followers become machine-like. The more they follow, the more machine-like they become.

This is not really the need. It is not a growth. But this is what many people want. You want to throw the responsibility, the burden, on someone else. And really, a person who is throwing away his responsibility can never be free.

Question

MY FEAR HAS BEEN THAT IF I FOLLOW YOUR METHODS OF MEDITATION, I WILL BE LEAVING MY RESPONSIBILITIES.

You are not going to leave your responsibilities. Rather you are going to add some new responsibilities. Doing this meditation is going to make you more responsible. You are going

to become more free, and a free individual is responsible. You take the whole burden for your growth on yourself; you are not throwing the burden on me. You are not becoming my follower; you are not following me.

I am not promising you anything. But by following my suggestions, you may achieve something. I am saying that by doing such and such a thing, you will grow. That is not following me. By doing something you may gain much, but the whole responsibility remains with you. I am not going to feel responsible for you or anyone else. If you fall, you fall. If you rise, you rise. When you achieve something, you need not even be thankful to me. You can just forget me. That is the only thankfulness that can be given. If you have to be thankful to me when something is achieved then 'the other' will be there. Then if you don't achieve anything, I am responsible.

You are not to follow me really. The very word 'follow' is not good. To be a disciple is not to be a follower. To be a disciple only means to learn. To learn, to be a learner, to be a receiver. Not to be a follower, because a follower can never learn. Before he learns, he begins to follow. A follower means that you have decided that the other person is right "... and I have to follow him." The decision to follow has come first.

A disciple is something quite different. He is not a follower, he is a learner. He has come to learn. He has come to no conclusions. With a conclusion, you become closed. Then you just close your eyes and follow me.

To follow someone you have to close your eyes, otherwise every moment there will be doubts, every moment there will be something that you can't follow. So a follower has to be really blind. A blind follower is the only follower, the only bonafide follower. If your eyes are open, you cannot be a follower.

By 'disciple' I mean a learner and by learner' I mean one who's open, one who is without enclosures, one who is ready to inquire. This opening creates receptivity and makes you a disciple. With this open consciousness, if you are near a mirror, many things will begin to happen without imposing any discipline. Neither the master is trying to change you nor are you trying to change yourself.

Just by having an open mind and being with a mirror-like man, things will begin to happen. They go on happening and much is transformed. Much is changed without any effort to change it. This is what the Indian term *satsang* means. The word means 'in communion with truth' -- in communion with someone who has become the truth.

Question

WHAT YOU TALK ABOUT CAN MEAN SO MUCH TO SO MANY PEOPLE. YOUR MESSAGE HAS TO SPREAD, IT HAS TO BRING ABOUT A SPIRITUAL EXPLOSION. THAT SEEMS TO BE THE ONLY HOPE THERE IS FOR US TODAY. HOW DO YOU INTEND TO LET YOUR IDEAS GROW AND SPREAD AND BLOSSOM, FLOWER, INTO SOMETHING MORE UNIVERSAL, MORE ACCEPTED, MORE USUAL?

That is a very difficult question. Difficult because, as I see it, the moment you begin to organize a thing, it begins to die. The moment you begin to propagate a thing, it becomes a dead dogma. The moment you say that everyone should try to live according to this principle or that, you become an enemy, despite your good intentions.

So as far as I am concerned, I just go on living the way I feel is right. I go on saying what I feel is right without any intention of turning the whole world on to my way. I have no plans to try to influence the whole world. In that respect, I am an anarchist. No religious person can

be otherwise.

The moment a religious person is followed by a group to whom he can tell what to do and how to live, the whole thing becomes not only nonreligious but, ultimately, antireligious. This has always happened. Every religion has done this, but no religious person has ever intended it to happen. It is a necessary evil. Whenever there is someone who has something to say, something to show, this comes to our minds very easily: how people can be benefitted by it. And this is good; it is done with compassion. But the very nature of things is such that the moment you begin to organize, it becomes a mission. The thing that you were trying to do dies in the process. But this is the very nature of things. You cannot do anything about it.

As I see it, religious people will be needed in the future, not religious organizations. Unless we discard organizations altogether, the spiritual explosion that you are talking about will never come. It cannot be brought, it can only come by itself. But we can help it to come by not organizing according to ideologies. Every ideology is good when it begins, but by and by it has to compromise. To compromise for the sake of the organization.

Sooner or later, the means always become the end. You begin to organize for the sake of the ideology, but ultimately the ideology begins to exist just for the sake of the organization. The organization becomes more important. You have to compromise for the good of the organization. Ultimately, the idea dies and only a church remains.

There are so many churches that no new church is needed. I am against churches. Really, I am against the very spirit of a missionary. As I see it, if I begin to be too concerned with you changing, I have begun to be violent. If I am too concerned with making someone else good then I have begun to be violent. And the violence that happens with good intentions is more dangerous than ordinary violence. All your so-called mahatmas are very violent people. They will not allow you to be yourself.

So what am I to do? It is a problem. I feel that something can be done, I feel that much is needed to be done, but it must be done in such a way that, in doing it, the quality of the thing is not going to change. If the quality changes, then I am for the quality not for the doing.

So I will go on talking. My talking is more or less directed to the individual. If something has to be done, the organization to do it will just be functional, utilitarian. I have to behave not like a missionary but like a poet. A missionary is more concerned with you, with your changes. A poet is more concerned with himself, with his own expression. If something happens to you through it, that is not the point. I can only say what is right as I see it. If something happens to you through my words, it is okay. If nothing happens, it is also okay. I have said what I had to say as best as it was possible for me to say it. It is enough; I should not be concerned with the result.

To be too concerned with the result is what is known as a worldly mind. Why should I be concerned with the result? I have said what I felt, I have lived what I felt. If you feel I am saying is worth trying, you can choose to do it. The choice must be yours. It must not be enforced in any way; it must not be manipulated in any way. Even you yourself should not be convinced about it. No conviction is good.

You can choose. This choice will remain alive because, in choosing it, you remain yourself. It becomes part of your greater unity. It is bound to undergo a deep change in you, it will be a different flowering. If I force it upon you then it will just be an imitation. Then you will be a follower, not an authentic being. And followers are not good, not good at all. They are dangerous people!

So what can I do? I can do only one thing: I can communicate my knowing to you. If I am not concerned at all with converting you to my way, communication is easy communication

is heart to heart. But if at any moment you feel that I am concerned with changing you, you will become defensive. Then I will have to fight. It is a fight, not a communion.

So I will not organize. The only spiritual explosion that can happen in the world will be through individuals, not through organizations. All organizations have failed: political religious, social. The world is the most ill it has ever been because of these organizations. Every organization was created around a very good idea, a very good, alive thing. It may have been around a Buddha or a Zarathustra or a Jesus -- a very alive person with something revolutionary, something essential to give.

But then... You must have read Dostoevski's *BROTHERS KARAMAZOV*. In that, he creates the parable of Jesus coming back after fourteen hundred years to see how the world has progressed under Christianity. "This is the time for me to be welcomed," Jesus thinks. "When I came to earth before, there was not a single Christian. That is why I was crucified. The crucifixion was because there were no Christians. Now I will be as welcome as anything -- half the world is Christian!"

So he comes. He comes to Bethlehem on a Sunday. People are coming out of church. He stands under a tree, feeling that everyone will recognize him -- they are coming from his church! But people begin to laugh at him and make jokes. They say, "Your acting is very good. You are just like Jesus."

Jesus says, "I am not acting. I am the real Jesus!" They begin to laugh even more.

Then somebody says, "Whether you are the real Jesus or not, you had better escape from this place. The High Priest is going to come out soon. You will be in real trouble."

Jesus says, "But he is one of my priests. Even if you do not recognize me, he will recognize me." So Jesus waits.

The High Priest comes. He looks at Jesus and says to the crowd, "Bring this man into the church. He is trying to create a nuisance. Either he is mad, or he is just trying to create trouble!"

He locks Jesus in a room. Jesus feels very disturbed. Again, the whole thing seems to be assuming the same shape. It looks as though the world has not changed at all. The Christians are going on in the same way as the non Christians have done. But he waits.

At midnight, the priest returns, unlocks the door and falls down at Jesus' feet saying. "I have recognized you. I know you are Jesus. But I could not recognize you in the market, in the crowd. I could not recognize you because you are a disturber. You will destroy everything and we have put everything right; we have organized the whole thing. If you are back again, you will destroy everything. So please, we are working things out very well. You are not needed at all. Remain with your father in heaven. We are your representatives here; we will take care of everything. You are not needed.

"I am saying this to you privately. Please don't quote it anywhere or I will be in trouble. You cannot be otherwise; you are an anarchist. It is not that you were against the Jews, it is not that you were against the Jewish church -- you are against all churches, you are against all organizations. You are against everything we stand for."

And this is authentic in a way; the priest is right. Whenever we organize, the whole mechanism of organization is such that a church results, not a religion. And once a church is there, it is always against religion. Any church is against religion, it cannot be otherwise, because religion means rebellion; religion means individuality; religion means freedom. The church cannot mean these things. The church means something else: a deep slavery, a spiritual slavery, a following; a dead dogma, a creed, a routine of ritual. The church can never mean freedom because it cannot survive freedom. But this has always been so.

Now I think, the human mind, human consciousness, has come to a point where we can begin to be individually religious. There is no need to be a Jew, no need to be a Hindu or a Christian. Being religious must be enough. That means, religion must be freed from all social phenomenon. It must become an individual existence.

If this is what I think, then what can I do? I can only go on communicating -- not waiting for any results, not waiting for any continuity of my thoughts, not hoping, that what I'm saying will be preserved for centuries. It should not be; this is a very wrong conception.

A flower has flowered. By the evening, it must die. Just like this, any idea that has flowered must die. It must not try to be permanent. It must allow other flowers to flower; it must die so that the next day something else can flower. If I create an organization, then I am creating a hindrance of my own that will prevent something new from arising.

So I am not intending to create an organization at all. I have no plans for the future. This moment is enough. If I am able to communicate something to even one single individual, it will be worth everything, in the world. A mass movement may happen around me, but it will have to happen as a chain reaction. We will have to be patient. A missionary is never patient, he can't be. Otherwise, he would never be a missionary.

Question

WHAT IS NEO-SANNYAS ALL ABOUT?

Neo-sannyas is an effort to introduce the concept of 'sannyas without any renunciation of the world'.

To me, India has given only one thing to the world, to human consciousness, and that is the concept of sannyas the concept of renunciation. But this renouncing can be one of two things. It can be of the world. Then it becomes negative: it becomes life-denying; it goes against life. To me that negative, life-denying aspect of sannyas is a disease. And because of that life-denying aspect, sannyas, religion, has suffered much. It couldn't become a major part of life, it couldn't become a part of human consciousness. The main current of it is life-denying.

Neo-sannyas is a total yes to everything in life -- including everything that gives you higher consciousness, including everything that gives you a nearness to the divine, including everything that has been denied only because it was life-affirming. For example, love.

Neo-sannyas accepts life in its totality. And also, sex in its totality. But not drugs, because drugs are an effort to be more and more unconscious, to be chemically seduced into a deep lethargy. Anything that helps consciousness, anything that makes you more alert toward the reality is included.

Question

IS IT A MINGLING OF DIFFERENT RELIGIOUS CONCEPTS?

It is not a mingling. Rather, it is the essential foundation of all religions. It is not a compromise of all the religions. Rather, on the contrary, it is the essence of all religion.

When a Jesus achieves something, the outward behaviour, the outward ritual that evolves around him, becomes Christianity. But the innermost core is lost. When a Buddha achieves something the same thing happens. The unknown is achieved again, but the nonessential begins to be more important and Buddhism is created.

So neo-sannyas is not a mingling of Buddhism and Christianity and other religions. Rather, it is a reassertion of the essentials that make a Buddha a Buddha and a Jesus a Jesus.

And that essential is one. So I say yes to all religions as religions and no to all religions as sects.

Question

WHAT IS YOUR ATTITUDE TOWARD SEX, AND SEX OUTSIDE OF MARRIAGE?

Sex is very important because sex is the root of life. You are born out of sex, your every cell in the body is a sex cell. Sex cannot be denied and any society that denies sex becomes suicidal. Then it is denying life itself.

So sex is very significant, very meaningful. But you can do two wrong things with sex. One is, you can be suppressive. Then you create perversions. In the West, Christianity has created a very perverted mind through too much of a 'no' attitude toward sex, too much fear about sex. Too much suppression has created a reaction. That suppression will lead to a perverted mind.

So I am not for suppression. Nor am I for indulgence. Indulgence is again a reaction. Indulgence is the opposite extreme to suppression. That, too, is not good.

I am for healthy sex that is neither indulgence nor suppression. Sex must be accepted in its totality. Then the question of inside or outside of marriage is irrelevant because marriage is just a part of the social system; there is nothing natural about it. To me, to be really authentic in your sex life you have to go beyond the structure of marriage.

You become inauthentic in two ways. If someone is in a sexual relationship with someone that he or she doesn't love, to me it is immoral. Even if he or she is one's husband or one's wife, if one is not in love then it is immoral. If love is the base, only then can you be honest, sincere and authentic. If love is the base then marriage becomes, by and by, a superficial structure.

Question

WHAT IS YOUR VIEW OF PORNOGRAPHY AND WHAT ARE YOUR VIEWS ON THE NEW MORALITY OF SEXUALLY FREE SOCIETIES LIKE SWEDEN?

I will not condemn. I appreciate it. Sexually free societies are not degraded. Rather, they have come to face the facts of life honestly. They are more honest than so-called moral societies, which are basically dishonest. If sex is a fact then you must take it as a fact. No beating around the bush.

And pornography is an art, unless your mind is perverted. If your mind is perverted, pornography becomes a disease. Otherwise it is a simple art. If I paint a beautiful flower you appreciate it so why not appreciate it if I paint a nude woman? It is just as beautiful. And if a naked flower is beautiful, a naked woman or a naked man is also beautiful.

But a naked flower will not create any attitude in you of condemnation, when a picture of a naked woman will. Not because it is pornography, but because the whole culture has been anti-sexual. Sweden is really the vanguard of the new morality that is developing. It is not a degraded society.

Question

DO YOU CONSIDER INDIA HYPOCRITICAL IN THIS RESPECT?

Yes. It is a country now of hypocrites.

Whenever a country reaches to the peak, to the flowering -- when it is healthy and young, fearless of everything -- then truth can be taken as truth. In India's golden days we created Khajuraho, Konark, Puri. It was rare daring. There is no comparison to it -- not only in India but in the whole world. A temple of God that has sculptures of *maithun*, of sexual intercourse. There is no pornographic attitude toward the sexual intercourses. It is so meditative, so celestial.

But those were the days when the country was healthy. Young -- taking life as it was, celebrating life in its totality.

Today it is a dying country, an old country just struggling to be alive somehow. The India that exists today must die in a way in order to be reborn. Only then will hypocrisy go. I;very old man becomes a hypocrite.

For the first time in the world, eros (sex and love) is becoming more significant. It is the antidote to war. If sex is suppressed then you become violent. Really, wars are nothing but a by-product of suppressed sexuality, suppressed sex energy. Your politicians, your so-called moralists -- regardless of how much they talk about peace, they are creators of wars.

Now -- and it is really for the first time in the world -- the younger generation is for love, for sex, for life. This is a very optimistic possibility. With these young people, a different world is going to be born.

If we emphasise love and life more, no one will be ready to fight. It is really a question of choosing between eros and death. Make love not war -- it is very symbolic. Make love and then you *cannot* make war. But if you cannot make love, you cannot make anything *except* war because the very energy that can love and create becomes perverted. Love is creative. If there is no love, then the same energy becomes destructive.

Question

IS LOVE OUR BASIC ENERGY?

It is practically love, but not just that.

I call the name of the basic energy, the energy that we are, *life*. If life becomes love, inner growth is happening. Then love can become light -- that is another growth.

If life becomes love you are on the path, and if love becomes light you have reached. These three words are very meaningful to me: *life*, the basic energy; *love*, the transformation of this energy into a celebration; and *light*, the transformation of love, through meditation, into divine existence.

Question

WHEN I GO BACK TO MY OWN COUNTRY, WHAT PLAN SHOULD I FOLLOW IN TRYING TO TEACH YOUR METHODS TO OTHERS?

Do not plan anything. Just go on digging within yourself. Things will take their own course.

Planning always presupposes frustration. When you plan, you create the seeds of frustration. Do not plan, just go on working. Let it come. It is always beautiful when it comes by itself. It is always fulfilling, never frustrating, because there has been no expectation. And when there is no expectation, you are never disappointed. The less you are disheartened, the more you can do. The more you are disheartened, the less you do.

So I say again: do not plan. Just go on. Let it come by itself. When we plan, we hinder the way of its coming. Because of the plans we make, life cannot work. Our plans come in the way.

I lead my life with no plans and I have never been frustrated. There is no question of frustration so I am always successful. I cannot be a failure because there is no plan against which I calculate.

No failure, no success is a success -- only our conceptions and predetermined plans make them so. If you fail in your plan, you feel disappointed; the ego is hurt. If you succeed, the ego is strengthened and it will plan more, ceaselessly, causing perpetual strain and burden on the mind. The ego is always afraid of life. In life we never know what is going to happen so we make plans for our security. But life continually disturbs our plans because we are not the whole and sole of life. We are only a negligibly small part of the infinite existence.

The moment you start planning, you begin to compare and contrast. Doubts and fears catch hold of you: will I succeed? Is it possible? What will happen, what will people say? The moment you plan, the seeds of frustration take root. Now anxiety will follow. We make plans in order to be free from anxiety, but the plan itself creates anxiety. We become anxious because of our plans, our expectations

So do not plan. Just go on. You do not plan your breathing, you just go on breathing. Let it come to you easily. All that comes easily becomes divine and nothing that comes with effort can be divine. The divine comes effortless! It is, in fact, coming all the time. Let it come! Just let go of yourself and see. Things will begin to move. You will find yourself in the midst of movement, but there will be no anxiety. Then there will not be any trouble created for the mind. If something happens, it is all right. If nothing happens, then too it is all right. Everything is all right when a mind that does not plan, that accepts life as it is.

Only then can meditation happen, otherwise not. Meditation is not a business, it should not be made a business. If it is, you will not be able to help others toward meditation much less yourself. Rather, you will be suicidal to your own meditation because it will be a burden to you.

If meditation has come to you, if something has flowered in you, the perfume will spread. It will work in its own way. Something *has* happened to you. You are calm and at ease, tranquility has been achieved. That will do the work; you will not have to work. What has happened to you will draw people to you. They will come by themselves; they will ask about what has happened to you.

Let others plan, and you just go and meditate. Things will begin to happen, they must happen. Only then do they have a beauty of their own, otherwise not.

Business is always tiring. It has no beauty, no joy. Meditation is not a business, but it has been converted into a business in India, a flourishing business. There are shops and there are factories. Do not take meditation in this way. You have experienced meditation, you have come to the door. You have seen something, you have felt something. Let it go on -- let God work.

When you leave here, go completely without planning. Do not even plan not to plan or it will be the same thing. Don't think at all about what you are going to do when you return home. Just *be* there. Your very presence will begin to work. Only then will it be my work. If you plan, then it will not be my work at all. You will merely be distracting yourself and others. You cannot help others to meditate if you yourself are tense. You cannot help! You will be helpful only if you proceed without plans.

Just go. Sit there, meditate and see what happens. Things are bound to take their own

course.

The Eternal Quest

Chapter #6

Chapter title: Religious Scriptures: History or Myth?

Date Unknown

Archive code: 6700000

ShortTitle: QUEST06

Audio: No

Video: No

Question

MANY WESTERN HISTORIANS FEEL THAT HUMANITY IS CONSTANTLY MAKING PROGRESS. IF THIS IS THE CASE, THEN HOW IS IT THAT HUMAN CONSCIOUSNESS IS SO UNEVOLVED?

The progress of humanity and the progress of human consciousness are two quite different dimensions. The progress of history is in time and the progress of consciousness is not in time. The progress of all that we can see, of all that is visible, is horizontal; while the progress of consciousness -- which we cannot see -- is vertical. And we cannot see it *because* it is vertical.

That is why history can never be in tune with the evolution of the human mind. At the most it can deal with the outward form; it can never get to the spirit. But that is not the fault of history, or of historians, or of the way in which history is written. Such is the nature of things. History can never be in contact with the formless; it can only talk about the form.

The formless is always transcendental to history -- and the real evolution is always formless. The outward progress is not really evolution; it is simply accumulation. There is no qualitative mutation in it; the change is only quantitative.

History can never transcend time. It can know only about those events which occur in time. It cannot know something that occurs beyond time, that is nontemporal.

Events can be perceived through the historian's eye: events exist at a crosspoint between time and space. An event happens somewhere, at some time. So the questions *where* and *when* can be asked about events; it will be relevant.

But *where* and *when* cannot be asked about spiritual happenings. There, time and space are both irrelevant. For example, Gautam Buddha achieved realization. He jumped into the absolute. All that can be known and realized he knew and realized. But when did it happen, and where?

History will ask when and where. The event has occurred so we can fix the point; we can know the date, time and place. But even if we know exactly at what time and at what place

this happening occurred, we do not have the fact itself. What has occurred remains transcendental. Where it has occurred we can know, when it has occurred we can know. But what has occurred to Buddha, what has happened within him?

History will say that under the bodhi tree -- at 'this' time and at 'this' place -- Gautam became enlightened, became a Buddha. But what is this happening, this Gautam becoming a Buddha? What has happened to him? The happening transcends history completely. And that happening is the real evolution of the human mind.

The nature of things is such. History is not at fault: it cannot go beyond time, it has a limitation. It is a temporal record. When a spiritual happening comes to exist, it touches time but is never within time. It happens some where, but the time and place are irrelevant. Whether Buddha was UNDER the bodhi tree or not is meaningless. It has nothing to do with the phenomenon that has happened in him.

Whether the bodhi tree exists or not, whether Gautam was in India or Palestine -- it makes no difference. When he became a Buddha, he jumped into nowhere. The phenomenon itself is not at all concerned with time and space. Once he is a Buddha he is nowhere: neither in time nor in space. He jumps out of the realm of history.

That is why we have never been concerned with history in India. We concern ourselves only with that which is meaningful. Concern with death is beyond history, all that is meaningful is beyond history, so history became meaningless to us. It records all that is nonsense. So India, the Indian mind, became nonhistoric. It is only with Christianity that history became meaningful.

History became meaningful with Christianity because a time concept, a linear time concept, came into existence. If time progresses linearly, if time progresses in a line, no event is repeatable. History cannot repeat itself because the past goes out of existence. The line is always going forward.

The Indian concept of time is circular. It does not progress in a line. It is always circular, coming back to itself. That is why, in India, the wheel symbolizes time. The wheel of the Indian flag is the Buddhist concept of time. We call the world *sansar*. The word *sansar* means the wheel: that which comes back, again and again. Every event returns in infinite repetition. It has been before: it will be again.

Only the unrepeatable, the unique, becomes historic. To Christians, Jesus is a historic personality. He cannot be repeated. But for Indians, Ram is not a historic personality. In every age, Ram will be repeated. In the same way, for Jains, *teerthankaras* are not historic. In every age they appear; there will be a repetition. The same thing will go on and on and on. It has always been the same so no event is particular and individual, and worth recording. To record it makes no sense.

But there are jumps in this circular progression, there are people who jump out of history. These people are religious. A person who is part of history is a political being. Politics is always of time, it can never go beyond time. But religion is never part of time. It is always beyond.

A person who has moved into an inner evolution may appear in history, but the moment of his realization is a spiritual phenomenon. When it happens, he is beyond history. That is why no record has been maintained of when Krishna was born or when he died. It makes no sense to us to record it. Any date will do, the date itself is meaningless, because the date is part of history, of time, and the person himself is beyond time. In whatever way the record of the happening is maintained, howsoever accurate it may be, it is meaningless because it cannot record that which is worth recording. That, is always lost. And what is the sense of

recording dates, years, places, names?

In the West, because of the linear concept of time and because there is so much obsession with temporal events, they have maintained very accurate records. But now the gap is beginning to be felt. The record is accurate, but something is missing. We know when Christ was born and we know when he died, but we still do not know who Christ is, what this phenomenon of Christhood is. The phenomenon itself escapes us. We know the moment, the phenomenon itself is beyond time.

A Buddha is never misunderstood like Jesus because we always know that no matter what he is talking about, he himself is something beyond time. We never misunderstand him, because we know this. But Jesus was very much misunderstood. When he said "the kingdom of God," people misunderstood this as being a kingdom of this earth. When he said "I am the king," he was talking about a phenomenon beyond time, but people understood that he was proclaiming himself the king. Jesus was crucified because his nontemporal words could not be understood. People only knew events; they understood his words in terms of time.

In India, neither Krishna was crucified nor Buddha nor Mahavir. Not because their teachings were less revolutionary than Jesus', but because we knew that they were not talking about this world. We understood that their words were meant for something which is not of this world. If they said, "I am the king," we knew what they meant.

If Krishna says, "I was, always. There was no time when I was not," we understand what he means by that. But when Jesus says, "I was, before Abraham," *what* he was could not be understood; it was impossible. There is a gap of a thousand years between Abraham and Jesus -- how could Jesus have been, before? In terms of time it is absurd, but in terms of existence it has a deep meaning. But the West could not understand it.

The western attitude is still time-obsessed. There are reason behind it. Why did time become linear in the West? Because the concept of rebirth never became prevalent. The concept was introduced so many times in the West: Pythagorus introduced it, but then it was lost; Jesus hinted about it, he talked indirectly about it. He never talked directly, he indicated it. But it could not be understood.

The concept of rebirth is the reason why the East could conceive of history in a circular dimension. If you are to be reborn again and again there will be birth and death -- then birth will follow and again there will be death. It will be a repetition.

But if there is only life -- birth followed by death, but death not followed by birth -- then birth becomes absolute, death becomes absolute. Neither will come again. That is why time became so important in the West, and the West became time-obsessed.

These are all related things: history, time, tension. Why has the West become so tense about time? Not a single moment is to be lost because, once lost, you cannot find it again; it cannot be reclaimed.

The East is at ease. Nothing is lost, everything can be reclaimed. You cannot lose it even if you try. Things will come back. Death will be followed by birth again, you will be young again. Everything will come back, will return to itself.

This seems more natural. Every movement is circular -- it may be of an atomic particle or it may be of a great star. Everything moves in a circle; there is no movement that is linear. Einstein talks of a limitless circular space. Even space is circular. Not only are things circular but even nothingness the vacuum itself, is circular. Even the movement of a vacuum is circular. In fact, that which is not circular cannot move: movement is circular.

The whole of nature moves in a circle. Summer follows again in the same course; each

season comes and goes and is followed in repetitive progress. Time cannot be different. Time is nothing but a medium of movement. If things are static, we will not feel time. We feel time, we become aware of it, only because things are moving. If we could be totally here for one hour, without any movement, we would not feel the passage of time. If you were always to remain the same age -- if nothing moved, if everything remained static -- then even eternity could not be felt.

You become aware of time because of movement. We cannot conceive of movement without time. Time means a sequence between moving events: something is followed by something else. This passage occurs in time. Since everything is moving in a circle, the passage of time cannot be non circular.

History is an awareness of time: its events and their position in a particular framework -- the framework of linear movement. People in the East became aware of linear time and of history, only when the East came in contact with the West. Then the East felt that it was lacking something. We have no history at all; we cannot create any history. Anyone can say that Buddha is mythological and we cannot prove that he is not. Anyone can say that Ram is just a story, a myth We cannot say that he is not because we have not maintained any record of when he lived. Where is the proof?

We were not aware that any proof is needed. We became aware of it only when we came in contact with the West we came to know that they have everything recorded; they have exact proofs. Only then, India began to write its history.

But still, a historic sense is not there. It cannot be, because with a circular time concept, history cannot exist. With an infinite opening toward the future, with an infinite possibility of repetition, a historic sense cannot exist. With the concept that death is just temporary -- just a phase and not the end -- history cannot exist. History can exist only with the concept of absolute death.

Then, each moment becomes significant, You have to live it, otherwise it will be lost. Tension follows; you become tense. How to live each moment so that it may not be lost, how to live it so that it may be lived to its fullest extent? You cannot be relaxed.

The West can never be relaxed unless its time concept changes. Unless death is just a passage for rebirth, unless each moment is a repetition, an infinite repetition, you cannot be relaxed. How can you be relaxed when a moment is going, passing, and it will not come back? And the paradox is that the more obsessed you become with time, the more tense you become and the less you can live each moment.

The moment is lost in tension; you cannot live it. You can only live each moment if you are relaxed -- if you are not aware of time, if you are not obsessed with it.

The more obsessed you are with time, the more you will write history and the less you will live it. History, as it exists -- and it cannot exist otherwise -- this history, this historic attitude, can never confront those phenomena that are beyond time. Even life is beyond time. It passes through time, but ,t is always beyond. It is like a lotus leaf: always in water, but still beyond water, untouched by it. Life is like that. And the deeper life becomes, the more lotus leaf-like it is. Always touching somewhere, but never touched. Always in touch with time, but always beyond time. Untouched, virgin.

That is why we can have a record of political events but not of religious happenings. Religion can never have a history; only politics can have one. We can talk about Ghengis Khan, about Tamerlane; we can talk about Stalin, Mussolini, Churchill, Nehru. We can talk about them because these persons live in events, amidst events; they live in the world of form. But we cannot know any history, any real history, about a Buddha or a Jesus or a St.

Francis. We cannot. And if you try to write about them, their lives will be uneventful compared to the lives of Ghengis Khan, Churchill, Stalin. Their lives will be eventless, totally vacant. Nothing happens.

Buddha sits under the bodhi tree. This is the event. But it is nothing; the event is not worth writing about. If he is allowed to continue to sit under the bodhi tree, he will sit under it eternally. He will just be there -- just sitting, not doing anything. Ages will come and pass, and he will still be sitting there just like a stone. That is why we have erected stone Buddhas and stone Mahavirs. It is not just an accident that Buddha is carved in stone. It is not accidental, it is meaningful. As far as Buddha's outward life is concerned, he was like a stone to us.

There is no difference between a stone Buddha and a real Buddha as far as the world of events is concerned. It makes no difference at all. On the contrary, you will be more attached to the stone Buddha because a living Buddha, sitting just like a stone, will be more troublesome. You will not be able to bear it, will not be able to tolerate it. You will think that a stone Buddha is better. You know that he is stone, so of course he is just sitting. No event is possible -- that is why no event is happening.

A real Buddha is also a stone Buddha as far as time is concerned. He is just a face. All that is meaningful is beyond the grasp of history, because he is beyond the grasp of time. There is an evolution. Spiritual, religious.

There is a progression to political events, a mechanical accumulation. Civilizations come and go, forms change, but there is no evolution in it; there is no qualitative change in it. Nothing changes really, only the form changes. But because of the change in form, a fallacious myth of progress is created. It *looks* as if things are progressing. Nothing is progressing. Only forms go on changing.

You go on changing your clothes and create a facade that you are changing. The change of clothes is not a change in you. Even a change of education is not a change in you; even changing your house is not your change. Everything can change and you can remain the same. Then, spiritually, no evolution has occurred.

On the other hand, everything can remain the same outwardly and you can change. No one will know it, no one will become aware of it, because outwardly everything is the same. But the person is transformed, he has undergone a metamorphosis. He is a new person; the old one is dead. It is a resurrection.

We recognize change only when form changes. But we never recognize, we never become aware, if the spirit changes. And real progress is vertical; it is not horizontal. Form changes in horizontal lines; spirit changes in vertical lines. Form goes forward; spirit goes upward. The progression of history is just like a bullock-cart: on and on, but on the same level. It is not vertical. It is not jumping from one level to another.

Two more things will also have to be understood. As far as form is concerned, as far as history is concerned, progress is collective; but as far as spirituality is concerned, progress is individual. You cannot evolve collectively. You can go forward, you can go backward, but you cannot go up collectively.

A spiritual happening is individual. That is why, when someone takes the jump, when he becomes enlightened, he goes beyond our grasp. We have not jumped with him; there is no communication. He is somewhere that we are not, so communication becomes impossible. He cannot communicate what has happened to him. He tries but fails, and feels the failure.

He uses our language, but with a very different meaning. We cannot grasp the meaning.

We can understand the words all right, but because we cannot understand the meaning, the words become the basis of misunderstanding. He is using them with quite a different meaning.

For example, Christ talks about a kingdom. We understand what is meant by a kingdom. The Roman governor, Pilate, knew very well what is meant by a kingdom. He was an educated person, one of the most educated of those days. He knew everything; he was more educated than Jesus himself. Jesus was an uneducated man, a villager, a carpenter's son. Those who crucified him were cultured, educated, civilized. But they crucified him because they could not understand what he was talking about. They asked him, "Are you the king of the Jews?"

He said, "Yes. I am the king. Who else can be king?"

Of course he was, but in a very different sense. As far as the outward form is concerned he was a beggar and nothing more, but as far as the spirit is concerned he was a king. Those who thought themselves to be like kings were more like beggars so he said, "Yes, I am. Who else can be?"

And whatsoever he was saying, he was saying with much consideration. He was right, a hundred percent right. But those who heard him just laughed. Either he was mad, or a very cunning fellow.

At the last moment, Pilate asked him, "What is truth?" Pilate was well versed in philosophy, he knew all the definitions -- what is meant by truth -- but he asked Jesus, "What is truth?"

It was right before Jesus went to the cross. Jesus just looked at him and didn't answer. He knew very well that whatever he answered would lead to more trouble, more misunderstanding. If he had been silent all along, it would have been better. Whatsoever he had said had come to be understood as something that he had never meant. And these people who were crucifying him were all educated, they were all well cultured. They were people who knew.

Pilate asked again, "Tell me, what is truth?" Jesus remained silent.

This silence is very meaningful. He was not a silent person, he was always ready to answer. He never lost an opportunity to talk about the kingdom of God and the truth about God. But now, he remained silent. It was a silent commentary, a silent verdict of a great failure. He had been saying things that were not understood. Each word he had uttered had led to a new misunderstanding.

Truth is individual. That is why it is incommunicable. And because it is individual and not collective, society is not interested in religion at all. It appears to be interested, but it is not interested. It shows interest to the extent that religion, too, can be made into a social affair. Otherwise society is very anti-religious. Whenever there is an individual who is really religious, society goes against him. It begins with a sort of religious facade (a deception), but whenever there is a religious individual or a genuine religion, it goes against them.

It cannot tolerate a Christ but it tolerates popes, because popes are not religious at all. It can tolerate priests, but it cannot tolerate enlightened persons. Popes, priests, all the so-called organized religious sects, all create a deception, a false illusion of being religious. They create a sort of respectability.

Society is never interested in religion because religion is individual and society is always afraid of individuals. It is fearful of individuals, it is fearful of spiritual persons, because they go beyond society. They are rebellious. But not consciously, not knowingly. The very nature of a religious mind is rebelliousness. Religious people are not against anybody, they are not

destroying things, they are not destructive in the least -- really, they are the only creative minds -- but their very existence is rebellious.

Society will not allow genuine religiousness. It will only allow the false faces of religion. Society creates civilizations, not religion. Civilizations can have a history, but religion has no history at all. It only has certain religious individuals that exist here and there. Sometimes someone takes a jump, becomes a flame and goes beyond. But the moment someone somewhere becomes a flame, a spiritual flame -- the moment he goes beyond our so-called world of forms -- he becomes one with all the flames that have ever gone beyond. Jesus is a different person from Gautam, but Buddha is not a different person from Christ. They are one flame.

Another thing; religious evolution is not collective. It is individual, yet universal. That is what makes it look so mysterious. It is not collective, it is individual, but it is still universal because the person who undergoes the religious evolution is annihilated. He transcends collectivity, but becomes one with the universe. He becomes cosmic, divine.

This divine phenomenon cannot be recorded. We have tried to record it, but all that we have succeeded in recording is just a bare outline. It looks absolutely dead.

What do you know about Christ? That he was born into a poor carpenter's family? Nothing else is known about him until after seven years. And then only one event is known -- that he was missing during some festival and his mother and father were searching for him. Then again there is a gap and then, when he is thirty, some events are recorded. And when he is thirty-three, the crucifixion is recorded. This is all that is known about his life: his birth and one or two events, ordinary events of childhood, and then whatever he said after his thirtieth year, as recorded in the gospels.

Whatever he said... The moment something is uttered, it becomes part of time; it can be recorded. But where a person like Jesus is concerned, every record contradicts every other record. St. Luke says one thing, St. Mark says something quite different, because what is recorded is not exactly what Jesus said. Only what is heard by the recorder is recorded.

So there are some sayings of Jesus that are recorded and then there is the crucifixion. This is all of Jesus' life that is known. Compare with it the life of Adolf Hitler. Then you will see what the recording of a life means. Events and more events and still more events.

Is this record of the life of Jesus really a record? If this is really the record of the person Jesus was... It is such a bare, naked outline that no one seems to be behind it. It is not a biography, but only footnotes. The real biography is lost; only footnotes remain. Something that is not substantial, something that can be complementary only if the substance exists. In itself, it is meaningless.

Jesus himself denied that anything that could be recorded about him was true. Once his mother and his brothers came to see him and someone said to him, "Your mother is asking to meet you. And your brothers have also come."

He said, "Who is my mother? Who is my brother? No one is my mother, no one is my brother." All that you can record is about he who was born and yet Jesus said, "No one is my mother, no one is my brother. And unless you deny your mother, you will not be able to come to me."

Jesus said, "Unless you deny your mother, unless you cut yourself off from your father, you will not be able to come to me." He said: unless you deny the life of the form, you can never know the life of the spirit. If you do not deny history, you cannot know the mystery of existence.

That is why history could not record what happened to Jesus. It cannot record such things.

But history is not at fault. The phenomenon itself is such. It is completely transcendental to history.

History goes on recording progress. This progress is a horizontal progress: the progress of things, the progress of scientific knowledge, the progress of medicine, the progress of health. All that is concerned with the outward form is recorded, but the inner cannot be recorded. And the inner is the real, the significant, the substantial.

With the inner, is the authentic spiritual evolution. History is meaningless as far as spirituality is concerned. It is a political affair. By 'political' I mean all that goes on outwardly. For example, the birth of Gautam is a political event, but his enlightenment is spiritual.

If you can see that the dimension of the spirit is a very different dimension then you can understand that history is just a collection of events about the form, that it is just on the periphery never at the center. Those cultures that have realized how shallow and limited history is have left it. They didn't bother to keep records. They said: it is enough that Krishna was. It is enough. It is an eternal epic. And even if someone says that he was not, that he never existed. it makes no difference. If there is even a possibility that he ever existed, it is enough. If he can ever exist, even in the future, it is enough.

Jesus' life was recorded by those who were trying to record him historically. The record is very naked: fragmented, useless. If you do not create a Christ of your own in your recording, then the record is meaningless.

Those who were writing about Krishna knew that the phenomenon was not historic, that they could not record it. But their record is very rich; it is very imaginative. It is very fulfilling. It is total in a way. How much they have written about Krishna! They could write it because there was no limit to it. There was no temporal limit, they were not bound by any temporal limits. They could be creative with it. No one could say what they should be writing. Something may never have happened but they say that it need not have happened.

An epic was created around Ram, a story was created around Krishna. Everyone was at liberty. Valmiki wrote one thing; Tulsidas wrote something else. No one can say that they are contradictory.

Mark and Luke are contradictory because they are writing history. But Tulsidas and Valmiki are not contradictory. They are not writing history, they are not concerned with history at all. They are reliving, in their imaginations. They say, "We cannot say much. We cannot say enough because we are not capable. All that is said is only a fragment. It is not the whole story."

If you yourself see Krishna, you will see something else altogether. But you are at liberty to see it because the event is not historical. So the life of Krishna or of Ram, becomes very rich.

Jesus' recorded life was very poor because his followers were obsessed with history. They could not write anything that was beyond history.

The eastern mind could see that we cannot do justice to Krishna or Buddha if we limit ourselves to bare events. This will be an injustice because the real has happened somewhere else. Then how to record the real?

It cannot be recorded. But, we can create a myth. And that myth can indicate, can show something about it. Those who will read the myth will not read a bare statement of events. They will go deep into the poetry of the myth, deep into the imagination.

And it may be possible that somewhere, from their own imagination not from the facts --

very far from the facts, from somewhere deep in their own unconscious minds, from what Jung calls 'archetypes' -- they might get a glimpse; they may be able to know what has happened beyond history. They may be able to know, from deep down within themselves.

History cannot go deep inside you. Only poetry can. But only from within you can something happen which will be in sympathy with the nontemporal, which can be in communion with the nonhistorical. Krishna's life and Buddha's life are only jumping points to enable you to go deeply inside yourself.

If you read Tulsidas, a western historian will say that this is not history; this is imagination. It is. But I still say that Tulsidas does more justice to Ram than Luke can ever do to Christ because he knows the secret. By going deeply into what Tulsidas has written, you will again relive the whole phenomenon. Time will be transcended; you will again be in the time of Ram. Now there are no space/time relationships. Deep within yourself, you are in Ram's milieu -- as if Ram was present, as if he was somewhere nearby.

That is why in India we perform *the ram leela* every year. We go on performing it every year just to create the same milieu again. When someone acts the part of Ram, it is not only that he is acting Ram. If you go into villages where the people have been untouched by today's concepts, the person who is playing Ram is Ram. The villagers behave with him as if he is Ram. They touch his feet. He is not an actor; he is Ram revived. The milieu is created. They will chant poetry, the whole story will be unfolded -- the story that they believe in.

That, too, is miraculous. If you see a film two or three times, you will feel bored. And if it goes on again and again, You will be mad. But even though everyone already knows the whole story when the *the ram leela* is unfolding, everyone is thrilled. If it was just a story or a drama, you would be bored. It is *ram*: alive again Re-enacted. It is not only a stage, but the whole world. Ram has come again It is as if you are living with him. The whole thing is being repeated. Everyone knows what is going to happen and, still, everyone is thrilled.

This is a rare phenomenon It is almost impossible. Ordinarily you will not be thrilled about something that you already know is going to happen But this is what happens in an Indian village. Villagers who see *the ram leela* are as thrilled as if something new is going to happen It is not just a story. A certain milieu is being recreated and the villager who is seeing the play is not only seeing a drama He is part and parcel of a great spiritual phenomenon. He is in it! The thing is unfolding and, by and by, his heart is unfolding

This is a mythological approach to the nontemporal. Re-enacting it. Reviving it. Resurrecting it. History cannot do this; only myth can do this. Myth is helpful but not substantial: A creative imagination is needed to fill in the substance.

This attitude -- the nonhistorical, mythological -- is more in tune with the unconscious. History is in tune with the conscious, myth is in tune with the unconscious. Myth is in tune with eternal, history is in tune with the temporal. History is yesterday's news and tomorrow's news. Today's news will become history: history is just an accumulation of news, a newspaper accumulation. It goes on becoming greater. But history is unnecessary, spiritually. Unnecessary, because it can never grasp the significant phenomena. In another sense, it is not only insignificant but dangerous also, because the more you record the past as the past -- and the more the accumulation grows -- the more you are burdened, unnecessarily burdened.

For a moment, imagine that we could destroy the whole history of the world. Ninety-nine percent of our problems would disappear. They all come from the past. The Mohammedan problem, the Hindu problem, the Vietnamese problem, the Kashmiri problem -- they all come from the past. It is sad but true that ordinarily ninety-nine percent of our lives are dictated to

us through the grave. Those who have died are ordering the whole nonsense! If history was not given so much importance, much unburdening would happen.

Myth is needed. History is always of the past but myth is not only of the past; myth is also of the future. The form of the myth comes from the past, but the opening is always toward the future. If someone is thinking about Krishna in terms of myth, he is not only thinking about the past. He is thinking about the potentiality, about what is possible. Human consciousness can become Krishna-consciousness, it can evolve to that point. So myth is only nominally of the past. It always has an opening into the future.

History is always of the dead past. It has no future at all. But it dictates the future; the dead go on dictating. Stalin is still dictating, Hitler is still dictating. They go on dictating because of the obsession with history. If we can remove history, they will not be able to dictate. We will be free of them, unburdened.

Myths should be continued. They open into the future. But history should be discarded. It should not be taught or thought about. It is concerned with absolutely unnecessary things, with nonsense. To me, all that is meaningful in the past must be made into a myth not a history. It must be thought about in terms of poetry not in terms of temporal events.

Poetry is never a closing; it is always an opening. It is never limiting. You can give poetry your own meaning; you have a certain freedom. But not with a newspaper. The more down to earth the record is, the less free you are. You cannot give it a meaning. You cannot relive it, you cannot create it. You cannot be creative with it; you can only be passive.

What can you do? Hitler is born in a particular year -- how can you be creative about it? It is a dead weight; you can only be passive with it. But with Krishna, you can be creative. There is no date. In a way, he is never born. You can give birth to him anytime. With poetry you are at liberty; with myth you are at liberty. You can create... and when you create, you are also transformed. In creating, the creator is always transformed by his own creation; he never remains untouched.

To me, history is a very worldly thing. Sometimes it is necessary, but usually it is an absolute burden.

Myth is a record of all that cannot be recorded, but that can be indicated. Some indications can be made. They have been made! Christianity would have been all the more richer if they had created a myth around Christ. But they could not create a myth. They were so obsessed with history that they could not add to it. They could not give a meaning to it, they could not develop or unfold the story. They were not even able to call it a story...

In India, we do not say 'the history of Ram'. We say 'the story of Ram': *ram katha*. It is not accidental. We give more importance to a story than to a history because with a story there are possibilities; with history there is no possibility. It is a dead thing; it is already in the grave. A story is a living thing. You can do something with it and it can also do something to you.

Because they could not create a myth around Jesus, Christianity could not really flower into a religion. Without a myth, no religion is possible. Christianity remained a clerical thing. It could not create sannyasins. It could not. It could only create preachers -- trained, dead, disciplined, knowing. The beauty and the poetry of a sannyasin is not here, the original source is not there.

Because they could not create a myth around Christ, they tried to make a history out of him. Western history begins with Jesus, the very beginning of western history is Jesus. That is why you calculate time 'before Jesus' and after Jesus'. He is the midpoint, the calculation

begins with him. After Christ: A.D.; before Christ: B.C.

The West tried to create history out of Jesus' life and they killed Jesus in the process. When they tried to deal with Jesus historically, it became absurd. They were not able to explain the miracles, the resurrection could not be explained. The attempt was bound to be a failure. They were not able to explain the miracles, because miracles exist only in myths; they never exist in history. Because the western mind was trying to create history, the miracles of Jesus became absurd, contradictory.

In India, if someone says that a dead person has returned to life it is not a miracle. It is an ordinary thing. After death, there is no way to move except to rebirth. Someone in India who reads about such a thing will definitely think in terms of rebirth. But in the West, Jesus became 'resurrected'. He came again to life. It became a problem that Christianity could not solve. They feel guilty: something is wrong somewhere -- how is it possible that a person who has died can come back to life? Because there was no myth surrounding it, the isolated phenomenon of 'coming back to life' became absurd.

It is never claimed that Buddha was resurrected, nor Mahavir, nor Krishna, because everyone is going to be resurrected. It is not a miracle. If someone had said that Buddha is great because he came back to life, everyone would have laughed. Everyone comes back to life! This is not something to be talked about.

Fragments in Jesus' life appear to be contradictory. They cannot be explained. But if we call it 'the story of Jesus' rather than 'the history of Jesus' there is no contradiction. Everything is possible in a story because logic is not needed. The only requirement is that the story be poetic, flowing. That is all; no logical reality is needed. The question of whether someone comes back to life again after crucifixion comes only if it is history. If it is a story then there is no problem. Then if someone says it is absurd, he himself becomes absurd. In a story you cannot raise questions. Only in a history can you raise questions and show contradictions.

Christianity would have been richer if, instead of history, there was a myth surrounding Jesus. If there had been a myth, then Christianity would not have become such a political religion. It would have been more religious.

The source is there. You can go deep into Christianity and be revived by it. Then you will not only be a Christian by doctrine. You can become a Christian by unconscious communication.

One thing to be noted is that whenever someone in the West goes deeply within, goes deep into his unconscious roots, he becomes an easterner. The very quality of the mind changes. Jesus is an easterner, Francis is an easterner, Eckhart is an easterner, Bohme is an easterner. It makes no difference where they are born. The quality of the mind changes.

On the other hand, whenever an easterner becomes superficial, his mind becomes western. Events become very meaningful to him, things become very meaningful. All that is on the surface becomes significant and all that is deeper is denied, negated.

The person who lives at his depths can accept all that is on the surface, but the person who lives on the surface cannot accept all that is deeply within him because the very acceptance will be humiliating. To acknowledge that he has deeper depths within him will be a proof that he is only living on the surface. He will deny it. But a person who lives at his depths can accept the surface. He can say, "Yes, it is true. It is there; it exists. But deeper layers are there also. It is not everything."

History is just on the surface because time is on the surface. Consciousness is at the very depths. Then there is no time. But this will be more meaningful to you when you go deep into

meditation. Then you will feel that your time sense is lost. By and by, you will feel that time is stopping. Finally a moment comes when there is no feeling of time. Time has stopped! Somewhere on the surface it is still going on, but inside, it has stopped. Then you yourself will be able to understand clearly what is meant by a spiritual evolution that transcends time.

When we live in time, in the world of events, if someone's s not doing anything it seems as if he is not. Doing is everything. Doing is in the realm of history, but being is in the realm of the spirit. You are; you just are. You are not doing anything, not even mentally. Nothing either physical or mental is happening There is no doing at all, no ripple of action at all you are in an absolute nondoing state. But you are!

This beingness is the vertical dimension. Through this beingness, you jump into the unknown, into the divine. And unless one jumps into this non-historical, non-temporal moment, one has not known what life is.

The Eternal Quest

Chapter #7

Chapter title: The Disease Called Seriousness

Date Unknown

Archive code: 6700000

ShortTitle: QUEST07

Audio: No

Video: No

Question

LIFE IS TREMENDOUSLY SERIOUS...

Life is not serious. You are serious. Life is not anything serious; nothing can be more nonserious than life. Life is absolutely nonserious!

Question

BUT CERTAIN THINGS HAVE BEEN ACHIEVED ONLY BECAUSE SOME PEOPLE HAVE BEEN -- MAYBE THE WORD 'SERIOUS' IT IS NOT GOOD, BUT, RATHER, 'INTENSE'.

Intensity is a very different thing from seriousness. If you are serious, you can never really be intense; you can only be tense. That's a different thing. With seriousness, you can never be intense and deep. You will always be shallow.

Life is not serious at all. It is just a nonserious play -- with nothing to be achieved, with nowhere to reach. It is just a play, with no end. Serious is always end-oriented. It means that you are living in order to achieve something, and life will be meaningless if you don't achieve it.

This is seriousness: the means lies in the end, not in The here and now. The end must be achieved. If you achieve it, then it is okay. If you don't achieve it, then everything is lost. You are serious because you have made some condition for your life. You have identified the meaning of your life by some condition that has to be fulfilled.

But you can never achieve anything because nothing is static, everything is constantly changing. You fix something today, but by tomorrow nothing is going to be the same. Not even you will be the same; everything will have changed completely. But in your mind, the end remains the same. The whole situation has changed now, so you can never achieve what you want. That is why there is so much frustration

Why so much preparation? You try, you think, you plan, you work, and then there is no achievement. The thing that you desire never happens, it never comes. If life was a static, fixed thing -- not dynamic and flowing -- then you could achieve what you wanted, but then life would be a death. Life is life because it is dynamic, changing. You cannot predict its course, it is unpredictable. It is dynamic and flowing -- always flowing nowhere.

If you are serious, then you cannot flow. Then you are frozen inside; then you become just a dead stone. Then there are resistances around you. You cannot melt, you cannot change as life changes. You have a fixed pattern, a fixed shape, and because of that shape you will resist change. Then you are not flowing with life, you are struggling against it. Seriousness creates frozenness, and frozenness creates struggle. You can just let go.

Be ready to be anyone, to be anything, to be in any shape at all. Any shape is good: trees are good and dogs are good and man is good. If you are ready to be anything at all -- anything that life requires -- you will be more alive, you will be able to live more intensely. Intensity is killed when you have become identified with a particular form, a particular way of being. Then you are shallow because you are concerned with your form not with your being. Then you will be tense, not intense.

If you are ready to exist in any way whatsoever then you have become part of the ocean of life. Then there are no more waves, there is no rising and falling. You have become the ocean itself. You are ready to be anything: to rise or to fall, be or not to be, Then you can flow with everything. And the more you flow, the more alive you are.

So if you know life, you know that life is not serious at all. Religious people have made it serious because they are anti-life. But to me, that is not religion at all. That is just a metaphysics for suicide. To me, religion means a very non -- serious attitude: very childlike, very innocent.

A serious person can never be innocent, and one who is innocent can never be serious. They are contradictory; they cannot exist together. A child is never serious, but he is very intense. In everything he does, he is intense. If he is playing he is intense; if he is angry he is intense. But an old man is never intense. He is serious. He will turn even play into work because his play becomes a fight, a struggle; a competition. There is either defeat or victory. All kinds of nonsense will emerge, it will not be just a play. Intensity is something else. It is not seriousness, it is something altogether different.

Whenever there is seriousness, sadness is about to come. You cannot enjoy seriousness, you cannot laugh with seriousness. Saints have never laughed. Sadness is bound to be somewhere around the corner, always.

Seriousness is sad, it cannot laugh. And even if it laughs, it is only a release mechanism. The laughter is not innocent it is only a release mechanism. A serious person can laugh but it is only to release the tension of seriousness. Then again he is ready to be serious, and more tensions are accumulated.

If I tell a joke, I create tension in you, expectation. curiosity. What is going to happen? How will it turn out? You become tense with expectation. You become serious, your mind begins to work. How is the joke going to end? if it ends just as you expected it to, you will not laugh because then there is no release. But if the end turns out to be completely unimagined, if it is a complete turnabout; if you never expected that this could be the end, then the tension that has been brought to a climax is released. You laugh. But the laughter is not innocent because it is just a release of tension. Every joke has to create a tension in you. Then, when you laugh, you feel released.

Innocent laughter is something very different. It is not a release mechanism, it is a way of living. It is just a way of living!

Take laughing as a way of living. Exist as laughter You will be absolutely nonserious. It may be that you will not be able to achieve anything, but what is the meaning of achievement? Even one who achieves -- what does he achieve? Even when achieving, nothing is achieved.

Then whole absurdity is this: that even if you achieve something, nothing is achieved and nothing lasts. But the nonachieving mind gains much, without gaining anything. Every moment, one who has a nonachieving mind gains. What he gains may not be something very beautiful -- in the end he may not have achieved anything -- but he will be rich inside. Every moment was rich: the achievement is in the being. He may not be a great man, a famous man -- a great scientist, a great painter -- he may be no one really, but he can die peacefully; he can die lovingly.

He is rich inside. Life, as it was, has given much. Nothing was snatched, nothing was taken with a struggle. It was a blessing, it was a beatitude, it was a benediction. As it was without any conditions.

The mind that is trying to achieve is saying to life, to the whole cosmos, "I can be happy only if 'this' is happening." The person is living with a condition.

You cannot place any conditions on the whole. The whole will never hear your conditions, you will never feel any resonance from the whole if you have any conditions. Your own condition will become a stone around your neck. You will be crushed under it, by your own hands. It is not that the whole crushes you: you crush yourself with your own stone.

Your conditions create a barrier between you and the whole. The whole cannot flow in you because you have a condition. You say, "Come in. But first fulfill this much.." Then the whole cannot flow in you and you cannot flow in the whole. Then everything is crippled and diseased.

Don't place any conditions on the whole; don't make any bargains with the whole. Don't compete with the whole, don't struggle with the whole, and then you will be holy. Flow into the whole and let it flow into you. Unconditional movement, unmotivated movement. Then you will be non-serious, intense. You will live blissfully; there will be no possibility of sadness.

Then there can be no frustration, it is impossible. No one can frustrate you. Whatsoever happens is good. Then good is not something opposite to bad; it is just a feeling. Whatsoever happens is good: there is nothing opposite to good.

This I call a religious mind: nonserious, playful, innocent -- without any struggle.

Someone has written me a letter. He writes that he believed in someone as if he was *bhagwan*, a God. For fifteen years continuously he believed in him. Then one day he saw that the man he had believed in was angry He writes that on that day not only did that man become just human -- not a God -- but from that day on "I cannot believe that any human

being can ever be *bhagwan*, can ever be a God."

I have written to him that there are two possibilities. "If one whom you believed to be divine became angry, there are two possibilities. Either this man is not divine -- or your definition of divine was wrong!"

But no, your definition can never be wrong. This man who you thought was divine must be wrong. Your definition is more meaningful to you than fifteen years of faith and rust.

But who says that the divine cannot be angry? Who says it? We don't know, but we have a particular definition. Who says that the divine cannot be angry? Of course a divine person must be angry in a divine way -- that's another thing.

We have certain definitions. But life always transcends definitions so we are frustrated. Because of our definitions we are frustrated. I have written to the man that that person was very honest: "He could be angry in front of you." It is very simple not to be angry in front of a person who has believed for fifteen years that you are *bhagwan*. Not to be angry is very simple, it is not a difficult thing. He was very sincere, he flowed: he could be angry.

Rinzai died as a master and his disciple, the chief disciple, begin to weep. These were at least one lakh people there. They were very confused because this chief disciple was known to be enlightened. How could he weep? He must not weep because if even an enlightened person weeps then the whole point of it is lost. Then there is no difference between one who is enlightened and those who are not.

Soon friends came to talk to him and requested him not to weep because his whole image would be destroyed. But the disciple said, "When have I promised you that I shall not weep? Was it a condition that you would believe that I am enlightened if I don't weep? When was this promise made? Two things: either decide that I am not enlightened, or change your definition!"

An enlightened person can weep -- of course, in an enlightened way. Really, a person who is one with life just flows. There is no resistance. Anything that comes from him, anything that happens, just happens. He has no resistance. He is not going to say that such and such must not happen. He has become the whole, he has said yes to everything.

We have created an image of divine persons, realized persons, according to our own definitions. If Mahavir laughs, his disciples will think that something has gone wrong. It is inconceivable that he should laugh -- because of the disciples' definition, a dead definition. Definitions can never be alive because anything that is living changes, and definitions cannot change. And if a definition changes, it is not a definition at all. A definition is fixed, but life is never fixed.

So don't think in terms of opposites. Just think about one thing: that you must be flowing. And let anything happen. Accept it. If you are going to be a loser, then be a loser. If you are going to be defeated, then be one who is defeated. And if you are ready to be defeated, to be a loser, then no one can defeat you because the whole thing becomes nonsense. Losing is meaningful because winning is meaningful, because you have a stake in it. Because you have it as a condition that you must win, losing becomes hard. you feel defeated, frustrated.

To me, a divine existence means to just flow. If you win, that is good. If you lose, that too is good.

The Eternal Quest

Chapter #8

Chapter title: A Quest, Not a Questioning

Date Unknown

Archive code: 6700000

ShortTitle: QUEST08

Audio: No

Video: No

Question

WE KNOW FROM MANY SOURCES, SUCH AS THE BIBLE, THAT GOD CREATED MAN IN HIS OWN IMAGE. IF HE HAS CREATED EVERYTHING, EVERYTHING MUST BE GOOD. THEN WHERE DOES THE IDEA OF WICKEDNESS COME FROM.

So many things will have to be taken into account. Firstly, to think of God as the creator is to divide reality into two: the creator and the created. There is no division, no duality like this. The creator is the creation! The world and God are not two things: the creation is the creator. It is not like a painter. A painter creates a painting. The moment the painting is created, there are two things: the painter and the painting. The creation is more like a dancer: the dance and the dancer are one.

When you think about God in terms of duality, God becomes a false God. There is no God who is separate, apart; sitting somewhere: presiding, engineering, administrating -- beyond the world. The very world, the very being, is God.

The term 'God' is anthropocentric; it is our creation. We have personified what is really a process. God is not a person but a process -- constantly evolving, changing, constantly reaching beyond and beyond. God is a process. So to me God is the creative process not the creator.

Human beings have thought of God in human terms. It is natural. We have said that God created man in His own image. If horses could think they would deny this: they would say that God created horses in His own image. Because man has created the philosophy, he has made himself the center. Even God must be in our image. He must have created us in His own image. Man's ego has asserted these things. This is not knowledge, this is not knowing -- this is simply an anthropocentric feeling.

Man feels himself to be the center. We have thought that the earth is the center of the universe and man is the center of creation. These conceptions are false imaginations, dreams of the human ego. God has not created anybody in His own image because the whole is His image. The trees, the earth, the stars; the animals, men, women -- everything that exists is His image, not just man.

Then too, we have divided the world into good and evil. The world is not so divided: good and evil are our evaluations. If man did not exist on the earth there would be neither

good nor bad. Things would exist, things would be there, but there would be no evaluation. The evaluation is man's: it is our imposition, it is our projection.

We say that something is good or something is bad. But as far as creation (the creative process) is concerned, everything simply is. There is no good, there is no bad. The night is not bad, the day is not good. The darkness simply is, the light simply is. These are not two things distinct, apart and opposite -- but rhythms of one thing. The darkness and the light are both waves of the same reality. For God, darkness is not evil. But for us it is evil, because our fearful minds have always been afraid of darkness.

Nothing is bad. We say that life is good and death is bad, but how can that be? Death is the pinnacle of life, death is the peak of life, death is part and parcel of life. There can be no living process without the dying process. Death and life are not two things, but two poles of a single, unitary process.

We are afraid to die so we say that death is evil. "If God has created the world then there must be life and no death." But if that had been possible, it would have been the most boring existence.

If there was only life and more life, and no death, then we would pray to God to give us death, because there is a moment to live and a moment to die. There is a moment to come up, and there is a moment to go down. There is no peak without the abyss, but we want only the peak and not the abyss. That is not possible.

These are two aspects of one reality: the evil and the good. So do not impose your own feelings, your own evaluations, on the creative process. Rather, if you want to know the creator, the creative process, go beyond yourself, beyond these dualisms. Do not think in terms of duality. When you go deeply into something, when you go to its very depths, the evil changes into good and the good changes into evil. These are just two waves of the same reality, two different patterns of the same reality.

For example: if I become diseased, to me it is an evil. But to the germs that are the cause of my disease, it is life, and good. Who is to determine whether it is good or bad: me or the germs? If I become healthy the germs are bound to die so for those germs my health is an evil and for me the life of the germs is an evil.

But to God, the germs and I are the same. So there is no evil for Him, no good for Him. He lives in us. He dies in us. He is the darkness and He is the light. That is why He is the transcendental, the beyond. That is why He both is and *is not*.

Our minds always think in terms of dichotomies. They cannot think without dividing. Whenever we go to think about something, we dissect it, we divide it into two. That is the methodology of the mind. Mind cannot think in terms of Unity, in terms of synthesis. Mind thinks in terms of analysis so everything passing through the prism of the mind becomes divided.

Just like the light is one but through a prism it is divided into seven rays, so, too, the prism of the mind divides everything. That is why if you want to know and realize that which is undivided, you have to go beyond mind.

Do not use your mind as the instrument. It cannot lead you beyond duality. If you use The mind, there will be a creator and that which has been created. This division is false and because of this false division you create false problems and false theologies. You create problems and then you think about the solutions. Because the problems are false, the solutions are bound to be false.

All theologies are based on dualistic concepts. That is false. Religion is not theology! A theology can be Christian, a theology can be Hindu, a theology can be Buddhist, but religion

itself is the realization of the whole. It is not divided into Christianity, Hinduism or Buddhism.

Theology is based on a false assumption: an assumption of duality. Then, problems arise. First you divide the existence, which creates problems. Then you go on solving the problems endlessly. But there is no solution. No theology has come to any conclusions; every theology has moved deeper and deeper into falsehoods.

That is why the new generation has come to a point of discarding all theologies: Christianity, Hinduism, Islam. The few generation has come to a breaking point where they want to discard all the falsehoods that theology has created. You have created the problems and you have created the solutions but you have not asked the basic thing: whether the problem is authentic or whether it has been created because of your mind; whether the problem is your creation or whether it is really a part of the reality.

In reality, there are no problems so there is no need of any answer. When you think, there are problems. When you do not think but you realize, there are no problems.

So religion is a process to go beyond thinking: to achieve a point in your mind where there is no thinking at all. You *are*, but without thoughts. You are in a state of mind which can be said to be a state of no-mind, a state of no mental processes.

A mind that is not thinking is a mind that is in meditation. That is the meaning of meditation. To meditate means to go beyond your thinking process. The moment you transcend the thinking process, you come to a realization, you come to feel that which is Philosophy cannot exist without thinking and religion cannot exist *with* thinking. Philosophy thinks. Religion knows.

Thinking means a mind that does not know. A blind man can think about the light and go on thinking about it. But he cannot come to any conclusion because he cannot really Think about it. You can only think about something you have known, but when you have known it, there is nothing to think about. That is the dilemma, the predicament.

That is the basic puzzle. A person who knows never thinks because there is no need to think. What you know, you know. There is no need to think about it. Only a person who does not know who is ignorant, thinks. But how can you think about what you don't know?

A blind man goes on thinking about light, but he cannot really think about it. He cannot imagine it, he cannot dream about it, because he has not known it. Light is foreign to him. A blind man cannot even think about the darkness because, even to know darkness, eyes are needed. Without eyes you cannot know the darkness: a blind man knows neither the darkness nor the light.

Ordinarily we think that a blind man lives in darkness. No, there is no darkness for a blind man. Darkness is as much a perception of the eyes as the light. You cannot say to a blind man that light is opposite to darkness because that, too, will be unintelligible to him. A blind man can know light only by becoming able to see. Thinking cannot become seeing.

In reference to this, one thing must be said. In India we have called philosophy *darshan*. *Darshan* means seeing. We have not called philosophy 'thinking'; we have called it 'seeing'. In Europe the term 'philosophy' carries another connotation. 'Philosophy' means love of knowing, love of thinking. There is no parallel term in western languages for *darshan*.

A new term has been coined by Herman Hesse. The term is appealing. The new term is *philosia*: the love of seeing. *Sia* means 'to see'. *Philo* means 'love.'

And *sophy* means 'thinking'. So philosophy means 'love of thinking'. We have no term in India for it. We cannot translate the word 'philosophy' into any Indian language. Our term is *darshan*. It means seeing. Not thinking, bUt seeing.

Seeing comes not through the mind but at the moment the mind is annihilated, the moment the mind is not, the moment the mind ceases. Every type of seeing -- either of science or of philosophy or of religion -- is an outcome of the state of no-mind.

We have known the example of Archimedes. He was thinking and thinking, and came to no conclusion. Then he was lying in his bathtub. Suddenly something was seen. He ran out of his house naked. He had seen something and he ran into the street crying, "Eureka, eureka! I've found it, I've found it! I've achieved!"

If you ask an Einstein or a Picasso or a Hesse, they too will say that something has been seen. Whether in poetry or in painting or in scientific discovery, something is seen. And the moment of seeing is not the moment of brooding, the moment of seeing is not the moment of logical thinking. Logical thinking is held in abeyance. The logical mind is not working and suddenly something overpowers you. Something comes to you, or you go somewhere -- somewhere beyond the human limits. Then you know; knowing is there.

So do not create dichotomies. First you create dichotomies, then you create problems, then you go on solving them. And then of course, as a logical consequence, theologies are created and there are theologians, teachers, professors, gurus, and the whole nonsense, the whole nuisance. So to me, there is no problem. The problem itself is false.

Question

YOU SAID THAT GOD IS THE CREATIVE PROCESS. THEN WHY ARE THINGS CREATED? WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF CREATION, OR IS IT SOMETHING THAT JUST EXISTS?

If God exists as a person then the question *why* becomes relevant. If God is a person then we can ask, "why have you created the world?" But God is not a person; God is a process. You cannot ask the process, "Why do you exist?"

Existence exists without any cause. Thinking in terms of causes leads nowhere. If you go beyond one cause then there is another cause. If you go beyond that, then another cause comes. And the why remains. Always, endlessly. You ask why and again you are confronted with another why.

If God is a person then the why becomes relevant. But God is not a person. You cannot ask Him -- you *are* Him. You yourself are the cause.

The existence is uncaused. Otherwise you will have to invent ultimate causes. But that carries no meaning. If you say that there is an ultimate cause it means that beyond a certain point you will not again ask what the cause is. Even a person who believes in God as the creator, who says, "God created the world," may invent *whys* and answers. But if you ask him, "Why is there a God? Why does He exist?" then the religious man will say, "God is uncaused. He is the cause, so He is uncaused."

Existence itself is uncaused. At the beginning, there is no cause. So in the end, there can be no purpose. Only when there is a cause can there be a purpose.

There is no beginning because if there is a beginning, then there must be a cause. Existence is beginningless. And there is no end because the beginningless cannot come to an end. It is endless. So there is neither a beginning nor an end to existence. It is eternal, uncaused, without any purpose.

For the human mind it is meaningless to say this because we think in terms of causes (from where?) and in terms of purposes (to what end?). Because of this limitation of the human mind, he cannot conceive of something that is beginningless, endless -- uncaused,

purposeless.

But how can there be any cause and how can there be any purpose? To be is enough, to have been is enough. *being* is enough.

You can think of it in another way, through another outlook. When you love someone, you do not ask what the cause of it is. If love is caused by something, it ceases to be love. Love flowers uncaused. If a cause could be pointed out then the beauty of love would be lost, then there would be a scientific explanation for it.

You cannot ask what love is for. There is no purpose in love. If I love you, I cannot ask why. If I am loving you for some reason then it is not love. Love is purposeless.

In love, we come closest to God. That is why Jesus said, "God is love." It is not that God is loving, no. That is not the meaning, God is love! In love, we come closest to the creative process, closest to God. Love is the peak from which we come to know what religion is.

Love is religious so a person who cannot love cannot pray. A person who cannot love cannot be religious. Only a loving mind can be religious because only a loving mind can think in terms of no purpose, no cause. Love is enough. It does not ask anything beyond itself. It is a fulfillment in itself; it is the end in itself. A single moment of love is eternity itself.

When we ask why, where, how, we are not asking religious questions. If you ask *how*, the question becomes scientific. The question *how* is the basis of science: how are things happening? And if you ask why, the question becomes philosophical.

Religion has no question. For religion, there is no questioning. There is a quest, but no questioning. There is a quest to know what is. Neither why nor *how*, but what is.

Of course, to solve the question how is easier. We can go on solving and solving and there will be no end to it. Every solution will again create a problem. The *how* will again be encountered, so science will go on progressing. You cannot conceive of a day when scientists will come out of their laboratories and say, "Now, science has achieved!"

Philosophers will go on thinking and thinking why, and there will be as many answers as there are thinkers. If everybody on earth begins to think about it, there will be millions and millions of answers. Everybody can say: because of this or that.

But religion does not ask. Religion is a quest, not a questioning. It is a quest after what is -- not after the beginning, not after the end. It is a quest for neither the cause nor the purpose, but for that which is -- this very moment, here and now. The 'what' is the quest.

A scientific mind can go on searching without ever changing itself. A philosopher can go on inventing answers without changing an inch. But a religious man cannot even begin without changing. The moment he begins to ask what is, there is a change, a transformation -- because he himself is part and parcel of what is.

You are neither part and parcel of the how nor of the why. You were not asked anything in the beginning nor have you been asked to plan for the end. You are somewhere in the middle -- in the is. You are only concerned with what is here and now, this very moment.

So religion is concerned with the present -- neither with the past nor with the future. And the present is the only existence, the present is the only time. The past is memory; the future is imagination. The present is the only reality, the only existence.

Religion is concerned with the existential, the purposeless, the meaningless, the uncaused. Things *are* -- and you can become one with them and can achieve a moment of bliss, a moment of pure existence, a moment of total consciousness. In India we have called this *satchitananda* -- the moment of total existence, the moment of total consciousness, the moment of total bliss.

Once you have a glimpse of it, there will be no question, no problem. You will be at ease with the reality. Then you will be in a state of let-go with reality. You will flow with it, you will live with it. You will breathe it, you will be one with it. You will *be* it.

Question

YOU SAID THAT GOD IS THE CREATIVE PROCESS AND NOT A PERSON. THEN WHAT IS PRAYER? TO WHOM DO WE PRAY?

You cannot pray, because there is no one to whom to pray. Your prayer is just addressed to the emptiness. But you can be in a prayerful mood -- that is another thing. Prayer is not something to be done; prayer is something to be. A person can live prayerfully, that is something else. It is not something to do.

To be in a prayerful mood is to be in love, in love with the existence. To be in a prayerful mood is to be in gratitude to the existence. To be in prayerful mood means to not be an enemy to the world but a friend.

For me, prayer is not an address because there is no one to be addressed. Prayer is a state of mind. It is concerned with you not with God. You can be in love without a love object; the object is not the necessity. You can exist in love, you can walk in love, you can sleep in love. Everything that comes in contact with you receives your love. If no one comes in contact with you, still the perfume of love is there. A flower may be on a path where no one passes, but there is still a perfume. It is not addressed to anyone; it simply bubbles out of the flower. Like that, prayer is a bubbling of your love: your love to the whole, to all that is.

What we ordinarily call prayer is childish. We are father-obsessed in a way. We have imagined God as a father image, as a powerful father sitting somewhere on a throne. And in our fear, we are demanding and asking and persuading Him. Our prayers are demands. Our prayers are born out of our fears. They are addressed to an image that we have created out of fear.

A person who lives prayerfully does not pray, does not demand. He doesn't offer prayers to God. He has no need for an intermediary. He comes in contact with the existence himself.

So to me, even the word 'God' is not the right word. 'God' carries the meaning of a person. To say 'the existence' is much more accurate and exact the moment we call the existence 'God', the image of a great father comes into our minds. Then we begin to pray.

But out of fear there can be no love; out of fear there can be no prayer. When I fear you, I cannot love you. All the old theologies were based on the exploitation of human fear. We still call a religious person God-fearing. It is absolutely ugly to call a religious person God-fearing because a religious person is God-living.

And where fear is, love cannot be. These two cannot exist simultaneously. With fear, hate exists. With fear, there is no possibility of love.

A loving mind is a prayerful mind. But there is neither a time to pray, nor a secluded corner to pray in, nor someone to be addressed. You *are*, and the existence is. To live with this existence in a loving relationship -- with the trees, with the sky, with the stars, with human beings, with matter, with everything that is -- to live with it lovingly is prayer.

Then you become prayerful. Then you never pray, but every moment prayer goes out of you, bubbles out of you. It becomes the perfume of your life, of your love. It is a flowering, not an address -- something coming from within, not something going out. The basic arrow is not to someone; the basic arrow is *from* someone. From someone to the all.

Question

WHAT IS DEATH, AND WHAT EXISTS AFTER DEATH?

If you think about what is, you will pervert it. If you think about it, then you will impose your own conceptions on it.

'What is' can be revealed only when there is no conception, no thought, no theory in you; when your mind is totally vacant; when your mind has become an emptiness, a nothingness; when your mind is just a womb, a receiver. When nothing from your mind is imposed, when your mind is naked and empty, only then is 'what is' revealed because there is no one to pervert it -- no one to imagine anything, no one to dream anything, no one to project anything.

One must approach reality completely vacant and empty, without any preconceived thoughts, without any prejudices, without any preconceptions of what is to be there. You must go into nowhere, you have to go into nothingness. Only then does your mind become just a receiver, a receptivity. And then, what is is revealed.

Even after that, when you have to assert it, express it, you will not be able to. You won't be able to express what has been known. Language is not adequate, words are not enough. Something so vast, something so multidimensional, something so unimagined, something so unknown, has come over you that you can be struck dumb. The greater the realization, the less the possibility of expressing it.

The truth has never been said. It has been known, it has been lived, but never said. No word, no scripture, has expressed it. They have tried, endeavoured, taken pains to express it, but it has remained unexpressed, unknown.

You can come to it only when you do not come with your scriptures; you can come to it only when you do not come with your theologies; you can come to it only when you do not come with your questions. A mute quest is required, not a verbal questioning.

And you can come to it at any moment. When you are under a tree -- just sleeping, relaxing, doing nothing -- you can come to it. Near a seashore -- just sitting, doing nothing -- and it can overwhelm you. Under the starry sky -- just existing, just being; just present, not doing anything -- it can penetrate you.

That is why there are glimpses of it in love. When you are in love, words cease, thinking ceases. When you are in love, something becomes silent in you. Then there is no communication -- and still there is a communication. You are silent, but communicating. In your silence, something comes to you and something goes out of you.

Religion points toward total silence. One must be silent to hear the creative process: one must be totally silent to know that-which-is. Every moment we are thinking and thinking. This thinking creates a barrier.

If you are listening to me and still thinking within yourself, then there will be no communication. When I am answering you, if you are still creating new questions -- comparing what I am saying, thinking about whether it is right or not -- then we are poles apart. Then there is no communication. Your thinking has come between us as a barrier, and that barrier cannot be crossed.

If you are just listening -- and that is the miracle: to be just listening! -- then even this communication that is happening right now between us can become a communication of what is. If you are just here -- present, doing nothing then something from my eyes, from my hands, from the friends who have gathered here, from the whole situation that exists right here, can become an awakening and you can come into contact with what is.

And you ask, "What is death?" One cannot know before dying. How can one know? You can think about it, but that will not be death, that will not be real. One has to die to know death and one has to live to know life.

Do not think about death. While life is, live! Know life! And if you know it then you will know death also, because death is pinnacle: the peak of life, the completion of life. So do not ask what death is. It will come, and you will go through it.

But it is possible to go through death and still not know it. We are passing through life and still we have not known it. We are asking, "What is death?" while we are alive. The reverse can also happen: when we are dying we may be asking, "What was life?" A dying person asks what was life and a living person asks what is death!

A living person can come to know life. Know it, be one with it. Absorb it, drink it completely -- eat it! Then death comes. When you have known the day, the night comes. When you have known the day's awakening, you will have to *know* the night's relaxation and sleep.

It is there. It is coming, it is hiding somewhere. It will come, but do not ask about it. Know what is here and now. Become a knower, a seer, so that when death comes, you will know it also.

A person who knows life, ultimately knows death also. And when he knows both, he knows that life is not against death nor is death against life. When he knows both, he knows that something unknown has come into being and that something unknown has left. Birth has been a door and death, too, has been a door. Something (the existence) has come in, and something has gone out. Nothing begins, nothing ends. There are births beyond birth and there will be deaths beyond death. There will be births beyond death and there will be deaths beyond birth. The process is endless, the voyage is eternal.

Know what is, do not ask what will be. How can you know it? You can only think about it and create theories. Theories are important, meaningless. Feelings are potent, meaningful, so while you are alive, feel life. Then you will become capable of feeling death when you die.

It is as blissful to know death as to know life. It is as blissful to awaken in the morning as it is to go into deep sleep at night. Both are blissful. But you must know them while they are happening; you cannot know them beforehand. And if you ask someone, then what you know is second-hand -- not a first hand knowledge, not a felt knowledge, not a realized knowledge, not a knowledge that has penetrated your ultimate being, that has come to you through your innermost core. The real knowledge always comes through seeing, through knowing firsthand.

First know life; do not ask what death is. Know life, and by knowing life you will come to know death also. What you are transcends both. You are neither life nor death. You have been living, you will be dying -- your being transcends both.

Do not identify yourself with life. If you identify yourself with life then you will think of death as your enemy. Know life and then you know that you are beyond -- unidentified, someone who has come to life. And you will know death too -- as a door going back, returning to the source. Life comes, death comes, but the source remains beyond both.

Question

CAN YOU TELL US SOMETHING MORE ABOUT THE CONCEPT OF GOD IN INDIAN PHILOSOPHY? WHAT IS TRUTH?

As I have said, to me there is no such thing as Indian philosophy. And God cannot be

represented by any idea; God is something beyond ideas. Every type of representation is a falsehood, a falsification. Every type of symbol is a dead symbol whether it is Indian or Western, Christian or Hindu. These are theologies not religion. Theologies are nothing but man's mental creations.

Pilate asked the same question that you have asked when Christ was going to the cross. He asked, "What is truth?" A Christian will have an answer to the question, a Hindu will have an answer, a Buddhist, a Sikh -- every body will have an answer. But Christ remained silent, he had no answer. He remained silent; he did not answer the question. "What is truth?" because the moment you answer it, it becomes a falsehood. It cannot be asserted. It can be known inside, it can be lived, but it cannot be asserted. Words, languages, expressions, are so feeble and dead that the living truth cannot be communicated through them.

Christ remained silent. But his eyes were not silent, his heart was not silent, his whole being was not silent. His whole being was expressing the answer, but Pilate could not see it. He knew only what was happening in terms of verbal communication. He would have known the answer to the question only if Christ had answered him through theology, through some theory -- some image, symbol, concept. Pilate turned away. Christ remained unknown to him.

What I am saying is this: that every type of symbology, myth, every type of theological system, is the creation of the cunning mind, of the mind which calculates, systematizes, makes wholeness out of theories. But it is dead. This is not religion; religion is something alive.

Somewhere Nietzsche has said that Christ was the first and last Christian. He was the last Christian because nowadays a Christian is simply a Christian through believing in a particular dogma. A Christian is a Christian through accepting a theology, not through knowing the truth. Hindus, Buddhists, Christians, Mohammedans -- they are all under the weight of tradition, of words, of verbalizations and languages. But to me, religion has nothing to do with words, language, scriptures. Nor is religion confined to any geography nor confined to any particular race. Religion is not confined to any savior, god, avatar or guru. Religion is available to everyone who asks for it, who is thirsty for it. Everywhere -- in every age, in every time, in every race, in every part of the world -- religion is as available as the air, as available as the existence. One only has to be one with the existence to know religion.

Question

WHAT YOU HAVE TALKED ABOUT SEEMS QUITE MODERN.

What I am saying is not modern. What I am saying is as much ancient as it is modern. What I am saying is the eternal truth. It has always been said, it has always been felt. Buddha felt the same, Christ felt the same, Krishna felt the same.

But language becomes old, assertions become old. The Gita has become old, the Bible has become old, Buddhist scriptures have become old. Every age has to coin new words, new expressions. The truth remains the same; religion is eternal. It is neither old nor new.

What I am saying is not modern. Only the way of expressing it is modern. All expressions become old. The modern, too, will become old. It has already become so. The moment we have talked about it, it has become part of the past; it has become old. The new always has to be invented. It is necessary because every age requires a new language to be understood, every age requires a new terminology to communicate its experiences.

But truth is timeless. It is neither old nor modern. And it is as much Hindu as it is Christian; it is as much Moslem as it is Buddhist. To me, Buddha, Mohammed, Christ when

they come to know -- know the same truth. But when they express it, their languages differ. That is natural. Buddha expresses in an Indian way, Christ expresses in Hebrew, Mohammed expresses in the Arabian way. Only the language differs, but because of the difference in languages, sects are created.

Then there comes to be an Indian religion and a non-Indian religion. There are at least three hundred religions on earth and three hundred languages. It is so. But three hundred religions? -- that's nonsense! Religion can only be one because nothing can be contradictory or opposite to the feeling of truth.

When I come to know it, I know the same truth. When you come to now, you will also know the same truth. But I will express it differently, you will express it differently. The difference is always in the expression, not in the experience. The experience is eternal. It is neither Hindu nor Christian.

These labels have become barriers to the universal: the one, the eternal; the endless, the beginningless. These expressions have become barriers, so every age has to discard the old prophets, the old traditions. Every age has to invent its own ground to stand upon, its own heart to feel, its own mind to know and experience.

Expressions differ. The expression might be modern, but the expressed, or the unexpressed, is still ancient. I am saying ancient, not old; eternal, not old -- because truth can never become old. It is always the living, the new, the young. It is always life itself.

The Eternal Quest

Chapter #9

Chapter title: The Need for Authenticity

Date Unknown

Archive code: 6700000

ShortTitle: QUEST09

Audio: No

Video: No

Question

IS REINCARNATION A PART OF YOUR TEACHINGS?

I don't talk much about doctrines. I am not very interested in intellectual gymnastics. Reincarnation is a fact, but I don't talk much about it. I may help you to remember your past lives, but I don't make a doctrine out of it. If you can remember them than it is okay. If you don't remember them, that too is okay. But I don't talk about it. It is useless.

Question

YOU HAVE SAID THAT BELIEF IS IMPOSSIBLE TODAY. PERHAPS WE CAN NO LONGER BELIEVE IN THE SAME THINGS THAT WE BELIEVED IN THE PAST, BUT

IT SEEMS TO ME THAT IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO TOTALLY DISREGARD BELIEF. FOR EXAMPLE, DON'T YOU BELIEVE THAT WHAT YOU ARE SAYING IS TRUE?

It is true, but I don't believe it. I *know* it. That's different. Knowledge is not belief.

Belief comes out of ignorance. You don't believe in the *sun*, but you believe in God. We do not need to believe that we are sitting here; we know it as a fact. But if I say that some ghost is also present, if you cannot see the ghost you will have to either believe what I say or disbelieve it.

Belief comes only when you don't know. When you know, there is no question of belief. What I am saying is not a question of belief. I know it is so; it is a fact. I don't insist that you should also believe it as a fact. I only say that you should experiment with it so that you can also come to know it as a fact.

Belief is basically concerned with ignorance. With knowledge, there is no belief. You do not 'believe' in science. What would be the use of it? You don't 'believe' that two plus two make four. Only fictions have to be believed, not facts.

What I am saying is a fact to me, but if I insist that you also believe it as a fact because I am saying it -- that kind of belief has become impossible. And it is good that it has become impossible.

Question

TO ME, IF SOMETHING IS A FACT THEN IT IS A FACT FOR EVERYONE. IF IT ISN'T, THEN IT'S NOT A FACT; IT'S SOMEBODY'S BELIEF.

No, no. There are two types of facts: objective and subjective. For example, if I say that I love you, there can be no objective proof. How can I prove it objectively? Can any kind of detection prove that in my heart there is love? If I try to act in a loving way so that you will know that I love you, then I am just acting. How can it be proved *objectively* that I have love in my heart? But it still is a fact, a subjective fact.

Belief in someone else's subjective fact has become impossible. A St. Francis or a Buddha may say, "I have achieved such and such," but he cannot show you what he has achieved. You can believe it or disbelieve it. Or, you can experiment and achieve the same thing. Then you can believe it.

There is no objectivity possible as far as inner truth is concerned. So don't insist on it. That is what I mean. If I insist that my fact must be your fact, then I am a violent man. And if I say, "Believe it, because I *know* it is so," that is violence. I simply say what is a fact for me. I can tell you the technique of how it became a fact for me, how I came to realize it. I can tell you the technique. You can try it. If you also come to the same bliss, then it will become a fact for you .

Science is concerned with the objectivity of the fact. Religion is concerned with the subjectivity. A subjective experience cannot be shown. I cannot show you what I have attained; there is no way. Still, it is a fact for me not a belief.

Question

ARE VALUES FACTS OR ARE THEY SUBJECTIVE?

Values must be based on your inner illumination. For example, Buddha says that to speak the truth is a value. For him, it is an inner realization. It is not a question of faith, he is not

saying that if you speak the truth you will attain heaven. He is not saying that if you speak the truth, God will be pleased with you; he is not giving you any profit motive. He is simply saying that when he speaks the truth he feels good, a well-being comes to him, and when he speaks an untruth he feels degraded inside, he feels suffering, he feels a bondage. This is *his* fact, subjective. And he says, "Try it." If you also feel the same thing, then it has become a realization to you. But just to believe in it because Buddha has said it is worthless.

This is my insistence: that unless something becomes a realization for you, it is bogus and, for you, it is false. Don't follow phantoms. It is better to experiment and come to an inner truth than to go on following things that someone else had said. Don't be traditional, be individual.

Religion is individual truth. You can be a Christian, you can be a Hindu, a Mohammedan, simply by belief. But that is bogus; you are not authentic. Simply being born in a Christian family or a Hindu family you can be a Christian or a Hindu, but whatsoever you believe is borrowed. It is not authentic; you are not true to it.

So it is better to find out some small fact upon which you can be authentically based and you can say, "This is my knowing." That will transform your whole being. You may believe in many, many things, but they are not coming from your experience. Then you remain a false entity, a pseudo-man.

When I say, "Make it your experience," I mean: be authentic about it. A single fact that you yourself have realized will be transforming. You will be a different man; your feet will be on solid ground. That's why I don't insist on doctrines but on techniques. Doctrines are others' realizations. They may not be true. Techniques are simple methods: you can simply do them. If the technique works, if it is right, then you will come to the same conclusion.

Buddha was one of the most authentic men who has ever lived. His dying words were, "Don't believe in me." Don't believe something because Buddha has said it, don't believe because others believe it. Unless it becomes a truth for you, don't believe it. That doesn't mean to disbelieve it. There is no need. Remain suspended. That is intellectual honesty: to remain suspended, to remain agnostic. Don't say *yes* or *no* until you come to *know*.

Believers are false, pseudo, inauthentic. That's why I say that faith has become impossible. To be authentic is to be religious -- even if you have to say, "I don't know God, I don't know Christ, I don't know the Holy Ghost. I don't know anything. And because I don't know, I cannot believe. Unless I know, I will not believe." Only this kind of attitude will create a situation for you to grow.

Question

YOU SAY THAT YOU HAVE NO BELIEFS. YET YOU HAVE A CERTAINTY THAT GOES FAR BEYOND THE PROBABILITY THAT THE CONFIRMATION OF A HYPOTHESIS WOULD ALLOW YOU TO CLAIM.

A hypothesis is not a belief. You need not believe in it; it is just a temporary thing. It may be true, it may not be true. There is no need to believe in it; the experiment will show whether it is true or not. You play with the hypothesis: without belief, without disbelief.

As far as objective facts are concerned, an experiment can only lead to a certain probability. You can never know any objective fact in its totality. Something else may be discovered which can change the whole thing. So with scientific facts, your knowing always remains relative. You cannot be absolutely certain because the fact, any fact, is just a part of the great world, the infinite. In that, infinity, whatsoever you know is always probable; it is

never certain.

Science can never be certain. It will always be probable, because something new can always be discovered. You may destroy the whole hypothesis, or change it. So science will remain probable. That is the very nature of it.

But religion can be certain because inner truths are not fragments. They are absolute in a sense. Once you know them, you can be certain about them. There is no need to be certain, but you are certain. That feeling comes. It is just like when you fall in love. You never say, "I am probably in love." When you are angry, you never say that you are probably feeling, anger. When anger happens to you, you are certain of it, when love happens to you, you are certain of it. If you say that you are *probably* in love, then you are not in love. With love, the certainty comes automatically. The more you move inside, the more certain you become. The more outer you move, the more probable.

The further a thing is from you, the more probable it will be. And the nearer to you, the more certain. When you come to the very center, it is absolutely certain. That's why Jesus or Mohammed or Buddha are so certain. They're absolutely certain. And Einstein or any other scientist is absolutely uncertain. It is bound to be so. It is the very nature of the thing. The further removed something is from you, the less certain you will be about it.

When something happens to you at the very center of your being, there is no possibility of any uncertainty. You are absolutely certain that it is so. There is not even any need to be so certain, but you are.

Certainty is inner truth; probability is outer truth. Science will never be certain and religion will always be certain. That's why religion appears to be very dogmatic.

It is bound to be. But don't try to enforce your certainty on others. That is irreligious.

An inner truth need not be believed. It only needs to be discovered. It is there already, you *are* it. And your inner truth is the only thing that can be truly known. Everything else will always remain probable.

If you allow me to say it, I will say that science is belief because it is always probable and religion is knowledge because it is always certain. The only thing you can be certain about is your own self. If you cannot be certain even about yourself, you cannot be certain about anything else. If I am not certain that I am sitting here in this chair, then how can I be certain that you are here? You are removed from me; you may be just a dream. If I am uncertain that I myself am here then I cannot be certain about you.

All certainty starts with me: that I am here. It is possible that I may be dreaming that I am here and I am not really here, but even to dream I have to be. That one thing is certain. You may be a dream, but I cannot be a dream because a dreamer is needed. The further you are removed from me, the more uncertain you will be. I cannot be certain about you; I can only be certain about myself. That is the only thing -- what Descartes calls the indivisible truth. Science is belief. Religion is knowledge.

Question

JESUS HAD A CERTAIN KNOWLEDGE AND BUDDHA HAD A CERTAIN KNOWLEDGE. YET THEIR KNOWLEDGE SEEMS TO BE CONTRADICTIONARY.

Whatever Buddha or Jesus have said is not what they mean. To know the inner is one thing, but to put it in words changes it completely. Jesus uses a different language than Buddha; it is bound to be so. Buddha uses a different language because he is living in a different culture, a different world. But whatsoever they know is the same. You can compare

Buddha's words with Jesus'. They are different, the language is absolutely different. Jesus uses Jewish symbology. Buddha uses Hindu symbology -- they are different.

But if you have the same experience, then you can look beyond symbols and see that the experiences of Buddha and Jesus are the same. If you don't have that inner experience, then the languages will look different, contradictory.

A Christian scholar and a Buddhist scholar will never agree that the experiences of Jesus and Buddha are the same. But the problem is semantic, one of language. Eckhart will agree that the inner experience of the two is the same Jakob Bohme will agree, because they themselves have achieved the same thing. *Because* they have achieved it, they can see beyond language. Language communicates, but it also becomes a barrier.

The Eternal Quest

Chapter #10

Chapter title: If You Take the Whole out of the Whole

Date Unknown

Archive code: 6700000

ShortTitle: QUEST10

Audio: No

Video: No

Question

HOW CAN WE BECOME ONE WITH THE REALITY AND WHY ARE WE SEPARATE FROM IS?

The division is something that we ourselves have created. Reality has always been one; it has never known any division. All division is a mental division, a creation of our own conditioning. Reality has always been undivided, indivisible. It is still so. It has always been so, it will always be so. But through our cultivated minds, we feel it to be divided.

The moment you become whole, the moment you become aware, there is neither the individual nor the cosmic. Or, you can say that everything is the cosmic. The cosmic does not exist in opposition to the individual. Rather, all individuals dissolve in the cosmic.

Question

HOW CAN THE COSMIC BE ACHIEVED?

By becoming aware of your fragmented mind, of your conceptions, your attitudes, your prejudices. By becoming aware of the mind that feels, hears, chooses. When you see a flower, it is not only that the flower is there. Between you and the flower, a particular mind exists, a particular attitude about the flower exists. Otherwise there would be no barrier between you and the flower. You would be one.

You and the flower are two extremes of one existence, two ends of one single moment. If your mind is not there, your consciousness and the flowering of the flower are two extreme points of one process. But if your mind is there (as it is always there), you are not just seeing the flower. Your seeing has a projection behind it, you are seeing in terms of your own conceptions, your own likes and dislikes.

You say, "This is a rose." But there is no such thing as 'rose'. The rose itself doesn't know that it is a rose. We are the ones who have called it that. And the moment you say 'rose', everything that is associated with the word 'rose' stands between you and the particular flower in front of you. The word has so many associations. If your culture says that a rose is beautiful, then the flower becomes beautiful. If your culture is against roses, then it becomes ugly. If your experience with roses is associated with pain with thorns, then the rose becomes one thing. If your associations are happy, then the rose becomes something different. But all the while, the rose itself remains the same. You see it with your mind. Your mind destroys that which is real and creates something imaginary, hallucinatory.

If you have no mind; if you can see the rose without your mind; if your seeing is totally innocent, completely fresh; if your seeing is not coming from the past; if you and the rose are living simultaneously in this moment -- if you are without mind: just aware, just existential -- then the rose is not known as something separate. Then you know it to be part and parcel of your consciousness. Then the flowering of the rose is your own flowering; then the perfume of the rose is your own perfume; then your consciousness is the rose's consciousness.

The rose is knowing itself through you. Identification is not an act of dualism, but of total being. Through your consciousness, the rose has come to know itself. This is the feeling! It cannot be expressed exactly, but the feeling is like this: that either you have flowered in the rose, or the rose has become conscious of itself through you.

Question

IS THIS WHAT IS KNOWN AS 'SEEING'?

It is *really* seeing. It is *darshan*, without the mind.

Question

THAT'S THE KIND OF THING KRISHNAMURTI IS ALWAYS SAYING.

I don't know what he says. But I say: this is seeing. Only when you are mindless is seeing there. The mind is the destroyer, it is a destructive force.

So do not try to be whole. You cannot try. There cannot be any effort because every type of effort is the effort of one particular mind against other minds. That is why effortlessness has to be understood clearly. You cannot achieve it because every type of achievement is the longing of a particular type of mind. You can only understand it. "This is so. This is the suchness."

The mind is fragmented. The mind is not one; it is poly-psychic. You don't have a mind; you have many minds. These minds are the experiences of the past to which you have become attached, associated, to which you are clinging. Why are you clinging? Because to exist mindlessly in dangerous, to exist mindlessly is insecure, to exist mindlessly is to always be in the unknown. That is why we have made everything that has become known to us a part of our consciousness. We cling to our experiences, our knowledge, so that we don't have to move into the unknown, so that we don't have to feel insecure about what is going to happen.

We are clinging to that which has already happened. These are our safety measures.

The mind that is longing for security cannot be mindless. This has to be understood. The mind that is longing for security can never be mindless because it will cling to past experiences, past knowledge, past information. You will always be living through a dead mind.

So there are three things to be understood. The first is that we do not have a single mind. We have many minds. Secondly, these minds are our past experiences. And thirdly, we cling to these multi-minds because of our fear of the unknown, because of the infinite possibilities of the future. The past is fixed because it has already happened. It is dead; you can deal with it. But you cannot deal with the future. The future is always unknown, uncharted. There are unknown, infinite possibilities about which you can never be certain.

Life means uncertainty; life means insecurity; life means to be in danger. Only a dead person is out of danger. Now he cannot become diseased, he cannot die. There is no death for him now; he is at ease. Everything has become certain. Now nothing else can happen so there is no danger.

If you understand these two things (the certainty of the past and the uncertainty of the future); if you understand that life means uncertainty, life means insecurity, life means danger, life means uncharted and unknown possibilities -- if you understand this, then by and by your minds will drop, they will cease to function, and you will become one, whole. By and by, your response will become total.

This total response is religiousness. It is a total response: every moment, in every situation. Be total within, and be total without. The moment this happens, the totalness within and the totalness without become one. Then there is no barrier between you and the whole.

There can never be two perfections. The moment two perfections come close, they become one. The wholeness is always one. There is a saying in the Upanishads: "If you take the whole out of the whole, the whole remains behind." Nothing is taken out, because you cannot take anything from the whole. Even if you take the whole, the whole remains behind. And you cannot add anything to the whole. If you add something to the whole, it will remain the same.

There is no method to become one with the whole. You are already that. All methods are to help you to understand. They are to create a situation in which you can understand yourself: your multiplicity, your poly-psychicness. When you know yourself in your totality, only then can you know what is beyond this totality. So the first thing to be seen is yourself. If you have not even seen yourself, then seeing the wholeness is not possible.

Question

WILL I BE ABLE TO SEE THE WHOLENESS AFTER DOING MEDITATION?

Yes. It will descend on you sometimes. When you are whole, the whole will explode in you. And this will go on becoming more natural as you continue to meditate. The gaps will be less, the intervals will be less. Finally a moment of explosion will come from which there is no escape.

Question

CAN THIS HAPPEN THROUGH WILL POWER?

Will *is* power; energy. There is no such thing as 'will power'. Will is power, will is

energy. But by 'will' I mean the whole: Those who use the term 'will power' use it in a psychic sense. They use it to mean the power of concentration. I am not using the term in that sense. To me, 'will' means the whole.

So only God is will. We are never will; we are just desires. Will is power, without desire. It is power with no movement or, with an inner movement. It is power without direction: directionless, dimensionless.

When we say, "God is power," it does not mean that God is powerful. It means: God-power. God is the energy of the whole, the power of the whole. So when I say 'will power', it does not mean that will has power. Will is power -- it is energy. You can only attain it when you have lost yourself.

While you are there, desire will be there. Your power will come from your desires. It will be created by concentration, by narrowing, by exclusion. Then you will have moments of powerlessness also. Your potency will exist in opposition to impotency so it will come and go.

But when will comes, nothing goes. Everything is. Even passivity is powerful, even impotence becomes potency. That is why the word *tao* is better than the word 'will' and better than the word *dharma*. *Tao* is both death and life, both darkness and light, both potency and impotency. Only then does power become absolute.

'Will power', as it is ordinarily used, only means that power that is created by conflict, created by concentration. This is not power. It is just creating a conflict within you, and making one part of your mind in control of the other parts. A subtle energy, a subtle force, is created. You can use it, but then moments of depression, of powerlessness, will follow.

When there is no direction that you have to move toward, when you have no desires, you are power, *you* are energy, *you* are life. Then you exist without any shadows, without being followed by the opposite. That is why it is said that God is shadowless. He IS, but there is nothing opposite to him that casts a shadow on him.

The Eternal Quest

Chapter #11

Chapter title: A Meeting with the Hare Krishna People

Date Unknown

Archive code: 6700000

ShortTitle: QUEST11

Audio: No

Video: No

Question

WHAT IS YOUR CONCEPTION OF ABSOLUTE TRUTH?

No conception about absolute truth is possible because every conception is bound to be relative. The absolute transcends every conceptualization; you cannot conceive it. You can

live it, you can be in it, but no intellectual conception is possible about the absolute. All conceptions are bound to be erroneous because conception, as such, is relative. So I can not say what my conception of the absolute is. I am only say that no conception is possible. The moment you go beyond conceptions, you know the absolute. But even when you have known it, you cannot transform it into a conception.

The so-called religious mind is always conceptualizing, but the really religious man is one who has come to know the boundaries of intelligence, the boundaries of intellect, the boundary of conceptions. The absolute is beyond. Or you can say the beyondness is the absolute.

I am not a philosopher; I deny every type of philosophizing. The truly religious mind is a mind that is not philosophizing about the truth. Philosophizing is a sort of mentation: the mind is working. And through mind, no contact with the absolute is possible. Only when the mind ceases, when thinking ceases, the ego ceases, do you come in contact with it. The absolute is beyond 'me', beyond 'you'. Where philosophy ends, the absolute begins. Where conceptions end, the absolute begins.

Question

WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY 'ME' AND 'YOU'?

These are conceptions, egocentric conceptions. When I say 'me' and 'you', I mean my mental process and your mental process. Unless these processes cease, we cannot be in contact with the absolute because these processes are the barrier. 'I' -- as a thinking mind -- is the barrier. But if I think of 'I' as an existential living unit and not as a thinking mind, then there is no barrier. Then there is no 'I' and 'you'; then the whole existence becomes one.

One ego is 'I' and the other ego is 'you'. The absolute comes only when there is egolessness. 'I' cannot conceive of it; 'I' can only dissolve in it.

You can dissolve in it, but you cannot conceive of it. A drop cannot conceive of the ocean. It can only conceive of a drop. That is its limitation. But a drop can become the ocean, it can drop into it and be one with it. Only then does it come to know the ocean -- through becoming, not through thinking. It becomes one with it.

Conceptions are mental, part of language. The mind transforms reality into thoughts. If I love you, there is no 'I' and there is no 'you'. Only love exists. We are two polarities of it: two extensions of one feeling, two waves of one feeling -- coming and going. But when you conceive of love, love becomes a theory, a dead concept. Words, principles, philosophies, doctrines are there, but there is no love. The theory of love is not love any more than the theory of God is God. The word 'God' is not God.

I'm not saying whether the Hindu concept of absolute truth is right or wrong. I'm saying that conceptualization, as such, is wrong. We cannot conceive of the absolute; it is inconceivable. The moment one begins to think about it, there are only words. The truth is being lost. The truth can never become a word.

Question

THEN HOW IS IT THAT THE SCRIPTURES OF THE VEDIC RELIGION -- THE VEDAS AND THE BHAGAVAD GITA -- ARE ABLE TO DESCRIBE THE ABSOLUTE

They do not describe it. They deny all conceptualization. They tell you to jump into it. Not to try to conceive of it, but to jump into it.

When you talk about the Vedic religion... The moment one says 'Vedic religion', 'Christian', 'Hindu', 'Muslim', religion is lost. You cannot name it. Religion is religion, it is neither Vedic nor Christian. Nor can it be. Religion is not a sect, it is not sectarian. So when you say 'Vedic religion', you are destroying religion itself.

Question

'VEDA' MEANS ALL-KNOWING!

If you say 'all-knowing', then the Bible is also the Vedas, then the Koran is also the Vedas. Then there is no need to mention a Vedic religion. It becomes absurd, irrelevant. If 'Veda' means knowledge, then if something is part of knowledge it is Vedic. What Mohammed said becomes part of the Vedas. But then you can't use the term 'Vedic religion'. When you say 'Vedic religion', you mean knowledge as conceived, of by the Vedas. Then you confine it, a sect is created. But a sectarian mind is not a religious mind: it is basically irreligious.

The mind wants to know, it tries to know. You search for meaning. But the moment you accept someone else as the authority, you deny your own individuality. It is a suicidal act. So once you say 'Vedic', you have lost something that is essential for religion.

You like the Vedas. That is quite another thing. You may love them that is something quite different. You may like the Bible, you may love it, but don't be bound by it. Don't make it a bondage, don't be confined to it, because knowing is such a vast thing. Vedas and more Vedas may come and go, but the mind never ends. Vedas end, but the mind never ends. Knowing is infinite, but the Vedas are not infinite so a person who attaches himself to one particular creed is not a religious person at all.

To me, religion means an attitude of inclusion. There are three attitudes possible. The first is the scientific attitude: a mind that believes in analysis; a mind that believes in objectivity; a mind that believes in laboratories, experiments -- not within but without; a mind that is concerned with the without of things.

Then there is the artistic attitude. A person who is not concerned with reality as truth but with reality as feeling, a person who is not concerned with the realization of reality but who is concerned with the expression of it. A participatory attitude toward the real. But devotional -- a feeling attitude.

Then there is the religious mind. In every way it is different from the scientific mind. It is not analytical; it is subjective.

When you say 'Vedas', you become analytical. You have begun to divide religion. Religion is an attitude of synthesis. If you say that all that has been known is the Vedas, then there is no need to mention 'the Vedic religion' at all. Then Christ is a Vedic personality, Mohammed is, Confucius is. Then I am, you are. But that is not what you mean. When you say 'Vedic' you have confined yourself to a particular scripture. The moment you mention the name, you have become sectarian.

But the sectarian mind is so small that it can never be religious. A religious mind can only be limitless: untethered to anything, not clinging to anything, not confined to anything.

When I say 'the attitude of a religious mind', I mean a mind that is subjective, a mind that experiments with reality subjectively. I mean, taking the approach of seeking the within of things, not being concerned with the without. The seeking is subjective, inner. You become concerned with the ultimate, but you move toward it as an individual, not as a member of a sect.

You cannot move toward the ultimate if your attitude is sectarian, because the moment you become a member of a particular sect, your mind is burdened with particular conceptions, authorities, scriptures. Then you are not fresh, then you are not naked, you are not innocent. Your mind has become calculating. You are not ready to receive truth as it is. Rather, on the contrary, you have your own conception of truth to impose on reality. Now the truth must correspond to your scriptures, it must correspond with your conceptions. You are not open.

Question

ARE YOU SAYING THAT IN THE GITA WHEN LORD KRISHNA SAYS "I AM THE ABSOLUTE TRUTH" HE IS NOT SPEAKING THE TRUTH?

Firstly, I don't call him 'Lord Krishna'. It is our conception that he is a lord. It is our conception that the Gita is a scripture, it is our conception that it is religious, it is our conception that everything that is said in it is true. These are our conceptions. The moment we conceive of a thing as a scripture, then everything that is said in it becomes authoritative, true. Then there is no need to think about it.

The truth can be known, but it cannot be expressed. Not even Krishna can express it. And the moment he expresses it, the truth becomes confined to words. If I have known the truth I can try to describe it, but it is never described. I can only try to describe the indescribability of it.

The only way I can help you is to deny your formulations. I can only try to point out the limitations of your mind, of your information, your scriptures, your knowledge. If this much can be pointed out to you, then something is being indicated that is significant. So all that can be done is negative, never positive.

We may experience our own individual limitations, but we still try to conceive of the unlimited. We try to conceive of the absolute, we try to conceive of the infinite. We try to conceive of it through scriptures. It becomes absurd. It shows that we are not completely aware of our boundaries, the boundaries of our thinking, of our thoughts. We are not aware.

The mind feels satisfied if words can be fed to it. Then the illusion of knowledge is created. I can read the Gita, memorize it, go on continuing to memorize it, and feel that something is being known. No, nothing is being known. You are just computerizing your mind, you are feeding it with information. The words may have been true on the lips of Krishna, he may have known what he was talking about, but the moment it is said, the truth is not conveyed. Only words are conveyed, and we begin to cling to these words. The words become the basis of all our knowledge.

Words can never be the basis of knowing. One must go into total silence, one must go into total wordlessness. If that is not possible, then the absolute truth cannot be known. You will only go on knowing relative conceptions of it.

Question

THE SCRIPTURES ARE MY AUTHORITY. WHAT IS YOUR AUTHORITY FOR WHAT YOU HAVE BEEN SAYING?

I am my own authority. How can I speak on anything else? How can my authority come from anything other than my own knowing? Even if you base what you say on the authority of the scriptures, that is *your* authority, not the authority of the scriptures. It is you who has

decided to give the scriptures their authority.

The Eternal Quest

Chapter #12

Chapter title: Right Questioning

Date Unknown

Archive code: 6700000

ShortTitle: QUEST12

Audio: No

Video: No

Before you ask something, I must tell you that there are two types of questioning. One type of questioning comes not because you do not know, but because you know something. It comes out of your so-called knowledge. You have the answer already and then you raise the question. It is so stupid!

Whatever you know, you have not really known it. Otherwise there would have been no question. And secondly, because the question has been raised by a preconceived answer, you are not ready to receive a new answer. Whenever there is such questioning it is absolutely useless. It leads you nowhere.

Never ask because you know something. If you know, it is good. Then there is no need of a king. And if you do not know, then ask as if you are ignorant, as if you do not know. Unless you feel that you do not know, you are never vulnerable, open, receptive. Receptivity is needed otherwise you raise a question and do not allow the answer to go in.

More or less, all questions are like that. We have the answer already and then there is a search for confirmation. We are not confident because we really do not know; we have simply gathered certain information. Now we want someone to give us conviction, someone to be a witness to our knowledge so that we can feel, "Yes, I am right."

This is very absurd. If you know, then knowledge itself, knowing itself, gives confidence. It is self-evident. If you know something then even if the whole world denies it, it makes no difference. And in the same way, if you do not know a thing and the whole world says, "Yes, this is right," that too makes no difference. Knowing is self-evident and ignorance is also self-revealing.

So do not ask from your knowledge. If you know, it is good. If you do not know, then be conscious that you do not know and ask from your conscious ignorance.

The second type of questioning -- which is authentic questioning, sincere, honest -- is always from the feeling that you do not know. Your doors are open. Now you are ready to invite the guest. Otherwise you invite the guest and your house is completely closed. Then you do not really invite. If you invite, then make a space for the guest. If you have ready-made answers then you have no space within you to receive the answer.

Questioning is useless if there is no space to receive. See when you are asking a question,

if there is any space to receive the answer. First create the space, then ask. Then the question is not merely intellectual, not merely mental. You are totally involved in it; your whole being is at stake, your total being. This is what is meant by being existential. Now the question comes from your very existence, from your very being.

The first type of questioning is always conditioned by others. This must be understood very clearly. Ignorance is yours, and your so-called knowledge is given by others. Ignorance is more existential than so-called knowledge. If you do not know, this not-knowing is yours. But if you say, "I know because I have read the Gita. I know because someone somewhere has said such and such a thing, because Buddha had such knowledge and I have become acquainted with it. Therefore, I know," this knowledge is not yours.

And remember, even your ignorance is more valuable than others' knowledge. At least it is yours. Something can be done with it. It is real, existential. Nothing can be done with a fiction. The real can be transformed and changed, but with a fiction you can do nothing, with imagination you can do nothing. Imagined knowledge, based only on information, is fictitious. It is not existential.

So ask a question, inquire about something, through your existential feelings not your accumulated, mental information. If you really ask from your ignorance then your question will be universal in a way and individual in a way because when you ask from your ignorance you ask about a problem that is the same for everyone.

If you ask from your knowledge, then the problem differs. A Hindu will never ask a question that a Mohammedan will ask; a Christian will never ask the same question that a Jain will ask. A Mohammedan's knowledge is completely different from a Hindu's knowledge, but there is no such thing as Mohammedan ignorance and no such thing as Hindu ignorance. Ignorance is universal, existential, but knowledge differs. Mohammedan knowledge is different from Hindu knowledge or Jain knowledge, or Christian knowledge.

If your questioning comes out of your knowledge, it is bound to come out of your social conditioning. Then it is not universal, existential. When a Mohammedan asks something, he himself is not really asking. That which has been forced upon him, imposed upon him, that which has been conditioned that conditioning is asking. The real man is hidden behind the Mohammedan. The imposed Mohammedan (the imposed Hindu) is asking. Then it is superficial, and whatsoever answer is given is not going to benefit you to your depths because the question was never from your depths.

Existential questioning means that you go through all the conditioned layers of your mind and ask -- just as a pure, naked existence not as a Mohammedan, Sikh or Jain. Ask as if you have not been given any answers before. Put your answers aside. Then your question will be individual in a way, because it has come from you, and it will be simultaneously universal -- because whenever someone goes inside himself so deeply, the same question comes.

So be existential in asking and never ask from your knowledge, ask from your ignorance. If you want transformation, mutation, then ask from your ignorance. Be aware of your ignorance. Dig deep and find that questioning which is coming out of your ignorance and not out of your knowledge.

Question

IS IT NOT TRUE THAT ANSWERS ARE USUALLY GIVEN WITHOUT ANYONE ASKING FOR THEM?

It is both correct and incorrect in a way. Questions have been raised, otherwise answers

would not be possible. It may be that you yourself have not raised the question but someone else has raised it. The first time the question was raised, it was raised from ignorance. And the first time it was answered, the answer was given by a person who knew. But then everything becomes formulated. The question becomes formulated and the answer becomes formulated. Then we have ready-made questions and ready-made answers.

Every child is going to ask the same questions really -- because existence is the same, the problems are the same. To pass through existence is to pass through the same suffering and the same inquiry. So just as a safety measure, parents and teachers give answers before the question is raised. Neither the question has been raised nor does the one who is answering it know the answer. Both have become traditional, fixed. Because we know that the question is bound to come... Before it comes, the answer is given.

Once the question comes by itself, you will not be able to give a fixed answer to it. Once a real question comes into being, the society, the establishment, the father, the mother, the teacher, they will not be able to impose any answer. The real question is so powerful that old answers will not do. So it is just as a safety measure -- before one asks, give him an answer. Then the real question will never be raised, will never come into being. When you have been given an answer, when a false answer has been planted in you, you will begin to ask questions about the answer and not about the basic question itself.

A child goes on asking. You have planted an answer in him: You have told him that there is a God and that He has created the world. The child never asked you, but you have given him an answer. The answer will go deep within the child because it was planted in him at a time when he was not even aware of the underlying question. He was not aware yet of existential problems.

Your answer will go deep in his mind and by the time the child begins to question things, the answer will have become a part of his unconscious. Now he will not ask whether the world has been created or not. He will ask, "If God created the world, then why is there evil?"

This is a secondary question. It is not authentic, existential. It is because of your answer -- the answer that God created the world. Now a problem arises. If God has created the world -- it is taken for granted that God has created the world -- then why is there evil? This 'why is there evil?' is a question that has been created by your answer -- your answer to a question that was never asked.

There are layers and layers. Even this question about why there is evil can be answered before the child becomes aware that it is a question. Then, from a third level, he will raise questions.

The more sophisticated a society, the further away the questioning goes from the existential level. Really, a sophisticated society, a cultured society, means one in which so many answers have been given for which there were no questions.

One has to begin from the beginning. That is why I insist that your answers must be thrown. Otherwise you will continue to ask questions that are not basic, not existential, but only secondary -- there because the answers were already implanted in you.

So I say that it is both correct and incorrect. If there is no question, no answer is possible. When a question comes into the world for the first time, it comes through existential inquiry. For a Buddha the question is existential, but for a Buddhist it is not. A Buddha's questioning does not come through his conditioning. He had raised the basic questions. He goes in search, and there is an answer. He comes to know something. His answer is authentic because it has come through authentic questioning.

This answer will then be given to others -- even though they may not be interested in the

basic question in the least. But they accept the answer. It becomes an accumulation that makes them richer. At least it makes them *feel* richer. Now, they also know.

So you accumulate answers, many answers. Then these answers get transferred from generation to generation. And every generation goes on adding to them because in every generation some existential questions are asked and some existential knowings become realized. And the answers go on adding up...

So the more cultured a society is, the more the accumulated heritage of answers and the less the possibility of your being in a situation where you can ask a basic question. But if you cannot ask a basic question, you cannot receive a basic answer. If your questioning is false, you will continue receiving false answers.

First be aware of whether your question is coming from some answer that has been implanted in you or whether it is authentic. Ask something that is existential to you. If nothing had been taught to you -- if no answer had been given to you: no theories, no systems, no religions -- would there have been any question or not? If there would be any question, only that question can be existential, basic, religious.

So put aside all conditioned answers and dig deep into your original being. There will be questions -- alive ones. You may even find it difficult to know how to formulate them, how to put them, how to ask them. Because you have never asked a fundamental question, you do not know how to ask.

Then, it is better not to ask. It is better to suffer because you don't know how to ask than to ask unnecessary things. Through that suffering, you will be able to ask. And the moment you are able to ask, you are ready to receive. The same process through which you become capable of asking a foundational question, the same process, is needed in order for a foundational answer to penetrate into you.

The same path is to be used. So go deep into yourself to find a real question. That digging deep will create a passage in you and this same passage can be used by me. If there is no passage in you then my answer cannot penetrate you any more than the depth from where your question has come. The same will be the layer of penetration. If your question is superficial then any answer will just become a superficial thing to you.

Sometimes it has happened that the questioner was authentic and the teacher was not. Still, the questioner could receive the answer. But when the reverse happens -- when the teacher is authentic but the questioner is not authentic -- then nothing can be done.

Even a false teacher will do because, really, the work is being done by you not by a teacher. Even a stone image will do. If you are really concerned with the question then even a stone image can give you the answer. But if you are not really concerned, then even a living Buddha is dead to you. It depends on you ultimately; it does not depend on the teacher. It depends on the disciple, it depends on the questioner.

If you can ask a foundational question, from the very heart of your being, the answer will come to you even if there is no one to answer you. The vacuum will create the answer, existence itself will give you the answer. But with false questioning, nothing is possible and nothing can be done.

So try to formulate a right question. Even if you fail in your effort it is good. Try to formulate some problem that comes from you: not from the society, not from your teachers, not from your upbringing -- just from you.

This is a meditation This finding out is the meditation. So -- find some question!

The Eternal Quest

Chapter #13

Chapter title: Moving Between Polarities

Date Unknown

Archive code: 6700000

ShortTitle: QUEST13

Audio: No

Video: No

Question

MAN IS WEAK AND HELPLESS WHAT CAN HE DO TO FIND STRENGTH?

It is not that you feel helpless and weak because you do not have strength You feel weak because there is a craving for more strength. It is relative.

It is not that you are weak. You are what you are: neither weak nor strong. But there is a craving to be more strong, to be *more* -- in any dimension That craving is in terms of relativity, so it continues. Wherever you are, howsoever you are, makes no difference. Even when you become stronger you feel weak because now your craving has gone further ahead. The same distance will be there between what you are and what you want to be, and you will still feel weak and helpless.

You have to understand the mechanism of why you feel weak. You feel weak because you create an image of strength. You create an end and put it somewhere in the future. Then you feel weak in comparison to it.

This weakness is just your creation. Even if you are the whole and soul of the universe -- even if you are a god! -- it will make no difference You will create the same distinction; the same distance will be created. You will feel weak because the same mind will be there. It will again project a better possibility.

Mind can always project, can always imagine a better possibility. No situation is such that you cannot imagine a better one. You can imagine a better one, always. And if you can imagine a better one, you will feel inferior in comparison to it.

So what to do? There have been teachers who have said. "Do not look in the future; look in the past." They say: "if you want to feel strong, do not create an image of strength but, rather, look into the past and see how weak you *were*. Then you will feel strong."

But the fallacy is the same and the foolishness is the same. It makes no difference. If you feel strong in comparison to

some weak image of yourself or of someone else, it is impossible to escape the future. You cannot escape from it. If the past is there, the future will have to be there.

As far as I am concerned, I see what you are now. You cannot be more at this moment or less -- only what you are, 'X', 'Y', 'Z' -- whatever you are. In this moment, the whole universe, the whole existence, has culminated in you *as you are*.

If you go away from this point in any way, you create misery for yourself. Remain with

the facticity of your being. *You are* this -- this is the fact. Do not create any image to compare with this. This is the fact: I am this. If I am angry, this is the fact; this is the truth. If I am ready and daring and courageous enough to be with this fact then there is no weakness, no helplessness at all.

I am not going to say that you will feel strong. I am not going to say that! You will feel neither strong nor weak. And that is the moment of freedom: when you are neither weak nor strong. You just *are*. When you are strong, the same process continues. Now more will be asked for. If you are weak more will be asked for and if you are strong more will be asked for. It makes no difference. The difference is only of degrees.

But whatever you are at this moment, be with it. Do not escape in your imagination. Then there is no helplessness. Then there is no weakness, there is no strength. When there is no comparison, you are authentically yourself. There is neither any condemnation nor any appreciation. You *are*, and there is total acceptability.

When someone accepts oneself totally, one accepts the total existence. And unless you can accept yourself, you will never be able to accept anyone else. One who cannot accept himself finds it impossible to accept anyone else. Then the whole misery follows.

You love someone, but you cannot accept him. He can be still more lovely, he can be still more beautiful, he can be still more healthy. The 'more' is there and with the 'more' you condemn that which is; you are bound to condemn. Then you cannot love because love requires total acceptance.

You cannot accept yourself so how can you accept anyone else? Impossible! And this non-acceptance, this constant denial, creates misery.

Wherever you are, you are unhappy. Not because there is any fixed destiny for you to be unhappy: it is only because you have been using that faculty of the mind that imagines and not that faculty of the mind that remains with the fact.

Mind has both faculties: to observe what is or to imagine what is not. Imagination is needed. It helps in many ways, it creates all the possibilities for discovery. Use it this way; invent through it. But it is a misused, misdirected imagination if you begin to deny the facts and create a fiction. Then you will miss existence completely, constantly, continuously.

That is why you feel weak. One feels weak and helpless because one has an image to live up to. It is your creation! Destroy the image and be with the fact. Then there is an explosion. You feel neither weak nor strong; you just feel that YOU ARE There is a freedom from relativity, from comparison.

Any once you are free from comparing yourself with your own images, you will never compare yourself with anyone else. He is he and you are you, and every comparison is nonsense. Then there is a total acceptance of all that is. In this total acceptance is the ecstasy of life. Moment to moment you live it and feel the bliss of it.

So it is not a question of how to be strong. It is a question of how to be free from this craving. Why the craving? Why do you want to be something other than what you are? Why this craving to be someone else, to be somewhere else, to be something else? Why?

If you go deep inside, you will come to know and understand that this constant craving to be somewhere else is because you have not yet learned how to be where you are. You have not gone through the discipline -- if I may use the word -- through the learning of how to be where you are. You know only one thing: to never be where you are but to always think about being somewhere else.

Why is this so? If you cannot be where you are then how can you be somewhere where you are not. You are trying a more difficult, a rather impossible thing. Try the possible

instead, the only thing possible: try to be *here*.

Why are you never where you are, why are you always somewhere else? The mind has a trick, a very cunning trick. The trick has proven very useful so the mind goes on using it. To be where you are is to face reality. There will be problems. But to be where you are not is to go on dreaming, so there will be no problems. It is intoxicating!

If you love a woman and remain with her, it is going to create problems. But if you imagine a woman and live with her in your dreams, it is going to create no problems at all. You are alone. There is no one to create problems -- you are somewhere else.

It is intoxicating to create dreams, because then you are the god amidst your dreams. It is *your* world. The real world is not yours. On the contrary, you are just a minute part of the real world, nothing really.

In the real world, what am I? Nothing! But in my imaginary world, I am divine. I am the whole and soul. My dreams are mine; the whole dreamy world is mine. I may do whatsoever I like. So the mind picks up the trick and whenever there is difficulty in the real world, you escape into dreams.

You learn the trick. And every moment there is difficulty in the real world. There is bound to be. So the mind goes on continually escaping somewhere else.

This is the reason why craving exists. Understand it, be aware of it, and by and by -- whenever you feel that you are creating a dream again -- you will just be aware. The dream will wither away and you will be thrown back to reality. Howsoever painful, be with the reality. Howsoever pleasant, do not be with the dream.

Dreams are pleasing. That is why we are with them. And reality is not pleasing. But through pleasant dreams, you are never going to get any bliss. Only through painful reality does one reach the blissful moment. If you want real bliss, you will have to pass through real pain, real suffering. That is the price to be paid.

If you do not pay the price then you can continue dreaming, but in the end you are paying more, and for nothing. In this way, you are not escaping reality. You are just thinking that you are escaping. You will suffer, you will continue suffering. Reality will be there, suffering will be there, pain will be there, only you have an opiate with you. That is the difference.

The human mind has always longed for intoxicating drugs. They are chemical ways to escape. Dreams are just mental ways to escape.

You will be surprised that the more aboriginal races, primitive races, do not dream much. A dreamer amongst them is a phenomenon. In a primitive community, one who dreams becomes a prophet because ordinarily there is no dreaming. They live so much with reality that dreaming is not needed.

The more cultured a society, the more dreaming there is. Finally, just the night is not enough. You have to dream in the daytime also. Then there is a continuous circle of dreaming inside. Sometimes you are dreaming less, sometimes more -- that is the only difference.

If you penetrate inside, you will see a film of dreams continuously going on there. Just close your eyes and there is a dream. It is not that you were without dreams when your eyes were open. A dream was there, it was running, but you were not there to see it. Close your eyes, relax and the dream is there. It is just waiting for you in order to continue. It is there, waiting.

This dreaming mind goes on creating better images. Then there is comparison, there is misery -- you feel weak. This weakness is created by the mind. Otherwise no one is weak and no one is strong. Everyone is as he is.

Each individual is so individual that comparison is impossible. How can you compare? You do not compare yourself with a stone. You do not compare: a stone is a stone. But you compare yourself with another man. Why? -- because you feel alike.

If you are a man, you will not compare yourself with a woman. The whole culture has trained your mind to feel that there is no reason to compare yourself with a woman. But you compare yourself with another man because you feel alike.

We compare only when we feel alike. No one will say that this tree is more beautiful than my wife. It is meaningless. And if you say it, your wife is not going to be angry about it. She will just laugh. But tell her that another woman is more beautiful and misery is created.

The whole attitude of comparison is based on the feeling of likeness. But no one is alike. It is not that one man and another man can be compared, no. They cannot be compared; they are absolutely different. More different than a tree is to a woman. Nothing is alike, every existence is unique. But this uniqueness can only be felt when you do not escape into dreaming.

Remain with the facts and you will come to know that everyone is unique -- that not only you are unique, but everyone is unique. Usually when you feel, "I am unique," you are still comparing. This uniqueness is in comparison to some -- one: "I am unique." Ordinarily if someone says that he is unique it is still a comparison, but once dreaming stops and you live in reality you know that everything is unique. Every moment of time, every stone, every tree, every leaf of a tree is unique.

This uniqueness is felt because you are living with your facticity. Then there is no comparison. Then you never feel weak or strong, foolish or wise, beautiful or ugly. There is nothing to compare with; you are alone.

Think in terms of this attitude: if everyone dies and only you have remained on earth, will you feel foolish or wise, beautiful or ugly? If you are alone then there is no comparison. You are the same as you were with others, but because there is no comparison you cannot say that "I am wise."

If you live with your facticity -- with your being, as it is -- you become alone amidst the crowd. You become just an island, alone, and there is no one to be compared with. All comparison falls. Then you have a freedom that is completely unknown to you now. In that freedom, you can be whatsoever you are.

That is the only freedom I know: to be whatsoever you are. Otherwise there is misery, layers and layers of misery and worlds and worlds of hell. You go on creating them continuously.

Everyone lives in a multi-dimensional hell. We do not only compare in one dimension; we are continuously comparing in multi-dimensions. Someone is more healthy, someone is more beautiful, someone is more wise, someone is more strong, someone is more wealthy. Multi-dimensions of comparison! Everyone compares himself with everyone else and lives in a multi-dimensional hell.

Everywhere is hell. The mind is such that no one can go through the continual comparison and reach to any heaven, to any blissful state of mind. Not even an emperor can. He may have everything -- the whole world in his hands -- but a beggar who is singing just passes by his side and he feels miserable. He cannot sing like that beggar sings. His whole kingdom, his whole world, all his victories become useless. Just a beggar singing by the corner of the road and the emperor is no more an emperor; he has become miserable. He cannot sing like that! The same mind, in different situations, will create hell through different routes.

So remain with the fact and do not ask how to be stronger, what is the method to be stronger, how not to feel helpless. If you are helpless, then feel helpless. Why create another possibility? And this is the miracle: if you can be at ease with your helplessness then you are no longer helpless. If you are ready to accept that you are helpless, if you are ready to live with this helplessness, then where is the helplessness? It is gone. You can never feel helpless now.

This is the dynamics of the mind: if you feel helplessness and you try to reach some point that is opposite to it, you are never going to be beyond it. Do not try to be the opposite. Just be with your helplessness and it withers away; it is nowhere to be found.

It is found only in the opposite -- and it is the mind that creates the opposite. This is not good. See the mechanism, see the stupidity of it. I am helpless, I am weak. Then my mind says: be strong. But how can a weak man be strong? If I can be strong then I am not weak.

But I am weak. My mind says, "You are weak. Now find some way to be strong." How can I find a way? How can I be strong when I am weak? Through weakness, how can strength be achieved? I will have to endeavour to be strong. The weak, the weakness, will endeavour to be strong.

How is it possible? It is impossible. I am helpless, I am ignorant, and the ignorance tries to be knowledge. How can ignorance be knowledge?

Look at it in this way: if a madman tries not to be mad, he will be *more* mad. How can a madman not be mad? If he tries not to be mad, the madness is doubled. If madness can try not to be mad, then anything is possible in the world.

But this is the case with all of us. Weakness trying to be strong, ignorance trying to be wisdom, ugliness trying to be beautiful -- everyone trying for the opposite and knowing very well what they are. If we can be aware of this phenomenon...

If you are weak, how can you be anything but weakness? There is nowhere to go. Accept it, do not try for the opposite. It is a fact: you are weak. Accept it.

And the moment there is no struggle, are you weak? Can you say you are weak? The moment the struggle drops, you are not weak. Create the opposite and you will remain the same. Accept it, and you are transformed.

This is the contradiction of all mysticism. Socrates says, "people call me wise because I am the only one who has become aware of his ignorance." And Lao Tzu says, "You cannot defeat me because I am already defeated. None can defeat me. My victory is settled because I have accepted defeat."

Come to defeat me. You will not have to try. I am already defeated so how can you defeat me? You can only have the pleasure of defeating me if I struggle with you. I lie down and request you to come and sit on me. I am defeated; you will be victorious. But you will look childish and foolish, because the whole pleasure of victory is in the fighting, in subduing someone. And I am already subdued...

There is a saying of Mansoor: "Death is impossible for me, because I have accepted it." It will be so, it is so. Death exists because of your fear of death. It cannot exist if you accept it, if you are ready to meet it, to invite it and embrace it.

That is the reason why the Upanishads speak in paradoxes. They say that if you want to enjoy, renounce; if you want to be in bliss, then be happily miserable. Then opposite must not be denied. Somewhere it must be accepted and assimilated, you must not be against it. Create a space in you in which the opposite is also accepted. Then both will negate each other and you will be free. Weakness denied creates the concept of strength. When weakness is accepted, there is no opposite to it.

For the first time in history, the sons and daughters of the wealthy have become hippies, seeking the opposite. Rockefellers cannot conceive that their whole effort to create so much wealth also creates an alternative community of beggars. Why? -- because the mind seeks the opposite.

It is not that you seek strength because you are weak. When you get strong, you will begin to seek weakness. You will begin to create illusions about weakness just as you are now creating illusions about strength.

Whatever you want, if it could be given to you this very moment, the next moment you would reject it. If it is not given -- that is the reason you continue to dream of it. Win the one you love and love withers. Get the thing you seek and you begin to ask for the opposite. It is not only that when you are weak there is a craving for strength. When strength is there, you begin to feel the beauty of weakness.

The mind begins to interpret, to glorify the opposite. For example, as far as the bliss of begging is concerned, no beggar has ever known it. But emperors have known it when they have become beggars. It is a miracle, it is really a miracle! No beggars has known it. He has known only misery and more misery. But Buddha has known the bliss, Mahavir has know it. When they became just beggars they knew the bliss of begging.

Is there bliss in begging? There cannot be. Beggars are there, they have always been there, and they have never known it. They cannot believe that it is even possible, that Buddha became blissful by becoming a beggar. How is it possible? The beggar cannot conceive of it because he has not known the other pole. But from the opposite pole, things appear to be different.

Someone asked Mulla Nasrudin, "Is your house on the left side of the road or on the right?"

Nasrudin closed his eyes, went into deep meditation, contemplated and then said. "Sometimes it is on the right and sometimes on the left. It depends. When I go there from here, it is on the left. When I come from the other direction, it is on the right. It seems to change sides. I have seen it in different places."

Where is bliss? On the left or on the right? In weakness or in strength? In begging or kingdoms? Where is it? It depends on where you are coming from: "I have seen it in different places -- sometimes on the left, sometimes on the right."

The Mulla was walking. He asked a man, "Where is the other side of the road?" The man said. "Are you a fool? That is the other side of the road."

The Mulla said. "This is very surprising. When I was on that side, someone said the other side is here. Either I am a fool or this whole city is crazy! I have asked so many persons. When I am on that side, they say the other side is here. When I come to this side, they say the other side is there. Tell me, please, where is the other side?"

The other side cannot be found. The moment you are on the other side it is not the other side. You can have illusions about the side that is not there, but you cannot have illusions about the fact. You can only have illusions about a fiction; the other side is always a fiction. Somewhere, far off dreams are possible -- you can project. But your dreams are never on this side, where you are.

If you become aware of both sides, you transcend. Then there is no other side. Then you stop asking where the other side is. In that transcendence of duality, of sides, of opposites, is freedom -- total freedom, infinite freedom. And with infinite freedom, there is infinite energy.

So it is not that knowledge can be acquired against ignorance, no. If your knowledge is the opposite of ignorance, it will just be a camouflage. It will just be a covering to hide something. The ignorance will remain inside and you will cover it with knowledge.

'Knowing' is when there is neither knowledge nor ignorance. I would have preferred it if Socrates had said something more. He said, "People call me wise because I have become aware of my ignorance." He has left one side -- the side which claims knowledge -- and has come to the other side which claims ignorance. He will have to leave this side also. Only then can he be perfectly wise: when he can say, "I am neither. I have known both and I am neither. Neither am I ignorant nor am I wise."

It is very easy to transfer your mind to the opposite pole and remain there. Both sides must fall down. Then there arises that consciousness which is really you. It is beyond the two sides. One has to pass through both sides. One has to suffer; one has to move to the extremes. Not asking for the opposite, but remaining where you are, right this moment.

Sometimes you will be one thing, sometimes you will be the opposite. Learn how to be with that which you are right now. Sooner or later you will be on the other side so don't bother about it. When you are there, be there. When you are here, be here. Do not bother about it just now, because then you will be missing something that has to be learned. If you cannot learn it here, then when you are at the other extreme the same mind will be there: you will be somewhere else -- again and again and again.

Do not ask for the opposite. And when I say do not ask for the opposite, I do not mean to suppress the opposite. If you suppress it in any way, you have already asked for it. Just be aware of this dualism of the mind, the dynamics of the mind -- that the mind works in this way. Just be aware, that's You are feeling weak. Be weakness, wholeheartedly. You feel ignorant. *Be* ignorant, wholeheartedly. This is how God is existing within you, when you are weak; this is how God is existing within you when you are ignorant. This is how existence, destiny, is in you at this moment: as you are. What can you do? Who are you to do anything? You are that which you are.

Do not divide yourself. But we are divided. When I say, "There is anger and it should not be," or "There is violence and it should not be," who is dividing whom? I am angry and in my thoughts I divide myself in two. I say that I am someone else -- some supreme self, some superconscious being -- and this anger is just like a disease; it must not be there.

When you are angry, find out if there are two things: the angry one and the anger. Don't think about it afterwards. Afterwards there will be two because by then the anger has become a part of memory; it is a dead thing. When it's happening while you are angry, just close your eyes and see whether there is someone who is angry or where there is simply anger. Is there just energy that has become anger, or is there someone who is above the anger, beyond the anger, different from the anger?

Do not stick to ready-made answers. They say, "Yes -- there is a soul, there is a self, there is a witnessing self." Rather, experiment. When you are in anger, know that there is something that is beyond anger. If you find that something, then you will not find anger. And if you find anger, then you will not find anything that is beyond it.

What does that mean? It means that there is only one: if there is anger then there is nothing beyond anger; if there is something beyond anger then there is no anger. It is the same energy: one energy, transforming itself in many ways. When it is anger then there is nothing left behind. You are totally angry. If you are witnessing then nothing is left to be angry -- you are a witness.

But in memory, retrospectively, you can make it two. Sometimes there is anger and

sometimes there is witnessing. Then you think that there are two, that there is a lower self that is to be condemned and destroyed and a higher self, a supreme self, that is to be saved and made free. This misconception comes to you retrospectively, when you *think* about anger. It is not there at the moment of anger.

When anger is a memory, when non-anger is a memory, you can divide them opposite to one another and you can choose how you wish to be. But you are falling into a very pseudo-phenomenon.

When you are in love, find out if there is any lover or if there is only love -- energy transformed into love. You will never find any lover. If you say, "I am the lover," then there is no love at all. You will not find even the ashes of love. Nothing will be left, not even smoke. The lover will be there but then there will be no love. And if you find love there then investigate. Investigate, and you will not find the lover at all because love is only an energy. Only in memory are you a lover. In fact, in reality, you are love.

So if you are weak, find out if there is someone beyond this weakness who is saying to be strong. Search within. If there is weakness then there is no one who is beyond weakness. And if you find someone within who is beyond weakness, then there is no weakness. They never coexist. Only in memory do they coexist.

Human ignorance continues because of memory. All teachings are bound to be based on memory because teaching is just the memory that is carried over by the society. Scriptures are memory. That is why we call them *smriti* or *shruti*. *Smriti* means that which has been memorized throughout the ages and *shruti* means that which has been heard. They both mean the same: *smriti* is on the part of one who relates and *shruti* is on the part of one who listens. The whole teaching is out of memory.

The scriptures divide you in two. They say, "Do not be angry," but the sentence is very false. It implies that you are something different from the anger: "Do not be angry!"

This creates duality. You begin to think: "Do not be angry? *How* to not be angry?" How to not be helpless, how to not be weak? Do not be weak! But the secret is that if you want to follow this inscription, this injunction to not be weak, then you have to accept your weakness. If you want to follow the inscription not to be angry then be *totally* angry and you will be aware that 'you' are not there. The awareness will have such intensity that it transforms the whole thing.

Physicists say that even atomic particles behave differently when they are being observed. It is possible. Sooner or later it will be proven that when you are looking at a tree it behaves differently, because the observer becomes a part of the phenomenon. It behaves differently because you have become a part of it. Atomic particles behave differently when observed: they zig-zag; they change their route when observed. It seems as if they feel that someone has been observing them.

Imagine that you are passing a lonely street. No one is there. Then someone leans out of his window and you become different. You may not even be aware that you have become different, but those two eyes that are observing you from the window have become part of you. You cannot be the same. The whole situation has become different. Two more eyes -- a consciousness that is aware of you, conscious of you -- and something becomes different in you.

This happens whenever you are observed. That is why everyone talks, everyone speaks, but if you are put on a pedestal and a crowd is there to listen to you, something changes in you and you cannot talk. You have been talking your whole life, never have you found any difficulty. What has happened now? A crowd of eyes are observing you; you are not the

same. So much observation! Something has changed within you; you are different. Suddenly you do not find anything coming to your mind. It has become vacant.

Observation changes that which is observed. If you can observe anger, it has a mutative effect. It changes the whole thing. Observe your anger. Then there is a mutation, a sudden change. There is no anger: only you are there. Both cannot be there together.

So whatsoever the fact is, be with it, observe it. Do not move into imagination.

Mind has two faculties: imagination and observation. Ordinarily we use only one faculty: imagination. That is the only difficulty for us, the only problem -- the faculty of imagination that is within us. It has become completely unbalanced; it has gone insane. It must be balanced by observation.

If you can observe yourself, then you can allow your imagination complete freedom. It cannot create any problem for you, it will be creative and helpful. But the observer must be there. If the observer is not there and only imagination is there then you are bound to encounter difficulties and problems, complexities, and conflicts. Let the observer come in. By the very presence of the observer, the nature of imagination changes.

As it is now, your imagination is destructive. Comparison is destructive; it is violence. You only create images to condemn yourself. But once the observer is there, imagination changes its nature. It becomes creative. Then it is not creating images for the future. It becomes a help in observation.

Because life is so rich, we have never known it. But if you observe it with a very imaginative mind, with a very sensitive mind, with a very creative mind, things have a beauty that we have not known before. A very ordinary flower becomes something supreme, becomes something ultimate. Observation must be there, total observation, and then the imagination can begin to work with the observation: to penetrate more and more, to dig more and more -- not in the future, but in the here and now.

Imagination has the power to take you somewhere. If you just allow it to go, it will move into the future. It will go to the moon and to planets and to stars and anywhere. This is one dimension of movement: Call it the dimension of time.

Ordinarily our imagination travels only in one dimension: the dimension of time. It goes into the future or the past. It moves in time. With observation, there is a change. Imagination begins to move in space not in time. That is the change that observation creates. The arrow of imagination moves from 'there and then' to 'here and now'. Space is always here and now: it has no expansion in time.

So imagination has two dimensions to develop in. Without observation, it goes from the past to the future and from the future to the past. With observation, it goes into space.

If you look at a flower -- the moment you look, all the flowers you have ever seen come into your imagination.

If you say how beautiful the flower is, you are not really saying it about this flower. You are saying it about the many associations that have created within you a feeling, a memory that this flower is beautiful. Your imagination has moved in the dimension of time.

It can also move into the future, imagining a more beautiful flower that is possible. More is possible. With some labor and effort, a bigger flower is possible: more beautiful, with more colors -- more alive. Now you have moved into the future.

You are not with this flower that exists at the crossroads of the future and the past. You just by pass it. Either you go to the past or to the future. But with observation, your imagination can move deep into this flower -- this very flower, this fact. This flower has a

depth that we have not known before because we travel in time, and time cannot reach to the depths.

Depth is spatial, it is part of space. If time is dropped... With observation, time stops. You cannot observe in the future, cannot observe in the past -- you can observe only that which is in the present.

Observation is nontemporal. The stops completely and there is only space to move in now, infinite space. A very small flower has infinite space within it. Move in it. You are entering infinite space; the flower is just a door. Through the flower, you enter the whole existence. The flower is just a symbol, just a beginning, just a starter. You move deep into space -- not into time. The flower creates awe in you and your imagination becomes creative. With that imagination, one can penetrate deep into existence. Then, everything has a depth.

We never penetrate the depth, not even with persons. Even when you love someone you are with him but you are remembering the love that has past or you are imagining the love that is going to be. Never do you move in the space that the person is in, here and now. The person is a space. I will not say that he has a space: he is a space, a universe in which to move.

But you are not moving in it. You have the hand of your beloved or your lover in your hand, but your hand has gone dead. You are not there. You are thinking of events of the past, you are imagining things for the future. And the space which you call your lover or beloved is *here*, the door is just nearby. If you can move in the space, through your lover, you reach to the ultimate of existence. If you move deeply through anything you come to the ultimate, but the movement should not be in time; the movement should be in space. And that movement in space, that movement of the imagination, comes with observation.

The Eternal Quest

Chapter #14

Chapter title: The Alchemy of Religion

Date Unknown

Archive code: 6700000

ShortTitle: QUEST14

Audio: No

Video: No

Question

PEOPLE IN BOTH THE EAST AND THE WEST ARE SUFFERING IN EVERY DIMENSION OF LIFE. WILL YOU DIAGNOSE THIS SUFFERING FOR US: ITS CAUSES, ITS PREVENTIONS AND ITS CURES?

Suffering is symbolic. It does not have causes, but only one cause. Howsoever different the suffering, the cause is always the same. The cause is that the hidden harmony between the

human mind and the cosmic existence is lost. Whenever the hidden harmony is broken, suffering arises.

The suffering that is all around is only symbolic of the broken harmony. Even physiological suffering is symbolic. It means that the harmony in the body is broken. In the same way, mental suffering means that the harmony in the mind is broken. Wherever harmony is broken, there is suffering.

Suffering means broken harmony and bliss means harmony regained. You can say it like this: that harmony is bliss and absence of harmony is suffering. Whenever and wherever -- in any dimension: physiological, mental or spiritual -- if there is no harmony, then there will be suffering.

The deeper the dimension of life concerned, the more suffering there is. On a physiological level, when there is no harmony you experience pain. The suffering is not so deep. It can be removed by outward methods because it is superficial. It is only the first layer of your being: the physiological. It can be removed, thrown. Medicines can help, chemicals can help, and your health can be regained.

This word 'health' must be understood. 'Health' really means harmony. The word 'health' comes from the same root as the words 'whole' and 'holy'. The moment the body is whole, it is healthy. When the body is divided, it is diseased. The word 'disease' also must be noted. It means dis-eased: two parts not at ease. So on the physiological level, help in regaining your body harmony is easily available because physiology is your outermost part. But the psyche, the mind.

If the harmony of the mind is broken, there is not pain but anguish. Then suffering is deeper. The most that outward help can do is to make you adjusted, not harmonious. On the physiological level, outward help can make you harmonious, healthy, holy, whole, but the mind can be helped only up to the point of becoming adjusted.

Western psychology is doing nothing but helping you to become adjusted. Freud said somewhere that the most that we can hope to do through psychology and psychoanalysis is to bring you to a state of normal insanity. That is the most we can hope for: normal insanity. In his last years, Freud wrote to some friends: "I do not have any hope that happiness is possible for the human mind. At the most, we can make man adjusted to normal unhappiness."

Outward help cannot be so deep as far as the mind is concerned. It can only make you adjusted. But the word 'adjusted' really means nothing because with each culture, adjustment is different. A person who is well adjusted in an eastern society will not be so well adjusted in a western society. For a particular religion, one may be well adjusted, while in another religion, the same person would be considered maladjusted. Adjustment is a criterion that is more sociological than psychological. It is mainly concerned with the particular society to which you must be adjusted.

As far as the innermost part of you is concerned -- your being, the spiritual part of you -- when it is not in harmony then no help from the outside, not even adjustment, is possible. Something more must be understood about it.

The innermost, central part of your being is not reached at all through psychoanalysis or through any science of the mind that is prevalent today. In fact, there is not even a word in western languages that is parallel to pain and anguish as far as the third dimension of your being is concerned. Pain is physiological, anguish is mental, but when the spirit is not in harmony, when your being is unhealthy, then you have no word for it.

Buddha used the word *dukkha*. It cannot be translated really. It is neither pain nor anguish

nor misery. *Dukkha* means a meaningless existence. You go on existing without any meaning. You go on existing unnecessarily, you are just a burden to yourself.

Buddha was not physically ill. He had one of the most beautiful and harmonious physiques. He was not in anguish. There was no psychological complexity, no psychological disharmony -- one of the most well adjusted beings. But he felt *dukkha*. I will have to explain to you what *dukkha* is. It is real suffering, the innermost suffering.

Buddha's whole story will have to be told to you:

When Buddha was born, all the wise men came to bless him. One wise man came from the Himalayas. The moment he saw Siddharth (Buddha's name), he began to weep. Buddha's father was disturbed. He asked, "Why are you weeping? You have come to bless the child and instead you are weeping. Is something going to be wrong with the child?"

The wise old man said, "No, nothing is going to be wrong with the child. I was weeping for myself. The child is going to be a Buddha, an enlightened one, but I will not be here to see it. I am going to die this year, my course is completed. My whole life I was seeking and seeking for a man who is enlightened, but I couldn't find one. This child is going to be an enlightened one, but I will not be there. That is why I am weeping."

This forecast disturbed the father even more, because if Buddha, Siddharth, was going to be enlightened, then what would become of the kingdom? So the king asked the other wise men how to stop the child from becoming a Buddha.

They said, "There are only two possibilities. If he can be prevented from becoming aware of suffering only then can you hold him back. Otherwise he is going to be a sannyasin. So don't let him know suffering, don't let him know DUKKHA."

But the father could not understand how it was possible to prevent someone from knowing *dukkha*. He again asked for advice.

The wise men advised him that Siddharth should never be allowed to see death. If there is death then life becomes meaningless, so he should not become aware of death. He should not know at all that death exists, that life is going to end. Secondly, he should not be allowed to become aware that old age comes. Otherwise, youth will become meaningless. And thirdly, he should never see a sannyasin. If he sees a dancing, laughing, blissful sannyasin, his life will become meaningless. "These three conditions must be fulfilled. he should never see a diseased old man, he shouldn't see anyone dead and he shouldn't see anyone blissful."

Buddha's father arranged it in such a way that not even a dead leaf would ever be seen by him. No old man could come nearby to where Siddharth was. Whenever he would go out in the streets, the whole street would be cleared so that no old man passed by. Nor was he ever allowed to become aware of death, or ever allowed to see a sannyasin.

But how can you prevent it forever? One day there was going to be a youth festival. Siddharth was invited to preside over it. Young men and young women had come from all over the kingdom. As he was moving on his chariot, an old man passed by. He asked his driver, "What has happened to that man?"

The chariot driver said, "I cannot deceive you. Nothing has happened to that man that does not happen to everyone."

Siddharth asked, "Will I also be like that someday?"

The chariot driver said, "I cannot deceive you. No one is an exception."

Siddharth said, "Let us go back to the palace. It is no use going to a youth festival. I have become an old man. If old age is to come someday, in a way it has already come. Youth is useless because it is just a hiding place for old age."

While they were driving back, a dead body was being carried by. Siddharth asked, "What has happened?"

The chariot driver said, "The second stage. After old age, this happens."

Siddharth said, "Then I am dead! Life makes no sense at all. It is meaningless, futile."

Back home, just when he was at the door to his palace, he saw a sannyasin. This is what the parable says. It seems impossible, it couldn't happen like that: first the old man, then the dead man and then the sannyasin. It was all arranged by destiny, by the deities. In life it couldn't happen that way -- that Buddha would see these things one after the other -- but according to the tale, the myth, it was arranged this way by the deities because otherwise Buddha would never feel suffering and if suffering is not felt, then you cannot attain that inner harmony that is bliss.

Dukkha means this knowledge: that whatever appears to be living is going to die; whatever appears to be blissful, is not so. Ordinary life is going to end in death; it is JUST a progression toward death. So on the third level, the innermost, suffering means *dukkha*. Or, you can call it 'spiritual agony.'

Today, there are very few people who are spiritually in agony, who are in *dukkha*. But anguish is there, mental agony is there, mental disharmony is there. And in the West, it is intense. In the East the mental agony is not so intense because it becomes intense only when physical pain is not there. When physical pain has gone, only then is your consciousness freed from the physiological level and it moves to the mental.

The same thing happens again when there is no mental agony and the mental realm becomes harmonious. Then you become aware of spiritual suffering, spiritual agony. If the body is suffering -- as it is suffering in the East you will not feel mental agony. You have no energy to feel it. You're exhausted by the day to day struggle to survive. The day to day struggle for the body to somehow survive exhausts you so

much that on the mental level you are simply tired, not in anguish. So whenever a society becomes materially prosperous mental agony deepens, but when a society is poor, mental agony is not there.

But this is not a good sign. In the East, people think that it is a good sign: we are in less mental agony than people in the West. But it is not a good sign at all. It simply shows that we are more poor, more hungry, more starved. We are so engaged with fulfilling the needs of the body that we cannot pay any attention to the mind. As far as the mind is concerned, we only feel tiredness, that's all.

So this is the difference: in the East, pain is predominant -- physical pain, physical suffering, is predominant -- and in the West, psychic pain, mental agony, has become predominant. This is a sign of progress. The East must also progress to at least this level: to be in mental anguish. But if and when this happens, if you are not in mental anguish then there is a harmony in the mind.

When the mind becomes harmonious, you become aware of a deeper meaninglessness. Then you become disturbed in a more fundamental way. The body, is okay, the mind is okay, -- now, you yourself are meaningless. You've taken care of everything -- there is no pain, no anguish -- but then what? When there is pain you struggle: to take care of your house, to take care of your body. There is something to do, to be engaged in and occupied with. But once your material needs are taken care of, the mind begins to suffer. It becomes aware of intrinsic contradictions, intrinsic tensions.

Meditation is a means to help the mind regain harmony. In fact, meditation leads you only as far as the last boundary of the mind. No method can lead you to the spiritual; it can only

lead you to mental harmony. And when mental harmony is attained you become aware of a deeper realm, because now you don't need to be concerned with the mind at all.

So the mind doesn't need only psychoanalysing. Psychoanalysis only gives a superficial adjustment. The West needs meditation. It needs methods of meditation that can bring authentic psychic harmony. Then you become aware of suffering, of *dukkha*, of the meaninglessness of life. But to be aware of this innermost suffering... This awareness is a great bliss in disguise because once you become aware that life is meaningless...

Death is awaiting you. Nothing leads anywhere, everything just ends. Your whole life, your whole effort, just leads to the grave, you come to an end. This suffering is *dukkha* -- the awareness of it -- is the point from where you can take a jump into another realm, into another dimension.

It is not that you will find meaning in life, it is not that now there will be no death, but once the boundary of the mind is crossed, you became aware of this inner suffering, this meaninglessness. This feeling of meaninglessness is bound with your past. You have always been purposeful, you have never conceived of existence as meaningless. That is why this suffering comes to you.

But once you take the jump, you cannot go back. There is no way to go back. Once you have come to the end limit of the mind, you have come to a point of no return. You cannot go back: for you, there is only meaninglessness and death. But if you can stay in it, if you can be courageous enough to be in it, to be a witness to it, then there is an explosion. Then, the suffering is lost.

Then there is no suffering, there is no longing for meaning, there is no desire for immortality. Then seriousness has gone. You become playful. Everything changes into a new dimension: the dimension of play, the dimension of leela. Harmony is regained between you and the cosmic, between you and the existence. Then there is no barrier, because there is no mind.

The mind is a search for meaning and a search for immortality. The ego is in fear of death and if there is no meaning then the ego has no foothold to stand on. This gap -- where you recognize the meaninglessness of life -- is a spiritual abyss. From the mind, from the boundary of the mind, you will become aware of the spiritual agony, the meaninglessness of everything. Death is the only goal. But if you jump into the abyss then everything is negated. There is no suffering -- you become blissful. Then there will never again be any suffering at all because the part that can suffer is lost -- the ego is lost, the mind is lost.

You can look at it in another way. The body becomes unhealthy if it is in tension, if it is disharmonious within itself or in relation to the atmosphere. The mind becomes anguished if it is in conflict with itself or with other minds. Your being feels a sense of meaninglessness *because* of your body and your mind. You become alienated from the cosmic spirit because of your body and your mind. Within these two boundaries, you become alien -- a stranger, uprooted from the cosmic existence. You feel suffering.

When these two barriers are not there, you have become one with the existence. Then there is no question for you of life having any meaning. You are not, only the cosmic is. Now you cannot die because you are not. The cosmic is -- you are just a wave in the ocean now. Even if the wave disappears in the ocean, the ocean remains. You have realized that you yourself are the ocean so there is no fear of death. Death is not. As far as your cosmic being is concerned, there is no death; but as far as your individual being, your ego, is concerned, there is death.

All the meanings that we look for, search for, desire for, are ego meanings. You must

attain something otherwise you are no one. You only feel fulfilled if you achieve something. Through achievement the ego is fulfilled so you must achieve something -- maybe riches, maybe prestige, maybe knowledge. You must attain something, you must be able to attach something to yourself that you can claim as *mine*: my achievement. Only then is there an 'I', otherwise 'I am no one.'

The mind feels anguish and the mind also feels suffering, *dukkha*. It feels anguish when there is mental disharmony and it feels suffering as far as ultimate suffering is concerned. This feeling, too, is of the mind. You must know the distinction clearly. Mind is in anguish as far as mental inner disharmony is concerned, and mind is in *dukkha* as far as the ego and ultimate destiny is concerned.

Once the mind is not, the mind is annihilated, there is no suffering at all, no *dukkha* at all. Body pain is possible even for an enlightened one -- even for a Buddha, body pain is possible -- but psychic anguish is not possible and *dukkha* is not possible. Suffering exists in all three of these dimensions.

To me, the ultimate suffering is because of the ego and the ultimate bliss comes through egolessness. The western mind has become more anguished because of scientific achievement. The ego is strengthened more. It is strengthened because western science has taken the attitude of trying to conquer nature. It is a very egoistic attitude: to *conquer* nature. For the last three centuries we have been constantly conditioned through science. Everywhere, but especially in the West, the mind is science-oriented. It thinks in terms of conquering nature, in terms of competing with others.

And the more science has progressed, the more the western mind has felt that religion is invalid -- because so many religious propositions have been proved wrong by science. But really, no religious statement can be proved wrong by science. Only those statements that were scientific statements recorded in the religious scriptures have been found invalid. They're not religious statements at all! If, in the Bible, the earth is said to be flat, it is not a religious statement. Religion is not concerned at all with whether the earth is flat or not. It is a scientific statement, according to the science of Jesus' day. When such a statement is proved invalid, it only shows that the older science has been proved invalid by the newer science. But it does not make religion invalid at all!

But this misfortune happens. We confuse one thing with the other and we think that now religion is invalidated. In the old days, religious scriptures were the only records made. In fact, Bible means 'the book'. It is the only book we have of those days. It is an encyclopedia. It has no name really. It means: the book.

The Vedas have no name either. They mean 'the knowledge'. All the knowledge of those days has been compiled. They have poetry, they have science, they have medicine, they have grammar, they have religion, they have philosophy. They have everything; they are encyclopedias.

But because the scientific knowledge of those days is compiled in them and newer science, newer searches, have disproven much of this scientific knowledge, it doesn't mean that religion itself is disproved. Not a single religious statement can be disproved by science because the dimensions are altogether different. They never crisscross, they never cross at any point. No matter what Einstein says, it never touches upon anything that Jesus has said -- any more than progress in higher mathematics can prove that Kalidas or Shakespeare are wrong. One has no relevance as far as the other is concerned. Poetry has its own dimension; mathematics has its own dimension. Howsoever great a poet, he cannot refute by his poetry -- howsoever profound it may be -- any mathematical statement. It makes no sense.

Scientific progress has given the western mind the false attitude that religion is refuted. And if religion is refuted, if there is no divine, no divineness, if no cosmic relationship is possible, then you are left alone, uprooted. That's why, in the West, this century is a century of alienation. Everyone feels alienated. And the further scientific progress goes, the more you will feel a stranger in a world in which you have no roots.

If we were to go back and ask some Vedic rishi, he would say that he lives in a cosmic family. Everything is related. even the sun is related, even the stars are related, even the *moon* is related. They are persons; it is a great family. He is rooted in it. He is intimately related to everything that exists; he is not alone. There is a cosmic relationship taking place with each breath.

But today, the educated mind is absolutely uprooted. The cosmic family has disappeared. The stars are dead -- you cannot be related to them. Existence is so material that no relationship can exist. And everything is inimical to you. It is bound to happen; it's a logical conclusion. Either you are rooted in the existence or the whole existence will become inimical to you. These are the only two alternatives; you cannot remain neutral.

Through scientific progress, our relationship to the universe has been denied. But we never realized that by the denial of our intimate relatedness to the whole we have made the second step inevitable: the whole has become inimical to the individual. That is the cause of the anguish today in the west. The family has disappeared, the cosmic family.

And because of that, the smaller family will have to disappear. If I am not related to the earth, how can I be related to my mother? The connection is the same. The rishi of old would call the earth 'mother'. He would go on calling, "My mother... mother earth." He would call God 'father', he would call the sky 'father'. We have denied it without thinking what the logical conclusion of this denial will be. If we deny the cosmic family, then the smaller family unit will be denied altogether. If I am not related to the earth, if I am not related to the sky, if I am not related to existence itself, then how can I be related to my mother or my father? What is the difference? If I am not related to nature...

My mother and my father are parts of nature to me. If I am not related to the cosmic existence -- they are part of the cosmic existence -- then I am not related to them. Then I am alone and there is darkness everywhere. Only a loving relationship creates light, otherwise there is darkness. Only love is light.

Otherwise, there is darkness. Everywhere is darkness, everywhere is the enemy. Friendship is inconceivable. I have to just struggle and fight. But for what? Anguish comes. I am alone.

If you are not related to anything and you think that there is no possibility of any relationship, then you can never transcend the psychic realm. You will never come to the spiritual because you can come to it only when you are related to the cosmic. Our personality flowers amidst relationships. The deeper you go into relationships, the more you will see that this is so.

For example, if a child is taken from his mother, he will not be the same person that he would have been with his mother. Something that grows in the mother-child relationship will not grow now; the child will be retarded in a way. We have roots, just like trees -- but of course, invisible. The child's roots are with his mother.

They have done so many experiments with animals. If the mother is denied from the very first day, taken away, and the animal grows up alone, he never grows really. Everything can be provided for him -- even better than his mother could provide -- but the mother's love is absent. He never grows. He becomes insane, he becomes perverted. And in the end he is

never found to be capable of love. He cannot love because the roots of love have been broken. It is not only that the mother is caring for the child. Unknown even to herself, something is flowing from her towards the child.

And it is not only that the mother is giving something. The child is also giving responses. Whenever a child is born, it is not only that the child is born. On that very day, the mother is also born. Before she was just a woman -- and there is a vast difference between a woman and a mother. Something new has come to her, something new has flowered in her. So the child is also giving something. It is reciprocal it is mutual. The mother grows into motherhood. She becomes a different personality altogether.

I have just taken this as an example.

A child growing up as part of the cosmic family will have a different personality when he is grown up than a child who is growing up in an individual family. The roots are less deep for the child growing up in a small family. Religion means finding roots in the ultimate, finding roots in the cosmos. Even the sun should not be thought to be unrelated to you, even the river that is flowing by should not be unrelated to you, the earth should not be unrelated to you. Everything should be related to you and you should be related to the whole.

This relationship is religion. The word 'religion' means to be related to the whole, related from all sides, from everywhere. If you are related to the whole in this way, then there is no suffering because then there is no possibility of death. You cannot die because you are not; the whole is. The whole has always been and the whole will always be. Then you are not in fear. You will always be part of the whole. If you are a drop, you will become lost in the ocean, but you will still be part of the ocean. Then there is no fear of death there is no problem about the meaning of life. Then you are not alone, you are not in a struggle, in conflict.

So this is another thing to be understood. Science has taken a very inimical attitude toward nature, but religion takes a very friendly attitude. It is not that we are to fight with nature; it is that we are to understand it. It would be a great transformation for science if science could take this attitude. Not of fighting, but of understanding. Fighting creates hatred all around. It exists only in hatred.

Understanding can exist only in a love relationship. Religion thinks in terms of understanding the whole. The more you understand it, the more you feel yourself to be part of it. Then you are not an outsider; you are part of the whole, you are in it.

This feeling of oneness is ecstatic. If you can feel that you are part of the whole, that you are the innermost part of it, then you are at ease. Then you can never be diseased, - you are at ease. You are in greater hands, there are greater forces that you can rely upon. You're not unnecessarily burdened; you're not alone. You do not have to carry the whole burden on your head. You are just like a child sleeping in his mother's lap: unburdened, carefree. The mother is there so he does not have to worry. There is no anguish, no suffering.

Religion has this attitude towards the whole. The cosmic is just like the mother. You are encompassed by it -- by greater forces, by infinite forces, by wisdom that you cannot fathom. Then you are at ease. This at-easeness, this let go, is a situation in which there is a flowering, an innocent flowering. You are unburdened.

To me, this flowering is *anand*: bliss, ecstasy. *Dukkha* is a retarded flowering, a flower that couldn't flower into the whole, that remained aloof, that uprooted itself from the earth. It will suffer; it is bound to happen. It will suffer, and there will only be death for it, no life.

Western science has conditioned man to be egoistic, alone. The eastern concept of knowledge, of knowing, is very different. It is 'to be in cooperation with'. It is not that you are

forcing nature to reveal its mysteries. On the contrary, you are opening yourself up to be in a loving participation with nature so that nature reveals its mysteries to you. It is just like asking your mother, questioning your mother. You do not have to force her.

Science has come to so many understandings, but they have been forcibly taken. They have blood marks, they have been violent. And any discovery that is violent, any knowledge that is violent, is going to end in greater violence. Nature will take its revenge. We are just nonentities and we have been fighting with the cosmic existence, with the cosmic force. We can be destroyed in a single moment, in a single second.

But man thinks that he is the master. This nonsense of being the master, this ego masquerading as the master, has created the whole chaos. The western mind will move deeper and deeper into anguish unless this absolutely false attitude of science (not only false, harmful!) is thrown altogether.

Nature *cannot* be forced, *should* not be forced. I will tell you something. Eastern minds have come to know something about nature through different methods, altogether different methods. If you look through old Iranian or Indian medicine books, it will look like a miracle. No laboratories existed at the time, but lakhs and lakhs of medicines were known. A single person would write about thousands and thousands of medicines. For one person, a single discovery would have been enough, but *one* person would write about thousands and thousands of things. And even today, when there are laboratory methods, these old findings are not denied.

The old medicine books say that these were not laboratory findings. These findings came through meditation. Now we cannot believe it. It is said that Lukman would go, sit under a tree, meditate and ask the tree, "What can you be used for?" He would sit under the tree in meditation and when he was in a deep trance when the mind was not there; he was empty, vacant, receptive -- he would pray to the tree to "tell me what I can use your leaves for." The tree would answer, and he would just note it down!

It seems unbelievable. How can this be possible? But if it is not possible, the other possibility is even less possible. Lukman had no laboratories, no method of chemical analysis existed. Yet even today, he is not refuted. Experiments prove him right again and again.

Do you know serpentina, a sleep-creating chemical? It *has* been known in India for ten thousands years as serpgandha. The newer name is just a translation of serpgandha: serpentina. All the qualities of serpgandha that have been written about in ancient Indian books have now been found, through chemical research, to be exactly true. But they had no laboratory methods so how did they come to know all the qualities of the drug?

They say that they came to know through meditation, by asking the serpgandha itself. I have worked deeply on such things. I have worked with meditation in so many ways that I can become a witness to the possibility of it. But its a possibility that comes from a very different approach -- through participation with nature. Not Fighting, participating.

This is something to be noted, that all the scientific inventions began in the East. It is only in the last three hundred years that scientific thinking has become prevalent in the West. All the inventions, the beginnings, were in the East, but they were never developed. Why? If the beginnings were in the East and there was every opportunity to progress from those beginnings into completion, then why?

In China, ammunition was known three thousand years before. Then why was it never used? They just played with it, they just made fireworks with it. They never used it for war. They knew everything about it, but they never used it. Why? If you ask them -- if you ask Taoist thinkers -- they will say, "If you participate with nature, if you ask nature itself, then

nature will prohibit you. It will tell you, 'Don't go further than this'."

Don't go any further! It looks as though the West needs that advice: don't go any further. But the western mind seems to be obsessed with progress, as if progress in itself is something meaningful. The atom bomb is created and then there is an obsession to create the hydrogen bomb. The atom bomb is enough, more than enough, but the mind is obsessed. The whole thing can only end in *chaos* -- as it is ending. We are reaching the end because we have been fighting against nature and we have never asked nature itself where to stop .

Knowledge is not always good. It can do great evil. It is only good up to the limit where it can be managed. By now we have transgressed the limit. It is not that we are managing knowledge. On the contrary, the knowledge is managing and controlling us. It seems that we cannot do anything else but take another step ahead, knowing very well that the next step may prove fatal. But no one is there to prevent us, because we are our own advisers. No advice is coming to us from beyond. It is as if children have become the masters of the house and no elder is there to give them advice. Or even if the elder is there, they have forgotten about him.

Suffering has become deep, intense, because of ourselves. The suffering that can be transformed into bliss we have not been able to *transform*, because all the doors are closed. And we have closed them ourselves.

We say there is no God. Then we have closed the door. Not even the possibility of God is there. It is not even scientific to say that there is no God. Only this much can be said scientifically: that science has not yet found any God. Then, there is still a possibility.

But we say that there is no God. The possibility is closed. And once the possibility is closed, once the suggestion is taken that there is no God, your mind will not look in that direction again. It will look everywhere else, but not in that direction. That possibility is closed. And it is the only possibility of transcending suffering.

A hundred years ago, Nietzsche said that God is dead. A very prophetic saying! The years that followed proved this: that as far as we are concerned, as far as this twentieth century is concerned, God is dead for us. Not that God is dead, but we are so closed inside ourselves that for us there is no God. If we say that there is no God it makes no difference as for as God is concerned, but it makes a great difference to us because a great possibility, a great relationship, is closed. We are thrown upon ourselves. Now we cannot go anywhere, we cannot transcend the human mind, because now not even a hypothetical possibility has been left. Where can we go?

At the most, we can go back to being animals. There is nothing beyond man; there is only something below him. If the beyond is dropped, you will fall back to a lower stage of development. This is one of the fundamental laws of nature: that either you progress, or you get pushed back to where you started. You cannot stand still, there is no situation that is a standstill situation.

In his autobiography, Eddington says that the word 'rest' is meaningless. There is no rest to be found anywhere: everything either moves ahead or moves back. You cannot be in rest. If you deny the beyond there is nowhere further to go. But you cannot remain where you are because the suffering is so great, the anguish is so great. To be human is to be so anguished, so tense. You cannot remain like that so you have to fall back. You use intoxicants to fall back, you go mad and you fall back, you become preoccupied with sex and you fall back. Somehow, you fall back to being an animal.

But you cannot really go backwards. You can only try. No going back is really possible. It is just like jumping in the sky. By jumping, you cannot really leave the earth. You come

back again. For a moment you feel that you are in sky, but then the earth attracts you; you gravitate again to the earth. By jumping, you cannot reach the moon. You can jump towards it, and for a single moment there is the illusion that you are now out of the field of gravity, but you have hardly gone anywhere when you have to come back again. And in the same way, you can go on jumping back towards the level of an animal, but you can't stay there. You return immediately to being human.

But to be human is such anguish. It always was but, before, there was a possibility to transcend and, now, because we have denied God, that possibility is no longer there. That's why the anguish is more intense, more frustrating. Now it can no longer be used as a means for transcendence. The whole art of religion is concerned with how to transform darkness into light, how to transform death into deathlessness, how to transform your suffering into bliss. The whole art, the whole alchemy of religion, is concerned with this.

Buddha was also in suffering, Mahavir was also in suffering, Christ was also in suffering, but they could transform their suffering into deep bliss. Now we are not able to transform it. What has happened? The possibility to transform your suffering has been denied.

To me, your suffering shows the possibility of transcendence. You cannot suffer unless there is a possibility to transcend. A person who cannot be healthy cannot see his illness. It is impossible. If you feel illness, it shows the possibility that you can be helped. Otherwise you cannot feel that you are ill. Only the capacity to be healthy can feel the actuality of illness. Only the eye that is capable of knowing light can know darkness.

So when I say that it is good that suffering is there, I mean that this suffering shows that bliss is possible. If there was no possibility of bliss, then you would not feel suffering. You feel it because of the absence of bliss. This absence is felt as suffering.

This possibility of transcending suffering has to be opened again. And the gates have to be made wider than they ever were before because the present mind needs wider openings. Otherwise, it will go on denying the possibility of transcendence. The cosmic must be allowed to burst forth upon us and everyone must become a gate. If you can transcend your own suffering, you will become a gate for so many others. Through you, they will come to know that something beyond exists.

This is the work to be done. But first become a gate so that whosoever comes in contact with you knows that something beyond is possible, something exists beyond.

That is our only hope. If we can make others feel, by looking through our eyes, through our whole being, that the beyond exists, that bliss exists, then and only then can humanity be saved. Otherwise, that which is going to happen will not be good.

The East is going to turn materialistic because it is so starved. It is bound to follow along the same lines, the same technological, scientific lines, as the West. If a Buddha comes to the East today, he will not be welcome. The East can welcome an Einstein but not a Buddha. Day by day, the East is going to become more materialistic. It will become communistic.

And in the West... If people become open, if some people become so concerned with meditation that it becomes a matter of life and death to them, if they transcend their suffering and become openings for the divine, then the West can move into a spiritual age. Otherwise, the West will go mad. It has gone as far as the mind can go, it has reached the limit and there is nothing beyond. The beyond is denied; it has become taboo. To talk of the divine, to talk of the spiritual, is taboo. If you feel something of the divine you can't talk about it or people will think you are crazy.

Day by day, the West is going mad, insane. And through insanity, much will happen. LSD will become more prevalent, mescaline will become more prevalent, marijuana will

become more prevalent. These are only attempts to escape, to escape from the overwhelming madness that is waiting right by the corner. You know that it's coming, so all you can do is to escape into oblivion. Take some drug; become unconscious. Then you don't care. But your noncaring will not prevent it. It is coming! And if you are unconscious, it will come even sooner.

If nothing happens to intervene, these are the possibilities that we are faced with The East will become materialistic and the West will become totally neurotic. Neither is good. And the East will not be able to remain non-neurotic for long because it is only a matter of time. Within a century the same thing will happen in the East as has happened in the West. When materialism is there, when a violent science is there, when a God-denying culture is there, there is no other possibility. There is no open space, there is nowhere to go.

But, something can intervene. So I am not a pessimist. Something *can* intervene. But we cannot go on just hoping for it. We have to become vehicles so that the intervention can happen. Each one of us has to become a passage for the divine to come to earth.

This is what my sannyas means. I am trying to make you a vessel, a vehicle, a window, a door through which the beyond can come. If you can be a witness to the divine, it will be enough. Just one ray of light will be a great phenomenon.

This is the first time on earth that no one is really a witness. Everyone goes on quoting others. If you ask an atheist he will say, "There is no God." If you ask a theist he will say, "Yes, there is a God. My father says so" -- or my father's father or some ancient rishi has said so. There is no one who is himself a witness, who says, "God is there. I say so because I know it is so." Whoever can say, "I am a witness," cannot only say it but can live his witnessing. His being can become a witness.

God, the dimension of the divine, has lost its hold because so many neurotic people, so many diseased people, have become interested in religion. They always become interested in it. Because of their frustrations they become interested in the divine. Their interest is negative so they become the wrong kind of witnesses. They are not blissful, they are not happy. They are sad images of sorrow. They close the gate rather than open it.

The gate to the divine can be open only if those who are concerned with religion become blissful, happy, dancing. Only a dancing God can contradict Nietzsche's statement that God is dead because only a dancing God can prove that God is alive.

So be a witness to it. Don't think of the suffering of others; transcend your own suffering. Then, you will be a help to others. Don't think of serving others. Serve yourself first transcend your own suffering. Then you will be a servant to all and you will be able to do something that means something, that is significant. Don't be a sad servant of the divine. Don't make helping others a duty...

The Eternal Quest

Chapter #15

Chapter title: The Last Flowering

Date Unknown

Archive code: 6700000
ShortTitle: QUEST15
Audio: No
Video: No

Question

ON EVERY OTHER STREET CORNER IN INDIA, IT SEEMS ONE SEES BEGGARS WHO CLAIM TO BE SADHUS, RENUNCIATES. ARE THEY JUST PARASITES ANT EXPLOITERS, OR ARE THEY REALLY AUTHENTIC HOLY MEN?

Everything that can be helpful can be harmful also. For every authentic coin there is, a false coin can be interpreted as authentic. But it cannot be avoided. If it is understood, then the likelihood can be lessened, but it can never be absolutely avoided. The only way to avoid it is to throw away the authentic coin also. If the authentic is to exist, the false will follow inevitably because it is easier to be false, it is not so arduous.

To really be a sadhu is the most arduous adventure possible. It is the greatest demand and challenge to the human mind. But to be one of the so-called sadhus that you see all over India is not a demand, not a challenge. Once a country has seen people like Krishna, Buddha and Mahavir the image is exploited. To me, the exploitation shows that the authentic has existed. The false coin only shows that an authentic coin has been. The false is accepted because people have known the authentic The false can masquerade as the authentic. But the moment the authentic is lost, the false will disappear as well. Then you cannot be exploited.

If there was no such thing as an authentic sadhu, then the falsehood could not continue to exist. But one of the contradictions of life is that everything exists in opposition in relation, to something else. Even a false sadhu has appear because the masses have known the authentic and the longing for the authentic lingers.

Question

THEN HOW CAN ONE TELL IF A SADHU IS AUTHENTIC OR NOT?

There is no need. If someone becomes a sadhu, it is his own private affair. There is no need to pay any attention to him. Whether he is fake or authentic, it is his affair. His belief is a private affair, his being a sadhu is a private thing. Once it becomes public, there will always be fakes, there will always be false people who will exploit. If one is a poet it is his own affair, if one is a dancer it is his own affair, if one is a sadhu it is his own affair. He should not be worshipped -- not even if he is authentic. If the authentic is worshipped, then the false will follow automatically and there will be those who exploit the phenomenon.

The need to recognize who is an authentic sadhu arises only when you want to worship someone. If you want to worship, then you have to know whether the person is authentic or false. But if you are not going to worship, there is no need to question whether the person is authentic. He may be, he may not be. It is his affair.

Unless and until we learn that to be a sadhu is one's own affair -- no one else need be concerned with it -- the false can_ not be stopped from exploiting. And because of the false, the authentic is lost. The moment there is no worship, the moment there is no special respect given to the sadhu, only the authentic will remain.

Only through respect and worshipping can the false exploit. To the false, being a sadhu is

not the attraction. The attraction comes from the worshipper. No one should be worshipped. Sadhus must not be treated with any special awe. Once they are not given any special attention, the false will disappear and only the authentic will remain.

An authentic sadhu is one to whom the world has become unreal, to whom another dimension has come into existence, to whom this mara is not the reality. This is not a belief; it is his experience. The whole existence has become divine. That is what the person has experienced; it has been an existential experience. To me, this is a sadhu.

No outward criteria will be applicable because an authentic person will never be an imitation. He will not be an imitation Buddha, he will be himself. So it is not important what he wears, what he eats, how he behaves. All that will come spontaneously to him. Only the false can imitate, never the authentic. The authentic is always individual so there can be no models and no predecessors.

This is also to be noted; that only a false sadhu will behave like a sadhu. The authentic will behave like himself. That's why, when a Jesus appears, he seems like an upstart.

Upstarts never seem like upstarts because they follow a fixed pattern. But an authentic man appears to be an upstart because he is not following the traditional pattern of other sadhus. He is himself.

So you will always think that the authentic man has gone wrong, he has gone to the devil, while the false man goes on being worshipped because he can imitate; it is not difficult. Every type of criteria can be imitated. Then the personality becomes double: when the public is watching he is one person, he imitates the outward manifestations of a religious man: and when he is alone, he is someone else. There is a division: a public face and a private face.

But as far as a real sadhu is concerned, he has no private self and no public selves. He is one. That becomes his difficulty. Whatsoever he is, he is always. He is bound to be anti-traditional, bound to be a non-conformist.

So the irony is that the false will be worshipped, and the real will be condemned.

Question

WHY ARE WESTERNERS BECOMING SO INTERESTED IN INDIAN RELIGIONS?

There is a deep reason. Religion is the last luxury so only an affluent society can afford religion. Religion is the flowering. When every so-called natural need is fulfilled, only then does the beyond become meaningful and significant. When body needs are fulfilled, when you are not in any struggle at the physical level, then a new struggle begins on a higher level. That is the struggle to achieve consciousness. So whenever a society becomes rich, only then does religion become meaningful. A poor society can never be religious.

Question

ISN'T INDIA RELIGIOUS?

Yes, India is religious. But India became religious when India was a rich country. Now it is just a hangover.

India was a rich country at the time of Buddha. It was at a peak, just like America is today. Patliputra was the same as New York is today. In the time of Buddha, India was at its golden peak. It could think in dimensions that are not confined to the body, not confined to the physical, visible world. So India could probe deeply into the ultimate mystery.

It is a strange fact that whenever a country becomes rich it becomes religious, and

whenever a country becomes religious it is bound to fall back from its riches. When a country becomes religious it becomes other-worldly; this world becomes meaningless.

Question

IS IT A VICIOUS CIRCLE?

I won't say 'vicious'; I will just say 'circle'. You have to look at many things. To become young, you will have to become old; if you want to be born, you will have to die. If you consider death bad, then do not be born at all. If you consider old age bad, then do not be young at all because to be young means that you are now on the way to being old. Life moves in circles. Nothing is bad.

A rich youth leads to a rich old age and a rich birth leads to a rich death. Religion is a flowering. Whenever a society reaches a point of leisure, art, meditation, religion flowers. Religion is the last flowering. But every flower is a sign that now the tree will die.

Question

CAN RELIGION OR MEDITATION HELP ONE TO BE MORE ECONOMICALLY WELL OFF? CAN IT MAKE A POOR COUNTRY RICH?

No, it cannot. It is not an economic movement; it is a religious movement. It has a specific dimension within which to work. It can help a person to become more conscious, it can help a person to be more silent, it can help a person to be calm and collected, but it cannot help economically in any way.

If you take life as a whole, then to waste life only in economics and politics is a great wastage. If you take life as a whole then ultimately, whatsoever you achieve, what is inside you is the only achievement. All else is just superficial.

Religion and meditation cannot help to make a poor country rich in any way. It cannot. But it can help a poor man to be rich -- in a very noneconomic sense. If riches only mean the outward thing then religion is absolutely irrelevant, but if you think in terms of inner consciousness, peace, a blissful attitude, a life lived as an inner celebration, then it can help. And to me, that is more meaningful.

Question

WHAT ARE YOUR IDEAS ON SOCIALISM?

Socialism, to me, is a very non-psychological way of thinking.

There is a longing to be equal, but that longing only shows that human beings are not equal in any dimension. They are unequal; the inequality is a fact. The concept of equality is only a fiction and whenever society hankers after a fiction, it falls into a chaotic way of life.

So socialism is not possible. It is an impossibility. It can only be possible if two conditions are present. The first is if the human mind is destroyed and man becomes a human automaton instead. Then socialism becomes possible because machines can be equal.

And socialists will go on trying to do this. They have been trying to wipe out the mind. Freedom of the mind will be the first target for socialism to clear away because freedom of the mind basically creates inequality.

Question

WHAT ABOUT SOCIALISM NOT AS A MEANS OF CREATING EQUALITY BUT ONLY AS A MEANS OF PROVIDING EVERYONE WITH THE BASIC NECESSITIES OF LIFE?

This vision of providing the basic necessities of life cannot be fulfilled, because one of the basic necessities is to be unequal. It is one of the very basic necessities. To be unequal to be oneself, to not be just a number but a name -- not even a name, but a signature. That is one of the basic necessities, more basic than food, Food seems to be basic because the world is poor, but the moment everyone is fed it will cease to be a basic necessity; it will be forgotten. Clothes are not a basic necessity. They only seem to be because the world is naked. The moment plenty of clothes are available, it will not be a necessity.

Ultimately, mind is the only basic necessity. And it can never be fulfilled. The stomach can be fulfilled, naked bodies can be clothed and sheltered... Science has come to a point where socialism is not needed in order to provide these things They can be provided more easily without socialism. For example, Sweden has fulfilled the basic needs of its people better than Soviet Russia. These basic needs must be fulfilled but that doesn't require socialism. Socialism has not fulfilled these needs. Rather, it has equalized poverty.

A poor man can be at ease with his poverty if everyone else is also very poor. Socialism has only equalized poverty. Even today, Soviet Russia is not a wealthy land. The poor in America are better off than the more successful people in Soviet Russia. But the poor person in America is not at ease because the comparison is there: others are rich.

Sudras were never as unhappy as they are now because everyone else in their world, in their class, was equally as poor. The world was taken for granted as being the way it was. It looked like a natural phenomenon, nothing could be done about it; it was determined by birth. It was taken for granted that to be a *sudra* was one's destiny. Competition was only possible between one *sudra* and another. But they were equally poor so they were at ease. The equal poverty was their consolation.

Now, when we have come to understand that a *sudra* is not born but made, the competition has moved from horizontal to vertical lines. The competition was very gentle between one *sudra* and another. Now the competition has become vertical. Everyone is competing with everyone else.

A capitalist society is a vertical society; a socialist society is a horizontal society. If you create a horizontal society, then the poverty will be evenly distributed. It is a consolation that everyone else is equally as poor, but the society will remain stagnant.

A socialist society is stagnant. That's why in the last five or ten years Soviet Russia has been moving away from socialism. That has been the basic controversy between Mao and Soviet Russia. Soviet Russia seems to Mao to be turning capitalistic now. It is no fault of Russia; it is because of a basic error in socialism itself. If socialism is to remain, it must become stagnant. The very inequality of individuals creates a restlessness to develop, to grow, to transcend. If everyone is equally placed, the society becomes stagnant. Then there is no motivation, there is no stimulation to work, to grow, to transcend. The motivation comes through inequality.

By and by, Soviet Russia will become capitalistic. It will have to. Otherwise it will die from stagnation. To me, a capitalist society is a natural phenomenon. A socialist structure is not natural. It is something imposed, something conceived of through the mind. Capitalism developed by itself; socialism has to be brought about, it cannot come by itself.

Marx thought it would happen, but he was basically wrong. And he has proven to be

wrong. He thought that socialism would be a natural outgrowth of capitalism -- the more capitalistic a country is, the more possibility there is of a socialist revolution -- but it has not happened that way

What has happened has been quite the contrary.

The less successful capitalist countries and the undeveloped countries, the poor countries that have no capitalism at all, have become more and more socialistic, while America has not become socialistic. According to Marx, socialism is a natural outgrowth of capitalism so America should be the first socialist country. It has not been so.

Socialism exploits the jealousy of the poor. To me, it is the greatest exploitation that has happened on earth. Capitalism has exploited the labor of the poor and socialism has exploited their souls. It is through jealousy that socialism steps in. But through jealousy, no revelation, no transformation can be achieved. It can kill, it can destroy, but it cannot create.

Socialism is a fiction. It is not scientific. To me, only a capitalist society is a scientific society. I am not saying that capitalism will remain as it is. It will go on growing and changing and all that socialism promises to fulfill will be fulfilled naturally. When affluence is created -- and capitalism creates it -- all the basic needs of survival will be there.

Soviet Russia has become successful not because it is a socialist society but because it has become a technological society. Poverty does not exist because of exploitation; it is because of the absence of a technology that is capable of fulfilling the needs of increasing numbers of people. Even if there is no exploitation, poverty will be there. In a primitive society, people are poor -- more poor than they are now.

Real change will come about only through technology. The more technology progresses, the less human labor will be needed. And the moment human labor becomes superfluous, the whole structure of society will have to change.

A scientific, technological society will not be a socialist society. Capitalism creates competition and through competition, technology develops. If there is no competition then there will be no possibility of any growth. New techniques, new methodologies, are invented only through competition.

Russia has not invented anything new as far as their inner economy is concerned. Everything new that they have invented has been because of competition with America. Through competition, new techniques are invented. Russia is capitalistic in relation to its competitions America and socialistic as far as its own economy is concerned. As far as the world market is concerned it is capitalistic, competitive. It is not socialistic -- there are double standards.

But capitalism itself is not going to remain the way it is. It is going through a second revolution. The first revolution was industrial. the second will be technological.