

---

# Theologia Mystica

Discourses on the Treatise of St. Dionysius  
Talks given from 11/08/80 am to 25/08/80 am  
English Discourse series  
15 Chapters  
Year published: 1983

---

## Theologia Mystica

Chapter #1  
Chapter title: None

**11 August 1980 am in Buddha Hall**

Archive code: 8008110  
ShortTitle: THEOLO01  
Audio: Yes  
Video: No

---

THOU TRINITY BEYOND BEING, DIRECT US TO THE HEIGHT OF MYSTICAL REVELATION, SUBLIME BEYOND ALL THOUGHT AND LIGHT; WHEREIN THE SIMPLE, ABSOLUTE AND IMMUTABLE MYSTERIES OF DIVINE TRUTH ARE HIDDEN IN THE TRANSLUCENT DARKNESS OF THAT SILENCE WHICH REVEALETH IN SECRET. FOR THIS DARKNESS, THOUGH OF DEEPEST OBSCURITY, IS YET RADIANTLY CLEAR, AND, THOUGH BEYOND TOUCH AND SIGHT, IT OVERFILLS OUR UNSEEING MINDS WITH SPLENDORS OF TRANSCENDENT BEAUTY.

THIS IS MY PRAYER. AS YOU , BELOVED TIMOTHY, EXERTING YOURSELF SINCERELY IN MYSTICAL CONTEMPLATION, QUIT THE SENSES, THE WORKINGS OF THE INTELLECT, AND ALL THAT MAY BE SENSED AND KNOWN, AND ALL THAT IS NOT AND IS. FOR BY THIS YOU MAY UNKNOWINGLY ATTAIN, IN AS FAR AS IT IS POSSIBLE, TO THE ONENESS OF HIM WHO IS BEYOND ALL BEING AND KNOWLEDGE. THUS THROUGH INDOMITABLE, ABSOLUTE AND PURE DETACHMENT OF YOUR SELF FROM ALL THINGS, YOU WILL BE LIFTED UP TO THAT RADIANCE OF THE DIVINE DARKNESS WHICH IS BEYOND BEING, SURPASSING ALL AND FREE FROM ALL.

Man up to now has lived in a very schizophrenic way. The reason why he has become divided is not very difficult to understand. For centuries he has been told that the world consists not of one world but of two worlds: the world of matter and the world of the spirit. This is absolute nonsense.

The world consists only of one truth. Of course, that truth has two aspects to it, but those aspects are indivisible. The outer aspect appears as matter and the inner as spirit. It is lie a

center and its circumference. This division has penetrated human mind in a thousand and one ways. It has become the separation between the body and the soul. It has become the separation between the lower and the higher. It has become the separation between the sin and the virtue. It has become the separation between the East and the West.

Man stands today so fragmented, so divided, that it is almost a miracle how we are managing to keep ourselves together. The whole energy is exhausted in just keeping ourselves together, because we are constantly falling apart.

The greatest need of the day is to get beyond this schizophrenia, to get beyond all divisions, to reach to the "one" which is neither this nor that, which is neither East nor West, which is neither man nor woman. That "one" has been called by the mystics God, truth, MOKSHA, NIRVANA, the absolute, Dhamma, Logos, Tao -- different names but pointing to the same one reality. It was possible up to now somehow to go on living in a schizophrenic way, but now it is no longer possible.

We have come to a point where the decision has to be made. If we want to exist we have to create a synthesis, or rather a transcendence, of all dualities. If we don't want to exist then there is no problem. If we want to commit a global suicide, then of course all problems are solved -- but I don't think anybody wants or desires a global suicide.

Man has achieved much in spite of all kinds of madness. Man has reached many peaks: religious, aesthetic, poetic, musical. And all this has happened in spite of all kinds of madness that we go on supporting, nourishing, because the vested interests don't want you to be united and one; the vested interests want you to remain divided.

When Rudyard Kipling said, "East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet," he was giving expression to all the vested interests. They want the world to remain divided, they want man to remain divided -- into many religions, philosophies, political ideologies, in every possible way they would like you not to become one. Why? -- because the man who is integrated and one is impossible to enslave. He cannot be exploited by the priests or by the politicians. In fact, he becomes absolutely free from all possibilities of exploitation and oppression. He becomes an individual, he becomes rebellious, he becomes intelligent. He becomes so sharp and clear that he can see through all superstitions, howsoever old and ancient. He can see the stupidity in which humanity has lived -- and not only lived in but glorified. He can see the foolishness of nationalities, the utter nonsense of so many religions in the world.

There are three hundred religions' in the world and at least three thousand subsects. He can see clearly that to divide matter from spirit is to create a division in the very being of man -- because the body, matter, is nothing but spirit manifest, and the spirit is nothing but matter, body, unmanifest.

God and the world are not tWo things. God is not the creator and the world is not the created; God and the world are one. It is a process of creativity. You can divide creativity in two parts, the creator and the created, but in fact that division is arbitrary. It is ONE flow of creativity God is not the creator, let me remind you again and again and the world is not the created. This whole existence is a riverlike creative energy.

My sannyasins have to understand this oneness in as many ways as possible so that no nook and corner of your being remains divided. The West is very proud of its materialism, science, technology. That pride hinders it from getting into a deep communion with the East, but that pride is nothing compared to the Eastern ego.

The Eastern ego is far more subtle and far more dangerous, far more poisonous. The Eastern ego pretends, projects, brags about its spirituality. Of course, the people who think

they are spiritual can condemn the people who are materialists more easily than vice versa, because even the materialist feels somehow that matter is a lower reality. He may not even consciously believe in any higher reality, but the conditioning is so old -- it has penetrated into the blood, into the bones, into the very marrow -- that a man can become consciously a materialist but deep down he remains part of the whole heritage of humanity. Hence the Western ego is not much of a danger, but the Eastern ego is very dangerous -- for the simple reason that it is more subtle, more hidden, not on the surface, more unconscious.

The East goes on proclaiming itself as the source of all spirituality, the source of all mysticism -- which is patent nonsense. It depends only on ignorance. If you ask any Eastern so-called mahatma, you will be surprised that he knows nothing about other spiritual Masters who have existed in other parts of the world. He has not heard about Lao Tzu, Chuang Tzu, Lieh Tzu, Ko Hsuan. He has not heard about Lin Chi, Basho, Bokujū. He has not heard anything about Pythagoras, Heraclitus or Dionysius.

WE ARE going to discuss Dionysius in this series. Dionysius is one of the greatest Buddhas ever. And whenever the Eastern scholar by any chance, if at all, comes across a person like Dionysius, he starts thinking that he must have borrowed from the East. That seems to be a tacit assumption: that the East has some monopoly over spiritualism. Nobody has any monopoly. East or West cannot make any difference in man's spiritual growth. Jesus could become a Buddha in Jerusalem, Lao Tzu could become a Buddha in China, Dionysius could become a Buddha in Athens. There is no need to borrow from anybody.

Yes, in scientific experimentation we have discovered very recently a strange phenomenon: that whenever one scientist discovers something, almost simultaneously many people all around the earth discover the same thing in different ways. Albert Einstein is reported to have said, "If I had not discovered the Theory of Relativity, then within two years somebody else was bound to discover it."

Why does it happen that some scientist working somewhere far away in Soviet Russia discovers something almost simultaneously with some other scientist who is working in England or in America or in India or in Japan -- not knowing anything of the other, not even being aware of the existence of the other, not knowing that somebody else is also working on the same problem?

Now it is becoming more and more clear that with all the great discoveries, although the initial effort is made by the conscious mind, the ultimate result always comes through the unconscious. And the deepest layer of the unconscious mind is collective. I am different from you as a person, you are different from me AS persons -- as far as conscious mind is concerned. If you go a little deeper, we are not so different in the unconscious mind. If you go a little deeper still, we come even closer in the collective unconscious.

And the mystics say there is even a little more than the collective unconscious; they call it the universal unconscious, or God. That is the very center. At that center we all meet and we all are one. All the great insights come from that center. It is only a question of who is looking in that direction -- he will get the insight first. Otherwise the insight starts happening to many people; they may not be looking at it and therefore they will miss it.

Alan Watts, writing on this small treatise of tremendous beauty, the THEOLOGIA MYSTICA of St. Dionysius, says that one is tempted, greatly tempted, to think that Dionysius must have visited the East; if not, then some Eastern mystic must have traveled to Athens.

In those days, when Dionysius lived, many Western travelers had started coming to India.

With the coming of Alexander the Great many barriers were broken, many bridges were made. And it was not onesided: Eastern mystics also started traveling towards the West. Even Jaina monks, who live totally naked, for whom the Western climate is bound to be far more harmful than Poona is for you, they went to Alexandria, to Athens, to the farthest corners of the known world. The Jainas are referred to in ancient Athenian treatises as "gymnosophists." SOPHIST means one who is searching for the truth and GYMNO comes from Jainu. "Gymnosophist" is the name for the Jaina mystics who had penetrated Athens. And there was great business going on between India and Greece. And, of course, with the businessmen, the traders coming and going, there was a great exchange of thoughts.

Alan Watts thinks either Dionysius visited India... because the way he speaks is so Eastern, the insight that he reveals is so Eastern. Even his words remind one of the Upanishads and nothing else. So Watts thinks either he visited the East or somebody from the East or many influences from the East somehow became available to him. But I am not tempted that way at all.

My own experience and understanding is this: that great truths erupt in many places in almost similar ways. Lao Tzu never came to India and nobody from India ever visited Lao Tzu. China and India were divided by the great Himalayan mountains; there was no business going on between India and China, no communication of ANY kind. Still, what Lao Tzu says is so similar to the Upanishads, is so synonymous with the teachings of Buddha, that there is a great temptation to believe that there must have been some communication -- either Buddha has borrowed from Lao Tzu or Lao Tzu has borrowed from Buddha.

But I say to you, nobody has borrowed from anybody else, they have all drunk from the same source. And when you taste the ocean, whether you taste it on an Indian shore or on the Chinese shore, it makes no difference; it always tastes the same, the same salty taste. So is truth: it has the same taste, the same flavor, the same fragrance. Maybe in expressing it there is a possibility of a few differences of language, but that does not matter much. Sometimes even those differences are not there.

Dionysius is a Christian, and one of the real Christians. It seems Friedrich Nietzsche was not aware of Dionysius and his Mystica; otherwise he would not have said that the first and the last Christian died on the cross two thousand years ago. In fact, there have been a few more Christs in the tradition of Christ. Dionysius is one of the most beautiful of them all. Then there is Meister Eckhart, St. Francis, Jacob Boehme and a few more -- not many of course, because Christianity became such an organized religion that it became impossible for mystics to exist, or even if they existed they went underground. They had to; there was no other way.

It is just like today in Russia you cannot be a mystic without hiding yourself. Because to be a mystic in Russia means you are insane, you have to be hospitalized, you have to be given insulin shocks or electric shocks.

It is fortunate that Buddha, Lao Tzu, Jesus, Mahavira were not born in today's Soviet Russia. Jesus would not have been crucified in Soviet Russia, that is true, but he would have gone through far more sophisticated tortures. Crucifixion is a very primitive phenomenon, and not so dangerous either; it kills you, that's all. Electric shocks will not kill you, but they will destroy all your splendor, all your glory, all your intelligence. They will force you to vegetate. Your life will become as lifeless as possible. You will continue to exist but it will be a mere existence, mere survival. Your dignity will be gone.

Jesus died a dignified man. He died with tremendous joy, he died fulfilled. But if he is born in Russia today he will have to die a very undignified death, or if he lives he will have to

live a very undignified life.

In Russia now, a really religious person has to go underground. There are my sanniyasins who have to go underground. They are WORKING underground -- in basements they meet in the darkness of the night. What an ugly world we have created, where you cannot meditate openly when you cannot discuss about truth, about love openly. To meditate as if you are committing some crime does not show that humanity has progressed; in many ways it has regressed.

Christianity did the same for two thousand years in the West. Communism is an offshoot of Christianity. Whatsoever communists are doing now they have learned from the Christian popes. Christianity destroyed all possibilities of mysticism.

There were only two ways to avoid being persecuted. One was to go underground or escape to some desert, to some mountains. And the second possibility was to exist as a formal Christian on the surface, use the Christian language, and go on doing your inner work privately. That's what Dionysius did.

You will be surprised to know: he was the first Bishop of Athens. He must have been a man of rare intelligence. To remain a Bishop of Athens and yet to penetrate the deepest mysteries of life like Buddha, Lao Tzu, Zarathustra, he must have been a man of rare intelligence. He managed a facade. He deceived the Christian organization.

His treatise was not published while he was alive. He must have managed it in such a way that it was published only when he was dead. If the treatise had been published while he was alive he would have been expelled from the Church, persecuted, tortured. And a man of understanding, a man who is not suicidal in some way, would not like to be persecuted unnecessarily. If it becomes a necessity he accepts the challenge. But he is not looking for it; he is not in some way hankering to be a martyr. He is not suicidal, he is not violent towards himself.

Dionysius is a rare man: living with stupid Christianity and its rigid organization, being a bishop and still being able to reach to the ultimate peaks of consciousness is something worthy of praise.

BEFORE we enter into these beautiful sutras of Dionysius, a few things have to be understood. One: these sutras were written as letters to one of his disciples, Timothy. All that is really great, all that is really of the ultimate, of the transcendental, can only be communicated to disciples. It has to be addressed to those who love you, to those who have a deep attunement with your heart. It cannot be addressed to the mass, to the crowd, to the indifferent, to the antagonistic. Great truths are communed only when there is love. It is possible only between a Master and a disciple that a truth can be transferred.

The disciple means one who is open to receive. The disciple means one who trusts so totally that there is no question of arguing, because these profound mysteries cannot be argued about. Either you know or you don't know -- you cannot argue. There are no proofs for them, except your trust in the Master. Of course, if you trust the Master, the Master can take you to the window from where you can see the vast sky with all its splendor... millions of stars. But you will have to trust him at least this much: to allow him to hold your hand, to allow him to take you to the window. If you start arguing about the window and its existence and there is no way to convince you.

There are no proofs for God; there have never been there will never be. Those who have known have known; only because of deep intimacy, because of a love affair with the Master. It is not a question of convincing somebody, it is not conversion to a certain ideology; it is

simply a mad love affair. You come across a man like Dionysius and the very presence of the man is enough: the very presence becomes a proof that there are many more things in life than you have ever dreamt of. The presence of the man penetrates your very heart. The presence of the man transpires something in you, triggers something in you of which you were never aware before. You start hearing a song, you start seeing a beauty, you start feeling a new mood of elation, ecstasy -- for no visible reason. Then it becomes possible to surrender your ego to such a person.

When you surrender your ego to the Master, the Master is only an excuse. You are really surrendering to God, not to the Master. In fact you are simply surrendering. It is not of any importance to whom: the question is not to whom, the question is that you are surrendering the ego. The moment the ego is surrendered there is a possibility of communion.

These are letters from Dionysius to his most beloved disciple, Timothy.

The second thing to remember is: Christianity, in becoming the religion ABOUT Jesus, missed something of tremendous importance. Because it tried to become the religion ABOUT Jesus it could not become the religion OF Jesus. And a religion about Jesus is NOT a religion of Jesus. In fact, the religion about Jesus IS AGAINST the religion of Jesus, because when a religion becomes about a person you lose contact with his inner reality; you become concerned with his outer expressions.

Christianity became too much concerned about following Jesus as an example. Now, that is getting into a wrong direction. Nobody can follow Jesus as an example, his life cannot be an example to anybody else, because a certain life exists in a certain context. To be exactly like Jesus you will need the WHOLE situation, the whole context in which Jesus existed. Where can you find the same context again? Life goes on changing; it is never the same even for two consecutive moments. You cannot be Jesus of Nazareth, impossible; there is no Nazareth anymore. You cannot be Jesus because that Jewish mind which crucified Jesus exists no more.

Amongst my sannyasins there are thousands of Jews. Jesus could not have believed his eyes if he had seen this! He was a Jew -- he was born a Jew, he spoke the language of the Jews, he believed in all the fundamentals of the Judaic religion -- still he could not find many followers. I am not a Jew -- I don't speak the language of the Jews, I don't believe in the Judaic fundamentals -- still I have been able to find thousands of Jews. The context has changed; it is a totally different world. Twenty centuries have passed.

Also, whenever you start trying to follow a certain person as an example you become imitative, you become false, you lose authenticity, you are no more yourself. And to make the point very emphatic, Christianity has insisted for two thousand years on a very absurd thing. The absurdity is that on the one hand Christianity says, "Follow Jesus, imitate Jesus! Let Jesus be your example!" and on the other hand the same Christianity goes on telling you that "Jesus is God, God's only begotten Son, and you cannot be related to God in the same way." Can you see the absurdity? On the one hand you say, "Follow Jesus, be like Jesus!" and on the other hand you make it absolutely impossible for yourself to be like Jesus, because Jesus has a special relationship with God and you cannot have that relationship; that is not possible.

Hence Christianity has created an impossible religion on the earth, telling people such nonsense. Such an absurd approach is bound to create guilt. People try to follow Jesus, but they cannot be Jesus-like; hence guilt arises, they feel guilty. No other religion has created so much guilt on the earth as Christianity. Christianity has proved the greatest calamity for the simple reason that religion is not supposed to create guilt. If religion creates guilt then it makes you depressed, then it makes you frustrated with yourself, then it creates a subtle

suicidal instinct in you.

A true religion elates you, enhances, enriches your being, makes your life more festive, creates more possibilities for you to celebrate and rejoice. And Jesus goes on saying to his disciples, "Rejoice! Rejoice! I say unto you rejoice!" And what has Christianity done? It has done just the opposite. Dionysius was aware of this fact.

The third thing: the experience of truth is like music -- yes, more like music than like anything else, because you cannot describe music to anybody else. You can say it was beautiful, but that is an evaluation, your judgment. You are not describing music, you are describing your mood that happened through the music. There is no way to describe the beauty of music.

The same is true about religious experience. That's why authentic religion is always mystic. By "mystic" I mean something that can be felt, experienced, but can never be described. Even though you know it, you are incapable of making it known to others; you are almost dumb. The more you know, the more dumb you are. When you have known it absolutely you become almost an absolutely ignorant man.

Dionysius has a special word for it; he calls it AGNOSIA. You must have heard the word "agnostic"; Bertrand Russell used the word for himself. The atheist says there is no God, but he says it AS IF he knows -- that "as if" is always there -- as if he has explored the whole reality and has come to know that there is no God. In declaring there is no God he is declaring his knowledge. He is a gnostic: he knows. GNOSIS means knowledge. The theist says there is a God -- as if he knows, as if he has attained, arrived. He is also a gnostic; he has GNOSIS, knowledge.

An agnostic means one who says, "I don't know, neither this way nor that. I don't know whether God is or God is not. I am utterly ignorant. " Hence Bertrand Russell says, "I am agnostic." He must have discovered the word in Dionysius: AGNOSIA. But Dionysius' use of the word is far more potential, far more pregnant than Bertrand Russell's; Bertrand Russell's cannot be more than a logical statement. He is a logician, a mathematician; he has never meditated, he has never gone within himself. He says he is an agnostic, but he has never tried to go beyond it, as if agnosticism is the ultimate and there is nothing more to do about it.

My feeling is that he is not a true agnostic. The atheist says, "I know there is no God," the theist says, "I know that there is a God," and the Bertrand Russellian agnosticism says, "I know there is no way of knowing" -- but that knowledge, that tacit knowledge is there.

Dionysius says that one can know God only when one comes to the moment when one knows nothing: the state of not-knowing is the opening of the door. By AGNOSIA he means exactly the same as the Upanishads mean. One of the most famous Upanishads, the KENOPANISHAD, says:

"It is conceived by him who conceives it not.  
Who conceives it, knows it not.  
It is not understood by those who understand it.  
It is understood by those who understand it not."

Or it reminds one of the Zen Master Yung-chia. In his SONG OF ENLIGHTENMENT he says:

"You cannot grasp it;  
you cannot get rid of it.

In not being able to get it, you get it.  
When you are silent, it speaks;  
when you speak, it is silent."

Or it reminds one of the great Socratic statement: "I know only one thing, that I know nothing."

AGNOSIA means the state of not-knowing. That's what SAMADHI IS, that's what meditation is all about: the state of not-knowing.

Meditation creates that state, AGNOSIA. When meditation has helped you to burn all your knowledge, to unburden you of mountainous loads of conditioning when it has left you utterly silent, like a small child full of wonder and awe, that state is called in India SAMADHI. SAMADHI means all is solved: there is no longer any question and there is no longer any answer; one is utterly silent. There is no longer any belief and no longer any doubt. Dionysius calls it AGNOSIA. It is through AGNOSIA that one comes to know.

This is the ultimate paradox of mysticism: that by not-knowing one comes to know it and by knowing one misses it. Not-knowing is far higher than all knowledge. The universities give you knowledge, but when you enter into the Buddhafield of a Master you are entering into an anti-university. In the university you learn more and more knowledge, information; you accumulate. In the anti-university of a Master you unlearn more and more... a moment comes when you know nothing.

It is a very strange moment, hence it has been described by Dionysius with tremendous beauty: he calls it "translucent darkness." Many mystics have called it different names, but Dionysius seems to surpass them all. Translucent darkness... darkness which is pure light. He also calls it DOCTA IGNORANTIA, the doctrine of ignorance. He also calls it "knowing ignorance." You can compare it with the knowledge of the knowledgeable people. The knowledgeable people are called by Dionysius people who have "ignorant knowledge." So he divides people in two categories: those who belong to the world of ignorant knowledge -- they know much, knowing nothing -- and the second category, the people who belong to the world of knowing ignorance -- they know nothing, hence they know all.

Now the sutras:

THOU TRINITY BEYOND BEING, DIRECT US TO THE HEIGHT OF MYSTICAL REVELATION,  
SUBLIME BEYOND ALL THOUGHT AND LIGHT; WHEREIN THE SIMPLE, ABSOLUTE AND  
IMMUTABLE MYSTERIES OF DIVINE TRUTH ARE HIDDEN IN THE TRANSLUCENT DARKNESS  
OF THAT SILENCE WHICH REVEALETH IN SECRET. FOR THIS DARKNESS, THOUGH OF  
DEEPEST OBSCURITY, IS YET RADIANTLY CLEAR, AND, THOUGH BEYOND TOUCH AND  
SIGHT, IT OVERFILLS OUR UNSEEING MINDS WITH SPLENDORS OF TRANSCENDENT  
BEAUTY.

You can immediately see that the way he writes is to hide his mystical revelation in Christian terms. He begins:

THOU TRINITY BEYOND BEING...

Now there was no need to use the word "trinity." That is just to befool the whole Christian organization, because these people live in words. Just utter a single word, "trinity," and everything is okay -- if you are a Christian and you believe in the Christian doctrine, then there is no danger. Hence he begins:

THOU TRINITY BEYOND BEING...

But immediately the condition that he puts on Trinity destroys the whole idea of the Christian doctrine: BEYOND BEING. No mystic has been so courageous, saying that God is beyond being. Many have said that God is beyond knowledge, but Dionysius seems to be the only one who says that God is beyond knowledge AND beyond being. You cannot say, "God is," you cannot say, "I know." How can you -- know when there is no God?

But you see the sharpness of his intelligence, his clarity? He uses the word "trinity." He starts with THOU TRINITY BEYOND BEING... If something is beyond being, how can you call it "thou"? That is just a facade to fool the fools who live only in words. Those who want to go beyond words will be able to sort it out.

THOU TRINITY BEYOND BEING, DIRECT US TO THE HEIGHT OF MYSTICAL REVELATION...

This sutra is something to be deeply understood:

... DIRECT US TO THE HEIGHT OF MYSTICAL REVELATION...

All the Upanishads in the East begin with this prayer:

Direct us, lead us, guide us, from darkness to light. TAMSO MA JYOTIRGAMAYA. We are in darkness: O Lord, lead us, guide us, direct us, so that we can move into the world of light. Guide us, lead us, direct us, from the world of untruth to the world of truth: ASTO MA SADGAMAYA. We are living in death, we are surrounded by death -- death surrounds us like an ocean surrounding a small island -- O Lord, lead us from death to deathlessness, from time to timelessness: MRITYOR MA AMRITAMGAMAYA.

All the Upanishads start with this prayer; there is something very significant in it. Dionysius also says:

... DIRECT US TO THE HEIGHT OF MYSTICAL REVELATION...

Although there is no God as a person, as a being, still the prayer is significant. You will have to understand something very subtle. People think a prayer is significant only if there is somebody to listen to the prayer, that is not right. The prayer is significant because you pray, it doesn't matter whether there is anybody to hear it or not. The prayer does not change God, the prayer changes you. The prayer changes the one who is praying, not the one prayed to.

When you pray you become humble. When you pray you become surrendered. When you pray you accept your AGNOSIA. You say, "I don't know where to go, how to find you. I don't know from where to start. Please guide me." Not that there is a God to guide you, not that somebody is going to come and guide you, not that somebody is going to fulfill your prayer, but just the capacity to pray is enough; it will help you. The capacity to bow down to existence is enough: you lose the egoistic stiffness. The prayer helps you to relax. the prayer gives you an opportunity to let go.

And in that let-go you start moving towards the right direction without anybody guiding you. It is the state of let-go that helps you to find the right direction -- because when you are not tense you are always moving towards the right direction. And whenever you are tense, even if you are moving in the right direction, the direction is not going to prove right because

you are not right. The question is not of direction; the question is of YOUR being right or wrong.

When you are relaxed, at ease, at home, trusting existence, loving existence, nothing can ever go wrong. That's the purpose of prayer. It is not a demand. It is not that you have to shout it so that God can hear it.

A great Indian mystic, Kabir, was passing by the side of a mosque, and the MAULVI, the priest of the mosque, was doing his morning prayer, shouting.

Kabir went in, shook the man and told him, "What are you doing? Do you think your God has gone deaf? Why are you shouting? Just whisper, that will do! In fact, there is no need even to whisper -- just the attitude is enough."

Prayer is an attitude. Prayer is not something to be done; rather, it is a quality. Call it prayerfulness and you will be closer to the truth. Prayer means prayerfulness.

... DIRECT US TO THE HEIGHT OF MYSTICAL REVELATION, SUBLIME BEYOND ALL THOUGHT AND LIGHT...

Mystics have always said that God is beyond all thought; there is no way to think about God. To think about God is to go on missing him. Think, and you will miss, because thinking means you are using your mind, and mind contains only that which you already know. If you know God already there is no need to think. If you don't know God already there is no point in thinking, because mind moves in the small world of knowledge. It goes on repeating what it knows again and again and again. It cannot move towards the unknown.

Mind has no capacity to rise towards the unknown, hence no thinking ever helps. It hinders, certainly, and hinders greatly, but it has never helped anybody. One has to put aside all thinking. One has to come to a moment of nothought.

But Dionysius is something really unique. He says:

... BEYOND ALL THOUGHT and LIGHT...

... because those who have said that God is beyond thought have always said that he is light. In fact, the English word "divine" comes from a Sanskrit root div. From the same root comes the English word "day." From the same root come the Sanskrit words DEVATA, DEVA. They all mean light: divine means light, day means light, DIV means light, DEVATA means light. Light has always been thought synonymous with God.

Dionysius says that to is a projection of thought: because you are afraid of darkness, out of your fear of darkness you conceive God as light. But light is also a thought a mind projection. When you go beyond all thought you also go beyond light.

Then what is God? Is God darkness? That will not be right -- God is not darkness either. Then what is God? God IS TRANSLUCENT DARKNESS, darkness which is luminous.

In this way, Dionysius is trying to help you to go beyond the duality of words. God is death and life both together, light and darkness both together, matter and consciousness both together, man and woman both together. So don't ask the question again whether God is a he or a she; he IS both and neither. That's why the Upanishads never call him he or she but IT. Of course, It with a capital "I" so that you don't misunderstand him as a thing, as a commodity. But God is IT.

Now in the West, Women's Liberation is raising great dust insisting that God should be called she, not he -- to call God he is nothing but the male chauvinist pig's idea. But to call him she will be the female chauvinist's idea. It won't make any difference; it will be the same. Any part of the duality is insufficient; he has to be called both together.

... WHEREIN THE SIMPLE, ABSOLUTE AND IMMUTABLE MYSTERIES OF DIVINE TRUTH ARE HIDDEN IN THE TRANSLUCENT DARKNESS OF THAT SILENCE WHICH REVEALETH IN SECRET.

GOD is known only in absolute silence. But that silence does not mean a dead silence -- not the silence of the cemetery but the silence of a garden where birds are singing and bees are humming and flowers are opening, where all is alive.

The silence that one comes to know through meditation, through AGNOSIA, IS a living silence. It is full of song, full of music, full of melody, full of joy, full of love-empty of all thoughts. Even the thought of love, the thought of joy, the thought of silence is absent. But joy is present, LOVE is present. The thought of love is not present; in fact, the thought of love is present only when love is absent. You think of joy only when you are not joyful. When you are really joyous you never think of joy.

Mind gives you substitutes. Because you are joyless, mind gives you the idea of joy. Because you don't know what love is, mind gives you a thousand and one definitions of love. When you know love, mind has nothing to do; mind simply ceases. One's real silence is not empty, it is not a kind of absence of everything. On the contrary, it is full -- too full, abundantly full, overflowing -- not with thoughts but with real experiences. And that is the revelation of the secret.

FOR THIS DARKNESS, THOUGH OF DEEPEST OBSCURITY...

Obscurity in the sense that you cannot figure out what it is and what it is not. Obscurity in the sense that you cannot define it and you cannot describe it. But it...

... IS YET RADIANTLY CLEAR, AND, THOUGH BEYOND TOUCH AND SIGHT, IT OVERFILLS OUR UNSEEING MIND WITH SPLENDORS OF TRANSCENDENT BEAUTY.

Beauty is there, but the idea of beauty is not there. You hear the music, but you cannot describe it -- not even to yourself.

Dionysius uses two kinds of language. One he calls "cataphatic." "Cataphatic" means a positive language which speaks of God as Father, light, spirit, power and being; it tells us what God IS LIKE. But remember, it is only a finger pointing to the moon -- the finger is not the moon. The cataphatic language is useful, at least useful for those who are very childish in their approach towards life. A child can understand God only as Father, hence all childish religions talk about God as Father. When religion reaches maturity it drops that idea completely.

Jainism does not talk about God as Father; in fact, it does not talk about God at all. Buddhism emphatically denies talking about God, because to talk about God you have to use cataphatic language and a cataphatic language IS at the most approximate. But as far as truth is concerned you cannot be approximately true: either you are true or you are not true.

Can you say to somebody, "I almost love you," or, "I love you approximately?" That will

look very stupid, silly! Either you love or you don't love. You cannot say, "I love you fifty percent, sixty percent, seventy percent. " The idea of percentage won't work; it is either a hundred percent or nothing at all.

Truth cannot be approximately described. Hence to call God "light" is helpful for children to understand, but is not the right way, because then darkness is denied. If you call God "consciousness," then where are you going to put matter? If you call God "spirit," then the body becomes something ungodly, undivine, evil.

It IS because of this cataphatic language that millions of people are misguided. They become anti-body, anti-life, anti-love, anti-joy, anti-pleasure-anti-everything! for the simple reason that they have become accustomed to a cataphatic language.

Dionysius says remember that cataphatic language is just like music. You cannot describe music, but you can give instructions about music, you can give notations for music. And the person who understands the language of notation, one who can decode it, will be able to produce music: the indescribable will be heard. But it is a very indirect way. If the person does not know anything about the notations he may start worshipping the notations as music. He may try to hear it by bringing the notation close to his ears and he will be surprised: "There is no music! And that fool was saying that great music is contained in this notation, and I don't hear anything at all!"

In the middle of a busy street, a madman is kneeling down, his ear to the tar. A passerby sees him and becomes very puzzled by the scene. Not being able to contain his curiosity he also kneels down and puts his ear to the ground.

He does not hear anything so he says to the madman, "What are you listening to? I can't hear anything."

The madman replies, "Yes, it has been like that since this morning."

You cannot hear music from musical notations -- that will be mad -- but you can produce it. Those notations are not descriptive, they are instructive. These two words are significant, "descriptive" and "instructive."

All great Masters are instructive, they are not descriptive. They are not describing God; they are simply instructing you how to create AGNOSIA, the state of not-knowing, so that knowing can happen.

The second kind of language Dionysius calls "apophatic." It is negative language which speaks of God in terms of what he is not. This brings you closer to the truth because it does not say anything about God; it does not affirm anything. It is not VIA POSITIVA, it is VIA NEGATIVA. It simply says, "God is not this, God is not this." It simply denies.

Dionysius says it is like a man who is trying to make a statue out of a marble rock. He goes on chipping, cutting pieces of rock, goes on throwing pieces of rock, chunk by chunk. Slowly slowly the statue emerges.

When you are with a Master who knows the art of apophatic language... and a Master cannot be a Master without knowing the use of apophatic language. All Masters are VIA NEGATIVA, NETI NETI, neither this nor that. If they sometimes speak in descriptive language, that is only for the newcomers, for the initiates, but not for the adepts not for those who are getting a little more mature, a little more centered. For them they always speak the language of negation. They always say, "This is not, this is not, this is not..." They go on eliminating the unnecessary. And finally, when they have eliminated all, they say, "Now this is it!" But still they will not describe it, they will only say, "This is it! Now, here... this

silence... this AGNOSIA... this is it!"

Dionysius says:

THIS IS MY PRAYER. AS FOR YOU, BELOVED TIMOTHY, EXERTING YOURSELF SINCERELY IN MYSTICAL CONTEMPLATION, QUIT THE SENSES, THE WORKINGS OF THE INTELLECT, AND ALL THAT MAY BE SENSED AND KNOWN, AND ALL THAT IS NOT AND IS. FOR BY THIS YOU MAY UNKNOWINGLY ATTAIN, IN AS FAR AS IT IS POSSIBLE, TO THE ONE-NESS OF HIM WHO IS BEYOND ALL BEING AND KNOWLEDGE. THUS THROUGH INDOMITABLE, ABSOLUTE AND PURE DETACHMENT OF YOURSELF FROM ALL THINGS, YOU WILL BE LIFTED UP TO THAT RADIANCE OF THE DIVINE DARKNESS WHICH IS BEYOND BEING, SURPASSING ALL AND FREE FROM ALL.

THIS is something tremendously beautiful. Dionysius writing to his disciple, Timothy, says:

THIS IS MY PRAYER.

A real Master cannot say more than that. He cannot order you. He cannot say, "Do it -- you have to do it!" He does not talk in terms of shoulds and should-nots. He is not in any way trying to lay his trip on you. He is simply praying for you. Dionysius says:

THIS IS MY PRAYER.

"This is what I would like to see happening in you. This is my wish, my prayer. So don't take it as an order; it is not that you have to do it. It is not that if you don't do it you will be punished, thrown into hell for eternity. There is no need to listen to me, there is no need to follow me. This is only my prayer, because I have experienced such transcendent beauty through AGNOSIA that I would like you, beloved Timothy, also to share it. I would like to share it with you. If you are ready, the sharing can happen."

And this is the way to be ready: exert yourself sincerely -- not seriously but sincerely. There are people who are always doing things halfheartedly; lukewarm is their life. They never achieve anything because they are always holding back. They never move into anything totally, intensely. They are always standing on the bank and thinking of the farther shore. Or even if sometimes they try, they are riding on two horses; in case the one fails, the other will always be there. They are riding in two boats. Their life is so divided that whatsoever they do they always do with a dividedness. And any flowering of consciousness is possible only when there is an organic unity in you. Hence:

... be sincere IN MYSTICAL CONTEMPLATION, QUIT THE SENSES...

Dionysius says: Watch your senses. You are not the eye but the consciousness standing behind the eye. The eye is only a window -- don't get identified with it. And so are all other senses: they are only windows. You are standing behind the window -- don't become the window! Don't start thinking, "I am the frame of the window."

That's what everybody is doing. You become identified with your senses, you become identified with your mind, you become identified with a thousand and one things.

And you completely forget that you are only one thing and that IS witnessing, consciousness, awareness.

... QUIT THE SENSES, THE WORKINGS OF THE INTELLECT...

Don't get involved in the mind. Watch the mind pass by. Slowly slowly the functioning of the mind ceases

... AND ALL THAT MAY BE SENSED AND KNOWN...

And go on dropping that which can be known and sensed so that you can fall into AGNOSIA.

... AND ALL THAT IS NOT AND IS.

And don't become attached to the positive or the negative, to the theist or the atheist.

A rare man Dionysius is. He is saying these things behind the cover of Christianity, hiding this great mystic approach -- as great as Lao Tzu's or Buddha's. behind the covers of the Bible. Hence he has survived -- he managed well. Christians have never condemned him, otherwise he might have been burnt alive; at least his letters would have been destroyed.

Thousands of great treatises have been burnt and destroyed, and if they are not burnt and destroyed they are Lying in the basement of the Vatican. Thousands of manuscripts never read, never allowed the light of the day! Nobody can approach them.

In fact, it should be one of the duties of the UNO to free all the manuscripts which are imprisoned in the Vatican. And there are millions, not few. This is a great crime! Centuries of understanding of enlightenment are hidden, not allowed. Catholics have a special category for such books. Once they are put on the black list, no Christian is allowed to read them; to read them is to commit a sin.

Dionysius must have been a very intelligent man; he managed well. He deceived the Vatican, he deceived the popes. After all, he himself was a bishop -- he knew all the inside tricks! His treatise is thought to be Christian; it is not Christian at all. It has nothing to do with Christianity. Jesus would have agreed with it, but not the Christian organization.

FOR BY THIS YOU MAY UNKNOWINGLY ATTAIN...

You see his words? -- UNKNOWINGLY ATTAIN. God is never attained knowingly, because before God is attained the knower disappears, so how can you attain him knowingly? God always comes unawares. When you are not he comes. When you are not he suddenly fills you. When you are absent he is present.

... IN AS FAR AS IT IS POSSIBLE, TO THE ONENESS OF HIM WHO IS BEYOND ALL BEING AND KNOWLEDGE. THUS THROUGH INDOMITABLE, ABSOLUTE AND PURE DETACHMENT OF YOURSELF FROM ALL THINGS, YOU WILL BE LIFTED UP TO THAT RADIANCE OF THE DIVINE DARKNESS WHICH IS BEYOND BEING, SURPASSING ALL AND FREE FROM ALL.

What Buddha calls NIRVANA, the absolute freedom, what Mahavira calls MOKSHA, the ultimate freedom, that's what Dionysius is talking about, but putting it into Christian terminology, into a Christian packet. But the inner reality is the same.

Nobody from the East has ever commented on Dionysius -- I may be the first person -- because the East lives with the ego that says they are the only spiritual people, only they have

reached the Everest of consciousness. That is not true. I have come across many people who have reached the same peak. Dionysius is one of them. He is a Buddha, he is a jaina, of the same height, of the same quality, of the same depth -- and sometimes even transcending them all, because no Buddha has said: unknowingly you ATTAIN HINT.

There are a few precious statements, rare, unique, never spoken before. No other Buddha has said that that experience is of translucent darkness, AGNOSIA.

Dionysius has to be meditated upon. Listen to these sutras. Sit silently. Meditate on each single word. If you can have even a small glimpse of agnosia, of not-knowing you will have stumbled into a door of the divine. The door is not far away; that which keeps you away from the door is your knowledge. Be knowledgeable and you will remain irreligious, unmystical. Attain to ignorance, total ignorance, and then all the mysteries are yours -- SURPASSING ALL AND FREE FROM ALL.

---

## Theologia Mystica

### Chapter #2

#### Chapter title: God is a Ventriloquist

**12 August 1980 am in Buddha Hall**

Archive code: 8008120

ShortTitle: THEOLO02

Audio: Yes

Video: Yes

---

The first question

OSHO, THE OTHER NIGHT AFTER DARSHAN I DREAMT THAT YOU SANG "I'M A STRANGER IN PARADISE" TO ME. IT WAS INCREDIBLE, AND YOU WERE REALLY GOOD AT IT! DO YOU EVER SING AND DANCE, BEYOND THE METAPHORICAL USE OF THE WORDS? YOU ARE SO FULL OF GRACE. WOULD YOU DO IT NOW?

Anand Alimo,

I AM doing it every moment... yes, even now. And not in a metaphorical sense but in as realistic a sense as possible. Singing or dancing to me mean much more than you understand by those words. Your meaning is very limited; my meaning is vast. It is not metaphorical but certainly vast, unbounded.

In fact, once you become aware of your own being you cannot do anything else but sing, dance, celebrate. Before that your singing is not much of a singing, your laughter is not much of a laughter. In fact it is just its opposite.

Once Friedrich Nietzsche was asked, "Why do you go on smiling and laughing about

very small things which do not seem worth laughing at?"

Nietzsche became very serious and said, "I laugh just out of fear. I laugh because if I don't laugh I am afraid I may start crying and weeping."

And he is saying something tremendously important. It is true about you -- about everyone who has not become a Buddha, a Christ, a Krishna. You laugh just to cover up your wounds, you sing so that you can forget your tears, and you celebrate because your life is so miserable. The more miserable you are, the more occasions you seek to celebrate, because that is the only distraction from your misery.

My laughter, my song, my dance are bound to be basically different from yours. I laugh because there is only laughter in my heart -- my laughter is not a cover-up. And I sing because there is nothing else to do -- my breathing is my singing. It is not something that I am doing, it is something that is happening of its own accord. Even if I want to stop, it cannot be stopped. In fact, there is nobody to do it and nobody to stop it either.

But I will tell you a joke:

Every day a man came into the bar with a box tucked underneath his arm, asked for a shot of whiskey, drank it and went away.

One day the barman, after observing this customer for some time, decided to ask him what he had inside his box in exchange for a free drink.

He opened the box, and inside appeared a little flea, singing, accompanied by a little roach playing the piano. The bartender was amazed.

So the next day when the man came in, the bartender offered him another free drink to listen to the flea singing and the roach playing the piano.

As time went on the bartender became more and more intrigued with this show and insisted on seeing it every day in exchange for a free drink.

One day, not being able to contain his curiosity any longer, the bartender offered the man a full case of his best whiskey in exchange for the secret behind the little performers.

The customer, after giving it a little thought, agreed. Once again he opened the box and the flea came out singing and the roach playing the piano. And he said. "The trick is this: it is not really the flea who sings, but the roach is a ventriloquist!"

It is not in fact me who is singing and dancing and doing all kinds of tricks, the secret is: God is a ventriloquist!

The second question

OSHO, I HAVE DROPPED ALL MY ATTACHMENTS; BUT STILL SUBTLE ATTACHMENTS REMAIN. I AM EVEN ATTACHED TO NON-ATTACHMENT, TO NO-MIND, TO NO NO-MIND. I AM AWARE OF THE SUBTLE EGO. HOW SHOULD WE GO BEYOND THIS VICIOUS CIRCLE?

Anand Virago,

IT is a great blessing that you are aware of it, of the vicious circle. It is one of the most significant things, to be aware of it. Only after that can something be done -- or undone. But there are many people who are not aware of it, even people who have risen to great heights of spirituality, who are almost enlightened -- just one step more and they will be Buddhas. But

the last step is certainly, and obviously too, the most subtle one.

It is easy to drop the mind; it is difficult to drop no-mind; and it is very very difficult to drop no no-mind, because the mind is a very cunning fellow -- it goes on creating itself again and again. It goes on receding: you drop the mind, it becomes the no-mind; you drop the no-mind, it becomes the no no-mind, and so on and so forth, AD INFINITUM. You drop your attachments, it becomes attached to the very idea of non-attachment. You drop out of the world, you renounce the world, now it clings to the very idea of renunciation. But the clinging remains. It goes on changing its object of clinging, but it continues to exist.

Just the other day I received a long letter from Holland from one of our most beautiful sannyasins, Amrito. He went to see J. Krishnamurti, and J. Krishnamurti behaves almost like a bull when he sees my sannyasins. The red color... and he simply loses all his enlightenment! That's why in Spain I have so few sannyasins: the bulls don't like it!

The moment he saw Amrito attired in his sannyasin dress he became furious. For one and a half hours continuously he spoke against clinging to the Master. Amrito was laughing at the whole thing -- why was he so disturbed? He could see his love, his compassion, his effort to help him, but he could also feel that there was something more to it; he couldn't figure out what it was. What he could not figure out is J. Krishnamurti's clinging to the idea of non-clinging. He is still very serious about it.

My sannyas is a non-serious phenomenon; it is really very light-hearted. It is given in love and laughter and it is received in love and laughter. It is not the old idea of sannyas -- of serious people, anti-life, anti-love, trying to escape from the world. It is not escapist at all. On the contrary, I teach my people to BE in the world -- and as totally as possible and as passionately as possible and as intensely as possible.

But Krishnamurti has carried a wound throughout his long life. He was brought up by Theosophists and from his very childhood he was taught a thousand and one rules, because they were bringing him up with a certain idea: that he is going to be the World Teacher, that he is going to be the new Christ, the Messiah, that it is through him that the world is going to be redeemed -- he is no ordinary person. They were preparing him as a vehicle so that God could descend in him and he could become a mouthpiece for God. Of course, tremendous discipline was needed and he was almost tortured.

There were two brothers, Krishnamurti and Nityananda; both were being prepared. Nityananda died -- and my own feeling is that he died because of too much discipline: fasting, yoga, and so many occult and esoteric processes they had to pass through. And they were very young, very tender. Krishnamurti was only nine years old. They had to get up early, three o'clock in the morning, and the training would start.

And the man who was in charge, Leadbeater, was a hard taskmaster. Not only was he a hard taskmaster, he was also a homosexual person. And it is a well-known fact that his interest in small children was basically sexual. He was found in very compromising postures with Krishnamurti too!

Those wounds have remained. Krishnamurti cannot forgive Leadbeater. Half a century has passed, or more; Leadbeater is dead, the whole Theosophical movement is dead, but those scars of Master and discipleship, of training, surrender, obedience, have not left Krishnamurti yet. They have become very subtle as time has passed. For almost fifty years he has been fighting against ghosts which are no more in existence. He goes on boxing in the air with ghosts which are non-existent.

My sannyas and my existence are so new to him he cannot understand it -- he has not made any effort to understand it. For one and a half hours he was hammering o4 Amrito:

"This is the most dangerous thing that you have done. Never become a disciple to anybody! Don't cling to a Master!"

Politely, many times Amrito reminded him that "I am not clinging to anybody. And my Master is not in favor of clinging: he gives us total freedom. It is out of freedom that we are with him, and any moment we decide not to be with him... he does not create any guilt because of that."

But he won't listen. He cannot understand this NEW phenomenon: a new kind of relationship between the Master and the disciple, the relationship which is not a relationship of dependence of any kind.

You are not clingers to me, you are not enslaved by me. My effort here is to help you to be free, to be totally free. I am included in that freedom. You have to be free of all, and I am included in that all. And if you are still with me it is not because you are dependent on me; it is because you are grateful for such a freedom. Who will not love a relationship which is basically rooted in freedom?

Relationship becomes ugly when it is not allowing you to be free, when it encages you, when it cuts your wings, when it chains your soul, when it does not allow you to be yourself. I am not imposing any rule on you, I am not forcing any discipline on you. My only message is of love, freedom and awareness.

But Krishnamurti was utterly deaf.

Amrito writes to me that "I came out with a headache." That is natural -- Krishnamurti himself suffers from headaches! For fifty years continuously he has suffered from headaches, severe headaches, not ordinary; for days they continue. Sometimes they become so serious that he wants to hit his head against the wall!

And the reason is that he has dropped everything -- as you say, Virago -- but now a new attachment has arisen in him, the attachment to non-attachment, clinging to non-clinging. He has attained to the state of no-mind, but he has not been able to drop that IDEA of no-mind.

And it is not going to help if you drop the idea of no-mind and then you become attached to no no-mind. It is the same game! It goes on becoming more and more subtle, and the more subtle it is the more dangerous, because you will not be able to see it. It will become so deep inside you that your consciousness will not be able to reach it. It Will poison your very source.

You tell me: I HAVE DROPPED ALL MY ATTACHMENTS...

Who has told you to drop all your attachments? The vicious circle starts there, in the dropping. Then you become attached to the idea of dropping. Then a new ego arises: "I have dropped all attachments." And suddenly you can see, and it IS GOOD that you can see, that "Now I am becoming attached to this idea. What to do now?" You can drop even THIS idea, and then you will feel even more happy, more proud. "Look!" You will thank yourself: "Virago, see! You have done the miracle. You have dropped even the idea of non-attachment." But now again it has come from the back door.

You ask me: HOW SHOULD WE GO BEYOND THIS VICIOUS CIRCLE?

Why start it in the first place? I am not telling you to drop attachments, I am telling you to just understand them. That's enough. Just see what your attachments are with no effort to drop them, with no judgment, no evaluation. Just see what they are. Whatsoever they are,

they are there. What can you do? -- Just as you have eyes and hands and legs and a certain color of hair and skin, so your attachments are there. Accept them! In that acceptance the revolution begins.

The moment you accept your attachments and you start understanding them, with NO idea to drop them... Remember, if there is the idea to drop them behind your understanding, your understanding cannot be profound and total; that idea will be a hindrance. Why drop attachments? God has not dropped the attachment to his world -- why should you drop your attachments to the world?

I have never dropped a single attachment in my life. I have seen them through and through, and by seeing through and through the miracle happens: suddenly you find the attachments are no more binding. They are there, but as far away as the horizon, and as non-existential as the horizon. They are no more binding on you. You can LIVE in the world and yet you are not OF the world.

And that's my whole vision of sannyas. Be a lotus leaf: in the lake and yet untouched by the water. Then there is no vicious circle. You create the vicious circle, and then you ask how to transcend it. And every effort to transcend it will be creating it again and again.

My humble suggestion is, please don't start the stupid thing! It is better not to start it. Once you start it, it is almost impossible to get rid of it.

The third question

OSHO,  
WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO BE RELIGIOUS? AFTER AWARENESS, WHAT IS THE  
FIRST QUALITY OF A RELIGIOUS BEING?

Anand Shravan,

RELIGION in the past has created in people nothing but ego. It has given people ideas of superiority, of greatness, of extraordinariness. In fact, only the very egoistic people in the past became interested in religion. And religion gives you a chance to fulfill your ego more easily than any other dimension of life.

If you want to be the richest man in the world, it is not going to be easy; but if you want to renounce the world it is simple. To be the richest man in the world will need many things. It will need a certain intelligence; it will require a constant effort, an unwavering, strong, staunch mind to remain attached to the goal, that you have decided upon in order not to change it, not to drop it. Even if all the circumstances change you have to go on dogmatically, blindly following it. It needs a certain willpower; it needs cunningness, cleverness, a certain quality of being political, competitive, ambitious, unscrupulous, not bothering about any moral values, reminding yourself again and again that the end justifies the means, so whatsoever means you are using is good if it fulfills the end. Be violent, be deceptive, be dishonest -- IF it pays.

They say, "Honesty is the best policy." But remember, it is a policy, it is not a value -- it is not something intrinsically valuable. Because it pays it is a good policy; if it does not pay, then dishonesty is the best policy.

And you have to be very mindful of what you are doing, of what you are saying, because you will have to tell many lies. You will need a good memory, otherwise you will forget what you have said yesterday and what you are saying today.

A politician needs a good memory. He may not be very intelligent, but he needs a good memory -- and they are two different things. A good memory is a mechanical thing; a good intelligence is a totally different phenomenon. There have been people of great intelligence and very low-grade memory: Albert Einstein, Thomas Alva Edison -- the highest intelligence with the lowest memory. And there have been people of great memory with no intelligence at all.

I was visiting the Hindi University in Benares. A man was brought to me and introduced to me as someone who holds two dozen M.A.s -- two dozen! So once in a while you come across a person who has double M.A.s, but two dozen M.A.s! He has set a record in the whole world. No other human being ever has possessed twenty-four M.A.s in twenty-four subjects.

But the man was utterly stupid! In fact, even without seeing him I would have said that he must be stupid. He wasted his whole life just collecting certificates. And when I told him, "You look stupid," he was very angry! He said, "You are the first person -- everybody has praised me! "

But I said, "I can see in your eyes there is no quality which can say that some intelligence is inside. I don't see any sharpness in you. You have collected degrees, but you have lost something while you were collecting all this nonsense. Your memory is good, but your intelligence is poor."

It is not necessary that both should exist together.

In the past, religion was the easiest approach to fulfil your ego. No intelligence is needed, no memory is needed, no will is needed, no struggle is needed. All that is needed is a weak, impotent personality. All that is needed is a cowardly man who is incapable of fighting in the world. He can escape to the monastery, and just by escaping to the monastery he becomes a great saint. In the monastery his whole day is uncreative: he is not doing anything, he is not enriching the world. And if he is doing something at all, that is a kind of self-torture. He may be fasting, praying five times a day, doing many yoga postures, standing on his head for hours, standing naked in the cold or in the heat -- all kinds of self-violence. And these qualities have been praised, highly praised.

We have praised stupid people as saints and we have praised uncreative people as religious, as spiritual. They have not contributed anything to the world; it is because of them the world is suffering so much.

In India religion has been very predominant, more predominant than anywhere else. And you can see the consequences! India has almost become the hell of the earth. People are starving; people are hungry, dying, ill, no energy, lethargic, no desire to do anything -- in every possible way immoral, but still thinking themselves spiritual because once a month they go on a fast, or once a week, or because they go every day to the temple, or because they read the Gita every day, or because every day they go on chanting some stupid mantra thinking that they are doing Transcendental Meditation. And you don't see any meditateness anywhere. You don't see any peace, silence, joy. You don't see anything that can be said to be the outcome of centuries of religiousness.

My vision of religion is totally different.

Anand Shraavan, you ask: WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO BE RELIGIOUS?

To me to be religious means many things, because religion is a multi-dimensional phenomenon. First it means an egoless state -- first and foremost it means a deep acceptance of one's nobodiness. Religion is not a ladder that leads you higher than others. It is not trying to achieve some superiority but, on the contrary, it is relaxing into your ordinariness. A religious person neither feels inferior nor superior; in fact, he never compares himself with anybody else. He cannot compare -- his understanding makes it clear to him that comparison is not possible because there are no two persons similar. How can you compare people who are so dissimilar? You cannot compare Buddha to Krishna, Krishna to Christ, Christ to Mohammed, Mohammed to Kabir, Kabir to Nanak -- no, that is not possible. You cannot compare anybody with anybody else; everybody is unique.

But when I say everybody is unique, remember the word "everybody." I am not using the word "unique" in a comparative sense -- more unique than others, more unique than somebody else. EVERYBODY is unique! Uniqueness is an ordinary quality, the MOST ordinary quality. A religious person is utterly ordinary.

In India there is a tremendously beautiful treatise which contains only the names of God and nothing else: VISHNU SAHASRANAM, THE ONE THOUSAND NAMES OF GOD -- just names and nothing else. But those names are something unbelievably beautiful, showing different aspects of God. In those one thousand names there are two names: one is "God is the most ordinary" and the other is "God is the most extraordinary." Ordinary and extraordinary, both -- two names of God.

The religious person is ordinary, very ordinary. He lives a very simple, unpretentious life with no claim to extra-ordinariness. But that's what makes him extraordinary, so there is no contradiction in those two names.

To be extraordinary is a very ordinary desire. To be ordinary is not an ordinary desire; it is extraordinary. And to relax into one's ordinariness is the most extraordinary phenomenon in the world. The moment you relax into your ordinariness and you start enjoying the ordinary small things of life... in the early morning a cup of tea, a walk in the woods, a swim in the river, listening to the birds or just sitting under a tree -- "doing nothing, sitting silently, spring comes and the grass grows by itself" -- or cooking food or cleaning your house...

Religion is not concerned with what you do, it is concerned with the quality that you bring to your work. You may be praying in a church and there may be no religion in it, because the WAY you are doing it is irreligious.

I have heard:

A king and the high priest of the country were both praying early in the morning. It was still dark and they could not see in the temple. The king was saying, "My God, I am just dust under your feet. I am nobody. Have mercy on me!" And the priest said almost the same, maybe in different words but the same thing, "I am nobody. Have mercy on us!"

And then they both heard, with surprise, a third voice. By that time it was becoming a little light and they could see -- the poorest beggar of the town was also praying and he was saying, "God, I am dust under your feet. I am nobody. Have mercy on us!"

The king blinked his eyes, turned towards the priest and said, "Look who is saying that he is just ordinary, that he is nobody. Just look! Who is saying, 'I am nobody'? Just a beggar! The king can say, 'I am nobody,' the high priest can say, 'I am nobody,' but a beggar? How egoistic! How pretentious!"

They both laughed at the idea of the beggar trying to be just like the king or the high

priest. He was also bragging about being nobody. The king and the priest thought it insulting.

Of course, THEY can say they are nobody, because everybody knows they are not. Even God knows they are not! They are just being humble. But this poor beggar -- what humility is there? He is certainly nobody, and he is saying, "I am nobody." What is the point of saying it?

Remember, your so-called saints have tried to be humble before God, but just in order that they can be higher in the eyes of people. But MY idea of a religious man is that he does not even claim ordinariness -- he claims not. He is simply ordinary, whatsoever he is.

A Zen Master, Rinzai, was asked, "What did you use to do before you were enlightened?"

He said, "I used to chop wood and carry water from the well."

And the man asked, "Now, now that you are enlightened, what do you do?"

He said, "The same thing -- chopping wood and carrying water from the well."

The man was puzzled. He said, "I cannot understand. Then what is the difference? Then what is the POINT of becoming enlightened? Before you used to chop wood and carry water, now you continue the same thing. Then what is the difference?"

And Rinzai laughed. He said, "The difference is: before I was doing it because I HAD to do it, it was a duty; now it is a joy. The quality has changed -- the work is the same! "

You eat, the religious person eats, but the quality is different. In the Upanishads it is said: ANNAM BRAHM, "food is God. " The religious person eats as if he is eating God, because all is God. He drinks as if he is drinking God, because all is God. To you he is just sipping tea -- he is sipping God!

Hence the Zen tea temple and the tea ceremony. The Zen Master gathers his disciples, prepares tea, and they sit silently listening to the samovar and its humming sound, and the aroma of the tea fills the small room. And the room is made in the garden by a pond. Birds are singing outside, the air is fragrant, and they are all sitting silently. The Master pours the tea; they receive it with great gratitude, with deep love. It is a gift from the Master -- it is no more ordinary tea, it is not tea at all -- as if the Master has poured his own being in their cups. Then silently, meditatively, prayerfully, they drink the tea.

When Christian missionaries came to know about it they could not believe how tea -- drinking could be called meditative. In a Christian church if you start drinking tea and coffee or smoking cigarettes you will be thrown out. "What are you doing?" Even in a Hindu temple you will not be allowed to drink tea. "This is a temple," they will say, "a sacred place, and you are doing such a mundane activity! Go to some hotel -- this is not a hotel."

But I agree with the Zen people: the small things of life have to be transformed by your inner transformation. This I call the religious quality; everything becomes sacred. Taking a bath, making love, eating food, going to sleep -- everything becomes sacred, because wherever you look is God and whatsoever you do you do WITH God.

Anand Shraavan, to experience life as divine is the most fundamental quality of a religious person. For him God is not a person but the whole energy of existence. God is godliness; not a person but a quality. He breathes godliness, he lives surrounded by godliness.

And you ask: AFTER AWARENESS, WHAT IS THE FIRST QUALITY OF A RELIGIOUS BEING?

That is very difficult to say because it happens to different people in different ways. After

awareness... awareness of course, is the method that transforms you, makes you religious. But then one never knows. Meera started dancing and singing. Buddha never danced and never sang in the same way as Meera. Meera never sat under a tree silently like a Buddha. Jesus speaks in words of fire. The words of Buddha are like lotus flowers falling from the beyond; there is no fire in them. Jesus is fire. He could drive away the money-changers from the temple almost violently, with a whip in his hand. He turned their boards upside down and single-handed he drove them out of the temple. You cannot conceive such an act from Buddha. Jesus is pure rebellion; Buddha is just silence.

It is said the first thing that Zarathustra did in his life was to laugh the moment he was born. Now children are not supposed to laugh when they are born, they are supposed to cry! Zarathustra laughed, and that laughter remained like an undercurrent his whole life. He is the most life-affirmative Buddha ever. He loved life so deeply that for him there was no God other than life.

Mahavira renounced life, renounced the market-place. But he was not an escapist, he was not a coward -- not at all. He lived with ferocious wild animals in the jungle, naked, in total insecurity, with no possessions. And he worked hard; in fact, nobody else in the whole history of humanity has worked so hard to achieve the ultimate state of no-mind. Buddha achieved it through relaxation and Mahavira achieved it through effort.

Now, individuals differ and one never knows. If you are carrying a talent hidden inside you for being a poet, the moment awareness happens to you you will suddenly start on a new pilgrimage: you will become a poet, you will explode like a poet. Or you may be a Vincent van Gogh or a Picasso, unaware of it. Once awareness happens you may start painting. One never knows because each person is such a mystery, unpredictable.

So I cannot say, Anand Shraavan, what will be the first quality of a religious being AFTER awareness. Awareness certainly has to be the most fundamental background -- without it nobody can be religious -- but AFTER that nothing can be said. People have behaved differently, and I accept them all as religious: the Zen Masters who painted, Krishna who played on his flute, Buddha who sat silently under the tree, Meera who danced all over the country from village to village, Jesus with all his rebellion, Zarathustra with his laughter. There is no way of saying, and it is better that there is no way of saying what will be the first thing, because the danger is that if it can be said you may imitate.

If I say that after awareness has happened you will dance, there is every possibility that at least you will try. Howsoever awkward it looks, howsoever embarrassing to others, but you will try -- you have to prove that you have attained to awareness, you have become a Buddha. Now, unless you dance...

I don't think Mahavira dancing would look very good! Meera looks beautiful while she is dancing. In fact, it would have been unfortunate if she had not danced and simply sat under a tree; we would have missed the beautiful songs she sang. Nobody in the whole world has sung such beautiful songs. They come directly from the innermost core of her being. They are not ordinary poetry, they are divine. It is not that she is composing them; they are simply flowing through her naturally. She never learned to dance; it exploded! It was an explosion.

So it is good that it cannot be said. Although all the religions have said something, and that's where they have created difficulties for people. Christians say what the qualities will be, Jainas say what the qualities will be, Buddhists say what the qualities will be. And then Buddhists and Jainas and Christians and Hindus and Mohammedans all have tried to imitate. People are imitators. Even if Charles Darwin had not discovered that man was born of the monkeys, sooner or later we would have had to accept it -- because of his imitativeness. Man

simply imitates.

My own approach is to leave you free. Awareness certainly has to be there, because without awareness nothing will happen, but then you have to be left absolutely free. Then you have to wait, then you have to see what happens. Not only will others be surprised, you are also in for a great surprise after awareness, because your innermost genius will surface and for the first time you will know what you really are. A rose will become a rose, a marigold will become a marigold, a lotus will become a lotus. And nobody knows, because man's intrinsic nature is freedom.

And it is good that different people will express their religiousness differently. It makes the world more beautiful, more ecstatic, more wondrous. It makes the world something worth living; otherwise it will be a monotonous world, it will be a boring world, it will lack variety.

The fourth question

Osho, AT KENNEDY SPACE CENTER, FLORIDA, WE SAW THE ULTIMATE IN SCIENCE TO EXPLORE OUTER SPACE AND CREATE "A BETTER MAN," AND AT RAJNEESH SPACE CENTER, POONA, IS THE EFFORT TO EXPERIENCE THE INNER SPACE AND CREATE "A NEW MAN." THE FORMER IS THE LAUNCHING PAD FOR THE NEW CENTURY BACKED BY THE WORLD'S RICHEST AND MOST POWERFUL NATION. THIS ONE IS THE FLYING SAUCER FOR THE NEW CONSCIOUSNESS AND YET DECRIED BY ONE OF THE WORLD'S POOREST NATIONS. ONE IS MATTER AND THE OTHER SPIRIT. WHAT IS HAPPENING?

Kul Bhushan,

THE IDEA of a better man is an old idea, very old, as old as man himself. Everybody is willing for a better man because it needs no radical change. A better man means something is added to you: you remain the same, you remain continuous; there is no discontinuity. And you become richer, better.

The idea of a better man is rooted in greed, hence everybody will support it. The rich countries will support it, the poor countries will support it. India was totally in favor of Mahatma Gandhi because he was trying to bring a better man.

The idea of a better man is reformatory, it is not revolutionary. But the idea of a new man is dangerous because it requires guts. Its basic requirement is that you have to die to the old and you have to be born anew -- it is a rebirth. Hence I am opposed. And it is not only here that I am opposed and decried, I will be opposed and decried anywhere else in the world; even if I am in Florida the same will happen.

In fact, there is more possibility of opposition in a richer and powerful country than there is in a poor and starving country, for the simple reason that millions of Indians have no idea of what is going on here. They have no time, they have no interest. It is not a vital issue for them, the birth of a new man. Their vital problem is how to survive, and you are talking of the birth of a new man! They are not even able to survive. Their problems are totally different. They are ill, they are hungry, their children are uneducated, they are unemployed, they don't have any land, no food, no shelter -- and you are talking about a new man? They are not interested; it is not their problem.

But if I talk about the new man in America I will be killed immediately, imprisoned. I will not be tolerated at all, because that means a danger to the whole American way of life.

The American way of life depends on ambition, and my new man has to be utterly ambitionless. America's whole approach is: things should be bettered, everything should be made better. It does not matter where it is going to lead, but things have to be better, better and better. They are obsessed with the idea of bettering things. You have to have more speed, better machines, better technology, better railroads, better roads -- everything better! Of course, in the same way, you need a better man. It fits with the whole American style of life.

Man is also thought to be a commodity. Just as you need better cows and better dogs and better cars and better airplanes, you need a better man! There is no difference: it is the same logic.

I am talking about a NEW man. The new man is not necessarily the better man. He will be livelier, he will be more joyous, he will be more alert, but who knows whether he will be better or not? As far as politicians are concerned he will not be better, because he will not be a better soldier -- he will not be ready to be a soldier at all. He will not be competitive, and the whole competitive economy will collapse. He will not be interested just in accumulating junk, and the whole economy depends on that. All your advertising agencies are just bringing to your mind the idea of collecting more and more junk.

The new man will have a totally different vision of life. He will live in a more loving way, because to him love is richness. He will know that money cannot buy love or joy. He will know that money is utilitarian; it is not the goal of life.

The whole American system depends on doing better. "Do it better!" What you are doing is not the point. "If you are murdering people, do it better!" You can see what happened in Hiroshima and Nagasaki: America really did it in a better way than anybody else has ever done it. "Reach the moon!" Nobody asks why. If you ask why you are crazy; such questions are not to be asked. The only question worth asking is: "How to reach the moon in a better way than anybody else? Defeat Russia. It should be an American who is first to walk on the moon." For what? That is not the point. As far as I am concerned, I can't see the point. The American standing on the moon looks so silly! But that is their way of thinking, their philosophy: "Even if you are looking silly, look silly in a better way. Defeat everybody else!"

My new man means the end of the old world. So it is not only a question of my being decried and opposed in India -- I will be decried and opposed anywhere else. In fact, I have chosen India for a particular reason: here people are so lethargic. Even if they want to kill me they will take twenty, thirty years! By that time I will have done my work -- I will have done the harm. It is not for no reason that I have chosen India: people are lethargic.

Just a few days ago a man threw a knife at me to kill me. Now, such a knife can be thrown only in India! When it fell just in front of me I thought it was a stone. My eyes are not bad, I don't need glasses yet: I can see very clearly. I thought it was just a stone -- it looked so dirty! And when I saw the pictures of it I was very much puzzled -- you could not even cut vegetables with it! This is the beauty of being in India. Now, in America or in Germany they would have done it with more sophisticated means. India is the best place at the moment to do my work, my kind of work.

And why is the new man decried? He has always been decried. Jesus was killed because he was talking about the new man, not about the better man. Mahavira was not killed, Buddha was not killed, because they were talking about the better man. You should see the difference.

Jesus said to Nicodemus, "Unless you are born again you shall not enter into my kingdom of God." Now you cannot find any parallel in Mahavira, in Patanjali, in Moses, in Mohammed; no, nowhere can you find a parallel. Jesus insisted that first you have to die to

the past, only then can a new consciousness arise in you. He was crucified.

Socrates was talking about a new man, remember. These are the differences. Why was Socrates killed? Athens was one of the most cultured cities of those days; in fact, not only of those days, but even today no city compares with Athens. Twenty-five centuries have passed, but neither New York nor London nor Paris nor Bombay nor Calcutta nor Peking nor Moscow -- no city has been able to achieve that peak of culture, sophistication, civilization, that Athens did.

But why did such cultured people become so animalistic, so barbarous as to kill a man like Socrates? He was talking about the new man. If he had talked about the better man he would have been worshipped..

Those who have talked about the better man have always been worshipped, because they are telling you that the past is beautiful but it can be beautified more. They are not against the past, they are not against conventions, they are not against traditions; they are all for them. The tradition has to be the foundation and on that foundation you can raise a better temple, a better house.

To talk about the new man, Kul Bhushan, is dangerous. A new man means cutting away totally from the past, disrupting, uprooting yourself completely from the past, dying to the past and living in the present. And old habits die very hard. We have become accustomed to hearing about a better man; it has gone into the very circulation of our blood. Every saint, every mahatma talks about the better man; that's his business, we know. But about a new man? Then we become afraid. He is bringing something absolutely new; he is taking us into the territory of the unknown, he is trying to uproot us from the familiar. And we have lived for thousands of years in a particular way; we are conditioned by it, we are part of it. Only very few people can manage to get out of it. Hence my message is going to remain only for the chosen few.

Remember, old habits die hard -- and our religions, our philosophies are very old, our styles of life are very old. And I am aU for the new. We think the old is gold -- and I say the old is just junk! I agree with Henry Ford that history is bunk. It is all bullshit! We have to free man from all that has gone before, and we have to free man totally, absolutely, categorically.

"Mummy, why did you marry daddy?"

"Ah!" replies the mother. "So you are wondering too!"

"Didn't I meet you in Texas?"

"I've never been to Texas."

"Neither have I. Guess it must have been two other fellows."I

These drunkards, these unconscious people have been dominating the whole of humanity.

It is a very rainy day. Two madmen are sitting on a bus. When the bus stops at the traffic lights, one madman looks out of the window and says, "Hey, Charlie, look at all that water! I am going to take a bath!"

So he opens the window and jumps out. After a few seconds his friend hears a shout, "Dive a little further away, Charlie, the water here is too shallow!"

Mad people and drunkards -- they have been our deciding factors in the past. We have never listened to the awakened ones. The awakened ones cannot talk about bettering man. It

is like telling an ill person that "I will give you medicine to better your illness." The ill person does not want to better his illness; he wants to get rid of it, he wants to be healthy.

It is Saturday night; the circus is packed. The owner enters the ring, stands in front of the audience and says: "Dingling Brothers Circus offers five thousand dollars the contents of this envelope, to any man courageous enough to perform three daring feats: make Zorba the elephant sit down; comb the hair of Leo, our lion; and thirdly, make love to this old lady over here."

As he is saying this, an attendant is bringing into the ring an enormous gray elephant, a ferocious-looking lion and a poor, stooped-over old lady.

"Who is gonna go for it? Five thousand dollars, five thousand just for laying out this old elephant, combing this cat's hair and loving this old lady."

From the back of the crowd comes a yell, and a drunkard, a strongly-built man, comes stumbling into the center-ring and says, "I will do it!"

So they open the door to the cage. The drunk enters, walks over to the elephant and kicks him in the balls. The elephant sits down with a thump. The audience claps.

Next he goes into the lion's cage and they get into a fight, struggling, rolling over each other, the lion roaring, the man screaming... total chaos.

After thirty minutes he comes out of the cage all bruised and battered. The lion is inside, stretched out and panting exhaustedly. The drunk staggers over to the Master of Ceremonies and asks, "Well, where is that old lady whose hair I gotta comb?"

---

## Theologia Mystica

### Chapter #3

#### Chapter title: True Life

**13 August 1980 am in Buddha Hall**

Archive code: 8008130

ShortTitle: THEOLO03

Audio: Yes

Video: Yes

---

The first question

OSHO, CAN YOU PLEASE SING US A SONG ON THIS? LATELY I HAVE SEEN THAT I AM TOTALLY VICIOUS. SUDDENLY MY HEART THEN CARRIES ME INTO A VERY INSECURE BUT BEAUTIFUL PLACE. I LOVE THIS WHENEVER IT COMES, BUT WHY THE INSECURITY AND MUDDLEDNESS, YET SO MUCK GRACE?

Prem Pavitro,

LIFE is basically insecure. That's its intrinsic quality; it cannot be changed. Death is secure, absolutely secure. The moment you choose security, unknowingly you have chosen death. The moment you choose life, unawares you have chosen insecurity. Ais DHAMMO SANANTANO -- such IS the law of life, something which is inevitable. Try to understand.

The moment things are secure you will feel bored because there is no possibility of any exploration. That's why marriages create so much boredom. It is the same love affair which was such an adventure; once it becomes institutionalized as marriage it loses all joy, all dance, all poetry. It becomes very mundane, it becomes very routine -- but it is secure.

Love is insecure. One never knows the ways of love. When it happens it happens, when it disappears it disappears. You cannot do anything about it. Marriage is manageable. The law, the society, the public opinion, the morality, the religion, the fear of hell, the greed for heaven -- these are all props which keep marriage somehow alive. But it is not TRUE life.

True life is always moving from the known into the unknown. And the crossing point from the known to the unknown is what insecurity is all about. The moment you cross the boundary you feel insecure. With the secure, with the familiar you are bored; you start becoming dull. With the insecure, with the unknown, the uncharted, you feel ecstatic, beautiful, again a child -- again those eyes of wonder, again that heart which can feel the awe of things is there.

You would like to know these beautiful spaces with security, but that is not possible in the very nature of things. Nothing can be done about it. If you want beautiful spaces you have to start loving insecurity. And then a miracle happens: if you can love insecurity, its "insecurityness" disappears. If you know insecurity contains love, beauty, ecstasy, truth, God, then where is the insecurity?

Insecurity exists in your fear of the unknown, of the true, because you have lived in lies for so long -- you have lived in lies for centuries. Your collective unconscious is full of lies, and it goes on projecting those lies on the screen of the mind. Everybody has lived in fear because all the religions have exploited the natural instinct of fear in man.

Hence the invention of hell. Hell exists nowhere; it is the invention of the cunning priests, Christian, Hindu, Mohammedan, Jaina, Buddhist. They may differ in their philosophical systems but they don't differ in the basic exploitation: the exploitation of man's fear and greed. Fear and greed are two aspects of the same coin. And once you have become afraid, once a trembling has become part of your being, you start LOOKING for it. Even if it is not there you will have to invent it, to satisfy your collective unconscious.

David, a young apprentice barber, goes to his boss and says, "Mr. Snippet, I am not going to work here anymore. All your employees are anti-Semites!"

"Anti-Semites? Where did you get a silly idea like that from?"

"I have good proof. I made a test," the young man answered. "I asked everybody the same question. The conclusion could not be more clear, boss -- all anti-Semites!"

"But what was the question?"

"I asked them how they would react if there was a mass extermination of all Jews and all barbers."

"Barbers? Why barbers?" asked the boss.

"See, even you, boss!"

You go on carrying your ideas and you go on projecting them. You will find ways to invent. You cannot remain with a vague fear; you want it to be solid, tangible.

The insecurity is there because you have not been brought up with a right approach towards life, you have not been given any insight into the truth of insecurity. You have been simply made afraid. You have not been trained, disciplined for adventure. You have been told to remain within the boundaries and never to go beyond the boundaries.

A person who lives within the boundaries defined by others... of course they are defined by others because a child cannot define his own boundaries. Parents define boundaries out of their fear -- their parents have done the same to them; now they are doing the same to their children. This is how from one generation to another the diseases go on being transferred.

Each child hates the parents but pretends to love them. I can understand why he hates them, because the parents are poisoning him. He feels it in his guts, that they are destroying something tremendously significant. They are destroying his very life! -- but they are destroying it for his own sake. He cannot even revolt because he is so helpless.

It was thought in the past that the proletariat is the most exploited class; that was not true. Later on we found it is not the proletariat but the world of women which is the most exploited world. But now we are discovering even that is not true. The MOST exploited class and the most helpless is the class of small children. The child is so dependent on the parents. He HAS to listen to them;; he cannot say no. Inside his being he says no;; in his bones, in his blood, in his marrow he says no. But on the surface he has to go on saying yes just to survive. So he accepts the boundaries.

And when you have accepted certain boundaries for twenty, twenty-five years, that is one-third of your life and the most important one-third... You will never be so intelligent again, never so vital again, never so vulnerable again, never so innocent again, never so unconditioned again. These twenty-five years, the first third of life, are managed by people who are afraid, trembling, who are slaves. I am not saying they are doing harm to their children knowingly, intentionally. They are good people; their intentions are good, but their understanding is poor, almost non-existent. Otherwise every parent would help the child to go beyond the known.

That is the true function of a parent, the true function of a Master: to help you to go beyond the known, to make you a lover of the unknown, to help you to risk for the unknown, to make you a gambler rather than a businessman, to help you to be more poetic rather than more calculative. Then there will be no problem. The loving space and the insecurity of it -- both will be rejoiced by you.

The second question

OSHO,

I AM CONFUSED. WHEN YOU SPEAK OF DIONYSIUS, IS THE DIONYSIUS THAT YOU SPEAK OF: FIRST, THE ANCIENT GOD OF GREEK THEATER, OF GREEK MYTHOLOGY? SECOND: A BISHOP WHO IS UNRELATED TO THE THEATER GOD OR TO THE MYTHOLOGY? OR THIRD: A COMBINATION OF FIRST AND SECOND? I AM ALSO UNAWARE OF WHO THIS ST. TIMOTHY IS. COULD YOU FIND A WAY OF SHEDDING LIGHT ON MY CONFUSION AND LACK OF AWARENESS ON THIS SUBJECT?

ROBERT GRAVES, IN "THE WHITE GODDESS", WRITES THAT DIONYSIUS WRITTEN THROUGH A BACKWARD PROCESS IN ROMAN LETTERS SPELLS JEHOVAH. AND I HAVE BEEN INFORMED THAT THE IHVH TETRAGRAMMATON

OF JEHOVAH IS THE FIRE, AIR, WATER AND EARTH OF BUDDHA'S PARAMATMAN. COULD YOU COMMUNICATE WHAT YOU ARE AWARE OF ON THIS SUBJECT? THANK YOU.

Mel,

THE FIRST thing that I would like to say to you is: I am not at all concerned whether Dionysius ever existed or not! It does not matter. What matters is those beautiful sutras; whosoever has written them was an enlightened person. It certainly cannot be the Dionysius of Greek mythology, because mythological gods are not known to write letters and sutras. In fact, they don't exist at all! And he is not a combination of the mythological Dionysius and the bishop. And I had told you in the first lecture that he is the first Bishop of Athens.

But it seems you love to be confused. It happens to people who are very much interested in rubbish knowledge.

You say: I AM CONFUSED...

That is absolutely true. But I am not confused, I am absolutely clear. My interest is not history, my interest is not the world of facts, my interest is the revelation of truth. Whosoever this man was, he was a Buddha. The proof is intrinsic, it is in his words. Those words cannot be spoken by anybody other than one who has arrived.

This is the Eastern approach. The West thinks too much of history. History means time consciousness: whether this man existed or not, then when, then who his father and mother were, on what date he was born and when he died, and where the proofs are for all this.

You will be surprised to know that the East has never taken any interest in history, for the simple reason that history means time. Time means mind. When the mind stops, time stops. You may have sometimes felt it. When there is no thought in your mind, is there any time left? The procession of thoughts creates time.

This is the most fundamental insight of Albert Einstein's Theory of Relativity: that time is a flexible phenomenon, it depends on your moods. If you are happy time goes by fast, if you are miserable time slows down. If you are sitting by the side of a dying man the night seems to be almost unending -- it seems as if the morning is not going to happen at all. And if you are sitting by the side of a woman or a man you love, then it seems time has got wings; it is flying. Hours pass like minutes, days pass like hours, months pass like days.

As far as the clock is concerned it makes no difference whether you are joyous, sad, happy or miserable. The clock moves unconcerned with you. So there are two things to be remembered: clock time is one thing, totally separate from psychological time; psychological time is within you.

Einstein was not a meditator, otherwise his Theory of Relativity would have reached a higher peak. He only says: When you are joyous time goes fast, when you are miserable time slows down. A great insight, but had he been a meditator the world would have been immensely enriched because then he would have said one thing more: If you are absolutely without mind, just pure consciousness, time stops completely, disappears, leaving no trace behind.

Bertrand Russell has written a book, WHY I AM NOT A CHRISTIAN, and he has said many things, significant things. He has argued well against Christianity. One of his arguments is that Christians say that for your sins you will have to suffer in hell for eternity. Now this is absurd! How many sins can you commit in a single life? And Christians believe

only in a single life, a seventy-year life. How many sins can you commit? Can you commit so many sins that it can make it look justified, the eternal punishment? Forever and forever you will be in hell? There must be a limit because your sins cannot be unlimited.

Russell says, "I have counted all my sins. If I confess to one of the most hard-hearted magistrates, he cannot give me more than four and a half years' imprisonment. If he also includes my thoughts about committing sins which I have not committed, just thought about, if my dreams and thoughts are also included as if they were acts, then at the most the sentence can be doubled -- nine years. But more than that is absolutely absurd."

And I agree with him, but still I will say he has missed the point, totally missed the point. Logically he is right, but he has missed the point of Jesus' insight. When Jesus says hell is eternal he is really saying what Albert Einstein said twenty centuries later: that hell is so painful, it is such a misery, that it appears AS IF it is eternal. It is not eternal, but it appears eternal.

And to balance it you will have to look into Hindu mythology: heaven is momentary. Then you will be able to understand the whole point; then both sides of it are available to you. Hell seems to be eternal and heaven seems to be momentary. All your pleasure seems to be momentary. All the so-called mahatmas and saints go on saying this, that your pleasures are momentary. But pleasures are bound to be momentary; there is nothing wrong in it. If it is a pleasure it is bound to be momentary. But they go on thinking that there must be a pleasure which is eternal. That is impossible: no pleasure can be eternal and no pain can be momentary. When pain is there it appears eternal, and when pleasure is there it appears momentary.

Hence in the East we have a third term which is neither "pain" nor "pleasure": it is "bliss." Bliss is timeless; it is neither momentary nor eternal. It simply has no relevance to time. Time means history.

Now, Mel, what are you going to gain even if you come to know who this man Dionysius is? Will it in any way help your understanding of his statements? Will it help you to become awakened, to become a meditator? No, you will be lost in a jungle of words; you will not be able to come out of the jungle. Scholarship is such a jungle -- in fact the only jungle that has remained in the world; all other jungles have disappeared. But once you enter into it there is no end to it.

Now, you are not only concerned with Dionysius, you are also concerned with St. Timothy. And who told you that he was a saint? I had just told you that Timothy was a disciple of Dionysius and Dionysius was writing letters to him. These are his letters. Now you have imagined, you have invented that he is a saint. If he was a saint there would have been no need to write letters to him; it would have been absolutely futile. What is the point of saying the same things that he already knows?

I have heard:

One American and one Englishman were walking in a forest. One hour passed. The American was feeling very uneasy because the Englishman was completely silent. Finally the Englishman said, "Spring in the air!"  
And the American said, "Why should I?"

Now there is a possibility of some talk, some dialogue. But between two saints there is no possibility of any communication. Of course, there is a possibility of communion, but communion happens in silence, not through words.

I have not said that Timothy was a saint. He may have become one finally, but he was not. He was just a disciple and I don't know anything more about him.

In fact, these are irrelevant things that you have asked; it is not inquiry. You are full of borrowed knowledge. Behind you are so many people like Robert Graves and others. Now they have filled your mind with esoteric bullshit: that written backwards it becomes JEHOVAH... If you want bullshit I can create it! For example, Dionysius is known by his short name, Dennis, and Timothy must be known by his short name, Tim. And Timbuktu is made from Timothy's name -- St. Timothy. Timothy becomes Tim, Tim becomes Timbuktu. And then you go on... Then you can find your own ways -- what to do and what not to do. Esoteric nonsense is so easy.

And remember perfectly well that Buddha does not believe in any PARAMATMAN; it must be the invention of Robert Graves. Buddha believes in no God. Buddha is the most godly person and yet the most godless. He is one of the most beautiful phenomena that has happened on the earth: godless and godly together.

But you are living out of borrowed things, and this happens. When you live out of borrowed things you are bound to be confused.

An old man lived with his old woman in a very cold little town in the interior of Brazil. It was a freezing cold morning and the old man came out of his house dressed only in the top of his pajamas.

When his neighbor saw him he could not help asking, "Eh, Jose, what are you doing naked outside?"

"Well, yesterday I came out without my scarf and when I returned home my neck was stiff from the cold."

"And what has that got to do with now?" inquired the neighbor.  
"I don't know, Pablo. It was my wife's idea!"

Avoid others' ideas, otherwise you will look silly and you will behave silly! And don't be concerned with non-essentials.

A young boy and his Jewish grandmother were walking along the shore when a huge wave appeared out of nowhere, sweeping the child out to sea. The horrified woman fell to her knees, raised her eyes to the heavens and begged the Lord to return her beloved grandson. And lo! another wave reared up and deposited the stunned child on the sand before her.

The grandmother looked the boy over carefully; he was fine. But then she glared angrily up towards the heavens. "When we came," she snapped indignantly, "he had a hat!"

Avoid non-essentials. If you have lost the child, why be worried about the cap? If the cap is lost, nothing is lost.

All your questions are simply stupid. Don't misunderstand me -- when I say stupid I MEAN stupid!

The third question

OSHO, WHY SHOULD THERE BE A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MORAL AND LEGAL STANDARDS IN THE MATTER OF HOLDING ONE GUILTY?

V.D. Sangvai,

THREE words will have to be understood. One is "religion," or "spirituality," the second is "morality" and the third is "legality." Religiousness or spirituality has no moral ideas; it is beyond moral and immoral, it is beyond right and wrong. It has no conscience; it lives out of pure consciousness. There is a tremendous awareness, and one acts out of that awareness. Whenever some action arises out of awareness it is inevitably good.

But man lives in unawareness. Man's whole life is full of unawareness; he is almost like a robot. He sees and yet he sees not, he hears and yet he hears not. He is, but only in a literal sense, not really, not like a Buddha or a Christ or a Zarathustra or like Dionysius, Pythagoras, Heraclitus. No, he does not exist with that intensity, with that awareness.

Hence morality becomes almost a necessity; it is a substitute. When you can't get the real thing then it is better to have something unreal than not having anything at all, because man needs a certain code of behavior. If it flows out of awareness then there is no problem.

In England the rain was falling non-stop for days and the Thames was overflowing its banks.

The butler of an English lord comes into the library where Milord is enjoying his drink and reading his newspaper in front of the fireplace.

"Milord," he announces, "the Thames is flooding the street! "

Milord very calmly answers, "Thank you, Jeeves!"

After a few minutes the butler comes in again and announces, "Sir, the Thames has reached to the front door! "

"Very well, thank you, Jeeves," replies Milord without raising his eyes from the newspaper.

After half an hour Jeeves knocks at the door, opens it and standing aside announces: "Milord, the Thames!"

This is the way people are -- just living in a thick cloud of unconsciousness. Their life is not that of light but of darkness, and out of this darkness, confusion, smoke, what can you expect? They are bound to do something foolish, something wrong.

Unless everyone becomes a Buddha there will remain a need for some kind of morality. Morality is not something great; it is a poor substitute for religion. If you can be religious then there is no need for morality.

My emphasis here is on religion, not on morality, because I have seen the utter failure of morality. It HAS been in a way utilitarian -- it has helped people to live somehow with each other, not cutting each other's throats very violently. They cut, but they cut in indirect ways and they cut by degrees, not suddenly, and they cut in sophisticated ways. First they give you tranquilizers or drugs to make you unconscious so you don't feel much pain.

All political ideologies and religious ideologies are nothing but non-medicinal tranquilizers. The whole purpose is to make you live in sleep so you can be exploited, oppressed, enslaved, and still you will not be aware of what is happening to you.

Karl Marx is right in that sense, that "religion is the opium of the people." But by religion he means Christianity, Hinduism, Buddhism. He was not aware of the religion I am talking about, the religion of the Buddhas. He was talking about the organized, institutionalized religion. He was not talking about the alive experience of the enlightened ones. Because that

is not an opium, that is just the opposite of it -- it is full awareness.

Sangvai, you ask me: WHY SHOULD THERE BE A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MORAL AND LEGAL STANDARDS...

There is a difference between religious and moral standards. Religion means you live out of your consciousness. Morality means you live according to the highest standards the society has imposed upon you; it is not according to your own light. It is the maximum potential, the hope of the society that has been imposed on you. And the legal standard is the minimum.

The moral standard is the maximum, the highest expectation of the society, and the legal standard is the minimum expectation. "At least you should fulfill the legal. If you cannot rise up to the moral, then please fulfill the legal." The legal is the lowest limit and the moral is the highest limit, hence the difference. The difference is there.

There are many immoral things which have nothing to do with law. You may be doing many immoral things, but you cannot be caught legally because legality consists of the minimum, the lowest limit.

It is said that the good teacher is one who is able to explain what he is saying to the most stupid student in his class. If the most stupid one can understand him, then of course all the others will understand. Law thinks of the most stupid person, the most inhuman person, the one who is very close to the animal. Morality thinks of the most intelligent, the most human. Hence the difference between the two, and the difference will remain.

And I have reminded you of a third thing also: the spiritual standard. That is the highest, the transcendental, beyond which nothing exists. The Buddhas live according to the ultimate, the saints live according to the moral and the so-called citizens live according to the legal. These are the three categories of human beings.

It will be the most evolved society when there is only one standard, but that is only a hope. When there is only one standard, the spiritual, then there will be no need for any law, no need for any morality, no need for the state, for the magistrate, for the police, for the military. Almost ninety percent of our energy is wasted in this whole arrangement. If man can live according to his own light -- and that is possible only if he reaches to his innermost core through meditation -- then all this criminal wastage of energy can be stopped. The earth can become paradise itself, because if one hundred percent energy can become available to creativity, to art, to science, to music, to painting, to poetry, we can create for the first time a real society of human beings.

Right now the human being only LOOKS like a human being; deep down he is nothing but an animal masquerading as a human being. His humanity is not even skin-deep: just scratch him a little and immediately the animal comes out. The human being that we are living with, that we have lived hitherto, is concerned with such trivia that it can only prove his mediocrity; it cannot give us any hint of his intelligence.

Man goes on arguing about great things, but goes on living in a totally different way. His thoughts are very great; his life is very immature. In fact, he creates all those great thoughts to cover up his immaturity.

Four colleagues from the philosophy department of a university went to play golf. On the first tee they found a foursome of psychologists just about to tee off.

One of the philosophers quipped, "You fellows must really have a terrible time trying to play golf while you psych each other out!"

"At least we don't argue," one of the psychologists replied, "about whether or not the ball is really there!"

Our philosophers, our psychologists, our theologians, have remained abstract, talking about great things just to escape from the ugly reality.

My effort here is to help you to become aware of the ugly reality because to be aware of it will change its ugliness into beauty. Awareness is a miracle. Otherwise people go on in a long process of hair-splitting and they call it philosophy and they call it religion, metaphysics, spirituality. And they remain concerned with such stupid things.

In the Middle Ages in European countries the great the great theologians were concerned about a problem you will laugh at. And they worked on it for hundreds of years and thousands of books were written on it. "How many angels can dance on the point of a single needle?" It was a GREAT philosophical problem. You will laugh, but they were very serious about it.

You are serious about many things others will laugh at, your children will laugh at. Drop all philosophical, all abstract wastage of your intelligence. Become concerned with the truth.

The truth is: man is not even legal, what to say about moral? And if he is not even legal or moral he cannot understand religion. Religion remains still for the chosen few, for the courageous, for the intelligent.

And the so-called moralists, the puritans, are not really moral people, remember. H.G. Wells has said, "Moral indignation is jealousy with a halo." And he is right. The so-called moral people are not really moral; they are living a double life: on the surface moral, but in reality as immoral as anybody else or even more. Maybe their morality is there to hide their illegal activities. And everyone seems to be in the same boat. From the lowest laborer to the man who holds the highest post, the prime minister or the president of a country, it seems all are in the same boat.

Richard Nixon was a great man till he was caught. Now Jimmy Carter is getting into the same trap. His brother has been caught -- he has taken millions of dollars illegally from a country; he was lobbying for that country. And just the other day his son was caught doing the same thing, and also his sister. So now you can wait for the news -- any day his wife! And finally you will find that he was at the center of it all. And he must be at the center of it all; without him all this could not happen. So just as Nixon fell down from the world of being a great man through Watergate, Jimmy Carter is falling every day through "Billygate"! His whole smile has gone. In the beginning you could have counted his teeth; now that whole smile has disappeared.

It seems a man is moral only till he is caught. So the difference between the moral and the immoral is only that of being caught or not.

I had a very beautiful teacher in my high school days. He was a Mohammedan, a very loving person, and he was the seniormost teacher in the school, so he used to be the superintendent of all the examinations. And I loved the man for many things. The one thing that I loved him very much for was that before every examination he would come to us and would declare, "I am not against copying, stealing from others, bringing books in -- I am not against it at all. But if you are caught, then you will be punished! So, mind you, you should not be caught. Once you are caught, then I cannot forgive you, but if you can manage then with all my blessings you can do it!"

And then he would say, "I will give you five minutes to think. If you have brought any

notes, any books, anything, and you want to surrender them you can surrender them within five minutes. Or, if you decide otherwise, go ahead. But remember, if you are caught then you will not find a greater enemy than me. But I am not telling you not to do these things. I am simply telling you that I am here to punish you if you are caught."

I loved him. And many people would start taking out their notes and their books and they would surrender them. "This man is dangerous -- he is telling a truth! " But from him I learned my first lesson about what is moral and what is immoral. The difference is not much.

Sangvai is an additional judge in Poona, so naturally the question has arisen in him:

#### WHY SHOULD THERE BE A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MORAL AND LEGAL STANDARDS IN THE MATTER OF HOLDING ONE GUILTY?

In fact, to hold anybody guilty is wrong in itself. The guilty person is not guilty; he has been brought up in a guilt-ridden society. He is not totally responsible for it. To punish him is criminal.

Once Lao Tzu was made a magistrate. The Emperor of China, thinking him the wisest man of the country, persuaded him to become a magistrate, the highest magistrate of the country. But only one case was enough and he had to be dismissed, because in the first case it became clear to the Emperor and to everybody else that Lao Tzu was dangerous, because he gave six months' jail to a man who had been caught stealing red handed -- and he also gave six months' jail to the person in whose house he had been stealing! Nobody could understand what was the matter.

The Emperor called him: "Are you mad or something? Why have you punished the man who has been robbed of his money?"

Lao Tzu said, "That man has accumulated so much that it is natural that he will be robbed. He should be thankful that he is not murdered! In fact, I am not fair in giving them both a similar kind of punishment. The rich man needs a harder punishment than the poor man who is a thief, because the first crime has been committed by the rich man, not by the poor man. The poor man has done a secondary thing; his crime is secondary, it is not that important. "

If in a society people accumulate wealth, then a few people are bound to steal, are bound to become thieves out of necessity. Nobody is really guilty. The whole structure of the society is guilty, and the structure needs to be changed. But we punish individuals and we go on perpetuating the same structure which creates these crimes.

A radical change is needed. And even if you want to change the individual, punishment is not the way. He should not be made to feel guilty. In fact, he should be sent for psychological treatment; he needs treatment. He needs a little more awareness, a little more lovingness; he needs a little more meditateness. Sending him for a few months to jail or for a few years to jail is not going to help; it will simply confirm him as a criminal.

In five years of living in jail, what is he going to learn? He will find there master thieves, murderers and all kinds of criminals, and they will teach him the art -- in which he must have been lacking, otherwise why should he have been caught? He will come out of the jail more skillful in doing the same crime or maybe even bigger crimes.

I am against ALL punishment, I am against ALL imprisonment. Prisons should be transformed into hospitals, and people should be sent to centers of meditation where they can gain a little more awareness, a little more lovingness, a little more meditateness. They

should not be changed or punished or beaten -- these are ugly ways of taking revenge. This is not justice, this is social revenge! The society is vengeful towards the person because the person has not followed the society.

This whole society is rotten and all its systems are rotten. This whole society needs to be changed from the very roots. Its legal system, its political system, its so-called religious system -- they are all rotten, they are all wounds full of pus. The society needs a surgical operation.

And that's what we are trying to do here. Naturally, people are going to be against me, because what they have been thinking are very important things, what they have thought are great things, I am telling you are just junk, just stupidities.

An English lord visits his doctor. He neatly hangs up his umbrella and his bowler. Then he takes off his jacket, his shirt and his trousers, folding them very neatly and putting them on a chair. He then takes off his shoes and puts them straight under the chair. Then he takes off his underpants, folds them and puts them on the chair.

Standing at attention in front of the doctor he calmly tells him, "Well, as you can see, doctor, my left testicle hangs lower than my right one."

Smiling, the doctor replies, "Oh, but that is perfectly normal. You have nothing to worry about!"

"Oh, I'm not worrying, doctor," replies the man, "but don't you think it is a bit untidy?"

These are the people... completely asleep, snoring. They have to be awakened. They have to be shaken out of their habits. They have to be given a new birth.

Hence I say we don't need a better man, we need a new man. Betterment has gone on for centuries and nothing has happened. Now we don't need any better man -- enough is enough! Now we want a totally new man, discontinuous with the past. We want to begin again as if we are Adam and Eve, just now expelled from the Garden of Eden.

I want to start afresh, and it is always easier to make a new house rather than to renovate an old one. And this old house has been renovated so many times, and you go on renovating it, supporting it from this side and that, and it goes on collapsing. It goes on and on, again and again. Still you are not fed up with it. You want to go on living in it -- even if your life is in danger. And that's how it is.

Humanity has come to a stage where if we continue in the old ways, man is finished. There is only one hope: if we can start a new man from ABC, then only can humanity survive on the earth, otherwise not.

The fourth question

OSHO, I GIVE AN INCH, I GET A MILE. THE ICEBERG IS MELTING BIT BY BIT. BUT SOMETHING IN ME REFUSES TO ACCEPT THAT IT CAN HAPPEN TO ME.

Deva Mitta,

WE HAVE been brought up with the idea that we are not right, that something is essentially wrong with us, that we are not to be ourselves, that we have to become Jesus, Buddha, Mahavira. One thing certainly has to be avoided: that is becoming ourselves.

Nobody has ever told you to be just yourself, hence there is guilt. Everybody is feeling guilty. And whatsoever you do you will feel guilty. because basically you have been conditioned with the idea, poisoned with the idea, that you are wrong and out of you only wrong things can happen.

My approach is totally different. I declare to you that you are perfectly right, that nothing is wrong with you, that you are not to follow somebody else, that you are not to imitate anybody else, that you have to love yourself, trust yourself, that you have to live a life of freedom, a life of rebellion, a life of exploration.

And then miracles start happening. When they start happening, of course you cannot believe it because you had always believed that you are a very inferior kind of person, ugly. You have been told thousands of times that whatsoever you do is wrong. Each child is told every day -- and how many times! -- "What you are doing is wrong. Don't do it! "

A small child was asked at school, his first day at school, "What is your name?" He said, "My name? Johnny Don't! "

The poor child -- because it is always, "Johnny, don't! " so he thinks that is his name. Whatsoever he is going to do -- he wants to go out, he wants to play, he wants to sing -- it is always "No! " Slowly slowly he starts thinking of himself as basically wrong.

Religions help the idea that man is born in sin. Adam and Eve committed some wrong -- and I can't think what wrong they committed. Eating the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge cannot be anything wrong. And if there is anything wrong in it, why did God create that tree in the first place? And we say God is omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent. He should have known it before, that if he created this tree then Adam and Eve were bound to eat from the tree. The Garden of Eden had millions of trees, and God told Adam and Eve not to eat from THIS tree.

In fact, he had forbidden them two trees. One was the Tree of Knowledge and the other was the Tree of Life. It is strange! God should have known a little more psychology -- and it is not much psychology either -- that if you prevent somebody, if you make it an order, "Don't do it!" you challenge the person. It is good that Adam and Eve accepted the challenge. I am all for them. If I have to choose between God and Adam and Eve, I will choose Adam and Eve because they did the right thing. They rebelled, they disobeyed. They said, "Who are you to tell us what we should eat and what we should not eat?" They inquired, they adventured, they risked, they gambled -- courageous people. They gambled Paradise. They said, "We are ready to lose Paradise, but we cannot lost our freedom." They respected freedom more than Paradise itself with all its pleasures. They were not hedonists, they were truth seekers.

And the moment God came to know that they had eaten from the Tree of Knowledge he expelled them immediately, because now he was afraid they would eat from the Tree of Life.

And it seems the Devil who had come to them in the form of a snake was right. He had told Eve, "God is jealous, very jealous. He is afraid that if you eat from the Trees of Knowledge and Life you will be a god yourself. And he is very jealous, he is afraid of that. " And it seems the Devil was right. Otherwise what was wrong with eating from the Tree of Life?

But what God did, the original father, all the parents have been doing to their children since then. "Don't do this, don't eat that..." They go on destroying your integrity, they go on destroying your morale, they go on destroying your respect for yourself. They create a

self-condemnation in you.  
That's why, Mitta, you cannot believe.

You say: SOMETHING IN ME REFUSES TO ACCEPT THAT IT CAN HAPPEN TO ME.

You cannot accept it because it goes against your whole training, your whole upbringing. And I say to you, you are ENTITLED to miracles, it is your birthright. And exactly this is the law.

You say: I GIVE AN INCH, I GET A MILE.

Yes, exactly that is the law: you move one step towards truth and truth moves one thousand steps towards you. You take just a little risk and thousands of blessings shower on you. The existence is ready to make you enlightened any moment, only you are unwilling. And why are you unwilling? -- because you have been told that Jesus can be enlightened because he is the only begotten Son of God, Buddha can be enlightened because he is born in a special way; he is no ordinary human being. He comes from the beyond -- he is an AVATARA, an incarnation of God. How can you be enlightened? Krishna can be enlightened because he is born enlightened. You are born unenlightened and you are going to remain unenlightened. At the most you can hope to follow some enlightened one. But following is not much of a dignity, it is not a glory.

I say to you there is no question of following anybody. My sannyasins are not my followers. I am nobody's leader, nobody's guide, I am just a friend. I am sharing my insight with you, and I am grateful that you are allowing me to share it with you. You need not be grateful towards me at all. I am too overfull with my bliss, with my peace, with my insight -- I want to share it. It is like a cloud full of rainwater which wants to shower. It is like a flower full of perfume which wants to share its perfume with the winds, and is grateful that the wind accepts it, that it is not rejected.

It is a question of wrong upbringing. Each child hates his parents, is bound to. Slowly slowly he forgets it because repressed, very deeply repressed. And each society teaches you to respect your parents. Why? Why does each and every society teach the children to respect the parents? -- for the simple reason that they know that if the child is not taught to respect he will hate. Hate will come naturally, hence it has to be repressed by respect.

"Dad," says the little boy, "would you buy me a real gun?"

"Are you crazy, son? Where did you get such a silly idea?"

"Oh, come on, dad, I really want a gun!"

"Don't bother me now, son."

"But I want a real gun, a gun that fires real bullets. Please, dad, give me one."

"Look, Johnny, if you don't stop this I will have to punish you."

"Oh, but please, I gotta get one!"

The father is fed up. He stands up and screams at Johnny, "No! I am the boss here!"

The small boy interrupts, "Yeah! Now you are, but if you buy me a real gun..."

You say, Mitta: SOMETHING IN ME REFUSES TO ACCEPT THAT IT CAN HAPPEN TO ME.

It is such a great miracle that it is very natural that something in you rejects it. We have been fed with many stories of miracles, but nobody believes in them -- not even those who tell them, who teach and preach; even they don't believe in those miracles.

Those miracles that Christians go on thinking Christ did, and Jainas go on thinking happened in Mahavira's life, and Buddhists go on writing about as far as Buddha is concerned, are all inventions. And they have been invented to prevent the real miracle from happening to you. Let me repeat it: all these stupid miracles have been invented and propagated around the world simply to distract you from the real miracle that can happen to you.

Now what is the point of a Satya Sai Baba materializing a Swiss watch? Millions of Swiss watches are available everywhere! How is this going to enrich the world? And in fact, he should be caught by the police because he must have stolen it from somewhere. otherwise how can it be Swiss -- made? It would have been Sai Baba -- made! It is Swiss -- made. Either he has stolen it or he is deceiving you.

Once I was staying in Bombay. A Parsi woman came to me, an old woman, and she said to me, "Satya Sai Baba used to stay at my house, but now I have discovered two things about him. And when I tell people, people think I have gone made."

Now he was spreading a rumour that this woman was possessed by evil spirits, and that woman looked perfectly sane.

I said, "What are those two things?"

She said, "One is, the last time he came here, just out of curiosity when he was taking his bath I looked into his suitcases -- they were full of watches! Secondly, he always makes friends with small boys, so I became a little curious. I looked through the keyhole -- and he is a homosexual! Now I am telling people these two things and people think that I am mad. And both things are absolutely true! And he is spreading the news about me that 'She is possessed by evil spirits.'"

In fact, homosexuality is an ancient religious tradition. To put nuns separate and monks separate is to create homosexuality. It is natural; it is bound to happen.

And these watches... and people think miracles are happening. And Jesus walking on water... I don't think that he was so foolish as to walk on water. But these miracles have been told to you so that you can be distracted from the real miracle, so when the real miracle starts happening you cannot believe it. You can only believe in miracles if they are in stories, and Jesus is nothing but a story to you and Moses is a story.

Moses parted the ocean... I have been trying to part the water in my bathtub and I have not been able to yet! It is all nonsense. Every day for twenty-five years... and I close my eyes and I open my eyes, and it is the same!

It is sill; to believe in such things, but we have been brought up on these silly things.

A Brazilian is sitting by the side of the road with his cow. He sees a Porsche in the distance coming towards him. The driver is a big shot from the city. He stands up as the car draws closer and signals the driver to give him a lift. The Porsche stops.

"Give me a lift, senhor," he asks.

"But what about the cow?" says the driver.

"Not to worry, I will tie her to the back bumper."

"What!" exclaims the city slicker. "She won't keep up with this car."

"Oh, don't you worry about her, she'll be all right," drawls the Brazilian.

So off they go, the cow tied to the rear of the car. The city guy, wanting to have fun, accelerates the car to fifty miles an hour. He looks in the rearview mirror and there is the cow running along at the same speed as the car. He cannot believe his eyes... sixty, seventy-five, ninety, one hundred miles an hour and there is the cow right behind.

The driver, both amazed and puzzled, speeds up even more to one hundred and twenty miles an hour, and the cow is still there keeping up with him. When he gets to one hundred and fifty miles an hour he looks through the rearview mirror and notices that the cow is still running but her tongue is hanging out.

"Looks like your cow can't take it for much longer, " he says with relief to the Brazilian. "Her tongue is already hanging out."

"On which side of the mouth is hanging?" the Brazilian asks casually.

"The left side," says the slicker.

"So keep to the right, that means she is signaling to pass you!"

Such things happen in stories, in jokes, but not in reality.

Mitta, what is happening to you is something real. You can believe in fictions and you have forgotten how to trust reality. Watch what is happening, respect it, trust it, and it will deepen -- it will become vaster, it will become richer, it will gain many more dimensions to it. You are on the right track, but don't refuse to accept it because if you refuse to accept it then you stop, then you become closed.

Remain open and vulnerable to all the winds and the rain and the sun. Remain available to existence as such. To me, existence is God and there is no other God. And existence is each moment a miracle -- we have just become blind.

There are many kinds of blindness: Christian blindness, Hindu blindness, communist blindness, Buddhist blindness, and so on and so forth. Drop all these blindnesses. Become simple and ordinary. That's what my sannyas is all about. Listen and watch and see what is happening. And many more miracles are bound to happen, they will be following. If you allow, then you are on an unending journey, a pilgrimage that begins but never ends.

---

## Theologia Mystica

### Chapter #4

#### Chapter title: Mystical Unknowing

**14 August 1980 am in Buddha Hall**

Archive code: 8008140

ShortTitle: THEOLO04

Audio: Yes

Video: No

---

BUT TAKE HEED LEST THE PROFANE HEAR THOSE, I SAY, WHO CLING TO CREATURES,

AND IMAGINE IN THEMSELVES THAT NOTHING IS BEYOND BEING, BEYOND EXISTENCES, BUT SUPPOSE THEMSELVES TO KNOW HIM "WHO MAKETH DARKNESS HIS HIDING PLACE." IF, THEN, THE DIVINE MYSTERIES ARE BEYOND SUCH, WHAT SHALL BE SAID OF THOSE YET MORE PROFANE WHO CONCEIVE THAT THE UNDERLYING CAUSE OF ALL IN TERMS OF THE OUTWARD FORMS OF THINGS AND ASSERT THAT HE EXCEEDS NOT THESE IMPIOUS AND MANIFOLD CONCEITS OF THEIR OWN MAKING? INsofar AS HE IS THE CAUSE OF ALL THINGS, WE MUST NEEDS IMPUTE AND AFFIRM OF HIM ALL THEIR ATTRIBUTES; BUT IN SO FAR AS HE IS BEYOND AND ABOVE ALL, WE MUST NEEDS DENY THOSE ATTRIBUTES TO HIM ENTIRELY, YET NOT SUPPOSE THAT THIS AFFIRMATION AND DENIAL ARE CONTRADICTORY, BUT THAT HE HIMSELF IS BEFORE AND ABOVE ALL DENIALS, AND BEYOND ALL NEGATING AND IMPUTING.

AFTER THIS MANNER, THEN, THE BLESSED BARTHOLOMEW SAYS THAT DIVINE TRUTH IS BOTH MUCH AND VERY LITTLE, AND THE GOSPEL BOTH WIDE AND GREAT, AND YET BRIEF. THIS SEEMS TO ME A MARVELOUS INSIGHT, FOR THE EXCELLENT CAUSE OF ALL THINGS MAY BE REVEALED WITH MANY WORDS, WITH FEW WORDS, AND EVEN WITH NO WORDS, INASMUCH AS HE IS BOTH UNUTTERABLE AND UNKNOWABLE, BECAUSE BEYOND BEING HE STANDS ABOVE ALL NATURE. HE IS TRULY REVEALED WITHOUT COVERINGS ONLY TO THOSE WHO PASS ABOVE ALL THINGS IMPURE AND PURE, WHO GO BEYOND ALL CLIMBING OF SACRED HEIGHTS, AND LEAVE BEHIND ALL HEAVENLY LIGHTS AND SOUNDS, AND SUPERNAL DISCOURSES, AND ARE TAKEN UP INTO THAT DARKNESS WHERE HE TRULY IS WHO IS BEYOND ALL THINGS. FOR NOT UNMEANINGLY WAS THE BLESSED MOSES HIMSELF FIRST BIDDEN TO BE PURIFIED, AND THEN TO BE SET ASIDE FROM THE UNPURIFIED; AND AFTER ENTIRE PURIFICATION HE HEARD THE MANY-VOICED TRUMPETS, AND BEHELD A MULTITUDE OF LIGHTS GIVING FORTH PURE AND MANIFOLD BEAMS. AFTER HE WAS SET ASIDE FROM THE MANYFOLK, HE WENT BEFORE THE ELECT PRIESTS TO THE UTTERMOST PEAK OF SACRED HEIGHTS.

BUT THUS FAR HE HAD NOT YET CONVERSE WITH GOD HIMSELF NOR BEHELD HIM FOR HE IS WITHOUT ASPECT BUT SAW ONLY THE PLACE WHERE HE DWELLS. THIS I TAKE TO MEAN THAT THE MOST HEAVENLY AND LOFTY OF THINGS WHICH MAY BE SEEN AND KNOWN ARE NO MORE THAN CERTAIN IMAGES OF THINGS SUBORDINATE TO HIM WHO TRANSCENDS ALL. THROUGH THEM IS SHOWN HIS PRESENCE EXCEEDING ALL COMPREHENSION STANDING ON THOSE HEIGHTS OF HIS HOLY PLACES WHICH MAY BE KNOWN OF THE MIND. AND AT TIMES HE WHO IS SET FREE OF THINGS SEEN AND OF THINGS SEEING, ENTERS INTO THE TRULY MYSTICAL DARKNESS OF UNKNOWING, WHEREFROM HE PUTS OUT ALL INTELLECTUAL KNOWLEDGE AND CLEAVES TO THAT WHICH IS QUITE BEYOND TOUCH AND SIGHT -- THE ENTIRE ESSENCE OF HIM WHO IS BEYOND ALL. THUS THROUGH THE VOIDING OF ALL KNOWLEDGE HE IS JOINED WITH THE BETTER PART OF HIMSELF NOT WITH ANY CREATURE NOR WITH HIMSELF NOR WITH ANOTHER BUT WITH HINT WHO IS INWARDLY UNKNOWABLE; AND KNOWING NOTHING HE KNOWS BEYOND THE MIND.

A PHILOSOPHER walked into a bakery and ordered a delicious fruitcake to be made with extravagant decorations.

"I want a birthday cake," he said, "with 'Happy Birthday' written across the top. When could it be ready?"

"I can give it to you in twenty minutes, sir," answered the attendant.

When the philosopher returned twenty minutes later, the cake was ready. He looked long and carefully at it, took a step back to examine it more closely, then said, "Look, I really wanted it to be more decorative. Lots of color and icing-sugar swirls. And see here, instead of 'Happy Birthday' write 'One Thousand Happinesses!'"

"okay," said the confectioner, a little disappointed. "Come again in another half an hour and I'll have it ready."

Half an hour later the philosopher returned. The cake was ready and he examined it very closely. He stopped and thought for a while, then said, "Will you do this for me? Put even more flowers and swirls around the cake, and perhaps you could compose a longer message

for the top -- something like 'Congratulations! Lots of Love.' Would you do all that?"

The confectioner agreed and made all the modifications. A little time later the philosopher returned, scrutinized the cake and exclaimed, "Oh! Oh, yes! Now it is beautiful!"

"Can I wrap it for you, sir?" asked the confectioner, relieved.

"Oh no, thank you, that's not needed. I'll eat it here."

The philosophers, the theologians, the logicians are the most stupid people in the world! And it is unfortunate, very unfortunate, that a man like Dionysius has to speak in the words of Christian philosophy, theology and logic. A Zen Master would have said the same thing in a very different way, very clearly, without using so many unnecessary words and without using the name of God at all.

Dionysius is in a difficulty: he wants to talk like a Zen Master -- he knows nothing of Zen but he has the same insight, the same experience -- he wants to say things straight, he wants to call a spade a spade, but it is very difficult. If you want to survive in a Christian world, in a Mohammedan world, in a Judaic world, then you have to use their language. So he has to go round and round. He says exactly that which he wants to say but has to use vague words, camouflages, facades, to protect himself. And I think he did well, because it was more necessary to survive and give the message that he had found within himself than to be a martyr.

Thousands of people have been burnt by Christians. The people who talk about love, the people who talk about peace, the people who think that Jesus came into the world to give the message of love, brotherhood -- they have killed more people than anybody else. And all their bloodshed was only a question of words -- words became so important.

With foolish people it happens always: the reality fades away and words take its place. The word "God" becomes more important than the reality of God; the word "love" becomes more important than the phenomenon of love. Then they can kill each other for the word.

It is unbelievable that for thousands of years people have trusted in words so much -- as if the word "fire" is fire, as if the word "water" is water! When you are thirsty, the word "water" is not going to help. Of course, if you are not thirsty then there is no difference between the word "water" and water itself.

But the philosophers are not thirsty -- they are not thirsty for truth. They are really on great ego trips. They are not exploring that which is; on the contrary, they are fabricating, manufacturing systems of thought of their own, and trying to impose their thoughts on reality. Hence they never go beyond the mind. And mind is always mediocre, mind is never intelligent -- it cannot be by its very nature

Mind cannot by ANY process be made intelligent because mind means memory. Mind means a mechanism that accumulates past experiences. Mind means the known, and intelligence means exploration of the unknown -- and not only of the unknown: when the intelligence reaches to its ultimate flowering it enters into the world of the unknowable.

So please forgive Dionysius for his way of expressing himself -- that is Christian, but his message is absolutely universal. We will have to sort it out, we will have to put the Christian words aside.

Did you hear about the philosopher who went to the local Saturday night dance and noticed a shy girl in the corner? He went over and asked her to dance. They spent the rest of the evening together and when it was time to leave the philosopher said, "How about coming to my place?"

"Oh, I can't!" replied the girl. "I have my menstrual cycle."

"Oh, that doesn't matter," said the philosopher, "we can take my new Honda 500 and pick up your menstrual cycle in the morning!"

The people who live in words are really ridiculous!

A large swarthy Mexican sauntered into a Tijuana whorehouse. The madam greeted him cordially and directed him to the first room on the right. The man returned shortly, explaining that he couldn't do it. The madam asked what the problem was. WITH SOME EMBARRASSMENT the Mexican explained, "Because sheez my seezter."

Understandingly the madam directed him to the second door on the left. Soon he returned. Again he was shaking his head and saying, "I cood not do eet -- sheez my seezter."

A little embarrassed too by this time, the madam directed the man to the last room on the right. True to form he returned within a few minutes, eyes downcast, saying, "Theez lady too eez my seezter!"

Amazed and perplexed the madam now directed the man to the room of a fair-skinned, blond Swedish girl on the top floor knowing well that this could not possibly be his "seezter."

As soon as the man had disappeared into the room, she rushed to a secret peephole in the room's wall to watch. After a time and with more than a little hesitation the man finally dropped his drawers. Seeing his huge prick unfold to his knees the girl exclaimed, "Oh, brother!"

And that was the whole problem -- the word "brother! "

You will have to be a little patient with Dionysius. He is using the way of writing and expressing that Christian theologians are accustomed to. Ninety-nine percent of it could have been avoided, but that one percent is so precious that the unnecessary ninety-nine percent can be tolerated.

And if you know the history of Jews and the Christians and the Mohammedans, they all belong to the same root, to the same source. In the world there are only two religious traditions: one is Judaic, the other is Hindu. From the Judaic tradition came Christianity and Mohammedanism, and then their offshoots -- Catholics, Protestants, Shiahs, Sunnis, and so on and so forth. And the Hindu religion has two main offshoots: Jainism and Buddhism, and then their many smaller branches.

The difference between these two traditions is tremendous. The Judaic tradition is very wordy; it has remained confined to the world of the mind. Only once in a while a courageous soul has taken a jump into the beyond. If he was not careful enough he was immediately murdered, crucified, killed.

Dionysius was very cautious because of this fact. Hence he hides his diamonds behind ordinary pebbles and stones and rocks. He says:

BUT TAKE HEED LEST THE PROFANE HEAR...

HE IS writing to his disciple, Timothy: "TAKE HEED LEST THE PROFANE HEAR... Be very careful and cautious. If the profane hear the truth you will be in danger, unnecessary danger. "

And who are the profane? He says:

... THOSE, I SAY, WHO CLING TO CREATURES, AND IMAGINE IN THEMSELVES THAT NOTHING IS BEYOND BEING...

Christianity, Judaism, Mohammedanism, all three religions that were born outside India, have remained dualistic: they believe in God the creator, and the world, the created. This is their basic dualistic approach. To them God is like a painter or like a sculptor who sculpts or paints. By the time the painting is complete it is an independent thing. Even if the painter dies, the painting will remain. Once the sculptor has worked to his satisfaction he is no more needed. Then the statue, his art, can persist on its own. Now the existence of the creator is irrelevant.

You may have noted it or you may not have noted it, that God in the Judaic tradition created the world in six days and on the seventh day he rested. And nobody asks what he has been doing since then. Still resting? It seems to be such a long holiday, and after only six days' work! And now for eternity there is nothing to do...

This is not the Eastern approach. God is not thought of as a painter or a sculptor, God is thought of as a dancer, Nataraj. You must have seen the statues of Shiva dancing; that is the Eastern vision of God, as a dancer. What is the difference? The difference is great; the difference is immense and of tremendous Importance. You cannot divide the dancer and the dance -- there is no possibility of division -- the dancer is the dance, the dance is the dancer. In fact, at the peak of dancing the dancer completely disappears into his dance; he becomes the dance.

In the East, God the creator, and the world, the created, are not two phenomena but two aspects of one reality. The world is the dance and God is the dancer, and if the dancer stops even for a single moment the world will disappear. The dancer cannot go on a holiday.

Hence in the East nothing like Sunday has ever existed; it is a Western contribution to the East. There have been festival days, but they were not for resting, they were for dancing, for celebrating, for singing. They were not "off" days -- in fact you were more "on," more "turned on" on those days than on any other days.

It comes from the original vision of God not as a creator but as creativity. And remember again the difference: God is not the creator but creativity, God is not a person but energy, a presence. The Eastern insight has reached to the ultimate peak beyond which there is no possibility of improvement.

Dionysius wants to express the same truth; he has somehow stumbled upon it. But he advises his disciple, Timothy:

... TAKE HEED LEST THE PROFANE HEAR..

And by "profane" he means the so-called religious. He calls them profane because they are dualists. ANY kind of dualism is part of a profane mind. The sacred consciousness knows no duality, no division; it knows only one organic unity. The whole existence is one organic unity: God and the creatures are not separate.

But Christians have condemned it very much -- they call it paganism. If you think everything is divine you are a pagan, you are very primitive; you have not yet risen to a sophisticated vision of the world, you are still living in a childish attitude. It is not a childish attitude. It is childlike but not childish. And it is childlike in the same way as Jesus says, "Unless you are like small children you will not enter into my kingdom of God." It is not

primitive -- it is simple, but not primitive. It is clear, very clear, but it is not primitive. It is, in fact, the highest expression of religiousness.

Dionysius says those people are profane who think in terms of duality, who divide existence into the creator and the creatures, and who cling to the creatures.

Now Christians cannot believe that you are gods. To declare oneself a god is sacrilege, it is a sin. Even Jesus says it in roundabout ways, not directly, not like the Upanishadic seers: "AHAM BRAHMASMI, I am God" -- not so directly. Jesus says, "I am the Son of God, and the Son and the Father are one." This is a roundabout way. Why not say, "Aham BRAHMASMI, I am God"? Why go in such a roundabout way: "I am the Son of God" -- using a very anthropocentric language, making God a father and yourself a son, creating the idea of a holy family? And the family is one of the unholy things on the earth! Now Jesus is projecting it onto the ultimate reality and then, by the back door, he asserts the truth: "I, the Son, and God, the Father, are not two." But it has become so diluted. It loses the sharpness of AHAM BRAHMASMI or Al-Hillaj Mansur's ANA'L HAQQ. ANA'L HAQQ means "I am the ultimate truth." These are direct statements.

But Christians condemn this directness. They will call these statements egoistic, they will call these statements pagan. The East says that everything is divine. The smallest leaf of grass is as divine as the greatest star, because nothing exists other than God. Existence becomes synonymous with God.

Dionysius says to Timothy, "Beware of the profane." He calls, in fact, all the Christians profane, all the Jews profane; he does not call them religious. He says these are the people "who cling to creatures," who go on saying that "We are creatures and we cannot be gods and we cannot be creators."

That is sheer nonsense. You are creators and you are creatures -- both. And you know it every moment. that you can exist either as a creature or as a creator. Whenever you are in a state of uncreativity you are a creature. But you know moments of creativity: in those moments you are not a creature, your hidden aspect surfaces. When you paint and you forget yourself completely in your painting, then are you a creature? When you sing and the song possesses you, are you a creature? When you love and love so totally that you are dissolved into it, are you a creature? You have all known moments when you are a creator. You have known moments when you know you can do miracles. You know there are moments when all the secrets of magic are in your hands -- you can transform dust into gold.

There is not a single human being so poor that he has never tasted something of it. He may not believe it, he may reject it, he may close himself to the experience, he may even try to forget all about it, he may think he has been imagining, dreaming. But these windows open once in a while.

To open these windows deliberately is meditation. When they open of their own accord you are not the master. Yes, watching a beautiful sunset you may feel something of the creator in you, but you are not the master. Seeing a bird on the wing you may become so one with the bird that you forget that you are on the earth, you are in the sky. But you are not the master of it. Meditation makes you a master of it.

But these profane people go on claiming that they are religious, and they are not religious. The world is full of pseudo-religious people. If you want to know how many pseudo-religious people there are you can count the Christians, the Mohammedans, the Jainas, the Hindus, the Buddhists, the people who go to the churches and the temples and the mosques and the gurudwaras. These are all pseudo-religious; they have nothing to do with truth. They are not interested in truth -- in fact they are afraid of truth. They are believers but not religious.

A believer is never a religious person, and a religious person is never a believer. A religious person knows; the believer only believes. And why should one believe at all unless there are some hidden motives? Either people are afraid of hell... They have been made afraid; their fear has been exploited for centuries. Priests became aware of the phenomenon, that man lives by two things, either fear or greed. And not only priests: the politicians, the pedagogues, they are all using the same strategy.

When a child is not behaving according to you, you punish him. What are you doing? You are exploiting his fear. You are making him afraid that if he is going to do the same thing again he will be punished, maybe more severely. And when he behaves according to you, the way you want him to, you reward him. That is exploiting his greed. The same is the structure of all educational systems in the world: punish and reward.

When I passed my post-graduate examinations, it happened accidentally, just accidentally, that I got the medal, the gold medal. It was a pure accident because I had never tried for it -- a sheer coincidence. My professors were puzzled, the whole university was puzzled, because nobody had ever thought that I would top the list. I myself was puzzled.

I went to the head of my department, Dr. Saxena, and asked him, "What is the matter? What has gone wrong? How come I have got the gold medal?"

He said, "We are all puzzled, because you were never present in the classes. Just because we love you we allowed you to enter the examinations, and we were afraid that you would not do all the papers."

He used to come to pick me up every morning so that he could see with his own eyes that I entered the examination hall; then he would leave. He was afraid I might not go, because that was my usual routine: to go to sleep at three o'clock in the night and then get up somewhere around nine, ten, eleven. And the examination used to be between seven and ten. By quarter to seven I had to be in the examination hall, and he was naturally afraid.

Finally we found out how it happened. One very famous philosopher, Dr. R. D. Renade -- he was the head of Allahabad University -- always liked very short answers and to the point. And I never used three hours; not on one single day did I use the whole three hours to answer -- within one hour I would be finished. I would simply write maxims.

In his whole life Professor Renade had not given anyone one hundred percent marks. He loved, not what I said, but more than that the way I said it. I answered the whole question in a single paragraph, or maybe just a small parable and no answer -- he had to understand the parable -- or just a joke. He must have laughed and enjoyed and become so happy with me that he gave me one hundred percent marks. That's how, accidentally, it happened.

When I was given the gold medal, the first thing I did was to go to the university well and throw it in there. A crowd gathered and they said, "What are you doing?" I said, "I don't believe in punishment and reward. To carry this gold medal with me is to respect the system, the whole stupid structure."

Reward people or punish people: this has been our whole way of life for centuries. The governments do it, the courts do it, the teachers do it, the parents do it. And the people who go to the mosques and the temples and the churches are the people who are either afraid of hell or desiring and greedy for heavenly pleasures.

One morning a man goes to the Vatican and inquires about the Pope's health. The Swiss guards answer that the Pope's health is very good.

The following morning the man is there again to inquire about the Pontiff's health. The Swiss guards reply that it is excellent.

This goes on for so many days that the astonished guards praise the man for his concern, which shows how good a Catholic he is.

But the man replies, "You see, I went to the doctor who said that my health is very poor and that I have to be careful -- cannot smoke or drink. And when I asked him about women he said, 'Oh well, just once every time a pope dies!' "

So you never know why people are going to the church or to the temple or to the mosque. Just by seeing them going there and praying there. don't be deceived, don't think that they are religious. Either they are afraid of hellfire or they are interested in heavenly pleasures.

And let me tell you a secret: hell is not so bad. In fact now it is all air-conditioned! It is no longer the same world. Where can you find petrol and kerosene to continue the hellfire? It is all finished! And so many scientists have reached there that they have all made it as technological, as sophisticated as possible. In fact, heaven is in a far worse situation than it has ever been, because what can these stupid saints do? Things have changed -- the wheel has moved. Now if you want to go anywhere, go to hell. And if you follow me you can be certain that you will reach there. I can assure you only of one thing: see you in hell! Heaven is no longer worth it.

In heaven one day the Holy Mary and St. Joseph were talking. "It is time, Joseph, for me to go into the world and find out how strong the people's faith is in Christianity. "

"Very well," said Joseph, "but you must call me on the hotline every evening so I know how you are doing!"

Mary agreed and left for earth that night. The first evening the telephone rang in heaven and it was Mary.

"Joseph," she said, "I am in Poland now. The faith is strong here, although it is a little subversive, and the devotion to me is great!"

The second evening the phone rang: "Joseph, I am in Italy. It is fantastic, and they say that in Brazil it is even better! "

On the third evening: "Hello, Joseph, I am in Holland now. The faith in my son is good, but with so many Protestants the devotion to me is low."

The fourth and fifth evenings there was no call. St. Joseph was puzzled and worried. He asked all the incoming souls whether they had seen the Holy Mary, but nobody had.

Finally after three more days the hotline rang. Joseph ran excitedly to answer it, picked up the receiver and cried, "Hello, Mary, hello, is that you?"

After a moment of silence a soft, foxy voice on the other end of the line replied, "Hello, Jojo, mon amour, is that you? Mimi calling -- I am in Paris!"

Avoid heaven -- it is very old -- fashioned! But the people in the religious places are still hankering for it, either out of fear or out of greed, which are two aspects of the same coin. It is good that Dionysius calls them profane. These profane people:

... IMAGINE IN THEMSELVES THAT NOTHING IS BEYOND BEING...

Now Dionysius wants to say something like Gautam the Buddha. He wants to say the truth of ANATTA, non-being, but how to say it in a Christian way? It is difficult, very

difficult; he has to be very subtle. Buddha could say it directly, that being is our invention, being is nothing but ego projected on higher planes. Existence is egoless, beingless; it is transcendental to being and non-being. You cannot say it is this or that: neither this nor that, NETI NETI -- you can only say that. Or, the best way is not to say anything at all, to be silent, because only silence can say something about it. The moment you use a word you falsify the truth, because no word can contain the whole truth; every word can contain only one aspect of the truth at the cost of other aspects. And that is not right for those who are enlightened, who know the truth in its totality.

But Dionysius finds a way. He says:

These people think, THAT NOTHING IS BEYOND BEING, BEYOND EXISTENCES, BUT SUPPOSE THEMSELVES TO KNOW HIM "WHO MAKETH DARKNESS HIS HIDING-PLACE."

He has to bring in scriptures to support him. He uses those scriptures in his own way -- he has to. It is like a Zen monk, a Zen Master, writing a Christian treatise. The ancient scriptures say God MAKETH DARKNESS HIS HIDING-PLACE. If that is true, Dionysius says, then how can these stupid people claim to know him? If he is hiding, how can you know him? All your knowledge is pretentious. And you say you know him AS IF he is a person, as if he is a being.

There have been thousands of Christians who believe that they have seen Jesus, who believe they have seen the Holy Ghost, who believe they have seen God the Father -- not only seen but talked with him, received messages from him.

Just the other day somebody wrote me a question about one of the disciples of Shivananda. He is well known in America, in Europe -- Vishnu Devananda is his name. Up to now he has been claiming that he goes on receiving messages from his late Master, Shivananda. Only recently he has confessed that somebody in his own organization was deceiving him, giving him messages as if they were coming from the late Master, Shivananda.

In the first place Shivananda was not a Master at all; he was only a teacher and a very ordinary teacher, a third-rate teacher. He was talking old rubbish. But a man like Vishnu Devananda who is worshipped by thousands of people in Europe and America -- particularly in Spanish countries he has a great following -- he can be deceived by someone in his own organization. Somebody was playing tricks on him. And these tricks are not new.

Madame Blavatsky used to play the same trick upon the Theosophists, and great Theosophists like Colonel Olcott and others were deceived. It was found out only later on that she had managed it through a servant; a servant used to hide on the roof. Just think... the roof of Buddha Hall and a sannyasin hiding there, and in the middle of the discourse a letter drops! And Madame Blavatsky used to claim that these letters had come from divine Masters, particularly from Master K. H., Kuthumi, who is the head of all the Masters, who is a direct mediator between God and the earth. Only later on did the servant confess before the court that he was hiding on the roof where there was a small place from which to drop the letters, and those letters were written by Madame Blavatsky herself. And then the experts on writing found out that that was true -- all the letters were written by Blavatsky herself.

Now somebody in Vishnu Devananda's own organization has been deceiving him for years. But these are the foolish people...

One of the very famous Americans, Baba Ram Dass, was deceived for one year

continuously by a woman who said that she was delivering messages from Ram Dass's late Master, Neem Karoli Baba. And the messages were not just ordinary messages -- tantric messages, "The Master has said make love to me!" So Baba Ram Dass was making love to the woman, and for one year continuously it went on. It seems people want to be fooled!

There are people who want to be fooled, there are people who are ready to be fooled. This world is full of such people, and they have been thought religious, esoteric, occult -- all kinds of beautiful names have been given to these fools.

It is good that Vishnu Devananda has confessed that somebody in his own organization was deceiving him, but what does it show? It shows one thing: that Vishnu Devananda is a fool. If somebody in his own organization, his own disciple can deceive him, then what integrity has he got and what consciousness? He should drop being a Master, he should stop initiating people. He has lost all right to.

In the name of religion so much stupidity has happened in the world that if religion disappears as it is, man will be immensely benefited.

Just the other day I was reading that in Arabian countries at least one thousand women are killed every day, for SMALL things; just the suspicion is enough. If the husband suspects that the wife is having some relationship with somebody -- and can you find a husband who does not suspect, or can you find a wife who does not suspect? -- then that is enough reason to kill the woman. And Islamic law allows it; it is not murder. You are killing your own woman, your own wife -- it is like destroying your own chair! Who can prevent you? It is your own chair. You can burn your bicycle -- so you have burnt another menstrual cycle! So what is wrong with it? Thousands of women are killed every day, in the twentieth century, in the name of Islamic law. We have not really evolved; we are still as primitive as we have ever been.

Dionysius says:

IF THEN, THE DIVINE MYSTERIES ARE BEYOND SUCH...

These people who call themselves religious, divine mysteries are beyond them.

... WHAT SHALL BE SAID OF THOSE YET MORE PROFANE WHO CONCEIVE THE UNDERLYING CAUSES OF ALL IN TERMS OF THE OUTWARD FORMS OF THINGS, AND ASSERT THAT HE EXCEEDS NOT THESE IMPIOUS AND MANIFOLD CONCEITS OF THEIR OWN MAKING?

There are two types of people according to Carl Gustav Jung: the extrovert and the introvert. The introverts become religious, the so-called religious. I don't mean really religious, just the so-called religious -- these are the introverts. They believe in the reality of God as a person, in the reality of the self, in being, and they believe in thousands of other things. One can imagine anything and if you imagine it strongly you will experience it. Believe it and you will know it, but it is not a truth; it is your own belief which has auto-hypnotized you.

And the extroverts are the materialists, the atheists, the communists. They believe only in the things that they can see, that they can observe; they believe in the objective reality. Scientists are extroverts; they believe in the objective world, in the material world. And the so-called religious people are introverts; they believe in the self, in God, in angels, in Kuthumi, in archangels, and all kinds of nonsense.

The really religious person is neither extrovert nor introvert. He transcends these

divisions. and in transcending these divisions he disappears, evaporates. He is, but no longer a self, no longer confined in any ego. The ego was just like an egg -- it has broken. The bird has flown into the sky, into the beyond.

INSOFAR AS HE IS THE CAUSE OF ALL THINGS WE MUST NEEDS IMPUTE AND AFFIRM OF HIM ALL THEIR ATTRIBUTES...

This is how Dionysius has to go through this tortuous language.

INSOFAR AS H IS THE CAUSE OF ALL THINGS WE MUST NEEDS IMPUTE AND AFFIRM OF HIM ALL THEIR ATTRIBUTES...

Of course, God has to be given all the attributes of the manifested things.

... BUT INSOFAR AS HE IS BEYOND AND ABOVE ALL WE MUST NEEDS DENY THOSE ATTRIBUTES TO HIM ENTIRELY YET NOT SUPPOSE THAT THIS AFFIRMATION AND DENIAL ARE CONTRADICTORY BUT THAT H HIMSELF IS BEFORE AND ABOVE ALL DENIALS AND BEYOND ALL NEGATING AND IMPUTING.

Just as there are extroverts and introverts, there are people who are positivists and there are people who are negativists. VIA AFFIRMATIVA and VIA NEGATIVA these have been the two paths of people to inquire into reality. But if you accept a certain standpoint from the very beginning, you miss.

The real inquirer starts his inquiry without any prejudice, without any A PRIORI; he starts his journey with knowing nothing, believing nothing. He does not believe, he does not disbelieve. He is not negative, he is not positive. He is not extrovert, he is not introvert. He simply says, "I don't know" -- AGNOSIA. He starts from a state of not-knowing, and only through that state of not-knowing does he come to know. But he cannot claim knowledge, never, because to claim knowledge is to claim ignorance. To say "I know" implies two things: that "I am," which is not true, and it implies another thing, that "There is something to know which is separate from me."

The moment you say "I know" you have accepted three things: the knower, the known and the knowledge that exists between the two. You have divided the world into a trinity, and the world is one. There is no knower, no known, no knowledge -- or, the knower is the knowledge and the known too.

Dionysius says: Remember, God is beyond affirmation AND negation. He simply is. And all that you have conceived of him is your own imagination. Drop your imagination if you want to know that which is. Truth cannot be known through imagination, it can only be known through meditation.

His word for meditation is AGNOSIA a beautiful word: a state of silent not-knowing.

AFTER THIS MANNER THEN THE BLESSED BARTHOLOMEW SAYS THAT DIVINE TRUTH IS BOTH MUCH AND VERY LITTLE...

He has to quote the authorities, the authorities of the Church, to make it clear that he is not trying to say anything individual, that he is simply following the tradition.

This has never been expected in the East. Everybody has been given the right to say whatsoever he feels like saying. There is no need to get affirmation from the past. Buddha

never says, "What I am saying is right because it is said in the Vedas too."

I myself say to you that whatsoever I am saying I am saying on my own authority. If some scriptures agree with it, it is good for those scriptures; if they don't agree with it it is unfortunate for THEM. BUT I AM not producing any evidence. I myself have experienced something, I am an eye-witness, and truth needs no proofs.

But this has not been so in the West for centuries; people had to give supports. Individual freedom has not existed in the Church. And this is strange, because Jews killed Jesus because he was speaking on his own authority. And Christians have been doing the same -- they have not learned a single thing, they have not understood Jesus at all.

Jesus is an individual assertion of truth. He says again and again, "It is said by other prophets, 'Do this,' but I say to you something else, totally different." He was speaking on his own authority. Experience always speaks with that quality. It is not authoritative, remember, but it speaks with authority because it knows, it has experienced. But the Christian Church has not allowed such things, hence Dionysius quotes authorities.

He says:

... THE BLESSED BARTHOLOMEW SAYS THAT DIVINE TRUTH IS BOTH MUCH AND VERY LITTLE...

It is true. It is so much that you cannot exhaust it; you can go on talking about it, but you cannot exhaust it. Buddha spoke for forty-two years continuously, still the message was incomplete. Mahavira spoke for forty years, still the message was incomplete. It cannot be complete -- no message can be entire because the truth is so vast. And yet it is very little -- you can write it on a postcard or even the postcard may be too big. It is so vast that millions of words cannot express it and it is so brief that even silence is capable of speaking it.

... AND THE GOSPEL SAYS IT IS BOTH WIDE AND GREAT AND YET BRIEF THIS SEEMS TO ME A MARVELOUS INSIGHT FOR THE EXCELLENT CAUSE OF ALL THINGS MAY BE REVEALED WITH MANY WORDS WITH FEW WORDS AND WITH EVEN NO WORDS...

THE best is with no words, but where to find people who can understand no words?

One of the most significant philosophers of this age, Ludwig Wittgenstein, says, "Do not say that which cannot be said." He is right, because saying that which cannot be said is dangerous. It is bound to be wrong, it is falsifying. It is exactly what Lao Tzu says, "Truth cannot be said. The moment you say it you falsify it." But Lao Tzu said it, and Wittgenstein could not control either.

The Upanishads say: "Those who know, they are silent, and those who do not know, they speak." But the Upanishads are saying it, so where to put the Upanishads? Socrates says: "I know only one thing, that I know nothing." But that one thing he knows, and that one thing contains all.

It is true that if it can be said without words that is the best, but who will understand it?

There is a beautiful story about Mahavira. When he became enlightened, seven days he spoke without words -- but who will understand without words? Only a few gods who had come to see this miracle, that had happened on the earth, only they could understand. But it was almost useless, because they knew it already anyway. What he was saying they could only nod their heads to. They could say, "Yes, it is right."

Then Mahavira had to speak in a language that could be understood by mortal human

beings. But his message was so condensed -- he was a lover of maxims. He wouldn't elaborate, he wouldn't explain; he would simply assert without any explanation. So only very few very evolved human beings could understand him and they became his interpreters, his GANDHARAS. He would speak to those eleven persons and then those eleven persons would go and speak to others.

Finally he decided that that too was not right, because the moment he said something it was falsified immediately -- it was no longer as beautiful as it was in silence. Then those GANDHARAS, those eleven interpreters, would hear; something more was lost because what THEY heard, they heard according to themselves. And when these GANDHARAS said it to the ordinary masses, something again was lost because they used THEIR language; they could not use Mahavira's language. And when the masses heard it, it was almost something totally different than what was said by Mahavira. So finally he had to speak directly.

All enlightened Masters would have liked to speak through silence, but where are people who will understand it? Then they have to speak the language of the people, and they have to prepare the people slowly so that one day they can understand the silence too.

That's what I am trying to do here: I am talking to you continuously only in order to help you one day to sit in silence with me. Nothing will be said, nothing will be heard: all will be said, all will be heard.

... INASMUCH AS HE IS BOTH UNUTTERABLE AND UNKNOWABLE BECAUSE BEYOND BEING HE STANDS ABOVE ALL NATURE. HE IS TRULY REVEALED WITHOUT COVERINGS ONLY TO THOSE WHO PASS ABOVE ALL THINGS IMPURE AND PURE...

He is inserting tremendously great truths into the Christian jargon. Buddha would have said simply, "Go beyond good and bad." That's what I have been telling you: that morality and immorality are very ordinary things. My sannyasins have to transcend both. It is better to be moral than to be immoral, but to go beyond both is just far out!

The moral person is a good citizen. He does not harm people or at least he harms only minimally, only when it is absolutely necessary. The immoral person harms others; he will not miss any opportunity to harm others. But the moral and immoral, both remained concerned with the other.

The religious person is one who forgets the other and dissolves into his own innerness, into his own interiority. When you are alone in your interiority, where is the question of being moral and immoral? The question arises only when you relate with others; the question is of relationship. But when you are absolutely alone you are amoral.

But Dionysius could not say it directly because the whole Christian attitude is moralistic, puritanistic: Do good, be good! Christians have created so many do-gooders that no other religion has been able to do as much mischief as Christians have done. These do-gooders are the most mischievous people in the world. They don't listen to you, whether you want good to be done to you or not; they go on doing it. They say, "We will do it, we have to do it.

This is our duty, our moral duty. This is God's commandment!" They go on forcing their idea of good on others.

When I used to travel in India, for twenty years continuously, I came across many things. In India people have the idea, particularly the villagers -- and eighty percent of India consists of villages -- that if you see a saint you earn tremendous virtue, PUNYA merit, and you will be rewarded greatly in heaven, so you have to serve a saint. Now whether the saint wants to

be served or not, that is not the point at all! So many times I had to force people to go out of my room because they wanted to serve me. And "service" in India means they will massage your feet... I would say, "But I want to sleep!"

And they would say, "You can sleep, but you cannot prevent us from serving you. Otherwise how are we going to earn merit?"

They would force themselves upon me.

It is out of those twenty years of experience that in my ashram you see guards -- because the people have served me so much, I am tired of it! They would start massaging my body and I would say, "I don't like massage at all!" But that is not the point, that is irrelevant, whether you like it or not. In the middle of the night, somebody would enter the train at a station and start serving me. I would be fast asleep -- he would wake me up. He would say, "You can rest, but the train is going to stay here for one hour, so I did not want to lose this opportunity." And for one hour I had to suffer! They would go on doing whatsoever they wanted to do.

In Rajasthan one woman who was worshipped almost like a saint used to come to see me, and of course a saint has to be served. But she had her own ways of serving. She would bring many mangoes -- if it was the time for mangoes, a bucketful of mangoes -- and she would force those mangoes on me. And I had just tasted one mango when it would be passed on, because she had at least fifty followers always following her. It had become prasad it had become a great gift. Now another mango had to be forced on me so that became PRASAD then the third mango... all my clothes would become wet with mango juice. But who was concerned with me? -- they were earning their merit.

And people ask me why there are guards! You cannot imagine what would happen to me if there were not guards -- you cannot imagine! Those twenty years I have suffered so much... In a way that suffering has been good: through that suffering I am finished with all my past karmas! But now there is no more left so I don't want any more service done to me.

Christians live with the idea of right and wrong, shoulds and should-nots, impure and pure. And Dionysius wants to take them beyond it, like Sosan: NEITHER THIS NOR THAT. He says:

HE IS TRULY REVEALED WITHOUT COVERINGS ONLY TO THOSE WHO PASS ABOVE ALL THINGS IMPURE AND PURE WHO GO BEYOND ALL CLIMBING OF SACRED HEIGHTS...

Because even if it is a sacred height it is an ego trip. Those who become absolutely ordinary... That is the Zen standpoint: to be absolutely ordinary, to be a nobody. That's how I define my sannyas: to be a nobody. But a Christian saint is somebody, he is not a nobody; he has reached to the sacred heights. And Dionysius wants to say that that too is the subtlest ego, far more dangerous than the gross one. Those who have stopped and gone...

... BEYOND ALL CLIMBING OF SACRED HEIGHTS AND LEAVE BEHIND ALL HEAVENLY LIGHTS AND SOUNDS...

Remember it, because when you enter inside you will hear beautiful music, you will see beautiful lights. You have no idea of how much beauty exists in the interiority of your world. But go beyond them.

... AND SUPERNAL DISCOURSES...

You will hear voices so sweet, so honey-sweet, that you will believe they are from angels, from God. But they are all from your own mind. The last strategy of the mind is to create what you are seeking, to make available imaginary plastic things instead of the real ones you are searching for, to give you toys to play with. Don't be deceived by them. Go beyond all.

... AND ARE TAKEN UP INTO THAT DARKNESS WHERE HE TRULY IS WHO IS BEYOND ALL these THINGS.

God is beyond all purity and impurity, right and wrong. God is beyond ALL that you can conceive. That is the meaning of Dionysian darkness. Darkness has many beautiful things about it. When it is light you can make distinctions: "This is beautiful, that is ugly. This is right, that is wrong. This is a man, that is a woman." But when it is darkness all distinctions are lost: you don't know who is who, what is what. Darkness dissolves all distinctions -- darkness is a state of non-distinctions. Light is always shallow, darkness has depth. Light is always momentary -- it depends on certain fuel.

Even the sun is going to die one day -- the scientists say that perhaps after four million years, because its fuel is being used every day, twenty-four hours a day; one day it is going to be exhausted. Many suns have died before; this sun cannot live forever. It has a lifespan, just as the candle burns, slowly slowly, and by the morning it is gone.

All light is momentary, but darkness is eternal because it needs no fuel. It simply is. It is independent; it has no cause. Hence darkness has some symbolic meaning which comes very close to the existence of God.

FOR NOT UNMEANINGFULLY WAS THE BLESSED MOSES HIMSELF FIRST BIDDEN TO BE PURIFIED...

DIONYSIUS has to go through all this unnecessarily. I feel sorry for the man. I have a deep love for the man, and many times reading his statements I have wondered... It must have been an accident that he was born in the West; he belonged to the East. In the East he would have flowered fully. There would have been no need to hide the way he is doing here. Now he brings in Moses. He says:

FIRST MOSES WAS BIDDEN TO BE PURIFIED AND THEN TO BE SET ASIDE FROM THE UNPURIFIED; AND AFTER ENTIRE PURIFICATION HE HEARD THE MANY-VOICED TRUMPETS, AND BEHELD A MULTITUDE OF LIGHTS GIVING FORTH PURE AND MANIFOLD BEAMS. AFTER HE WAS SET ASIDE FROM THE MANYFOLK HE WENT BEFORE THE ELECT PRIESTS TO THE UTTERMOST PEAK OF SACRED HEIGHTS.

BUT THUS FAR HE HAD NOT YET CONVERSE WITH GOD HIMSELF NOR BEHELD HIM FOR HE IS WITHOUT ASPECT BUT SAW ONLY THE PLACE WHERE HE DWELLS.

He is using Moses to hide something of immense value, so only those who are capable of absorbing it will be able to discover it. He says: He SAW ONLY THE PLACE WHERE HE DWELLS. That place is AGNOSIA a state of not-knowing, a luminous darkness, what Patanjali calls SAMADHI -- a deep dreamless sleep but with full awareness.

THIS I TAKE TO MEAN THAT THE MOST HEAVENLY AND LOFTY OF THINGS WHICH MAY BE SEEN AND KNOWN ARE NO MORE THAN CERTAIN IMAGES OF THINGS SUBORDINATE TO HIM WHO TRANSCENDS ALL. THROUGH THEM IS SHOWN HIS PRESENCE EXCEEDING ALL

COMPREHENSION STANDING ON THOSE HEIGHTS OF HIS HOLY PLACES WHICH MAY BE KNOWN OF THE MIND. AND AT TIMES HE WHO IS SET FREE OF THINGS SEEN AND OF THINGS SEEING ENTERS INTO THE TRULY MYSTICAL DARKNESS OF UNKNOWING, WHEREFROM HE PUTS OUT ALL INTELLECTUAL KNOWLEDGE AND CLEAVES TO THAT WHICH IS QUITE BEYOND TOUCH AND SIGHT -- THE ENTIRE ESSENCE OF HIM WHO IS BEYOND ALL. THUS THROUGH THE VOIDING OF ALL KNOWLEDGE HE IS JOINED WITH THE BETTER PART OF HIMSELF NOT WITH ANY CREATURE NOR WITH HIMSELF NOR WITH ANOTHER BUT WITH HINT WHO IS INWARDLY UNKNOWABLE; AND KNOWING NOTHING HE KNOWS BEYOND THE MIND.

Mind is knowledge, meditation is non-knowledge. Mind knows, meditation experiences. Mind can only give you a certain acquaintance but not the taste. If you want the taste of the Tao you have to move to no-mind, to meditation, to AGNOSIA.

A tremendous awareness is needed, an awareness that can help you to cut yourself off from the mind, from words, from theories, from philosophy, from theology, from religions, from priests: a tremendous awareness like a sharp sword that cuts ALL that binds you and makes you free.

To indicate that freedom Dionysius has used the most beautiful word I have ever come across: AGNOSIA. Be so silent, so unknowing, so non-existential, a deep emptiness, a nothingness, and then mysteries will be revealed to you. Then God can stand naked before you. But if you know something about God then you will never know him as he is.

It is said that the word "God" stands for three words. G stands for "that," O stands for "which" and D stands for "is." God is a code word; it means nothing, it simply represents THAT WHICH IS. But to know that which is you will have to come to a certain state: a state of absolute emptiness. What Buddha calls SHUNYATA nothingness, Dionysius calls AGNOSIA. I call it meditation, but these are different words for the same phenomenon.

If you have attained to AGNOSIA YOU have found the place where he dwells, you have found the temple where he lives. And that temple is not outside, it is within you. It is at the VERY core of your being.

---

## Theologia Mystica

### Chapter #5

#### Chapter title: Man's is Life's Invention

**15 August 1980 am in Buddha Hall**

Archive code: 8008150

ShortTitle: THEOLO05

Audio: Yes

Video: Yes

---

The first question

OSHO,  
TO WHAT EXTENT DOES LIFE HAVE RELEVANCE TO LOGIC?

Mavji Savla,

LOGIC is a very small thing, life is vast. Logic is utilitarian, it is an invention of man. Life is non-utilitarian, it is not an invention of man; on the contrary, man is life's invention. Logic is one-dimensional, life is multi-dimensional. But for thousands of years man has been conditioned to believe that logic and life are synonymous.

This has destroyed the whole joy of the human heart, it has destroyed the most precious thing in existence: it has poisoned man's capacity to love, because logic goes against love, logic goes against bliss, logic goes against meditateness, logic goes against godliness. But logic is good in a marketplace -- it is calculative, mathematical. Logic is good with things but not good with persons.

If you want to live with things logic is enough, but that is not going to be much of a life. When you live with persons, when you relate with persons, logic is not enough at all; in fact you have to put logic aside.

To relate to a person is to relate to an infinity. Logic cannot contain infinities. To fall in love means you are moving into the world of the uncalculated, the incalculable, the immeasurable, the uncharted. Logic will tell you, "You are going mad. Stop before it is too late!" Logic always creates a prison around you. Of course, it convinces you that it is for your own sake, it is for your safety, security, comfort. And in a certain sense it does give a certain security to you -- but that security is the security of death not of life.

If you want to be absolutely secure the grave is the best place; then there is no insecurity, no discomfort, no illnesses, no problems, no anxieties, no calamities, no death even! Once you have died you have died; it is all finished. Now you can rest forever. That's why on graves you will find these words: Now Rest in Peace. What else can you do in a grave?

One woman made a beautiful marble stone for her husband's grave: "Rest in Peace" was written on it in golden letters. After three days the will was opened and the husband had not left anything for the woman. She was furious. She rushed to the grave and underneath the golden letters "Rest in Peace" she wrote in her own hand "Till I Come!"

Life is insecure. There are wives and there are husbands, and there are children and whatnot. Life is insecure but that's the beauty of life, that's its adventure, that's its exhilaration, ecstasy. Logic makes everything dull, boring -- two plus two is always four.

In life it is not so: two plus two is sometimes three, sometimes five -- in fact, it is never four! In life it is never four. And now even mathematicians, geometers, logicians have started becoming aware of the phenomenon. A new branch of geometry has happened, non-Euclidean geometry; it has changed the whole Euclidean static world. In non-Euclidean geometry nothing is logical. But you will be surprised to know that Albert Einstein found it far more helpful in discovering the Theory of Relativity than Euclidean geometry, which is logical.

Albert Einstein, before he died, just two days before, said, "When I started my adventure into the world of science I was very certain that two plus two is four. Now I cannot say that -- I cannot say it with any certainty. All certainty is gone. As I have gone deeper into the mystery of existence. I have found that our logic is applicable only to the most superficial.

The deeper you go, the more irrelevant it becomes." His last words were, "To me life is a mystery now, and I feel that there is something in life which is absolutely unknowable."

Logic believes in two categories: the known and the unknown. That which is unknown today will become known tomorrow. That which is known today was unknown yesterday. So there is not much difference between the known and the unknown; they belong to the same category. Logic does not believe in the unknowable -- and the unknowable is the very heart of life, the very heartbeat of the universe.

I am not against logic. Use it -- it is a beautiful strategy as far as things are concerned, the marketplace is concerned, the superficial world is concerned -- but beware that you don't go on carrying it into deeper layers of life and experience. There it is a hindrance.

Logic means mind. Mind is helpful in understanding the objective world. Mind is a hindrance in understanding the subjective world, because the subjective world is beyond the mind, behind the mind. You can use your eyes to see others, but you cannot use your eyes to see yourself. If you want to see yourself through your own eyes you have to use a mirror. To look in a mirror means you are creating a reflection of yourself -- which is not you, certainly not you, but you can see the reflection. Logic can see only the reflected glory of existence; it cannot see existence itself because existence is far deeper than logical formulations.

Mavji Savla, your question is significant, very significant.

You ask: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES LIFE HAVE RELEVANCE TO LOGIC?

To a very small extent, just skin-deep. Deeper than that logic loses all relevance; not only that, it becomes ridiculous.

A young officer's extreme keenness in demanding strict adherence to official regulations was causing problems.

Eventually the genial general took him aside for a chat on "man management," suggesting that the regulations should be taken as a guide and were not meant to be strictly applied.

"Where in the regulations," he asked briskly, "is that stated?"

There are people who live by the word and lose the spirit: we call them pundits, scholars, knowledgeable people. They live according to the literal meaning, they never think in terms of metaphors and poetry. And life is more metaphorical than anything else. It is poetry, it is pure poetry. It is music, it is sheer music.

A poor Englishman worked his whole life to educate his only daughter born from a birth that left him a widower. With a very meager salary he saved hard to give the girl a decent education and had her entered in one of the best schools in the country.

At the end of the year he went to pick up his daughter at the railway station.

"Tell me all your news, darling," he asked his daughter.

"Dad," said the girl, "you always trusted me so I want to tell you that during this last semester I lost my virginity. "

"Nooo!" says the father desperately. "I can't believe it. After all the sacrifices that I made to put you in the best school in the country, you can't even tell me this news in proper English?"

"Am I mentioned in the will?" the nephew asked anxiously.

"You certainly are," replied the lawyer. "Right here in the third paragraph your uncle says: To my niece Sarah I bequeath a hundred thousand dollars, to my cousin Janice fifty thousand dollars. and to my nephew Charles, who was always curious to know if he was mentioned in my will, I say 'Hi, Charles.' "

One day a creditor knocks on the door of an impoverished English Lord. The butler opens the door and tells him that milord only receives at seven p.m. sharp.

That evening at the time appointed the creditor knocks again on the door, but he is told that the time for visits is over.

"What do you mean?" exclaims the creditor in anger. "It is seven o'clock!"

"Milord receives at seven SHARP, sir," answers the butler, "not one minute before nor a minute after!"

Logic can make you very stupid. Of course its stupidity is a very decorated stupidity, polished, cultured, so it is very difficult to see the foolishness of it. But life is far more because logic can contain only one polarity. For example, logic can think of darkness OR light but not of both together; logic can think of life OR death but never of both together. That becomes inconceivable. But that's how it is: life is death too. Light is darkness too.

Logic will not be able to comprehend Dionysius' idea of luminous darkness; it will look simply mad. Luminous darkness? How can darkness be luminous? How can darkness be translucent? Darkness has to be dark, light has to be light. Logic believes in pigeonholes, in categories, and life is one organic unity. Everything penetrates everything else. There are no categories; life goes on flowing. Light becomes darkness, darkness becomes light. Birth becomes death, death becomes birth. Love becomes hate, hate becomes love. Friendship becomes enmity, enmity becomes friendship.

And now we know that a man can become a woman, a woman can become a man. There is no intrinsic impossibility in it. Just as electricity consists of two poles, the negative and the positive, the whole existence consists of polarities. Logically they look opposite, but if you put logic aside then they are not opposites but complementaries: without The negative the positive cannot exist. Then how can you call them opposites? If the negative is a necessity for the positive to exist, if the positive is a must for the negative to exist, they are not opposites, they are complementaries.

Now a totally different vision is arising slowly: the vision that takes opposites as complementaries. Aristotelian logic is dying, it is on its deathbed. In fact, it is dead; it is being kept alive by artificial breathing. The Theory of Relativity has dealt it the final blow, the death blow. The Theory of Relativity has simply transcended all logic. And that is the beauty of Einsteinian physics: it is for the first time that a physicist has spoken the language of the mystic. It is one of the greatest events that has happened in our lifetime: that physics speaks the same language as mystics have always spoken.

Physics has come very close to mysticism; that is the beginning of a meeting, of a synthesis. And the synthesis is not very far away. Soon you will see -- those who have clear eyes can see it right now -- that logic has no more relevance because physics has gone deeper than the superficial, objective world. Now matter exists no more. You SEE matter, it is very logically there; in fact logically you cannot disprove matter.

One of the great English philosophers, Berkeley, was going for a morning walk with his friend, Dr. Johnson...

In Western philosophy Berkeley is almost the equivalent of Shankaracharya. Shankaracharya has said that the world is an illusion: it is only a dream, it is a thought, it does not consist of things, it consists of thoughts. We have always accepted that mystics talk such nonsense! Berkeley also used to talk the same way: that the world is only a dream.

Dr. Johnson was a very pragmatic and practical man, and of course very superficial too. He could not argue with Berkeley, so he took a rock from the side of the road and hit Berkeley's foot with the rock. Berkeley screamed, and the blood started oozing out of his foot.

Dr. Johnson laughed and he said, "Now what do you say? Is this rock real or not? And what is this scream all about if the rock is only a thought? How can it hit you?"

And from where is the blood coming out, and why? You are just being hit by a thought?" Berkeley could not say anything.

The friendship ended because this is no way to argue. But Berkeley was unaware of the Indian mystics. Had he known anything of Indian mystics he would have answered Dr. Johnson perfectly well. Berkeley was bringing a new idea to Western philosophy. In India it has existed for centuries. It is said about the great Buddhist monk, Nagarjuna, that he was caught hold of by the king of the country because he was saying that nothing exists, nothing at all. Existence is a pure dream.

He was far ahead of Berkeley and anybody else because he was saying the world is a dream, and because the dream is false how can the dreamer be true? The world is false, it is a dream, and because the dream is false the dreamer is false. So nothing exists: neither the dreamer nor the dream. Shankaracharya at least accepts that the dreamer is true, and Berkeley also accepts that the subjective is true, the objective is false. But Nagarjuna seems to be far more clear. If the objective is false, how can the subjective be true? If the seen is false, what is the proof of the seer? If the known is false, then how can the knower exist? -- on what grounds?

He was caught hold of by the king. The king was a very pragmatic man. He must have been like Dr. Johnson; maybe Dr. Johnson was just another incarnation of the same king. He caught hold of Nagarjuna, he listened to his ideas. It was difficult to argue with him, almost impossible. How can you prove that life is true?

For example, we are sitting here. I may be just dreaming you, or you may be dreaming me, or we both may be dreaming simultaneously. But what proof is there that you are really there and I am really here, that I am talking to you and you are listening to me? It may be just mind stuff, nothing else. And many times in your dreams you have seen me. Of course, I don't dream; so I don't see you in my dreams. I am so fed up seeing you the whole day that it is natural I don't see you in my dreams. And orange is such a dangerous color.

The king could not argue with Nagarjuna, but he had a mad elephant. So he asked the mad elephant to be brought before the palace. The person who was ordered to bring the mad elephant asked why.

The king said, "We have to give proof to Nagarjuna. We have to see what happens when the mad elephant chases him, catches hold of him and throws him a hundred feet away. Then we will see whether it is a thought or a reality! "

And when the mad elephant came Nagarjuna started running. The mad elephant was chasing him and Nagarjuna was shouting, "Save me! Save me! All that I was saying was nonsense. Forgive me!" And he was crying so desperately that the king had compassion on him. He stopped the mad elephant, he called Nagarjuna. Nagarjuna was trembling, perspiring, breathing hard, could not speak for a few moments. Then the king asked, "What do you think

about this elephant? Is this elephant real or just a thought?"

Nagarjuna said, "Sir, the elephant is just a dream."

The king said, "What? Then why were you crying and screaming and shouting and asking me to stop the mad elephant?"

Nagarjuna said, "Sir, that too was part of the dream. Your stopping the elephant is also part of the dream. You can again put the elephant behind me and I assure you I will again scream and shout. But that doesn't prove anything; it simply proves that one dream creates another dream. It does not prove the reality of the elephant. It simply proves that one dream can trigger another dream."

That's how the world continues -- one dream triggering another dream.

This has always been the language of the mystics. But for the first time in the history of man physics also is speaking the same language: Matter exists no more. If you ask them, "Then what exists?" they shrug their shoulders. They say, "Something -- X,Y,Z. We call it 'electrons, neurons, protons,' but they are just X,Y,Z -- names given to certain entities nobody has ever seen. Nobody is ever going to see them -- we don't know whether they exist or not. All that we know is that if we accept them our calculations come right. If we don't accept them then it becomes difficult to make our calculations. So they are hypothetical realities. "

Buddha has said God is a hypothetical reality, self is a hypothetical reality. Logically they are needed -- I and thou are needed -- but the need is logical, not existential. Those who have penetrated the subjective reality, they have come to know that all our words, all our logic, all our hypotheses are only arbitrary. And now even physics agrees. The Theory of Relativity is the beginning of a totally new science, the beginning of the meeting of East and West.

You will be surprised to know that Mahavira, the twenty-fourth TEERTHANKARA of the Jainas was the first man in the whole world who talked about the Theory of Relativity, twenty-five centuries before Albert Einstein ever thought about it. Of course, he was talking about the theory of relativity in relation to the subjective world and Einstein focuses the same vision on the objective world, but both have come to one conclusion: that life is more than logic -- far more, immensely more.

But unless you are deeply meditative you will not be able to live that tremendously illogical life because it will drive you mad. If you are not meditative, Mavji Savla, then remain confined to the world of logic, otherwise you will go mad.

In English we have two words, very beautiful, of great significance: one is "breakdown," the other is "breakthrough." Breakdown is when you don't know any meditation and your logic becomes irrelevant. You don't know how to reach to the heart and your head has become absolutely meaningless to you, then there is a breakdown, you go insane. But if you know meditateness -- meditateness means the art of transforming the opposites into complementaries -- then there is a breakthrough: you enter into a new world, a new vision, a new perspective.

In a sense you are again mad. That's why Jesus is known as mad. Francis used to call himself mad -- and for all practical purposes he is mad. Buddha and Mahavira... they are all mad in a sense. They are not sane the way you are sane, either they are below you or above you, but one thing is certain: they are somewhere else. If they are below you it is a breakdown. If they are above you it is a breakthrough. Meditation is the art of transforming madness into Buddhahood. Meditation is the art of taking you beyond logic and yet keeping your sanity intact. Meditation is the greatest discovery ever made, and I don't think there is

ever going to be another discovery which can surpass meditation.

The second question

OSHO,

I HAVE HAD LOTS OF EXHILARATING MOMENTS OF WHAT SEEMED TO ME TO BE REAL CONSCIOUSNESS, BUT THEN AS SOON AS I HAVE FELT CONSCIOUS I BEGIN TO FEEL UNCONSCIOUS, AND IT SEEMS MORE AND MORE TO ME THAT BEING CONSCIOUS IS A STATE ONE HAS TO JUST EXPERIENCE AND NOT RECOGNIZE.

HAVE YOU ANYTHING TO SAY ON THIS?

Prem Devo,

THE STATE of real awareness is not exhilarating. It has no excitement in it, it is absolutely peaceful. It is neither hot nor cold. You live in a world of coldness, dullness, hence your mind is constantly seeking for something exciting, exhilarating, elevating. You live always in dark valleys so you hanker for peaks, sunlit peaks. That is your desire, but that is not the nature of consciousness itself.

Consciousness is exactly in the middle. It is neither low nor high, it is neither a valley nor a peak, it is neither cold nor hot. Buddha has called it MAJJHIM NIKAYA -- the middle way. It is exactly in the middle, and it is in the middle that transcendence happens. It is neither positive nor negative, neither good nor bad, NETI NETI, neither this nor that. You have come to such a delicate point where everything is balanced. You are not leaning towards this or towards that.

It is like a tightrope walker who is exactly in the middle. If he leans towards the left he will fall; if he leans towards the right he will fall. He is neither a rightist nor a leftist -- both are going to fall. He is exactly in the middle.

It is like the pendulum of a clock. The pendulum goes to the left, to the far left, then it goes to the far right. Through its movement between these two extremes it keeps the clock running. You may not have observed it, but it has to be contemplated: when the pendulum is moving towards the right it is gaining momentum to go to the left. Apparently it is going to the right; deep down, hidden inside, it is gaining momentum to go to the left. When it is going to the left it is gaining momentum to go to the right.

And this is so in your life. When you love a person you are gaining momentum to hate the person. That's why it is the same person you both love and hate; they are not two different people. Modern researchers have found the love relationship to be far more complicated than it was ever thought before. They call marriage an "intimate enmity" -- intimate enmity! Two persons are quarreling in a very intimate way.

If you watch lovers you will see this phenomenon continuously. Like the pendulum they go on moving away from each other -- that's what fight is. Every night the pillow fight! It does not exist so much in the East because Eastern women have not yet learned the art of how to throw pillows; they are still old -- fashioned. But in the West it is almost a routine scene. Before love -- making the pillow fight is a must: that creates energy, that releases energy. First the lovers have to fight. By fighting they go farther and farther away from each other. They go as far as possible, as they were when they met for the first time -- it is a mini-divorce -- and once they are that far away, again the same attraction; a mini-honeymoon

follows. They start coming close.

And this remains a constant phenomenon: coming close, going farther away, again coming close; asking for one's own space and then feeling lonely, then searching for the other, then being together and feeling bored with each other... The man cannot live without the woman the woman cannot live without the man -- and they cannot live together either! And this is so about all aspects of life.

Consciousness means stopping the pendulum in the middle. If you stop the pendulum of a clock in the middle, what will happen? The clock will stop. And it is very symbolic. If you can stop your consciousness in the middle, neither cold nor hot, neither dull nor excited, then your mind stops, because mind is time -- mind is your inner clock. And the moment mind stops, who is there to recognize? Who is there to say, "Now I am conscious"? If you say, "Now I am conscious," the mind has come back.

That's what has been happening, Prem Devo.

You say: I HAVE HAD LOTS OF EXHILARATING MOMENTS OF WHAT SEEMED TO ME TO BE REAL CONSCIOUSNESS...

It is not real consciousness -- they were exhilarating moments. But when you are exhilarated, soon you will slow down; you will have to go back to your original state.

You say:... BUT THEN AS SOON AS I HAVE FELT CONSCIOUS I BEGIN TO FEEL UNCONSCIOUS...

This is a great revelation if you Try to understand it. Why does it happen? The moment you feel conscious, why do you become unconscious? -- because to FEEL conscious means the mind has come in. Otherwise there is nobody to feel, nobody to recognize, nobody to say, "This is this" -- there is no labeling process. The mind is back, and the mind is always hankering to come back; any excuse is enough.

The moment you say, "Look! It seems this is real consciousness," the mind is back. The mind is not going to miss this opportunity. The mind will pat you on the back and will say, "This is great! You have done it. You have arrived. You have become enlightened. This is what Dionysius calls AGNOSIA. SO now this is the thing, the real thing! " And then the mind goes on and on, and you know that you have become unconscious. All those peaks are lost, that sun has set, that light has disappeared. You are back in your valley, in those dark spaces.

When you are really conscious there is no recognition You don't label it -- there is nobody to label. You are simply conscious and it is finished then and there -- the full point. But mind is not going to leave you so easily; it will come again and again. You have to become aware of mind's subtle strategies. You have to see and watch how the mind comes back. And it comes in such ways that unless you are very alert it will deceive you. It is a great politician.

Mind can live only when you are unconscious. To be conscious means the death of the mind -- and nobody wants to die. Mind exists only when there is deep unconsciousness; the deeper unconsciousness there is, the more nourishment for the mind.

A man goes to a doctor. The doctor's wife leads him into the office and explains that the doctor went out and will be back shortly. Sitting down with the man, the wife starts flirting with him. One thing leads to another, and in no time at all she is giving him a blow-job.

Suddenly there is the noise of a car and in great distress the woman exclaims, "Here's my husband -- let me go!"

"No, no, please!" pleads the man. "I am just coming -- please continue a few seconds more!"

Just then they hear the key turning in the front door.

"Let me go! Let me go!" cries the woman.

"No, no, please! A few seconds more!"

But the woman violently tears herself away and manages to escape into the other room.

When the doctor enters, the man says, "Good morning, doctor. I heard you coming so I decided to undress in order to avoid wasting your time."

"Good," says the doctor, "but what are you doing with those two ears in your hands?"

Man lives in unconsciousness. He lives without knowing why, without knowing where, without knowing whence. He simply goes on like a robot. And if you watch yourself you will be surprised how you have lived up to now -- almost in a dream.

Maria and Giovanni are having their breakfast. Giovanni says to Maria, "Amore, I can-a understand-a that you are nervous about having your driving-a examination, but last-a night-a it was-a too much! With your mouth-a you were making the noise-a of the engine.and with your hand-a you were changing gears -- using my prick-a!"

But that's how people are living their whole lives, day and night!  
Prem Devo, it is good that you have realized that:

... BEING CONSCIOUS IS A STATE ONE HAS TO JUST EXPERIENCE AND NOT RECOGNIZE.

But what will you do? Will you say, "I will not recognize it! No, it is not there! No, it is something else! No, I am not going to be deceived again"? But the mind has come in! Again it is there -- from a different door, of course.

Don't try to recognize, don't try to not-recognize.

And you say: It is A STATE ONE HAS TO JUST EXPERIENCE...

Who is going to experience? What is this "just experience"? If you try to experience it, even if you call it "just experience," you have created a separation between the state and yourself. And any separation between the state and yourself is enough for the mind to come in.

Just understand it and forget all about recognizing it, not recognizing it, just experiencing and not thinking about it. Forget all these things. When it comes, enjoy; when it goes, ENJOY. When it comes, live it; when it is not there, live its absence. Don't make much fuss about it, whether it is there or not. Remain calm and quiet, calm and collected, as if it does not make any difference at all.

Whether you are conscious or unconscious you are the same. If you evaluate Consciousness, if you say consciousness is better than unconsciousness, then there is bound to be difficulty because whenever there is consciousness, your mind in a subtle way will start clinging to it -- and the very clinging brings the mind in. Mind is a clinger.

You have to learn one thing: to live each moment as it comes, not asking for its opposite, neither clinging to it nor withdrawing away from it. When you are in a dark mood, live it in totality; don't be worried about it. What is wrong with darkness? It has its own beauty -- it is very velvety, it has its own depth. Live it, love it, enjoy it! Take as much nourishment from it as possible. Roots need darkness; without darkness roots cannot grow. So let your roots be nourished by it. And when you have sunlit peaks, let your flowers bloom. Enjoy that too. Flowers are yours as much as your roots are -- both are yours.

My own experience is this: that life has to be used in its totality, in all its dimensions. Yes, even the darker ones, they have their own share to contribute to the richness of life.

Whenever you make a division that "this is good and this is bad," that "this should be and this should not be," you are creating trouble for yourself. Life is one organic unity. When it is night, sleep; when it is day, wake up. Don't hanker for the night in the day; don't hanker for the day in the night.

Rinzai is right when he says that "Whenever I feel hungry I eat and whenever I feel sleepy I sleep. This is my whole SADHANA, this is all that I do."

And this is what I say to my sannyasins. When you are unconscious, nothing is wrong; when you are conscious, nothing is great. Bring them closer to each other to such a point where both weigh equal, then the mind will disappear. There is no need to recognize, there is no need to praise, there is no need to feel egoistic, elated; there is no need to brag about it.

And the moment mind goes totally, all is God, all is godliness, all is bliss, all is benediction.

The third question

OSHO, I HAVE ONLY ONE DREAM IN MY LIFE, AND THAT IS TO ATTAIN PHYSICAL IMMORTALITY. CAN YOU HELP ME TO REALIZE MY DREAM? I HATE THE MOMENTARINESS OF LIFE.

Surendra,

MEDITATE over these three maxims of Murphy.

First: If life were a bed of roses, some people would not be happy until they developed an allergy.

Now what is wrong the momentariness of life? Just think of a kiss with a woman which is eternal... Just think about it. Eternal! Now there is no way to escape. What is wrong with a kiss? A kiss has to be momentary, only then is it beautiful.

I have heard about a Mohammedan king whose wife fell in love with one of his slaves. He was so angry that he wanted to punish him, and punish him in such a way no man has ever been punished. He asked his wise advisors...

One old man said, "Do this: bind them to a pole and let them make love to each other, and keep them chained to the pole in a state of lovemaking for twenty-four hours. "

The king said. "What? Is this a punishment?"

The wise man said, "You just do what I say and see what happens."

And really there has never been such a punishment before. They were forced to be naked, they were forced to make love chained to a pillar with thousands of people watching. Then many things happened -- twenty-four hours is a long time. They started smelling, they started

peeing, they defecated -- they had to. It became such an ugly affair, and thousands of people watching... When after twenty-four hours they were freed, it is said they escaped from each other and never saw each other again their whole lives. Enough is enough!

Now Surendra, what is wrong with a momentary life? Your saints have been poisoning you. The flowers have to be momentary, otherwise they will be plastic. Life is beautiful only because it is fragile, because one moment it is there, the next moment it is gone. That's its whole beauty.

Do you want beautiful men and women made of plastic? They will be immortals. Sooner or later that calamity can happen through science: your whole body can be exchanged slowly slowly, part by part, with plastic things. You will be alive but in a plastic body -- and plastic is the most immortal thing in the world. And then your parts can always be changed. If one of your hands goes wrong, you go to the workshop, you go to the garage, and they immediately change your hand. You want to change your head; you simply go to the market, you look for another head and you change it. It is only a question of taking out a few screws, that's all, to fix a new head on you. Your heart can be plastic. There is no need for blood, we can have artificial blood. Everything can be artificial.

And in many ways it will be good: the bodies will not perspire, because nobody has ever heard of plastic perspiring, and you will not need deodorants and soaps, et cetera; and you will never grow old -- plastic never grows old. And if something goes wrong -- you have a car accident or something -- there will be no need to live with a crippled body; parts can always be changed, and they will be available everywhere.

Life will be immortal, but will it be beautiful? Will it be blissful? I don't think so. I love life the way it is, so please don't ask me such foolish questions. I don't think there is any need for physical immortality.

And your soul is immortal! Search for that rather than trying to search for physical immortality. But there are fools who go on thinking in these ways.

Sri Aurobindo's philosophy became world famous for the simple reason that he was saying to his disciples that physical immortality is possible. And the day he died, the disciples could not believe it. In fact, one of my friends who was in the ashram, told me later on that for three days it was kept secret that Sri Aurobindo had died, because it was unbelievable. When the Mother was asked, she said "He has gone into a deep SAMADHI. It is not death. How can he die? He is physically immortal." But after three days when the body started stinking, they had to bury him.

Then they started believing that the Mother was immortal. Then one day the Mother died. Now those fools are believing that they have both gone to the other world to bring back some more secrets and that they will come soon, they will be back. They are hoping that they will be back with the secrets of physical immortality!

The immortality of the soul is enough. There is no need for your body's immortality. In fact seventy years is enough -- enough to enjoy, enough to suffer, enough to understand, enough to misunderstand. In fact whatsoever you want to do, seventy years is enough. And if you really go on doing things totally, within seventy years you will be capable of seeing the whole absurdity of being in the body. You will not ask for an immortal body, you will ask how to get rid of this whole business of being born and dying again and again and again, how to get rid of the wheel of life and death.

The second maxim of Murphy: Millions long for immortality who do not know what to do with themselves on a rainy Sunday afternoon.

And you ask me: OSHO, CAN YOU HELP ME TO REALIZE MY DREAM?

The third saying of Murphy is: The best way to make your dreams come true is -- wake up.

The fourth question

OSHO, HOW WAS IT POSSIBLE FOR DIONYSIUS, AS AN ENLIGHTENED BEING, TO CARRY OUT HIS DUTIES AS BISHOP IN A GUILT-PROMOTING ORGANIZATION? HOW COULD HE PRESENT A FACADE TO THE WORLD WITHOUT CREATING DIVISION WITHIN HIMSELF WITHOUT COMPROMISING HIMSELF -- FOR INSTANCE WHEN HE HAD TO FOLLOW STUPID ORDERS FROM HIS ARCHBISHOP?

Devagiri,

THIS is one of the most fundamental things to understand: that an enlightened person becomes a perfect actor! He is not a doer, he is only an actor. He does nothing, but he acts perfectly. For him the whole of life is nothing but a drama, so there is no question of compromise, there is no question of getting divided, becoming schizophrenic, there is no question of being two -- saying one thing, doing another thing. He remains undivided because life becomes a playfulness; he is no longer serious.

You are taking it very seriously, hence the question. It comes out of your seriousness. You don't know what playfulness is.

The enlightened person can be absolutely playful in ANY situation; no situation can disturb him. He can be in a guilt-promoting organization, but he will not promote guilt and he will not promote the organization; in fact, he will sabotage it from within. That's what Dionysius did, and he did it well: he sabotaged the whole Christian stupidity -- from within.

There are two ways: either you fight from the outside or you fight from within. And my feeling is he chose the right course. If Jesus had also chosen the same way he would have destroyed the Jewish religion completely, but because he fought from the outside he could not change the Judaic tradition. Of course he convinced a few people: he helped a few people to come out of the organization.

Dionysius is not a serious man. No enlightened person is ever serious -- cannot be.

It is said about Bodhidharma that the day he became enlightened he started laughing; for days together he laughed. Finally people asked him, "What is going on? Have you gone mad? Now stop laughing!"

He said, "It is very difficult to stop laughing because now I see the whole ridiculousness!" People asked, "Ridiculousness of what?"

And you will be surprised to know his answer. He said "The ridiculousness of trying to become enlightened -- because everyone is BORN enlightened! We have it already and still we are trying to achieve it. That is the ridiculousness. "

Trying to achieve something which you already have is the most absurd thing possible in the world. How can you achieve it? So if you fail to achieve it it is not because enlightenment is difficult to achieve but because it is already the case. You are bound to fail. Sooner or later, by failing many times, one day you understand the point. It depends how thick your skull is. If it is very thick it takes many lives; if it is not that thick then it is easier. Then one can see in

a single moment that "I am already perfect" and drop the whole effort to become perfect.

One starts enjoying life then wherever one is, whatsoever one is. If one is a cobbler one remains a cobbler. Jacob Boehme was a cobbler; he remained a cobbler. And Kabir was a weaver and he remained a weaver. And Gora was a potter and he remained a potter. And Raidas was a shoemaker and he remained a shoemaker.

It so happened that Diogenes was a bishop.

Murphy says: Never bow to authority. but always tip your hat.

That's what he did his whole life.

In Moscow applicants were being interviewed for a government position. Each was asked, "How much is two and two? The answer was always: 'Four!'"

One candidate, however, replied, "How much do you want it to be?"  
He was appointed.

Now I will call this man enlightened! To be in Russia and say that two plus two is four is stupidity, sheer stupidity. The man must have been enlightened. I don't know his name, but that doesn't matter. He said, "How much do you want it to be? What does it matter? I am ready to play the game according to the rules. A game is a game. You decide the rules and I will play the game!"

You are asking me:... HE HAD TO FOLLOW STUPID ORDERS FROM HIS ARCHBISHOP?

Of course, he knew that they were stupid orders, but still he followed them.

A bunch of cowboys were sitting around a campfire about to eat dinner. The cook, a grimy, stubble-faced little man, was lecturing the boys, spoon in hand: "The first one of you guys to make a fuss about yer supper gits to do the cookin' tomorra night!"

There was a careful silence as the slop was served and the eating began.

"God, this tastes like shit!" exclaimed one of the cowboys. Immediately remembering the punishment for his complaint, he added enthusiastically, "But good shit, real good shit!"

"Have you ever wavered from the party line?" a party-member was asked by an official.

The man turned white with fear and protested vehemently, "No, no, no! I have always wavered WITH the party line!"

An enlightened person becomes an actor. I don't think that Diogenes was in any difficulty; he must have enjoyed the whole show.

Two East German guards were standing near the Berlin wall.

"What do you think of our regime?" asked the first.

"The same as you!" the second replied.

"In that case," said the first guard, "it is my duty to arrest you!"

It must have been a little difficult, THAT I can understand. It is easier to be free like me: free from all religions, free from all political ideologies, free from all philosophies. So I do

not have to bother at all to adjust to any A PRIORI idea, I need not be consistent with anybody. It is easier for me.

Why have I chosen this way? The reason is I don't have a good memory, so I don't know what I told you yesterday and I cannot be consistent -- for that one needs a good memory. If you want to lie you need a good memory, and I don't have a good memory; I go on forgetting things. But I don't care about it because I am not at all interested in being consistent. In fact, to me, to be contradictory is part of my message, because if you want the polarities, the opposites to be complementaries, you have to be contradictory.

Diogenius had chosen a difficult job. He had to remember continuously what the Christian ideology is, what the dogmatists say, what the Creed is, what is written in the Bible, what all other saints have said. He certainly chose a difficult line, but he must have liked it, because there was nobody forcing him. He could have renounced his job; there was no need to remain a bishop.

But one thing is certain: that he was not divided inside, as you are afraid.

**YOU ASK: HOW WAS IT POSSIBLE FOR DIONYSIUS, AS AN ENLIGHTENED BEING, TO CARRY OUT HIS DUTIES AS BISHOP IN A GUILT-PROMOTING ORGANIZATION?**

He managed well.

**HOW COULD HE PRESENT A FACADE TO THE WORLD WITHOUT CREATING A DIVISION WITHIN HIMSELF?**

If you know you are acting then there is no problem. The moment you start becoming identified with your acting, then the problem arises. If you are acting you are acting -- it is just a facade. You are not it; you are just a witness of it. Just as you observe other actors, you observe yourself also.

This is my suggestion for everyone: if you are in the world of acting -- for example, Vinod is sitting here -- if you are an actor, act as if it is real life, then you will be the best of actors. And if you are in life, live as if you are an actor and you will be the best of lives.

Once in a while Dionysius may have shouted, once in a while he may have rebelled, but he must have done it in private.

A man walks into a pet shop: "I want to buy a female parrot."

"We only have that one over there," says the owner, pointing to an ordinary-looking parrot.

"How much does it cost?" asks the customer

"Only fifty dollars, sir."

"What! All the other birds here cost half that price. Why is that small parrot so expensive?"

"She is the only female parrot in captivity that lays square eggs," announced the shop owner.

"Square eggs? Well, that really is an unusual phenomenon. But really I am more interested in a parrot that can talk," says the man.

"Well," ventures the owner, "she also talked -- not much, but she does talk."

"What can she say?"

"Once in a while," replies the shop owner, "she says 'Yowch!'"

Once in a while Dionysius must have said "Yowch! " -- because he was laying square eggs! But he must have loved it. Nobody was forcing him to be a bishop; it was his choice.

So please, Devagiri, don't be worried about him. He lived a perfectly beautiful life, he died a perfectly beautiful death, he has left a perfectly beautiful message behind. And I don't think that he would have been any more happy in any other situation. He was absolutely adjusted to the role he was playing. Don't you be worried about him, you be worried about yourself

A woman visited the psychiatrist with a problem. "You've got to help my husband," she said. "He has delusions and thinks he is an elevator!"

"Send him in," replied the psychiatrist, "and I'll try to straighten him out."

"Oh, I can't do that," said the wife. "He is an express elevator and doesn't stop at your floor!"

Now the wife needs treatment, not the husband, but she is worried about the husband!

Please, don't you be worried about anybody else. Your own worries are enough. But people try to worry about others; that is a way of distracting themselves from their own worries. It is a way of intoxicating themselves with great problems.

Now what have you got to do with Dionysius? Nothing at all -- you have no relationship with him. Or do you think, Devagiri, that you have some blood relationship with the poor man? He was a Catholic bishop, never married -- unless he left a few bastards! I don't know... Don't be worried about him, you be worried about yourself. Take life easily, lovingly, playfully, non-seriously. Seriousness is a disease, the greatest disease of the soul, and playfulness the greatest health.

The last question... or a series of very serious questions from Devaraj.

OSHO, WHAT DO YOU CALL AN INDIAN WITH HALF A BRAIN?

Lucky!

OSHO, HOW DO YOU KEEP AN INDIAN BUSY ALL DAY?

Give him a piece of paper with PTO written on both sides!

OSHO, WHY DO INDIANS HANG AROUND IN GROUPS OF THREE?

One can usually read, one can usually write, and the third likes to hang around with the intellectuals.

OSHO, WHAT HAS AN INDIAN GOT INSIDE HIS SKULL?

A piece of paper with "brain" written on it.

OSHO, WHAT ARE THE THREE THINGS COMMON TO ALL GOVERNMENT

PROGRAMS IN INDIA?

A beginning, a muddle and no end.

OSHO, HOW DO YOU MAKE AN INDIAN LAUGH ON MONDAY?

Tell him a joke on Friday.

---

## Theologia Mystica

Chapter #6

Chapter title: None

**16 August 1980 am in Buddha Hall**

Archive code: 8008160

ShortTitle: THEOLO06

Audio: Yes

Video: Yes

---

The first question

OSHO,

WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN BEING AN INDIVIDUAL AND JUST BEING STUBBORN

Yoga Prem,

THE DIFFERENCE is immense -- it is absolutely unbridgeable. Two things will have to be understood: one is personality and the second is individuality.

We ordinarily don't have individuality at all. That's what Gurdjieff means when he says it is very rare to find a person who has a soul. He is the first enlightened Master who has said it so clearly. Otherwise, Mahavira, Buddha, Krishna, Christ, they have all given the impression at least that everybody has a soul. Everybody has a self but not a soul, and the self is a barrier not a bridge to the soul.

Personality is your circumference, not your center. The word "personality" comes from a Latin root persona. In Greek theater the actors used to wear masks; they would speak through the mask. Sona means sound, persona means sound coming through the mask. You cannot see the real person, you cannot see his original face. You only see a facade, something pseudo, something made-up, invented. The word "personality" comes from persona.

When the child is born we start giving him personality -- by educating him, by giving him a certain religious attitude, by imparting some philosophy, some political ideology. Slowly slowly, brick by brick, we create a structure around him in which he becomes imprisoned, so much so that he starts feeling identified with the edifice created by others

around him. He does not feel imprisoned.

To feel imprisoned is a great insight, because from that moment one starts making efforts to be free. Whatsoever you are, you are a creation of others. You have been pushed and pulled from all directions, you have been given a certain shape. It is not your originality; it is something imposed, painted. But you have known it from your very beginning. You have known it for so long that you don't remember that you can be anybody else. And you are somebody else -- you are not this personality.

This confusion prevails all over the world. Just a few days ago, Sarjano wrote to me saying, "Osho, it seems I have a strong individuality and I cannot surrender to the commune. I cannot possibly become part of the commune. I want to cook in my own way." Now he thinks he has a strong individuality; in fact, he has no individuality at all -- not yet.

When you come to me you come only with a personality, a persona. And my work is an absolutely thankless job because I have to destroy your personality; that is the only way to help you to discover your individuality. The individuality is your original face: it is the way God wanted you to be, it is the way you were made by him. Your individuality has the signature of God on it, but your personality is a social phenomenon. Hence there are Christian personalities, Hindu personalities, Mohammedan personalities, and so on and so forth.

Individuality is simply individuality. It is neither Christian nor Hindu nor Mohammedan, it is neither Catholic nor communist, it is neither Eastern nor Western. In fact, individuality is neither male nor female. It is the personality that has all these divisions, categories, aspects.

Sarjano wrote, "I feel I have a strong individuality." Individuality is never strong; it is very fragile, as fragile as a roseflower. Of course, even in its fragility the roseflower has a certain strength. It can dance in the wind, in the rain, unafraid. It is fearless, but it is not strong in the sense steel is strong.

Buddha is not as strong as Joseph Stalin is. The very name "Stalin" comes from "steel." It was not his real name; it was given because he was a man of steel. Buddha is not a man of steel; he is made out of very fragile elements: the rainbow, the lotus, the fragrance of flowers. He is very feminine -- feminine not in the sense of being female but in the sense of being very vulnerable, receptive, very available to existence.

The strong person is one who is stubborn.

Yoga Prem is asking: What is the difference between being an individual and just being stubborn?

Personality is always stubborn, individuality never. Personality has to be stubborn, because it is false. If it is not stubborn it cannot exist at all. It has to be maintained continuously -- you have to fight for it. The personality consists of nothing but ego, self, greed, anger, violence, because deep down you are aware of the trembling, of the fear of death. Deep down you know your inferiority. The personality brags about its superiority.

Remember always, whatsoever the personality brags about is exactly the opposite of your reality. If you are feeling unintelligent inside, your personality will project intelligence. If you are feeling unloving inside, your personality will create a very sweet, smiling, loving quality. It is not just to deceive others; it is really, basically, to deceive oneself. You want to forget your unlovingness. If you are feeling empty inside, your personality will start gathering a thousand and one possessions.

Alexander the Great, Napoleon, Adolf Hitler -- these people have lived only as

personalities, very stubborn. They have to be stubborn because they know that if they are not stubborn, if they are not continuously fighting, the personality will disappear -- because it is a false phenomenon. It is not a reality; it is manufactured by the mind, hence the mind has to go on finding mote props for it

But individuality is egoless, selfless, a state of no-mind. It has no ambitions, no desires, because it is immensely fulfilled just being itself. It need not fight for its existence; it is existential. It cannot be destroyed; it is indestructible, but not strong -- very fragile, very feminine, never aggressive, always receptive. It never brags about itself -- there is no need because there is no inferiority complex in it. Not that it feels superior! Those are two aspects of the same coin: the inferior and the superior.

The real person, the authentic being, the individual, is neither inferior nor superior; he is simply himself. He never compares himself with others -- the idea of comparison does not arise at all; he knows everybody has unique individualities.

The word "individuality" is also significant; it means indivisible, that which cannot be divided. Individuality is organic. Personality is a patchwork -- something from here, something from there. You go on collecting, and hence you are always afraid it can be taken back.

Somebody says to you, "You are so beautiful!" Now you will be dependent on the person, because he can withdraw his statement any moment. Not only can he withdraw it, he can say, "I have never seen such an ugly person as you!" Then what? You have to cling to his statement, and to cling to his statement you have to compromise. You have to go on persuading him, buttressing him, so that he goes on continuing saying that you are beautiful.

Dale Carnegie in one of his famous books suggests to couples, particularly husbands, that they should go on saying to their wives, whenever there is an opportunity, "I love you. You are the most precious thing in my life. I cannot believe there can be any person more beautiful than you." Whether you feel it or not, that is not the point, he says; the point is repetition.

And the wife has to do the same: "You are the greatest man in the world. There is nobody who even comes close to you. You are divine. You are almost a god to me. I will worship you forever and forever, in this life and afterwards too." Whether you feel it or not, that is not the point. You may feel, "I have never seen such a man, so stupid, so ugly, so cunning, so mean!" Go on feeling that, but never say it because people live on words -- personalities live on words.

I asked a woman . . . I knew her husband -- he was always in the library. I asked the woman, "Is your husband a bookworm?" She said, "No, he is just an ordinary worm!"

But these things have not to be told to the husband!

Dale Carnegie has become the prophet of the American way of life. In America, after the Bible, Dale Carnegie's book has been the biggest seller: *How to Win Friends and Influence People*. And this is the secret -- simple: just go on feeding their egos and you can win people; they will be your friends. You can persuade them even to die for you, because all that they need is support for their personalities, and it has to come from all sources. The priest has to support them, the educational system has to support them, the social system has to support them. And if you cannot find ordinary ways -- for example, not everybody can hope to become the prime minister or the president -- then you start creating your own small clubs:

the Rotary Club, the Lions Club. Now, go to a Lions Club and see how many sheep are gathered there pretending to be lions!

Once I went to a Lions Club meeting in Poona -- fifteen years must have passed since then -- and thinking that they were lions, I shouted and roared. I was staying at Sohan's house. When we came back she said, "You were the only lion there, and they were all sheep!" -- because they became so afraid. They were so shocked, because I started destroying all their assumptions.

Now there are Rotary Clubs all over the world. The word "rotary" is because people become president by rotation. So everybody has a chance; you just have to wait for your chance. Sooner or later . . . first you will become the Vice-President, then the President and then the Governor, and so on and so forth. They have a very cunning strategy to fulfill everybody's ego. And then there are committees and chairmen of the committees . . . No work is done at all!

I have been to Rotary Clubs all over the country, and they have a placard on the president's table: "We serve." I have never seen them serving anybody; they must be serving each other. And they do serve each other -- they serve each other's personality. It is a tacit assumption that "I will help your ego, you help my ego."

Then there are churches and religions . . . but have you seen the phenomenon? No religion has remained undivided. Why? What happened?

The day Buddha died, Buddhists were divided into thirty-six sects. Why? These people were one when Buddha was alive, and just after Buddha died they started quarreling, as if they were just waiting for Buddha's death. There must have been many egoists around who wanted to be the chief, but how to be the chief when the Buddha is alive? So they must have waited for their opportunity.

The moment Buddha died, immediately . . . the body was burning on the funeral pyre, and they started playing their political game: "Who is going to be the successor?" Now there were thirty-six pretenders so Buddhism was divided into thirty-six sects.

Christianity could not remain one. Since Christ there have been many sects, many sub-sects, and the greatest division was created by Luther. Luther was one of the most egoistic persons ever. He had nothing to do with Christ, he had nothing to do with Christianity, but he was in a constant fight with the Pope. The Pope was just as egoistic, and Luther refused to submit to the Pope's ego. He created the Protestant section of Christians.

The same has happened to Jainism, to Islam, and it has happened more to Hinduism. Hindus have a very quarreling spirit, very quarrelsome. I don't think any country has such a quarreling spirit. The reason is that Hindus don't fight physically so their whole fight becomes intellectual; it has to find some way. Now Hindus have so many sects, sub-sects and sub-sub-sects that it is almost too difficult to know how many Hindu religions there are. There are so many, almost unbelievable. And this is not only so about religion; it is so about everything that Hindus have done.

India has never been a nation because the Hindu mind is continuously quarreling and fighting. In Buddha's time there were two thousand Indias, not one India, because two thousand kingdoms existed -- just small kingdoms, with each kingdom trying to be the suprememost. And the disease has gone so deep into the Hindu blood that in every sphere, even in politics, it is the same. Now there are so many Congress Parties... not only are there so many Congress Parties -- that can be understood -- there are so many Communist Parties in India that you will not believe it. Nowhere in the world are there so many Communist Parties. Even the Communist Party -- which is an absolutely non-Indian phenomenon, which

is anti-religious, atheistic -- even the Communist Party is not one in India. There are many Communist Parties quarreling, continuously quarreling. The old Hindu spirit cannot leave you so easily. You may become a communist, but basically you will go on doing your old tricks.

But the whole thing happens because of personality: "My ego has to be supreme."

In India there are so many jagatgurus. Jagatguru means World Teacher. Now without asking the world, how can you be the World Teacher? And there are so many World Teachers! There can be only one World Teacher; one is enough because there is only one world. I came across so many World Teachers while traveling that I was surprised: in one world so many World Teachers?

In one village they brought a man and they said, He is a world teacher, jagatguru. " I asked him, "How many followers have you got?"

He looked a little embarrassed. The man who had brought him said, "His philosophy is so abstruse, so difficult to understand, that I am his only disciple."

I said, "Don't feel embarrassed. You do one thing. Jagatguru means the World Teacher; jagat means the world. guru means the teacher. So you change your name: simply make your name Jagat, the world. And he is your guru -- Jagatguru, the World Teacher -- so the problem is solved! Then you need not feel embarrassed -- he is the guru of Jagat!"

Personality is always dependent on others. Because it is dependent on others it is a prisoner, and because it is dependent on others it has to be stubborn. Otherwise others will make you an absolute slave; they will reduce you to the status of a thing. You have to be stubborn, you have to fight, you have to struggle for your survival.

Yoga Prem, individuality is never stubborn. Individuality is very liquid, very flowing -- just like a river it goes on moving towards the ocean. It has no fixed route, it has no a priori ideas as to what direction to go in, it has no plans. It adjusts to situations; it is very adjusting.

But the personality is not so adjusting; it has to be on guard. It is not liquid, it is very solid. It is more like ice than like water. But the personality is a false phenomenon. It cannot give you any joy, it cannot make your life a festival, it cannot give you the sense of the divine. It is a human phenomenon, a human structure. It will keep you empty, meaningless; it will keep you miserable.

Individuality makes your life significant. It makes your life a beautiful song, but the song is no more yours, the song is God's. Individuality is divine. You are simply a hollow bamboo: you become a flute on the lips of God or on the lips of the whole existence. Then whatsoever the whole wants, you allow it; you remain in a let-go.

Sarjano is absolutely wrong if he thinks that he has individuality; he just has a very strong ego. And it happens when people come to me, if I see that they have strong egos, the first thing that I do is to start puffing up their egos, pumping up their egos, making them bigger and bigger like big balloons so that they can see, others can see . . . And that's what I was doing with Sarjano.

He became very happy. He misunderstood the whole thing -- he misunderstood the device. He became very happy; he thought, "This is the place for me!" He started thinking he had found the right man. He started telling people, "Jesus is nothing compared to Osho. Jesus is just a pygmy!" Because I was pumping up his ego and making his balloon bigger and bigger, of course he started paying me in the same coin. He thought, "These things are going to help."

Just old, stupid mind games. But I go on making the balloon bigger and bigger, up to a certain point -- when I see now the balloon is so thin that it needs just a pinprick and it will burst.

Whenever Devaraj comes to take my blood he always says, "Now comes the prick," and I start laughing inside. I say, "That's my whole work!" He is telling me, "Now comes the prick," and that's what I go on doing, day in, day out.

So when I told Sarjano, "Now comes the prick," he started packing his luggage. Now he is trying to go to Italy. Go anywhere, the prick is bound to come. My prick is long enough! It can reach to Italy -- you cannot escape!

The second question

OSHO,  
ANY MESSAGE FOR KUTCH?

Navin Mehta,

I AM coming! And I am coming with my whole world of orange people. We are going to change the whole color of Kutch -- we are going to make it orange! First ten thousand sannyasins will arrive, then more will be coming.

Within five years fifty thousand sannyasins will be there and within ten years one hundred thousand sannyasins will be there.

So, Navin Mehta, tell the people of Kutch: Get ready! We are certainly going to destroy many things -- many things which need to be destroyed, which should have been destroyed long ago.

The whole of India is suffering from many stupidities, many superstitions. We are not going to leave a single stone unturned! We are going to destroy every nonsense, howsoever ancient and old it may be. We are going to bring a totally new vision to Kutch.

I have chosen Kutch for the simple reason that it is one of the most innocent parts of India. They are simple-hearted people, and very poor too, because all the cunning people have left it; there was not much possibility for exploitation.

Just one hundred and fifty years ago, the great River Sindh changed its course. It used to go by the side of Kutch; then Kutch was very prosperous, really golden. But the whole prosperity was dependent on the great River Sindh. The Sindh is one of the greatest rivers in the world.

You will be surprised to know that the name "India" comes from the River Sindh. When the Greeks came to India with Alexander the Great they called the country Indus, because in their language Sindh became Sindhus and from Sindhus it became Indus, from Indus the name India.

Kutch was very prosperous, very rich. But once the river changed its course, Kutch became a desert and the people started leaving, particularly the cunning, the ambitious -- they all left Kutch. You will find them all over India, particularly concentrated in Bombay. They are one of the richest peoples in India, but outside Kutch.

Kutch is poor, innocent and, because these ambitious people have left it, it is the right soil for us to work in. And because the people are still in a way primitive, they have some quality of childlike innocence, and that childlike innocence can be transformed very easily into a spiritual revolution.

So Kutch is going to be our great experiment. One hundred thousand sannyasins have never lived together anywhere in the world at any time in history. This will be the first sannyasin city. This is going to be something of a unique experiment.

Naturally, there are a few people who are against it, but very few, not more than two percent. But they are very articulate people; particularly the businessmen who have left Kutch, they are afraid of my going to Kutch for the simple reason that Kutch has always been dependent on them. They have not given much to Kutch, but Kutch feels very grateful to them for whatever small amount they give. And they know that once I am there, once my people are there, we are going to transform Kutch -- and then they will be nowhere. Their leadership, their great altruistic works will fade away. They are afraid of losing their grip on Kutch. The business people, the politicians, they are very much afraid.

I have been looking at the reports in the Kutch papers, in the Gujarati papers: every day there is something about me and my people going to Kutch, for and against. I was surprised to know that the names of those who are opposing me that have come to me again and again through these newspapers are only six -- six names -- not more than that. The same people, the same six people: the same person presides over every meeting, and the same speakers participate. They are moving all over Kutch and Gujarat and Bombay trying to create a camouflage to make it appear as if the whole of Kutch is against me. But their game is political.

These are the defeated politicians, these are the followers of Morarji Desai -- Morarji Desai's hand is behind it. Now they have nothing else to fight for, to create chaos for. They have found this: that my coming and my people's coming will destroy the culture of Kutch, it will destroy the religion of Kutch. As if Kutch has a different culture than India and a different religion than India! As if Kutch has something special! It shares in the same stupid culture that the whole of India has -- and wherever I am, I am going to destroy it! And in fact it is going down the drain by itself, because it has no future. It has a great past but no future at all. It has become absolutely irrelevant.

Two politicians were walking along a beach where they saw some boys catching crabs. The boys were storing all the captured crabs in a bucket.

One of the politicians approached the lads and said, "Hey, why don't you cover the bucket? What if some crabs climb out?"

One of the boys replied, "You needn't worry, mister. These crabs are like politicians: if one of them tries to climb up, the others will pull it down!"

Now because Indira's Congress Party has come into power in many parts of the country, in Gujarat particularly, the defeated politicians are trying to find some excuse or other. And because Indira is favorable to me and the Gujarat government is favorable to me . . . The Chief Minister of Gujarat, Solanki, just declared two days ago that he is determined to give the land to me and to invite me to Kutch, and this small opposition cannot deter him.

These six people immediately ran to Indira. They went to Delhi, seeing that the Chief Minister was determined. But Indira herself wants me to go to Kutch. She can understand the benefits that will become possible for Kutch. She can understand the transformation that can happen to Kutch.

So, Navin Mehta, tell the people of Kutch that just because of these few people, who can be counted on your fingers, I am not going to be prevented. I am going to come

And these stupid politicians, what can they do? It is my birthright to be anywhere in

India; nobody can prevent me. In fact, that's why I have not left India, because in any other country they can easily prevent me, but in India they cannot prevent me from going anywhere. This is a freedom guaranteed by the Indian constitution -- the freedom of movement. And of course, when I am there, nobody can prevent people from coming to me, to visit me. Wherever I am, my whole world will be there.

Hector, being an idiot, decided to have a brain transplant. He went along to the hospital and was given the choice of two brains: an architect's brain for fifty dollars and a politician's brain for ten thousand dollars.

"Does that mean the politician's brain is much better than the architect's?" asked Hector.

"Not necessarily," said the brain transplant salesman, "it's just that the politician's brain has never been used!"

So these stupid people cannot prevent me, and I am really enjoying the challenge! It is going to be a beautiful journey to Kutch -- they are making it almost adventurous. Just a few people, but they are creating so much dust that in the smoke and in the dust they may be thinking there are many people. They are making so much noise that they may be deceived by their own noise. And politicians are drunk with power, with money, with prestige; they can't see clearly.

Navin Mehta is from Kutch. His other friends are here: Mavji Savla is here, Nirmal Vaswani is here, and many people from Kutch have started coming to see the ashram. And they are all feeling sorry because we were going to move two years ago to Kutch but because of Morarji Desai it became impossible. He created such a cunning atmosphere that I thought it was better to wait for a while, because I knew perfectly well this man could not stay long. He was just accidentally prime minister of India -- he never deserved it, he had no capacity for it. But sometimes just because of some accidental situation it can happen, and it happened.

He pretends to be a Gandhian, a lover of truth, but whatsoever he did was absolutely untrue. He tried to persuade the army to prevent me, to say that my moving to Kutch was dangerous for the security of the country. And once the army says that it is dangerous to the security of the country, then it becomes very difficult to move. Now all those files have been looked into -- the army has never raised any objection to it. It was all fabricated, it was false. It was declared in the name of the army without the army saying anything about it. Maybe Morarji simply persuaded them to keep quiet while he created the atmosphere that it is dangerous for the country's security.

And now these four, five people are again raising the same old thing, that it is dangerous for the country's security. But they are making such a noise that they may themselves be deceived by it.

A drunkard leaves a bar late at night. The road is deserted, but in the dark he manages to stagger into a lamppost. He takes a few steps back, then stumbles forward again and bumps his head into the same lamppost. He steps back, reels forward and crashes straight into the same lamppost.

"Oh, my God!" he exclaims. "I am lost in an impenetrable forest!"

And there are a few pundits, scholars, saints, mahatmas who are also trying to create some antagonism against me. That is natural, expected. They are the people who are afraid;

their vested interests are there. They have lost their lives in futile exercises, but that has become their profession. Now they are exploiting others and destroying their lives.

My presence there is bound, is certainly bound, to bring many people from their folds to my commune -- that is their fear. So Jaina munis, Hindu monks and other priests and scholars, they are creating a little bit of a stir.

A professor was taking a sea voyage on a small boat. One night he goes up on deck, meets with an old sailor, and after introducing himself asks him, "Hey, old man, what do you know about oceanography?"

The old sailor says he does not know what the word means.

The professor, amazed, says to the old salt, "You've wasted a quarter of your life! Here you are voyaging across the seas and you don't even know what oceanography is."

The next night the professor goes up to the old man and says, "Hey, old man, what do you know about meteorology?"

The old sailor shakes his head in ignorance.

"So you have wasted half of your life!" exclaims the professor.

The next night the professor goes up to the old man and asks him, "What do you know about astronomy?"

"Nothing," replies the old sailor.

"Here you are out on the ocean needing the stars to navigate, and you don't know anything about astronomy? You have wasted almost all of your life, old man! "

The next night there was a storm at sea and the old sailor comes rushing up to the professor and cries, "Hey, professor, what do you know about swimmingology?"

The professor replies, "Well, nothing really. I have never heard about it. What do you mean?"

The old sailor says, "I mean, do you know how to swim?"

The professor says, "No!"

"Pity!" says the sailor. "The boat is leaking! You have wasted your whole life and, mind you, not almost but the whole of your life!"

These people have wasted their lives. They have not learned anything about the truth. Hence they are afraid that if I come there and I start telling people the simple truth of life, their whole business will be in danger.

And, Navin Mehta, I don't own many newspapers. I, in fact, don't own any newspapers. Newspaper people have been coming to the Foundation asking for money, saying, "If you give us money we will start writing for you." I have said, "We cannot give a single cent to anybody. Go and write against us! That's my way of spreading my word to people."

They are being paid by the priests, by the industrialists, by the rich people, by the munis -- they have been paid! Now this is a well-established fact: they have been paid to write against me. But what can newspapers do?

Just a few days ago Laxmi went to Kutch and thousands of people gathered around her, and they were asking, "When is Osho coming? We are ready to welcome him." Not a single person against! But newspapers can create -- at least outside Kutch -- an impression in people's minds as if the whole Kutch is against me.

The whole Kutch is for me! And you will see -- when we go there you will see the whole of Kutch receiving us!

Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar and Napoleon were viewing a military parade in Moscow. Alexander could not take his eyes off the tanks.

"If I had had chariots like these," he said, "I could have conquered all of Asia!"

Caesar eyed the missiles. "With such arrows I could have ruled the world!"

Napoleon glanced up from the copy of Pravda he was reading. "With a newspaper like this," he exclaimed, "no one would have ever heard of Waterloo!"

The third question

OSHO, WHO WAS THAT GUY YOU WERE TALKING ABOUT WHILE DISCUSSING ST. MURPHY'S SUTRAS TODAY? WAS IT DIOGENES OR DIOGENIUS OR DIONYSIUS?

Chaitanya Kabir,

HE HAS neither Diogenes nor Diogenius or Dionysius. He was Diorajneesh!

The fourth question

OSHO, THE MANY PROBLEMS OF THE WORLD ASK FOR NEW HUMAN SOLUTIONS. DUE TO THIS IT SEEMS NECESSARY TO BECOME NOT ONLY MORE CONSCIOUS ON THE SENSUAL AND MENTAL LEVELS, BUT ALSO ON THE LEVELS OF SPIRITUAL THINKING AND PERCEPTION. YOUR DISCOURSES AND YOUR INVENTIONS IN ALL FIELDS DEMONSTRATE THAT YOUR ART OF THINKING IS DEVELOPED TO THE HIGHEST STANDARD OF CONSCIOUSNESS. COULD YOU RECOMMEND TO US SPIRITUAL EXERCISES WHICH ARE HELPFUL TO MAKE OUR HARDENED MINDS MORE MATURE, MORE INSPIRED AND UNIVERSAL?

Ilas,

IT SEEMS you have fallen into wrong company! This is not the right place for you. Get lost as quickly as possible, because this is the last place where you can make your "hardened minds more mature." We destroy minds! We don't make them more mature.

This is the last place where you can get more inspiration. We don't believe in inspiration. Inspiration is just a beautiful word for imitation. I am against all imitation, against getting inspired. You are not to be inspired by me, you have to understand me. Inspiration is a state of hypnosis: you become hypnotized. It is the impact of a charismatic personality: you become enslaved. It is not a good situation to be in.

And you want your mind to be universal. The mind can never be universal. It is the mind that is not allowing you to be universal.

But, Ilas, you must have been studying all kinds of occult and esoteric nonsense, that's why you talk about "levels of sensual and mental and spiritual thinking."

We are against thinking! What levels are you talking about? We are against all levels of thinking. Our effort here is to create a mind which is not a mind at all. To be more correct, we are here to create a state of no-mind, agnosia, as Diorajneesh says!

And you are searching for spiritual exercises. We don't do any exercises here. What to say about the spiritual? -- not even physical exercises! People simply sit silently doing nothing, waiting for the spring and for the moment when the grass grows by itself. Why bother? The whole universe is running so beautifully well without your spiritual exercises! And do you think that just by standing on your head you are going to help it run better or in a more smooth way?

But you are too full of knowledge. You have not heard me. You are just hearing what you can hear; you are not hearing what is being said.

A gay guy at a Hollywood party was so excited to meet Burt Reynolds that when Burt asked him his name he didn't understand and said, "I beg your hard on?"

When one is too full of one's own mind one goes on hearing things which are not being said. You are too preoccupied.

The triplets were talking while waiting inside their mother's womb. The baby located furthest inside said, "When I grow up I want to be a doctor. I want to care for those people in worse positions than myself."

The baby in the middle said, "I want to be an engineer a master of balance."

"I want to be a detective," said the baby closest to the outside world.

"A detective?" chorused the other two babies.

"Yes, so I can discover who it is that comes and pushes me about every evening!"

Preoccupations from your mother's womb! And then your whole life you are preoccupied with your ideas. You never see what is, you never hear, you never taste, you never sense anything of the reality. Your preoccupations always interfere.

If you want to really understand me, Ilas, you will have to drop your a priori conceptions.

You say: The many problems of the world ask for new human solutions.

Do you think the world has ever been with less problems than it is today? The problems have always been there. And do you think new human solutions will solve everything? They will only create new problems. Man has been evolving solutions, and each solution creates a new problem. You do one thing and something else goes wrong.

Hence I teach non-doing, so nothing can ever go wrong. Or even if it goes wrong, it is perfectly okay. So what? We don't have any expectations. We are not interested in solving the problems of the world; we are more interested in becoming problemless ourselves, because to me a problemless person radiates a certain quality, a certain vibe which helps others to solve their problems.

He does not give them instructions for solving their problems, he does not give them commandments -- he is not a Moses -- he simply lives his life peacefully, lovingly, without any worry and without any hurry, and just because he lives in a certain grace he creates around himself the vibe, the music, the unheard music which starts pulsating many hearts.

Ilas, if you want to be here, be here with your heart, not with your mind.

You say: Your discourses and your inventions in all fields demonstrate...

What nonsense are you talking? What discourses? I am just telling a few jokes! These are not discourses. Discourses are delivered by priests, bishops, popes. I am an ordinary person, just a madman, so utterly mad that there is no cure for it. I simply go on telling a few jokes. These are not discourses, these are not even talks, at the most you can call them chit-chats -- gossiping, not gospels!

And when you write about my great ideas don't call them gospels, just call them gossips -- divine gossips if "gossips" does not satisfy your ego -- because the disciple always feels hurt. "Gossips? So we are hearing gossip?" So hear divine gossips! But from my side they are just gossips.

You may be thinking I use jokes as illustrations -- you are wrong. Jokes are the main thing; everything else is just an illustration. First I choose a joke and then I look at the questions. Whichever question fits the joke -- that's how I choose the question, not vice versa.

And you say: ... your art of thinking...

I have never learned the art of thinking. I don't know how to think, I know only how not to think! When you ask me a question I don't think about it, I simply start talking about it, hoping something will come out. If something comes out, good; if nothing comes out, far out!

But you have some investment in thinking, in philosophy, in occultism, in theology, in theosophy. You must be reading Leadbeater, Colonel Olcott, Blavatsky, Annie Besant. You must be reading Rudolf Steiner. And there are so many fools ... the whole world is full of them! They are such articulate people and they put their bullshit in such beautiful packages that one tends to buy, one is tempted.

And you are very greedy. You want some spiritual ambition to be fulfilled. Here we are not trying to help anybody to fulfill any spiritual advancement, any spiritual growth. Any idea of being somebody else somewhere else is a projection of the mind.

What my simple approach is is totally different from ambition, achievement. It is just to be as you are. Enjoy the moment to its fullest. Love the moment with intensity, passion, totality. and forget all about spiritual growth. For five thousand years men have been trying for spiritual growth, for spiritual planes, and all that is meaningless. The only spirituality that I know is of the moment, now, here.

But your greed knows no bounds. It is greedy for money, and then it is ready to do anything. It is greedy for power, and then it is ready to do anything. If somehow you manage to shift your greed from power and money then it becomes greed for spirituality. Again it is ready to do anything.

A rough-looking building worker entered a bank in an expensive part of town and was received at the counter with some distaste by a rather prim and proper female bank clerk.

"Good morning, sir. In what way may I be of service to you?"

"I want to open an account and get a fucking checkbook with it," stated the laborer.

"I beg your pardon?" answered the lady indignantly.

"I said I wanted an account with a fucking checkbook! "

"If you insist upon using such language while addressing me," announced the flustered lady, "I will have to summon the manager who will have you ejected!"

Looking impatient the laborer repeated, "Just give me an account with a fucking checkbook. I haven't got all day! "

The distressed lady called the manager and described the man's behavior. Taking on a commanding air of authority the manager told Miss Hopkins not to worry, he would deal with the matter. He then approached the worker . . .

"I am sorry, my good man, but I am afraid Miss Hopkins finds your manner offensive. I must request you to leave our bank premises immediately."

The laborer replied, "Look, bozo, it is simple! I have just won two hundred and fifty thousand pounds on a National Lottery and I want to open an account with a fucking checkbook!"

"Well," replied the manager, "don't just sit there like an old cow, Miss Hopkins. Get the gentleman an account with a fucking checkbook!"

Greed is ready to do anything, and greed goes on changing its face. And you have to be aware of the ways of greed, ego. The moment the greed and the ego and the ambitiousness of your mind fall through understanding -- jut through understanding, not through any effort -- individuality arises, spirituality arises. It has been there all along, just covered; it has to be discovered. It has not to be achieved -- it is not far away somewhere else -- it is within you. The solution of solutions is within you. It is in your meditateness, in your state of no-mind.

And please, don't hope for any miracle. New people who come here come with the idea of fulfilling their greed their desire, by some miracle. Miracles happen only in stories and nowhere else.

I am not a magician and I am not a miracle worker. I am out and out an ordinary person. If you want to be ordinary, be here with me. If you want to have some extraordinary spiritual status, then go somewhere else. The only miracle I know of is to be absolutely ordinary. Not desiring to be anybody else is the greatest miracle. All other miracles are only in stories.

A young couple checked into a hotel room for the first night of their honeymoon. The young bride shyly went into the bathroom to change into her nightgown. Catching sight of her skinny body in the mirror she sighed and said sadly, "I wish I had a set of forty-fours!"

Zap! Crash! Poof! Suddenly she had tits out to here... Excitedly, she ran into the bedroom to tell her new mate.

"It is incredible!" she blurted. "There is a magic mirror in the bathroom that gave me these beautiful boobs!"

The husband could not wait to try his luck, so, standing in front of the mirror, he said, "Magic mirror, I want a prick that will touch the floor when I am standing up!"

Kabang! Scrunch! Poof! And there he was -- standing on four-inch legs!"

---

## Theologia Mystica

### Chapter #7

#### Chapter title: Translucent Darkness

**17 August 1980 am in Buddha Hall**

Archive code: 8008170

ShortTitle: THEOLO07

Audio: Yes  
Video: No

---

WE LONG EXCEEDINGLY TO DWELL IN THIS TRANSLUCENT DARKNESS, AND THROUGH NOT SEEING AND NOT KNOWING TO SEE AND TO KNOW HIM WHO IS BEYOND BOTH VISION AND KNOWLEDGE -- BY THE VERY FACT OF NEITHER SEEING HIM NOR KNOWING HIM. FOR THIS IS TRULY TO SEE AND TO KNOW, AND, THROUGH THE ABANDONMENT OF ALL THINGS, TO PRAISE HIM WHO IS BEYOND ALL ABOVE ALL. FOR THIS IS NOT UNLIKE THE ART OF THOSE WHO HEW OUT A LIFELIKE IMAGE (FROM STONE), REMOVING FROM AROUND IT ALL WHICH IMPEDES CLEAR VISION OF THE LATENT FORM, SHOWING ITS TRUE AND HIDDEN BEAUTY SOLELY BY TAKING AWAY.

FOR IT IS, AS I BELIEVE, MORE FITTING TO PRAISE HIM BY TAKING AWAY THAN BY ASCRIPTION, FOR WE ASCRIBE ATTRIBUTES TO HIM WHEN WE START FROM UNIVERSALS, AND COME DOWN THROUGH THE INTERMEDIATE TO PARTICULARS. BUT HERE WE TAKE AWAY ALL THINGS FROM HIM, GOING UP FROM PARTICULARS TO UNIVERSALS, THAT WE MAY KNOW OPENLY THE UNKNOWABLE, WHICH IS HIDDEN IN AND UNDER ALL THINGS THAT WE MAY BE KNOWN. AND WE BEHOLD THAT DARKNESS BEYOND BEING, CONCEALED UNDER ALL NATURAL LIGHT.

WE HAVE PRAISED THOSE THINGS WHICH FITLY PERTAIN TO THE THEOLOGY OF AFFIRMATION; HOW THE DIVINE AND EXCELLENT NATURE MAY BE SPOKEN OF AS ONE, AND HOW AS THREE; HOW IN ACCORD THEREWITH THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD MAY BE EXPLAINED, HOW THE SONSHIP, AND IN WHAT MANNER THE TRUTH OF THE SPIRIT MAY BE REVEALED; HOW OUT OF THE INCORPOREAL AND UNDIVIDED EXCELLENCE THEY PUT FORTH THESE THREE INTERIOR LIGHTS OF GOODNESS, AND HOW IN HIMSELF AND IN THEMSELVES, AND IN THEIR MUTUAL AND CO-ETERNAL PROPAGATION THEY REMAIN TOGETHER, NOWHERE GOING APART; HOW JESUS, WHILE ABOVE ALL CREATION, MAY BE IN VERY TRUTH OF THE SUBSTANCE OF HUMAN NATURE. WE HAVE TOLD HOW HE MAY BE CALLED GOOD, BEING, LIFE, WISDOM, AND POWER, AND WHATSOEVER ELSE CONCERNS THE SPIRITUAL NAMING OF GOD.

THEOLOGY is a perverse discipline: it is masochistic. It is a subtle way of torturing yourself, but very subtle. In fact, nobody has ever said that it is a hidden form of masochism, self-torture and perversion, but I would like to make it clear to you that the theology of all the religions is basically stupid. It talks about things it knows not. It talks about things which cannot be talked about. It goes on moving in a vicious circle of contradictions -- because religion is silence and theology is nothing but words.

In the East the division has been very clear, hence we have been saved from a very great curse. In the East the mystic has never tried to be a theologian and the theologian has never been thought to be a mystic. They have been separate disciplines. In the West theology has dominated, so much so that either a mystic had to talk in terms of theology or he had to be ready to be burnt alive.

Dionysius must have felt the utter futility of all that he was saying. I can feel his pain. I can feel compassion and love for him. I can see the man knows. But the people who were in power were utterly ignorant of the truth. And he did not want to be burnt alive so he had to talk in a stupid way.

Lao Tzu talks directly, Buddha's statements are absolutely clear; there is nothing airy-fairy about them. Mahavira says whatsoever he wants to say without creating a great camouflage of big words, theories, ideologies, philosophies. They are very, matter of fact people and very, precise too, almost mathematically precise.

That's why in the East the statements of all the great enlightened Masters are known as sutras. Sutra means a very condensed statement; all that is non-essential has been eliminated,

only the very essential has been expressed. They are like seeds. You can sow those seeds in your soul and a big tree will start growing in you with millions of flowers and millions of seeds. But the statements themselves are very small. They don't go zigzag; they are straightforward, they go like an arrow. They don't go in a roundabout way because they are not afraid to say whatsoever they feel like saying.

The West has not allowed that freedom. And now even in the East the Western disease is spreading. Now even in the East the freedom is disappearing.

I am continuously condemned just because I go on saying the truth as it is without making any compromise with any kind of theology -- of the Hindus, of the Jainas, of the Buddhists, of the Mohammedans, of the Christians. They are all against me. It is a strange phenomenon in the East. It has been the tradition in the West, but the disease has come to the East too. Otherwise in the East nobody has ever been crucified, nobody has ever been killed, poisoned, like Socrates, Jesus, Al-Hillaj Mansur and many others.

Buddha's statements are far more dangerous than whatsoever Jesus has said. Jesus does not deny the existence of God; Buddha denies the existence of God, Mahavira denies the existence of God. Patanjali says that God is only an arbitrary, hypothesis: you can use it if you want, but remember it has no truth about it; it is only a means towards meditation. See the radical, revolutionary,, rebellious spirit of the statement from a man like Patanjali, who has never been surpassed as far as methodologies for the inner journey are concerned, who is the suprememost Master of Yoga and meditative methods.

All over the world it is thought that meditation is a means to God; God is the end. Patanjali reverses the whole situation: he says meditation is the goal, God is only a hypothesis. If your mind is very childish and you need the support of a God to meditate, okay, you can take the support. But remember, the moment you have learned how to meditate, drop that support. It was just to help you in the beginning.

It is like small children's books. If you look at them you will see big pictures, colored pictures, with small texts. If a child has to be helped to understand things and words and language, that's the only way. If you want to teach him what the word "mango" means you have to paint a colorful, very juicy-looking mango. He is interested in the mango, he is not interested in the word "mango." Children are very very pragmatic; they are not as stupid as theologians. But through the picture you can help the child to understand the word "mango." Slowly slowly the picture will disappear -- but it was only an arbitrary device.

Because we are all children as far as the ultimate truth is concerned, Patanjali says, there are many supports. One of those supports is the belief in God. If it helps you to surrender the ego, good; if it helps you to drop the mind, good; because the ultimate thing, the essential thing, the important thing is how to drop the ego, how to drop the mind. Any excuse will do. God is just an excuse. Once the mind is dropped God is also dropped -- because God was nothing but a thought in the mind. Once the ego is dropped God is dropped, because God was nothing but a projection of the ego. The ego means "I" and God means "thou." How can the "thou" exist without the "I"? They can either both exist together or both disappear, evaporate together. They are simultaneous phenomena.

Mahavira, Patanjali, Buddha -- all the three deny any existence to God. Buddha goes a step further: he even denies the existence of the self, of the soul, because, he says, the very idea of the self or the soul is in some indirect way protecting the idea of the ego. You can call it "self," you can call it "soul," but you have saved the idea of the ego in some subtle way. If the ego has to be dropped, eradicated totally, then all these ideas have also to be dropped. There is no God and no soul.

Then what remains? That which remains without "I" and "thou." Buddha calls it the truth. It is not an experience because there is no experiencer and no one experienced. It is not knowledge because there is no knower and no known. Buddha would have been killed in the West immediately, Patanjali would have been crucified, Mahavira would have been poisoned. In the East we accepted them.

ONE strange thing I would like to remind you of: in the East there has been freedom of thought, freedom of tremendous value as far as your thinking is concerned, but there has been no freedom of social forms. In the East there has been a deep slavery as far as social relationships are concerned but absolute freedom for the intelligentsia, for intelligence -- no social freedom, but absolute spiritual freedom.

In the West just the opposite has been the case: social freedom is there. If a couple are hugging each other on the sea beach it is nobody else's concern in the West; that is their personal affair. They are not doing any harm to anybody, and who are you to interfere? But in the East it is almost inconceivable. You cannot even talk to your married wife in front of others during the day in the old, traditional families. You cannot even talk to her, what to say about embracing or kissing her? Your own wife! I am not talking about somebody else's wife -- your own wife. You cannot talk with her in full daylight in front of somebody else. The wife cannot pronounce the name of the husband; that is insulting.

I have never heard my mother pronounce my father's name. I have never even heard my father pronounce my mother's name. For that I always respected him, because that is not the traditional way. They would have to speak in a roundabout way. My father would always call my mother "Rajneesh's mother" -- not directly. no direct relationship. Even when I went to college and to university and for years disappeared from the house, every night he would come home and knock on the door and call, "Rajneesh's mother."

A father cannot even play with his own child in front of his own father. My mother used to tell me that when I was small my father could not carry me around, play with me, because the family was big -- the grandparents were there, uncles were there, others were there. It was not thought right that you should play with your own child, because that shows you are being related to your wife in a sexual way. Otherwise, from where has the child come? A very indirect indication of it.

In the East there has been a social slavery. That's why you are puzzled and the Poona people are puzzled. In the West there is social freedom -- and not only with your own wife. Who cares? It is nobody else's affair at all. You are totally free to relate with people. Everybody has a girlfriend, and not only young people.

Just a few months ago Mukta's father died. He must have been seventy-five and he had a girlfriend -- on the deathbed! He had a wife, children, everything, but also a girlfriend, a young girlfriend. And he was almost dying! He was hanging between death and life for months. and he was a very rich man; he has left much money for the children, for the wife, for me via Mukta! But he has left half of the money to the girlfriend! and it is accepted; there is no problem.

There has been great social freedom in the West, but there has been no intellectual freedom the way it has existed in the East. Buddha condemned Mahavira's stand-point vehemently. Buddha was criticized by Shankaracharya with no compassion. Shankaracharya was condemned and criticized by Ramanuja in the same way as Shankara had criticized Buddha. And there has been no problem. These people were listened to respectfully, with great honor, because they were bringing more spiritual insights, different aspects of reality.

Nobody ever thought that they were destroying religion -- they were enriching it.

But today that has disappeared. Social freedom has not appeared in the East as it should appear, but intellectual freedom has disappeared. Now in the East to be a Buddha is as dangerous as it was in the West.

Hence I can understand Dionysius -- I am in the same situation -- but I would not like to speak... It will look a little ridiculous, but I can speak very easily the way Hindus would like it or the Jainas would like it or the Buddhists would like it. It is only a game with words, but I don't want to speak that way.

Dionysius must have been absolutely convinced that if he spoke the truth clearly and was caught, then his fate was going to be the same as Socrates' or Jesus', and that was not going to serve truth at all. That was his personal decision.

In fact, I don't agree. I would have like him to die like a Jesus, like a Socrates. But nobody can say for another how he should behave; everybody has to decide according to his situation. He decided to speak the language of theology, Christian theology.

A man walking across a bridge late one night noticed another on the parapet about to throw himself over. He rushed forward and shouted, "Don't jump! Come, have a drink and talk things over." It so happened that the would-be suicide was a great theologian.

They went to the nearest pub and spent the next hour discussing the oneness of God and the threeness of God, the virgin birth of Jesus Christ, how many angels can dance on a pin-point, what the Holy Ghost is and things like that. Drinks finished, they went back to the bridge -- and both jumped.

It was one of those universities in the West where attendance was not compulsory. One student of theology attended just one lecture and obtained ninety-six percent.

"Surely you could have got the four percent also," his professor of theology suggested.

"Sure I could," the student replied, "but I attended one of your classes and got confused."

A woman graduate on a return visit to her Alma Mater ran into a professor of theology. "Don't you remember me?" she asked. "You once asked me to marry you!" "Ah yes!" nodded the professor. "And did you?"

It is a kind of insanity. It is a kind of chess with words. You can become very proficient at playing with words, but howsoever proficient you are, anybody who has a little intelligence can see the utter nonsense of it all. And the libraries of the world are full of all these theological treatises -- although nobody reads them, fortunately. They are written by theologians for other theologians. Nobody else reads them.

"Don't you find writing a thankless job?" a great theologian was once asked.

He said, "On the contrary, everything I write is returned to me with thanks."

The theologian's mind works in a very strange way. He can make a mountain out of a molehill. In fact, if he is a great theologian, he can make a mountain even without a molehill! They have created great mountains. Sometimes it is good to look into their books just to see what man has been doing for centuries. And we have thought these people very intelligent people!

ALL the religions are concerned with why God created the world. Nobody can really

answer it -- nobody will ever be able to answer it. In the first place nobody knows whether God ever created the world or not. In the second place, even if he created it, how can you answer why he created it? To know the answer he would have to be psychoanalyzed. He may not know himself

Do you know what things you go on doing? If somebody really asks, "Why? Why have you fallen in love with this woman?" you shrug your shoulders. You say, "It just happened!"

A professor of theology to his agitated wife: "And another thing -- it was not you I was whistling at twenty years ago, it was a taxi!"

Why have you fallen in love with a certain woman? And whatsoever reason you give will look absurd. Her long nose, or the black hair, or the blond hair. When you think about these things you will feel embarrassed even to talk about them, even to say anything about them. So we have found a cover-up. We say, "Love happens, nobody knows why. It is a mysterious phenomenon." There is nothing mysterious about it -- it is just pure chemistry! You put a few chemicals in one bottle and a few chemicals in another bottle and they will fall in love. And of course they will also find reasons: that the neck of the bottle was so beautiful, it was so shapely, and the color inside -- fantastic!

Once a theologian found it difficult to sleep at the inn he had put up in for the night. Scores of bugs in the bed made it difficult for him to drop off. Disgusted, he summoned the innkeeper and complained to him vehemently about the bugs.

"But, sir," the innkeeper protested. "There isn't a single bug in this room!"

"I know, I know," countered the theologian heatedly. "They aren't single -- they're all married and have large families. I can see!"

People become accustomed to a particular way of thinking, and once you have become accustomed to a particular way of thinking it feels perfectly right to you -- but only to you. Anybody else listening to you will find it very difficult to understand what nonsense you are talking about.

An arithmetical chap had to manage his children for a single evening when his wife was away. The following is a record of his activities for the evening:

Opened door for children 108 times.

Shouted "Shut up!" 94 times.

Stopped quarrels 17 times.

Provided water to them 29 times.

Answered the phone 11 times.

Lost temper 45 times.

Cried and wept 29 times.

Ran after children 4 1/2 miles.

Once you are obsessed with a certain pattern of thinking, then to you it looks perfectly right. Now this mathematical chap is doing something right -- according to him everything has to be on record, written mathematically. To you it will look absurd.

THESE words of Dionysius will look very absurd to you, but there is an undercurrent

hidden somewhere that's what I would like you to discover. And then you will be surprised: it is the same truth as Lao Tzu's, as Buddha's, as Zarathustra's, as Jesus'. There is nothing different; it is just that the language, the jargon he uses is that of a theologian -- out of necessity. He must have been surrounded by theologians. He may have come from a family of theologians.

To become a bishop, the first bishop of Athens, seems to be a great honor. He must have been respected by the theologians; he must have many friends. Maybe for many generations his family was practicing the profession of the theologian, and he had become accustomed to talking in this way. Even though he became enlightened the old patterns may have continued, or knowingly he may not have dropped them.

It is said: Only a friend can become an enemy. A relative is one from the very start!

So he must have been surrounded by many enemies -- relatives and friends. To satisfy them he speaks in a very tortuous way. Don't get impatient with him. He says:

WE LONG EXCEEDINGLY TO DWELL IN THIS TRANSLUCENT DARKNESS . . .

Nobody before him, particularly in the Christian tradition, had ever talked about the darkness of God. God had always been thought of as light. He is the first in the Christian world to introduce a new vision of God: as translucent darkness. It was dangerous because God had been thought of as pure light. Darkness is of the Devil, that's why the Devil is always painted black. And God is just pure light, transparent light, light and nothing else.

He says:

WE LONG EXCEEDINGLY TO DWELL IN THIS TRANSLUCENT DARKNESS . . .

But I also feel that his choice is far better. Light is a momentary phenomenon, darkness is eternal -- as eternal as God. Light divides. It is light and I can see you all as different persons. If suddenly darkness descends you will all disappear in the darkness; all distinctions will be lost. Nobody will be rich, nobody will be poor. Nobody will be young, nobody will be old. Nobody will be a man, nobody will be a woman. Even if somebody is sitting there totally dead you will not know the distinction, who is dead and who is alive, who is a sannyasin and who is not a sannyasin. All distinctions will dissolve -- darkness will overwhelm all distinctions; it will encompass you. Light cannot do that miracle, and in that way God is closer to darkness than to light.

Just to satisfy the Christian theological world he calls it translucent darkness, so they don't feel too offended -- translucent darkness, darkness which is full of light. If he had been free to say it he would have said simply darkness, pure darkness, unadulterated darkness. Why adulterate it with light?

You can see it in Lao Tzu: whatsoever he wants to say he says. He says, "I see that everyone in the world seems to be very clear, thoughtful; there is clarity in people's minds. I am the only one who is muddle-headed -- because I cannot see distinctions. I am the only one who is unclear about everything. I am the only one for whom everything is vague, everything is melting and merging into everything else. I cannot define -- I cannot say this is this and that is that." He has the courage to call himself muddle-headed -- no problem about it.

Darkness has depth, light is always shallow. Light is always finite, that's why it is shallow; and darkness is in-finite, it is not shallow.

The Bible says in the beginning there was darkness -- not light, because how can there be

light in the beginning? Who will bring the light? Who will create the light? Light has to be created; darkness is something uncreated. Darkness is like God because God is also uncreated. In the beginning there was darkness... that is a tremendously significant statement. Dionysius says:

WE LONG EXCEEDINGLY TO DWELL IN THIS TRANSLUCENT DARKNESS . . .

Our only desire is to dwell in this darkness, in this infinity, in this distinctionless, unadulterated, abysmal darkness. We want to lose ourselves into it.

. . . AND THROUGH NOT SEEING AND NOT KNOWING TO SEE AND TO KNOW HIM . . .

The only way to see God is to stop seeing, and the only way to know God is to drop all knowledge, because your knowledge will be an interference. Your seeing will be your seeing; it will be a projection of your ego. You have to forget knowledge, you have to forget seeing. Ordinarily we think we see whatsoever is there. That is not true, that's absolutely untrue.

Charles Darwin remembers in his memoirs that when he reached near a small island with his big ship, he was puzzled to know that nobody on the island could see the big ship. It was really a strange experience. Such a big ship had never come before, so they had no idea about it, they had never heard of one. They knew only small boats, very small boats, fishing boats -- only two persons at the most could sit in them. That was their traditional idea of a boat, and the ship was so huge that it simply eluded their vision; they could not see it.

You will not believe it. Even Charles Darwin could not believe it. When he inquired of people, they said, "What you are talking about? We don't see anything." Their seeing had become fixed: they had become accustomed to seeing certain things and they would see only those certain things.

And this you can experience in many ways. For example, if you go into a primitive aboriginal society... There are many such societies still alive in the world -- in India there are.

I have been many times to Bastar, to one of the most ancient aboriginal tribes, which is now slowly being destroyed by the Christian missionaries. Of course, with good intentions -- they are destroying it thinking they are helping. They are making hospitals, and they have introduced diseases which the tribe had never known before. Of course, when missionaries come they bring many things with them: modern diseases... They have introduced modern education -- of course with good intentions, they want to educate people -- but as people become educated they become cunning, dishonest.

In Bastar it has been on record... government records, British government records say that Bastar is the only place where no divorce has ever happened, and Bastar is the only place where no theft has ever happened, and Bastar is the only place where sometimes murders happen but the murderers come to the police station to report that "I have murdered such and such a man." And they come walking hundreds of miles to the police station, otherwise the police would never come to know. Hundreds of miles of thick jungle and mountains they cross to come to the place where the police are available to inform; otherwise the police would never come to know that any murder has happened. And the murderers themselves come to inform them!

Such simplicity, such honesty -- no theft, no cunningness, no deception, no exploitation. In Bastar there has never existed anything like taking interest on money; in fact, there exists no money at all, people only exchange things. In Bastar women are almost naked, just as men

are almost naked. No man is interested in their breasts, no man at all. But when the missionaries come, their whole interest is in their breasts. And they have beautiful breasts -- their womenfolk are very alive, wild and primitive, as alive as animals, and of course they have the same agility and the same flavor of wildness. But the missionary immediately becomes interested in their breasts.

If you see a woman, your first interest is in her breasts. Why? Your mind has become somehow focused from the very childhood. In all civilized countries children are prohibited as much as possible by their mothers from feeding from the breast. Their mothers don't like it because the more children feed from the breast, the more the breasts lose shape; they start hanging, they start looking ugly. So no mother wants the children to breast-feed. Naturally there is a reluctance; even if she has to feed them it is with reluctance not with love. And that reluctance creates a deep desire in the child to cling to the breast.

Now the whole human civilization suffers from that clinging: your whole poetry, great poetry -- Byron, Shelley, Keats, Kalidas. Don't think that it is only in the West, don't think that Indian culture is very spiritual; in fact, Kalidas, Bhavbhuti, the great Indian poets, talk much more of breasts than any Western poet has ever talked.

And you can go into Indian temples and see: the breasts seem to be too big. Go to Khajuraho, Konarak, Puri, and the breasts seem to be inventions; such big breasts do not exist. And these are not my creations, remember -- I have not made these temples. They are thousands of years old, they are absolutely Indian: they represent Indian culture, Indian religion. And you will be surprised to know that in these sculptures all kinds of perverted sexuality is depicted. From where does this perversion come? Repression brings it. You see that which has been repressed, you see that which has been denied. You don't see that which is.

Now scientists say that your eyes only allow two percent of information to pass through; ninety-eight percent of information is prevented outside. And the same is we about other senses too.

If we want to know the truth we will have to learn some new way. That's what meditation is all about: not seeing, not knowing. That is meditation, agnosia, because that is the only way to see and to know him. If you want to know him, if you want to know the truth, you will have to un-learn all your ways -- Christian, Hindu, Mohammedan, Jaina, Buddhist. All your ways of seeing and knowing -- you will have to drop all that. You will have to be utterly empty, in a state of not-knowing, agnosia. Only then will you be able to see and know who he is:

... WHO IS BEYOND BOTH VISION AND KNOWLEDGE...

THE TRUTH is beyond your vision and your knowledge, because your knowledge is your knowledge; it is just ego-confined. And when ego itself is a lie, how can it give you the truth?

A lie, says Murphy, is a very poor substitute for the truth, but the only one discovered so far.

And the whole of theology is full of lies. The truth cannot be said, cannot be uttered, and still people go on talking about it. God has been talked about in millions of pages. About and about, around and around they go, in circles, never touching the center of the reality. That

center can be touched not by thinking but only by meditation.

HE IS BEYOND BOTH VISION AND KNOWLEDGE -- BY THE VERY FACT OF NEITHER SEEING HIM NOR KNOWING HIM.

So, remember. Many people come to me and say, "We want to see God. " Forget all about it if you want to see God you will never see him. You have to disappear.

Kabir says, "I longed and I searched long for God, but I could not find him. Then one day I dropped that longing, that desire, that search, and since that moment he goes on following me. He is always with me. In fact, he has always been with me, but I was so occupied with searching that I never saw him."

I call this the totally relaxed state of your being: when there is no search, no inquiry, no question, when you are so relaxed that you start falling deep within your own being. Soon you touch the rock bottom of it; from that touch great revelations happen. You are not inquiring about God, God starts inquiring about you.

That's actually what Kabir says: "When I stopped searching for him, he started following me. Now he goes on calling me, 'Kabir, Kabir, where are you going?' And I don't care a bit at all about him -- because I know, the moment I start caring about him he will disappear. Either I can be or he can be; we cannot both exist together."

Jesus says the path, the bridge is straight but very narrow, so narrow that it cannot contain two persons.

FOR THIS IS TRULY TO SEE AND TO KNOW, AND, THROUGH THE ABANDONMENT OF ALL THINGS, TO PRAISE HIM WHO IS BEYOND AND ABOVE ALL.

Now he goes on taking detours. He goes on putting in a little bit of Christian theology, just to befool the fools.

... THROUGH THE ABANDONMENT OF ALL THINGS...

Now Christians will think he is talking about renouncing things. He is not talking about renouncing things. He is saying that the abandonment of things means that you don't look at things as things; that is abandonment, not renunciation. When you renounce something you still think about it in the same old way.

A man is greedy for money: he thinks money is very valuable, everything can be purchased through it. Then one day he comes to know that his whole effort was futile, nothing, that he has wasted his life. Realizing it, he renounces the money, he escapes from the world of money, but still he values money. Now he is thinking that by renouncing money he is going to attain truth. First he was thinking that by having money everything can be purchased; now he thinks that by renouncing money everything can be got, even truth. But the logic is the same; it has not changed a little bit -- it is still the money. The focus is the money and the money is valuable. First he was accumulating it, now he is renouncing it, but he has not changed, his approach has not changed; money is still the target.

Dionysius says abandonment of all things. That is a totally different phenomenon. The abandonment of things means don't look at things as things, because all is full of God. Everything is so full, overflowing with God, a that to call it a thing is not right. Nothing is dead, all is alive -- of course, alive in different ways, but all is alive. Even a rock is alive. The

man who has known God knows the aliveness of existence and knows the falsity of death. And if death is false then there is not a single "thing" in the world.

Ordinarily we go on doing just the opposite: we reduce persons to things. When you marry a woman... Before marriage she was a person, an independent person, and you were a person, an independent person; after marriage she becomes a wife, a thing, and you become a husband, a thing. The husband is not a person, the wife is not a person: the wife is some thing that has to be used, the husband is some thing that has to be used; they have become things, commodities. We reduce people to commodities, to things.

And the man of vision, of meditation raises things to persons. He even starts talking with things, with trees, with animals; he starts imparting personality to them.

St. Francis used to talk with trees. He would go to the trees and say, "Sisters. how are you? You look a little ill today." When he died, just before dying he thanked all his disciples for all that they had done for him, and the last thing he did was to thank his donkey. He said, "Brother Donkey, you have been such a great servant to me. In what words can I be grateful to you?" To call the donkey a brother is spirituality. It is raising the donkey to a spiritual being. And Francis is calling him brother!

This is abandonment of things. Things disappear from the world; the world becomes full of beings.

FOR THIS IS NOT UNLIKE THE ART OF THOSE WHO HEW OUT A LIFELIKE IMAGE (FROM STONE), REMOVING FROM AROUND IT ALL WHICH IMPEDES CLEAR VISION OF THE LATENT FORM, SHOWING ITS TRUE AND HIDDEN BEAUTY SOLELY BY TAKING AWAY.

Now this is what I say -- he is going into unnecessary theology. It may have been a necessity for him, but after two thousand years it looks very tortuous, meaningless. All that he wants to say is that God can be described more accurately by negatives. To say this simple thing he has to go in such a roundabout way so that the Christian theologians, the Church, the Pope, cannot catch hold of his idea.

All that he wants to say through this whole statement is contained in two words of the Upanishads: *neti neti*, neither this nor that, or what Buddha calls *via negativa*. The truth is more clearly understood *via negativa* than *via affirmativa*, because when you affirm, whenever you say something, whenever you attribute some quality to God, you give him a finiteness, a boundary. If you say God is beautiful then you have made him limited. Then what about ugliness? Where will ugliness go? If you say God is good, then what about bad? If you say God is this, then what about that? If you say God is man, if you say God is the father, then what about the woman, what about the mother? The moment you affirm something you negate much.

So *via affirmativa* on the surface seems to be affirming, but it affirms less and negates more, while on the contrary *via negativa* apparently negates but basically affirms. *Via negativa* means we don't attribute qualities to God. That's what Dionysius means by darkness: he is so dark you can't see any aspects, any qualities in him. He is so dark that there is no distinction between ugliness and beauty. In darkness, what is the difference between a beautiful woman and an ugly woman?

That may be one of the causes why for centuries people have decided to make love in the night in darkness, because it helps one thing: the woman does not know how ugly you are, you don't know how ugly she is. It is a good arrangement in a way. If you see the woman and the man naked in the light you will soon be bored with each other. The hidden remains

attractive.

And women are more intuitive about it. That's why when embracing you, kissing you, loving you, they will always close their eyes. To look at you in those moments is profane. It is far better to feel you with closed eyes rather than looking, because looking is a partial phenomenon, feeling is total. When somebody is kissing a woman, she wants to feel him with all her cells from head to toe, from her guts, in her bones, in her blood, in her marrow -- she wants to feel the kiss, to let it sink as deep into her as possible -- while the man simply goes on looking.

The man is too interested in the superficial; he is an observer. That's why he is so interested in pornographic magazines, Playboy, et cetera. He is so interested in seeing that he has completely forgotten feeling.

Via negativa the mystic denies all qualities to God. God becomes a pure darkness, emptiness; you have to feel it. And the only way to feel the emptiness of God is to become empty yourself. God is a nothingness, and by "nothingness" I mean "nothingness." So if you want to feel God you will have to become a nothingness. Buddha calls it shunyata, nothingness.

These are the two methods. The organized religions believe in via affirmativa, and the individual mystics have always believed in via negativa. Hence there has been a fight, a continuous struggle, between the priest and the mystic. The priest is an enemy of the mystic. The priest has tried in every possible way to destroy the mystics, because the mystics talk of a totally different process.

These two processes have to be understood. Via negativa means you start with the particular and then you start moving towards the universal. And the universal means the infinite; the particular means the finite. You start with the particular.

For example, you fall in love with a Master. That is something particular: a certain quality in the Master, a certain presence around him, a certain light in his eyes, a certain gesture, a certain grace, anything, but it is particular. And then from the Master you slowly start moving towards the ultimate Master, the Master of Masters. That is universal. You can hold the hands of the Master; you cannot hold the hands of God. You can touch the feet of your Master, but you cannot touch the feet of God. The Master is a visible reality, God is invisible. The Master is just in between. You are almost a thing, God is nothing, the Master participates in both. He participates with you -- he is a human being -- and he also participates with God because he has become a nothing.

That's why Jesus says again and again: I am the Son of God and also I am the Son of Man. That's his way of saying this paradox: that from one side he is the Son of Man, from the other side he is the Son of God. From one side he is a particular human being, from the other side he is just universal nothingness.

Via negativa starts with the particular and ends in the universal, starts with things and ends in nothings. Via affirmativa is just the reverse process: it starts with the universal -- God the infinite, God the indefinable -- and then it comes to the particular -- the pope, the priest, who represents God. You need not bother about God -- for that the pope is enough. He will take care, he is the mediator.

The Master is not a mediator; the Master is only a friend, he only gives you hints. And the Master, if he is truly a Master, is a Master only if he becomes slowly slowly less and less necessary to the disciple. That's the definition of the perfect Master: one who makes himself less and less needed by the disciple.

Buddha says: If you meet me on the way, kill me immediately -- don't hesitate for a single

moment. The priest says: I am always absolutely necessary -- without me you cannot reach God. The priest says: Without me there is no God, I am the bridge, and the only bridge, so don't go to other priests. The Hindu priests will prevent you from going to the Christian priest and the Christian will prevent you from going to the Mohammedan priest. In fact, the Catholic will prevent you from going to the Protestant and the Protestant will do the same.

The priests and the popes and the imams and the ayatollahs -- these people create the organized religion. And the moment a religion becomes organized it becomes dead, it becomes political, it becomes an institution.

FOR IT IS, AS I BELIEVE, MORE FITTING TO PRAISE HIM BY TAKING AWAY THAN BY ASCRIPTION, FOR WE ASCRIBE ATTRIBUTES TO HIM WHEN WE START FROM UNIVERSALS, AND COME DOWN THROUGH THE INTERMEDIATE TO PARTICULARS. BUT HERE WE TAKE AWAY ALL THINGS FROM HIM, GOING UP FROM PARTICULARS TO UNIVERSALS, THAT WE MAY KNOW OPENLY THE UNKNOWABLE, WHICH IS HIDDEN IN AND UNDER ALL THINGS THAT WE MAY BE KNOWN. AND WE BEHOLD THAT DARKNESS BEYOND BEING, CONCEALED UNDER ALL NATURAL LIGHT.

HE SIMPLY wants to say that rather than thinking in positive terms about God, think in negative terms. Dionysius here is pure Buddha just his language is Christian.

WE HAVE PRAISED THOSE THINGS WHICH FITLY PERTAIN . . .

But he is aware that this can be caught; what he is saying can be caught by the priests. So immediately he adds:

WE HAVE PRAISED THOSE THINGS WHICH FITLY PERTAIN TO THE THEOLOGY OF AFFIRMATION; HOW THE DIVINE AND EXCELLENT NATURE MAY BE SPOKEN OF AS ONE, AND HOW AS THREE; HOW IN ACCORD THEREWITH THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD MAY BE EXPLAINED, HOW THE SONSHIP, AND IN WHAT MANNER THE TRUTH OF THE SPIRIT MAY BE REVEALED; HOW OUT OF THE INCORPOREAL AND UNDIVIDED EXCELLENCE THEY PUT FORTH THESE THREE INTERIOR LIGHTS OF GOODNESS, AND HOW IN HIMSELF AND IN THEMSELVES, AND IN THEIR MUTUAL AND CO-ETERNAL PROPAGATION THEY REMAIN TOGETHER, NOWHERE GOING APART; HOW JESUS, WHILE ABOVE ALL CREATION, MAY BE IN VERY TRUTH OF THE SUBSTANCE OF HUMAN NATURE. WE HAVE TOLD HOW HE MAY BE CALLED GOOD, BEING, LIFE, WISDOM, AND POWER, AND WHATSOEVER ELSE CONCERNS THE SPIRITUAL NAMING OF GOD.

He immediately adds that "We are not denying the positive."

He is good, being, life, wisdom, and power, and whatsoever else concerns the spiritual naming of God.

"All the names of God... we are praising and affirming all those things too. We affirm that God is the Father, we affirm that Jesus is the Son, and we affirm also that Jesus is above all creation."

Now this he must be doing just to satisfy the stupid Church, the stupid theologians. Otherwise how can he say that anybody is above all creation? Even God is not above all creation. God is creativity -- how can Jesus be above creation? And if Jesus is above creation, then why not Dionysius, then why not Buddha, then why not Krishna, then why not Lao Tzu? Then every enlightened person is above creation. And then why should the unenlightened

ones be under creation, not above creation? -- because they also have the potential of becoming enlightened.

This he says only to satisfy the fools, but this is not his real approach. He has said clearly that the best way to describe God is that of . . .

. . . THE ART OF THOSE WHO HEW OUT A LIFELIKE IMAGE (FROM STONE), REMOVING FROM AROUND IT ALL WHICH IMPEDES CLEAR VISION OF THE LATENT FORM, SHOWING ITS TRUE AND HIDDEN BEAUTY SOLELY BY TAKING AWAY.

Negation, he says, is the way, not attributing positive qualities to God. The moment you attribute positive qualities to God you create belief in people, worship in people; you create churches and temples. You don't create religiousness; you create only pseudo religion.

When you take away all qualities from God, when God is just a pure nothingness, then only will those who are really interested in knowing the truth become interested in him. Those who are ready to lose themselves, those who are ready to drown themselves, to surrender themselves, those who are ready to die and be reborn into that nothingness -- only those few people will be interested, and they are the only religious people in the world. My sannyasins have to be religious in this sense.

---

## Theologia Mystica

### Chapter #8

#### Chapter title: The Real Magic

**18 August 1980 am in Buddha Hall**

Archive code: 8008180

ShortTitle: THEOLO08

Audio: Yes

Video: Yes

---

The first question

OSHO,  
I UNDERSTAND YOU SAID THE OTHER DAY IN THE LECTURE THAT JESUS DID NOT WALK ON WATER AND THERE ARE NO MIRACLES AS SUCH. BUT BY PRACTICING THE SAMYAMA ON PATANJALI'S UDANA SUTRA, IS NOT MAN ABLE TO DO THIS?  
PLEASE COMMENT.

Anand Guenter,

I SAY again that there are no miracles as such, because the whole existence is a miracle.

What more miracles can there be? Each moment, each event, is miraculous.

The religious person is one for whom everything, from the most ordinary to the most extraordinary, has become a miracle. A seed growing green leaves, is it not a miracle far greater than any guy walking on water on the Sea of Galilee? A bird flying in the sky, on the wing, is it not a greater miracle than anybody walking in fire? The roses, the lotuses, the marigolds, the millions of flowers . . . and you don't see any miracles in them.

And you look for stupid things. Somebody materializing a Swiss-made watch -- that is a miracle, and a rose is not a miracle. Somebody producing holy ash -- that is a miracle, and the man who produces holy ash is nothing but an asshole! -- and a cuckoo calling from the distance is not a miracle. You are blind, utterly blind and insane. You can only believe in childish things. You are not in search of the real magic of life; that's why stupid magicians can deceive you.

Just to be is more than one can believe. To be able to breathe, to be able to see the rising sun, to be able to hear the chirping of the birds, to be able to feel love, prayer, gratitude, silence . . . This very moment -- this is a miracle. The silence that encompasses you, the love that transpires between me and you, the communion, the satsang, with open hearts like lotuses -- you are drinking me with such vulnerability, with such immense trust -- what more miracles are needed to prove that existence is a mystery?

It happened:

A great mahatma -- great because he used to walk on water -- came to see Ramakrishna Paramahansa. Ramakrishna used to live in Dakshineswar near Calcutta, on the bank of the Ganges. He was sitting under a banyan tree looking at the beautiful Ganges flowing by, and the mahatma came. And, of course, such people are on great ego trips. Because he could walk on water, of course he was great. His every vibe was saying "holier than thou."

He stood in front of Ramakrishna and said, "I have heard that people think you are a great mystic -- but can you walk on water?"

Ramakrishna said, "No, I cannot walk on water. In fact, I cannot even swim! Can you?" And the man said, "Yes, I can walk on water."

Ramakrishna asked, "Sir, please tell me how long it took for you to learn the art?"

The man said, "I have devoted eighteen years to learning the art of walking on water."

And Ramakrishna started giggling like a small child, and he said, "This is stupid, because whenever I want to go to the other shore the ferryman takes me, and he takes only one cent! Just for one cent I can go to the other side -- and you wasted eighteen years? It is only worth one cent, not more than that. And you think yourself holy?"

The same type of story happened with that mysterious Mohammedan woman, Rabiya. Hasan, a Sufi mystic, came to see Rabiya and he wanted to show her his powers.

The very desire to show your powers is ugly; it is political. It is not religious, not at all spiritual. He talked about other things, but he was waiting for the right moment to arrive so that he could show his power.

And Rabiya said, "It is time now for me to read my Koran. Are you going to participate in reciting the Koran with me?"

And this was the right moment for which he was waiting. He said, "Let us go on the water." The lake was just in front of them. "We will walk on the water reciting the Koran!"

Rabiya said, "Walking on water, reciting the Koran? That does not appeal to me much. Don't you see the white cloud in the sky? We should go there, sit on the cloud and recite the

Koran."

Hasan said, "But I don't know how to fly in the sky. Have you learned the art of flying in the sky?"

Rabiya said, "Birds can fly in the sky; it is not much of an art. Fishes can swim in the river, in the lake; it is not much of an art. Hasan, come to your senses! I was just joking. I cannot go to the cloud, I cannot walk on the water. But the teal miracle is: reciting the Koran, I disappear. Can you do that? Only reciting remains, singing remains -- the singer disappears, I am no more."

I agree with Rabiya. There have been very few women who can be called Masters; Rabiya is one of them.

You ask me, Guenter: OSHO, I UNDERSTOOD YOU SAID THE OTHER DAY IN THE LECTURE THAT JESUS DID NOT WALK ON WATER...

Yes, because I respect Jesus so much, I cannot believe that he was so stupid as to walk on water.

And you say: YOU ALSO SAID THERE ARE NO MIRACLES AS SUCH.

Yes, there are no miracles as such because the whole of life is miraculous. Your being here and nowhere else -- is it not a miracle?

It is said that once Mulla Nasruddin was making love to a friend's wife and suddenly the friend came in. The wife told Nasruddin, "Hide somewhere -- my husband is coming! Be quick!"

Finding no other place, he went into the cupboard.

The husband came in. He saw the shoes of Nasruddin; he recognized them. He saw his clothes on the table; he recognized them. He saw the wife worried, embarrassed, naked. He asked, "Where is Mulla Nasruddin?"

The wife said, "I don't know. He has not been here!"

And the husband was furious -- as husbands are supposed to be. He ran all over the house, looked in every nook and corner, under the bed, in the bathroom, in the kitchen. And finally he opened the cupboard, and Nasruddin, utterly naked, was standing there.

The friend asked, "Why are you standing here?"

Nasruddin said, "That's a great metaphysical question! One has to be somewhere. And I am not an expert in philosophical things. Now you are almost asking me, 'Why do you exist?' 'Why are you here?' you are asking me. This question can be asked any where; wherever I am somebody can ask, 'Why are you here?' "

The man agreed. He said, "That's right, the question is metaphysical."

Why are you here? Why does this whole existence exist? Is it not tremendously mysterious, miraculous? And you are asking for small things. Those small things are all invented; they are small magic tricks -- or those things exist only in stories.

I have heard a story that Jesus, Luke, John, all three were going to the boat that was in the middle of the lake. Luke walked over the water, then John also walked over the water; they

both reached the boat. Then Jesus followed them and started sinking.

Luke said to John, "Should we tell him where the rocks are?"

And this story:

In a small town there was a lake whose waters were known to be miraculous. People came to the lake, dived into its waters and came out the other side cured.

"I have seen it all," stated an old-timer of the town. "I have seen a blind man jump into the lake and emerge on the other side, yelling, 'I can see! I can see!' "

An old and poor cripple listening to this story decided to go to the miraculous lake himself. When he got there he saw a man with one leg jump into the lake and come out the other side crying in disbelief, "I can walk! I have two legs! "

The cripple could not wait any longer, so he jumped into his old wheelchair and pushed himself into the lake . . .

The townspeople pulled him out the other side, dead. But his wheelchair came out with brand new tires!

It seems the wheelchair knew Patanjali's art and the secrets of doing miracles!

Patanjali's Sutras certainly mention miracles, but for a totally different reason, not for the reason, Guenter, that you think. Patanjali has written a separate chapter about siddhis, miracles, for the specific purpose that nobody should get involved in such things. It is to debar, prohibit. It is not his purpose that you should become interested in miracles. His purpose is very clear.

He says those who get lost in miracles are lost in a jungle. Certainly there are powers within you, hidden powers within you, which you are not aware of. And when you start going deeper into meditation those hidden powers start manifesting themselves, and there is every possibility you will be tempted by those powers. There is nothing miraculous about them; they are as natural as any other law. We just don't understand the law underlying them, hence we call them miracles.

For example, if you meditate, soon you will realize the fact that you can read other people's thoughts. Now it will look like a miracle: before the person has asked the question you can answer him. And he will be surprised, and you will be worshipped as a great saint. But you are being very stupid, because somehow you have got rid of your own ideas, now you are becoming interested in other people's ideas. Your ideas were useless; do you think other people's ideas are very significant? It took a long, arduous journey to somehow get rid of your mind, and now you have got into more trouble. Millions of minds around you, and as each person passes by you will read his thoughts. You have missed the point!

This is not intelligence. It is a very stupid act on your part, very mediocre, to get involved in other people's ideas and start reading them. Of course, they will be impressed and they will worship you, but all their worship will simply strengthen your ego. And soon you will see that as the ego becomes strong again, your mind comes back and you stop reading other people's ideas.

Then people have to invent strategies so that they can go on claiming the power that once was there and is no more there. It is very difficult to accept defeat. Then a person becomes a charlatan, a cheater. In the beginning it may have been some inner power that became manifest in him; now he has lost it. But how to say to people that "I have lost it"? The moment he says he has lost it, all the worshippers and the followers will disappear.

Patanjali has written a whole chapter just to make you aware that these things are possible. There are possibilities hidden in you, undreamt by you; they can become manifest when you go inwards. But don't get in any way involved with them; remain a witness. Remain untempted and go on moving inwards. And the temptation will be great. There are no devils or Satans tempting you; it is your own mind and its inner capacities which tempt you.

For the same reason I deny miracles. I don't want you to become interested in any sort of thing that can become a distraction from your real search. I know perfectly well that if the fish can swim in the water and the bird can fly in the sky, there is a possibility that through certain yoga practices your body can start levitating. You can lose gravitation's grip on you, you can be free of it, through a certain process of breathing. You can become almost weightless, and then you can walk on water or fly in the sky.

But I deny all these things for the same reason that Patanjali mentions them, because my own experience has been this: that Patanjali's mentioning them has not been of help. If he had not mentioned them it would have been far better, because people are so foolish . . . In fact, people read that chapter more. Patanjali's Sutras contain only four chapters. Three chapters have to be practiced and the fourth has to be avoided. But people become interested only in the fourth, and if they are interested in the three they are interested in the three only as a means towards the fourth. Patanjali's purpose is completely lost.

After five thousand years of spiritual search and groping in darkness and observing millions of people, this is my conclusion: that if Patanjali had not mentioned those miracles, many more people would have been benefited.

It is the same story... God told Adam and Eve not to eat the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge -- and they became interested in it. In the Garden of Eden there were millions of trees; they were not interested in any other tree anymore. They were tempted more and more by the Tree of Knowledge. "Why has God forbidden it?" The forbidden fruit becomes more appealing. We all know the forbidden kiss is far more sweet -- and the stolen kiss can give you diabetes! It is pure white sugar.

The day God told Adam, "Don't eat from this tree," from that day Adam must have dreamt of the tree again and again. He must have gone for a morning walk, evening walk, night walk around the tree, many times a day, to see whether the tree still existed or not and how the fruits were growing. You can imagine how much he must have thought about it again and again.

And this is just nonsense to say that the Devil came in the form of a snake to tempt him -- God was enough. His forbidding him was enough to tempt him. There was no need for the Devil, no need for any snake to come in.

Say to any child, "Don't do this," and there is every possibility that he will do it.

My father told me, "Before it is too late I want to tell you, don't smoke."  
And I told him, "Now it will be difficult for me!"  
He said, "What do you mean?"

I said, "I had never thought about it. In fact, the whole idea has always seemed foolish to me. Instead of breathing pure air, taking dirty smoke in and out . . . And you have to pay for it! And you have to suffer for it. And I have seen people coughing and still smoking."

My own grandfather suffered his whole life from a cough. And the doctors were saying, "Don't smoke," but that was impossible for him. To the very last he continued to smoke.

So I said, "Watching my grandfather was enough. Why did you say to me, 'Don't smoke'? Now I can assure you that I will smoke!"

And that very day I smoked for the first time. Of course it was bad -- a bad experience: tears came to my eyes and I started coughing. I could not believe that millions of people are doing this. But I told my father, "I have smoked today and I am finished with it. Had you not told me, I may not have even tried. There are millions of things in the world to be interested in."

The same mistake has been made by Patanjali, with all good intentions. He mentions in detail all the siddhis, all the powers that are possible, just to make the seeker aware -- but he himself is completely unaware of the foolish people who are going to read these sutras.

In fact, in those days Patanjali's Sutras were not written, so it was safe because they were delivered from the Master to the disciple orally; they were delivered only to the person who was intelligent enough, capable enough. But now the danger is widespread.

Whosoever reads Patanjali's Sutras becomes immediately interested in the chapter which is specifically there to prohibit you. But that's how people are. Not even small people but people who are very intelligent, great people, they also become interested in things which are prohibited.

For example, J. Krishnamurti, one of the most intelligent persons today, still reads detective novels, and for the simple reason that in his childhood, when everybody likes detective stories and novels, he was prohibited. Each thing was watched: what he ate, what he read, where he went . . . He was brought up like a prisoner. From the age of nine up to the age of twenty-five he was continuously watched -- not even a single moment of aloneness.

And that dirty old man leadbeater who was his guardian appointed by Annie Besant, the President of the Theosophical Society, followed him like a shadow. And always somebody was there to keep an eye on him, because he was going to be the World Teacher. Now the World Teacher cannot be allowed to smoke cigarettes, to play cards, chess, or to experiment with psychedelic drugs, or to fall in love with a girl.

He was not allowed the company of any girl of his own age. When he was thirteen he was only allowed the company of a woman who was forty, and even then there were rumors all around the world that they had fallen in love. The woman was forty and the woman almost thought of him as her son, but the rumor became so widespread that finally they were separated -- forced to separate. They had fallen in love in a way: he started loving her as his mother and she started loving him as her son. But even that was not right -- any kind of attachment may deter the progress of the World Teacher. And, of course, no detective novels, no stories...

Once he became free, once he declared at the age of twenty-five that "I am not going to be the World Teacher. I disband the organization that has been specially made for me . . ." A great organization had been created to receive the World Teacher, the Order of the Star of the East; he dissolved the Order. He returned all the properties that belonged to the Order; he returned all the donations that had come to the Order. At the age of twenty-five he became free from the Theosophists. Since then he has never read the Gita, the Koran, the Bible, the Upanishads, the Tao Te Ching, the Talmud. Since then he has been reading only detective novels. This is how mind works. That prohibition is still a hangover.

Guenter, it is not that I am not aware that there are many many hidden powers in man, but I don't want you to become interested in them. Hence I simply say they are stupid. And there are far more miraculous things happening all around. Become interested in them, because my whole effort here is to help your spiritual growth, not to hinder it.

The second question

## OSHO, IS GOD REALLY DEAD, AS FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE SAYS?

Satsang,

FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE is one of the most important beings in the whole history of man, of the same caliber as Jesus, Moses, Mohammed, Mahavira, Buddha, Zarathustra. He would have become an enlightened being, but something went wrong. Instead of going through a breakthrough, he went through a breakdown.

What really went wrong was the Western atmosphere, the whole Western intellectual climate. The responsibility is that of the Christian Church. The Christian Church is the culprit. It has destroyed the possibility of many many people like Friedrich Nietzsche becoming enlightened.

The Christian Church has destroyed all intellectual freedom in the West. The people who showed any sign of rebellion were burnt alive; their books were burnt, prohibited. The Christian Church has been one of the most fascist organizations in the history of man. It is not an accident that fascism, Nazism, communism, all the three dangerous dictatorial trends of this century, are outcomes of Christianity.

The East cannot be held responsible because in the East intellectual freedom has always existed, has always been respected. No intellectual in the East has been crucified like Jesus; no philosopher has been poisoned like Socrates; no mystic has been murdered like Al-Hillaj Mansur. And the East has known more people like Socrates than the West, and the East has produced more people like Jesus than the West, and the East is studded with mystics like Al-Hillaj Mansur. But never, not even for a single instant, have we destroyed anybody's freedom. We have respected freedom as the ultimate value. Hence, when a man becomes enlightened and attains to the ultimate truth we say he has attained to moksha. The word moksha means absolute freedom, unconditional freedom, a freedom from which no fall is possible.

But Christianity has been very dictatorial. The ultimate consequence was that only the mediocre people remained in the Church and the intelligent people left the Church, or even if they remained in the Church they remained only formally; their hearts were not with the Church.

Friedrich Nietzsche became so disgusted with Christianity... And he knew only Christianity; he never knew anything about Zen, Sufism, otherwise he would have been a totally different man. The breakdown may not have happened; the breakdown may have changed into a breakthrough. He fought against the whole tradition of Christian domination, so much so that finally he became Anti-christ. He was fascinated by the personality of Jesus, but because Jesus is at the root, unfortunately -- not that he intended to be at the root of the Christian Church, but it happened so, that the whole Church is based on Christ's idea -- Friedrich Nietzsche became Antichrist. In his last days he had started signing his name "Antichrist Friedrich Nietzsche." He went mad. He risked his sanity, but he saved his freedom.

I respect the man, I love the man. I would have liked him to become a Buddha -- he had all the potential -- but he was in a wrong climate. He needed the Eastern freedom and the Eastern soil.

His antagonism became so great that not only did he become against Christ, he became an archenemy of God himself, because as he looked deeper into the phenomenon he found that Jesus is not the real foundation of the Christian Church -- the real foundation rests on God, on the idea of God. Unless you remove that very foundation the Church cannot collapse.

Hence his statement that God is dead. You may not have heard the whole statement; this is only a part, and the whole is very significant. The whole statement is: "Rejoice! God is dead and now man is absolutely free." Then it makes sense. "Rejoice that God is dead! Now there is nobody to dominate you. There is nobody above you; you need not be afraid of any God -- you can forget all about God and Jehovah."

Because the Jewish-Christian-Mohammedan idea of God is not of a very nice fellow; he is not a gentleman. The Jewish God who is at the root of both the Christian and the Mohammedan God says himself, "I am a very jealous God. Those who are against me, I will destroy them. Those who are not with me are against me. Those who are with me will have all the pleasures of heaven, and those who are not with me will suffer eternal hellfire."

Nietzsche says, "Rejoice, God is dead! There is no heaven and no hell. Don't be afraid of hell and don't be greedy for heaven, because there is no God. God is dead, and man is absolutely free."

This has been done in the East in a far more subtle, delicate way. Mahavira says there is no God -- for the same reason as Nietzsche. Mahavira says if there is a God then man cannot be free. There is a very significant logic in it. If there is a God then man cannot be free. How can man be free? because man is just a created creature. God decided to create you, so he created you. If he decides tomorrow to uncreate you, he will uncreate you. What freedom have you got? It is God's decision to create you the way you are; you are not responsible for it. How can you be held responsible for all the instincts that have been given to you by God?

Mahavira said: See the futility of the whole argument of the theists. See the ridiculousness of the whole idea of man's self-condemnation -- because of sex, because of anger, because of greed. What can man do? If God created man in this way, then God is responsible, not man. And why did he create this type of man and this type of world? If anybody has to suffer, then God has to suffer, not man. Man is only a creature.

It is like if you make toys. Now if something is wrong with the toy, who is responsible? You cannot condemn the toy. You make machines. If something goes wrong, then you are responsible, not the machine.

When atom bombs were dropped on Nagasaki and Hiroshima, you cannot condemn atom bombs or atomic energy; you can only condemn the politicians who used atom bombs there, you can condemn the scientists who created those atom bombs. And Albert Einstein felt it continuously after Hiroshima and Nagasaki -- he was sad.

And the day he died somebody asked him, "If you are going to be born again what would you like to be? Would you like to be a physicist, a mathematician again or not?"

Einstein said, "No, never! Rather than being a physicist I would like to be a plumber, because I have done so much harm to humanity" -- unconsciously, of course.

But you cannot say that about God, that he has created man unconsciously. If even God is unconscious, then what is the possibility of man ever becoming conscious?

Mahavira says there is no God, because only in the non-existence of God does man become responsible. And I agree with Mahavira, with Buddha, with Nietzsche. The first and the foremost quality of a religious person is self-responsibility, to feel that "I am responsible for whatsoever I am. It is my choice. I have been given all the alternatives. I was born open-ended; nothing was predetermined. Whatsoever I am, it is my responsibility -- good or

bad. There is no fate, no God."

Mahavira denied God, but he never went mad like Nietzsche. Meditation saved him. Buddha denied God -- not only God, Buddha went a step further; in fact, now there is no further to go -- Buddha denied God and Buddha denied self. Buddha said there is no God and no self. Buddha said if there is a self, then again you cannot be totally free. Your self will have certain qualities and those qualities will go on persisting; they will be intrinsic. Your freedom will be conditional. The first thing is to get rid of God; the second thing is to get rid of your self. Then your freedom is total. Then there is only freedom and nothing else. But Buddha never went mad for the simple reason that meditation saved him.

Nietzsche would have been a Mahavira or a Buddha, but there was no meditative dimension available to him. Once you deny God, the whole mountainous responsibility of your being falls on your own head. You can be crushed by it. That's what happened: Nietzsche was crushed under his own freedom, he was not able to cope with the freedom.

God, as Christians, Mohammedans, Jews and Hindus have conceived him, does not exist. But I will not say, like Mahavira or Buddha or Nietzsche, that there is no God. I say life is God. In fact, I don't want to use the word "God," my own preference is bhagavata, godliness. The existence is full of godliness, and in deep meditation you become part of that godliness. If God is life, synonymous with life, then there is no question of God dying. Life cannot die; it is eternal.

I have heard:

There are two tombstones seen on a remote part of the planet. On one is written: "God is dead, signed Friedrich Nietzsche." On the other is written: "Nietzsche is dead, signed God."

And I think the second is truer -- Nietzsche is dead. God is not dead in Nietzsche's sense, because his idea of God was basically wrong. It was a Christian idea: God as a person, and a dominant person.

One of the great Indian mystics, a baul of Bengal . . . The word baul means a madman. The bauls are really mad -- madly in love with God. This mad baul Chandidas says: "Sabar upar manusatya. Tahar upar nahin -- Man's truth is the highest truth. There is no other truth higher than that." He is saying the same thing as Nietzsche, but in a more positive way. He is declaring man's godhood, man's godliness. Nietzsche simply denies, and affirms nothing. His denial brings a negative emptiness. Chandidas denies, but his denial brings a positive emptiness.

"Sabar upar manusatya . . . The highest truth is the truth of man and there is no truth higher than that. " He is also saying there is no God, but he is at the same time declaring that you are God. God is not dead because life is alive. The flowers are still flowering, birds are still singing, the existence continues -- how can God be dead?

But Nietzsche is dead, and his life was a life of tremendous misery. It was unfortunate that he was born in the West in a Christian climate; he needed the Eastern atmosphere. He needed to be in a Zen monastery or a Sufi commune. He still would have come to know there is no God but then he would not have gone mad; on the contrary he would have become enlightened.

The third question

OSHO, YOU HAVE GIVEN ME THE NAME OF DEVADATTA, AND MANY

PEOPLE SAY TO ME THAT HE WAS THE GUY WHO TRIED TO KILL GAUTAM THE BUDDHA MANY TIMES. THEN WHY HAVE YOU GIVEN ME SUCH A NAME?

Devadatta,

THE NAME in itself is very beautiful. It means: given by God, by the grace of God, a gift of God. It means exactly what the English name John means. John means: a gracious gift of God. Devadatta also means the same. It was just a coincidence that this was also the name of the man who tried to kill Gautam Buddha many times.

He was Gautam Buddha's cousin-brother, and he was very jealous. He became a disciple of Buddha, but because he was a cousin-brother, almost of the same age, and they had studied in the same school and they had played together and they had hunted together, he felt that he was equal to Buddha. And Buddha told him many times, "Not only are you equal to me, everybody is equal to me. The moment I became enlightened, all questions of inferiority or superiority disappeared. Even rocks are equal to me -- because it is all one existence."

But that was not enough to satisfy him, because Buddha was the great Master and he was just a disciple amongst thousands of disciples, just a nobody. Finally he conspired against Buddha. He collected a few disciples and betrayed Buddha, hoping that many more followers would come to him. But nobody came to him, just those few people, and even they slowly started deserting him -- because he had nothing to give to them. No truth was there in his experience yet; he was as unconscious as they were. So for a few days he could deceive them -- he was a great intellectual but not an enlightened person -- he could argue well, he could convince people intellectually, but that does not satisfy the deep longing of the heart to attain the truth.

People slowly deserted him. Then he became very angry, enraged. Then there was only one possibility for him: to kill Buddha. He tried many times but failed, always failed. The story is told:

Devadatta was despairing after his latest attempt to assassinate the Buddha had failed. "It looks like that guy really is divine," he sighed reluctantly to his chief assassin. "I really can't get to him!"

In desperation at his own failure as a seeker, he decided to end it all.

"Oh well," he said, "I can will the insurance money to his sangham, maybe that will earn me some merit. Tell me, old friend, how much will you charge to bump me off?"

His Old associate looked at him for a moment and said, "Oh, Devadatta, for you I will do it free!"

Remember one thing: the person who kills and the person who commits suicide are not different people. The person who wants to murder somebody is the same person who can murder himself. Psychologists have still to discover the fact that these two people are not different. It is the same energy, the same violence. Turned on the other it becomes murder; turned on oneself it becomes suicide. Going extrovert it is murderous; going introvert it is suicidal.

Devadatta failed to Kill Buddha; in that failure he thought of committing suicide. The same happened to Judas. Indians are thinkers not doers, so Devadatta really never committed suicide, he only thought of it. But Judas really committed suicide, the next day, the very next day. One day Jesus was crucified, the next day Judas committed suicide. He was the man

responsible for Jesus' murder: he sold Jesus for only thirty silver coins. But once Jesus was killed the whole scene changed, the whole context changed.

In fact, it is something worth understanding: if you lose your friend you don't lose much, but if you lose your enemy you lose much. The moment your great enemy dies something in you becomes empty, because you were fighting with him, you were engaged with him, you were occupied with the idea. Now there is nothing to do -- all is finished.

Judas was contemplating for months and years how to finish Jesus, not knowing that the moment Jesus was finished he would feel absolutely empty and meaningless. His whole meaning was around Jesus. And that's what actually happened. The next day he felt so empty, so futile, that he committed suicide.

This happens to everybody in different ways, in different situations, and everybody has to understand it.

Just the other day Sheela wrote me a letter saying that since Chinmaya's death she is feeling very empty and continuously remembering Chinmaya, and that her relationship with Veetrag is almost on the rocks. Some barrier has arisen between them; they are not as attuned to each other as they were when Chinmaya was alive.

When Chinmaya was alive, to fall in love with Veetrag was not really falling in love with Veetrag but just a way of escaping from Chinmaya. Sheela was very happy and the relationship with Veetrag was going great. And I was afraid that the day Chinmaya died the relationship with Veetrag might die also -- it depended on Chinmaya's existence. Once Chinmaya was gone the whole conflict with Chinmaya was gone too. And now the mind remembers all the sweet memories and the beauty of the person.

And certainly he was a beautiful person. He lived beautifully, he died beautifully. He suffered much, but he suffered in a graceful way. And I can understand Sheela's difficulty. To live with a person who was constantly ill, who for years was almost on his deathbed . . . I knew him for at least eight years and throughout those eight years he was on his deathbed. Now you can love a person who has dengue fever -- two, three days, it's okay; or even hepatitis -- three to six weeks, one can conceive the end of it.

I have every compassion for Sheela. It was difficult, very difficult, to live with a person who was bound to die. The doctors in the West had said that he could not survive more than two years; he survived eight years. Those eight years were a long suffering for Sheela, and certainly she wanted some distraction, some place where she could forget Chinmaya completely. He had to be looked after twenty-four hours a day, round the clock, and Sheela served him as lovingly as it is possible in a human way. The whole night he was suffering, coughing. His breathing was hard, noisy, wheezing continuously; the whole body was in pain. It was a torture. He was witnessing it all and he was growing, but for Sheela it was far more of a torture, and she wanted some distraction.

Falling in love with Veetrag had nothing to do with Veetrag. That's my observation: that Veetrag or anybody else would have been the same. It was an excuse, but while Chinmaya lived the love affair continued. Now Chinmaya is no more. I was afraid: now some barrier was bound to come between Sheela and Veetrag, because the person from whom she was trying to escape for a few moments at least, to forget and to drown herself in somebody . . . Veetrag was just like an intoxicant, a tranquilizer, an occupation, so she could forget all about Chinmaya and his illness. It was needed, it was good, so I was not against it; I favored it. I said, "It is perfectly good." But the fear was there that once Chinmaya was gone, then what would happen? -- because the source was in Chinmaya; she was withdrawing from Chinmaya. Now there is nothing to withdraw from.

So Veetrag started getting farther and farther away, and Sheela is puzzled why it is happening because now she has twenty-four hours a day available for Veetrag. Why is there a barrier coming? It never came while Chinmaya was alive.

This is simple psychology, and everybody has to understand it. You go on doing many things for reasons you are not aware of; you become aware only when those reasons disappear.

Now this relationship can only be somehow carried on; it cannot have the same flavor. It was a negative relationship, it was not a positive relationship. It is bound to wither away sooner or later. And if they both understand it then they can allow it to wither away joyfully, thankfully, because whatsoever it has given to them was beautiful. Why ask for more? Why be greedy? When the time comes to let go of a thing one should be capable of letting it go.

I can understand the trouble for Sheela: Chinmaya has gone and this relationship is disappearing. She seems to be left absolutely alone. Don't be worried at all, Sheela, because out of absolute aloneness something tremendously beautiful will arise which can never arise in your so-called relationships. And if you can become capable of being alone, if you start rejoicing it, if you start dancing it, then there will be a possibility of a totally new kind of relating with people. You may love again, but that love will be out of abundance -- because you have too much, so you want to share it. Otherwise, because we are empty inside we want to stuff ourselves with somebody else's energy -- and he is also empty. Two beggars trying and hoping that "The other is rich and I am going to get something from the other," are bound to fail, are bound to feel frustrated. They are doomed.

I was going to call Sheela and tell her this, but then I thought it was better to tell you all because this is an experience which is significant for everybody, because everybody has to pass through such experiences.

The last question

OSHO,  
ARE INDIANS REALLY AS UNINTELLIGENT AS YOU SAY?

Sant Maharaj,

DON'T lose heart! There are even people far worse than the Indians -- always think of them and you will feel good and cheerful. There are Polacks . . .

Bhavita has asked me: Osho, why do Polacks open the bedroom door while they are making love?

Bhavita, so that nobody can peep through the keyhole. This is intelligence!

Bhavita has also asked: Osho, do you know what the Polack answered who was walking home from a fair with a pig under his arm, and a guy who knew him came up to him and asked, "Where did you get him?"

Bhavita, before the Polack could answer, the pig replied, "I won him at the fair!"

So there are Polacks . . . Sant, don't be worried.

Bhavita asks: Osho, did you hear about the Polack who tried to take his new car for its

first service?

Yes, Bhavita, it wouldn't fit through the church doors.

And Bhavita asks: Why is Polack toilet paper five hundred sheets longer than usual?

Bhavita, because the first five hundred sheets are instructions.

Sant Maharaj, cheer up! There is no need to be worried.

Bhavita asks: Why can't one put a Polack into a cannon?

Bhavita, because according to the Geneva Convention, dum-dum bullets are illegal.

And Bhavita also asks: How is a Polack ladder different from an ordinary one?

Bhavita, it has a stop sign at the top -- otherwise the Polack will never stop, he will go on and on. The ladder will be left behind.

And you say: Are Indians really as unintelligent as you say?

Not all Indians . . . Sant is not unintelligent. I make him sit by my side . . .

Somebody has asked a question. The questioner is Emilio Ducoli. He says: "Osho, if someone said to you, 'Don't speak, don't be silent, but tell me who you are?' what would be your answer?"

For that Sant is sitting by my side: he will hit him as hard as possible! In the old days, Zen Masters used to hit people themselves. I am a lazy person, and Sant is a good boxer. And you know boxing needs no intelligence! Sant will teach him a lesson. That is the special purpose for which he is allowed to sit by my side. I will not answer Ducoli; I will simply look at Sant and Sant will answer.

A man came to me once and he said, "Twenty-four avatars were born in India, twenty-four teerthankaras were born in India, Gautam Buddha was born in India and also in his previous lives he was always born in India, as were so many saints and so many mahatmas. And God has said in the Gita that 'I will always come whenever I am needed' -- and he has always been coming to India. Do you still say that India is a materialist country, do you still say that India is not very intelligent, do you still say that India has no special spirituality, that it is not a religious land?"

I said, "Yes, still I say that. In fact, all these things prove what I say." In the Gita, Krishna says, "Whenever you need me I will come. " It seems India needs gods more than any other country! Twenty-four avatars and where are we? We still need; even forty-eight avatars won't help us much. Whatsoever they do we are expert at undoing it. Twenty-four teerthankaras and what has happened?

It is like a man who brags about his health: "Because," he says, "look! All the doctors of this city visit me. I must have the best health in the world!" He must be the most ill person in the world if all the doctors have to visit him continuously.

God has been visiting India so much that it seems it is a mess! Yes, Buddha is intelligent, but how many Buddhas are there? Mahavira is intelligent, but how many Mahaviras are there? Yes, once in a while, among millions of people, one person has risen to the ultimate heights -- but how many? They can be counted on your fingers. And don't think that their intelligence is your intelligence. Don't live in a reflected glory; that is absolutely foolish. That's what we have been doing for centuries: living in a reflected glory. Krishna, Buddha,

Mahavira -- and we feel so happy that we completely forget that we have to do something too, that we have to be intelligent too, that we have to create something too.

Yes, there have been spiritual people in India, but India is not a spiritual land; there have been intelligent people, but India has not proved intelligent itself. As a country, for two thousand years we have been living in slavery. Is this intelligence?

As a country, I think India has the lowest morality in the world. The whole Indian idea of morality is concentrated on sex; anything else has nothing to do with it. You can lie and nobody will think you immoral. You can deceive, you can be Insincere, you can promise to come today, and for months you may not come, and nobody will think you are immoral. In India a promise means nothing. If somebody says, "I am coming at five," he may come at four, he may come at six; he may not come at all today; he may come tomorrow at five. And you cannot say that this is immoral. People are adulterating everything -- not only milk, even medicines are adulterated. You cannot rely on Indian medicines. You may be hoping that the injection is going to save you; it may kill you, because it may be just ordinary water -- not even pure water. Everything is unreliable.

The whole morality consists of you clinging to your wife and your wife clinging to you, and you remain like detectives, after each other; that is your whole morality. This is a very silly idea of morality and a very limited idea of morality.

In fact, to live with a woman you don't love is immoral; Whether she is your wife or not does not matter. To live with a man, to go to bed with a man you don't love -- he may be your husband -- but it is immoral. It is prostitution -- of course, approved by the society, but approval cannot take any difference. And how many couples love each other?

I have been a guest in hundreds of families all over India and I have never come across more than two or three couples who are really in love. Otherwise they are enemies, fighting each other tooth and nail, always at each others' necks, but very moral because the wife remains strictly faithful to the man -- to the man she does not love. What kind of faith is this? And the man remains faithful to the woman whom he always wants to murder, or hopes that somebody else will do the thing, or hopes that some natural calamity . . . the house will collapse in the rain or some illness will catch her or something. And in India things are always happening buses falling in the rivers, airplanes crashing, trains disappearing. . . So the man goes on hoping that "Someday something is bound to happen and I will get rid of this woman." But till then he is faithful to the woman whom he has never loved.

Without love can there be faith? It is only fear, not faith. It is formality, not faith. It is just cowardliness, not faith. If you are brave, if you are really a man, you will say to the woman, "I don't love you, hence I cannot go on reproducing children with you." And the woman will say, "I don't love you either, so it is better we part company." But this is our whole morality.

Almost the whole of India is against me for the simple reason that they think I am destroying their morality. I am not destroying their morality; I am bringing a real moral sense to you. Now my movement to Kutch is opposed because I will "destroy the morality of Kutch. " But I cannot go on destroying the morality of Poona only; I have to move, I have to destroy a few other people's morality!

What morality have you got? I am coming to Kutch to destroy your immorality. I call all this that goes in the name of morality immoral. It is utterly immoral.

The whole idea of marriage is immoral, and an arranged marriage is basically immoral. Only a love marriage has a morality, and that too only to the extent that the love is alive. The moment love disappears, morality disappears.

Yes, in India we have seen great enlightened people, but they are like silver lines around

black clouds. Don't believe that those silver lines are of much help; you cannot even read by their light. When there is lightning you cannot even read, you cannot write. Yes, for a moment you can see, and then all is darkness -- even darker than it was before.

Whenever a Buddha dies this country falls into a deeper valley of darkness. Yes, when a Buddha is alive there is a little glory around him, a little splendor, a little light, but that too is available only to those who are courageous. And India is a country of cowards -- otherwise how can you explain two thousand years of slavery?

Yes, once in a while, Sant Maharaj, there are people who are intelligent and they invent new things; they need Nobel Prizes.

I have heard this story:

At the Vatican in Rome a gathering of missionaries from all over the world met to discuss their experiences in the Third World countries.

The priests working in India and in Africa were talking together.

"Well, Father, how are things going in India?" asked the African priest.

"Very well, thank you, Father," he replied. "We have been working on ways to ease the food shortage and have found a new way to reduce the population."

"How?" inquired the African priest. "Are you using new methods of birth control?"

"No, no. After much experimentation we have seen that that doesn't work. So we have invented a very simple and effective technique: the 'Crunch Scrunch Method.'"

"What is that?" asked the priest, intrigued.

"In the big centers like Bombay and Calcutta, our organization has begun to construct new hygienic male toilets -- but with a unique design. When a patron squats down to shit, his balls hang down through two separate holes and we have one of our workers standing underneath with a brick in each hand -- crunch! scrunch! -- we smash their balls together!"

"Holy Mother of God!" exclaimed the other priest with a gasp. "That must hurt!"

"Oh no, not really," said the Indian priest, "not if you keep your thumbs out of the way!"

---

## Theologia Mystica

### Chapter #9

#### Chapter title: I laughed

**19 August 1980 am in Buddha Hall**

Archive code: 8008190

ShortTitle: THEOLO09

Audio: Yes

Video: Yes

---

The first question

OSHO,

I AM DEEPLY CONVINCED THAT OUR WAY IS TO DROP THE EGO, TO COME BACK TO OUR POTENTIAL OF SENSUALITY AND EMOTIONAL SENSITIVITY, AND TO INCREASE IN TOTAL AWARENESS. I NEVERTHELESS HAVE DIFFICULTY IN COMPREHENDING THAT SPIRITUAL CREATIVITY SHOULD NOT BE AN ORIGINAL PART OF OURSELF. AGAINST THIS I REALIZE THAT THE CREATIVE SPIRIT IS HAPPENING HERE AND THAT NEW FORMS OF LIFE HAVE BEEN CREATED IN POONA. CAN WE CONSIDER THOUGHTS, IMAGES AND SPIRITUAL GUESTS, FOREIGN GUESTS, COMING TO US WITHOUT OUR MENTAL ACTIVITY -- JUST AWARENESS NEEDED? I THINK THIS IDEA IS REALLY NOT EASY TO UNDERSTAND FOR THE WEST. IT SEEMS THE POINT TO JUMP, BUT IF I DID NOT FEEL A STRONG FAITH IN YOU AND READINESS FOR YOUR MESSAGE I WOULD NOT BE HERE. PLEASE BE PATIENT.

Ilas,

I REALLY will have to be patient! The first thing.

You say: I AM deeply convinced...

Do you understand the reason why we go on asserting such statements as "I strongly believe," "I am deeply convinced" ? The truth is just the opposite -- it is a cover-up. If you know, you know; there is no question of strong belief or deep conviction. Are you convinced that the sun rises in the east, deeply convinced? You simply know it, you don't have to believe in it. Knowing needs no belief, and all believing is an effort to pretend knowledge which does not exist in the first place. Belief is pseudo knowledge.

And because deep down you feel that you don't know, this not-knowing has to be repressed. By strong beliefs you repress this state of not-knowing. By deep convictions you force your natural state of not-knowing to the unconscious layers of your mind.

A man of knowledge has no beliefs at all. He does not believe even in God, he knows, and his knowing is enough. There is no need for it to be strong -- against what? Why do you need a strong conviction? -- because there is a strong doubt to repress. You are divided. Look into it! I am not talking about any theory, it is a simple fact. Look underneath your convictions and you will always find undercurrents of strong doubts.

That's why believers can change their belief very easily, but they cannot allow the natural doubt to surface. The theist can become an atheist; when he was a theist he was strongly convinced of its truth, and when he becomes an atheist, he is strongly convinced again of the truth of atheism.

Kahlil Gibran has a beautiful story about it:

In a small village there were two scholars, philosophers. The village was really small and it could not contain two scholars. One was a theist, the other was an atheist -- obviously, because scholars cannot agree; their only agreement is to disagree. And they were constantly quarreling, fighting, arguing -- not only that, they were disturbing the peace of the town.

People were not concerned at all whether God exists or not. Who is concerned? Except for a few fools, nobody is concerned whether God exists or not; that is not a real concern of life. Real concerns are different. Love may be a real concern, fear may be a real concern. Violence may be a real concern. Death, life -- these are real concerns. What has God got to do with you?

The villagers were tired, the more so because both were great logicians and the village was continuously wavering. They would become convinced of atheism, and then the atheist would come and destroy their conviction. They would become convinced of theism, and then the atheist would follow. It became a nightmarish phenomenon

Finally they decided: they requested both the scholars to argue one full moon night, and the whole village would listen to their argument. And whatsoever the conclusion the whole village would follow the conclusion, "So this arguing can be stopped, so that we can be left in peace You decide whether God exists or not. You both argue and decide."

Great argument followed. It continued the whole night. It was complex, intricate, but the villagers were really interested because they were giving such beautiful arguments for and against that each moment there was a wave of change. When the atheist spoke, the whole village would feel "Now this is the end." When the theist spoke they would think, "Now, what more can there be?"

In the morning they were in for a great surprise. A great miracle happened: the theist became convinced of atheism and the atheist became convinced of theism. But the problem of the village remained the same. The whole night wasted, and there was nothing in their hands.

It is not difficult. In fact the more strongly you are convinced, the easier It is to change your conviction -- because the more strongly you are convinced, the more indications you are giving that there is a very strong doubt which needs such a strong conviction to repress it.

Soviet Russia before the revolution was one of the most theistic countries in the world. Even India is not so theistic. It was the orthodox stronghold of Christianity, very orthodox. And then, within a few years, within just five to ten years, the whole country changed from a strong conviction of theism to a strong conviction of atheism. What happened?

China was one of the most religious countries in the East under Confucius, Lao Tzu, Mencius, Chuang Tzu, Lieh Tzu -- the great heritage. And then the impact, the great impact of Buddha and Bodhidharma. Thousands of monasteries, thousands of monks, Taoist, Buddhist, Confucian, and at least five thousand years of traditional up-bringing, yet within ten years after the revolution all that disappeared. Now China is as strongly convinced of atheism as it was convinced of theism.

My feeling is that if any day this misfortune happens in India, that India becomes a communist country, it will become the most atheistic country in the world. The same people who look so religious will become anti-religious in the same way, with a vengeance, because the doubt is there deep down waiting for the right moment to assert itself.

You cannot make America atheist in the same way that you can India, for the simple reason that in America the conviction is so lukewarm it does not really matter. God is only a formality, religion is nothing but a Sunday affair, the church is not more than a club. A few people go to the Rotary Club, a few people go to the Lions Club, a few people go to the Catholic Club and a few to the Protestant Club... These are clubs where people talk sweet nothings and gossip about the society -- good meeting places, nothing is wrong with it, but very lukewarm; there is no question of anything strong. Because there is no strong conviction in America, America can never become a stronghold of atheism.

That's why communism is not succeeding in America, for the simple reason that communism is an atheistic philosophy, fanatically atheistic. In fact, Karl Marx, Friederich Engels, the founders of communism, had prophesied that America would be the first communist country. They would have never thought, even in their dreams, that Russia would

be the first communist country, because both were economists -- they knew nothing of psychology and they knew nothing of the inner workings of the human psyche.

If they had asked me I would have told them that America is going to be the last country in the world to become communist. I would have suggested India, China, Russia -- these three countries have the most potential to turn towards communism. Two have already turned, the third is getting ready -- for the simple reason that five thousand years of repressed doubt has become tremendously strong. Remember one thing: the conviction through which you repress the doubt goes on becoming weaker because its energy is being used in repressing. That which is repressed goes on becoming stronger because it is not losing any energy at all; it accumulates energy.

You say, Ilas: I AM DEEPLY CONVINCED THAT OUR WAY IS TO DROP THE EGO...

Look into your conviction and you will find a very great doubt about what you are saying. And once you find the doubt then something can be done, because the doubt is the reality. Nobody teaches you doubt. There are schools of Hindus and Mohammedans and Christians teaching you belief. There is nobody who teaches you doubt -- even communists don't teach doubt. They teach a new kind of belief -- the belief in no-God.

They have their own religion. Of course Kaaba is not their holy place; it is the Kremlin. They have their own trinity. You may not call it a holy trinity, you can call it an unholy trinity. It is not God the Father, the Holy Ghost and the Son; it is Karl Marx, Friederich Engels, V. I. Lenin -- the trinity, the same trinity. Karl Marx is the father, Lenin the son, and this Friederich Engels is certainly a Holy Ghost, because his whole purpose was to supply Karl Marx all his needs.

You will be surprised to know that Friederich Engels was one of the richest men, one of the greatest industrialists in Britain. Marx lived on his money his whole life because he never earned any. It is because of Friederich Engels and his capitalist money that communism has come to become a philosophy, a way of life for millions of people.

Everybody teaches belief, but doubt is natural. Hence the real Masters of the world... for example, Gautam Buddha, says to his disciples, "Don't believe just because I say it is so. Don't believe just because the holy scriptures say it is so. Don't believe because the masses believe in a certain thing. Unless you experience, never believe in anything. Go on doubting -- go on doubting to the very extreme."

Doubt is a natural, intrinsic quality of your being; it is God-given. Use it, because it has tremendous power in it. It is an instrument to discover truth.

Ilas, I will not suggest that you become deeply convinced of anything, I will suggest that you doubt and doubt totally so that you can discover truth. Doubt is not against truth, doubt is a methodology to discover truth. Doubt is not an enemy of truth but the only friend. Belief is the enemy of truth because it is belief that prevents you from discovering, from inquiring.

So the first thing I would like to suggest;to you is: drop this idea of deep convictions.

Again in the end you say:... a strong faith in you.

Forget this language; this is not the right language -- at least not in this place. In this context I respect doubt, I don't respect belief, because my own experience is that through doubt people have discovered truth, and through belief people have remained ignorant their

whole lives, they have never discovered truth.

But priests won't say this to you. Priests are all for belief. And if you are Strongly convinced the priest is very happy because now you can be used as a fanatic fool, now you are available to the priests to be exploited.

I am not a priest, I am just a friend. I am here to explain to you how I have discovered truth. Doubt has been my own process, my own way to reach to truth. And I would like you to become more and more sharp, intelligent. Doubt more scientifically. Just as in science doubt helps you to discover. it also helps in the inward journey.

Drop condemning doubt and praising faith, belief, convictions.

You say: I AM DEEPLY CONVINCED THAT OUR WAY IS TO DROP THE EGO...

Who is this "I am"? Who is convinced? Now this is a contradiction.

You say: I am deeply convinced that our way is to drop the ego . . .

"I am" is nothing but another name for the ego. Now you will be getting into trouble. If the ego is convinced that the only way is to drop the ego, then who is going to drop whom? And how? It will be like pulling yourself up by your own shoestrings. You will look just silly. Watch each word that you use. "I am" is nothing but the ego.

The second thing: nobody has ever been able to drop the ego because ego is not a reality that you can drop; anything to be dropped at least has to be real, substantial. Ego is just a notion, an idea. You cannot drop it, you can only understand it. Can you drop your shadow? You can run as fast as you want but your shadow will run at the same speed, exactly the same speed.

There is a Taoist story about a man who became afraid of his shadow. He was reading a story... He was alone on a farm in a small hut, and in the deep darkness of the night, reading a story that was saying shadows are nothing but ghosts, he became so frightened that he looked at his own shadow and started running. Again he looked and the shadow was there. The natural logic was that he was not running fast enough, so he started running faster and faster. The faster he ran, the faster the shadow followed him. He became utterly exhausted and tired, so much so that he could not run anymore and just sat under the shadow of a tree. The moment he sat under the shadow of the tree, his shadow disappeared.

He was very much puzzled: he could not get rid of the shadow while he was running so fast, and now that he was simply sitting under the shade of the tree, the shadow disappeared.

This is a beautiful parable, of great significance. You cannot drop the ego. Once you start trying to drop the ego you will get in a very deep mess; you will become more and more worried and puzzled. And this is not the way to get rid of the ego. The only way to get rid of the ego is to look at it.

First, try to find out where it is, whether it is there or not in the first place. And one who goes in never finds it; it simply disappears. Ego is just an idea, the idea of those people who have never gone in. And they suffer because of the ego -- because it is a false thing, it creates suffering. Remember, reality always creates blessings and falsity always brings misery.

Hell is the most false thing in the world -- it exists not. Heaven is the only reality. We are in it right now, this very moment. We cannot be anywhere else. If you are in hell that is your creation, your fantasy, you are seeing a dream. If you are in heaven that is not your fantasy, that is not your dream, that's how things are. Heaven is the way of things.

Just look inside and try to find out, to point out where the ego is, and you will be surprised: you cannot find it anywhere. And when you cannot find it anywhere, it is gone -- without dropping it.

But if you start dropping it, that will be like running to get rid of the shadow. You will become unnecessarily exhausted, unnecessarily tired, and you will start feeling very guilty because you have not been able to get rid of the ego. You will start feeling that you are a sinner, you will start condemning yourself. Your whole life will be destroyed just because of a simple mistake: that you looked out and started running, you never looked in.

Just a single experience of the inner world is enough to reveal the fact that the ego is a falsity, that we are not separate, that we are one, that we are part of one organic universe.

That oneness is the goal of all true religion. You can call that oneness moksha, nirvana, God, or whatsoever you like, but oneness of the whole existence. The trees, the rocks, the stars, the people, the animals, the birds -- they are all one. It is one life manifesting in millions of ways, one ocean waving in millions of waves, but one ocean. Each single wave has no separate identity.

It is not a question of dropping the ego, it is a question of understanding the ego. The moment you understand it, it is no more there. If you don't understand it, it is there, and you can go on doing all kinds of austerities -- you can stand on your head, you can go on a long fast, you can go to the mountains, to the monasteries -- but remember, your ego will become more and more subtle, more and more strong. That's why your so-called saints are more egoistic than anybody else. Even politicians cannot defeat them.

Your so-called saints are egoists for the simple reason that they are trying the hardest thing in the world, the most impossible thing in the world -- going to the moon is not so difficult, going to Mount Everest is not so difficult -- they are trying to get rid of the ego. And how much they are sacrificing for it: fasting for months, reading the holy scriptures the whole day, reciting the Koran, the Gita, doing all kinds of stupid rituals, worshipping gods of their own imagination! If you look at people -- what they are doing -- you will be surprised.

Somebody is worshipping Hanuman -- a monkey god! Somebody is worshipping Ganesh -- an elephant god! Human beings doing such stupid things that I have seen monkeys laughing, elephants giggling, because I have never seen a monkey worshipping the statue of a man! No monkey is so foolish, no elephant is so foolish. But man is not only worshipping statues, he worships stones, he worships trees, he worships rivers -- anything. He just has to be hypnotized by tradition, by convention, by the mass, by the collective mind -- he has to be hypnotized.

Millions of people go to Kaaba. Every Mohammedan has the idea deep in his mind that if he does not go to Kaaba his life will be in vain. And what is there in Kaaba? -- just a black stone. But more people have kissed that black stone than any other stone. Now, in fact it is very dangerous to kiss it -- it must be carrying so many germs! Millions of people down the ages, for fourteen hundred years, have been kissing the stone.

Scientists say that with a single kiss at least one hundred thousand germs are exchanged between a man and a woman; or, if you are gay, then between a man and a man. What about kissing the stone of Kaaba? -- for fourteen hundred years millions of people, year in, year out, go on kissing it. It must be the most dangerous stone in the world. But every Mohammedan

has the desire to go on a hajj, on a holy pilgrimage, so that he can become a hajji, so that he is known as a holy pilgrim -- he has been to Kaaba, he has kissed the stone, the holy stone.

Either the whole existence is holy or no stone can be holy.

Hindus go to the rivers... Now scientists say that the Ganges is the most polluted river in India; it is very dangerous to take a dip in the Ganges. But who listens to the scientists? Hindus think this is the holiest river and once you take a dip in the river all your sins are washed away. And my feeling is that the scientists must be right because so many people have washed their sins in it... It is not only polluted, it is the most sinful river, because how many people have been washing their sins in it! Now even to take a dip in it is dangerous: you may wash away your sin, you may bring back somebody else's with you. It is always good to have your own, at least you are familiar with them. Now bringing back somebody else's sin you never know what you are in for.

The only true religion is the religion of understanding, and understanding comes out of agnosia. Never forget this beautiful word of Dionysius': agnosia, a state of not-knowing.

Ilas, I have to be patient with you only because you are so full of knowledge, so full of words. Your questions are not real inquiries, they are all intellectual, they are not existential.

You say: I AM DEEPLY CONVINCED THAT OUR WAY IS TO DROP THE EGO...

If you are deeply convinced then drop it and be finished! Then why are you carrying it? With such a deep conviction, why are you carrying the ego? Do you need more deep conviction? How much have you been able to drop of the ego with so much deep conviction? If you have not been able to drop any part of your ego then no conviction is going to help.

And you say:... TO COME BACK TO OUR POTENTIAL OF SENSUALITY AND EMOTIONAL SENSITIVITY AND TO INCREASE IN TOTAL AWARENESS...

You have simply learned words, otherwise there is no going back ever. One cannot go back in time, one always goes forwards. One becomes a child again, but that is not going back, that is going forward.

That's why the words of Jesus are not... Remember the words. He says, "Unless you are like small children you shall not enter into my kingdom of God." He has not said, "Unless you are children," he says, "Unless you are like small children . . ." It is very clear that he is saying you should be a grown-up person and yet like small children. It is not children themselves who will be able to enter into the kingdom of God, but people who have passed through all the experiences of life, good and bad. sweet and bitter, who have come to a certain maturity through experience, who have lived life dangerously, who have gone astray many times and who have committed thousands of mistakes -- because this is the only way, this is the only fire that crystallizes you. These people can be children again.

But this is not going back, it is going forward. It is the ultimate peak, like the snow-covered peaks of the Himalayas. It has a purity far more beautiful than children can ever have, because children are just ignorant. They are innocent because they are ignorant. Their innocence is not that valuable. It is out of ignorance, that is why they are innocent. All animals are innocent because they are ignorant.

If you want to go back, you will be ignorant and innocent. If you go forward, you will be wise and innocent. And the difference is tremendously great. With wisdom, innocence has a totally different flavor, a different beauty. With ignorance, it is nothing; sooner or later it is bound to be lost -- it has to be lost. It is like the first set of teeth, they are bound to fall out,

the milk teeth -- they will fall out. Then the real teeth will come. The child's innocence is only ignorance -- it has to go, and the sooner it goes the better. Don't protect it and don't hope that you can go back. Going back is not going to help. That's where I differ from Primal Therapy.

It is good as an experiment to go back in your memories. You only go back in memories, you cannot go back in time. It is good to go back in your memories just to see how it was when you were just a small child. But Primal Therapy cannot help you unless you move forward in meditation. Primal Therapy may become an impetus, an inspiration, a triggering phenomenon -- it may give you an insight into the beauty of the innocence that childhood was. But there was something ugly also, ignorance. Now you have to sort it out. Ignorance has to be dropped and innocence has to be increased. Ignorance can be dropped only by wisdom, by awareness. It is going forward, it is not going backward. But you have learned beautiful words from books.

You say: I NEVERTHELESS HAVE DIFFICULTY IN COMPREHENDING THAT SPIRITUAL CREATIVITY SHOULD NOT BE AN ORIGINAL PART OF OUR SELF

The original self is not a self at all, the original face is not a face at all -- it is pure emptiness. There is no center in it called "self," because that is again ego coming from the back door. And out of that emptiness certainly great creativity is born, but that is not your creativity. You have nothing to do with it -- you are no more there -- God starts flowing through you. That's why in the East we say the Vedas are not written by man, they are apaurusheya, they are divine. Man has only recorded them; they have been revealed by God.

The same is said about the Ten Commandments in the Old Testament -- God gave those Ten Commandments to Moses. Moses is not the creator, he is only a messenger. The same is said about the Koran: the Koran is not Mohammed's creation, it is not his writing; he is just a vehicle.

Yes, when you attain to an egoless emptiness great creativity happens. But one never knows what kind of creativity it will be. One cannot predict it, because it has nothing to do with you. One never knows for what God is going to choose you. He may sing a song through you, he may become a bhagavadgita, a divine song, or he may paint through you, or he may do something else. Nobody knows -- nobody can know -- one can only wait and allow the whole to take possession of you.

The creator is one who is possessed by the whole. Ninety-nine point nine percent of your so-called creators are not creators, they are all egoistic people. Your painters. your poets, your authors, they are very egoistic people.

These three are the most egoistic people: the saints are the first, the second are your so-called intellectuals, the intelligentsia, and the third are the poor politicians. They come third in the race because their power is very gross. The intelligent person thinks his power is more subtle, and the spiritual person thinks, of course, his power is the most supreme power.

You say: AGAINST THIS, I REALIZE THAT THE CREATIVE SPIRIT IS HAPPENING HERE, AND THAT NEW FORMS OF LIFE HAVE BEEN CREATED IN POONA.

We are not doing anything creative -- we are not the doers, we are meditators. We have come together here not to do anything at all. But then things happen... Out of that nothingness

many flowers bloom, blossom. And when something comes out of your nothingness, it has the signature of God on it.

You say: Can we consider thoughts, images and spirits as guests, foreign guests, coming to us without our mental activity -- just awareness is needed?

Yes, that's exactly how it is. But as far as you are concerned, Ilas, I don't think you know through experience what awareness is. If you knew it there would have been no question. That too is just guesswork.

That's why you say: Can we consider thoughts, images and spirits as guests, foreign guests, coming to us without our mental activity -- just awareness is needed?

Each thought comes from the outside and goes back to the outside. It is just like breath.

Teilhard de Chardin has coined a word, "noo-sphere. " Just as there is air surrounding you, atmosphere he used to say that another, subtle atmosphere is surrounding you, the noosphere. Just as you breathe air in and out, that is a must for your body, from the noo-sphere, the thought sphere, you continuously breathe in and out -- that is a must for your psychological existence. All thoughts come from the outside, and just as they come. they go. But you start claiming that "These are MY thoughts!" That's where the problem arises. If you can simply watch . . .

Buddha's method was: first watch your breathing coming in and going out. Start with breathing because that is a gross thing and can be watched more easily. Start with the most gross: watch your breathing coming in, going out.

He divided your breathing in four steps. First, the breath comes in. You just watch the breath going in, the subtle touch, your lungs being filled with it. Then there comes a moment of pause -- for a split second all stops; the breath is in, nothing is moving. Watch that pause because that is the most important thing. Then another process begins: the breath starts going out. Watch it again. Then your lungs are empty, they shrink; the breath has gone out totally. Again there is a pause -- for a split second all stops. Watch that too, because these two pauses are the most significant for the meditators. Then the breath starts coming in.

So these are four things: the breath coming in, the breath going out, and the two pauses at both ends. Those two pauses, when everything stops, are of tremendous silence. If you can watch those pauses, then comes the second step: start watching your thoughts. Each thought goes through the same process, the same four steps. The thought comes in, stays for a moment, goes out, and the pause. Another thought comes in, pause, the thought goes out. Start watching your thoughts.

And the third step is... Because of watching your breath and thoughts you have come to know now that you are neither thoughts nor your breath, you are the watcher, the witness. This is awareness. This is what I call meditation. Once you have known this awareness you are unidentified with your body, with your mind. Now you experience a vastness inside you, in one sense utterly empty and in another sense overflowing full. Because of its emptiness you will remain calm and quiet. And because of its overflowing fullness you will be creative.

But please, Ilas, don't go on guessing, thinking. Experiment, experience.

You say: I THINK THIS IDEA IS REALLY NOT EASY TO UNDERSTAND FOR THE WEST.

This is not an idea. For you this is an idea, that's the difficulty. This is not an idea at all, this is a very tangible reality -- you can hold it in your hands. That's what I am here for: to help you to hold it in your hands. This awareness, this nothingness, this fullness is the most potential reality in the world. It is the first experience of God, or godliness.

And you think it is difficult to understand for the West? Don't be worried about the West, you just be worried about yourself. What has it got to do with West and East? It has nothing to do with geography.

There have been people in the West who have experienced it. From Moses to Jesus, to Eckhart, there have been many who have experienced it. I think if somebody really counts all the Western enlightened people and all the Eastern enlightened people the number must be the same, because there is a subtle balance in existence: the East must balance the West, the West must balance the East, otherwise the balance of nature will be disturbed and nature never allows disturbance. It always keeps the balance.

In the West you have not thought much of your enlightened people, that's why many names have disappeared. In the East we have respected them very much so we have not lost a single name. But according to the law of balance, East and West have both experienced the same quality of consciousness in the same number of people.

Don't be worried about the West. You are here, experience it.

You say: IT SEEMS THE POINT TO JUMP,...

So what are you doing? For what are you waiting? Jump! How much longer do you have to wait?

And you say:... BUT IF I DID NOT FEEL A STRONG FAITH IN YOU AND READINESS FOR YOUR MESSAGE I WOULD NOT BE HERE.

Please remember perfectly well that I don't expect any faith from you or any belief from you in me. If you are here to believe in me for some strong reasons that you call "faith," "conviction," then you are here for wrong reasons. Be here to experiment, to experience.

I am not a philosopher -- I am not teaching you a certain philosophy, I am not imparting any knowledge or information to you -- I am available for a totally different kind of work. You can call it transformation but not information.

The second question

OSHO,  
WHAT WAS THE FIRST THING THAT YOU DID AFTER YOU BECAME ENLIGHTENED?

Ashu,

I LAUGHED, a real uproarious laugh, seeing the whole absurdity of trying to be enlightened. The whole thing is ridiculous because we are born enlightened, and to try for something that is already the case is the most absurd thing. If you already have it, you cannot achieve it; only those things can be achieved which you don't have, which are not intrinsic parts of your being. But enlightenment is your very nature.

I had struggled for it for many lives -- it had been the only target for many many lives. And I had done everything that is possible to do to attain it, but I had always failed. It was bound to be so -- because it cannot be an attainment. It is your nature, so how can it be your attainment? It cannot be made an ambition.

Mind is ambitious -- ambitious for money, for power, for prestige. And then one day, when it gets fed up with all these extrovert activities, it becomes ambitious for enlightenment, for liberation, for nirvana, for God. But the same ambition has come back; only the object he changed. First the object was outside, now the object is inside. But your attitude, your approach has not changed; you are the same person in the same rut, in the same routine.

"The day I became enlightened" simply means the day I realized that there is nothing to achieve, there is nowhere to go, there is nothing to be done. We are already divine and we are already perfect -- as we are. No improvement is needed, no improvement at all. God never creates anybody imperfect. Even if you come across an imperfect man, you will see that his imperfection is perfect. God never creates any imperfect thing.

I have heard about a Zen Master Bokuju who was telling this truth to his disciples, that all is perfect. A man stood up -- very old, a hunchback -- and he said, "What about me? I am a hunchback. What do you say about me?" Bokuju said, "I have never seen such a perfect hunchback in my life."

When I say "the day I achieved enlightenment," I am using wrong language -- because there is no other language, because our language is created by us. It consists of the words "achievement," "attainment," "goals," "improvement" "progress," "evolution." Our languages are not created by the enlightened people; and in fact they cannot create it even if they want to because enlightenment happens in silence. How can you bring that silence into words? And whatsoever you do, the words are going to destroy something of that silence.

Lao Tzu says: The moment truth is asserted it becomes false. There is no way to communicate truth. But language has to be used; there is no other way. So we always have to use the language with the condition that it cannot be adequate to the experience. Hence I say "the day I achieved my enlightenment." It is neither an achievement nor mine.

[At this point there was a power failure: no light, no sound.]

Yes, it happens like that! Out of nowhere suddenly the darkness, suddenly the light, and you cannot do anything. You can just watch.

I laughed that day because of all my stupid ridiculous efforts to attain it. I laughed on that day at myself, and I laughed on that day at the whole of humanity, because everybody is trying to achieve, everybody is trying to reach, everybody is trying to improve.

To me it happened in a state of total relaxation -- it always happens in that state. I had tried everything. And then, seeing the futility of all effort, I dropped... I dropped the whole project, I forgot all about it. For seven days I lived as ordinarily as possible.

The people I used to live with were very much surprised, because this was the first time they had seen me live just an ordinary life. Otherwise my whole life was a perfect discipline.

For two years I had lived with that family, and they had known that I would get up at three o'clock in the morning, then I would go for a long four- or five-mile walk or run, and then I would take a bath in the river. Everything was absolutely routine. Even if I had a fever or I was ill, there was no difference: I would simply go on the same way.

They had known me to sit in meditation for hours. Up to that day I had not eaten many things. I would not drink tea, coffee, I had a strict discipline about what to eat, what not to eat. And exactly at nine o'clock I would go to bed. Even if somebody was sitting there, I would simply say "Goodbye" and I would go to my bed. The family with whom I used to live, they would inform the person that "Now you can go. He has gone to sleep." I would not even waste a single moment in saying, "Now it is time for me to go to sleep."

When I relaxed for seven days, when I dropped the whole thing and when on the first day I drank tea in the morning and woke up at nine o'clock in the morning, the family was puzzled. They said, "What has happened?"

Have you fallen?" They used to think of me as a great yogi.

One picture of those days still exists. I used to use only one single piece of cloth and that was all. In the day I would cover my body with it, in the night I would use it as a blanket to cover myself. I slept on a bamboo mat. That was my whole comfort -- that blanket, that bamboo mat. I had nothing -- no other possessions.

They were puzzled when I woke up at nine. They said, "Something is wrong. Are you very ill, seriously ill?"

I said, "No, I am not seriously ill. I have been ill for many years, now I am perfectly healthy. Now I will wake up only when sleep leaves me, and I will go to sleep only when sleep comes to me. I am no longer going to be a slave to the clock. I will eat whatsoever my body feels like eating, and I will drink whatsoever I feel like drinking."

They could not believe it. They said, "Can you even drink beer?" I said, "Bring it!"

That was the first day I tasted beer. They could not believe their eyes. They said, "You have completely gone down. You have become completely unspiritual. What are you doing?"

I said, "Enough is enough." And in seven days I completely forgot the whole project, and I forgot it forever.

And the seventh day it happened -- it happened just out of nowhere. Suddenly all was light; and I was not doing anything, I was just sitting under a tree resting, enjoying. And when I laughed, the gardener heard the laughter. He used to think that I was a little bit crazy, but he had never seen me laugh in that way. He came running. He said, "What is the matter?"

I said, "Don't be worried. You know I am crazy -- now I have gone completely crazy! I am laughing at myself. Don't feel offended. Just go to sleep."

You ask me, Ashu, What was the first thing that you did after you became enlightened?

Laughter. And that's the thing that I have been doing since then. I cannot laugh before you while telling jokes because that destroys the jokes, but I laugh through you.

Mario staggers into his favorite bar and asks for a triple scotch.

"What happened to you?" the bartender asks.

"I am fucking mad!" Mario says. "It all started late last night. We had been working late and my secretary asked me to drive her home. When I turned on the ignition of my car, the key snapped off in my hand!"

"Oh, that would sure piss me off," says the bartender.

"No, that didn't get me mad," says Mario. "We just took a cab, went up to her apartment and ate a little snack she prepared. Then she asked me if I would like to lie down with her a while."

"And then?" asks the enthralled bartender.

"Well," continues Mario, "as I unzipped my trousers my bloody fly got jammed and I couldn't get my pants off!"

"Wow! That would really get me mad!" exclaims the bartender.

"Naw... That didn't get me mad. We got into it soon enough, and there we were going at it good and strong when all of a sudden there was a key in the latch. 'Quick,' she said, 'it must be my husband. Hide!' "

"Now that's a real piss-off!" says the bartender.

"No," says Mario, "that's not what made me mad. I had to hide fast. In the cupboard and under the bed were obvious places, so I hung by my fingers out of the window. '

"And then?" says the bartender.

"Well, the husband bursts in and yells, 'Where is that sonofabitch hiding?' And without waiting for an answer he looks under the bed and in the cupboard and then he looks out of the window and sees me hanging by my fingers there with no clothes on."

"And then?" says the bartender.

"Well, he runs to his cupboard and pulls out a nine iron from his golf bag and with a grin on his face jumps onto the window sill and starts teeing off on my finger-tips, one by one."

"Jesus Christ! No wonder you are mad!" says the bartender.

"No! That's not why I am mad!" says Mario. "It was only when he got down to the last finger that I looked down and realized that I was only twelve inches off the ground! That's why I am mad!"

---

## Theologia Mystica

### Chapter #10

Chapter title: None

**20 August 1980 am in Buddha Hall**

Archive code: 8008200

ShortTitle: THEOLO10

Audio: Yes

Video: No

---

I THINK, TOO, THAT YOU HAVE UNDERSTOOD HOW THE DISCUSSION OF PARTICULARS IS MORE LENGTHY THAN OF UNIVERSALS.

FOR THE MORE WE ASPIRE TO HIGHER THINGS, THE MORE OUR DISCOURSE UPON THINGS OF THE INTELLECT IS CUT SHORT, EVEN AS, WHEN WE ENTER THAT DARKNESS WHICH PASSES UNDERSTANDING, WE SHALL FIND NOT BREVITY OF SPEECH BUT PERFECT SILENCE AND UNKNOWING.

HEREIN SPEECH DESCENDS FROM THE UNIVERSAL TO THE PARTICULAR, AND AS IT DESCENDS IT IS INCREASED IN PROPORTION TO THE MULTIPLICITY OF THINGS. BUT NOW, IN TRUTH, IT ASCENDS FROM THE PARTICULAR TO THE UNIVERSAL, AND GOING UP IS WITHDRAWN AS IT RISES, AND AFTER THE WHOLE ASCENT IT BECOMES INWARDLY SILENT, ENTIRELY UNITED WITH THE INEFFABLE.

WE SAY, THEREFORE, THAT THE TRANSCENDENT MAKER OF ALL THINGS LACKS NEITHER BEING, NOR LIFE, NOR REASON, NOR MIND, YET HE HAS NO BODY; NEITHER HAS HE FORM,

NOR IMAGE, NOR QUALITY, NOR QUANTITY, NOR BULK; HE IS IN NO PLACE, NOR IS HE SEEN, NOR HAS HE SENSIBLE TOUCH; NOR DOES HE FEEL, NOR IS HE FELT, NOR HAS HE CONFUSION AND TUMULT, NOR DISTURBANCE OF MATERIAL PASSIONS; NEITHER IS HE WITHOUT POWER, SUCCUMBING TO THE CONTINGENCIES OF SENSIBLE THINGS; NEITHER IS HIS LIGHT IN ANY DEFICIENCY, NOR CHANGE, NOR CORRUPTION, NOR DIVISION, NOR LACK, NOR FLUX, NOR IS HE NOR HAS HE ANY OTHER SENSIBLE THING.

AN ENGLISH Lord is playing golf with his wife, Lady Evelyne, who has lost the sight of one eye in an accident. While playing, the Lord hits the good eye of Lady Evelyne with the ball and she goes completely blind.

After a moment's hesitation, he says, "Sorry, darling... good night, darling!"

A Swiss guide was taking a group of tourists up a mountain. It was a very tricky climb. Before reaching the summit they passed across an enormous abyss, at which point the guide said to the group: "I advise all of you not to look down, avoid vertigo." There was a pause..."But if by any change some of you slip and fall down, if you remember to look to your right there is a breathtaking panorama! "

Tired and thirsty, a man had lost his way in a desert. After wandering about for a while he met another rider. Glad to see somebody he hailed the rider with a friendly "hello. "

"Hello," answered the second.

"I'm English," said the first.

"I'm English too," answered the second.

"I'm Oxford," continued the first proudly.

"I'm Cambridge," came the answer.

"Sorry! "

It is very difficult to drop old habits, and that must have been the case with Dionysius. He was trained as a theologian; he speaks the language of a theologian, although now he is no more a theologian, he is a mystic. But the moment he starts expressing himself it is but natural that his whole training, upbringing, will come into his expression. So please forgive him for his expressions. They are not as clear as the statements of the Upanishads, because the Upanishads were sung by mad poets not by theologians. Hence the beauty of the Upanishadic statements.

It is fortunate, very fortunate, that Jesus was never trained by the rabbis; otherwise we would have missed the immense poetry and the grace of the New Testament, particularly of the Beatitudes: "Blessed are the meek for theirs is the kingdom of God. Blessed are the poor in spirit for theirs is the kingdom of God. Blessed are those who are the very last because they shall be the first in my kingdom of God."

These are not the words of a rabbi; these are the words of a simple man -- not very articulate, not trained in reasoning. He is simply making statements without giving any reasons for them; he is not argumentative. These are shouts of joy. They are like small children playing, shouting, running, for no reason at all, just the overflowing energy. They are innocent statements.

One can see very easily the difference between Jesus and Dionysius, between Lao Tzu and Dionysius, between Zarathustra and Dionysius. It was unfortunate that this tremendously great man had to pass through a theological training. It was just an accident. But his training hangs around him; it is very difficult to get rid of old habits. What he is saying is of immense

importance, but the way he is saying it is that of a very ordinary theologian.  
Just listen to his statement:

I THINK, TOO, THAT YOU HAVE UNDERSTOOD HOW THE DISCUSSION OF PARTICULARS IS MORE LENGTHY THAN OF UNIVERSALS.

Now, Lao Tzu has not talked about particulars and universals, neither have Buddha nor Jesus nor Kabir nor Farid. It is a philosophical problem: it has some importance in the world of philosophy, but it is utterly meaningless as far as mystic experience is concerned. But Dionysius cannot find any other way to express himself; you will have to be a little patient with him. What he is saying is significant, but the way he is saying it is not significant at all. You will have to search for the diamonds hidden behind his expression.

By "particulars" is meant the manifestations of existence. There are people, animals, birds, trees, rivers. Then among people also there are black people and white people and yellow people and red people. Then among white people also there are men and women, children and old people. And if you go further into the particulars you are moving to the atomic. Ultimately you will have to come to the indivisible unit which cannot be divided anymore.

That's exactly what the meaning of "atom" was in the beginning. Finally it was found that even the atom can be divided, but the old name has remained. Now the atom is divided into electrons, neutrons, positrons; they have become indivisibles. But who knows? Sooner or later somebody may divide electrons. There may be female electrons and male electrons -- there is every possibility. Positive electrons and negative electrons are there, and the attraction between them is the same. You can call them yin and yang, male and female, Shiva and Shakti; it all depends on what expression you have chosen. The "neutron," the "positron," that is a scientific way of speaking, but some day somebody is bound to divide them.

Science goes on this way towards the particular, hence science can never conceive of God because God is the ultimate universal. God means the whole, the organic whole, and science and its concern is with the part, the ultimate part. You can see the ways of religion and science going in opposite directions. Science moves from the universals to the particulars; religion moves from the particulars to the universals. Hence they cannot agree; it is almost impossible for them to agree. They will not find any common ground where they can agree.

Science is bound to believe in analysis because analysis is the methodology for reaching to the particular, and religion believes in synthesis because synthesis is the ladder that leads to the whole, to the universal.

Sigmund Freud called his psychology "psychoanalysis," and he was right in calling it psychoanalysis because his whole effort, his whole life was devoted to one thing: how to make psychology a science. It can become a science only if it becomes analysis. His insight was very clear.

Assagioli calls his psychology "psychosynthesis." He is on the right track, for making psychology a religion, but he is not so insightful as Sigmund Freud. His synthesis is not much of a synthesis. Sigmund Freud really analyzes, and what Assagioli does is to reassemble the parts divided by Sigmund Freud.

It is like the body of a man is divided into parts, cut into parts by a butcher, and then, just by putting those parts together, or gluing them together, you think you will get the whole man back. You are wrong. You will not get the whole man back; you will only get a corpse. That's why Assagioli has not made much impression: he has got only a corpse. He is trying to undo

Sigmund Freud; he is just putting together whatsoever Sigmund Freud has divided. But he is not himself a mystic, and without being a mystic you cannot reach to the alive universal.

The particulars are bound to be material, the parts have no life of their own. Life belongs to the whole. Life is the quality that arises in a miraculous way when parts are in a symphony with each other, in harmony with each other.

You can dissect a flower, but the moment you dissect it you are killing it too; and once dissected, you cannot put it together again. Yes, you can put it together materially, but the life of the flower will never come back. You cannot bring the original organic unity back to it.

Sigmund Freud's work has left a great impact on humanity, because this is the age of science and Sigmund Freud helped psychology to become at least something closer to science. Assagioli's idea was good, but he was not capable of fulfilling his idea: he promised something which he was not capable of. He was not a Lao Tzu or a Buddha or a Dionysius.

Dionysius knows exactly what happens in these two processes. He was not aware of modern science, but in these words he describes it accurately, precisely. From the universal you come to the particular; that is the scientific approach.

Just one thousand years ago there was only one science. That's why in old, ancient universities like Oxford the department of science is still called the department of natural philosophy. There was only one science, the philosophy of nature; that's why it is still a hangover. You may get a doctorate in psychology, but you are still called a Ph.D. -- Ph.D. means a doctor of philosophy. You may get your doctorate in chemistry and still you are called a Ph.D. -- a hangover. You have nothing to do with philosophy, but in those days that was the only science: philosophy.

Then in these one thousand years science became divided again and again and again. Chemistry became a separate science, physics became a separate science. Then pure physics became a science separate from practical physics; organic chemistry became a science separate from inorganic chemistry. Now there are even more chemistries -- biochemistry... and soon there will be more divisions. There are almost three hundred sciences available today. Just within one thousand years one science has become divided into three hundred sciences.

The whole process of science is knowing more and more about less and less. Science is an expertise, and the expert has to know more and more about less and less.

Just twenty years ago you used to go to the physician, to the doctor, and that was enough; now it is no more enough. You go to the physician; he suggests that you consult a few experts because he cannot say anything about your eyes. Twenty years ago he would have done everything for you; your eyes, your nose, your ears... your whole body was his domain. It is no more so. If your eyes are hurting he will send you to the eye specialist.

And I have heard that in the twenty-first century a man goes to an eye expert, and just before the expert is going to examine the eye of the man he asks, "Which eye is hurting? " And the man says, "The right eye."

He says, "Sorry, then you have to go to another expert because I cannot say anything about it. I only have expertise in left eyes."

And don't laugh because even a single eye is a universe unto itself. Even to understand a single eye, left or right, is enough work for your whole life. In fact, there is not a single person in the world who can say he has read everything written about the eye. So much research has gone into everything about it that there are experts and experts; you have to go

to many experts.

And a great problem has arisen: there is no one to look at you as an organic unity. Somebody treats your eye; he does not know anything about your heart. Somebody else treats your heart; he knows nothing about your stomach. Somebody else treats your stomach... You are being treated in parts and nobody knows about the whole unity of your body -- what to say about the whole unity of existence?

Hence, experts are creating great confusion. The eye expert may do something which goes against the heart or goes against the brain. The brain expert may do something which goes against the eye or against the nose. The heart specialist may do something which goes against the stomach or the kidney, and so on and so forth.

Now one of the greatest problems before all the scientists of the world is how to unite all these different branches. In the old days, in Aristotle's time, a single person used to write about the whole of science. Aristotle, a single man, has written about all the sciences. Now nobody can be an Aristotle again; those days are gone. He has not only written about all that was scientifically available, he has also written about God, heaven, hell -- the supernatural world.

Hence the word "metaphysics." Metaphysics has a very strange origin. Aristotle wrote about mathematics, chemistry, physics, whatsoever scientific knowledge was available in those days. And then after all these chapters he wrote a chapter about God. It was just a coincidence that after the chapter written on physics he wrote about God; the next chapter was about God. "Metaphysics" means "after the chapter called Physics." It became the very name of philosophy -- metaphysics, beyond physics. In fact, it refers to Aristotle's book: the chapter that followed the chapter "Physics. "

But one man like Aristotle will never be possible now. Science has become very much divided, and it goes on being divided. Remember the definition: knowing more and more about less and less. Then religion will be just the reverse process: knowing less and less about more and more. Hence in religion nobody can be an expert. It is a movement from the particular to the universal.

And mysticism is the ultimate peak of religion. Mysticism can be defined in the same way: knowing nothing about all. That's how Dionysius defines it: agnosia, knowing nothing. About the all, about the whole, nothing can be known because you are part of it. The knower and the known are no more different; they are one.

This is what he is saying in the language of theology. What he is saying is significant. He is defining science very clearly, not knowing that he is defining science. He is defining religion very clearly and mysticism very accurately. He says:

I THINK, TOO, THAT YOU HAVE UNDERSTOOD HOW THE DISCUSSION OF PARTICULARS IS MORE LENGTHY THAN OF UNIVERSALS.

Of course. The description, the discussion of the particulars is bound to be very lengthy. The Encyclopaedia Britannica cannot be written on a postcard. But the essence of all the Upanishads, one hundred and eight Upanishads, can be written on a single postcard, or even a single postcard may be too big. It can even be condensed into a single sutra, into a single statement. And exactly that kind of statement is available.

The Upanishads say: Tattvamasi, Thou art that -- and they say all is contained in it. Everything else that is said in the Upanishads is nothing but an explanation of this single statement consisting of three words: "Thou art that." There is no difference between you and

the universe. You are it.

But you cannot describe science in this way. Science has to be lengthy -- science has to cover millions of things. Even now we don't know how many species of alive beings exist on the earth. After three hundred years of research, every day people go on finding new species of insects, flies -- new species which have never been known before. We don't know how many species of vegetation exist on the earth; millions have been catalogued, but many more are still there.

And there is no problem in going into research as far as science is concerned: thousands of unknown territories are still available. Millions of stars have been counted, but still many more are there to be counted. It seems the universe is so infinite that we may never be able to know all the forms. And to be concerned with the particular means to be concerned with all the manifestations.

Dionysius says:

FOR THE MORE WE ASPIRE TO HIGHER THINGS, THE MORE OUR DISCOURSE UPON THINGS OF THE INTELLECT IS CUT SHORT, EVEN AS, WHEN WE ENTER THAT DARKNESS WHICH PASSES UNDERSTANDING, WE SHALL FIND NOT BREVITY OF SPEECH BUT PERFECT SILENCE AND UNKNOWING.

But as you start moving from particulars to universals -- and that is what he means by "higher things"... Remember, he is not talking of any moral evaluation, he is simply talking of higher things in the sense of universals. For example, to be a Hindu is lower than to be a human being, to be a Mohammedan is lower than to be a human being. To be a man is lower or to be a woman is lower than to be just a human being. But to be a human being is lower than just to be a being, because being covers a far greater territory. Then animals are in it, then insects are in it, then trees are in it. To be is even higher than to be a being because then rocks are in it. Then even things which you think are dead things are included in it because they are. Even dreams are included in it because they are. Howsoever false, howsoever imaginary, but they exist. To be is equivalent to God.

This is what he means by going higher: higher means reaching closer and closer to the ultimate universal. The very word "universal" has to be understood: it means one "uni"; "uni" means one. It is not a multiverse, it is a universe. Coming closer to the one is what he means by going higher; coming closer to the many is what he means by falling lower. His evaluation is not moral, his evaluation is far more significant -- it is existential. He says:

FOR THE MORE WE ASPIRE TO HIGHER THINGS, THE MORE OUR DISCOURSE UPON THINGS OF THE INTELLECT IS CUT SHORT...

And, in fact, the higher you move the less you will need the intellect, because intellect is nothing but an instrument of analysis.

Now you will be able to understand why all the mystics have been against the mind: for the simple reason that mind means the process of analyzing, and analysis leads to the particular. If you drop the mind, the universe is one, suddenly one. All distinctions disappear because distinctions exist only through the intellect. Intellect says, "This is different from that." Intellect is a process of labeling: "This is man, this is woman. This is Hindu, this is Mohammedan, this is Christian." And not only that: "This is a Catholic Christian and this is a Protestant Christian," and so on and so forth. It goes on dividing and labeling.

As you move higher the function of the intellect is less and less. In other words, if you

want to move higher you will have to move beyond intellect. That's what he wants to say, but his way of saying it is theological. If he had been a Zen monk like Bodhidharma he would have said the whole thing in a single word: "no-mind."

When the Emperor Wu asked Bodhidharma, "What is your message for me?" he said, "No-mind" -- and that's all.

When Lin Chi was asked by a philosopher... Lin Chi was sitting on the bank of a river and the philosopher came, bowed down and asked him, "What is your essential message?"

Lin Chi looked at the philosopher and did not say a single word. The philosopher thought, "He is very old, maybe he is deaf too. He shouted, "It seems you cannot hear me! I am asking: what is your essential message?"

Lin Chi laughed. The philosopher thought, "Something is strange. First he didn't answer, now he laughs! Maybe he is just trying to pretend that he has heard, but because he has not answered he cannot have heard. That laughter seemed to be just a cover-up." He shouted even more loudly; he said, "I am asking: what is your essential message?"

Lin Chi said, "First I said silence. You could not understand it; I had to come a little lower. I said laughter. You could not understand even that, so I have to come a little lower." And he wrote on the sand with his finger "Meditation." He said, "This is my message, the essential message. "

The philosopher said, "Elaborate a little more. Make it a little more clear. "

Lin Chi said, "It cannot be made more clear! All that can be said has been said in it."

But the philosopher insisted, so Lin Chi wrote, in bigger letters, again MEDITATION.

The philosopher was getting a little irritated and angry and he said, "Are you joking or what? You are writing the same word in bigger letters! I want a little more elaboration -- I am a professor of philosophy!"

Lin Chi said. "Why didn't you say that before?" So he wrote "No-mind. "

The philosopher hit his head with his hand and left the place without even saying goodbye to Lin Chi. "What kind of man is this? First he writes 'Meditation,' then he simply writes 'No-mind.' "

But Lin Chi is saying exactly that which is pertinent, to the point. Lin Chi is not a theologian or a philosopher; he is a pure mystic.

Lin Chi brought the message of Bodhidharma from China to Japan. Lin Chi transformed the whole of Japan into a new vision, into a new world. Japan owes to Lin Chi more than to anybody else. Lin Chi is Japan's first Buddha, and then from one light another light... and then many Buddhas blossomed. But Lin Chi was the beginning: he brought the seed from China. Just as Bodhidharma took the message of Buddha from India to China, Lin Chi did the same, taking it from China to Japan.

But Dionysius is a rare case. Theologians are not known to become mystics, hence he is, in a way, more important.

I have heard:

One day a great mystic and a great pundit, a great scholar, died -- the same day, the same time. And they used to live just opposite each other in the same street.

The mystic was surprised to see that the angels of death were also carrying the pundit, the great scholar, to heaven. He had never thought, no mystic has ever thought, that pundits can

enter heaven. Even sinners can enter, but not scholars, not theologians, not philosophers. They are wordy people. They know nothing, but they go on pretending that they know. They are the most hocus-pocus people around the earth, the most superficial and shallow people, but they use big words, great jargon.

But the mystic kept silent. And he was even more surprised when the doors opened: St. Peter received the pundit, the scholar first -- in fact, the mystic was almost ignored -- and with great singing and alleluias and a big divine band he was taken in. Nobody took any notice of the mystic who was standing outside the gate looking at all that was happening.

When the procession of the scholar, of the pundit went away inside, St. Peter asked the mystic to come in -- without any music, singing, any band; nothing, just "Come in."

The mystic said, "I am a little puzzled. I lived my whole life in prayer, in silence, in meditation, and is this the way to receive a mystic? And this man, I know perfectly well, is only knowledgeable. He does not really know anything, he has never experienced anything. And he has been received in such a way?"

St. Peter laughed and he said, "You don't understand. Mystics come here almost every day. This is the first time that a scholar has come. It is a very rare occasion, that's why the special reception. It may not happen again for millions of years because for millions of years it has not happened before. It may not happen again at all, so this is the only opportunity to receive a scholar."

Dionysius is a rare flower in that sense, because theologians, rabbis, pundits, are not known to know. Knowledgeable they ARE, they have great information, they can quote scriptures, but they have not experienced anything on their own. Dionysius has experienced.

But this is to be understood: whatsoever you are now when you experience you will have to express it in the old way, the way you were before the experience. For example, if you are a painter and you experience God, what will you do? You will paint -- of course with a new quality -- the same sunrises, the same sunsets, but with something new added to it, something inner, interior to it, some depth to it.

A famous Zen story says:

The Emperor of China asked a Zen Master, "I would like you to paint something on the wall in my palace which I sit for meditation. I have a small temple. I would like you to paint something on the wall."

The Master said, "Okay, I will do it, but it will take one year or two or three years. One never knows -- because I paint only when He paints through me. Sometimes it happens, sometimes it does not happen. I am just a vehicle."

The Emperor said, "You take your time."

After three years, the painting was complete. The Master had painted all the walls inside the temple with beautiful mountains, rivers, springs, fountains. And he had told the Emperor not to enter the temple till the painting was complete, so for three years the Emperor had waited, asking again and again, "When? When can I come?"

After three years, one day the Master said, "Now you can come. "

He went in. He was surprised: the temple was so small, but the way the mountains were painted all around gave it such vastness. The feel was as if you were standing in the mountains, not inside a temple. And he started inquiring about everything: "What is this? What river is this? What mountain is this? What is this peak called?"

And then they came to the most beautiful peak. There was a small path going behind the

peak and the Emperor asked, "Where does this path lead to?"

The Master said, "In fact, I have never gone on it, but I will try. You wait."

And the Master entered the painting... and never came back again!

Now this is a very strange story, but I love it. It is really beautiful: it shows how the painting was alive. The Master must have poured himself totally into it. That is the meaning of him getting lost in it, of him never coming back.

When a Master painter paints, the painter disappears, only the painting remains. When the Master musician plays, the musician disappears, only the music remains. When the Master singer sings, there is only song and no singer at all. So whatsoever your training is before your enlightenment, that will become your expression after enlightenment.

Dionysius was a theologian, a bishop. And to be Bishop of Athens means he must have been very sophisticated, very educated, the most important bishop of those days; because Athens was one of the most cultured cities that the world has ever known. So he speaks in this language, but don't get lost in his language. Just try to find out the essence of it.

He says:

AS OUR DISCOURSE RISES UPWARDS TOWARDS UNIVERSALS, THE INTELLECT IS CUT SHORT, EVEN AS, WHEN WE ENTER THAT DARKNESS WHICH PASSES UNDERSTANDING, WE SHALL FIND NOT BREVITY OF SPEECH BUT PERFECT SILENCE AND UNKNOWING.

THIS is a very pregnant statement and, in a way, unique. There have been mystics who have said and talked much about the knowledge that passes understanding. That can be understood: knowledge that passes understanding. You know something, but you cannot understand it. You know the beauty of a roseflower, but do you understand it? If somebody asks you, "What is beauty?" you will be at a loss. And it is not that you don't know. You have seen it in the sunset, in the stars, in the face of a woman -- you have seen it many times, you know it -- but you cannot say that you understand it. Knowing is one thing, understanding is totally different. Understanding means comprehending it by the mind. Knowing is existential, understanding is intellectual.

Many mystics have said "that knowledge which passes understanding," but Dionysius is very special in this way. He says that darkness which passes understanding. Why even call it "knowing"? -- because knowing somehow carries something of understanding in it. The moment you say "I know," somewhere there is a lurking idea that you understand.

St. Augustine is reported to have said, "I know what time is, but don't ask me. The moment you ask me what time is, I don't know."

Everybody knows what time is, but can you explain what time is? In fact, physicists have been working for fifty years on time and have not been able to come to any conclusion about what exactly it is that we call time. We have certain vague notions about time, but they are just vague. The moment you start thinking about them you will find them all faulty.

For example, we say "Time passes by" -- as if time is a river. But is time a river that passes by? Do you stand on the bank and time passes by? It is not so, because with time you go on changing; with the river you don't change. You can even stand in the river and you will feel the flow of the river, the passing of the water, but you are not changing; you are the same person. But time never leaves you the same person. And in a river you can go backwards. you can go upstream, but in time you cannot go backwards -- except in H. G. Wells' novel, *The Time Machine*.

H. G. Wells invented a machine in his novel in which you stand and it takes you back. You just turn a dial, you say, "Twenty years back," and you move twenty years back, and you are a child. H. G. Wells' idea has arisen out of the ordinary understanding of time, that time passes. If time passes, then why can we not go backwards? If we can go forwards then why not backwards? What is wrong with going backwards? But this idea of time cannot be proved. You don't even feel its passing. You feel the breeze, you feel the water passing by; you don't feel time passing by at all, not at all.

And from where does it come? The river comes from somewhere; the Ganges comes from Gangotri in the Himalayas. From where does time come and to where does it go? From nowhere to nowhere, from nothing to nothing. It exists only for a single moment, the now. And then where does it go? Can something disappear into nothing? Can something come out of nothing? Then a thousand and one questions will arise.

And St. Augustine is right: "I know what time is, but please don't ask me the question. If you ask me the question, then I won't know at all."

He is saying that knowing and understanding are different things. But in knowing there is some vague undercurrent of understanding. To avoid that, Dionysius is the only mystic in the whole world who has not used the word "knowledge." Instead he says darkness which passes understanding, unknowing which passes understanding, agnosia which passes understanding.

And then he says: As you go higher it is not only that you find brevity of speech... Yes, there is a stage, the Sutras of Patanjali, the Brahmasutras, the Bhaktisutras... In the East, all the great scriptures are written in sutras. Sutra means the most condensed statement, so thin as if it is just a thread. Sutra literally means a thread, a thin thread. Everything inessential has been cut; only the essential-most has been saved. It is the most telegraphic way of expressing things. Hence in the East there are great commentaries. In the West there are no commentaries at all, because in the West no sutras have been written. A sutra needs a commentary.

For example, all the great sutras in the East start with one word, *athato* -- now. *Athato* means now. Every great scripture in the East -- Brahmasutras, Bhaktisutras, YOGASUTRAS -- they all start with *athato*. The Brahmasutra, the most important sutras in the East, starts with this statement: *Athato Brahma jigyasa* -- Now the inquiry into God. What do they mean by "now"? Thousands of commentaries have been written on the single word "now" in "Now the inquiry into God." Why "now"? Is it not enough to say "the inquiry into God"? Or "We start the inquiry into God" ? But "Now" ? It has a significance.

My own interpretation is: unless you have experienced now -- the present moment -- you cannot inquire into God. "Now the inquiry into God." In fact, to be in the now is to be in the inquiry for God. The mind is always in the past or in the future. The past is no more, the future is not yet. And God always is, God is always now. To inquire into now is really to inquire into God.

But the sutra is so condensed, it does not say a single word about the "now" -- just "now"... and finished. Sutras means small seeds which contain thousands of flowers. But then you will have to sow them, grow them, protect them, and wait for the spring.

As you move upwards, first comes brevity -- your statements become sutras -- and then comes perfect silence. Even to say a single word seems to be doing something wrong.

Lao Tzu says: To say the truth is to falsify it. Hence he avoided doing so his whole life; he never wrote a single word. He indicated in indirect ways, hinted at but never said any direct thing about God, never mentioned God.

Buddha, when he became enlightened, for seven days remained silent. And the story is

that the gods became very disturbed because it was such a rare opportunity -- a man becoming enlightened, "Is he going to speak or not? If he does not speak then the world will lose such a precious treasure." So they came down from heaven, bowed down to Buddha and asked him to speak. Again and again they said, "Sir, speak, because this is a rare experience! Once in a while a man becomes a Buddha -- he should speak. Be compassionate, because there are millions who are searching for truth. Your single word will be like a drop of nectar to them."

But Buddha remained silent. When they insisted, he argued. He said, "For seven days many times I have thought whether to speak or not to speak, and always I have concluded that it is better not to speak. In the first place, no word is adequate enough to contain my experience. In the second place, whatsoever I say will be misunderstood. I know it because when I was not enlightened if somebody had said something I would have misunderstood him myself. So what is the point of unnecessarily falsifying the truth and creating misunderstanding and confusion in people?"

"Thirdly, out of one hundred people ninety-nine point nine percent will not be benefited at all; they will remain the same. Yes, point one percent may be benefited, but about that point one percent I have also been thinking that if a person can understand what I am saying, then he is so intelligent that even without my speaking sooner or later he will discover the truth himself. So why not let him discover it himself? Maybe it will take a little longer -- so what? There is infinity."

But the gods also discussed among themselves how to persuade him, how to argue with him. This man was saying something right, they could not deny it. But they found out something which persuaded Buddha to speak. They said, "We agree with you on all the points -- just one doubt remains. We know a few people, very few people -- and you also must be aware of those very few people -- maybe one in a million, who is intelligent enough to understand you, but is not intelligent enough to discover it by himself, who is just on the boundary line. A little push, and he may take the jump. And if there is nobody to push he may not take the jump. He may even turn back, he may lose whatsoever he has gained. He may go back to the world, into the world of things. What about that man? And they are not many, we agree, but the question is not of many, it is not a question of quantity. The question is: if even a single man can become a Buddha through your speaking that is enough, more than enough, more than one can ask for."

And Buddha had to concede this point. But whatsoever he has said is very condensed. The Dhammapada, his statements, are just small sutras; they have to be elaborated, they have to be explained. They are seeds; they have to be opened. They contain mysteries, but those mysteries are hidden.

The most important thing that Dionysius says is:

... WE SHALL FIND NOT BREVITY OF SPEECH BUT PERFECT SILENCE AND UNKNOWING.

This and unknowing is his specialty, his unique contribution to the whole history of mysticism. Even Buddha says, "I cannot say that which I have known, because no word will contain it." Dionysius says: It is a state of unknowing, so how can any word contain it? If it is a state of knowing then maybe some part of it can be contained or maybe a bigger word can be found or maybe better words can be invented... Why not? If we have been able to invent words to express beauty, love, bliss, why can we not invent words to express truth, nirvana, moksha? The words can be improved upon. But if it is a state of unknowing then nothing can

be done. Then it is not a question of language at all; then it can be conveyed only in silence.

Do you see what he is saying? He has taken a step ahead of all the Buddhas in expressing the fact that because it is a state of unknowing, it is impossible to express it.

HEREIN SPEECH DESCENDS FROM THE UNIVERSAL TO THE PARTICULAR, AND AS IT DESCENDS IT IS INCREASED IN PROPORTION TO THE MULTIPLICITY OF THINGS. BUT NOW, IN TRUTH, IT ASCENDS FROM THE PARTICULAR TO THE UNIVERSAL, AND GOING UP IS WITHDRAWN AS IT RISES, AND AFTER THE WHOLE ASCENT IT BECOMES INWARDLY SILENT, ENTIRELY UNITED WITH THE INEFFABLE.

The particular can be expressed. Hence science is very precise in its expression; it can express things with absolute clarity. For example, H<sub>2</sub>O; now nothing more can be added to it, nothing can be misunderstood about it. H<sub>2</sub>O means simply H<sub>2</sub>O. Science has found a mathematical language to express itself because its concern is particular.

But as you move up from the particular to the universal you become vague. More and more mist surrounds you, more and more mystery. And ultimately you become one with the ineffable, the inexpressible.

These are the stages to be remembered. The first stage according to Dionysius -- and I agree with him totally -- is the state of unknowing. If you descend from it, the second state is a vague knowing. You know that you know something; what it is exactly is not yet clear. It is just like early in the morning the sun has not risen yet and great mist surrounds. You cannot see far away, but you can still see a little bit. It is not dark, it is not light either.

In India the language of the mystics is called sandhya bhasha, the evening language. It is neither night nor day; it is in the middle. Something is dark in it and something is luminous in it. Hence Dionysius' expression: luminous, translucent darkness.

The first state is of unknowing; nothing can be said about it. But if you want to approach people, if compassion arises in you...

Buddha has said that there are two types of enlightened people: one he calls arhatas and the other he calls bodhisattvas. Arhatas are those who remain in the state of unknowing; they never bother. That's what Buddha was thinking for seven days: he was thinking to remain an arhata. Nobody would have heard about him, nobody would have known about him; he would have never conveyed anything to anybody. He would have blossomed like a lonely flower far away in the deep forest. Nobody would have even smelled the perfume of it. Nobody would have known that the blossoming had happened, that a flower, a beautiful flower, had opened up. No bees would have reached it, no butterflies would have flown to it.

The second he calls bodhisattvas: the people who, out of compassion for others, speak. The gods helped him to become a bodhisattva. And then his whole life he insisted that all his bhikkhus, all his sannyasins, become as loving and compassionate as possible, because when you attain to truth, if your heart is full of compassion you will become a bodhisattva. If you have not gathered any compassion in your heart, if you have remained dry like a desert, you may attain to truth, but nobody will be benefited by it. You will reach to the other shore, but alone.

The arhata remains in the unknowing state, in agnosia. He disappears into the universal without leaving a single trace behind. Nobody is helped by him. The bodhisattva descends from those heights. He has known the sunlit peaks of Gourishankar, of Everest, and then he remembers all those struggling millions in the dark valley of life and he descends, back to the valley.

This is the descent: from unknowing he comes to vague knowing; from vague knowing to

articulate knowing, from articulate knowing to expression, language, words; through language and words he reaches the listener's mind; then the listener's mind interprets it, then the person who has listened to those who have known starts telling others.

These are the seven stages, but much is lost by the time it reaches the seventh; almost all is lost. But nothing can be done, that's how things are. Ais dhammo sanantano, Buddha says -- such is the law of life.

Dionysius also is trying to be a bodhisattva, but he can use only his old language.

A Jew asks his neighbor for a hammer.

"You don't have one?" asks the neighbor, surprised. "Yes, I do," replies the Jew, "but it's a new one and I'm afraid of spoiling it!"

Two Jews are sipping a drink in the garden of a luxurious villa. One says to the other, "Well, yes, my dear friend, I am a self-made man. I started with nothing, absolutely nothing... Now I have over two million dollars worth of debts!"

A Jew heard that at a certain gas station they pumped up tires for free. He went there, and in his excitement over the deal he blew all four tires.

Old habits die hard. And it is very difficult to find a man without habits. Life naturally becomes patterned, structured. Otherwise, truth could be said more clearly. Now look at these words:

WE SAY, THEREFORE, THAT THE TRANSCENDENT MAKER OF ALL THINGS LACKS NEITHER BEING, NOR LIFE, NOR REASON, NOR MIND, YET HE HAS NO BODY; NEITHER HAS HE FORM, NOR IMAGE, NOR QUALITY, NOR QUANTITY, NOR BULK; HE IS IN NO PLACE, NOR IS HE SEEN, NOR HAS HE SENSIBLE TOUCH; NOR DOES HE FEEL, NOR IS HE FELT, NOR HAS HE CONFUSION AND TUMULT, NOR DISTURBANCE OF MATERIAL PASSIONS; NEITHER IS HE WITHOUT POWER, SUCCUMBING TO THE CONTINGENCIES OF SENSIBLE THINGS; NEITHER IS HIS LIGHT IN ANY DEFICIENCY, NOR CHANGE, NOR CORRUPTION, NOR DIVISION, NOR LACK, NOR FLUX, NOR IS HE NOR HAS HE ANY OTHER SENSIBLE THING.

Now this is just an old habit! The poor fellow cannot forget -- a hangover. To express the inexpressible a child will be far more capable, but a child cannot know it, that's the difficulty. If a child can know the truth he will be very clear, he will be straight. And that's why I see the beauty in Jesus' words: he is more like a child. He was very young, only thirty, when he started expressing. Dionysius must have been old by the time he wrote this treatise.

The teacher was describing the Last Judgment dramatically: "Thunder will boom! Flames will come from the heavens! There will be earthquakes and floods! The whole world will split and swallow millions!"

Right there, Johnny held up his hand and asked, "Will we get the day off from school?"

Now children are very clear and straight! "What nonsense you are talking, that is not the point. The point is whether we will be able to get the day off to see the whole scene or not!"

While helping her son with his spelling, the mother came to the words "conscious" and "conscience." Did he know their meaning?

"Sure, Mom," he said, "Conscious is when you're aware of something and conscience is when you wish you weren't! "

So clear!

Six year old Jojo approached his neighbor, a beautiful lady, and asked, "Will you marry me?"

To which the lady replied, "I don't like kids!"

Answered little Jojo, "Then we won't have any!"

Two babies were talking together in a maternity ward. One says to the other, "So what are you -- a boy or a girl?"

"I don't know," replies the smaller of the two.

"Well," says the first, "let's wait till the nurse goes out and then we'll find out."

When the nurse is safely out of the ward, the bigger baby sits up, looks carefully from side to side, then quickly takes a look under the blanket of his little neighbor.

"You are a girl," he announces.

"How can you tell?" asks his little friend in awe.

"Because I saw your little pink booties!"

If children were writing about God things would be very clear! But theologians write, scholars write, or people who have been scholars in the past and then become mystics. But their old language persists; they go on talking in it.

And the problems become more and more difficult because of the continuous fall from the truth. From unknowing to vague knowing much is lost. In unknowing, everything is as it is: in vague knowing, something of your mind has entered in. Then in articulate knowing, the third step down, something of your logic has also come in -- not only mind but logic too. And then in the fourth, when you express, there is not only logic but language, and language is created by others. And there are things which cannot be translated into any language. The moment you translate, something goes wrong.

A firm experimenting with an electronic brain designed to translate English into Russian fed into it the words: "The spirit is willing but the flesh is weak." The machine translated the sentence into Russian, which read: "The whiskey is agreeable but the meat has gone bad."

It is always a problem to translate. The more poetic a phenomenon, the greater the danger in translation. That's why many beautiful books cannot be translated at all; if you translate, you destroy.

The Tao Te Ching of Lao Tzu has been translated many times, many people have translated it, and each translation has something of its own. But when all the translations are read together you will be surprised: it seems that the real thing is still missing, because there is something in one translation, something else is in another translation, and both seem to be right. When you read them they seem logical.

The moment you start using language for something which has been experienced in silence, a great distance arises. You know it perfectly well, that now you are moving into the world. And once the words have escaped you, you are no more master of those words; then the listener's mind enters in. Up to now at least everything was within you and you have known the ultimate, so you knew what faults have entered, what flaws have entered. Now, once the truth is expressed, it enters into a mind which knows nothing of the heights. What this person will think about it depends on him; his mind will be the decisive factor.

One day an unhappy citizen in New Delhi was wandering around alone in a back street, muttering and talking to himself. "I hate them," he was saying, "those dirty profiteers, nepotists, squanderers," and other unprintables. "I hate them, I hate them, I hate them!"

At this point a policeman tapped him on the shoulder and said, "You are under arrest for insulting the Government. "

"I didn't even mention the Government!" retorted the citizen.  
"I admit that, but you described it so perfectly!"

The sixth thing is when the listener not only listens but interprets. And the seventh is really very very far away from the original source: when the listener starts telling others according to his interpretation.

That's what for two thousand years Christian missionaries have been doing, for twenty-five centuries Jaina monks have been doing, Buddhist monks have been doing, and for five thousand years the Hindu pundits have been doing. They have heard... Each Buddhist scripture begins: "I have heard..."; this is the beginning of each Buddhist scripture. It is a report by somebody who has heard. Now what he has heard cannot be the same as what was said.

Young Vladimir, visiting the big city for the first time, is impressed by its tall buildings and its cultural happenings. While wandering around the city's museums Vladimir is suddenly possessed with the urge to shit. When his efforts to locate a toilet fail, he finds a corner and spreads his handkerchief on the marble floor. He grunts and groans for a few minutes and deposits a fairly healthy load. Vladimir leaves the museum, handkerchief in hand, and at that precise moment a thief is making off with four pounds of meat from the neighboring butcher shop.

The police arrive on the scene immediately, a crowd gathers, and in the confusion Vladimir is taken into custody. His innocence is proven when a high-ranking police officer, schooled in the latest investigatory techniques, is called in to solve the baffling case. After many hours of fruitless investigation, the officer decides to weigh the handkerchief and finds it weighs only three pounds.

Vladimir, again a free man, returns to his home town.

He is met at the train station by many friends and townspeople who eagerly inquire about life in the big city.

"It is wonderful," says Vladimir, "really amazing! But let me warn you -- if your shit weighs more than three pounds, you can get into a lot of trouble!"

This is what has happened to all the religions. That's why there is so much trouble in the world, a lot of trouble. People have interpreted the great Masters according to themselves. Knowing nothing, understanding nothing, never having meditated in their lives, they go on pretending that they know. Just words, and in those words they go on putting their own meanings

The game between Celtic and Rangers was in its twenty-ninth minute when Celtic scored the first goal. One spectator cheered wildly with all the Celtic fans, though he was not wearing the colors of either team.

Ten minutes later Rangers equalized. The Rangers fans went wild, so did the lone

spectator.

The man standing next to him exclaimed, "Just a minute, Jock -- you're yelling for both teams?"

"That's right," said the spectator. "I am enjoying the whole show and I don't care who wins."

"Oh, an atheist, eh?" said the second man.

If you are enjoying the whole scene then the other immediately interprets that you are an atheist, you don't belong to a particular religion -- Christian, Hindu, Mohammedan.

And that is the problem with my sannyasins: I am enjoying the whole scene and you are enjoying the whole scene. Otherwise Hindus listening to Dionysius or Christians listening to Rinzai or Jainas listening to Mohammed -- impossible. It has never happened in the world.

Hence there are many who call me an atheist. They don't know what theism is, what atheism is, but they go on using words not even knowing their meaning. But this is bound to happen. One should be aware of it -- you have to be aware of it.

What I am saying, never try to interpret it. Listen silently, absorb it. Let it become part of your blood, bones and marrow. And then you will know its meaning far more clearly than through your mind.

---

## Theologia Mystica

### Chapter #11

#### Chapter title: The Real Alcoholics

**21 August 1980 am in Buddha Hall**

Archive code: 8008210

ShortTitle: THEOLO11

Audio: Yes

Video: No

---

OSHO, ACCORDING TO WHAT I HAVE BEEN HEARING YOU SAY, THE TITLE OF THIS SERIES, THEOLOGIA MYSTICA, SEEMS TO BE A CONTRADICTION IN TERMS.

Yoga Anurag,

IT is true, but the title was given by Dionysius himself, so at least I am not responsible for it. In a way, mysticism is bound to be a contradiction in terms, whether the word theologia is in it or not. Mysticism itself, by its very nature, is a contradiction, because it is not an ism. It is not a creed or dogma in which you can believe. You can be a mystic, but there is nothing like mysticism. And when one is a mystic the paradox deepens, it does not disappear. When one is a mystic there is no one left. There is a mystery, but with no center to it. It is like a cloud: translucent darkness, infinite darkness.

One of the most important statements about mysticism in the Western hemisphere is the

book called *The Cloud of Unknowing*. The name of the author is not known; it is good that we don't know who wrote it. It indicates one thing: that before he wrote it he had disappeared into a cloud of unknowing. It is the only book in the Western world which comes close to the Upanishads, *The Tao Te Ching*, *The Dhammapada*. There is a rare insight in it.

First he calls it a cloud. A cloud is vague, with no definable limits. It is constantly changing; it is not static -- never, even for two consecutive moments, is it the same. It is a flux, it is pure change. And there is nothing substantial in it. If you hold it in your hand just mist will be left, nothing else. Maybe your hands will become wet, but you will not find any cloud in your fist.

That's what happens to the mystic: he becomes wet, really wet. Those countries where alcohol is prohibited they call dry, and those countries where alcohol is not prohibited they call wet. But the only wet person is the mystic. He is a real alcoholic! He cannot be helped by Alcoholics Anonymous. If a mystic enters there, they will all become alcoholics themselves!

But for Dionysius it is even more a contradiction because he was a theologian. His whole book is written with a disguise, as if it is a treatise on theology; mysticism is just something by the side, secondary, not primary. Hence the name *Theologia Mystica* -- as if mysticism is only a consequence of getting deep into the world of theology. Just the reverse is the case.

The word "theology" means logic about God; *theo* means God. But there can be no logic about God. There is love about God, love for God, but no logic about God. There are no proofs possible. The only proof is the existence of the mystic. The presence of Dionysius, of Ramakrishna, of Bahauddin -- the presence of these people is the proof that God exists, otherwise there is no proof. Because Buddhas have walked on the earth, there are a few footprints of God left behind on the shores of time.

Philosophers have argued for centuries, but all their arguments are utterly futile and impotent; they have not come to a single conclusion.

The mystic has to speak in contradictions because he is speaking about the whole, and the whole contains the contradictions. It contains the day and the night, both. If you call God the day, then it is only half the truth; if you call him the night, that too is only half the truth.

Hence Dionysius calls God translucent darkness -- as if the sun has risen in the night.

The whole consists of both life and death. If you call God life, only life, then it is a half-statement. And remember a half-truth is far more dangerous than a complete lie because the complete lie is bound to be discovered sooner or later -- just a little intelligence is needed. But the half-truth is very dangerous; even intelligent people, very intelligent people, may not be able to find that it is untrue. That is the danger of half-truths: they look like truths and they are not. They can keep you deceived for centuries.

Mysticism is the whole truth; it has to be contradictory. Somewhere logic and love have to meet, because they both exist. Hence *theologia mystica*. Somewhere man and woman have to meet and merge and disappear into each other because they both exist and they are both halves of one whole. Hence the beauty and the bliss of a real meeting between a man and a woman: the orgasmic joy is possible only because two halves of a single whole have come together. Both were suffering, both were missing something. Suddenly, all that feeling of missing has disappeared. Of course, the meeting between a man and a woman can only be momentary. Again they are separate, and again the misery sets in, and again the desire to be united. Because the meeting is physical it cannot be very deep and it cannot be lasting either.

But the meeting of the mystic with the whole is absolute; there is no coming back. He has gone beyond the point of no return. He has dissolved himself like a dew-drop slipping out of the lotus leaf into the lake. He has become the lake. Then whatsoever he says will be

contradictory, because a part of it will be the vision of the dew-drop and a part of it will be the vision of the total lake, a part will be the standpoint of the part and a part will be the standpoint of the whole. Hence all mystics have spoken in contradictory terms.

This is one of the reasons why intellectuals are against them, because the intellectual demands consistency and the mystica cannot be consistent. By the very nature of things that is not possible. He is helpless -- he has to be contradictory. He has to say, "I am contradictory because I am vast enough to contain contradictions."

Logic is a small thing, love is infinity.

The second question

OSHO,

THESE DAYS THE PAPERS ARE FILLED WITH REPORTS OF COMMUNAL RIOTS ERUPTING ALL OVER INDIA. NO REAL REASONS FOR THIS VIOLENCE AND DESTRUCTION OF PROPERTY ARE BEING GIVEN, JUST VAGUE REFERENCES TO "ANTI-SOCIAL ELEMENTS," WHATEVER THAT PHRASE MEANS. CAN YOU THROW ANY LIGHT ON WHAT IS HAPPENING IN THIS COUNTRY, ON WHY THERE IS THIS OBVIOUS AND ANGRY UNREST?

Krishna Prem,

THE FIRST thing is: India is a religious country, and all the religions down the ages have depended upon fear. They have exploited the fear instinct of man, they have made man afraid. Hence the word "God-fearing" -- it exists in almost all the languages of the world, and they say it means "religious." It is pure nonsense. A religious person is not God-fearing but God-loving. A God-fearing man is pseudo religious: a person who has not sought religion on his own but has been forced to be religious by others.

And there are only two ways to force things on people -- not in fact two, but two aspects of the same coin -- fear and reward, punishment and reward, fear and greed. Hence hell and heaven. Heaven is greed, reward, hell is fear, punishment.

India is a religious country, full of God-fearing people. And with the existence of fear many problems arise. The first problem is: love disappears.

Remember, hate is not the real opposite of love; the real opposite of love is fear. You can still love the person you hate. In fact, the latest research says that you always hate the person you love. Hate and love are two poles of the same energy: they are complementary, they are not Opposites.

Hence you see the conflict between lovers, continuous conflict. They are always fighting, as if it is a necessary part of love affairs -- and it is. A love affair is not possible without conflict; a love affair becomes possible through conflict. You fight with the person you love, you hate the person you love from your very guts, and because of this hate and this fight and this conflict you go on creating a distance between you.

There is a certain moment when the distance is so big that a desire to meet the other arises. It arises only at a certain distance. If your woman or your man has been away for a few days and then comes home, then there is great Love. Those few days have created a certain appetite. Of course, if you go on eating the whole day you won't have any appetite. Appetite depends on the fast between two meals. Everybody fasts between two meals; hence the English word "breakfast": you have fasted the whole night in your sleep. Of course, when

you are awake it is difficult to fast but when you are asleep what can you do?

A few people certainly manage to get up in their sleep and go to the kitchen or go to the fridge; they are sleepwalkers. But . . . some strange thing: sleepwalkers always go to the fridge! They open the fridge -- and they are asleep! -- and they eat something and they close the fridge, and they come back in the darkness, and they go to sleep. And they go on gaining weight and they go on dieting in the day. And they are always puzzled: "What is the matter? Why does my weight go on increasing?" Otherwise, normal people have an eight hour fast. After that eight hour fast, appetite arises.

The fight between lovers is like fasting: withdrawing from each other, then the desire -- because love is a nourishment. Remember. love is food. It is as much food as any other food, but a very subtle food -- a food for the soul. So when lovers fight they remain on a fast. Soon the appetite arises and soon they start moving closer to each other. After each fight they can make love in a far better way than at any other time. It has intensity, it has passion. But after each meal you have an aversion to food.

If you have eaten well, the very idea of food will be a little nauseating. One who has eaten enough, if you put around him all kinds of food, he will go crazy. He will hate the food, he will hate you; he would like to escape from the room. There is a certain aversion; that is natural, otherwise how will he stop eating?

So when two lovers have made love, a certain aversion arises. These are natural phenomena. Once we understand them, they are not problems. After each love-making the husband turns over and goes to sleep, and after each love-making the wife cries, weeps, because she feels exploited. This same man who is now sleeping, keeping his back towards her, snoring, this same man, this sonofabitch, just a few moments before was talking such beautiful poetry, and now he is not at all concerned. She feels cheated. But that is wrong; that is a misunderstanding. It is a natural phenomenon: love fulfilled, aversion arises. Of course, after a twenty-four hour fast he will again talk poetry. That's how the wheel moves.

Love and hate are not opposites. but love and fear are. The afraid person becomes incapable of love. And all the religions have depended on fear, hence they have made millions of people incapable of love. And the people who are incapable of love are only capable of violence.

So, Krishna Prem, it is nothing new in India. It erupts almost every ten years; ten years seems to be the limit. Within ten years everybody accumulates so much violence within himself that it has to find an outlet. otherwise it will destroy him. He will be burnt up by his own violence. So he has to find some excuses; political, religious, social -- any kind of excuse will do. And this limit of ten years is not only limited to India; it seems to be universal. every ten years there is a great war. The whole of humanity gets involved in destruction.

The responsibility is of the religions, because they have not taught you how to love, they have only taught you how to be afraid. Remember, fear is the same energy as love, but it has been poisoned -- your energies have been poisoned for centuries. So it has become a routine phenomenon that after a few months, a few years, after a certain period, one accumulates so much violence... which would not have been there if love had been flowing. Because love has been stopped there is no flow in your life. Your own energies go against you; they become destructive. Then any excuse is enough -- such stupid excuses that if you look at them you will laugh; they are ridiculous!

In Moradabad, where this whole problem started -- and now it has spread almost all over the country -- the cause was just ridiculous. Mohammedans had gathered to pray in their

idgah, the prayer place. It is an open place; they just face towards Kaaba and pray. A policeman was on duty, and some cow entered the prayer space. Now the cow is the symbol of Hinduism and the Mohammedans became enraged. They said, "The policeman is responsible. He was standing there. Why did he allow the cow to enter?" In fact they said that not only did he allow it, he brought the cow in! And killing started.

Now one hundred and thirty people have died just because of that holy cow which may have entered innocently. They are roaming all over the country -- they don't know which place is Hindu and which place is Mohammedan. And because one hundred and thirty people have died there -- and this is an official number... Official numbers are never right. Multiply by four and you will find the right number. That has always been my observation: multiply by four. At least five hundred to six hundred people must have died. Now in other places revenge has to be taken.

Can you see the cause, the stupidity of human beings? The excuse is not worth calling an excuse! But this is how things begin.

The real thing is that people are accumulating great violence, anger, in them. If you cannot release your love you will accumulate anger. Love standing on its head becomes anger. And when anger accumulates you are just looking for some excuse. If you cannot find an excuse you will invent one, but you will have to invent some cause so you can release, cathart. This is a catharsis -- on what grounds it happens is immaterial.

Hindi speaking people start killing non Hindi speaking people; non Hindi speaking people start killing Hindi speaking people. The Gujaratis start fighting with the Marathis, the Mohammedans with the Hindus the Jainas with the Hindus, the Sikhs with the non-Sikhs. Anybody is ready to fight with anybody else; just a small excuse, real or invented, is needed. The fight happens first, then later on we discover why it has happened.

People are gathering so much poison, anger, that these flare-ups are bound to happen. And then politicians have no understanding, so they simply go on dumping the whole thing on "anti-social elements," as if these anti-social elements appear only once in a while and then suddenly disappear. They are always there, but the riots are not always there. For years these anti-social elements become very peaceful and very Gandhian, very non-violent, and then one day suddenly they erupt, and they erupt all over, it is almost like a chain reaction.

The politicians have to say something. They don't understand what is happening at all, and even if some of them do understand they don't have the courage to say it.

The real cause is thousands of years of imposed fear on people, condemnation of love. And you are well aware of it here... If two of my sannyasins are just standing holding each other's hands in the garden, it is obscene. Two people lovingly holding each other's hands is obscene or two lovers embracing each other is obscene -- and two people killing each other is not obscene!

If two people are fighting on the road, a crowd will gather and they will all enjoy the fight. And everybody will go home very satisfied, very contented, because in a vicarious way they have also been able to cathart their anger through the fighters. But seeing two lovers, only jealousy arises, great jealousy and great anger.

But this is how they have been brought up for centuries -- this they call religion. Because I am against it, they think I am trying to destroy their religion, their morality. And what morality have they got? This is the morality: that every day somewhere or other there is violence. This is Indian culture, Indian morality -- these Hindus and Mohammedans and Jainas! They will all say beautiful things and they will all do ugly things. Because I am pointing at the naked truth, they are all opposed to me.

The politicians cannot say the truth, even if they know it. In the first place they don't know, because they don't have that much intelligence -- otherwise they wouldn't be politicians in the first place. Secondly, even if they have some idea of what really is happening in the psyche of the country they cannot say it because they have to ask for votes from the same people. If they say the truth they will lose their votes, so they invent some vague excuses -- "antisocial" elements."

Now what is this "anti-social element"? -- Hindu, Mohammedan, Christian, Jaina, Buddhist? What is this anti-social element? -- Just a word, a label. You can throw all the responsibility on it and you can feel very relieved.

You ask me, Krishna Prem: THESE DAYS THE PAPERS ARE FILLED WITH REPORTS OF COMMUNAL RIOTS ERUPTING ALL OVER INDIA. NO REAL REASONS FOR THIS VIOLENCE AND DESTRUCTION OF PROPERTY ARE BE.NG GIVEN, JUST VAGUE REFERENCES TO "ANTI-SOCIAL ELEMENTS", WHATEVER THAT PHRASE MEANS. CAN YOU THROW ANY LIGHT ON WHAT IS HAPPENING IN THIS COUNTRY, ON WHY THERE IS THIS OBVIOUS AND ANGRY UNREST?

This is going to continue -- unless this country drops this stupid idea of being religious, unless this country drops the rotten culture that it has carried for centuries, which is only a corpse. It is stinking, but they go on carrying it because it is so ancient; it is their past, their "heritage." This country has to cut itself off from its past totally, abruptly; a discontinuity is needed. Only then will India be reborn.

One of my political friends, Seth Govinddas, he was a Member of Parliament in India for the longest period. In fact, except Winston Churchill and Seth Govinddas, nobody else in the world has been a Member of the Parliament for so long. He was called "the father of the Indian Parliament." He has been a Member for nearabout fifty years.

He always used to say, "There have been many civilizations in the world, but they all died." And with great pride; he was very proud of it. "Where is Babylonia? Where is Syria? Where is Greece? Where is Egypt? All have disappeared from the world. The only ancient civilization alive is the Indian civilization."

And I always used to say to him, "Don't be proud of it -- be ashamed! because it is time that this ancient country should learn how to die and be reborn.

Unless you die you cannot have a rebirth. This country needs a death -- and not a partial death, a total death -- so that a new, fresh race can come up. And it is not difficult.

But the vested interests are against rebirth. They go on propounding the old tradition. The newly-born country, the newly-born race will not be so easily enslaved by them. They will lose, and they don't want to lose. Hence they are against me.

You can see. What reasons they give against me are worth considering, contemplating. They say that I am destroying their culture, I am destroying their morality, I am destroying their civilization, that I am an enemy. In one way they are right, but in another way they are absolutely wrong. They are right because I am certainly against all that is dead and I want it to be burnt -- with all due respect, but burn it, say goodbye to it! Don't look backwards. Look forward, look ahead!

So in one way they are right that I am against all these things. but in another way they are wrong. I am against these things not because I am against religion, culture, morality, civilization, I am against these things because they are dead.

I am absolutely in favor of a new culture arising, a new civilization arising, a new

morality arising, a new humanity arising. Otherwise this country is going to remain poor, starved; continuously fighting, quarreling, murdering each other.

This country needs to be taught ways of love. This country needs to be told: Except love there is no God. Drop all fears! Don't go to the temples because of fear, and don't go on worshipping stupid idols and gods because of greed. Drop greed and fear and live out of love. Love people, love trees, love animals, love this existence, because God is nowhere else. God is spread all over existence. God is simply another name for life, existence, that which is.

That's my work here. It is dangerous work -- dangerous because I am fighting against powerful forces, dangerous because I am fighting against almost all the vested interests. Nobody will be in favor of me; I have to stand alone. Just a few people who will be courageous enough to be with me, ready to risk their lives with me, will be with me; otherwise nobody is going to be with me.

But it is a thrilling project; it is very adventurous. It is a great challenge; it is worth accepting. And through it not only can this country's humanity have a new birth; through it we can show the way to the whole world, because the whole world needs more or less a new birth, a new man.

The third question

OSHO, I CANNOT DECIDE WHETHER TO STAY HERE WITH YOU OR NOT, AND ALSO WHETHER TO BECOME A SANNYASIN OR NOT. CAN YOU HELP ME TO DECIDE?

John,

Toss a coin! If it is heads, stay, but don't become a sannyasin -- because the coin coming up heads shows you are a head. So accumulate as much intellectual garbage as you can, and if by chance you are a German, then it will be really good for your head too, good manure.

One day looking out of my window I saw two sannyasins working outside -- two of Deeksha's handymen, one Italian and one German. They were about to hammer away at a concrete pillar with a sledge hammer and a wrecking bar. The German was holding the wrecking bar and the Italian the sledge hammer.

On the first try with the sledge hammer, the Italian missed and hit the German on the head. The German, unaffected, continued to hold the bar, waiting for the next try.

The Italian again missed and hit the German on the head once more. Without batting an eye, the German continued to hold the bar. The Italian tried once again and once again missed, hitting the German again on the head.

This time the German looked at the Italian with a wary eye and said, "Swami, please be careful. If you hit my fingers you can hurt me!"

But if the coin comes up tails, then put your tail between your legs and escape from here as fast as possible!

That's exactly the origin of the word "hippie" -- "Hippie" comes from "hips": one who cannot encounter a challenge and shows his hips and escapes. So if it is tails, then understand the message -- escape like a hippie.

But by chance -- and miracles happen! -- if it stands on edge, then become a sannyasin.

Then I cannot help it. Then God decides so.

The fourth question

OSHO, DIONYSIUS IS AGAIN AN ENLIGHTENED MALE MASTER. IS IT MORE DIFFICULT FOR A WOMAN TO BECOME ENLIGHTENED THAN IT IS FOR A MAN.?

Samya,

YOU don't understand the trouble!

The fundamental reason women do not achieve so greatly as men do is that women have no wives. Until such a time as science or economics corrects this blunder of nature we shall remain, I fear, the weaker sex.

Man is the weaker sex. And because the wives drive them crazy in every possible way, they start running in all directions, stumbling in all directions, groping in every possible way to escape. And a few of them, by chance, become Masters. A few of them become painters, a few of them become poets, a few of them become scientists...

Women cannot achieve so greatly for the simple reason that there is nobody to drive them. Of course, man cannot say clearly, "You are driving me mad." He says, "You are inspiring me! Without you I would be nothing." And that is true, literally true.

So feel compassion for the poor men. They had to become Masters, Buddhas, Zarathustras, Dionysiuses. Just think of Socrates and his wife Xanthippe... without the wife there would have been no Socrates at all. It was the wife who drove him into the world of philosophy. What else can you do to protect yourself? You have to philosophize.

A young man asked Socrates. "I am thinking of getting married, and because I have always found your advice tremendously significant I have come to ask you. What do you suggest? Should I marry or not?"

Socrates said, "You should marry, you ought to marry."

The young man was thinking that Socrates would say "Don't marry," because he knew what Xanthippe was doing to Socrates. One day she had even poured a whole kettle of boiling water on his head -- the whole kettle of boiling water! She burnt half his face and he remained his whole life with a burnt face. She used to beat him -- must have been a real woman, an Amazon!

And this young man was thinking that Socrates would say, "Never get married. Look at my life!" But Socrates said, "You ought to get married."

The young man said, "I am more puzzled than I was before I came to you. You are saying I ought to get married? For what reasons?"

Socrates said, "If you get a beautiful wife you will live a contented life, and if you get a wife like mine you will become a great philosopher!"

The woman has not achieved in any direction, in any dimension, for the simple reason that she has no inner tension for achievement. Jokes apart, she has no inner tension for achievement. She is more relaxed than man she is more balanced than man. Man has a deep imbalance in him.

Psychologists say that because man cannot produce children -- he cannot become a mother, he has no womb -- he feels deep down a certain envy. The woman seems to be creative, she brings life to the world, and he seems to be almost barren. To substitute for it he creates great painting, poetry, sculpture, architecture; he goes in search of truth.

The woman is at ease, at home. In fact, she cannot understand why a man like Mahavira tortured himself for twelve years. I have heard of no woman in the whole history of man who has tortured herself in such a way even for twelve days, the way Mahavira did. "In search of truth? What truth?" It is not a woman's concern at all. She is more concerned about what is happening to the neighbor's wife. "What truth? And what will you do even if you get it? Can you eat it? Can you sell it? Will it increase your bank balance? What will you do with the truth?" She is simply unable to understand why these people are so crazy about truth, "the ultimate truth." And they want to attain to eternal life when they don't know how to live this small life!

The concerns of the woman are different. Her concerns are more pragmatic, less metaphysical. She is more concerned with love than with logic. Logic has no appeal for women. I have never seen a really intellectual woman. Today, because of the Women's Liberation Movement, many women try to become intellectuals and to smoke like men and to talk about great things, but you can see it is all shallow; it cannot be deep. It is not her nature. Her nature is totally different, and nothing is wrong in it.

Man has his own way. And of course, because all the history books have been written by man, he has written about other men. The women have been neglected, ignored. There have been great women, but of course they were great in a different way -- great lovers, great mothers, great wives. They may not have been great poets, but they have been great cooks.

Just the other day the manager of the Taj Mahal Hotel was here. Now, the Taj Mahal Hotel is the biggest hotel in India, the costliest, the world-famous hotel in India. And even he asked Laxmi, "Can you send that Italian mamma, Deeksha, just for one month to teach our people how to cook?"

Now who will write about Deeksha as an enlightened cook? Nobody will write, because that is not man's concern. And, in fact, food is far more important than poetry. If it comes to a choice, then I will choose Deeksha instead of Dionysius! What will I do with Dionysius? THEOLOGIA MYSTICA -- I can do it myself, but who is going to give me the food? And unless you have enough spaghetti in you you cannot write a Theologia Mystica -- impossible. It is the subtle working of spaghetti inside you; spaghetti going on and on inside creates great mysteries!

I don't want women to compete with men; they should simply be their own selves. This has never been told, that is true, but the woman should be her own self, and whatsoever her nature is she should try to meditate according to that nature. Her meditation should be her own natural, spontaneous life. Then there will be enlightened women. They will not be like Buddha -- they cannot be, and they need not be, and they need not feel in any way inferior -- but they will have their own heights, which no Buddha can ever have; they will have their own experiences, which no Mahavira can ever have. The woman has a different interiority than the man. Man is aggressive.

You ask, Samya: Dionysius is again an enlightened male Master...

In fact, to be a Master you need a little bit of aggression in you, otherwise you cannot be a Master. The woman can be a tremendously beautiful disciple but cannot be a Master. And

remember, nothing is wrong in it, and she is not inferior because she cannot be a Master.

The disciple needs receptivity; he has to receive. Even the male disciple has to function almost in a feminine way. With the Master he is a womb, a receiver, a receptacle. Hence the woman proves to be the perfect disciple.

Mary Magdalene is the perfect disciple -- no other disciple of Jesus even comes close to her. In fact, one of his disciples, Judas, was the cause of his death, and all the other disciples escaped when he was crucified. Who brought his body down from the cross? -- three women. One was his mother, Mary, the others were Magdalene and her sister. Where were the male disciples? They had all escaped. They were afraid they might be caught. But these three women were not afraid -- love knows no fear. And their discipleship was perfect.

To be a perfect disciple is equivalent to being a perfect Master. But there are different approaches. It is very difficult for the man to be a perfect disciple; he remains somehow imperfect. I have never come across a man who can be a really perfect disciple: ninety-nine percent. maybe even ninety-nine point nine percent, but because he is male, something, his own aggressiveness, somewhere remains. Howsoever refined it becomes, somewhere it remains.

But he can become a perfect Master. This much is enough: if a male disciple is ninety-nine point nine per-cent a disciple he will become enlightened, he will become a perfect Master. But the woman is a perfect disciple -- so perfect that the idea to become the Master never arises in her. She is so contented in being a perfect disciple, she is so fulfilled, there is no intrinsic necessity for it in her.

This is my observation: every male disciple deep down has the desire one day to become the Master. Hence many male disciples have betrayed their Masters, because they could not wait long.

One of Mahavira's greatest disciples was Goshalak, who betrayed him, because one thing was certain: unless Mahavira died he would not have the same position, the same power. Even if he became enlightened he would be just an enlightened disciple. Mahavira's death was a must. And Mahavira was very healthy; in fact, Goshalak was not such a healthy man. It was impossible to wait. He betrayed. He declared himself a Master although he was not yet even a perfect disciple. His Mastership was bogus, and this he realized before he died.

His last testament was: "Let it be known to the world that I betrayed my Master, that I pretended to be a Master myself, but it was false because I have not realized any truth in my life. In fact, something that was happening when I was a disciple of Mahavira stopped the moment I left him."

Buddha's closest disciple, Devadatta, his own cousin, betrayed him. And Judas was the most intellectual disciple of Jesus, the most intelligent. In fact, he would have been the head once Jesus was gone. Maybe in an unconscious way that was the reason why he conspired with the enemies, helped the enemies to catch hold of Jesus, because I don't think that he was interested so much in thirty silver coins. He was not that kind of man -- very intellectual, refined, very cultured. He would not have sold Jesus only for thirty silver coins. But there must have been an unconscious desire in him: if Jesus was removed from the scene then he would be able to dominate the whole scene. And of course he was the most intelligent, most intellectual person around Jesus. All the others were farmers, fishermen, carpenters, gardeners -- poor people, simple people.

The male disciple unconsciously carries the idea that sooner or later he will be the Master. And if he remains with the Master, sooner or later he will be a Master. But there are very impatient people also, who are in such a hurry that they cannot wait. But the woman

disciple has no desire to be a Master. She has a desire to be a total disciple, an absolute disciple -- and she can be, one hundred percent.

I have been thinking to choose male mediums also. Many times I have thought about it, many times I decided that now a group should exist of male mediums. But when I look around, then I find difficulties: they cannot relax totally. Yes, there are a few people like Teertha -- there are a few people who can be mediums without any difficulty. But I have not been able to find at least twenty men who can be mediums, who can be totally relaxed, available.

But as far as women are concerned my problem is totally different: whom to choose and whom not to choose, because almost hundreds of women disciples are here who are capable of being mediums. And I am sorry that we don't have that much space right now. In the new commune I will have. So if some woman is not chosen, don't feel worried about it, don't feel that you are not worthy of it. It is only that the Chuang Tzu Auditorium is very small; I cannot have more than thirty mediums there. And the problem is not that it is difficult to choose; the difficulty is whom to choose and whom to leave, because almost all are ready, totally available.

Samya, your question is just like this: if a man asks me why it is always that women become mothers and never a man, what am I going to say? What can I do about it? Their biology is different and so is their psychology. They are different species really, and that is the attraction between them. They live on different planets.

The man lives in intellect; intellect is aggressive. The woman lives in instinct, in intuition, which is receptive. The man lives in the head, the woman lives in the heart. The man lives in logic, the woman lives in love. For man, love is only a relaxation from logic. For woman, logic can only be a game; she can play once in a while to show that she also knows it, otherwise it is not her real concern.

And when I am saying these things I am not taking account of exceptions, remember it. Exceptions simply prove the rules; I am talking about the rule. There have been a few women Masters: Rabiya el Adawiya, Sahajo, Daya, Lalla, Meera -- a few, only a few women Masters. They must have had a very male psychology somewhere. And there have been great male disciples. Buddha had many: Sariputra, Manjushri, Modgalyayan, Ananda, Maulingaputta, and many more -- totally devoted.

Manjushri became enlightened; he was his first disciple to become enlightened. And Buddha would ask every day, "Where is Manjushri?" And he would avoid him. Finally Buddha caught hold of him one day. He caught hold of him in the night when he was asleep, otherwise he would have escaped.

He said. "What is the matter with you? You cannot hide the fact from me -- I know it has happened! Then why are you avoiding me? You should have come for confirmation."

Manjushri said, "That's why I am avoiding you. I know it has happened and I don't want any confirmation from you, because any confirmation from you means you will say, 'Manjushri, now go away. Spread my word to the people.' And I don't want to go anywhere else. I want to remain here. It is better to be unenlightened." said Manjushri, "and to be with you, rather than to be enlightened and to go somewhere else. So please don't recognize me as an enlightened person -- I am not! I say to you I am not! And even if you feel that I am, please keep it a secret."

Because once you are enlightened the Master is bound to say, "Go now, help others."

Now this Manjushri is an exception: he has no desire to be a Master. Sariputra was different. When he became enlightened he immediately asked Buddha himself, "Now that I am enlightened, what should I do? Where should I go? Whom should I teach?"

In fact, even before he was enlightened, even before he had ever become a disciple of Buddha, he had pretended for many years that he was a Master. He had five hundred disciples when he came to see Buddha. With five hundred disciples he had come really to argue that "I am right and you are wrong." He had come to convince Buddha to be his disciple. Now that desire to be the Master must have been there.

You can find the same examples here. Now Teertha is here -- the same type as Manjushri. Even if he becomes enlightened he will not come to me to be recognized. I will have to wake him up in the night. That's why I have given him the room just above mine, so he cannot escape anywhere!

And then there was Somendra. Somendra always wanted to be a Master. He was in such a hurry that I told him, "You go to the West. Help people there." In the beginning he went to the Western centers as a sannyasin, because he must have been afraid that if he goes as a non-sannyasin then nobody will support him. But now, just two days ago, the message has come that now he has dropped sannyas and is declaring that he has become enlightened. That's what I was expecting, that he would do that. That's what he wanted to do. but here it would have been really difficult to declare. Now in the West he can declare whatsoever he wants to declare. But I hope that he will not suffer like Goshalak. I hope that he will soon come back to his senses.

When Goshalak died he said, "Let the whole world know that I was deceiving people." Not only that: he felt so guilty that he told his disciples, "Drag my corpse through the streets of the town, spit on my face and let the whole town know that I have done something very ignoble and I need the punishment."

I hope that Somendra will not wait that long, that soon he will recognize. He has the capacity one day to become enlightened, but the hurry is preventing it; the very desire is a barrier.

The last question

OSHO,  
MY BOYFRIEND WANTS TO PICK A FIGHT WITH ME. THAT CONFUSES ME.  
WHAT CAN I DO ABOUT IT?

Prem Toshi,

IT SIMPLY means he still loves you. The day he stops picking a fight with you, know well that the love affair is finished. It is simply a sign that the love affair still continues. Now, it is difficult to love a woman or a man twenty-four hours a day. You can love for a few minutes, and the rest of the time...? It is perfectly good to pick a fight. Just make it a little more sophisticated. Don't let it be like Astha and Deepak.

Astha is continuously picking fights with her boy friends; she enjoys them. If there is not a fight going on that means there is no excitement. Deepak is a very soft person, but Astha drove him to such a point that he hit her so hard that not only are her lips wounded, her head struck the wall and she had a concussion. Now she is going gaga! This is a love affair, but a little bit primitive!

So, Toshi, there is nothing to be worried about. Why you should be confused? Love is a mad thing in the first place -- it is maddening; if it is not maddening it is not worth it. When you are in a love affair you should know that you have accepted some mad part in you; you have given it recognition. You are following some mad element in you. That's why it is called "falling in love"; otherwise it should be called "rising in love." You don't rise, you fall.

A minister visits the new mental hospital. As the director is leading him around they come to a swimmingpool full of people who are obviously enjoying themselves tremendously. Some are even jumping from a three meter high platform.

"Are these your patients?" the astonished minister asks.

"Oh yes, for sure," exclaims the proud director, "but that's nothing. You should see them when there's water in the pool!"

A love affair is something like a swimmingpool without water: jumping and swimming, and there is no water! It is a mad affair. Because you cannot be alone, you are not sane enough to be alone, you are not centered enough to be alone, hence you need the other. And the other is in the same situation: he needs you, or she needs you, because without the other he is just empty. So two emptinesses trying to fill each other -- is it not mad, utterly mad? How can it be possible?

And then people are different. There are sadists who will torture the woman; unless they torture here they cannot love her. First they will beat her, make her cry, scream; only then they will get excited. Unless they see the woman crying and screaming they don't get excited. Their excitement comes only when the woman starts going crazy.

The word "sadist" comes from the name of a famous novelist, de Sade. He was really an expert. He used to carry a bag like a doctor's bag with all kinds of instruments in it that he had invented to torture women -- all kinds of instruments. And he was a very beautiful man, very rich, and had some charisma. It was impossible not to fall in love with him. Any woman who came in contact with him would soon end up in his torture chamber -- not love chamber. He had a beautiful mansion and his love chamber was a torture chamber. He would lock the door and then he would show all his instruments -- he would open his bag. And on the walls also were many kinds of instrument the woman may never have seen.

But it is said, although the women were tortured, beaten, and blood would start rushing out of their bodies, many women confessed in the court -- because finally he was caught -- they confessed, "Although he tortured us, we had never had such a beautiful orgasmic love with anybody else in our lives." So there are women also who are masochistic.

And the best marriage, the perfect marriage, is between a sadist and a masochist. There are men who are masochists: they want their woman to torture them, to nag them. That brings them a little life -- they become alive.

People are different. When you love a person you should know it. Never try to change the person, because nobody has ever been able to change the person. You can change your lover from A to B, but don't try to change A into something else; that has never been possible. That is a sheer waste of time.

Wilma, Martha and Liza met in the Harlem laundromat and, as usual, the talk soon got around to sex. They began talking about their lovers and the nicknames they had given them.

"I've called my man Rolls," began Wilma, "after Rolls Royce, because he starts at the push of a button, never fails to get goin', and moves just so smooth and silent like, why it's just

soopreem comfort all the way."

"My man is just like a Ford," said Martha, "maybe one of them old Model T's. Sometimes I've gotta crank him to get him started, he coughs and backfires a little, but when he gets right on chuggin' away, why, he can go all night without stop."

"Well," said Liza, "I call my man Drambuie."

"Drambuie?" said Martha. "Why now, ain't that some kind of fancy likker?"

"That's my man!"

---

## Theologia Mystica

### Chapter #12

#### Chapter title: None

#### **22 Augy 1980 am in Buddha Hall**

Archive code: 8008220

ShortTitle: THEOLO12

Audio: Yes

Video: Yes

---

The first question

OSHO,

WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A MASTER AND THE PERFECT MASTER?

Tiko,

FIRST try to understand the difference between a teacher and a Master, then the difference between a teacher and a perfect teacher. Only then will you be able to understand the difference between a Master and a perfect Master.

The teacher is one who teaches borrowed knowledge. He knows nothing, he has not experienced anything -- it has not happened to him -- but he has heard it, read it. He is skillful in transmitting it verbally, intellectually: he is capable of communication.

The perfect teacher is one who knows this: that he does not know. The teacher forgets it, tends to forget it. He starts believing in whatsoever he is teaching others. He is not only a deceiver, he is also deceived. He starts living in a deep auto-hypnotic sleep. First he convinces others, and when others are convinced, seeing their conviction he becomes convinced himself.

Sometimes it happens that even though he is only a teacher he may get a perfect disciple and he will see miracles happening in the disciple. Then the temptation is great to believe that he must be somebody special, extraordinary.

It happened in Marpa's life: Marpa went to a teacher. He was well known for his scholarship. a great pundit. and many followers, many students, many disciples were

gathering around him. Marpa was in search. He went to the teacher, he surrendered to the teacher, and from that moment miracles started happening.

The other students were very jealous, obviously. They told everything to the teacher. The teacher himself watched him; he could not believe his eyes -- Marpa was able to walk on water. He asked Marpa, "What is your secret?"

He said, "YOU are my secret. I just take your name and that's enough. I say within my heart, 'My Master, take me to the other shore.'" His trust was so total that he was capable of walking on water, walking through fire.

Marpa's teacher tried to test him. He told him to jump from the mountain into a deep abyss. The moment he said, "Jump!" Marpa jumped. It was absolutely certain that he would die, that not even pieces of his body would be found. And when the teacher and the crowd that was watching came down, Marpa was sitting there in deep meditation, unhurt, unscratched.

Again the teacher asked, "What is your secret?"

He said, "YOU are my secret. And each time things like this happen my surrender to you goes on deepening, it goes on becoming more perfect than it was before. It was perfect before too, but there are possibilities, dimensions of even perfection becoming more perfect."

Seeing this, the teacher became convinced that he had some tremendous power of which he was not aware. He tried to walk on water. He said to himself, "I am the != teacher, the great teacher of Marpa, and I want to go to the other shore!" And he had to be saved because he was drowning. He could not believe his eyes! But from that moment, Marpa's own miracles disappeared. Seeing the Master drowning in the water, the power that he had created through trust evaporated.

It happens many times through teachers that many people start experiencing spiritual revelations. But if the teacher becomes deceived, auto-hypnotized, then he is only a teacher, a very ordinary person.

Vedant and Kamal have just come from the West. They had a great desire to travel to the West, and they have come with many experiences. Particularly in California, California-land. they were thought to be great Masters, and things started happening to people. They themselves have not done a single group here, and they became great group leaders there, Tantra Masters! And people were worshipping them and begging them to stay there.

That's what has happened to people like Muktananda; it is not different. Kamal and Vedant have far more intelligence than Muktananda. Kamal was surprised when for the first time it started happening. In one of our centers they were leading a group and Kamal just went there and sat. A few people's kundalini started arising and they started swaying, and of course, the only visible cause was Kamal's presence. They must have fallen at his feet: "A great Master has come from the East!"

I have heard that Yogi Bhajan, who is a very famous teacher in America, was just a porter at Delhi Airport. Seeing Muktananda coming with seven hundred American disciples to Delhi Airport and looking at Muktananda, he thought, "Why am I wasting my life here, carrying luggage and people's bags?" And certainly Yogi Bhajan has a far more beautiful personality: he is a Sikh, tall, healthy, looking beautiful, impressive, presentable. Muktananda is just ugly, a duckling! Yogi Bhajan resigned from his post immediately and went to America. His name was Sardar Bhajan Singh; there he became Yogi Bhajan. And now he is the suprememost commander of the Sikh religion in the Western hemisphere and he has thousands of followers.

When others become convinced -- and there are gullible people everywhere who are ready to believe, who are really desperately in need to believe, who cannot stand on their own feet, who want a father figure so that they can throw all their responsibility on his shoulders, so that they can be unburdened... They are ready to believe. Then of course the law of economics works: wherever there is demand there is supply.

Now it will be difficult for Kamal and Vedant to start working here again. Vedant going back to Vrindavan will find it difficult, Kamal going back to driving will find it difficult -- they have tasted something of the ego. The only thing that can prevent them is that they became tired of the whole speedy life in the West, utterly tired. And the second thing that can keep them here is their deep love for me; otherwise they can be great Masters themselves in the West.

The teacher becomes auto-hypnotized. The great teacher is one who teaches, but knowing that "It is not my own." Not only does he know it, he makes it clear to everybody that "I am just an interpreter, a commentator," that "I have studied, I am a scholar, a professor. I am teaching things about which I have no experience of my own," and who is capable of so much awareness that he never becomes deceived. Even though others start believing in him, he never believes in himself unless he starts experiencing.

The moment a person starts experiencing he becomes a Master. Then it is not borrowed; then it is his own authentic knowing, it is his wisdom. But not every Master is capable of bringing his wisdom to people, to those who are utterly ignorant, of bringing his light to those who are blind, who are living in darkness. The Master is one who has experienced. He is greater than the perfect teacher, but he is an arhata, in Buddhist terminology: he knows, but he cannot make it known to others.

If he has been a perfect teacher before, only then is it possible that he may be able to impart something of his revelation. If he has not been a perfect teacher before then it is impossible, and there is no necessity. A person can move into the world of being a Master directly; there is no necessity that he should come via being a perfect teacher. But if he has been a perfect teacher, then it will not be long before he becomes a perfect Master.

Out of a hundred Masters only one is a perfect Master. Ninety-nine know and in certain ways try to help people, but their ways are haphazard, their devices are primitive; what they teach looks childish. Their skill as far as teaching is concerned is very limited. They know more, far more than they are capable of teaching. The perfect Master is one who is capable of communion.

The perfect teacher is one who is capable of communication. the perfect Master is one who is capable of communion. He can help you through intellectual understanding, but that is not the only way and not the whole way and not necessarily successful. But he is also capable of imparting his energy to you, he is capable of imparting his flame to you. Just being with him, being in his presence, something can transpire in you. Just being close to him is enough, and whatsoever he does has a perfection about it. His devices...

For example, Gautam Buddha's device of vipassana is a perfect device. Twenty-five centuries have passed, but nothing has been added to it. Thousands of enlightened people have passed through it, but nobody has been able to improve upon it. It is absolutely perfect; nothing is missing. Hence Buddha is a perfect Master.

Patanjali is a perfect Master. Whatsoever he has done as far as Yoga is concerned seems to be the crescendo. Five thousand years have passed but his Sutras are as fresh as this morning's rose flowers. They don't become old, they can't become old. Nothing has been able to supercede his Sutras. And thousands of books on Yoga have been written in these five

thousand years, but no other book has been able to impart that glow, that aliveness, that perfection. Patanjali is a perfect Master; others are only apprentices. No book reaches that perfection.

The same is true about Lao Tzu: his Tao, his approach to the ultimate truth seems to be impossible to improve upon. It very rarely happens that a person gives you the total perfection of a thing, but it happens.

It happens in other arts: Michelangelo cannot be improved upon, Leonardo da Vinci cannot be improved upon, Shakespeare cannot be improved upon. Kalidas cannot be improved upon -- these are perfect Masters. There are thousands of painters, but there is something which makes Vincent van Gogh a perfect painter. Nobody comes close to him; they lag far behind. What is it that makes him perfect? It is impossible to improve upon him. Whatsoever you do will destroy its beauty, it will bring it, lower; as if the whole dimension has become exhausted and you have come to a full point.

There have been only very few perfect Masters. Hindus call them avatars, Jainas call them teerthankaras, Buddhists call them Buddhas. In the Western world, Jesus is a perfect Master, Moses is a perfect Master, Eckhart is a perfect Master, Francis is a perfect Master. Whatsoever they have done, they have done it so totally that they have reached to the very end of that dimension. Now there is nothing more to do about it, everything is complete.

The teacher is dangerous because not only can he deceive others, he can become deceived himself.

I am tremendously happy that Kamal and Vedant were not deceived. They proved more intelligent than Satprem or Somendra -- they are getting deceived. Because something starts happening in other people, you need not presume that it is because of you; it may be just their faith. You may not be a part of it at all; it may be just their own auto-hypnotic state.

The great teacher has a beauty because he himself is aware and makes others always aware that "Nothing can happen through me because nothing has happened to me. Learn as much as you can learn from me as a student, but I am not a Master and you are not a disciple." Great courage is needed to be a great Master, and only if a great teacher becomes a Master is he capable of helping, because he has learned all the techniques to help. Now the experience is there; he can pour out that experience and use all his old techniques.

Otherwise there are many enlightened people who simply become Masters. That's the difference between the ARHATAS and the bodhisattvas. Arhatas are just Masters, enlightened people. Nothing is lacking in them as far as their experience is concerned; it is the same as the experience of the bodhisattva. The only thing that is different is that the bodhisattva is capable of accepting disciples, the arhata is not capable.

In Buddhism there are two schools: Hinayana and Mahayana. Hinayana belongs to the world of the arhatas. Hinayana means a small boat, so small that only you can go to the farther shore; you cannot accept anybody else, otherwise not only he will be drowned, you will be drowned with him. The boat is so small...

Mahayana means a big ship; that is the way of the of the bodhisattva. He goes on inviting people: he creates a Noah's Ark and he goes on inviting all kinds of people to become part of his commune, his sangha, because the ship is going to leave soon. He collects thousands of people and then moves towards the farther shore. He is the great Master.

OSHO,  
CONCERNING THIS MORNING'S INSIGHTS ON SCIENCE AND MYSTICISM, THESE

WORDS OF D. H. LAWRENCE:

"IT IS EASY TO SEE WHY MAN KILLS THE THING HE LOVES. TO KNOW A LIVING THING IS TO KILL IT. ONE SHOULD BE SUFFICIENTLY INTELLIGENT AND INTERESTED TO KNOW A GOOD DEAL ABOUT ANY PERSON ONE COMES IN CLOSE CONTACT WITH. ABOUT HER. ABOUT HIM. BUT TO TRY TO KNOW ANY LIVING BEING IS TO SUCK THE LIFE OUT OF THAT BEING. ABOVE ALL THINGS, WITH THE WOMAN ONE LOVES. EVERY SACRED INSTINCT TEACHES ONE THAT ONE MUST LEAVE HER UNKNOWN. YOU KNOW YOUR WOMAN DARKLY, IN THE BLOOD. TO TRY TO KNOW HER MENTALLY IS TO KILL HER. BEWARE, O WOMAN, OF THE MAN WHO WANTS TO FIND OUT WHAT YOU ARE. AND, O MAN, BEWARE A THOUSAND TIMES MORE OF THE WOMAN WHO WANTS TO KNOW YOU, OR GET YOU, WHAT YOU ARE. MAN DOES SO HORRIBLY WANT TO MASTER THE SECRET OF LIFE AND OF INDIVIDUALITY WITH HIS MIND. KEEP KNOWLEDGE FOR THE WORLD OF MATTER, FORCE AND FUNCTION. IT HAS GOT NOTHING TO DO WITH BEING.  
AND AGAIN:

"LOVE OUGHT NOT TO BE PERFECT. IT OUGHT TO HAVE PERFECT MOMENTS AND WILDERNESSES OF THORN BUSHES, WHICH IT HAS. A PERFECT RELATIONSHIP OUGHT NOT TO BE POSSIBLE. EVERY RELATIONSHIP SHOULD HAVE ITS ABSOLUTE LIMITS, ESSENTIAL TO THE SOUL OF EACH INDIVIDUAL. A TRULY PERFECT RELATIONSHIP IS ONE IN WHICH EACH PARTY LEAVES GREAT TRACTS OF THE OTHER UNKNOWN. "  
ISN'T THAT ALSO A DESCRIPTION OF A POET -- A MYSTIC? AH, OSHO, THERE COMES A GLIMPSE OF YOUR MYSTERIOUS, MISCHIEVOUS SMILE. YOU NEVER STOP YOUR LOVING EMBRACE WITH LIFE.

Anand Jerry,

I LOVE these two men immensely: Friedrich Nietzsche and D.H. Lawrence. Both had the capacity to become enlightened Masters, but both missed. Still, they had glimpses -- glimpses of great insight.

D. H. Lawrence is a great poet and has something of the mystic in him too, but the only unfortunate thing is that he never became interested in meditation as such, he never tried to seek and search for his innermost core. And he was very close to it, so close that even not knowing about it something of it has penetrated into his words.

Both these insights are tremendously true. To know a thing certainly means to reduce it to something dead. Life as such is intrinsically mysterious: it cannot be known the way physics knows, it can be known only the way poetry knows. The poet also knows about the roseflower, but his knowing is absolutely different from the knowing of a chemist, of a biologist. of a physicist.

If the physicist tries to know the roseflower he will think in terms of electrons, neutrons, positrons. If the chemist tries to know about the roseflower, then the roseflower is nothing but chemistry, chemicals. The poet does not look at the roseflower in terms of physics or chemistry; in fact, he does not observe the roseflower the way a scientist observes a thing. The scientist remains aloof, detached. He does not enter into the experiment himself -- he is

just a watcher; he simply takes notes about what is happening. But the poet becomes a participant.

In the world of poetry, knowing happens not through detachment but through sympathy -- or it will be even better if we use the word "empathy." Empathy is the highest peak of sympathy. In sympathy you feel how the other is feeling. The other is in pain, in misery, sad or joyous; you feel it. Your heart gets in tune with the other; that is sympathy. It is a kind of symphony. But in empathy you become one with the other; it is not only a question of getting in tune, it is merging, it is melting.

The real poet melts into the rose. The observer and the observed become one; they are no more separate. There is no poet standing aloof, away from the rose; there is no roseflower separate from the poet. They have merged into a deep dance. The poet is the roseflower, the rose flower has become the poet. There is no distinction left; they have trespassed each other. Then a totally different kind of knowing happens: that knowing cannot be called knowledge.

Science is knowledge; the very word "science" means knowledge. But poetry is not knowledge. Of course, it is a kind of knowing, but so different, so qualitatively different, that even to call it knowing looks a little unjustified. But we don't have any other word.

In Sanskrit we have two words: knowledge is called gyan, and knowing is called pragyan. In English we can say that knowing is experiencing -- not experience. mind you, but experiencing. It is a deep merger. When the poet comes back to himself he has brought a beautiful diamond.

Vincent van Gogh has painted trees which reach above the stars. Now nobody has ever seen such trees -- such trees don't exist -- but when he was asked he said, "That's how I feel. Whenever I become one with a tree I feel the ambition of the whole earth to reach beyond the stars in every fiber of the tree. I have felt it, I have experienced it, and not once but always, without any exception. Whenever I see a beautiful tree and I become one with it, I feel the urge of the earth to transcend the stars. My paintings are paintings of that immense urge, that longing, that thirst of the earth."

Of course, scientists cannot know anything about it.

Tennyson has said, "If I could understand a single flower in its totality, then I would have known the whole existence" -- because a single flower contains the whole universe. The whole universe has joined hands together to create this single flower. This flower does not exist as an independent unit, it exists as an expression of the whole universe.

The poet merges with the whole universe, and he reaches the flower in this subjective way. He knows an inner way, a secret path: his approach is intuitive. The scientist observes everything as an object.

The word "object" has to be understood. "Object" means that which stands as an obstruction. It is like a wall confronting you -- it has to be conquered. That's why science speaks in terms of conquering the world. Even a man like Bertrand Russell wrote a book called *The Conquest of Nature*.

The poet can never speak about conquest; there is no question of it because there is no conqueror and nothing to be conquered. All is one, one organic unity. But the poet knows these moments only once in a while.

D.H. Lawrence was a poet and had the quality of a mystic, but only once in a while; otherwise he was very intellectual, very argumentative. Even Bertrand Russell was very much irritated by him. Bernard Russell himself was one of the greatest intellectuals of this age, but the way D. H. Lawrence argued made him angry. He was very argumentative, very much in the head, but once in a while he slipped out of the head and then there were great

insights.

This must have been such an insight:

IT IS EASY, HE SAYS, TO SEE WHY MAN KILLS THE THING HE LOVES...

because when you love someone, some deep instinct in you starts hankering to know the person. And remember, knowledge is always an effort to conquer, to possess. Because you want to possess the person you love you want to know all the secrets, because that is the only way to possess. If something of the person remains unknown, that unknown part is not in your possession.

That's why husbands and wives and lovers go on playing detective with each other: they want to know everything. They go on goading each other, "Open your heart. Say it, whatsoever it is. Bring it out!" That is really ugly because you may be able to know a little more about the person, but at the same time the love is dying because love can exist only between two mysteries -- two persons who are mysteries to each other.

IT IS EASY TO SEE WHY MAN KILLS THE THING HE LOVES. TO KNOW A LIVING THING IS TO KILL IT.

If you really want to know you have to dissect. If the chemist wants to know the rose he has to dissect it; he has to reduce it to the basic elements from which it has arisen. The earth has to be separated, every chemical has to be separated~ the water has to be separated; only then will he be able to know it. He has to decompose it so that he can know how it was composed in the first place. The poet does not even touch the flower. There is no question of dissection, analysis; he simply loves. He can dance around it, he can sing a song to the rose, he can put his cheek close to it. Sometimes he may even close his eyes while looking at the rose; that will be impossible for the scientist to understand. "What is going on? If you want to know the rose you have to keep your eyes open!" But the poet's way is totally different: it is not the way of knowledge, it is the way of love. And love enhances life just as knowledge kills it.

ONE SHOULD BE SUFFICIENTLY INTELLIGENT AND INTERESTED TO KNOW A GOOD DEAL ABOUT ANY PERSON ONE COMES IN CLOSE CONTACT WITH.

It does not mean that you should not be acquainted with the person; if you want to live with a person you have to be acquainted. But acquaintance is totally different. Acquaintance is a must of every relationship.

ABOUT HER. ABOUT HIM. BUT TO TRY TO KNOW ANY LIVING BEING IS TO SUCK THE LIFE OUT OF THAT BEING.

Never try to know. Never try to penetrate the ultimate secret of the person; leave it free. Love gives freedom -- it is not a question of conquering. And the more freedom you give the more knowing happen -- but it is not knowledge. It is a feeling, it is intuitive.

ABOVE ALL THINGS, WITH THE WOMAN ONE LOVES...

because the woman is far more mysterious than the man, in fact the most mysterious

phenomenon in the whole existence, and very delicate, very fragile. Love is always very fragile -- handle it with care.

EVERY SACRED INSTINCT TEACHES ONE THAT ONE MUST LEAVE HER UNKNOWN.

Never try to know the woman you love, because the moment you start the effort to know her you have already started destroying her. Soon she will be reduced to a wife, but then she is not the woman you had loved in the first place. The mystery has disappeared -- and you are the cause of it.

YOU KNOW YOUR WOMAN DARKLY, IN THE BLOOD.  
IN THE BONES, IN THE MARROW.

TO TRY TO KNOW HER MENTALLY IS TO KILL HER. BEWARE, O WOMAN, OF THE MAN WHO WANTS TO FIND OUT WHAT YOU ARE. AND, O MAN, BEWARE A THOUSAND TIMES MORE OF THE WOMAN WHO WANTS TO KNOW YOU, OR GET YOU, WHAT YOU ARE.

Why a thousand times more? -- because the woman's way of knowing is far deeper than the man's way of knowing. The man's way of knowing is scientific and superficial objective; the woman's way of knowing is intuitive, subjective. She can penetrate to the deeper realms of the man, and that's why she is capable of killing the love more easily than the man is. Hence a deep fear in every man of the woman he loves -- a certain intuitive feeling that the woman represents not only life but death also.

In the East, particularly in India, we have the image of the goddess Kali, the mother goddess, Kali. She is both a great lover and a great destroyer. If you have seen the image or any picture you will be puzzled -- particularly people coming from the West are very much puzzled -- but it has a great psychological insight in it.

Kali is dancing on the chest of her lover, Shiva. In Sanskrit Shiva means one aspect of God, and Shiva -- just a little difference in spelling -- Shiva means God, Shiva means corpse. She is dancing on the chest of Shiva, destroying him, making him into a corpse. Shiva is becoming a Shiva! She has a garland of human skulls around her neck and in one hand she holds a freshly cut head, blood coming out from it.

Why this strange image? It is not strange, it is tremendously psychological: the woman has great power because she is intuitive. Hence Lawrence is right when he says:

... BEWARE A THOUSAND TIMES MORE OF THE WOMAN WHO WANTS TO KNOW YOU, OR GET YOU, WHAT YOU ARE...

because you may know or may try to know the woman, but your effort is going to remain superficial; but if she starts penetrating you she can reach to the very core. It is not surprising why almost all husbands become henpecked: the woman reduces them to slaves.

MAN DOES SO HORRIBLY WANT TO MASTER THE SECRET OF LIFE AND OF INDIVIDUALITY WITH HIS MIND. KEEP KNOWLEDGE FOR THE WORLD OF MATTER, FORCE AND FUNCTION. IT HAS GOT NOTHING TO DO WITH BEING.

And the second insight is also of tremendous importance:

LOVE OUGHT NOT TO BE PERFECT...

because the moment anything is perfect it dies. Perfection means death.

IT OUGHT TO HAVE PERFECT MOMENTS AND WILDERNESSES OF THORN BUSHES, WHICH IT HAS. A PERFECT RELATIONSHIP OUGHT NOT TO BE POSSIBLE...

because once a relationship is perfect, nothing is left -- nothing is left to explore. All mystery is gone, evaporated.

Every relationship should have its absolute limits, essential to the soul of each individual. A truly perfect relationship is one in which each party leave great tracts of the other unknown.

Jerry, to give freedom is the most essential part of love; to make the other absolutely free is the ultimate of love. Only those who give freedom know what love is, and only those who love know what freedom is.

The third question

OSHO,  
DON 'T YOU FEEL SOMETIMES JUST TO TAKE A DAY OFF AND REST?

Nandan,

NOT ONLY sometimes but every day! But there is a problem...

It was the first day of the term and Mrs. Jones marched into her son's bedroom determined to get him to school on time. She shook him by the shoulder and said, "Good morning. Thomas, time to go to school! Up you get -- we don't want to be late, do we?"

Thomas pulled the sheets over his head and refused to get up.

"Come on, Tommy, you have to get your books ready. Don't be silly!"

"No, I'm not going! I won't go there ever again. I hate the place!"

"Well, Tommy," said his mother sternly, "it's no use arguing about it, you just have to go."

"Give me three good reasons why I should!" muttered Tommy from under the bedcover.

"Well, my son, you are the Principal, you know!"

And that one reason, Nandan, is enough!

Vivek reminds me every morning. She shakes me and says, "Get up! You are the Principal, you know. You have to go!" So here I am!

The fourth question

OSHO,  
HOW CAN I CONQUER GREED, ANGER, SEX -- THE THREE GREAT  
TEMPTATIONS OF THE DEVIL?

Virendra,

IT HAS been one of the obsessions of Indians for centuries, and the only result of it all has been that they are the most greedy people on the earth, and the most angry and the most sexual. For centuries they have been fighting against these three -- greed, anger, sex -- and what is the outcome? Do you see so much greed in anyone else anywhere on earth?

Indians go on calling Western people materialists without ever seeing the fact that to possess is not to be a materialist but that the desire to possess is the foundation of materialism. The West possesses; that does not mean that it is materialist. It simply means it is scientific, it is technological, it knows how to create things. It has penetrated deeply into the world of objects and has come to know its secrets. It has worked hard. It is not materialist, it is simply technologically more developed.

But Indians have a great desire to possess. You may not have anything, and still you will be a materialist if the desire to possess is there. You may possess only a small hut or only a begging bowl, but that is enough for your whole possessiveness to be focused on. And you will be a materialist, not a spiritualist.

Materialism has nothing to do with greed; materialism is a way of living your life, just as spiritualism is. If you are constantly thinking of things and there is nothing more in your being, no desire for anything more, then you have chosen materialism as your way of life.

Here you see people from all countries, and the question is asked again and again by Indians: "Why are there so few Indians?" There are so few Indians because only very few Indians are interested in spiritualism as a way of life. Yes, they can talk about it, they can brag about it -- it fulfills their ego -- but they are not really ready to live it. Even if they come here they come with the specific purpose that I can help them to go to the West through some Western sannyasins, to be educated at Cambridge, at Oxford, at Harvard, so that they can become capable of earning more.

So many letters come to me saying: "You have so many disciples all over the world. Can't you help us poor Indians to get scholarships, some support from foundations like the Ford Foundation or the Rockefeller Foundation?" Their whole interest is in how to possess more power, more things, more money, more prestige. They are not interested in meditation at all.

And what is the reason? What has happened? What has gone wrong? For five thousand years they have been thinking of fighting with greed, anger, sex, and the total result is that the Indian mind is absolutely full of sexuality. They talk about spirituality, but if you look in their minds, if we could make small windows into Indian minds, you would be surprised... In their films even kissing is not allowed. The government even decides how close the lips of the lovers can come: six inches -- more than that is obscene. And if you could make small windows into Indian minds you would see such obscene scenes that all your Playboy magazines will be nothing compared to them! And this is proved by the whole history of India.

The first book on sexual postures was written by Indians -- Vatsyayana's Kama Sutra -- very obscene, ugly. Then the second book also was written by a Kashmiri brahmin scholar, Pundit Koka, Koka Shastra. I sometimes suspect he may be the discoverer of Coca-Cola too

-- his name is Koka. His book is one of the dirtiest in the whole world!

You can go to see Khajuraho, Konarak and Puri -- and there are many other temples like them. And you cannot even imagine -- even your fantasy will fail when you see the sculpture of Khajuraho. What imagination! And for hundreds of years they must have worked, thousands of sculptors must have worked to create so many temples. It is a whole city of temples -- only temples, because now the city is deserted. Hundreds of temples have disappeared, but hundreds of temples are still intact; a few are absolutely intact.

Do you think group sex is something discovered by the Americans? You are wrong! On the Khajuraho temples there are scenes of group sex. You cannot imagine -- Khajuraho shocks everybody. The woman is standing on her head and the man is making love to her -- headstand love! The man is standing on his head and the woman is making love to him. All kinds of obscene, stupid, silly ideas! And India is a spiritual country!

And anger you can see every day in communal riots. Everywhere people are ready to kill so easily, and just a moment before they were praying, they were doing their namaz, they were doing their prayer. But it is very strange that people go to do namaz with weapons, because immediately after the namaz the killing starts -- as if they were ready! And Hindus go to the temples with weapons!

All the political leaders of India go on talking of non-violence, and all these murders, killings, riots... ! Houses are being burnt, post offices are being burnt, police stations are being burnt. People are being burnt alive! There are so many rapes all over the country, and still the leaders go on talking about non-violence.

And the miracle of miracles is that all these things are provoked and managed by the opposition parties. All these communal riots are being done, inspired, triggered by the same people who had come to rule with Morarji Desai for three years. The same people, the same communalists, the same Hindu chauvinists are behind the whole scene -- because they have tasted once the joys of power and now they cannot remain powerless. Now by any means they have to reach to power.

First they will create a state of chaos in the whole country. And of course if the government cannot control the chaos, "the government is impotent." Then there are only two alternatives left for the government. One alternative is to just stand by the side and watch because "it is a democracy and everybody has freedom of expression..."

And in India people have only these repressed things to express: anger, violence, greed, sex. The moment a riot happens, immediately there are rapes, immediately shops are looted -- immediately these things start happening -- all three things together. This seems to be the innermost trinity in the Indian mind: sex, anger, greed; they all come simultaneously.

And the whole thing is managed by the opposition parties, so they have left only two alternatives for Indira Gandhi. One is: don't do anything, just watch, try to manage somehow -- which they will make impossible. The second thing is: be strict, impose something like the Emergency again. Then they will say, "Look, we have been telling you that if you bring this woman back to power she will bring the Emergency back immediately. Democracy will be destroyed. Had we not said that bringing Indira Gandhi back to power would mean the end of democracy? Look!" Now these two alternatives are left for Indira Gandhi; there is no other alternative. And this is how they are hoping to come back to power.

If you stand by without doing anything, then the chaos will make it absolutely clear to the country that the government is impotent, that it cannot do anything -- it has to be changed. Or if you do something, that means you are destroying democracy, you are taking people's freedom away, and that is enough cause to pull you down from power.

My own suggestion to Indira Gandhi is: impose a stricter Emergency than before, and for fifteen years no elections in this country. For fifteen years this country needs no democracy! This country is not capable of having democracy -- it has not that much intelligence. It has lived for two thousand years in slavery; it only knows how to live peacefully in slavery. If it has freedom it does not know how to cope with it. And in those fifteen years try forcibly to teach this country how to live independently. Nobody has taught this country how to live independently.

And you are asking me: These are the three great temptations of the Devil. How to conquer them?

This is the question Indians have been asking for five thousand years, Virendra, and the result is total anarchy. I cannot suggest to you any method of conquering because there is none. Understanding is possible, victory is not possible. Through understanding, victory also is possible, but trying to be victorious even understanding becomes impossible.

And the more you try to escape from these temptations of the Devil, the more you will be in their grip, because every temptation becomes more appealing the farther you escape from it.

A beautiful woman went to see an old and experienced doctor. During the examination he noticed two strange green spots on the inside of her thighs and he asked, "Are you married?" "Engaged," replied the woman.

"What is your fiance's profession?"

"Well, doctor, he doesn't really have a profession. He is a gypsy  
"A real one?"

"Yes, doctor, a real gypsy."

"Look, lady," said the doctor, "he may be real, but his earrings are not!"

For five thousand years you have practiced a religion which is false. The outcome shows this absolutely clearly, and still you are asking the same question.

A woman returns from a shopping trip wearing a very chic new dress. Her husband, appalled at the cost of the dress, tells her angrily that they cannot afford to spend money that way.

"Well," says his wife, "I'm afraid the Devil tempted me!"

"Don't you know," fumes the husband, "that when the Devil tempts you you are supposed to say, 'Get thee behind me!'"

"Yes," she replies, "I did that, but then he said, 'My dear, it fits you so beautifully at the back!' "

No old strategies will help anymore. It is better to go through all these experiences of greed, anger and sex.

Don't be a coward, Virendra. Your name means courageous, brave, and what you are asking is cowardly. Go through these experiences. Accept them as part of life, as God given gifts -- there must be something in them. There is! If you go through greed, sharing arises. If you go through anger totally, in deep awareness, meditateness, love arises, compassion arises. If you go through sex consciously, meditatively, you will have the first glimpses of

samadhi, you will know the first windows opening into the divine.

The old man is showing his son the family album. The boy sees a photograph where his father is sitting in a chair with his legs crossed while his mother is standing by his side with a pained expression on her face.

"Hey, dad, what is this?" asks the son.

"What, son?"

"This photo," says the boy. "Why are you making mother stand while you are sitting down? That's not being a gentleman!"

"Ah, son," explains the father, "this photograph was taken on our honeymoon. At that time your mother could not sit down and I could not stand up!"

Virendra, you need experience, you need understanding. And through understanding is transformation.

---

## Theologia Mystica

### Chapter #13

#### Chapter title: Neither This Nor That

**23 August 1980 am in Buddha Hall**

Archive code: 8008230

ShortTitle: THEOLO13

Audio: Yes

Video: No

---

GOING YET HIGHER, WE SAY THAT HE IS NEITHER A SOUL, NOR A MIND, HE IS NEITHER A SOUL NOR A MIND NOR AN OBJECT OF KNOWLEDGE; NEITHER HAS HE OPINION, NOR REASON, NOR INTELLECT; NEITHER IS HE REASON, NOR THOUGHT, NOR IS HE UTTRABLE OR KNOWABLE; NEITHER IS HE NUMBER, ORDER, GREATNESS, LITTLENESS, EQUALITY, INEQUALITY, LIKENESS OR UNLIKENESS; NEITHER DOES HE STAND NOR MOVE, NOR IS HE QUIESCENT; NEITHER HAS HE POWER, NOR IS POWER, NOR LIGHT; NEITHER DOES HE LIVE, NOR IS LIFE; NEITHER IS HE BEING, NOR ETERNITY, NOR TIME, NOR IS HIS TOUCH KNOWABLE; NEITHER IS HE KNOWLEDGE, NOR TRUTH, NOR KINGSHIP, NOR WISDOM, NOR ONE, NOR ONE-NESS, NOR GOODNESS; NEITHER IS HE SPIRIT, AS WE CAN UNDERSTAND IT, NOR SONSHIP, NOR FATHERHOOD, NOR ANY OTHER THING KNOWN TO US, OR TO ANY OTHER CREATURE; NEITHER IS HE OF THINGS WHICH ARE NOT, NOR OF THINGS WHICH ARE; NEITHER DO THE THINGS WHICH ARE UNDERSTAND HIM. AS HE IS IN HIMSELF, AS HE IS IN HIMSELF NOR DOES HE HIMSELF UNDERSTAND THEM AS EXISTING IN THEMSELVES, NEITHER IS THERE UTTERANCE OF HIM, NOR NAME, NOR KNOWLEDGE; NEITHER IS HE DARKNESS, NOR FALSEHOOD, NOR TRUTH; NEITHER IS THERE ANY ENTIRE AFFIRMATION OR NEGATION THAT MAY BE MADE CONCERNING HIM. BUT ON THE OTHER HAND WE MAKE AFFIRMATIONS AND DENIALS OF THOSE THINGS WHICH ARE LESS THAN HIM (AND FOLLOW FROM HIM!) BUT OF HIMSELF WE NEITHER AFFIRM NOR DENY ANYTHING, SINCE HE WHO IS BEYOND ALL ATTRIBUTES IS PERFECT AND ALONE THE CAUSE OF ALL -- BEYOND ALL NEGATION THE HEIGHT OF THAT WHICH IS ENTIRELY FREE FROM ALL AND BEYOND ALL.

MY GOD... this is pure nonsense! The only good thing about it is that this is the last sutra. This is theology at its best or at its WORST -- which are the same as far as theology is concerned. It is all sheer bullshit! You will have to take a jump into it and search out if something worthwhile can be found.

After a hard morning at his new job on a construction site, the Polack asked his foreman where he could go to have a shit. He was directed to a small tent. Inside was a small pit with a wooden plank set across it.

One hour later the Polack had not returned so the foreman went to look for him. He entered the tent and found him wading around in the piss and shit. "What on earth are you doing in here?" cried the astonished foreman.

"It's my jacket, sir. I hung it on that hook and it fell in!"

"But you can't wear it after it has been in there!" said his boss.

"Of course not," replied the Polack, "but my sandwiches were in the pocket!"

It is going to be a little bit difficult -- Dionysius himself must have felt it -- but this is the way theologians have always talked. This is the way, the only way, they can understand. This is their language. It is not poor Dionysius' fault. He was talking to theologians and, being a theologian himself, he was well-equipped with all this jargon.

As time changes, language also changes. Modern languages have become very sensible, to the point, mathematical, scientific. They don't go round and round in circles. They have become more telegraphic: all that is unessential is dropped out.

But Dionysius is not contemporary; that you have not to forget. And there are a few gems of tremendous value, genuine gems, which are scattered among all this theological jargon. Avoid the jargon, but don't throw the baby with the bathwater. The temptation is great one feels like throwing the bathwater and the baby and all! But the baby has to be saved -- it has immense value.

Just the other day somebody asked, "Osho, you say the Hindu shastras are full of shit, but then why are there a few gems, beautiful gems?" There is no contradiction: gems can be found in shit. In fact, where else will you find them? That is the best place to hide them! Nobody will steal them -- nobody will even think that they can be there.

And he had to use this language for two reasons. One: that was the only language he knew, the only language that he was acquainted with. And second: that was the only language in which he could hide his immense insights. He was not in the East where for thousands of years it has become an accepted fact that one can speak directly of the truth, there is no need to go in circles. In the West that has not yet become the accepted thing.

The Western theologian still writes the same way, thinks the same way. It is a torture to read these people! And whenever somebody like de Chardin wrote about God, love, truth, clearly, scientifically -- because he was a scientist -- the Catholic Church prohibited him because he was also a priest. The Church ordered that whatsoever he wanted to write he could write but he could not publish it. And whatsoever he wrote he had to surrender to the Vatican.

You may not be aware that such a great intelligent man was absolutely unknown while he was alive. He started becoming known to the wider world only when he was dead, because his books were only published posthumously by others. He was so obedient to the stupid church that he accepted that he could go on writing, but that he should not publish anything. It is good that his friends were not so stupid; when he died they started publishing his books.

Now the same Catholic Church brags about de Chardin because he belonged to them. His only fault was that he was writing in a clear way which any intelligent person can understand. To understand this kind of theological knowledge is really difficult; it has become more and more difficult for the contemporary mind.

Theologians are still not contemporary. In their monasteries, in their churches they still go on talking in the same old jargon -- they create it. They have become so skillful in these two thousand years, so sophisticated in creating it that whosoever is more sophisticated in creating it starts moving higher in the hierarchy of the priests. They create the language; they don't bother to know about the truth.

A man goes to a prostitute and says he wants a special favor.

"All right, ducky," she says, "but it'll cost you an extra fiver."

He agrees and explains that he wants to put on a plastic raincoat and have her stand on a table stamping her feet, banging cymbals and pouring buckets of water on him.

They begin: the man stands there wearing his plastic raincoat, while the prostitute runs up and down the stairs fetching buckets of water and pouring them over him, while stamping her feet and banging her cymbals. After an hour the exhausted prostitute, gasping, exclaims, "Hey, mister, when are we going to fuck?"

"What?" exclaims the man. "In weather like this?"

They create the weather first and then they get more and more confused in the weather created by themselves! All these words create a certain kind of climate -- very rubbishy -- but unfortunately that has been the way of the theologian all along. The Hindu, the Mohammedan, the Christian, the Jewish, they all speak in the same way. This is not the expression of the mystics

And the problem with Dionysius is that professionally he is a theologian and spiritually, existentially, he is a mystic -- which very rarely happens. I have never come across another case like Dionysius, not at least in the Western history of thought. In the East it has happened a few times that the same person was a mystic and a theologian, and whenever it happens in the East the same problem arises. The language is of the theologian, and in the language, in the thick forest of words, the truth is lost.

But the truth is valuable and has to be saved. That's why I decided to speak on Dionysius. I was aware that I cannot like the way he speaks, his expression -- I hate it! But I love the truth that he wants to express.

I have heard a rumor that he was really an Italian who migrated to Athens and settled there. That may explain many things: too much spaghetti, and it goes round and round!

The Italian father and son are traveling on a bus in London.

"Dad, what's that building over there?"

"Don't know, son."

"Dad, what's that statue over there?"

"Don't know, son."

"Dad, what's that park over there?"

"Don't know, son."

"Dad, you don't mind me asking all these questions, do you?"

"Of course not, son. How else are you going to learn?"

Italians have their own way.

They say: How do you sink an Italian ship?  
Launch it!

Did you see the party where all the Italians were on the roof?  
They had heard that the drinks were on the house.

"Why don't you wipe the mud off your shoes before you enter the lobby?" the hotel clerk asks the Italian.  
"What shoes?"

"Darling," asks the Italian wife, "why do you always say nasty things about me in your sleep?"  
"Who's sleeping?" says the Italian.

The Italian couple were playing chess when the wife remarked, "This reminds me of when we were dating!"  
"We never played chess in those days."  
"No, but even then it took you two hours to make a move!"

GOING YET HIGHER, WE SAY THAT HE IS NEITHER A SOUL, NOR A MIND...

GAUTAM the Buddha has said -- he was the first man to utter it -- that there is no self, no soul. His word was anatta; anatta means no-selfness. Dionysius is saying the same truth:

... HE IS NEITHER A SOUL...

He is not a self. People ordinarily think of God as the supreme self -- not only a self but the supreme self. We are all selves and he is the supreme self. Buddha says we are not selves and there is no supreme self at all. Buddha was condemned in India as an atheist. Dionysius was not in any way ready to get caught by the Catholic Church and condemned as an atheist. It was okay for Buddha to say that there is no self because in India, at least in those days, you were not going to be burnt alive. Otherwise maybe Buddha would not have said it so clearly, may have gone round and round to deceive the fools who are always dominant in the organized religions.

In fact, no mystic can be a part of any organized religion; it is very difficult -- he will have to create so many unnecessary disguises just to protect himself and his teaching. But Dionysius thought otherwise; maybe that was the only course open for him. But he is saying a few tremendously beautiful things. One is: God is not a soul. Here he is absolutely in agreement with Gautam the Buddha. In fact, if God is not a soul, it is another way of saying that there is no God. But he is not saying it so clearly as Buddha says It.  
He also says:

... NOR A MIND...

That is Bodhidharma's expression. Bodhidharma defines meditation as a state of no-mind.

The moment the mind disappears, you know. Knowing happens only when there is no mind; mind is a barrier to knowing.

Dionysius says God is not a mind.

... NOR AN OBJECT OF KNOWLEDGE; NEITHER HAS HE OPINION, NOR REASON, NOR INTELLECT....

He goes on denying everything, but he goes on saying "he." He is playing a trick on his fellow theologians. He goes on taking apart the Church brick by brick; ultimately the whole Church is removed, but he removes the bricks and goes on declaring that he is creating the Church. He removes it brick by brick, slowly, and he continues to use the word "he," he continues to use the word "God."

Mahavira says there is no God, and that is that, and he is finished with it forever -- he will not talk about it again. If he is not, what is there to say about him? But then he is thought to be an atheist, and for hundreds of years Dionysius has been respected by the Christian Church as a great theist, a great theologian. He succeeded in befooling the fools!

He says:

... NEITHER IS HE REASON, NOR THOUGHT, NOR IS HE UTTRABLE OR KNOWABLE; NEITHER IS HE NUMBER. ORDER, GREATNESS, LITTLENESS, EQUALITY, INEQUALITY, LIKENESS OR UNLIKENESS; NEITHER DOES HE STAND NOR MOVE, NOR IS HE QUIESCENT; NEITHER HAS HE POWER, NOR IS POWER...

The religions, particularly the organized religions, have always given three qualities to God. He is omnipotent -- absolutely powerful; omniscient -- knowing absolutely everything that is, that has been that will be; and he is omnipresent -- he is everywhere present, there is not a place where he is not present. The organized religion depends very much on these qualities. Why? -- because people can be enslaved only if God is the suprememost power.

In fact, people are always seeking somebody who is more powerful than themselves so that they can throw all the responsibilities on his shoulders. God has to be omnipotent; there can be nobody more powerful than him. He is pure power. That is the strategy of the priest to enslave people. If he is power, pure power, the highest power, the omnipotent power, then of course all that you have to do is just be a slave. Trying to escape from him is futile, trying to be independent is futile, trying for freedom is futile. It is better to serve him, to be just a servant.

You cannot escape from him because he is omnipresent; wherever you go you will find him. He is always watching, he is always looking at you. It is not only that he watches your acts, he watches even your thoughts, so even in thinking you are not free, you are not left alone; there is no privacy. If God is omnipresent then there is no privacy at all. Then you are never alone, he is always there. This is to create fear. You cannot do anything without him knowing it. In fact, before you have done it he knows it.

He is also omniscient: he knows all -- past, present, future. So not only does he know your past, not only the present, but also the future. What are you going to do? You are absolutely caught, absolutely imprisoned. You cannot escape from God.

This is how Jews, Christians, Mohammedans, Hindus, all have believed. This is a must to create submission in people. And it fits with the upbringing of people -- because the child is born dependent, helpless. He is dependent on the father, on the mother, and so utterly helpless that he cannot survive on his own. He has to compromise, he has to listen and be

obedient, and if he does anything against the parents he starts feeling guilt.

Parents create guilt. That is the greatest sin against humanity. To create guilt in a child is criminal because once the guilt is created, the child will never be free of it. Unless he is very intelligent it will be impossible for him to get rid of it; something of it will remain around him like a hangover.

But the priests and the politicians both conspire in creating guilt in people. The politician wants to enslave your body and the priest wants to enslave your soul, your mind. Your outer side and your inner side, both are being enslaved by the politician and the priest. They have always been in a deep conspiracy.

It is not strange that whenever there are elections, politicians start going to the saints and to the temples and to the holy places. For what? Simply to convince the priests that "We are with you, we will never go against you." And the priests are always willing to help the politicians -- their purpose is the same. One wants to rule man's interiority and the other wants to rule his exteriority, but both want to rule.

And the parents creating guilt in the child are very helpful, tremendously helpful, because the guilty person always feels that he has to receive orders from somebody and he has to follow them. Whether it is the politician or the priest does not matter -- somebody has to order. He is always at the receiving end. His function is to efficiently fulfill the order. His function is not to think, his function is not to be aware, his function is not to decide.

And all parents like stupid children because they are obedient. The intelligent child is bound to be rebellious. Intelligence has the flavor of rebellion. Intelligence has to be completely destroyed, and instead of intelligence a mediocre mind has to be created.

My own observation is that each child is born very intelligent, but our whole conditioning hitherto has been such that his intelligence starts gathering dust. And we allow it to gather dust: his sharpness is lost, his sword becomes rusty. and that's what we want. We don't want him to have a sharp intelligence because then he will ask questions -- and there are no answers with the parents, with the priests, with the politicians. They don't have any answers. They have power -- they can punish you for asking an embarrassing question. They don't allow you to ask questions; your function is to fulfill the order, to do and not to ask why. The whole of humanity has been reduced to slavery.

This is the real spiritual slavery! Political slavery is nothing compared to it. Regimes change -- a capitalist country can become communist, a socialist country can become fascist, a Hindu country can be ruled by the Christians or Mohammedans, a Mohammedan country can be ruled by the Christians -- it does not matter at all; the spiritual slavery continues. It depends on the idea that God is omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent: you cannot escape him, you cannot deceive him. It is really ugly, the very idea that he is always watching you, that you are never left alone.

What Dionysius is saying is exactly the same as what Nietzsche said in more clear words: that God is dead and man is free. But he is saying it in such a way that the theologians will not be able to detect it. He says:

HE IS NOT POWER, NOR LIGHT; NEITHER DOES HE LIVE, NOR IS LIFE...

Nietzsche says God is dead, and Dionysius says: neither does he live, nor IS Life. Is there any difference? In fact, Dionysius' statement is far more profound -- because to say that God is dead means you have accepted one thing, that he was alive before. At least up to now he was alive, maybe on his deathbed, but he was alive. Nietzsche accepts one thing, that he

was alive up to now; now he is dead. But Dionysius says he has never lived, he is not alive, he has never been, nor is he life.

... NEITHER IS HE BEING, NOR ETERNITY, NOR TIME...

In many ways he goes deeper than many other mystics. The Upanishads say God is not time. Jesus was once asked, "What shall be the most unique thing in the kingdom of God?" And he said, "There shall be time no longer." This is not recorded in the Christian gospels, this comes from the Sufi tradition, but Gurdjieff loved it very much. All the Upanishads say: To go beyond time is to know God, because he is eternity.

Dionysius says:

... NOR ETERNITY, NOR TIME...

And certainly his statement is far more profound than all the Upanishadic statements about God being eternity: that he is eternal, that he has no beginning, no end, that he is forever and forever. Why is his statement more profound? Ordinarily time means something momentary, limited; it comes and goes. Eternity means that which never comes and never goes but always is. It is not momentary; it is permanent, absolutely permanent. But from where do you get the idea of permanency? You get the idea from time. What is your eternity? What is the definition of your eternity? Timelessness. But the definition, the very definition, comes from time.

If you look at our definitions you will be very much surprised: all your definitions are tautologies. If you look in the dictionary to inquire what matter is, the dictionary will say "not mind." Then look for what mind is, and the dictionary says "not matter." Nothing is defined. You don't know matter, you don't know mind. When it comes to define matter you simply use "mind," which is as unknowable as matter itself, as unknown, as undefined as matter itself. You are trying to define one indefinable by another indefinable. But that's how on whole language is.

If somebody asks, "What is light?" you will say, "Not darkness." "And what is darkness?" "Not light." And you feel perfectly at ease, and you think you have defined things. But what you have done is just deceived the other person and yourself too. Rather than accepting your agnosia, accepting your ignorance, you have deceived yourself that you know. That's how we go on defining.

Very rarely there is a man who stands, stops and looks at words. All words are deceptive.

D. H. Lawrence was walking with a child in the garden, and the child asked, "Why are the trees green?"

Now any knowledgeable person would have answered, "They are green because of chlorophyll." But D.H. Lawrence stopped, closed his eyes, waited for a few moments, meditated and then said, "They are green because they are green!"

The child said, "That's right, absolutely right! That's what I have always been thinking, but whenever I ask others they always give some other answer. You are the first person who has given me the answer that satisfies me totally. They are green because they are green!"

In a way this is not an answer; in a way this is an acceptance of ignorance. D.H. Lawrence is saying, "I don't know. They are green because they are green!"

This is the way of all those who are true seekers. Otherwise we go on from time to eternity, from death to life, from darkness to light. And we go on defining in such a circular way that nothing is ever defined. Still everybody believes that all is defined and clear. We want to believe that all is defined and clear; we are not courageous enough to live in ignorance. It really needs guts to live in ignorance, but tremendous is the joy of the person who is ready to live in ignorance because his silence is infinite, his depth is immeasurable.

Knowledge is shallow, ignorance is deep. Knowledge is superficial, not-knowing leads you into the abyssal to the bottomless. You start falling into the abyss of existence itself. And Dionysius has given one beautiful word -- agnosia -- "not knowing." That is the world of the mystic.

... NOR IS HIS TOUCH KNOWABLE; NEITHER IS HE KNOWLEDGE, NOR TRUTH...

The Upanishads say: God is satchitananda. Sat, chit, ananda -- they define him with these three words. Sat means truth; chit means consciousness, ananda means bliss. Nobody has ever dared to say that God is not truth, except Dionysius. He says:... nor truth. Nothing more can be denied.

There is another definition in the Indian scriptures: satyam, shivam, sunderam -- God is truth, God is good, God is beautiful. But Dionysius denies all qualities, all possible qualities. Hence this long, long denial:

... NOR KINGSHIP, NOR WISDOM, NOR ONE, NOR ONE-NESS...

He does not want to leave a single loophole; otherwise you will say God is wisdom, prajna. That's what the Upanishads say, the Vedas say: God is pure wisdom.

... NOR ONE...

God is not one. Shankaracharya says God is one, he is non-duality, he is oneness. Dionysius says he is neither one nor oneness.

... NOR DIVINITY...

Otherwise you can say God is nothing but divinity, the quality of divineness. He denies that too. He is taking everything from God, everything conceivable.

... NOR GOODNESS; NEITHER IS HE SPIRIT, AS WE CAN UNDERSTAND IT, NOR SONSHIP...

Now, after so many denials, he comes to deny the Christian idea. He could not say it directly, but after so many denials, after so much smoke, he can put something in an indirect way that the Christian Church would never have accepted directly. Now, when he has even denied God being truth, wisdom, oneness, order, greatness, power, self, what objection can you have after so many denials, great denials? He says:

... NOR SONSHIP, NOR FATHERHOOD...

The whole of Christianity is destroyed, because the whole of Christianity depends on the idea that God is the Father, that God is a trinity: Father, Son and the Holy Spirit. He has denied all three: God is not the Spirit -- holy or unholy is not the question -- he is not the Spirit at all; he is not the Son, he is not Jesus Christ. Just see the tremendous rebellion in it! But the language he is using is of convention. He is hiding fire behind subtle words, and he succeeded perfectly.

... NOR FATHERHOOD...

To say that there is no God as Father, as Son, the whole Christian Church collapses! Nothing is left. There is no question of worshipping, there is no question of prayer, there is no question of any ritual, Catholic or Protestant.

... NOR ANY OTHER THING KNOWN TO US...

He does not want to leave a single thing that you can conceive of as God, so he says:

... NOR ANY OTHER THING KNOWN TO US OR TO ANY OTHER CREATURE; NEITHER IS HE OF THINGS WHICH ARE NOT, NOR OF THINGS WHICH ARE; NEITHER DO THE THINGS WHICH ARE UNDERSTAND HIM. AS HE IS IN HIMSELF...

But he goes on using the words which can satisfy the theologians. He still says:

... AS HE IS IN HIMSELF NOR DOES HE HIMSELF UNDERSTAND THEM AS EXISTING IN THEMSELVES...

But he is taking everything away. The "he" becomes just emptiness: neither is he known nor does he know. This is also something very new. There have been many mystics who have said that God cannot be known, he is unknowable, but Dionysius is the only one who says that God himself does not know. It is not only that we don't know him, he himself does not know what is the case. Not only are we in ignorance, but he is also in ignorance. He just keeps the word "he," but now it becomes more and more empty -- all the contents are disappearing. But the word "he" helps his book; it has survived for centuries. It is being studied in Christian colleges where theologians are prepared and it is respected immensely. Just that empty "he"...

... NEITHER IS THERE UTTERANCE OF HIM...

Nothing can be said of him.

... NOR NAME...

There is no name for him. Hindus say he has one thousand names -- they have a whole scripture devoted to his names: Vishnu Sahasranam, "The One Thousand Names of God." Sufis say he has one hundred names; it is better than one thousand -- nine hundred have been denied. They say he has one hundred names, but when you ask them to say what those names are they will only tell you ninety-nine. And when you insist, "Where is the hundredth?" they will say, "That is unutterable -- that is his true name."

Just two days ago somebody asked, "Osho, the number of the car of the Lord Mayor of Poona is 1, and the number of your Rolls is 99. Is there some esoteric thing about it?" There is! Ninety-nine is a Sufi number -- "the ninety-nine names of nothingness," Sufis say. The real name is the hundredth, but that is unutterable.

Jews, particularly the mystics born in the Jewish tradition, have always insisted that to take the name of God is a sacrilege, a sin. In the ancient Judaic tradition only the highest priest of the great temple of Jerusalem was allowed to utter God's name, and that too only once a year, and one time only. But even that was not to be uttered before the people. He would go into the temple, all the doors would be closed. He would go to the innermost sanctuary the innermost shrine, where he would go only once, and there behind closed doors he would whisper the name of God -- once a year, and nobody should hear it. And it could be given by the highest priest only to his successor; in his ear he had to whisper it. It simply says that there is no name for him.

Jews, even today, whenever they write "God" never write G-O-D because that is a crime; they always G-D. They drop the O so that we know that whatsoever we utter is incomplete. The O is missing -- the most central part is missing. The O is also the symbol for zero -- and zero is the essential core of existence -- nothingness, shunya. It is beautiful the way Jews write "God," G-D; the O is missing because that is the true God. But when you take the O separately it is nothing but zero. It simply represents nothingness.

These are ways of saying that God is absolute nothingness. You cannot worship God. All that you can do is: you can become nothing. That is true worship, that is prayer.

That is what I teach you here: to be nobodies, to be nothingnesses. Sannyas can be defined as a way of life which believes only in nothingness. To live as a zero, that's what sannyas is all about. And that's what Dionysius is doing by denying. I have never come across any list so long only of denials!

... NEITHER IS THERE UTTERANCE OF HIM, NOR NAME, NOR KNOWLEDGE; NEITHER IS HE DARKNESS...

Up to now he has been saying that God is darkness. That was only to help you move a little further towards the ultimate nothingness. If you have to choose between light and darkness, Dionysius will say God is more darkness than light. In that too he is very unique. Many things are unique in him; that's why in spite of all his theological nonsense I have chosen to talk on him. He has many things unique.

For example, God has been defined by the Koran as light, by the Bible as light, by the Vedas as light. All the religions of the world which believe in God have defined him as light. Why? Christians don't agree about anything else with the Hindus, Mohammedans don't agree about anything else with the Hindus, but about one thing, that God is light, they all agree. What is the cause of this agreement? The cause is very simple -- because everybody is afraid of darkness. Hindu, Christian or Mohammedan -- they are all afraid of darkness. The fear of darkness is the cause of defining God as light. They all define death as darkness and life as light. All over the world, even negroes think of the Devil as dark. Now how dark can he be? If he mixes with the negroes I don't think you will be able to find him, where he is!

Mulla Nasruddin was sitting with one of his photographer friends on a bench in the park, and a negro passed by. Mulla Nasruddin said, "Look! Look! A negative!"

He is using the language of the photographer -- a negative. Somebody has forgotten to make the positive of the poor man!

Death is thought of as negative, life as positive, and of course God is positive, affirmative. And there are shallow thinkers, particularly in the West, who go on talking about positive thinking, about the positive qualities of God. It is just out of fear.

Each child is afraid of darkness for the simple reason that he cannot see his mother. He starts crying, weeping, because he cannot see his mother -- the mother who is his very life. If he cannot see the mother he becomes afraid. How long can he survive without the mother? From where is he going to get his nourishment? He starts feeling uprooted.

This fear of darkness has created the idea of God as light and death as dark, the Devil as dark and God as light.

Dionysius is unique. He says that if you have to choose between these two words, "light" and "darkness," if it is a must that you have to call God something, then better call him darkness -- because darkness is uncaused, just as existence is uncaused.

Light has to be caused. Light needs fuel, darkness needs no fuel. Light is bound to be temporary; sooner or later the fuel will be finished and with it the light will disappear. Darkness never comes and goes; it always is. If you bring light you cannot see darkness, that's all. If you take away the light you can see it again. It is just like the stars in the sky: in the day you can't see the stars -- not that they have all disappeared; you cannot see them simply because of the light. In the night you can see them because the light disappears and against the background of tremendous darkness those stars start shining -- because of the contrast.

Darkness is far more timeless than light, far more eternal. And the person who gets rid of fear will be able to feel the beauty of darkness. Its very touch is velvety, its depth is immense. And it leaves you so alone, absolutely alone... the whole world disappears, only your consciousness remains. And there is no object to know, there is only darkness. Nothing to know... you start melting and merging into it.

Nobody has thought of darkness as one of the most important meditations, but it is.

This is only for the beginners; ultimately that too has to be denied, because how will you define darkness without light? And God is not light, hence he cannot be darkness either. These are always two sides of the same coin.

NOR FALSEHOOD...

He has said God is not truth, and our minds immediately jump to the opposite. If he is not truth, then God is falsehood. If somebody says, "I don't believe in God," we immediately conclude that he disbelieves. He has not said that. If somebody says God is not true, we immediately conclude that he is saying that God is falsehood. That is an unnecessary conclusion; you are jumping too early to a conclusion. It is not good, it is not logical. But to avoid any misunderstanding he says:

... NOR FALSEHOOD, NOR TRUTH; NEITHER IS THERE ANY ENTIRE AFFIRMATION OR NEGATION THAT MAY BE MADE CONCERNING HIM.

Nothing can be said about him in an entire way because whatsoever you say about him is going to be wrong and something will be missing in it. If you say he is darkness, then what is light? If you say he is light, then what is darkness? This is one of the greatest problems

metaphysicians have been continuously discussing.

Shankara in India says that God is absolute affirmation: God is and the world is not. To affirm God totally he has to deny the world, all existence, because if the world has even a little bit of existence then that much existence will be less in God. To make God entire, a total, perfect affirmation, he says: Jagat mithya, the world is untrue; Brahma satya, and God is true.

And there have been atheists in India, a long tradition of Charvakas; they do the same in an opposite way. The Charvakas are exactly like Epicurus in the West. They say the world is true and God is untrue. God is an invention of the priests to exploit people; the world is the only truth. That's what Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels and the communist metaphysicians say; it is the same tradition as that of the Charvakas. But there is no basic difference between the Charvakas and Shankara.

You will be surprised at my statement that Shankara and Karl Marx agree on one point: that only one can be affirmed, not both. Now it is your choice which one you affirm. If you affirm God entirely, then the world becomes illusory it is maya. If you affirm the world, then you cannot affirm God; if you affirm the world, then God disappears. Then God becomes an epiphenomenon; that is Marx's word for maya. He becomes illusory; he is just the hallucination of a few stupid people.

You can create the hallucination easily. Within three weeks you can experience God; all the requirements are simple. The first is: you have to believe in a certain personality of God, Christian, Hindu, Mohammedan. You can choose any personality -- God with a thousand hands God with three heads or four hands, whatsoever you want -- you have to think in terms of a personality, and then go on a fast in a lonely place. A three weeks' fast, hungry continuously, your body energy falling low... And remember, as your body energy starts falling low your brain starts losing its efficiency, its clearness. It becomes vague, it becomes smoky, it becomes dreamy; it starts hallucinating. Now, if you have a certain idea of God and you are fasting for three weeks in a lonely place, not with people, so there is a great need for the other...

When you are with people, the need for the other is not so great because others are there. Your wife is there, your children are there, your parents are there, the family, the friends. And particularly when you are on a religious fast, relatives will come to see you and friends will come to see you. Many people will appreciate the whole thing, and you will be on an ego trip.

Go into the mountains to a cave, alone. Fast for three weeks with a certain idea in your mind of God, and concentrate on that idea. Within three weeks you will be able to hallucinate: God will be standing before you as real as anybody you have ever felt, or even more real. You can talk, and your God will even answer you. In fact, there is nobody to answer; you will be doing both the things, questioning and answering. A part of your mind will question, another part of your mind will answer. And the answers will be tremendously satisfying because they will be the answers that you always wanted to hear. It is you and nobody else. It is a monologue.

According to Marx, God is only a hallucination; according to Shankara, the world is a hallucination. But both are trying to do one thing, which is impossible: they are trying to either affirm entirely or negate entirely.

Dionysius has a significant contribution to make. He says:

... ANY ENTIRE AFFIRMATION OR NEGATION THAT MAY BE MADE CONCERNING HIM... IS NOT RIGHT.

Nothing can be said absolutely about whether he is or he is not. Then what are we supposed to do? We have to drop all intellectualization about God. We have to forget the whole idea of knowing about God. We have to relax into ourselves, into our ignorance, dropping the whole search for knowledge. And in that agnosia, in that state of not-knowing, some miracle happens, and you start feeling... What you feel is not God, what you feel is not life, what you feel is not confined to any word. It is so vast that all words become meaningless, inadequate.

Mahavira calls it moksha -- freedom -- and that is a far more beautiful word than "God." Buddha calls it nirvana -- cessation of the ego, death of the ego. That is also a far more beautiful word than "God," because freedom cannot be worshipped -- freedom does not need any priests nor does egolessness need any priests. The idea of God as somebody somewhere has created all the temples and the mosques and the churches and the whole business of priesthood, and the great exploitation has continued for centuries.

BUT ON THE OTHER HAND WE MAKE AFFIRMATIONS AND DENIALS OF THOSE THINGS WHICH ARE LESS THAN HIM (AND FOLLOW FROM HIM!) BUT OF HIMSELF WE NEITHER AFFIRM NOR DENY ANYTHING, SINCE HE WHO IS BEYOND ALL ATTRIBUTES IS PERFECT AND ALONE THE CAUSE OF ALL...

You see his problem: he has to satisfy, continuously satisfy, the desire of his colleagues, of his bosses, of the Vatican, of the pope. So after all these denials and after saying such profound things, he falls back. He ends on the same note. He says again:

HE IS PERFECT AND ALONE THE CAUSE OF ALL -- BEYOND ALL NEGATION THE HEIGHT OF THAT WHICH IS ENTIRELY FREE FROM ALL AND BEYOND ALL.

He goes on persisting in using the word "he," and finally he says:

HE IS PERFECT AND ALONE THE CAUSE OF ALL...

Beware of his language. He is not trying to say exactly what he feels. He says that, but immediately he camouflages it in the jargon so that he cannot be caught. And he was never caught -- he succeeded. In fact, to catch him would have needed another man of the same genius, another Dionysius. Those foolish popes would not have been able to discover it. He creates so much dust of theology around it that you cannot see clearly what his point is.

And there are people all over the world who, when they cannot understand something, they think it must be profound.

An American theologian is on tour of the city of Rome; his guide is showing him the famous monuments of the ancient city. At the Pantheon the Italian guide proudly announces, "This is our famous Pantheon -- a graceful, silent monument to our glorious past!"

The theologian takes a quick look, then turns to the guide and asks, "How long did the construction take?"

A little surprised at the question, the guide answers, "It took over two hundred years of human effort to build this masterpiece of architecture."

"Oh!" says the American theologian. "In America we would build it in ten years!"

The guide feels a little irritated and takes the American on to the Colosseum, where he announces even more proudly, "Signor, the Colosseum!" But before he gets any further the American theologian interrupts, "How long did this one take to build?"

"Fifty years," the Italian replies curtly.

"Back home we would do it in five," says the American.

The guide is feeling pissed off and quickly leads the American away to the Capitol. "It took three years to build this," he announces hotly.

"Well, in America we could do it in three months!"

The Italian guide, very pissed off, continues the tour. They pass in front of the Vatican; the guide says nothing.

"What is this?" asks the American theologian, looking over the Holy City.

"What is this?" replies the guide casually. "I have no idea. It wasn't here yesterday!"

---

## Theologia Mystica

### Chapter #14

#### Chapter title: Understanding is Enough

**24 August 1980 am in Buddha Hall**

Archive code: 8008240

ShortTitle: THEOLO14

Audio: Yes

Video: No

---

The first question

OSHO,

WHEN I WAS A CHILD ATTENDING SUNDAY SCHOOL THERE WAS A HEBREW PROVERB HANGING ON THE WALL. IT READ: "THE BEGINNING OF WISDOM IS THE FEAR OF THE LORD." FOR MANY YEARS I WAS CONVINCED OF THE MEANING THAT GOD WAS FRIGHTENED OF MAN GAINING ANY WISDOM. AFTER ALL, DIDN'T HE FORBID EATING OF THE TREE OF KNOWLEDGE?

AND THEN ONE DAY IT WAS EXPLAINED: "FEARING GOD IS THE FIRST STEP IN MAN'S PATH TOWARDS UNDERSTANDING." AGAIN IT MADE PERFECT SENSE. AFTER ALL, WASN'T JEHOVAH A FEARSOME, PUNITIVE, OMNIPOTENT GOD! AND NOW I AM FINDING IT HARD TO RECOVER FROM THAT IDEA, AND IT INTERFERES WITH MY LOVE FOR YOU. IN SPITE OF "KNOWING BETTER" I HAVE TO SEE YOU AS ALL-POWERFUL; I HAVE TO BE DEPENDENT ON YOU FOR MY LIBERATION; AND SOMETIMES IT FOLLOWS THAT THEN I HAVE TO BE AFRAID OF YOU AND YOUR "PUNISHMENT." IF UNDERSTANDING DOESN'T EFFECT THE CURE, WHAT TO DOES?

Anand Nirgrantha,

THE PRIEST is the most cunning person in the world. They say prostitution is the oldest institution; it is not. Priesthood is the oldest institution in the world, because without the priests who will create the prostitutes? The priest is at the root of almost every problem that man is facing today.

And one of the greatest problems is because we have been conditioned by the priest for thousands of years, he has become almost part of our blood; he is not there somewhere outside. The outside priests -- the imam, the ayatollah, the pope -- they only represent something now which has become part of our inner world. In fact, whatsoever is known as conscience is nothing but the priest and his voice echoing in you. But now you think it is your voice; you have become identified with it.

That's why we cannot understand our problems and we cannot find any solutions for them. Otherwise, every problem, rightly understood, is immediately solved. To see what it is is also to see the way out of it. It is not that after understanding something more is needed -- understanding is enough unto itself. It melts and dissolves the problems. It is like the sun rising in the morning... and the dew drops start evaporating.

Nirgrantha, you say that in your schooldays you read this proverb -- and you must have read it again and again because it was hanging on the wall in the school -- "The beginning of wisdom is the fear of the Lord."

That is the beginning of ignorance, not the beginning of wisdom. That is the beginning of slavery. That is the beginning of insanity. But the priest wants humanity to be in an insane state; only then can he and his profession prosper.

There are professions in the world which are self contradictory. For example, the profession of the physician, the doctor; it is a self-contradictory profession. If the doctor succeeds finally in eliminating all the illnesses from the world he will have committed suicide. On the one hand he tries to cure -- he tries to find more and more and better methods, techniques, medicines to cure illnesses; on the other hand, deep down, he hopes that he will not succeed. That hope may be unconscious, but it is there, because his success will be suicidal. What will the function of a physician be if all illnesses disappear from the world?

Confucius was very wise in that way when he said that the physician should be paid not because he cures an illness, he should be paid because he does not allow the illness to happen. This is a totally different approach. You should pay your physician because the whole year you have not been ill; he has taken care of you. If you have been ill you should not pay him; in fact, he should pay you.

Unless this happens the profession of the physician will remain self-contradictory. He lives and thrives on your illness. He prays that more and more people should be ill. When there is an epidemic the doctors call it "the season." And, of course, it is a season for them.

The same is true about the priest in an even wider sense, in a deeper sense. The priest can exist only if you are afraid, frightened, scared. Otherwise what need will there be of him? If you are free of fear, if you live in freedom, the priest becomes absolutely useless. Who will go to him? For what? You go to him because you want somebody to console you. You want somebody to give you hope, encouragement, to make you in a certain way secure in a very insecure life.

Life is insecurity and nothing is wrong in it. In fact, life cannot be otherwise. Death is secure, life is insecure. Marriage is secure, love is insecure. Marriage is dead, love is alive.

The more alive you are the more your life remains in insecurity, because the livelier person will be exploring the unknown, he will be adventurous. It is life's nature, its law, its very intrinsic soul.

But the priest has exploited it. He has given you consolations, securities, insurances, not only for this life but for future lives too. He says, "Don't be worried. If you follow a certain code of conduct, if you cultivate a certain character, if you follow the commandments given in the scriptures, then you need not be afraid. Then God is going to reward you. You will be punished only if you go against the convention, against the tradition."

What he is saying is: if you go against b m, because he represents the convention, the tradition, the past. But he never says it directly, that "If you go against me you will be punished" He says, "If you go against the Koran, if you go against the Bible, if you go against the Vedas, you will be punished because these are divine scriptures. God himself has written them. They have to be followed literally, word for word. If you go astray, you are taking a great risk and then I cannot help you."

The priest goes on telling you to remain within the confinement, the imprisonment that he and his predecessors have created for you. It is a prison cell. He makes you very much afraid of the open air and the sun and the stars and the sky.

If there were priests in the world of birds, no bird would ever fly; they would all remain imprisoned in their nests. No bird would ever gather the courage, except a few crazy birds -- a Buddha, a Jesus, a Zarathustra, a Lao Tzu. But they would not be the rule; they would only be the exceptions. And the priest will always be against them, remember.

The priest was against Jesus, the priest was against the Buddha, the priest was against Zarathustra, the priest was against Lao Tzu. What was their fault? Why was the priest against them? The priest was against them because they were cutting the very roots of his profession. They were telling people to be free of fear, they were helping people to be free of fear. They were telling people to live dangerously, to live like rebels, to die to the past and to live in the present.

Buddha says, "Be a light unto yourself." Now he leaves no place for the priest. The priest says, "I am the light; you need not have any other light. I represent the whole sacred tradition -- I have carried the flame down the centuries. This is enough. You don't need a private light of your own. "

But the last words of Buddha were, the last words that he uttered on earth: "Be a light unto yourself." He said it to Ananda, one of his most beloved disciples, because the moment Buddha said to his disciples, "Now the last day has come and I hAVE to leave today. My ship has arrived.

Do you have any questions to ask me?" there was a great silence. They were shocked. Ananda started crying. He was just sitting by his side.

Buddha said, "Ananda, that does not befit you. Why should you cry?"

He said, "I could not become enlightened while you were alive. Now what hope is there for me when you are gone? I will have to live in darkness forever and forever! And I don't think that I will be so fortunate as to meet another Buddha again, because you will dissolve into the universe and I cannot imagine meeting another Buddha in some other life. And even if I meet one I may repeat the same mistake because I will have completely forgotten all about you and what happened, what transpired between me and you.

"Forty-two years I have been with you and I have wasted the whole opportunity; hence I am crying. I am ashamed. I am crying for myself, I am feeling pity for myself that I have been a fool."

Buddha laughed and said, "Ananda, you need not depend on me. You can become enlightened without me. And, in fact, it may be that it was because of me and my presence that you could not become enlightened, because you were dependent, you were always thinking I would do something for you, although I was continuously telling you 'Be independent.' "

But nobody wants to be independent for the simple reason that independence brings fear, responsibility. Everybody seeks some kind of dependence so that one can throw all the responsibility onto the shoulders of the other.

Buddha said, "Maybe my death will help -- there will be nobody to depend upon. And one thing is certain: after being with me for forty-two years, now you cannot depend on anybody else. You will not find another Buddha, that is certain."

And actually it happened like that: Ananda became enlightened after Buddha's death within the small period of twenty-four hours.

To Ananda Buddha said, the departing message: "Be a light unto yourself -- appo dipo bhava."

How can the priest forgive the Buddha? He is destroying his whole profession. The priest is a mediator between you and some unknown God that he talks about. He knows nothing about God -- no priest has ever known anything about God; that is not his interest.

In fact, I have observed all kinds of priests: they are the most atheistic people in the world. The priest does not believe in God, he cannot believe in God. He knows that it is his creation, how can he believe in God? This is experienced in many spheres of life.

I had one friend, a very nice Bengali gentleman, who used to help hundreds of people with homeopathic medicines. But whenever he fell ill he would go to an allopathic doctor. I asked him, "What is the matter? You help so many people and so many are cured..." Almost miraculous cures were known to happen through him. "When you are ill, why do you go to an allopath?"

He said, "The truth is I cannot trust those sugar pills. I know everything about them -- they work if you believe, but how can I believe? I manufacture all those medicines! Sometimes they are just sugar pills and nothing else. In fact, I am puzzled when I come to see that they have been of great help."

The reason is: ninety percent of people's diseases are false, that's why there are so many "pathies." Otherwise, except allopathy, they are all unscientific. But ninety percent of diseases are false and with a false disease allopathy is dangerous, because allopathy will give you a real medicine and the illness is false, and the real medicine is bound to do something to you. You need a false medicine for a false illness; it cannot harm you. That's why homeopathy never harms anybody. You will not find "Poison" written in big red capital letters on bottles of homeopathic remedies.

Homeopathy never harms anybody, but it helps many for the simple reason that if your disease is false then all that is needed is belief, trust. If you trust the man who is giving you the medicine that trust helps you.

The priest cannot believe in his gods -- impossible, because he has seen the dog piss on his god, he has seen the rats running over his god. He knows everything about the god -- he has created it. In fact, the god needs his care; without him the god is nothing. It is a psychological atmosphere that he creates around the god with worship, with prayer, with fragrance, with lights, with flowers, with chanting ancient scriptures. He creates a certain noo-sphere, a certain psychology around a false phenomenon, to exploit you -- and you need somebody to depend upon.

Now God is very vague; you cannot depend on such a vague idea. You need somebody solid, substantial to represent him. That's the work of the priest. He stands at the door of the temple and says, "You cannot see God, but I can see him. You can depend on me, you can follow me."

Kahlil Gibran has a beautiful story:

A man used to travel around the country talking to people, preaching beautiful sermons to people, telling them that "If you come and follow me I will lead you to the ultimate home of God."

People would worship him and they would say, "Yes, when the time arrives, when the opportunity is right, when the situation is favorable we will certainly follow you. We are convinced you are right, we know that you know the path."

Nobody ever followed him, hence nobody ever came to know that he knew nothing about the path, about God, about the ultimate. But once it happened, a crazy young man stood up and he said, "Okay, I am coming with you. I will follow you. Unless I reach the ultimate home of God I am not going to leave you."

The man was a little afraid, but he thought, "I will give him such stupid things to do that he will become tired and escape."

But the young man was really crazy: whatsoever the old preacher said he did. In fact he did more than the preacher was saying. If he said, "Stand on your head for one hour," he would stand on his head for two hours. If he said, "Fast one day," he would fast for three days. If he said, "You have to recite this mantra one hundred times," he would recite it one thousand times.

And the story says in this way seven years passed. Instead of the young man getting fed up with the old fool, the old fool started getting fed up with the young man -- because of him his reputation was being destroyed. Now people started asking, "What is the matter? For seven years this young man has been following you and nothing has happened!" And the young man would say, "I have been doing everything, but nothing is happening." He was destroying his whole profession.

It is like a man sitting in the waiting room of a doctor saying to new patients, "Beware! This man has been treating me for seven years and nothing has happened!" Now how long can the practice go on?

People started thinking that this old man knew nothing. The audience became thinner and thinner. Finally only the young man was left. And one day the old fellow fell at the feet of his disciple and said, "Please leave me. Leave me alone!"

But the young man said, "I have not yet reached the ultimate home. I have to experience God!"

And the old man said, "In fact I knew the way before I met you. Since you have been with me, because of you even I have lost the way! I don't know now where the way is and where the ultimate home is. Please excuse me, forgive me, and leave me alone. You have destroyed my whole profession!"

The whole profession was dependent on those people who listened to him but never followed.

The priest knows perfectly well that he knows nothing. hence he quotes authorities from the scriptures. He becomes a mediator between an invented God... Maybe it was not invented by him but by a procession of priests in which he is a link.

People need somebody to depend upon because from their very childhood they have been brought up by parents -- they have been dependent from their very childhood, dependent on their father, dependent on their mother.

It is not an accident that there are only two kinds of God: either God the Father or God the Mother. Have you ever heard of any other God -- God the Uncle, God the Brother-in-law? Just two: either God the Father or God the Mother, because the child has depended on these two people. He grows only physiologically; psychologically everybody is retarded.

The psychological age of average human beings is only twelve years. It is shocking to know: a twelve-year-old child in a body of eighty years, seventy years. Only the body is old, but inside the mind is very childish. It still wants a hand to hold him, to guide him, to support him, somebody to be a guide, somebody to indicate the way, somebody to take the responsibility. And the priest fulfills that role: he becomes your father, he becomes your mother or he becomes both together in a certain way. He fathers you, mothers you. Now he cannot allow you to grow psychologically; he does not want you to become adult psychologically. That will be suicidal to his profession.

Hence the persistence of the idea that "The beginning of wisdom is the fear of the Lord." He cannot say to you, "Be afraid of me." That will not be easy because you will see all his human flaws, human limitations. You will see that he is as weak as you are, you will see that he is as greedy as you are, you will see he is as angry as you are, as jealous as you are. It will not be possible for him to pretend that he is higher than you. The only way he can do it is to say that he has been chosen by God as a vehicle. He is a prophet, a messenger, a paigambar. He is nothing in himself, he is nobody, but God speaks through him; God uses him as an instrument, as a vehicle.

He goes on imposing the fear of God on you, the fear of hell, the fear of great punishment if you do not listen to him, and also goes on giving you the idea that those who listen to him and follow him will be rewarded. On the one hand he creates fear, on the other hand he creates your greed: greed for heaven, paradise, beautiful women there. Here he is against the woman -- the woman is the door of hell -- but in heaven every religion provides beautiful women, always young, stuck at the age of sixteen. Their bodies don't perspire -- they don't need any deodorants! Their bodies are made of gold. Every religion provides all kinds of pleasures that it condemns here on the earth. This is a strange logic!

Wine is prohibited here on the earth, and the saints who have never touched wine in their life will go to FIRDAUS, to paradise, where wine is not sold in wineshops but is simply flowing in streams.

In India the priest has been telling people, "Drop all desires, because all desires are sin," and in the Hindu paradise, SVARGA, there are KALPAVRIKSHAS, wish-fulfilling trees. You sit under the tree, you just wish, and immediately it is fulfilled. But what kind of logic is this? -- the same thing is condemned here. Then why is the same thing provided as a reward, and more abundantly?

If you understand, the thing is clear. The priest knows your desires -- everybody knows your desires; he has to provide for them.

In the Mohammedan paradise, not only are beautiful women available but beautiful boys too, because in Mohammedan countries homosexuality has been a long long tradition; it still exists. So, homosexuals, please note it: if after death somebody asks you, "To which heaven do you want to go?" choose the Mohammedan heaven because it is gay.

If you look, in all the religions you will find this strange logic: the same thing is provided.

The priest knows perfectly well these are the two driving forces in man: fear and greed. And if you can use both you can enslave humanity. And, up to now, Nirgrantha, they have kept humanity in total slavery.

You say: FOR MANY YEARS I WAS CONVINCED OF THE MEANING THAT GOD WAS FRIGHTENED OF MAN GAINING ANY WISDOM.

God is not frightened because there is no God as a person, but the priest is frightened and whatsoever the priest is he projects it on his God. The priest is very much afraid of you gaining wisdom.

Hence the biblical story. It says nothing about God, it says something about the people who wrote the story. The biblical story says God prohibited man from eating from two trees: one was the Tree of Knowledge and the other was the Tree of Life, eternal life.

The priest is afraid of these two things, remember. Forget God because it is not God who created that story, it is the priest. The priest is afraid of two things, and he has made it clear that he is afraid that if people are completely free of fear then they will not be Jews, Hindus, Mohammedans, Christians, Jainas, Buddhists -- no, not at all. They will become Buddhas. They will be Christs, not Christians; even the cross will not frighten them. They will not be Mohammedans but Mansurs; even murder will not frighten them.

Mansur laughed when he was killed. Jesus was full of love even on the cross -- no fear. Remember, love is the exact opposite of fear. Instead of getting afraid he was full of love. He prayed to God, "Forgive these people because they know not what they are doing." This is tremendous love, unconditional love.

It is the priest who creates the story and he makes it dear. If you analyze the story it will give you great insights. First he is afraid of you becoming wise. Hence all the priests have tried to keep the society as ignorant as possible.

In India the woman is not allowed to read the holy scriptures; for her, stupid stories have been invented. She can read the Ramayana, she can read the puranas -- just stupid stories, illogical stories, unbelievable, fanciful, nothing of any importance. She is not allowed to read the Vedas, the Upanishads, the Brahmasutra; they are prohibited. To prohibit the woman means that fifty percent of people are prohibited.

Then the sudras, the untouchables, are prohibited. They cannot read the Vedas. The word veda is beautiful; it exactly means wisdom. The very word "wisdom" comes from vid; vid is the root of veda and also of "wisdom." Vid means to know. The person who knows becomes free. Keep him in ignorance. So the untouchables, the poorest part of the people, are prohibited. That means one fourth again is prohibited.

Then the vaishyas, the business people- they need not read the Vedas. Although they are not prohibited, they need not. And they don't have any time. And the priest says, "We will do whatsoever is needed. If you want a temple to be made we will make it, if you want worship to be done we will do it. We will read, we will chant -- we will do everything for you. You have only to pay." And the businessman found it easier to hire a priest rather than to bother himself about the Vedas and their subtleties. He is dropped.

The warrior, the kshatriya: his work is not to become wise but to be a great warrior. Krishna says to Arjuna in the Gita, "This is your religion: to fight."

Arjuna was trying to become a brahmin. He was saying that "I am fed up with all this nonsense! I can see unnecessary violence. Millions of people will be killed for no reason at all. And I am not so interested in being the king by killing so many people. I want to

renounce the world and go to the forest and meditate."

That means he was trying to become a brahmin. A man trying to become a brahmin means a man trying to become the ultimate truth or to know the ultimate truth, which are both the same. To know is to be: to be is to know.

Krishna says, "This is not for you. Swadharme nedhanam shreyah. It is good to die in your own religion. Per dharmo bavaha baha. Somebody else's religion is very dangerous. Beware of it! Your religion is to be a warrior, your religion is not to be a sannyasin. You are not supposed to be a meditator, you are supposed to be a fighter. Do your duty!"

Even a man like Rama is known to have almost killed a poor untouchable person because he had heard some sutras of the Vedas. It was reported to Rama -- he was the king -- that "This sudra has been trying to know about the Vedas. When the Vedas were being recited by the brahmin in a certain temple, he was hiding outside and listening. "

And even a man like Rama did such an ugly act. He poured melted iron into the ears of that poor man. He must have gone deaf forever; even his brain may have been damaged. Melted iron! His ears were closed forever, and a lesson was taught to the whole country: that no person who has been prohibited should even dare to hear. If he reads, his eyes will be destroyed; if he hears, his ears will be destroyed.

And Rama is still worshipped as an incarnation of God. In fact, in India Rama is worshipped more than anybody else for the simple reason that he supports the priests more than anybody else. He is the priests' favorite god.

The priest has been afraid of people becoming wise, because if they are wise then they will be competitors. If they are wise they will see the stupidities of the priests. If they are wise they will see all the superstitions. If they are wise then they will see through all the strategies that the priests have imposed on people -- their whole exploitation their whole machinery. They will revolt. So in the biblical story the priests, in the name of God, prohibit Adam and Eve from eating from the Tree of Knowledge.

And the second fear is that if somebody becomes eternal... Just think: if death disappears from the world, religion, so-called religion, will disappear. Only something that I call religion can still exist; otherwise, Hindus, Mohammedans, Christians, Jainas, will all disappear. They all depend on death. Death gives them the opportunity. They make you afraid: "Death is coming closer. Do something before death destroys you. Before death comes you have to practice certain austerities, create a certain character, a certain morality, fulfill certain commandments. Death is coming! And death may come any moment, so be quick. Don't waste time, don't wait for tomorrow. There may be no tomorrow at all, so if you want to do anything, do it now."

And what do they prescribe? Their prescription is: donate to the temples; that will give you great punya, great virtue. Donate to the brahmin because that will earn you a great bank balance in the other world. The Buddhists say, "Don't give to the brahmin, give to the bhikkhus. " The Jainas say, "Don't give to the bhikkhu or the brahmin, give to the munis, the Jaina monks." But donate -- they all agree on donation. It is another thing whom to donate to. Of course, there will be differences. The Jainas would like every donation to come to the Jaina muni, and the Buddhists would like every donation to come to the Buddhist bhikkhu, and the Hindus would like every donation to come to the Hindu brahmin. But donation is the greatest religion. Charity -- but charity for whom?

The same people who are teaching you charity, they have to be given to. They are telling you, "Money is dirt!" and then they are asking you, "Give us money so that you can earn virtue in the other world." Strange! If money is dirt, then give as much dirt as you can give to

your priests. Don't give money, give dirt! Collect all the dirt ever; day early in the morning and go and donate it to the bhikkhu and to the munis and to the brahmin because money is dirt, so dirt is money! It is a simple logic. Money is dirt; but by donating it, it becomes valuable.

"Do good deeds." And what are good deeds? Obedience to the society, to the established order of things. Never be disobedient. That's why Adam and Eve were punished, thrown out of paradise, because they disobeyed. Disobedience is the greatest irreligious act. Of course the priest is afraid of disobedience. And he is afraid that if people become eternal...

Just think: one day, if science manages to postpone death forever, all religions will disappear. They all exploit death. Because death is there, you start thinking about what will be after death; some arrangements have to be made for that great journey. And because nothing is known about that great journey you have to depend on those people who pretend to know about that great journey. It is all pretension, because nobody has ever returned from death and nobody has ever said what exactly happens after death. Nobody knows, but there are pretenders, and priests are the pretenders.

The story is tremendously significant: that two trees were prohibited. But ordinarily you hear only about one tree, because once Adam ate from the Tree of Knowledge, the gods -- that means the priests hidden behind the masks of gods -- became so afraid that they expelled him from Paradise, because now the next step was absolutely certain to happen: that he would eat from the Tree of Life. And once he ate from the Tree of Life, even the Bible says, he would become a god. Wise, eternal... what else is needed? And if he is a god, of course God is jealous. He will not like anybody else to be a god. This is just priesthood in the name of God!

Now for three hundred years the priests have been fighting against science. It is not accidental that the priests were the first, and because science was born in the West it was the Catholic Church that started fighting the scientists. Kepler, Copernicus, Galileo were all tortured in every possible way because the popes became aware of the danger.

If science can have its own way the ultimate result will be that Adam and Eve will eat from the second tree too. That will be the ultimate result of science. In fact, that's what science is searching for: the secret of life. And it is coming closer every day, because once the basic cells that constitute your life can be analyzed like the atom, if they can be dissected -- they carry the whole program -- if they can be dissected and their program can be changed, then your whole life can be changed.

For example, when a boy or a girl is born, the child brings in his cells the whole program for his life: that he will live seventy years, that he will have black hair, that he will have a certain kind of nose, that he will have a certain kind of skin, that he will have certain kinds of diseases. He brings almost the whole program and even the details of the program: at what time he will die...

Now, if this program can be changed, if it can be reprogrammed, if the cells can be arranged in a different way, if they can be told, "Live for a hundred years, not for seventy," then death can be postponed. And once we know how to postpone it, it can be postponed ad infinitum. Then it will only be up to you to decide when you want to die.

Just as people right now write their wills, their last testaments, saying what will happen to their property, to their money after their death, in the future when life can be prolonged, people will write their wills saying that "At this time, in this season, on a particular day, in a particular place, I would like to die."

Now there is a movement all around the world, particularly in the West -- obviously,

because in the East the problem is not death, the problem is birth... Here the question is how to stop birth, so we think of birth control. In the West the problem has moved to the other extreme. Now medicine has become capable of prolonging people's lives, the question is: if the person wants to die, what to do? -- because in the ancient law there is no provision for it, for euthanasia.

If a man of one hundred years feels that he has lived enough, that he has known whatsoever life can give, that he has tasted all the bitterness and all the sweetness, that he has seen all that is worth seeing, experienced all that is worth experiencing, now he does not want to hang around unnecessarily, it becomes a drag on him. All his friends have died, all his acquaintances have disappeared. Now his children's children's children have no relationship with him at all; they live in a totally different world. He was born one hundred years before, and so much water has gone down the Ganges in these hundred years that the children speak a totally different language which he cannot understand, and what he says they cannot understand. There is no communication. And for what to live now?

So the question is: has he the right to tell the doctors, "Kill me"? Has he the right to mercy killing, to euthanasia? Can he take a big dose of sleeping pill and die legally? That has become a problem.

There are now societies in the West which are propagating this: that every man has the right to die. Nobody has heard it before, that every man has the right to die; we have heard that every man has the right to live. And up to now all the religions have condemned suicide; suicide is the greatest sin. Now suicide seems to be one of the greatest freedoms.

The priest has always been afraid: if life can be prolonged, then he will be ignored. If life can be prolonged indefinitely then he cannot tell people to make arrangements for the afterlife. And if man can be immortal one day -- which in a way does not seem to be impossible, although I don't think anybody of any intelligence would like to be immortal... But the possibility is there. If the body can live for seventy years, why not seven hundred years? If the body is capable of renewing itself for seventy years it can be taught to renew itself for seven hundred years.

Now there are trees in California which are four thousand years old. If a tree can live for four thousand years, why not man? In the Himalayas there are trees which are seven hundred years old. If these trees can live for seven hundred years, why not man? The secret has to be known.

The biblical story is really very strange, as if from the very beginning the priest was aware of two things: wisdom and eternity -- these two things have to be kept secret, then man can be exploited.

Nirgrantha, God is not frightened of man gaining any wisdom -- it is the priest. But he always speaks in the name of God.

And, then, you say, one day it was explained: "FEARING GOD IS HE FIRST STEP IN MAN'S PATH TOWARDS UNDERSTANDING. "

Of course the priest would like you to fear God. Religious people are called all over the world "God-fearing." I find the word very self-contradictory. A religious person is God-loving, not God-fearing, and the person who is God-fearing can never be religious. He can be Hindu, he can be Mohammedan, he can be Christian, but not religious, because fear is poison; it destroys all possibility of your religiousness.

Fearlessness, Buddha has said is the foundation of all true religion -- fearlessness. It is no

surprise why the Hindu brahmins uprooted the whole of Buddhism from India, why the Buddhists were killed, why the Buddhists were chased out of the country. In a way it was a blessing in the form of a curse, because Buddhism spread all over Asia. The Buddhist monks had to escape from India to save themselves. They went to China, to Tibet, to Korea, to Japan, to Sri Lanka, to Burma. They spread all over Asia -- they had to. Otherwise, Indians are not very interested in going that far! No Indian would have ever tried to go to Tibet and to go to China, crossing the Himalayan ranges; no Indian would have bothered about that. But they had to because the brahmins were simply burning them alive, roasting them, killing them mercilessly. The whole of Buddhism was uprooted from India, totally uprooted.

You will be surprised to know that at the place where Buddha became enlightened, Bodhi Gaya, the temple that is the memorial to his enlightenment is under the control of brahmin, because not even a single Buddhist was left to be a priest in the temple where Buddha became enlightened. The reason was that Buddha was saying fearlessness is the base of all true religion, and he is absolutely right. But then there will be no possibility for priesthood at all.

You say: AFTERALL, WASN'T JEHOVAH A FEARSOME, PUNITIVE, OMNIPOTENT GOD?

These are all inventions of different kinds of priests; Jewish, Christian, Mohammedan, Hindu -- but the priesthood has the same investment, the same strategy. Their dogmas, their theologies differ, but their weapons are the same. They use different poisons, labeled differently, in different languages, but they kill man's freedom, man's love, man's integrity, sincerity, authenticity. They reduce man to a commodity.

And you say: NOW I AM FINDING IT HARD TO RECOVER FROM THAT IDEA...

Naturally. The habits, particularly the old habits, die hard.

Nirgrantha, I have given you this name -- let me remind you what it means. It means a man without any knots, a man without any complexes. It is the name of Mahavira, one of the greatest awakened souls on the earth. He was called Nirgrantha: one who has dropped all kinds of complexes from his mind, from his being; one who is free of all complexes, all knots; who has become simple; whose life is no more entangled in problems.

But these old habits create complexes. These old habits are there rooted in your unconscious; they go on functioning from there. Hence even though you are here, my sannyasin, you are finding it difficult to get rid of the idea. And I am hitting the idea every day, twenty-four hours a day, year in, year out. What am I doing here? -- destroying your complexes, destroying all kinds of seeds that have been sown in you by the priests. But old habits die hard...

"Hey, Sol, how did your sister Rena make out on her driver's license test?"

"She flunked. When the car stalled, from force of habit she jumped into the back seat!"

People live almost mechanically. And the idea of a jealous God is just an unconscious shadow: it can keep you afraid your whole life, it can destroy all your juice, it can suck you, but it is your own projection.

It is midnight and the London streets are empty, clouded in a thick fog. A woman in a mink coat is walking alone, glancing around fearfully. On the dark street only the sound of her footsteps are heard: click click click. Suddenly other footsteps are heard: boom boom boom. Afraid, the woman starts running: click click click. But the heavy footsteps follow behind: boom boom boom. Blind with horror, she runs faster: click click click. But from right behind comes: boom boom boom.

The woman, running faster and faster, realizes that she has come to a deadend alley and the footsteps -- boom boom boom -- are right behind her. She turns around and screams, "Ah! Eek! The monster of London!"

A black shadow bending slowly over her looks at her and says, "So, who told you that you are so pretty, hm?" and turns around offended.

Now this ugly woman really desired somebody to follow her; that must have been a long, long-cherished desire. Today, suddenly finding the right opportunity, it blossomed. Nobody is there. It is her own idea, her own desire a deep deep wish but fulfilled today in this darkness, in this lonely street. She has auto-hypnotized herself.

That's what we go on doing: our old habits we go on repeating again and again. The more we repeat them the more deep they become in us, the more they become ingrained.

And you say: IT INTERFERES WITH MY LOVE FOR YOU.

It will interfere with all possibilities of love in you. It will interfere not only with your love for me, it will interfere with all kinds of love: love for your woman, love for your child, love for your mother, love for your father. It will interfere with love as such, because fear is a poison that kills love. And fear creates anger. When you cannot love, when your energies cannot flow in love, they become anger. The same energies go sour, bitter; poisoned they become.

This is always a problem. All the Masters have known it; many have pointed towards it. The Master has always to be aware of his disciple's anger, violence, for the simple reason that the disciple finds it difficult to love. He wants to love but finds it difficult to love because of his whole upbringing. His whole unconscious, even the collective unconscious, is against love. And when he cannot love, the same energy turns into anger. And when it is anger he starts becoming negative.

This happens every day here. So many sannyasins, thousands of sannyasins, are here. Every day I receive so many negative letters; There are ninety percent positive letters, ten percent negative letters. The positive letters are poetic, beautiful, loving. But the strangest thing is: the people who write very positive letters, I note down their name and I wait for their negative letter, sooner or later. And it comes, it comes inevitably! Just after a few days they take revenge, because they start feeling that they have done something wrong. Such a loving letter? So much trust and surrender? It goes against their ego and the ego starts feeling hurt, wounded. Then they are searching for some excuse -- and you can always find whatsoever you are searching for, you can always find it; if it is not there you will invent it. And then immediately they are against you.

One woman used to send me books, money, magazines, presents from America -- a very loving woman. Laxmi always used to think that: a very loving woman. She was not even a sannyasin. Then one day a letter came saying that she wanted to become a sannyasin, and I felt, "Now, things are becoming more and more dangerous." She became a sannyasin and

after just six months she wrote a very angry letter saying, "My real Master is Jesus, not you!" But who has been telling her to make me her Master? And she was really angry because she started feeling guilty, divided, as if she had betrayed Jesus. So I told Laxmi to write to her saying, "Drop sannyas and be with Jesus and be at ease."

She received the letter. Yesterday the mala and the name came back with a letter. Now she has started feeling guilty again that she is betraying me, that she has betrayed sannyas -- is it right or wrong? So she wrote a letter with a note on top of it: "Nobody should read it except the Master." And in the letter the problem is that now she thinks that the first letter must have been written to her asking her to drop sannyas without my knowledge, because how can a man like me, with such compassion and love, ever ask anybody to drop sannyas? "I cannot believe it. It must have been the doing of the office people! You please write directly to me." Now she is inventing her own game. I am not in it at all.

This problem is an everyday problem. One friend has asked, "Somendra was a devotee, Osho. He loved you and you him. Were you maybe a little hard on him?"

It is not a question of being hard. He loved me, that is the problem. And you have been brought up in such a way that love is almost impossible. To love means going against your whole past. He certainly loved me... and I was waiting. I had told him even when he was here that he was going to betray me, that he could be a Judas. And he laughed at that moment.

When he went to the West he went on writing to other sannyasins here, particularly to those sannyasins who can send a message to me that they have received a letter from Somendra. And he was saying, "Osho is with me and I love him and he loves me." Continuously those letters were coming. Then suddenly they stopped. I knew it was going to happen. He loved me -- that is the problem.

When you love you love against your ego, and the ego waits for the right opportunity to take revenge.

Judas must have loved Jesus, that's why he betrayed him, because you are not meant to love. Unless you are very alert, very conscious, and drop your ego totally, deliberately, and don't allow it from the back door again, your love is going to become a danger for the Master. You will love and you will hate, and for small excuses.

He still loves me and he will love me his whole life; that is the trouble. Because he still loves me, he will go on saying things against me. Because he still loves me, he will have to go to the other extreme to repress that love. He will have to do it just to satisfy his ego.

You cannot do both: you cannot satisfy both your love and your ego. And the priest creates the ego. Fear helps the ego. Fear is a food for the ego and love is food for egolessness.

Nirgrantha, you have to understand it. Your love for me is there, but your whole past will interfere with it.

I still love Somendra and I will always love him. He is a beautiful man of great potential, just as Nirgrantha is, but my love for him also became difficult for him. You don't know your limits. You cannot accept even love because you have been told again and again from your very childhood that you are worthless, that you are not worth loving.

Your mother has said it, your father has said it, your teachers have been telling you, your priests have been telling you -- from everywhere you have received the message that you are worthless unless you prove otherwise. You are not accepted as you are.

And I accept you as you are, I love you as you are. I don't expect anything. I don't want to improve you, I don't want to better you, I don't want to make you something great, extraordinary, spiritual. I love you as you are in your ordinariness, and that is difficult for you to accept. You will reject my love. That is what the hard part in it is -- not my love but your

rejection. You would really like me to punish you!

If I had punished Somendra he would have been here. If I had punished him enough that would have been acceptable, because you have been punished from your very beginning. In fact, you have learned it: that unless somebody punishes you he does not love you. Your mother punished you, your father punished you; your teachers punished you -- everybody punished you because they loved you so much that they wanted you to become somebody special. That's why they were punishing you: you were punished for your own sake.

And I don't punish anybody at all. That is the trouble, that is the hard part. You cannot accept my nonpunishment. I don't create any guilt in you. If you are negative about me I accept that. I don't say, "Don't be negative -- it is sin." I simply say, "Watch it, accept it. That is part of your upbringing. And it will dissolve easily; there is no hurry either. And I love you with all your limitations, with all your flaws."

That's one of the reasons why in India I am being condemned and opposed, because their idea of a spiritual man is one who tries to improve people. I don't try to improve anybody. Who am I to improve you? I can shower my love on you, and if that love is accepted you will start growing; that love will nourish you but you reject it.

The most difficult thing in life is to accept love. When somebody says, "I love you," listen. Whether you say it or not, somewhere inside you there is a no -- because you cannot accept the idea that you are worth loving, that anybody can love you. He must be cheating you, he must be deceiving you; he must have some ends in his mind. He wants to exploit you.

No woman believes it when you tell her, "I love you." She thinks, "This man is trying to exploit my body. He wants to use me as an object." She is reluctant, she creates every kind of barrier; she rejects, she withdraws. These are her ways to test whether you really love her. She will create every kind of objection to your love and will wait and will see whether your love is still alive. Unless she is convinced totally that you love her, she will not accept your love. And even then that acceptance is only superficial; soon she will start nagging you, soon she will start taking revenge, soon she will be fighting with you.

And the same is true about men -- even more so. That's why no~woman ever says to any man, "I love you." She never initiates the process, because to tell any man, "I love you," means danger. He will escape, he will escape immediately! The woman only withdraws, but she does not withdraw totally; she withdraws only so far. She remains in a way available. Even if she says no she says it in such a beautiful way that you feel there is a possibility of yes.

One day I saw Nasruddin very happy and I asked, "What is the matter?"

He said, "The woman I love has said to me that 'This is the last time I am saying no!'"

The man thinks that a woman's no means yes. Somewhere, the way she says it... the word is no, but it carries the meaning of yes. She withdraws only so far that she remains within your reach. But man really becomes afraid, very much afraid.

Man is a weaker sex. This is my categorical statement: man is a weaker sex. The woman is a far stronger sex. Nature has made her more strong. She has to be more strong to give birth to children, to carry the child for nine months in the womb. She has a more resistant body, she lives longer than man, she is more healthy than man. More men commit suicide, almost double the number of women. Although women talk about suicide -- sometimes they even take pills, but always in such a way that they can be saved. Out of ten attempted suicides only one succeeds, and that I also think by some mistake! But twice as many men

commit suicide in comparison to women, and also double the number of men go mad in comparison to women.

Man is a very much weaker sex. He has no resistance: he falls ill more, he lives less -- five years less than women... So the moment a woman says, "I love you," he becomes very much afraid.

One sannyasin has asked, "Why is it that whenever a woman approaches me I become frightened and scared?" It is not an individual, personal problem. Every man becomes afraid when a woman approaches him. That's why women all over the world have decided not to approach men, never to initiate anything -- wait. The woman functions like a mousetrap: she simply waits for the mouse to come in. And the mouse comes! He will go round and round, make a few circles, look here and there, watch, come a little closer and see whether there is any danger or not... and then, slowly slowly, he will be caught.

And then the woman can always say, "I was never after you!" And she has always been after you. That mousetrap was watching, looking where the mouse is going, what he is doing, how far he is. But the woman remains very detached, aloof; that is part of her feminine beauty and attraction. If she jumps upon you, you will escape! Just think of a mousetrap running after a mouse -- do you think it will ever catch any mouse? Impossible! The mouse will run into its hole and will never come out!

You say, Nirgrantha: IN SPITE OF "KNOWING BETTER" I HAVE TO SEE YOU AS ALL-POWERFUL...

That is why the priests have been telling you that you are helpless, without God you are powerless: God is omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent. They make God all-powerful so that you can depend on God. And, of course, depending on God means depending on the priest.

I am not a priest. And I agree with Dionysius totally that God is not powerful, God is not power at all. There is great insight in that statement. In fact, God is not a person at all, God is only a quality -- a beauty that surrounds existence, a fragrance, a dance, a celebration that goes on and on in the trees, in the birds, in the animals, in the rocks, in men, in women. God is this organic unity, this organic accord that exists between the smallest grass leaf and the biggest star. There is a communion, there is a love affair. God is a love affair! And it is always going on, it is always a honeymoon -- except for man, because man has fallen out of this immense harmony.

And the priest does not want you to go back to the harmony. If you go back, his whole profession is gone. It is a great investment; millions of people are involved in it.

There are thousands of religions on the earth -- three hundred big religions, and then there are subsects and sects and sects within sects. It is almost like a Chinese magical box -- box within box within box. You go on and go on unwrapping it and you will never come to the end. There are Christians, and then there are Protestants and then there are Catholics. And then among Catholics there will be different churches, and among Protestants different sects, and then small sects...

The whole earth is exploited by the priests. If they are counted they will be in millions. It is one of the greatest vested interests.

I am not in any way powerful. In fact, I am not. That's the only way you can commune with me -- a nobody, a nothingness. And I live in agnosia, in a state of not-knowing, in a state of silence. You can have a communion with me only if you also come to the same state: the state of not-knowing. That's why I go on destroying knowledge. I have to destroy all the

knowledge that you have gathered. All has to be burnt, completely burnt. Unless you become a no-mind you will not be able to see me, understand me. Becoming a no-mind you will suddenly have a transformation; your vision will be clear.

You say: I HAVE TO BE DEPENDENT ON YOU FOR MY LIBERATION...

No dependence can ever lead to any liberation; dependence will lead to more dependence. Liberation means liberation from the very beginning. I am not here to make you dependent on me. I am here to help you to be independent. That is the function of the Master: to help the disciple to be totally independent.

You say:... SOMETIMES IT FOLLOWS THAT THEN I HAVE TO BE AFRAID OF YOU AND YOUR "PUNISHMENT."

That you are unnecessarily waiting for. I never punish anybody; nobody need be afraid of me. You can all go against me, you can all betray me, you can all be enemies to me, but I cannot punish you. The very idea is not possible. I can only pray for you, I can only love you.

You say: UNDERSTANDING DOESN'T EFFECT THE CURE, WHAT TO DO?

No. Understanding will bring the cure. You have not yet understood, Nirgrantha. Understand the whole process of the priesthood and its investment; see the priest inside you and become aware of the priest speaking to you. Don't get identified with your inner conscience, be liberated from it. The moment you are aware of the whole process you will be freed. The problem will disappear as if it existed never.

---

## Theologia Mystica

Chapter #15

Chapter title: None

**25 August 1980 am in Buddha Hall**

Archive code: 8008250

ShortTitle: THEOLO15

Audio: Yes

Video: Yes

---

The first question

OSHO,  
DO YOU REALLY LOVE SOMENDRA STILL?

Manu,

MY LOVE is not conditional. Love cannot be conditional -- either it is or it is not. It is not caused by anything, hence nothing can disturb it. But you know something else in the name of love: you know only infatuation, attraction, lust. Your love is nothing but a subtle strategy to exploit the other, hence it is bound to disappear sooner or later -- and you will find enough reasons why it disappears.

But my love is not a relationship. I love you because I am love. Even if I want to I cannot unlove you.

What Somendra does, what he says, how he behaves does not matter at all as far as my love is concerned -- his doings and sayings are absolutely irrelevant. My love continues and will continue. And that is the only hope for him, because he is a tremendously intelligent person and he has tasted something of my love; he has known his heart opening up a few times. One time he was very close, very close, but missed only by inches. One can come to the abyss and can turn back. One step more and he would have been what he is now pretending to be.

Hence he will miss me, immensely he will miss me, and sooner or later he will be back. And I will invite him back whenever the time is ripe, whenever I feel that this is the time for him to put his ego aside and come back home. But I will have to wait for the right moment. It is difficult to find the right moment, it is very easy to miss it.

Gautam the Buddha used to say that life is like a vast palace with thousands of doors. All the doors are closed except one. And a blind man on a dark, dark night has lost his way in the palace. There is nobody who can show him the way out; all the guards are gone, the palace is utterly empty. He stumbles, gropes, he tries to find the way out, and he passes thousands of closed doors. Slowly slowly -- and naturally -- he becomes convinced that no door is open.

And then suddenly he comes to the door which is open. But he has tried and touched and groped and always found ten thousand doors closed. He feels so tired, exhausted, that he thinks, "This door is also going to be closed. Why bother?" And he passes the door without making an effort to see whether it is closed or open. Again he will have to pass thousands of doors. One never knows when the next opportunity will be when he will come back to this door which is open.

And any small excuse -- just an itching in the head -- and he can miss it. He can start scratching his head and he can miss it. Just a thought in the mind, and he can become distracted and he can miss it. A fly can distract him; a noise, a dog barking somewhere outside is enough.

This story Buddha has repeated many times because it is so true about life. And Somendra has missed the open door this time. I will have to wait for the next time when he is again close to it. But man remains always unpredictable; nobody can say anything about it, when the next moment Will come -- just the next moment may be the moment or it may take years. But love is always open, always ready to take you back.

And I was aware of certain things which were going wrong in him. That's why I told him to go to the West, because it was becoming difficult for him here. He was boiling with negativity inside and there was no possibility to express it here. I have sent him to the West so he can cathart -- this is just part of catharsis. Soon he will realize it because he is not a stupid person; soon he will realize where he has gone wrong. And the moment he realizes it I will call him back.

Another question has been asked about Somendra by Prabhu Maya. She says: "Osho, you keep telling us that we are enlightened and all we need to do is to become aware of it. So what is wrong with Somendra declaring himself enlightened and dropping sannyas?"

Maya, I keep telling you that you are enlightened -- but you are not to believe me. You have to experience it. And if you experience it you cannot drop sannyas; it is impossible. Because you experienced it through sannyas, how can you drop it? You will be immensely grateful to it. And if you experience what I am saying to you, you will not be in a hurry to declare it; in fact, you will hide it, you will wait for me to declare it. There is no need for you to declare it. The moment one becomes enlightened there is nobody to declare it; there is no desire to declare it.

And that's what Somendra was trying here in every possible way. He was restless; he was trying and asking me in direct and indirect ways to declare him enlightened. But how can I declare unless you have experienced it? When he experienced satori I did declare it. But there is a difference between satori and samadhi.

Satori means only a glimpse, a faraway glimpse. Satori is a Japanese word, very beautiful, untranslatable, but it can be described. It is like on an open day when there are no clouds you can see in the sun the Himalayan peaks, the virgin snow on the peaks shining like silver or gold, from thousands of miles away. You are seeing the truth, but the distance between you and the truth is there -- you are not it. This is satori. Seeing the truth but not being it is satori.

Then there is the Sanskrit word samadhi which is also untranslatable. Samadhi means being the truth: where the knower and the known become one, where the experienced and the experiencer are one. It is no more a question of an open, unclouded day, it is no more a question of the sunlit peaks rising high in the sky. You are it! -- not even the distance of a single inch.

Chuang Tzu says: Even the distance of a hair is enough, and heaven and earth fall apart. Just the distance of a hair -- not much at all, almost negligible -- but it is enough to separate earth from heaven. When even that much difference is not there, one is enlightened.

Somendra has not yet experienced it. He has immense desire to experience it -- that desire is becoming a cause of his misery. That desire is the hindrance, because to desire anything means you are in the mind. All desires are in the mind, even the desire for God, the desire for enlightenment, the desire for truth, for freedom -- all desires. Desire as such is part of the mind. And mind is the barrier, not the bridge.

The last desire to leave is the desire for enlightenment. And, of course, because it is the last desire it becomes very intense. All the energies involved in all other desires -- for money, power, prestige, et cetera -- all become concentrated on a single desire, the desire for enlightenment. It imprisons more than any other desire because all other desires are divided: there are many millions of desires, and your energy is fragmented. But the desire for enlightenment, your whole energy pours into it. It is the thickest and the strongest chain that keeps you imprisoned, and it is the last to give way.

And that desire is surrounding him very deeply. He has come to the last desire, and that is a great advancement, that is a great achievement. It is no mean achievement, mind you; it is one of the greatest achievements, to come to a single desire. In a way it is very strong; that is its danger. In another way, because it is only one desire and you have been able to drop so many desires, you can drop it too. But because of this desire to become enlightened he is getting caught.

I feel very much for him because he is one of those few sannyasins who were coming

close to the ultimate. I hope that soon he will understand the mistake.

Prabhu Maya, your question shows something about you too. It is not really about Somendra -- Somendra is just an excuse. The way you have formulated the question shows something about you. You say: "You keep telling us that we are enlightened and all we need to do is to become aware of it. So what is wrong with Somendra declaring himself enlightened and dropping sannyas?"

Both these desires must be in you too: to declare yourself enlightened and to drop sannyas. In the name of Somendra you are trying to defend something unconscious in you. Become aware of it. Nothing is wrong in being enlightened, but Somendra is not yet enlightened -- I know him far more deeply than he knows himself. Nothing is wrong in dropping sannyas -- many people drop sannyas and I don't care a bit. But about Somendra I do care, because he was so close. Just the last rung of the ladder... and he has dropped the ladder.

If the person who has not even started the journey drops, who cares? He is not even on the path and he drops. In fact, he is not dropping anything because he has nothing. But Somendra had something precious. And dropping sannyas is not just dropping sannyas; it is disconnecting yourself from me. And all that has happened to him has happened through the connection. I am still connected, but from his side something has gone wrong.

It is like when you phone somebody: from your side everything is clear -- you can hear the other person -- but from his side something is wrong -- he cannot hear you. Communication becomes impossible.

That's what has happened: from my side everything is clear, from my side everything is as it has always been -- the same love, even a little more, if a little more is possible. But from his side he has put down the phone. He will realize it soon and he will see that he has harmed himself. But sometimes it happens: unknowingly, unconsciously, one can become a victim of some deeprooted desire. And the desire for enlightenment is in everybody.

Enlightenment simply means becoming full of awareness, and he is not yet full of awareness. Yes, once in a while like a breeze the awareness comes to him, and in those moments one can be befooled and deceived, but it has not become his state. If it had become his state there would have been no restlessness in him for it to be recognized or for declaring it. When I am here to declare your enlightenment, you need not.

And it is impossible to drop sannyas after enlightenment -- you will feel so grateful that doing such an ungrateful act is inconceivable.

The second question

OSHO,  
YOU SAY YOU WANT TO SHOW INDIA "LOVE," YET MOST INDIANS WHO COME  
HERE, WHEN FACED WITH LOVE, SEE IT ONLY AS LUST. WHAT SHOULD BE  
DONE ABOUT IT?

Krishna Prem,

MIND of India is one of the most ancient minds in the world, hence it has its problems. A child has no problems -- they are yet to arrive -- but the old man has a long past, and the whole past goes on becoming bigger and bigger every day. It is accumulative. It carries a thousand and one hang-ups, obsessions, nightmares, un-lived experiences still hankering to be

completed...

India has one of the longest histories in the world. Compared to India, America is just a new-born child. Even the orthodox historians believe that India has lived for at least ten thousand years, without a single revolution. Revolution means destroying the old and beginning the new -- then it would have been totally different.

One day I asked Mulla Nasruddin, "Your umbrella is so new, so beautiful. When did you purchase it?"

He said, "It is a miracle, Osho! It is not new, it is at least thirty years old."

I said, "Thirty years old? It looks so new -- as if it has not been in the rain even a single time!"

He said, "It is thirty years old, but has been exchanged for many other umbrellas at least a hundred times. Just the other day in the temple again it happened!"

Now, if just the other day it happened again that you exchanged it for somebody else's umbrella and you still call it thirty years old, that is another matter. But India has not changed its umbrella for ten thousand years -- and that is according to the very conventional, orthodox historians. If you listen to the Hindu chauvinists, then India has lived at least ninety thousand years. That was the calculation of Lokmanya Tilak -- he also lived in Poona. Ninety thousand years was his calculation. Whether it is ten thousand or ninety thousand it does not matter. All that matters is it has a very long past and that past has never been broken; it still continues.

During this long past, India has lived a very repressed life. At least twenty-five centuries are perfectly well-known, historically well-known; before that things are a little vague. But these twenty-five centuries after Gautam Buddha and Mahavira are perfectly well-known. In these twenty-five centuries no other country, no other culture, no other race, has been so life-negative as India. A strange disease entered into India's heart, something like a cancer -- incurable. It became obsessed with the idea that if you want to attain to God or liberation you have to be life-negative, you have to renounce life -- as if God is against life.

Now this is the most stupid thing that can happen to any country. On the one hand people go on saying, "God created life, God created existence, God created us -- God created everything that is," and on the other hand the same people, very illogically, go on insisting that "If you want to come closer to God you will have to renounce the world that he has created."

It is almost saying something like this: that if you want to love Rabindranath Tagore you will have to hate his poetry, or if you want to love Picasso you have to destroy his paintings. If God is the creator, if God is the poet, the musician, the dancer, then this whole existence is his dance, his painting, his music, his poetry, his song. This whole existence is *srmat bhagavadgita*, God's song. If you want to come close to God you will have to come closer to this existence.

But India has lived with this denial. Why did this denial appeal to India so much? Denial always appeals to the ego. The ego lives surrounded by no's: no, no, no. It lives in a forest of no's. The moment you are full of yes the ego starts dying -- a natural death, a very effortless death; you have not to kill it. Yes is the death of the ego.

The Indian mind became egoistic about its spirituality, about its religiousness, about its sacredness, about its ancient heritage. And the more egoistic it became, the more it had to live and nourish the ego through denials.

In India, a man is thought to be a saint according to the quantity of things around him that he denies. He denies himself food, he denies himself all the comforts of the body, he denies himself shelter, he denies himself even clothes -- he denies himself everything that human nature feels comfortable with -- then he becomes a great saint, a mahatma.

That's why I appear almost like a sinner; it is a natural conclusion. If denial, saying no to life, is to be a saint, then certainly I am not a saint. I say yes to life, to all its joys and beauties, to all its splendor. I say a total, wholehearted yes. I am ready to accept being called a sinner, but I am not ready to deny life.

Love is saying yes to life. Love is nothing but saying yes to life. Hate is saying no to life. And in India the person who hates life, renounces it, denounces it, condemns it, is worshipped as a saint. And because of these people and because of this tradition and because of this conditioning, everybody has become repressed. Everybody's love energy is in a perverted state. When love becomes perverted it creates lust. Love is beautiful, lust is ugly.

When you see a woman, a beautiful woman, or a beautiful man, you can see her or him through loving eyes or lustful eyes -- and the difference is tremendous but very delicate. When you see a woman through loving eyes you are seeing a roseflower or a lotus or a sunset. And if you say the sunset is beautiful and if you stop for a moment, nobody will say that this is wrong, that this is immoral. If you say that the roseflower is beautiful and if you go close to the roseflower to smell the perfume of it or even to touch it tenderly, softly, to feel its velvetiness, nobody will call you a sinner. People will think you are a poet, a sensitive man, that you have some aesthetic sensibility.

But if you go to a beautiful woman just to touch her, to see her skin, to feel it, and to say to her, "You are beautiful!" suddenly great fear arises. This cannot be done; this is immoral -- she is somebody else's woman. Or even if she is your own woman, this has to be done in privacy, as if you cannot enjoy the sunset openly -- you have to hide somewhere, then you can enjoy -- you cannot enjoy the starry night.

Love simply means sensitivity to beauty, to life. Lust means a desire to exploit, a desire to use the woman as a means. Lust is sexual, love is sensitive. There may be sex in love, but then it has a totally different connotation, a different meaning, a different flavor. Then it is not the center of it.

In a loving relationship sex may happen, may not happen; there is no inevitability about it. If it happens then it is part of love, of sharing energy. If it does not happen, that too is part of love. There is no need to come to the physical level; you are capable of sharing your energies psychologically, spiritually.

So love has many dimensions, at least three dimensions: the physical, which can become sex; the psychological, which becomes friendship; and the spiritual, which becomes prayer. And it is possible that in love all three dimensions may be present simultaneously, but they are all part of a loving approach towards life. There is no exploitation; there is no desire to use the other as a means and then throw them away.

Lust means sex is the center: you don't have any sensibility for beauty, you don't have any aesthetic sense. Can you think of a man of aesthetic sense going to a prostitute? Impossible. Can you think of a man who has some aesthetic sense raping a woman? Impossible. Or even hitting a woman in the crowd or just touching her body in such a way as if he was not meaning to touch her, as if it happened accidentally? This is not love, this is not sensibility, this is not sensitiveness. It is lust.

Lust means you don't respect the other at all. You have a deep, repressed desire, repressed sexuality which comes in many perverted ways. Then your eyes become covered and colored

with only sexuality.

The most important thing in the Indian mind is sex. Hence every day so many rapes happen, and no woman is safe walking on a street. How many sannyasins have written to me, particularly women sannyasins, saying, "Is it not our right to walk alone under the stars in the sky? Are we not human beings? Don't we have such a simple human right?" But in India it is impossible.

Just the other day a young woman sannyasin was attacked by four Indians. Of course she screamed, and some sannyasins reached in time; otherwise they were going to rape her -- they had torn her dress apart. And this is not just one accident, it has been happening every once in a while for almost six years.

The Indian mind is so sexually repressed that it cannot love, it can only lust. And once the lust is there you start looking at everybody else in the same way; that is your language.

When two Western sannyasins are hugging each other and the Indian -- any Indian -- sees them, the only idea in his mind is that of sex and lust; he cannot understand love. Not a single sannyasin from the West in these six years -- and thousands have come, at least fifty thousand people come every year -- has raped any Indian woman. But hundreds of attempts have been made by the Indians on Western women, and not only by ordinary people but even by police officers. Even to go to the police station is dangerous! Everywhere there are wolves -- and these are very spiritual wolves, very religious! But they know only one language: that of lust.

Two drunkards were walking home across a bridge, when one suddenly lost his balance and fell into the river.

"Help! Help!" echoed from under the bridge.

The help took a little while coming. When they found the drunkard, he was already dead.

"What happened?" asked his friend.

"He drank too much water," was the reply.

"Poor guy," exclaimed the drunkard, "it was the first time he drank water!"

Two little Indian pigs were chatting.

"What a boring day! Nothing happening!"

"Yeah!" sighed the other.

"Got any ideas for an adventure?"

"No, have you?"

"Well," said Pinky, "why don't we go down to the butcher shop and have a look around?"

"What for?" asked his friend.

"To see if there is any new naked lady!"

Sex can be raised to higher levels of love and prayer, and sex can also be reduced to lower levels of lust and animality. Sex can become a conversion or a perversion; it has both the possibilities. And because of twentyfive centuries of continuous condemnation, every Indian is full of perverted ideas.

A farmer lived with his young, voluptuous, blonde haired daughter who was a virgin.

One day three young men came and asked to stay the night. The farmer agreed, but to protect his daughter's virginity he placed a chastity belt with steel claws around her vagina.

The next morning the farmer woke the three young men, shouting, "Drop your pants!"

One young man dropped his pants, showing his tool all mangled and bloody. The second

young man dropped his pants, showing his tool all mangled and bloody, but the third one revealed his manhood still intact.

"Ah," said the farmer, "at least one of you is moral and decent! Thank you, young man!"

Shaking his head, the young man opened his mouth, scattering blood and broken teeth in all directions.

Life should be lived naturally, life should be lived according to the laws of nature -- not according to the laws of Manu, not according to the ascetics, not according to the saints, but according to the Dhamma. Ais dhammo sanantano, Buddha says: This is the eternal law. We have to find the eternal law in things, how the whole universe runs in a harmony, how there is such tremendous order. It is not a chaos, it is a cosmos. Man has also to become a cosmos, and it is possible only through love.

You ask me, Krishna Prem, how to help them. The only way to help them is to persuade them to meditate, to be here, to become more sensitive, more aesthetic. It is a great work because to change such a big country with such a nonsense past it is not an easy job. But it is a challenge and worth accepting!

The third question

OSHO, DURING LECTURE RECENTLY, I SOMETIMES GET THIS ALMOST IRRESISTABLE URGE TO JUMP UP AND DOWN, WAVE MY ARMS AND SING OR MAKE NOISES. I AM SCARED THAT ONE DAY I WON'T BE ABLE TO CONTAIN IT AND I WILL CAUSE A DISTURBANCE. WHAT SHOULD I DO?

Prem Veechi,

YOU NEED not worry. That is the responsibility of the guards! That is for them to think what to do. What can you do? If it becomes irresistible, if you cannot contain it anymore, what can you do? What can I do? That's why we have the guards, just to divide responsibility -- that is their responsibility.

But why is this happening to you? Just meditate over this story:

A man lost his prick in an accident. Quite upset, he went to see a doctor to ask if anything could be done

"Well, you're lucky," said the doctor, "I have an elephant's trunk in my fridge and if you don't have any objections, we could do some surgery and use it as a replacement."

Happy that there was some solution, the man agreed. After a successful operation the man returned home satisfied. A few weeks later he went to see the doctor for a check up.

"Everything okay?" the doctor asked.

"Oh yeah, doc, it's fine!" he answered. "It's jolly good, this new instrument."

The doctor turned to the man's wife and asked if she had any problems with it.

"No," she replied, "but when we visited the movies last time, something strange happened. James really started to get turned on. He started jumping up and down in his chair and snorting all the time. When I asked him what was happening he said, with eyes big and red and sweat dripping from his forehead, "Can't you see the bag of peanuts on the chair in front of us?"

Veechi, you better go to the Medical Center. You need a total check up! Do you see a bag of peanuts in front of you? What makes you so excited? So leave it to the Medical Center and to the guards, and don't bother me about such problems. Once in a while I expect such things to happen!

The fourth question

OSHO,  
WHY IS IT THAT EVERY RELIGION BOASTS ABOUT BEING THE GREATEST AND TRUEST RELIGION IN THE WORLD?

Svabhava,

IT IS strange but it is true that although religions have been teaching people to be egoless, they have only succeeded in making people egoists. Maybe they have helped people to get rid of the gross ego -- which is not very difficult because the gross ego is very clearly seen by everybody -- but they have created a bigger problem than that. Their solution has been a curse, not a blessing: they have created a very subtle ego in people.

The gross ego is direct. The newly rich you can see by his eyes, by his nose, the way he walks, the way he talks -- you can see the gross ego, very gross. The politician when he is in power, you can see. It is not difficult; it is very tangible.

But the religious person has a very subtle ego; he says, "I am a humble man." In fact he wants to be recognized as the humblest man in the world, and that is the subtle ego.

Once a Sufi fakir was brought to me and his disciples said, "He is a very humble man." When he came, he really touched my feet, and his disciples looked at me with their eyes saying, "Look, how humble he is!" And he said to me, "I am nothing but dust on your feet!"

I said, "I can see you are!" And he was offended. I said, "This is strange! You yourself are saying that you are just dust on my feet and nothing else. I can also see that you are right. You are absolutely right! I don't deny it, I agree! But why are you becoming so angry with my agreement?"

In fact, he wanted something else: he wanted me to say, "You are so great, so humble, so simple! You are a man of God!" Then he would have been happy.

Religions have created a very subtle ego in the world. You will see it in the saints, in the mahatmas, in the sages -- a very subtle ego. But it is there and it is far more dangerous because nobody can see it unless he has tremendous intelligence. And the person himself may not even be aware of it; he may really think he is a humble man. Because of this humbleness, which is cultivated from the outside and has not arisen from inner vision, the ego goes into a hiding place; it starts moving in the unconscious.

That's what I mean when I say "the subtle ego." The gross ego functions in the conscious mind; it is available. You can see it, you can pinpoint it. The subtle ego goes into unconscious layers. It goes deeper in you, in such dark spaces where it can work without your being aware of it. Then it finds vicarious ways: it will claim that "My religion is the greatest religion!" It is not concerned with the religion at all; it is an effort of the subtle ego to prove itself great -- greater than others. But now it cannot say it directly; it has to say it indirectly, via something. It will say, "My country is the greatest country in the world." Every race believes that. "My race is the purest in the world." Every race believes that. "My people are the greatest people on the earth." Everybody believes that. "My religion, my scripture, my

morality, my culture" -- but the emphasis is on "my." Whether it is religion, culture, society civilization -- it does not matter what it is -- the emphasis is on "my," and behind "my" is hiding the "I."

AU these religions go on boasting, fighting with each other, trying to prove themselves greater. Ask the Indians; they will say their country is the holiest country in the world. Why? -- because the twenty-four avatars of the Hindus were born here; they had chosen India to be their birthplace. Ask the Jainas; they will agree, but for a different reason -- not because of the twenty-four avatars of the Hindus. They don't think them of any value; one of the Hindu avatars, Krishna, has been thrown in hell by the Jainas! India is great and sacred because of the twenty-four teerthankaras, the Jaina Masters, the Jaina enlightened ones. It is a different reason on the surface. Ask the Buddhist. He will say, "Yes, India is the greatest country because Buddha was born here" -- not Mahavira, not the Jaina teerthankaras.

In fact, the Buddhist has never accepted Mahavira as an enlightened person. The Buddhists have always condemned Mahavira as a little perverted because he was moving naked -- something is wrong with the man! In contemporary language you can say the Buddhist has always thought of Mahavira as a masochist, torturing himself.

And ask the Jaina: he thinks the Buddha was not a real ascetic -- he lived in a little bit of comfort. He was not a real ascetic like Mahavira, moving naked in the heat, in the rain, in the cold, in every season, and almost starving. There is a record of his twelve years of spiritual exercises in which it is said that he ate only once every week or every month -- only once. Sometimes he would eat after one week, sometimes after two weeks, sometimes after three weeks, sometimes after four weeks -- only once. In the whole twelve years he ate only three hundred and sixty-five times; that comes to one year. On average, in twelve days he ate only once. Now this is asceticism! Buddha eats at least once every day; he lives in comfort. He is a good man but not enlightened, not yet enlightened -- according to the Jainas he will need at least a few more births to become enlightened. But the Buddhist thinks India is the sacred land because of the birth of Buddha. The same is true about others.

Jews think they are the chosen race of God because God himself delivered the Ten Commandments to Moses. In fact, I have heard the story that first God asked other races, "Would you like to have Ten Commandments?" He asked the French and they said, "They are so much against adultery, we don't want them!" He asked the Hindus and they said, "They are so much against greed, we don't want them." And so on and so forth. Finally he asked Moses, "Would you like to have the Ten Commandments?" And Moses said, "How much will they cost?" He did not ask at all about what those Ten Commandments were -- a Jew is a Jew! -- he asked, "How much will they cost?" God said, "Nothing." Then Moses said, "Yes, you can give me ten, twenty, thirty, as many as you want!"

But Jews think they were the chosen people -- God has given them the Ten Commandments -- and they still think they are the chosen people. They have suffered for three thousand years just because of this stupid idea that they are the chosen people, but they insist that they are the chosen people and Jerusalem is the sacredmost place on the earth.

And the Christians think in the same way because their religion is born out of the only source, the real source, the Son of God, Jesus Christ. And they make it absolutely clear that he is the only begotten Son of God, otherwise others may start claiming for other sons of God. God has only one son: "One God, one son, one religion" -- and that is Christianity.

And ask the Mohammedans; they say, "Yes, the Bible was sent by God, Moses gave his first version to the world, but then man progressed and a new, more sophisticated edition was needed; that was given by Jesus. Then the world progressed still more; the last edition is the

Koran. And God has said in the Koran that now there will be no more books coming from above -- this is the last. And the last is bound to be the best."

Remember how the logic works: the Hindus say, "The Vedas are the first, and the first is bound to be the best." And Mohammedans say, "The last -- and the last is bound to be the best." But the deep desire is simply one: that "We are the highest, the greatest, the best people in the world." And we go on finding reasons, excuses, rationalizations, but it is nothing but human stupidity and human ego.

Four union members were discussing how smart their dogs were. The first was a member of the Vehicle Builders Union and said his dog could do maths calculations. His dog was named T-Square and could go to the blackboard and draw a square, a circle and a triangle with consummate ease.

The Amalgamated Metal Workers Union member said his dog was much better. He then told his dog, named Slide Rule, to fetch a dozen biscuits and divide them into four piles. Slide Rule did all this without problems.

The Liquor Trades Union member admitted that both dogs were quite good, but he felt his dog could do much better. His dog, named Measure, was told to go and get a stubby of beer and pour seven ounces into a ten ounce glass. The dog did this without a flaw.

They turned to the Waterside Workers Union member and asked him, "What can your dog do?"

The Waterside Workers member called his dog, named Tea Break, and said to him, "Show these bastards what you can do, mate!"

Tea Break went over and ate the biscuits, drank the beer, pissed on the blackboard, screwed the other three dogs, claimed he injured his back, filed a workers' compensation form and shot through on sick leave.

It is the same -- whether about dogs or about religions, it is the same ego persisting, trying to prove that "I am better than you, holier than thou." It can be allowed to dog-owners because they are not much better than dogs -- otherwise who bothers to own a dog? But to religious people it cannot be allowed, it cannot be forgiven. Their whole message is of egolessness. Hence to brag and boast that "My religion is the best" is sheer nonsense. It is ridiculous, it is absurd.

And once the religions stop boasting about their religions' greatness, all unnecessary conflicts in the world will disappear. Otherwise small things, just small things, are enough to create quarrels. And even amongst those who belong to the same religion there are sects and sub-sects.

Jainas have two sects, the digambaras and the svetambaras. The only difference is that the svetambaras think Mahavira was not naked, although he appeared naked, His clothes were given by gods and they were invisible, transparent. All the women here would feel jealous -- transparent clothes, and given to Mahavira! They should be given to the modern woman, to the contemporary woman. All that she wants is clothes which don't hide anything but expose. Now transparent clothes -- a great discovery, given by the gods! So it was only to fools that he appeared to be naked, other wise he was completely clothed.

And the digambaras say that he was naked. Now according to the svetambaras, the digambaras are fools: they could not see that he was not naked, although he appeared naked. And the digambaras think that the svetambaras are just destroying the whole religion, because Mahavira's nakedness proves his innocence, that he was like a child, and they are

destroying the whole thing. That is the only difference, the uniqueness. Neither Jesus is naked nor Mohammed nor Moses nor Buddha nor Krishna nor Confucius -- nobody else amongst the great founders of religion is naked. Mahavira's nakedness is his specialty!

This is their fight, and they quarrel and continuously argue. For two thousand years they have been writing against each other and trying to prove who is right. And the point upon which they disagree is so stupid, so childish!

What is the difference between Protestants and Catholics? Nothing at all, nothing as far as any essential teaching of Jesus is concerned -- just ordinary invented theories, dogmas, theologies. This man Luther was an egoist, as all so-called saints are, and he could not tolerate that the Pope should be the only mediator between humanity and God. He claimed himself to be the mediator, direct, not via the Pope. He received messages direct from God. Why should he receive them from the Pope? If the Pope can receive direct messages, why not Luther? That is the only difference between the Catholics and the Protestants, then everything else is just dust raised, smoke created to confuse people.

The essential core of all religions is not different, but different egos are in conflict. If you look at the essential core of meditations you will find only two things: one is meditation, the other is love. Meditation makes you capable of being alone and joyous, with no need of the other, and love makes you capable of sharing your joy with others. Meditation is inner, love is outer. Meditation is of the interiority and love is of the exterior.

And because these two sides have to be balanced, meditation and love balance each other. These are the two words, two aspects of the same coin, which are essential to every religion. You can call meditation prayer, you can call meditation by some other name, contemplation; that is immaterial. What name you give to love is immaterial: you can call it prayer, you can call it compassion; that is immaterial.

A man who is intelligent will be able to see that all the religions are basically one. And in the future that is the only hope: if we can bring all the religions to this understanding, to this realization, that the essential center is one... On the circumference we may differ, but those differences are only of detail and of no real consequence. But the egos won't allow this to happen.

And religious people cannot be forgiven; everybody else can be forgiven. I can forgive a sinner, but I cannot forgive a saint, because the saint's whole life should be a proof of egolessness, but it is not so. And we have to change this whole situation.

We have to bring a religiousness into the world which is neither Christian nor Hindu nor Mohammedan nor Jaina nor Buddhist -- just pure religiousness. That will be the greatest revolution, and humanity is waiting for it.

OSHO,  
THE OTHER DAY YOU SAID THAT PUNDIT KOKA, WRITER OF THE KOKA SHASTRA, MUST HAVE BEEN THE DISCOVERER OF COCA-COLA. THAT EXPLAINS "COCA, " BUT WHAT ABOUT "COLA"

Sant Maharaj,

MEDITATE on this small story:

Grandma Zottola who has been voting in America for thirty years finally decided to become a citizen. She arrived in court on the appointed day. The first part of the test was on

American history. The judge held up a picture of Abraham Lincoln and asked, "Who is this?"

"That's-a Abraham-a Lincoln-a," replied Mrs. Zottola. His Honor then held up a picture of George Washington. "And who is this?" he inquired.

"That's-a his wife-a!" answered Grandma with pride.

So Coca-Cola has both the names. Coca is the name of Pundit Koka, the writer of The Koka Shastra, and Cola must have been his girlfriend!