

*Satsang with Swami Dayananda Saraswati in Saylorsburg
October 5, 2008*

Swamiji: Okay, what's going on?

(Laughter)

Radha: Chuck had a question, Swamiji, and I think others of us have had questions too. So we can start with Chuck.

Chuck: Start with me...ah. I'm wondering, Swamiji, what...what happens to ah...what happens to *māyā* at *pralaya* [dissolution of creation]? You know, when everything is rolled up.

Is *māyā* always there with *brahman*, all times, even when there is no creation?

Swamiji: Yeah.

Chuck: How...

Swamiji: So the...as long as the *jévas* continue...

Chuck: Yes

Swamiji: *māyā* will be there. This is our, ah...we have to...we have to accept that because as long as the *jévas* are there. One *jéva* gone, and then there's no *māyā*. There's only *brahman*. Then the other *jévas*, from their standpoint, *māyā* is there. *Māyā* is there. Then for them *māyā* is there.

Th-n, even from *brahman's* standpoint...You are *brahman* now. From your standpoint, your standpoint. It becomes no more *brahman's* standpoint. It is your standpoint. And your standpoint, the *māyā-upādhi* [māyā-conditioning adjunct] is there. And so...so you become *Éçvara*. So that will continue because the *jévas* are countless, and so the cycle keeps on going. The cycle...

Chuck: Yeah

Swamiji: that'll keep going.

Chuck: No, I understand that. I'm just ah...I guess I'm confused.

Swamiji: No, no when ah...but the *māyā* is a *vibhūti* [glory]. It's not an issue. For *brahman māyā* is...is a *vibhūti*. See, there's only *brahman*. *Māyā* also is *brahman*.

Chuck: Right

Swamiji: As long as the *jévas* are there, then the infrastructure called '*jagat*' [world]

must be there. *Jéva's çaréra* [body] must be there. Order, laws, everything must be there. *Éçvara* continues. That's why *Çaikara* always uses the word '*Éçvara*' for *jagat-käraëam* [cause of the world]. Even the definition of *brahman* is *taöañöa. yato vä imäni bhütäni jüyante--*. From which all these have come, by which all these are sustained, unto which all these go back, that is *brahman*. The definition itself is like that, so *taöañöa*. Even though in *brahman* you don't see *jagat*, but the *lakñäëa* [accurate description] is *taöañöa* [the property of a thing that is distinct from its nature and yet is a property by which it is known].

Chuck: Yeah. I...I mean I'm just a little worried about what...what happened, you know if...if there's *pralaya* [dissolution], the whole creation...

Swamiji: Yeah, all unmanifest, then *mäyä* is there.

Chuck: Unmanifest is a seed or something.

Swamiji: Yeah. Yeah.

Chuck: It has to be there, potentially.

Swamiji: Yeah. It'll be there. That's the cycle, so unmanifest, then manifest, unmanifest, manifest.

Chuck: And so that potential *mäyä*, or potential creation, whatever you want to say...

Swamiji: Will always be there. Always be there as long as *jéva*... You have to put one 'as long' as for safety, as long as *jévas* are there. Then afterwards we say, *jévas* will always be there, because they are countless. Yeah.

(Laughs)...countless...Some people get worried. If all get enlightened...so if all the *jévas* get enlightened, what will happen to... (Laughter.) So they should have some cause to really worry about

Durga: Swamiji. Swamiji. I have a question that troubles me a little bit because we say 'when the creation is unmanifest,' and we say 'when.' But my understanding is time itself is part of the creation. So how can we say 'when the creation is unmanifest,' cause there is no time...

Swamiji: No. That's *upacära* [figurative]. That's *upacära*. That's not ah...there's no 'when' or anything. 'When it is unmanifest,' we have to say, because we are dealing with manifest. So it becomes unmanifest. Even...it becomes unmanifest, you have to add 'when'...when it becomes unmanifest. Then there is no time there. Then...then we'll not...we'll not bother about that, because when it is manifest it comes with...along with time and space, like sleep.

We are dealing with it all the time. When you go to sleep there is no time. That's only

language, because there is such a thing called 'sleep.' It begins at a given time. Therefore 'when' is not an inappropriate word. Hah. Hah. And it breaks at a given time. So when it begins and it breaks, then 'when' is not an inappropriate word.

Jagadisha: Swamiji, why is the *våtti* [thought modification] 'I am limited,' why is that *våtti* so strong?

Swamiji: It's that...the *våtti* is as good as limitless.

Jagadisha: But the *våtti* 'I am just this...'

Swamiji: No, no, *våtti* cannot stay because *våtti* is only when it is... We call it a *våtti* only when it is an object. Then evident is limitless what *våtti* will be there? And the limitless is self-revealing, I have already told. This is a modern problem.

Jagadisha: But the *våtti*...ah...ah...

Swamiji: Resolves

Jagadisha: Yes, but...but the truth is I am...I am the whole, and there is a *våtti* that says, 'I am limited,' and that *våtti*, 'I am limited,' is very strong.

Swamiji: No. No. It's a...it's a *våtti* that resolves into self-revealing limitless consciousness. So all that is there is one *caitanya* [consciousness]. So then, even when there is a *våtti* that limitless is...ignorance is not there. We don't need a *våtti* for it. There is no ignorance, that's it.

Jagadisha: But

Swamiji: Even there is subject object it is limitless. We don't need a *våtti*.

Jagadisha: Swamiji, I understand, but 'I am the whole' is the truth. Okay, so maybe the word '*våtti*' is not great. Maybe, why is the conviction that we feel, 'I am limited' that... why is that conviction strong enough to overcome the truth that 'I am the whole?'

Swamiji: Limitless whole is all one and the same, you know. And ah...this is a question of 'What is this knowledge?' This question you have to understand, but ah, the answer to this question...Question needs to be reshaped. How does the knowledge take place? How does the knowledge of limitless take place?

Is there a *våtti*, 'I am limitless?' There is a *våtti*. It's called *akhaëða-äkåra-våtti*. The *jéva* and *Éçvara* are one and the same. That *akhaëða-äkåra-våtti*, the contradictions resolve. *Jéva* is individual. *Éçvara* is all. So the all includes individual. How individual can be all? That is a contradiction. This contradiction gets resolved when we understand these both are non-separate from self-revealing limitless consciousness, which is *satyam* [real, true]. And with that, *våtti* goes. Removing that confusion the *våtti* goes.

Jagadisha: Swamiji, I can understand all that.

Swamiji: Yah, then what else?

Jagadisha: The question is...ah, I know that I'm the whole, but there is a *våtti*, ah, a conviction that I am a limited *jéva*. That conviction, that *våtti* sometimes is there. Now if the truth is 'I am the whole,' and I know the truth, the *våtti*, 'I am limited' also is there.

Swami Vagishānanda: Swamiji, I think he's talking...if I am correct, I think he's talking about the *viparita-bhāvana* [erroneous Self-identification], or the habitual identification with the body.

Swamiji: Eh?

Swami Vagishānanda: I think...I think he's talking about the habitual identification with the body, even though '*ahaà brahmāsmi*' [I am Brahman] is understood. Still the habit of identification with the body continues. Um, and is it correct?

Jagadisha: Yes. Why...why does that happen?

Swamiji: Therefore what?

Swami Vagishānanda: What ...what is the reason of that?

Jagadisha: Yes, what is?

(Laughter)

Swamiji: That's orientation. The whole, we have been talking about that. That is the orientation, old orientation.

Jagadisha: Ah ha, just old habit.

Swamiji: Yeah

Jagadisha: Old habit. Ah ha. *Om*.

Swamiji: You said it, habitual, yeah. So, it's not that ah...it's unlike any knowledge. Any knowledge is...is knowledge of an object, to which you are related as a knower. So, it's different. It's one-time knowledge. Ignorance is gone, and you have knowledge. And therefore, unless you forget or something, because of some hemorrhage or damage, there's no...there's no...there's no question of again ignorance coming back. Here also, ignorance doesn't come back.

Jagadisha: Hmmm, understood. Now...

Swamiji: Experientially if you find (yourself) estranged, or as though you lost it. It's all as though. *dhyäyati iva* [as though he contemplates], *leläyati iva* [as though he trembles] As though it is lost, and as though it is gained again. And you do *dhyänam* [meditation]. That's the contemplation. *dhyäyati iva* --You as though contemplate, because as though lost, and as though contemplate. And you begin and it is...it ends, because ah, you do use your will at that time to sit in contemplation. Afterwards then...then take care of a word, or whatever, so. Knowledge takes care of it, yeah.

Durga: Swamiji, in *satsaig* someone asked you the question, "What did *hariù om* mean?" And...in *satsaig* one time, somebody asked you, what did *hariù om* mean, what the meaning was. And you gave the meaning, but I believe you also broke down the word *hariù* into separate Sanskrit words, but I didn't hear Swamiji translate those words. Did that happen? I'm not sure.

Swamiji: No. No. *hariù* is *harati* [he removes], *harati päpäni* [he removes sins] *duikhäni* [sorrows] *duikha-hetu* [the cause for sorrow]. And ah...the one who removes the *päpa*. *Päpa* means *duikha*, all forms of pain, causes of pain. And ah, either you are invoking *Éçvara* in the form of remover of pain, when you say 'Hara,' or 'Hari.' Only *pratyaya* [grammatical affix] is different. And ah, root is the *hå* root, *har*. Then *Om* is *avati*, *rakñati* [he protects, does good to] The one who is...one who...one who blesses. So, source of blessing, source of sustenance, that which sustains everything. That is *Om*. I don't know what connection I gave. So there is no connection between that, even though *rakñäëam* [protecting] is one thing, *haraëam* [removing, taking away] is another. By...by removing...ah..." *hariù om*," I said that. I remember that. By removing all the causes for *duikha*, *Om rakñati*, protects, blesses. *hariù om*. For that I gave the answer, yeah.

Somebody asked what is 'Hari Om?' *hariù om* ...same. *Om* is *Hari*. First, remover, remover of *duikha*. That's all what you require. Remover of *duikha* means all smallness has to go, ignorance has to go, confusion has to go. It's all *sab harati* [he removes everything] So what is left out is *Om*. Then you can also invoke as, 'Oh Remover, and bless.' The one who is a source of blessing. So *hariù om*, that's the meaning you can give.

We use these two words all the time, *hariù om*. In the Veda also, while chanting also *hariù om*. But you have to say, 'hariù om.' The *visarga* [the affix *ù*] remains before *Om*. Ahhh.

Radha: *Om* always remains untouched.

Swamiji: Ah. It doesn't ah jell with any. It stands out. (Laughs) *Om*. So the...the respect for *Om*.

Radha: Swamiji, could Swamiji talk about *pratibandhaka-jänam* [knowledge with obstacles] a little bit? There's different standpoints that Swamiji's taken. And also

Çaikara has spoken of it. So I'd like to hear some of those different ways of viewing it, and how Swamiji would translate it also.

Swamiji: Yeah. *Sapratibandhaka-jñanam* [knowledge with obstacles]. So, *sapratibandhaka-jñanam*, mean *jñanam* with *pratibandhaka*. *Pratibandha* means obstacle. Some obstacles, inhibiting factors are there. This...this *pratibandhakas* are generally called *āvaraëa* [covering] and *vikñëpa*. So, *āvaraëa-vikñëpa*, these are the *pratibandhakas*. Main *pratibandhaka* is *āvaraëa* and *vikñëpa*.

So this *āvaraëa* is removed. *Āvaraëa* is cover, not knowing. So this...for want of a *pramäëa* [means of knowledge], *āvaraëa* continues. For want of *pramäëa*, there is no knowledge, and for want of knowledge continuity of *āvaraëa*. *Āvaraëa* cannot go. How will it go? In the wake of knowledge, it'll go. And for the knowledge you require *pramäëa*. *Pramäëa* is *Çästra*. *Çästra* exposure you require.

And when the *Çästra* exposure is there, adequate exposure, and *Çästra* handled by a teacher, because it's purely handling. It is something like therapy. It's purely handling. Suppose there is a book on therapy. You read a book, you don't get therapy. (Laughter) Yeah. It means, you can say, 'that I...I read all the therapy books three times, enough.' You don't get therapy.

So similarly also this teaching is a super therapy, because therapist also doesn't do anything, doesn't create anything new, confusion removes. Whatever the confusion is there that has to go. And to some extent it goes. They shift from the self-blaming to the people who are to blame, a shift. That's a very big thing. It's a...it's a...at least you are not blaming. It's not you. So that's a freedom. So freedom from self-blaming, self-loathing.

Then, then we...we can go one step further. Say, not only you are not to blame, even you mother is not to blame, and your father is not to blame. Nobody is to blame. There is an order in all this. And therefore you go one step further, and then one more step further, that you are unaffected and all that. That is the teaching.

So, you bring in *Éçvara*, and then you are validated. *Éçvara* is infallible, or infallible is *Éçvara*. And because he's in the form of order, *Éçvara* in the form of order and all my lot is by *Éçvara*'s law. My own capacity to change also is within the law. All that we have...appreciate, and therefore there is some kind of a therapy. And it has to be done, and done only by a teacher. It's no...no question of reading a book and getting anything. It's a therapy.

It's a reorientation, complete reorientation, opposite, centered on 'I,' not an object. So, this ah...being 'I' centered, you require that kind of reorientation. If it is object centered knowledge, you don't need orientation, you don't need therapy.

I have to understand how to make cheese. (Laughter) So...so I don't need any therapy, so, cheese therapy. (Laughter) It's a reorientation. You don't need. But then if you think, 'I am cheese,' then you require a lot of therapy. (Laughter)

Therefore, the...you require a teacher. Alright, teacher is there, and it's a...and it's a proper teacher. That also I have to add. All this you have to make *pakka*. The...the requirement is to be made...made tight. So, the teacher is there, teaching is there, *pramāëa* [means of knowledge] is available. Therefore, there should be no reason for the person who is exposed to the teaching not to know. There is no reason, unless somebody is damaged cognitively.

If there is a cognitive damage, then it is a problem, because understanding won't take place. Cognitive damage takes place because of too many issues to be processed. So that unless they are processed they are not going to allow you to solve the problem, because it is a self-addressed. And there is something there to be processed, and that is not yet processed, that is the self you have got. That is the ego. Unconscious is not an object. It is centered on ego. It is the other side of the ego, flip side of the ego. How will it allow? It won't allow. It'll stand like a block. It'll not allow. It will find out enough reasons to deny what you...what you think you know is not true. It'll deny. It'll protest.

All *pürvapakñas* [opposing positions]...I consider all the *äcäryas* [teachers] are there because of...because of psychological problems. Different schools of thought all because of needs. Needs, they want somebody to be there to save. It's all...it's all unconscious problems. They can't accept *mithyä*, even these people who don't accept *pramāëas* also have got father issue, authority issue, from Buddha onwards, authority issues. So all schools of thought are born out of emotional needs.

We interpret everything in such a way, or deny everything. Deny means authority. I say this. I'm not going to accept anybody. This is not acceptance of anybody. That is not understood. I'm not going to use my eyes for seeing. (Laughter) That's...that's why I... that's how I go about. Then what you are going to use? I use my ears. (Laughter) And to hear you say this, I will use my eyes, okay? To hear you say this, I will use my eyes. 'Get lost,' that's the meaning for that. And therefore... (Laughter)...so this...

So, I...I am very definite about this, even though I can't talk for...for civility, for not hurting people. But I am hundred percent sure, not I have a theory. I see it. It's all due to issues. *Viçinädvaitam*, *Dvaitam*, all these theologies, serious psychology. Somebody must be there to save. All savior religions are like that. How anybody can deny? It's all needs.

So even...even some people say ah, 'There's no guru. You are your own guru.' You have been fifty-five years, and so nothing has happened. [Tamil] Even now, *buddhi* [understanding] doesn't come. (Laughs) All funny people, and ah, it's not authority, it's a...it's a means of knowing.

So, they will...they will protest. When issues are there inside they will protest and make sure...Because they have issues they will go to spirituality. They will go to spirituality, but they will not...they will not be able to see. They will try to prove they are wrong, because it'll solve the problem. And also, I become lovable. I am not lovable. That is

definite. The child knows I am not lovable. And you say, 'You are lovable.' That is bluff. That is bluff.

It has to prove. It has to set up. It has to create a theology. And if there is some education and intelligence is there, all that is available will be used to prove that I need to be saved.

Question: Swamiji. Swamiji, can one say *jéva's* problems are really emotional problems and Vedanta is a cognitive solution to the emotional problems of the person?

Swamiji: That...so, we...we are cognitive of that also. We...we take into cognition.

Question: That is...Swamiji, but the fact that if the person has emotional problems, and he doesn't have the cognition to...available to that person, therefore it becomes difficult.

Swamiji: That's a...Yeah. It is difficult. That's why we have got *adhikāritvam* [status of being a qualified student] We have got *adhikāritvam* proper. So, that our...the lifestyle that is ah...that is advocated, and the values, attitudes...Values are easy. Attitudes are difficult. Values are easy for a person who understands values. It's not very difficult. Values are easy, not to tell a lie, not to cheat anybody, not to take advantage of. It's all...it's all simple for any mature person. It's not a very big thing, it is. Most of them are like that. That's how society running, because people follow all these values.

Attitudes are...nobody talks about attitude. Whole life is attitude. Attitude towards yourself, attitude towards others, attitude towards money, attitude towards power, attitude towards health, all attitude...attitude towards the world, attitude. And therefore, so much understanding is necessary to have a healthy attitude. Healthy attitude is an attitude born of understanding of what is. That's how *Éçvara* comes into the picture.

And so this ah...enough exposure is there, there is no damage done to the cognitive skills, there'll be knowledge. You cannot say, 'He's a *abrahmavit* [one who doesn't know *brahman*].' You cannot say. Suppose I ask anyone who was exposed...were exposed to this teaching for a length of time, teaching with me. (Laughter) Really, you can't assure for others, I know. So you are exposed to me, 'cause I am sure what I am doing, and exposed to me for a length of time. And that person, suppose I ask a question, "So, are you ignorant of *brahman*, or are you...are you free from being ignorant?"

No one can say, "I am ignorant." Everybody will say, "I know but..." (Laughter) Hah! This 'but' is called *pratibandhaka* [obstruction]. (Laughter) That is the *pratibandhaka*. The 'but,' something is there, and that is *pratibandhaka*. (Laughs) Whatever he says, that is *pratibandhaka*. And that comes from whatever is the background. And so,

Çaikara accepts, in the 18th Chapter of the *Gétä, jüana-niñöha*. He talks about *niñöha*. And also the second chapter there is a *sthita-prajiaù*. *Prajia* is enough, and *sthita-prajiaù*. *sthitä prajiaù sthirä prajiaù yasya* whose *prajia*, whose knowledge is *sthira* [firm, steady].

Then we say ‘firm knowledge.’ There is no firm knowledge. There is no wobbly knowledge. (Laughter) But knowledge can be vague, very hazy. So, still it is knowledge, hazy knowledge. Therefore, we need to use an adjective to knowledge, because there is growing clarity. This growing clarity is two-fold. Growing clarity implies a reorientation to the old orientation, reorientation of this knowledge, in terms of this knowledge, against old orientation.

Old orientation means you have nurtured that. You have gathered so much guilt and so much hurt because of that old orientation, and you are saying that I am *brahman*, I am the whole, I am *asaiga*, I am uninvolved, I am untouched, I’m always *nitya-çuddha* [eternally pure], *nitya-buddha* [eternally knowledge]. All these words are only pointing out *sapratibandhaka-jänam*. Otherwise you don’t need *çuddha*, *nitya çuddha*, *nitya-buddha*, *nitya-mukta* [eternally liberated]. Why? Because I am bound and I am impure. All these words are there, therefore here is a pile up of words.

It’s not that *ätmä* [the Self] is found out with all these embellishments of *çuddha*, sitting here, *buddha*, sitting there. They are not...they’re not adjectives, qualifying the *vastu* [that which actually is], some kind of a necklace, so many precious stones. One stone is *çuddha*. (Laughter) One is *buddha*. One stone is *mukta*. One...one stone is *asangha* [unattached]. It’s not like that.

All the words are only pointing out what is. But we need all these words because *pratibandhakas*, guilt, hurt, *pratibandhaka*. That is the impurity. We have to say ‘*nitya-çuddha*.’ By saying, it doesn’t go. So, *nitya-çuddha* will become a superimposed concept upon guilty. Or if you have got sufficient exposure and insight is complete, then you can highlight the meaning of the word *çuddha* by contemplation. And that should... that...that should slowly filter into the guilt itself. That should filter into the guilt itself, and swallows that, devour that, make it *mithyä*.

These are all...these are all ah...*kärya* [the effect], *mithyä*. So you have to make the *mithyä*, *mithyä*. And look at that guilt. Face...face the guilt with the *çuddha-buddhi* [pure mind]. With the *çuddha-buddhi* you face the guilt, not get away from the guilt. That’s called *satyam mithyä*. Face the guilt, and make it *çuddha*. There is *duikha* [suffering]. Face *duikha* and...with the *buddhi* of *änanda* [fullness]. So that which sustains *duikha* is *änanda*. In *duikha-vätti* [sorrowful] itself you see *änanda*, *caitanya* [consciousness], limitless.

So, that is why we have many words. Otherwise we don’t need all these words. Ones who have done the job and they go away. Words we bring in only to communicate. Words we don’t need to remember *ätmä* [the Self]. People come and say, “Swamiji, I forget the *ätmä*.” (Laughter) So that you know that you have forgotten is the *ätmä*. Because of what you know that you forgotten, that is *ätmä*. So, this is a common expression, common...

And therefore, there is growing clarity. And whatever that was obstructing, we are facing

it. We learn to face them in contemplation. And if it is little too much, we bring in more *Éçvara* into one's life, and face them through *Éçvara*. Afterwards it's easy, only *Éçvara* is, *Éçvara saccidānanda* [existence-consciousness-fullness], so.

This...in 'Aparokānubhuti said, 'Kāryam is the *kāraēatvena dāsya* [the effect should be seen as the cause], very beautiful *paçya* [may you see]. The last few verses, the *kārya* [effect] should be seen, should be faced as *kāraēam* [cause], like a wave is seen as water. Every *vātti* [thought modification] is myself. The contemplation is depending upon what is the problem. We have to discern that. What kind of problem I have? This is all truth, and then what is the problem I have? And then, you address that problem with the understanding, the same way. Therefore, there is *sapratibandhakajānam* [knowledge with obstacles]. And the *pratibandha* keeps going.

If there is cognitive problem, then some kind of therapy will be better, yeah. That is also *sādhana*, so, without condemning the person. So therapy is not... that's also some kind of a spiritual process, *sādhana*. I can say that therapy also as a spiritual *sādhana*. For somebody it is necessary, it is necessary, because it's addressing the problem. Therapy means a spiritual person is one who doesn't blame the world and...and addresses the problem. I define like that. I define my own spirituality. I don't use the word 'spiritual,' because everybody has his own definition. And therefore, I don't use that.

One fellow told me, "I am spiritual."

So I said, "What...what...what is it that you do? Do you have any practice like this?"

"Every evening I drink."

(Laughter)

"And drink is spirit."

So, that's enough?

Radha: Thank you, Swamiji.

Swamiji: Okay.

PAGE

PAGE 1

