

*Satsang with Swami Dayananda Saraswati in Coimbatore  
May 26, 2008*

Swamiji: You have those questions.

Radha: I have some, Swamiji. I think Swamiji is going to be getting into some of this in Vedantasara.

Swamiji: Yeah. Yeah.

Radha: But these are the questions if Swamiji wants to...

Swamiji: Yeah, I will see.

Radha: Okay.

Swamiji: What are your questions?

Radha: The first one...set...is about *éçvara* [the Lord], again. Sometimes Swamiji uses the phrase for *éçvara*, 'manifest knowledge.' Other times, Swamiji used to talk *upädänakäraëa, nimittakäraëä* [material cause, efficient cause]. So could Swamiji...

Swamiji: It's all the same.

Radha: But could Swamiji just elaborate?

Swamiji: Yeah. Yeah. See, when you say 'the maker and material cause,' it is based upon the usual *käraëa-kärya* [cause-effect] understanding. People have cause/effect understanding, like a pot/pot maker. So mere pot maker cannot make a pot, and clay itself cannot make itself into a pot. It has to be in the hands of a pot maker. The pot maker without clay also cannot make a pot.

Therefore, you need two causes for making a pot. One is maker, and the material. This is the general understanding. And now, first we present this for *éçvara*, maker and material. Then, is there a separation between the maker and the material? We raise a question.

Then we say, 'there is no separation here,' for which we give an example, the dreamer and the dreamt world. The Upanishad gives an example of spider and web. But we give this example of...I give the example of the dreamer and the dreamt world.

So, the dreamer is the one who makes the dream world. He's a conscious being who has got knowledge and has got power to make the dream world. Otherwise, he can't make it. And then the dream world is...is also from the maker. Any material is required for making the dream world is only from the maker. Therefore, maker and the material cause are one and the same.

You say this. If you give a spider and the other example for maker and the material cause being one and the same, that example is over. This is one level of understanding *éçvara*. This *éçvara* understanding is not enough really, because it'll be away from you. That *éçvara* is still away from you.

But that's not the truth. But we try to bring *éçvara* closer by including...my body, mind, sense complex as a part of the *jagat* [the world]. Then once that is included, *éçvara* has come closer.

Still *éçvara* is the material cause for the *jagat* [the world]. Then the material is always taken as something insentient. Therefore, the sentient insentient division is a very big division in *Viçinõädvaita*, in all this. In *dvaitam* it's very big, *cidjaòabheda* [sentient insentient division].

So this is a...*bheda* [division]...This is the big problem in all theologies also it has got... All of them theologies only. Our own theologies are there, so you need not go outside India for theologies. We have got enough theologies. We have got enough theologies and their followers also, and very vociferous, vocal followers are there.

And therefore, this...when you say material cause, what do you mean? One more question we have to ask. My dream example is a dream example. You can't get an example like that.

(Laughter)

You have to dream for such an example. *Bhagavan ne diya hai*. [Bhagavan has given]. It's a blessing, that example, because in the dream, the material cause for the dream world is nothing but your knowledge. Your knowledge is manifest in the form of *jagat*, because you have got knowledge of trees, knowledge of mountain, knowledge of clouds, knowledge of birds, and then you have that knowledge manifesting in that form.

If you don't have that knowledge, there will be no manifestation. *Tadaikñata, tadasåjata* [He saw that, he created that] The Upanishad makes it very clear. *sa tapo'tapyata*. [He deliberated] *jñanam ayaà tapaù* [Knowledge is this tapas]. Knowledge...Therefore, it is unmanifest knowledge, undifferentiated knowledge, as though differentiated. Differentiated for us to recognize one from the...distinct from the other.

Therefore, there you get sentient, insentient because of *sūkñma-çaréra* [subtle body], *sthūla-çaréra* [physical body], sentient, insentient. That which has no *sūkñma* [subtle (body)] is insentient. That which has *sūkñma* [subtle (body)] is sentient. Like in the dream there is a mountain. There is a mountain rat. Whether the mountain animal is sentient, and the mountain is insentient, but both of them are objects of my knowledge, non-separate from consciousness.

Therefore, there is no *acetana* [insentient]. There is no *çetana- acetana- bhedaù*. For *dvaita* that is the problem, *çetana- acetana- bhedah* [sentient insentient division]. There is no *acetana* [insentient]. There is the presence of *sūkñma* [subtle (body)] and absence of *sūkñma* [subtle (body)]. The mountain doesn't have *sūkñma-çaréra* [subtle body], and the mountain lion has got *sūkñma-çaréra*[subtle body]. (Laughs) Correct?

So the difference, sentient and insentient, is there, but the basis is different. It is not consciousness, and other than consciousness is *jaðam* [inert]. There is no such thing.

Therefore, it's so important to present *éçvara...éçvara's* all knowledge alone is this *jagat* [world].

And also, analysis of the *jagat* [world] as *mithyà* [dependent reality] implies naturally understanding of *nāmariüpa* [name and form], which is reduced to further *nāmariüpa* [name and form]. If you take one *nāmariüpa* [name and form], and then it is reduced to so many other names, *nāmni nāmāni* [names in the name], only *nāma* [name] is there. Shirt if you take, shirt is a name and a form. Shirt is a word and a form, the meaning. That's in your head. It's not outside, really. It's right in your head only in the form of knowledge.

Then whenever you see such a form, you call it 'shirt.' But then, you can't think of that shirt independent of fabric. You can't even think. That is what we call '*nāma*' [name]. You can't imagine.

What is the big deal? There is a shirt. We say there is a shirt, and there is no shirt. You can't think of it. You can't think of it without thinking of another, but whereas, you can think of fabric without thinking of shirt. Therefore, fabric becomes *satyam* [the truth-what is actually there]. Shirt is only name with a meaning.

In the beginning there was word, and the word was with God. This is what I give the meaning for that. Then afterwards, then the fabric becomes *satyam* [the truth-what is actually there], and that...Suppose you say '*satyam ätmä tat tvam asi*' [the Self is the truth, you are that.]then you have to say 'I am fabric.' No. The fabric also is put together. It is also put together. It is name and form, cause yarn is *satyam*.

Therefore, fabric is just another word. You can't think of fabric without yarn. Therefore,

yarn you can't think of without the fibers. So, that means what you cannot think of without the presence of what? And that is *mithyā* [dependent reality]. And *satyam* [reality] is the one without which you can't think of the other. And that is *satyam*. That is only self-evident being.

So, for *satyam/mithyā* [reality/dependent reality] understanding it is so important to point out *éçvara* is nothing but all knowledge, which is manifest in the form of *jagat* [the world], which is *nāmariipa* [name and form]. The beauty is the knowledge, and each name has got its own something, function, etc. This includes laws, all actions, means, ends, causes, effects within that. That's what we understand.

Then, I reduce it to order, *éçvara*, that all knowledge manifesting is available for our understanding. Otherwise, how will you know all knowledge? All knowledge you cannot know. Unless you have all knowledge, you cannot understand what is all knowledge. Therefore, all knowledge I reduce to just orders, a few orders, adequate orders, for us to understand all.

So, we are within the order. So we can get to see what is *adhīñöhānadevatās*, what is everything. So beautiful.

Radha: Swamiji, even though we can't have a perception of infinite manifest knowledge, and we require *çruti- pramäëa* [the Upanishads, which are a means of knowledge] for that, still in this moment of Swamiji's perception of the world is the *éçvaratvam* of the world [the world being *éçvara*]...of this perception that you are having right now direct immediate knowledge, or is it...?

Swamiji: It's knowledge.

Radha: What kind of knowledge? Like for Swamiji...

Swamiji: You see, there is a, there is a...There are two types of *sarvajiatvam* [all-knowledge, omniscience].

Radha: Yeah

Swamiji: One is general, reality-wise. The other is detail-wise. So here also, the *sarvajiatvam* [all-knowledge, omniscience] is in terms of order and all that, so we can understand *éçvara*. Then in terms of details of the whole thing, that is what every discipline of knowledge is going into. There is biology. There is physiology. It's endless. And that is what they are trying to get the details of *éçvara*.

Radha: What I mean, Swamiji, is in...for Swamiji...

Swamiji: Therefore, you are in the presence of...your awareness of the presence of *écvara* is in terms of the total, *samañöi* [the total, the whole] . That's all what you want. *manmanä bhava madbhakto bhava mäà yäjé mäà namaskuru* ["May you become one whose mind is committed to Me, who is devoted to Me, who offers rituals to Me, and may you surrender to Me." BG 9.34] All these *väkyas* [sentences] are only asking for our awareness in terms of the total, that *vibhüti* [glory] *Bhagavadvibhüti* [the Lord's glories]. Tenth chapter, you know, Gita.

Radha: Yeah. Let me ask in a different way, Swamiji, cause my question is not that clear.

Swamiji: Yeah.

Radha: If Swamiji says, "There is nothing here but *brahman*. This is only *brahman*. I am the whole. I am the whole." What type of knowledge is that?

Swamiji: That is *aparokña* [direct immediate knowledge].

Radha: When Swamiji says, "I am the whole," looking out at all of these...

Swamiji: Subject object is whole. At any one thing, the wholeness is only subject object. There is no other wholeness.

Radha: So in Swamiji's experience, saying right now, "I am the whole,"...

Swamiji: Yeah.

Radha: ...could you break down that internal experience that allows Swamiji to say that?

Swamiji: You see, you breakdown the subject being non-separate from...from the self-evident consciousness, and object also is non-separate from the self-evident consciousness, which is *sat cit*.

Radha: Would Swamiji say that is *aparokña-jñanam* [direct immediate knowledge] because there is no *dehätmbuddhi* [taking the body to be the Self]?

Swamiji: Yeah.

Radha: If the *dehätmabuddhi* is not there then there is nothing separating your self-experience from any perception.

Swamiji: I mean...that's another way of saying. Yeah, that's okay. But suppose you look at even the *deha*. It can be the same. If you look at the *deha*...focus...any one focus implies subject object. And the subject object, both are one and the same. And the subject and the object are not negated, but they are...they draw their being from what is self-revealing consciousness, *ätmä* [the Self]. So that is the whole.

Radha: There's a logical jump that I'm trying to get at there. It's this. In terms of the *våtti* [thought modification] it's very clear that the *våtti* comes from me, is sustained by me, resolves into me, is nothing but me. The *mithyätva* [being dependent reality] all of the aspects of the *våtti* as *mithyä* [dependent reality], and having me as its being is clear.

It's *aparokña-jñānam* [direct, immediate knowledge]. It's the logic. The experiential logic is there. But then when we go from the *våtti* to the perception...the objects of perception, there's going from the subjective to the objective, and so, to be able to say...

Swamiji: It's the same. You see, now that is why it is important to understand *éçvara*.

Radha: Yeah.

Swamiji: Because otherwise, this will be reductionism.

Radha: What does Swamiji mean?

Swamiji: I mean if you simply just talk about the *våtti*, and then that can be dismissed.

Radha: Exactly

Swamiji: In fact, that is dismissed by all the dualists, that is dismissed, and uh...because unless the world that you deal with is purely idealism...It is idealistic. The world is idealistic means, you think and therefore it is.

Radha: Solipsism

Swamiji: It's not the truth. Whether you think or not, it is. And that is why you get bumps on the road. You know?

And therefore, so whether you think, or you don't think, it is there. So that's a...If that is

included...That's why *éçvara*, we have to say. That is why we say, subject and object are *brahman*. That's a very beautiful thing. Why? Because there is no object outside *sat* [existence]. That *sat* is important.

When the outside object comes, you have to add *sat* [existence]. Inside, *cit* [consciousness] is enough. Any *våtti* [thought modification] you want to resolve, *cit* is enough, consciousness is enough. When you come out the existence is there of the object, whether you like it or not, whether you see it or not.

Therefore, sight is only if that only brings what is there into your understanding. What is already there, you come to know through your *våtti*. Therefore that has got an existent thing.

So we think that it is self-existent. No. That is not a reality. That is *vyāvahārikam* [empirical reality]. The *pāramārthika* [absolute reality] is the *satyam* [existence] of the *våtti*[thought modification] and the *satyam* of the object of the *våtti* is one and the same. Is. That isness of consciousness.

Radha: But we know that it's one and the same through a logical progression. In other words, that I know any object here is really nothing but *nāma* [a name] that's infinitely divisible. It has a beginning and an end. It has no substance of its own.

Swamiji: We have to do that logical...that is the contemplation. In contemplation...in contemplation you use one step or two steps, and then resolve, resolve. Then afterwards, you need not resolve. Consciousness is.

Radha: You need not resolved because that knowledge has taken place.

Swamiji: Yeah. Knowledge is set. 'Is' is consciousness. The moment you say...see an object is that's consciousness. That is. *Sat* is *cit*. *Cit* is *sat*. That's *aparokña* [direct, immediate knowledge]. And the *parokña* of *éçvara* as *sarvavit* [the indirect knowledge of the Lord as omniscient in reference to detailed knowledge] will always be there for the individual.

Radha: Detailed knowledge...

Question: Swamiji, why I heard you say once if you don't get the *sat*, there will not be *ānanda* [fullness]. Could you...

Swamiji: Yeah, I mean...*ānanda*, if you take as limitless, *sat* is there, then the *sat* is including the whole *jagat* [world], you know. So, the subject object *sat*...*satyam* really makes the jump, the quantum jump, from subjectivity. The subjective resolution doesn't

imply the object's presence or accountability. So once *sat* is included, and without the *sat* being there, there is no *sat* is, then any one object you see, it is the same consciousness, *cit* which is *sat*. And therefore, *sat* is important. The external *sat* is important. Once the *sat* is recognized, then the subject and object both become one and the same, then it's called *ananta* [limitless]. Yeah, nondual.

And therefore whenever you go anywhere out *änanda* [limitless fullness] is moving.

(Laughter)

That's how I move...

So...crucial words, *saccidänanda* [existence-consciousness-limitless], very important words.

Radha: Thank you Swamiji.

PAGE

PAGE 9