

*Satsang with Swami Dayananda Saraswati in Saylorburg
September 28, 2009*

Swamiji: Looks like I can start.

Radha: ...Wanna do that one?

Chuck: Hah?

Radha: Wanna do yours? The one we were talking about?

Chuck: I guess.

Tom: You got it boiled down. That's the...

Radha: We were talking. Chuck has an interesting question. We've been around it before, about *māyā*. Let's do that one. Chuck can you...can you make it clear?

Chuck: Yeah. Yeah, I...my question...I know we've been around this a few...

Swamiji: Yeah

Chuck: ...a million times already.

Swamiji: No, no, no--yeah

Chuck: The ah... *mithyā* ...um...how, how can you...all the examples of *mithyā* are dependent reality. You know, it's dependent on something else for its reality. How can you talk about *mithyā* when you have one nondual *brahman*? It's...it's nondual. There's... there's no possibility that something else is there that's dependent on it.

Swamiji: Something else is not there.

Chuck: Yeah.

Swamiji: So ah...*mithyā* is a funny situation.

Chuck: Yeah.

Swamiji: And because...ah...all that is there is one nondual *brahman*. We don't say *mithyā* exists. We say that is *brahman*. If you ask me, "Is there a chair?" There's no chair. There's only *brahman*. Then, there is a word called "chair." There's a word "chair," and it has some meaning. That's what *māyā* is about, the word and its meaning. And ah...that's

what we say *mäyā*. It's only from a standpoint.

So, if there is nondual *brahman*, how to account for the...the...the various things that are validly known? By valid means of knowledge...the valid means also are *mithyā*. But still, this is what we say *vyāvahārika*. There is *vyavahāra*. That's *mithyā*. *Vyavahāra* is *mithyā*. *Mithyā* means non-separate from nondual. When you look at it as nondual you have no question. If you don't have a question you can't ask me, "How can there be *mithyā*?" When you say...when there is nondual *brahman*, where is *mithyā*? You can...you cannot ask that question. There is nondual *brahman*.

So, when there is nondual *brahman*...this "when" and all that doesn't work then. [Laughter] Ahh! There is nondual *brahman*...there is no question, and that nondual *brahman* is not in any way compromised. And ah...you call a *nāmarūpa*, you call anything, you call world; it is nondual *brahman*. The whole thing is nondual *brahman*. And so ah...only from a shifted standpoint, and you ask the... "I accept the nondual *brahman* is the truth of this *jagat*. But what is this *jagat*?" Eh...it is nondual *brahman*, because, once you accept nondual, the *jagat* is really a superimposition, *adhyāsa*, *nāmarūpa*. *Mithyā* is a better word than *adhyāsa*.

So *nāmarūpa*, it is *mithyā*, and it is not an addition. This is a very beautiful thing that is said in *pūrēmadāṁ pūrēamidam*. Otherwise, you don't need to say *pūrēam* is enough. *Pūrēam* is nondual *brahman*. But, the...the concession is given: *adaṁ pūrēam*, the cause is *pūrēam*; that is *pūrēam*. "That" means cause. The cause is *pūrēam*. The effect, *this* is *pūrēam*. "This" is always referred to *jagat*. So the *jagat* is...*this jagat* is *pūrēam*. The cause is *pūrēam*. That means the *jagat* is never separate from the cause. That is *pūrēam*, this is also *pūrēam*. This is... "also" is not necessary. That is *pūrēam*, this is also *pūrēam*. And *this*... there from that *pūrēam* alone, this *pūrēam* is...is born. And if you look at this *pūrēam* as non-separate from that *pūrēam*, all that is there is *pūrēam*, nondual *brahman*. Beautiful. So, it's a...it's an accommodation. Otherwise, there's no discussion. It's an accommodation. The question arises only when *nāmarūpa* standpoint. That's a method, a method used by the *ṣāstra*; handling...handling of the perception of the...the world and then the senses and mind and all this are put together.

Chuck: But this...this...this comes from the standpoint of saying there is nondual *brahman*.

Swamiji: Ah.

Chuck: Now we're going to discuss the rest of the creation, and show that it's only nondual *brahman*. It isn't from the standpoint...

Swamiji: Yeah, people do that...

Chuck: ...it doesn't prove...

Swamiji: ...yeah, there are the *swamis* who do that: There is nondual *brahman*. What is it you are talking? Then you say, "What about the *jagat*?" *Jagat* is nondual *brahman*. "Then how did this come?" What? There is only nondual *brahman*. What are you asking?

Chuck: No, but...what I...but what I mean is...

Swamiji: ...I'm just telling...

Chuck: ...okay...

Swamiji: ...the *swāmī* that I am talking...

Chuck: ...yeah.

Swamiji: ...there are some *swamis*, and they don't talk about *Vedānta*. They talk only nondual *brahman*. *Vedānta* means you have to say *karaëa kärya*, all these. He doesn't talk. Some people are discussing in a *bhandära*, and ah...in Rishikesh. One fellow says *mäyā hai, mäyā-avacinna* and this *brahman mäyā se sarvajäi ho gayä śakti ho gayä* so from *sarva-śakti-brahman* everything is born. Like this he will tell, talk about. Then another person will be asking questions, and this man will come. He has taken enough marijuana [laughter]...and so this...green leaves. He makes a paste out of it, and these balls he will just take...and a few of them...and, but he knows one thing. So this is what it is all about he knows. And he...he will come there, and he will ask, "What are you all talking?" *No, no, this world, how it has come about.* "Which world?" *No, no, this world, jagat.* "There is no *jagat*. There is only *brahman*, nondual *brahman*." *What about you?* "I'm nondual *brahman*." *What about me?* "You are also nondual *brahman*." *What about this bhandära? O bhi nondual brahman hai? Sab, everything is nondual brahman.* No talking. You can't talk to him. Can't talk to him *Vedānta*, and we can talk to him only *bhandära, puri, laddu*. We can talk to him about that. It is one type of ah...dismissal. And he's right. He is right, totally right. You can't talk. Once you say nondual *brahman*, you don't ask how it has become this and all that.

Some people ask me, you know, this question. They ask,..."If ah...if *ätmä* is nondual *brahman*, how did it become *jéva*?" Hey, if it had become *jéva*, I can't tell you you are nondual *brahman*. Yeah. It had not become, that is why I am able to tell you you are nondual *brahman*. That has not become." *But, ah...how did it become. Why...where is the necessity for you to tell me that I am nondual brahman?* Hey, my necessity comes

because of you. So, because of you. You are saying that there is a *jéva*, there's a *kartä*, there is a *bhoktä*, and therefore we have to tell.

So, it's eh...it's a typical ah...a situation where, where it's ah...eh...that produces paradoxes, a paradox producing situation, because you make a statement and you can't defend the statement from another standpoint. And ah...therefore paradox. You have to use a paradox. All...anything you say becomes a paradox. If you say from *brahman* this...even *pürëamadaù* is a paradox; from that *brahman* this *brahman* came and now what is...how many *brahmans* are there? How, from *brahman*, *brahman* can come? That's a paradox: from that *brahman* this *brahman*.

We circumvent all these paradoxes by saying...so this *nämariipa*. So this *nämariipa* is a very big ah...a big device to get rid of paradoxes. So, nothing has come really, because it is not there. Only that knowledge is there. How did that knowledge come? From *brahman*. *Brahman* has this knowledge.

Radha: So how did it come?

Chuck: Well, that's the second part...

Swamiji: Yeah.

Chuck: ...part two.

Swamiji: That's what we say. That's...that's *mäyä*.

Chuck: But that goes to the definition of *brahman*.

Swamiji: Yah yah.

Chuck: ...and...

Swamiji: No, no. Definition of *brahman* includes...

Chuck: ...knowledge.

Swamiji: ...includes...no. It includes...it includes this dual, dual form. See, once you say *satyam jänam anantam brahma...*

Chuck: Yeah.

Swamiji: ...that is one. The cause of this entire *jagat*, that is two. And once you say that is the cause of this entire *jagat*, you have another definition. That is called *taöasthalaknäëa*. And so, that's very important. That accounts for everything. And therefore,

being *taöastha* means that's *brahman*, which is the cause for the entire *jagat*, must necessarily have all the wherewithals for becoming this *jagat*—as though becoming—and that is all-knowledge. We need only all-knowledge, nothing else. All-knowledge is what is required, because all that is here is all knowledge.

Radha: Why doesn't all-knowledge create a duality...

Chuck: Yeah.

Radha: ...with *brahman*?

Swamiji: Where is the duality?

Radha: Well, just that there is knowledge.

Swamiji: Yeah.

Radha: Even if you say knowledge or *mäyä*, why doesn't knowledge or *mäyä* create a duality with *brahman*? Because even if you say it is *mithyä*, there's still something which is *mithyä*.

Swamiji: That is why *mithyä* is to be understood. There is ah...that is only a provisional word we use in order to explain away this contradiction. The nonduality is not effected by having this *nämarüpa* which are...which are not...which are non-separate from nondual. If they are non-separate from nondual, you cannot say, "Even though they are non-separate, then how it has come about?" and all that. We cannot ask questions.

Radha: You could say that the nondual is not really nondual, because the knowledge itself which *is* dual is not separate from it.

Swamiji: What...what is the nondual, the nondual *brahman*, is so nondual it can accommodate both subject and object. I am the subject who is asking the question. So, I am the subject who answers the question, and who addresses the question. That is the subject, and there is an object. This subject-object relationship is...*is*, is opposed to nondual for an *ajjäné*. It is unopposed to nondual for a *jjäné*, because nondual includes the subject-object also. This nondual nature is like that.

Radha: I think Swamiji's made real headway with...with explaining this by talking more about *mithyä*, and then, instead of *nämarüpa*, word and meaning. Swamji, you started using the word meaning...

Swamiji: Yeah.

Radha: ...instead of rūpa

Swamiji: Ah.

Radha: ...in order to...

Swamiji: Yeah, so that...so that this question can be avoided.

Radha: So could Swamiji do that again?

Swamiji: Word and meaning. You see, you take the table. This table is the ideal table, and because this table has got too many other things. So...one simple...one simple something; it is only wood. You have a word “table,” and this is beautiful. And the “table” word has a meaning. This table-word meaning has been there. This meaning has been there as a possibility; *anādi* it is. Table, word and its meaning. In your head there is only the...the meaning is there, and of course it is contained by the word “table”—the word “table” and meaning. And eh...because you know the meaning, you call it “table”; because you got “table,” you got the meaning. So like this they become...they become ah...they become *abhidhāna-abhidheya-abhedai*; so there is a non-difference between the word and its meaning.

Okay. Now...then what happens...what happens if there is a table made of steel? You will call it table. Made of plastic, you will call it table. Why? Because you have the word and meaning. That doesn't include the material, just a word meaning. It excludes the material. The substance it excludes. Amazing! That which gives substance to the table [laughter]...so, that's included in your understanding of the word “table.” And therefore, you exclude. This is how you understand everything. That means you exclude *brahman* and understand everything. [Laughter]The *ajīānam* is amazing *ajīānam*! Because the substance is *not* wood! Wood also has a substance. Its substance, and its substance, its substance...really substance is only *brahman*, *brahman* plus the meaning, knowledge. That's *māyā*. Makes no difference.

Radha: So, all along there is no substance other than *brahman*...

Swamiji: Yeah.

Radha: ...and we even accommodate that with our language not thinking about it.

Swamiji: Yeah, and there is so much ignorance. We create a language born of ignorance. Our perceptions are all wrong. Then we say wooden table; wood becomes adjective. We create. Whole culture, everything, it's all nuances, literature. That's how it is. In this,

somebody is better, somebody is...all comparison, *whole* thing, *whole* thing.

It's like you make something, and then to make it look better...and then you add some leaf or something which is not a part of the cake, okay? You can't eat it. You just look at it and remove it. The language is like that. So...all some kind of a...

Chuck: But, Swamiji, is that...is that...is that knowledge with *brahman*, that knowledge of the table?

Swamiji: That *is brahman*.

Chuck: So then how do you...

Swamiji: Then...there, you see...then what is *brahman*? It's a question

Chuck: Yeah. Is it...

Swamiji: See, that knowledge is...the knowledge of the table...

Chuck: Yeah.

Swamiji: ...is *brahman*. It is *brahman*. Whether the *brahman* is that knowledge is the question. If *brahman* is that knowledge, you require a faculty to gain that knowledge.

Chuck: Yeah.

Swamiji: You will never know *brahman*, because all-knowledge.

Chuck: Oh.

Swamiji: Aah! All-knowledge you have to get.

Radha: Oh, I see.

Swamiji: Aah! You will never know *brahman*, because this knowledge...whatever you talk about—table—there's no substance. It is just knowledge that is there with reference to your *vyavahāra*. You can't dismiss it as *tuccham*. You can't accept it as false, also. The *tuccham* is gone. False is gone. Table is not false. False is gone. And then you have...you have what? You have something. That "something" *sadasadbhyām anirvacanéyam*, the categorically...so, not available. That's a paradox. Categorically not available. And that's what it is. What it is you can say *māyā*, you can say *mithyā* and...and this is from the standpoint of our empiricity, our own point of view. We have...we have this *jagat*, and it is easy for us to understand all-knowledge by examining this with the help of the *śruti*. And then we can understand the *śruti*: *brahman* is all-knowledge; the cause is all-

knowledge. Then we can understand that.

Then...then how do you know? This all-knowledge, how will you know? All-knowledge *brahman*, how would you know? All-knowledge *brahman* I can know because I am all-knowledge *brahman*, self-evident. Now the problem is, I am all-knowledge *brahman*; if I say, “So why I don’t have all knowledge?” I have all knowledge. All is *brahman*, and I am all-knowledge. That is what that swāmi—bunk-swāmi—says. I am all-knowledge *brahman*. You...prove that I am not all-knowledge. I am all-knowledge *brahman*. I am *brahman* which is all-knowledge. This is all the *jagat*. “You don’t have all knowledge.” Why...how can you say that? All that is here is *brahman*; that is *I am*. Therefore, it’s all-knowledge *brahman*.

I am all knowledge. Where is the problem? No, no. You don’t know the...know the... what all things are that are there. You don’t know the...the particle physics. You don’t know the electrochemistry. You don’t know the organic chemistry. You don’t know the inorganic chemistry. You don’t the...all these workings of your...the left brain, the right brain, all these things. You don’t know. You have no neurology. You have no...even if you’re a neurologist you don’t know how it works. Yeah. Okay? Therefore, I’m not alive? How can you say all knowledge?

Okay. I say I am all knowledge because all that is here is *brahman*. I am all knowledge. I am all-knowledge *brahman*, because all-knowledge alone is this. I can say that. Then, I can say, alright, when you say “you don’t know all this,” you don’t know all this...so you are pointing out my mind, my *buddhi*. And “you” there indicates my *buddhi*. And that “you” is not addressing all-knowledge *brahman*. You are pointing out my *buddhi*. My *buddhi* will never know all-knowledge, because...that is why the *buddhi* has got means of knowledge, reasoning. All-knowledge means I should not have any necessity; there should be no necessity for means of knowledge, means of knowledge and *buddhi- vātti*. All these are required only when you have ignorance.

When you have ignorance you can never be all-knowledge. [When] ignorance about all that is here is there, then you need a faculty to know. One-by-one you will be knowing all through your lifetime—never all-knowledge. We are not talking of that. We are not talking of the mind, *buddhi*, etc. I am all-knowledge *brahman* from the standpoint of... not “from the standpoint” even...for the sake of saying, being what I am I am all-knowledge *brahman* with reference to *jagat*. And this all-knowledge...or from the standpoint of small-knowledge, one truth is there. All-knowledge is *satyam jñānam anantam brahma*. Small knowledge also, because you have a faculty, that is *satyam jñānam anantam brahma*. Very important. Which is self-evident, and which is everything.

Tom: What's self-evident?

Swamiji: Ah?

Tom: You say what's...you say it's self-evident.

Swamiji: Yeah.

Tom: What are you saying is self-evident? *Satyam jñanam anantam* is...

Swamiji: I am. Yeah. What is self-evident is *satyam* is *jñanam anantam*. What is *satyam* is self-evident *jñanam*. We can prove all that so...left and right. And so, there's no contention. It's the truth. This all-knowledge...you can say that...you can find out that all-knowledge is...is ah...there seems to be something that *brahman* has to make it all-knowledge. And if it...if it has something, it has got to be this...exactly as true as all-knowledge. All-knowledge is but consciousness, *brahman*. And therefore, to have all-knowledge if there is some *upādhi*, something is necessary. That is also the same, same *mithyā*; it is again all-knowledge, *brahman*.

Therefore, we are talking of the *avyakta, māyā, avyakta*. These are all words.

Radha: *Avyakta* means unmanifest.

Swamiji: The unmanifest, [un]differentiated *jagat*...undifferentiated *jagat*.

Radha: Swamiji, I think maybe the one issue, though, is...like, Swamiji, if you get to the definition, the etymology of *māyā* that Swamiji says sometimes, *yā mā iti māyā*...

Swamiji: Yeah.

Radha: It has to be understood that, whether you say all-knowledge or *māyā*, that is has no um...no other being other than *brahman*, and that's why *advaita*. But somebody can say, "Yeah, but even if you say it doesn't have any other being, Swamiji, it's still here to be accounted for." And I think that becomes the...a problem.

Swamiji: What we say *advaita* does not stand opposed to anything. It doesn't brook any other thing. All things that you mention are *brahman*; then only, it is *advaita*. So it is not shy of having a subject-object.

Radha: But this has to be something unfolded in such a way that the intellect, the *buddhi*, can grasp it and say, "Yes, even though this...this *māyā* is here, it *really, really* is not a second thing on *any* order, in any way whatsoever is it a second thing from *brahman*."

Swamiji: See...the ah...there is some kind of understanding of nonduality which is opposed to this. Understanding of nonduality is this...there is...there is *satyam jñanam anantam brahma. Neha nanāsti kiñcana*, there is nothing other than that. That is nonduality. The subject is nondual *brahman*, object is nondual *brahman*.

Then they ask, “If the subject, the effect, nondual *brahman*, and the object effect is nondual *brahman*, and [then] how it is caused?” Suppose you say *māyā* or *avyakta* or unmanifest. Then, unmanifest plus *brahman*, because that...you are thinking there is a cause, there is an effect, and then *brahman* plus and all that. This “plus” and all that is to be removed. Those words have to be removed. What you have to say now, subject-object effect. This is effect. This is *brahman*, nondual *brahman*, and if this difference is not there, this subject-object difference is not...it’s all word and meaning.

Radha: Yeah.

Swamiji: If this subject-object difference is not there, then it’s unmanifest, undifferentiated. Then, that also is nondual *brahman*. Eh, differentiated nondual *brahman*. If it is undifferentiated it becomes duality? Differentiated it is nondual *brahman*, subject-object. Undifferentiated? Nondual *brahman*.

Radha: But there must be something...just to push this to the breaking point. [Laughter] There must be something that comes in to bring about this non-differentiation...this differentiation, which we give a name for as *māyā*. And I would like that, Swamiji, to... address that into non-existence. [Laughter]

Swamiji: I don’t need to [much laughter], because I don’t except non-existence at all. I don’t need. I don’t need. I don’t except non-existence. *Abhāva* doesn’t exist. You don’t see *abhāva*. How can you see *abhāva*?

Radha: I didn’t mean it that way Swamiji. I meant just...

Swamiji: No, no. [Laughter] This is a very important thing I’m talking...

Radha: I know.

Swamiji: ...it’s an answer.

Radha: Okay.

Swamiji: It’s an answer to the question.

Radha: Okay. Actually...okay.

Swamiji: *Mâyä* doesn't...I don't need to prove that it doesn't exist, because there is no such *abhäva*. *Abhäva* means ah...absence, zero, it doesn't exist. And ah...that is why we say zero is *püjya*. Zero, what we call zero, is infinite. It's infinity, like an integer. You go minus...you see, if a ... point-one, point-zero-one, point-zero-zero-one, point-zero-zero-zero-one, and it's infinite. It goes. It goes all the way. There is no such thing as zero. That is *püjya*, quantifiable...non-quantifiable, no attribute. We say that there's no attribute. That's infinite.

Now, that's okay, but what I say...there is no such thing as absence. You say a think is absent in a given place at a given time, *deça-kala*. So, in my left hand there is no cup. Now, in my right hand there is no cup. That's all what you say. You don't say there is no cup. When you say there is no cup, then already there is a cup in your head, which is not there in my hand. Correct? Aah! You are there very much anyway, to say that. There is no absence. When there is no absence, so there is no non-existence, then everything is existent. Everything is existent. We are dealing with only existent things. And existence you find is ah...is *trikäle'pi tiñöüati*, one existence.

Existence itself is a time-bound existence and not-time-bound existence. The not-time-bound existence is not going to be at any time compromised. It did not become the world. It did not become time. It...it remains; whatever it was, it remains. Then, there is this word-meaning. "Time," the word, its meaning. "Past," the word, its meaning. Every law you mention, it's all its meaning, meaning, meaning. That's all knowledge. So, this all-knowledge *jagat* has an existence. What kind of existence? Don't dismiss it as non-existent. Don't dismiss it as false. It is *pramäëa-präpta*, and *pramäëa* is given. Means of knowledge is given. It is *pramäëa-präpta*.

The opponent says *pramäëa-präptatvāt satyam*. It is because *pramäëa-präpta*, therefore it is *satyam*. We say, need not be. Like blue sky, *pratyakñä-pramäëa-präpta*. Doesn't mean it is true. Then, by another means of knowledge, you are able to dismiss that. Seeing the blue sky you dismiss it, that it is not true, because it's ah...it's contradicted by another *pramäëa*. The perception is not contradicted. So, perception itself need not be true. And therefore, what we say...this existence, whatever that you have, is but pure knowledge. It's just knowledge; everything together you can use one word, *jänam*, word and its meaning, *jagat* and its meaning. Severally you see, together you see—*jagat* and its meaning.

Because it is *sadasdbhyäm anirvacanéyam*, an undifferentiated status of this *jagat*. This *jagad äsét*, undifferentiated. It was *sat, sadeva äsét*, undifferentiated *sadeva äsét*. It's very interesting.

Chuck: Yeah.

Swamiji: *Idam jagat*, this *jagat*, was there undifferentiated...*sat*. The teaching is, differentiated it is *sat*. Undifferentiated is *sat*; differentiated it is *sat*. And therefore, what is this differentiation? That is a question.

Chuck: Yeah.

Swamiji: Aah!

Chuck: That's another...

Swamiji: Yah yah.

Chuck: ...you're covering all the...

Swamiji: Yah yah. What is this differentiation?

Chuck: ...entangled.

Swamiji: See, *avyakta* becoming *vyakta*...*avyakta* becoming *vyakta*, like in a seed the tree. But then, there is a seed, there is a tree, there is differentiation, there is a trunk. All these are word-meanings, words and meanings, words and meanings, words and meanings, all words and meanings. That's the magic. This is what we say *mäyā*. When you say *mäyā* you are...you're...you are not in any way compromising with what is nondual. What is nondual is not compromised. This is how nondual is, *satyam* and *mithyā*. This how nondual is. Subject-object is nondual. Undifferentiated, also, it is nondual. Differentiated, also, it is nondual. Therefore, we have to understand *anirvacanéya*.

The ah... *anirvacanéya* is neither *satyam*...only if it is *satyam*, then only, you can say nondual is affected. Then, therefore, the word *satyam* is used for it. So, you can't have another *satyam*. We use the word *mithyā*. *Mithyā* also is something. Eh, not something. It is neither *satyam* nor it is *tuccham*. Non-existent doesn't exist. You are dealing with existent nondual *brahman*. And therefore, *brahman* is the subject, *brahman* is the object. And so, if both are objects, then why should there be subject-object? And that is...it is there because you can ask questions. And so...hey, that is called *mäyā*—subject-object as well, . That it exists is a wonder. That it exists is a wonder. That is a *māl masāla*. *Brahman* alone... *brahman* alone will not have...will not cause any situation, problem... Vedanta, etc. we don't need. We don't need all that. And ah...even now, *brahman* alone. This "as-though" is the...is the whole trick in Vedanta. In Vedanta is...the difficulty is ah...understanding *Éçvara*, because it comes to *Éçvara* now. Once subject-object come,

Éçvara has come in. *Brahman* has everything. *Éçvara* has come in. So, minus *Éçvara*, Vedanta doesn't work. Aah! It's all *Éçvara*.

We are not establishing *mäyā*. We are not dismissing *mäyā*. Understand, we are not establishing *mäyā* as *satyam*, not at all. Then, one plus one will come.

Chuck: Yeah.

Swamiji: So, we are not dismissing *mäyā*; because, if you dismiss *mäyā*, there is no discussion. Like Swami; he dismisses *mäyā*. "There is only *brahman*. "*Brahman hai*." He will talk in Hindi, "*hai sub brahman hai*" That...that's a...what they call is *prauḍha* ...a very-- *prauḍhavāda*, dismissive *vāda*. That doesn't help anybody. The dismissive *vāda*, you cannot talk to him, and so you have to keep quite. It's nothing. So, we have to ah... accept the reality of the questioner and the question. Then, *mäyā*, is it a plus? That's the question. It's not a plus, because it's not *satyam*.

Chuck: Because what?

Swamiji: It's not *satyam*

Chuck: Oh.

Swamiji: ...another *satyam*. Yeah... *anirvacanēya*. All the *dvaitins* and others ask the same thing.

Chuck: Yeah. Hey, and the other thing is, from unmanifest to manifest. Like, what makes manifestation?

Swamiji: Yeah. That's a cycle. Yeah.

Chuck: Yeah. I mean, but how can...what...there has to be a cause for manifestation, then.

Swamiji: No. The cause for manifestation also was...in the unmanifest it is there. So, previously it was manifest.

Chuck: Yeah.

Swamiji: There was a cause for it. There was a cause for it, and then the same cause is now unmanifest, hibernating. And then it is again manifest, like a turtle. And it goes hibernating like all these...these ah...spores, you know? These...these bacteria. They hibernate. We just make powder out of it and keep them, keep them in fridge; they won't

manifest. And then in correct atmosphere, and they all come out.

Chuck: Now see, I have problem with that...

Swamiji: Conducive...

Chuck: ...that's...

Swamiji: Eh?

Chuck: Well, because that implies that there is something there.

Swamiji: No, no. That something...something is there only...something is there is only *anirvacanéya*, and that is *karma*, the *präëi-karma*. *Präëi-karma* is highly instrumental in manifestation. Then, how did you get karma? Then, *anädi*. Therefore, *anädi* is a better answer for all this, because...we are dealing with *anirvacanéya*.

Chuck: Yeah

Swamiji: Aah! No categorical expression.

Radha: Swamiji needs to...

Swamiji: We have to eat now. [Laughter]

Radha: Thanks Swamji, this...

Swamiji: You all have to eat.

Radha: Yeah. This was really good, Swamiji. Thanks.

Swamiji: Aah, good. Thank you.

PAGE

PAGE 1

