

ASAMVEDOPANISHAD

BEING BEGINS WHERE BHAAVA ENDS

**HARIKESH GANGA
(@ lulu.com)**

HARIKESHGANGA (@lulu.com)

First Edition: 1974

Fifth Edition: 2001

Seventh Edition: 2010

ASAMVEDOPANISHAD

PART I

This is the only authentic and complete edition of the Asamvedopanishad, which proclaims, “Being begins where bhaava ends” to reinforce the ancient vedaantic Nirguna/ Non-identity as both the Means and End of Self-Realization/ Enlightenment. The mind is all bhaava, fabricating endless identities, the network of Maayaa. The root identity, Ahambhaava, seals off Being/ Truth, which defies all identity. The Upanishad resurrects the sovereign Socratic Enlightenment, freeing it of the cobwebs of Plato’s mediation and its tortuous system-building agenda. Nothing short of utter Honest Intelligence, unbound by tradition, culture, custom and their contending dogmas and doctrines, can lead to True Being. The Upanishad is severely critical of J. Krishnamurti and his faked-up freedom of hopping from perception to perception, moment to moment.

Part II deals with parityaaga satyaagraha, the practice of vedaanta in actual life, here and now, particularly in its social dimension, clinching the sterling validity of the Socratic-Gandian vision all through human life..

PART I

1. LAGHU GNYAANA

NON-REACTION OR ASAMVEDA

‘Mantravid evaasmi na aatmavid.’¹

How odd indeed is it there isn’t in general a more tangible awareness of what may be beyond immediate or surface experience! And yet the trans-phenomenal is the essential working hypothesis of the entire temporal frame of life -- its norms, values and ideals, its reason, belief and faith. Many a mystic-philosopher of the east and the west has spoken of the Ego as the source and substance of this ignorance. Accordingly, as all temporal knowledge proceeds from the Ego, there can be no doubt that such knowledge is built upon ignorance, though this deficiency is a trifle made good by invoking faith -- which is again no more than a *pis aller*. (One who has realized needs no faith.) In the scriptures the Ego has been in effect identified with desire (*kaama*) and the shedding of desire is believed to lead to the eradication of the Ego. Many an approach has been recommended to this end and, depending upon the seeker, each one of them may be effective, including the sundry yogas.

Nevertheless, the problem itself needs not a little further exploration and refinement. All temporal knowledge as well as experience is the product of human reaction -- expressing itself in various modes and on various planes, like perception and conception, instinct and reason, feeling, fancy and imagination. There is no knowledge or experience that isn’t at bottom the outcome of this phenomenal reaction and this would apply to the purest mathematics and the noblest poetry or philosophy. Obviously this can’t be real Knowing (since how one reacts determines what one knows; even unanimity of human reaction wouldn’t make it Egoless) and in realizing this much it should be possible to contemplate a Knowing that would entail no reaction. Even kaama, on further inquiry, may be seen to be nothing but one mode of reacting. What is called the Ego is only a structural term for this function of reacting and it follows that in the absence of reaction there can be no identity or Ego. (For want of function it can’t help withering away.)

So, if a pure Awareness or Knowing is visualized, one that isn’t the parent or product of the Ego, evidently the only manner of attaining it is to cease reacting and so shed the Ego. Thus *non-reaction is not only the end, it is also*

the means: the *upeya* is the *upaaya*. If all the various ways prescribed for ending the Ego aim only at a non-reactive Knowing, why not give up reacting and begin to attain that Awareness? Doubtless this is Gnyaana yoga, yet much simpler indeed. In Gnyaana yoga, what puts off the tender-hearted is the unrelenting inquiry into Reality -- even ‘who am I?’ the great key of Ramana Maharshi -- which can take one to Enlightenment by the shortest, if perhaps the steepest, route. But if the ‘I’ is only a bundle of reactions and the best objective understanding is still no more than reaction (Most rationality is rationalizing closed and contrived.), it shouldn’t be difficult to comprehend them as such and that should enable us to stop reacting. It is as though one turned volition against itself and volition willed itself out. But really speaking, it doesn’t partake of the process of willing even in a negative sense. It is, on the contrary, an acute realization that volition and reaction bespeak Egotistic Ignorance and *in that very realization* the will withers away and one emerges out of Ignorance. So when reaction completely ceases the ‘I’ -- the root identity -- is already gone and there can then be no question even like “who am I?” or “who is the ‘I’ that reacts?” This has, so to speak, a certain methodological edge over the traditional mode of Gnyaana yoga; indeed it is ‘laghu Gnyaana’, so it seems, even in the sense that it is elementary. A further advantage with it is that even one to whom the reactive base of the ‘I’ isn’t self-evident may start very sceptically on a hypothesis and suspend reacting experimentally, and this should suffice to engender an analogue I-lessness.

When the Ego withers away, all forms of reaction are gone -- the mind, the ‘heart’ and, most important of all, the *will*. If we pause to consider how much of our understanding is independent of our volition (or velleity), most of humanity would have to confess that it is pretty little. When we don’t react, don’t desire or will, the natural outcome of it is an ever present Awareness, pure and true, which is Knowing without reacting, without being *for* or *against* anything. It is an Awareness that eludes phenomenal dichotomies (even freedom and necessity -- freedom too is Egodom), a *Knowing which is Being and Acting* as well. (A Gnyaani’s Being is Knowing, so he needs no learning.) There is no scope here for volition, which is again but the Ego being for or against anything. (Action is born of Knowing; what is born of willing is only reaction. In the battle-field Krishna enjoins Arjuna to act, but he could act only when he quit reacting, becoming servant of God.) The will’s intrusion between knowing and acting - - to rent them apart to block knowing and take over the reins of action, can’t continue any longer. All this is very mundane, there is no trance or ecstasy, but there is no chasm or conflict between the mundane and the mystic and, in the absence of dichotomies, the sort of Awareness adumbrated here can be both mundane and mystic at the same time. Samsaara is Nirvaana.

2. AMANASKA OR MANONAASA

One morning as Ramana Maharshi was climbing up the Arunaachala hill, his thigh quite accidentally hit against a bush and disturbed a hive of wasps behind a dense foliage. The wasps, provoked by the disturbance (how could they know it was only accidental?), besieged Maharshi's thigh and went on stinging (only) the thigh that had offended. Until the wasps could sting his thigh to their full satisfaction, Maharshi stayed there motionless, telling the thigh: "Take the consequence of your action." The thigh got swollen with acute burning pain. He still managed to climb up the hill and only by evening could reach Jadaswaami's cave, where they gave him some milk and fruit. Until then he had had no food whatever. He spent the night at Virupaaksha cave. The leg got still more swollen. Seeing it all, Palaniswaami began applying some gingelly oil to it, but found that in every place the Maharshi had been stung there was a spike as strong as a wire nail. With great effort he took out every one of them and gave some treatment. The swelling subsided after two or three days.

Years later Maharshi was asked: "Since the disturbance of the wasp hive was accidental, why should it be regretted or atoned for, as if it had been done intentionally?" and the Sage replied: "If in fact the regretting and atoning is not *his* act, what must be the true nature of '*his*' mind?"²

3. One and none and non-twain are one, being phenomenally none.
4. There is no absolute without the relative, no infinite without the finite, no eternal without the temporal, no real without the unreal. What is called Being or Knowing is neither either nor both nor neither of all either/ors: thus Nirguna.
5. The End is Nirguna; so is the means. The End Itself is the Means.
6. The intellect always proceeds from prior ends and clarifies only the means. Where the end itself is the means the intellect has no place.
7. There is no subject to know objects in Knowing; there is no other even to be *witnessed*. Dichotomy is reaction. Can reason survive dichotomy?
8. It is irrelevant to a Gnyaani that Gnyaana satisfies the tenets of reasoning.

9. “...as soon as a soul is touched with very contemplation -- as it is in this noble noughting of itself and this high alling of God -- surely and verily right then dieth all man’s reason.”³
10. The Buddha’s ‘I don’t know’ and the ‘I know that I don’t know’ of Socrates are the starting point of Knowing. Who is the ‘I’ that doesn’t know or knows that he doesn’t Know? The knower must die to Know. **‘I am that I am.’**
11. Gnyaana vichaara is no intellectual investigation; on the contrary, it is investigating the intellect -- *by turning the intellect against itself*. To Know is but to *unlearn*.
12. Aatma vichaara or Self-Inquiry is no intellectual exercise. The vichaara itself becomes dhyana or meditation. If you go on earnestly inquiring ‘who am I?’ -- and you can answer the question only by *unlearning*⁴ -- your awareness is truly transformed. So it is Gnyaana by dhyana.
13. The total fusion of Chit into Sat is Aananda. The nature and function of intelligence, as Socrates stressed, is to absorb Reality; else chit is caught in asat (maayaa).
14. Intelligence is in truth Holy. The true task of your intelligence isn’t to gorge itself with conception, opinion, about Truth purveyed by others or commentaries on them by yet others. The task of true intelligence, on the contrary, is to shed the dross of opinion, to *unlearn*, and stare itself in the face in that vacuum of simply knowing nothing -- to stare at the ‘knower’ who is not -- which ends the frenzied tumult of the mind.

In that Beatitude of utter Stillness, of *unwithholding* Silence, intelligence is overrun by Truth.
- 15.1. To inquire or meditate is to observe one’s own mind, to *concentrate* on the warp and weft of consciousness -- and probe who is the mind, what is consciousness. And when probed to the very *Source* the mind and the Ego wither away (manonaasa). In that utter Stillness and Peace is the dawn of Pure Awareness (Pragnyaana/ Nirvaana).
- 15.2. Inquiry about Self-Inquiry is no Self-Inquiry; to know about aatmavichaara is not to know aatmavichaara; *Naayamaatmaa labhyaha aatmavichaarasya vichaarena*.⁵ Anaham vai Brahma⁶.

16. **Negative Capability:** A great variety of sensuous apprehensions are transmitted from the Unconscious, if only you had all the wavelengths to be receptive. The 'you' is the unregenerate will that jams the transmission. Let but the will die, and your entire reception is attuned to the infinite span of the Unconscious. In that Bliss of Experience you are not.

There is no volition or velleity in meditation; a thousand selves with a thousand voices converse in you and in their free concourse what facets of awareness emerge! You aren't for or against whatever, you don't react. And so the Ego dies and with it all the many selves and their many voices. In that Infinite Silence you are not -- it's all Awareness in Being, nothing to be aware of.

"...the Aloneness of the Only One... Alone with the Alone." (Al Hallaaj). Alone all, All One. "*Ana'l-Haqq*." ⁷

17. To Know is to Know the 'knower' who is not; the knower must die to Know -- to Be. True Living is Knowing that is Being. It is no escaping the world. Samsaara is Nirvaana. Samaadhi or Nirvaana is the Perfect Peace of Total Dissolution "in the which a soul is oned with God." ⁸ "*Al-baqaa b'ad al-fanaa*." ⁹
18. Knowing is willy-nilly. Where Knowing is Being there is no willing. Where there is Contemplation, no will. Where no will, no Ego. To react is not to Know, to Know, not to react.
19. When you cease reacting 'you' realize that all reaction is illusion. But to *resolve* not to react is to react further.
20. Communication is reaction; Mouna, to wit Shaanti, is the death of the Ego.
21. When reaction completely ceases the Ego is irretrievably dead -- and then the Gnyaani can 'react' without any Ego. For a Gnyaani's 'ego' is a functional figment with no prior foundation. (A Gunaateeta is free to assume any guna for the nonce.) Others may identify a Gnyaani with 'his' 'mind', but his apparent ego has no subjectivity (*anaham*).

22. STHITAPRAGNYATA

- 22.1. Time is flux; a Gnyaani knows no flux -- nor fixity.
- 22.2. Nothing eventuates for one whom nothing affects (Sthitapragnya).
- 22.3. The Jeevanmukta is not bound by tradition or culture; there are no morals and manners for him (avyavahaarya); they are only attributed to him by onlookers.
- 22.4. Conscience proceeds from the Ego; the Egoless is beyond conscience.
- 22.5. "We are the makers of manners."¹⁰ "There is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so."¹¹
- 22.6. Heaven or hell -- or earth -- makes no difference to a Gnyaani. *Sarvam Khalvidam Brahma.*¹²
- 22.7. Is it Gnyaana to lament birth, to dread rebirth? Did God fear birth would there be avataars?
- 22.8. Realization is an Experience only so to speak; really speaking, it is the absence of all experience (Asamveda). A Gnyaani is no witness even. *Gnyaanamanaham.*
- 23. Desirelessness, not itself desired (*nishkaama-nishkaama*) called Gnyaana has few imperatives; Gnyaana may be feebly described, seldom prescribed for.
- 24. "Sankaracharya has been criticized for his philosophy of Maya without understanding his meaning. He made three statements: that Brahman is real, that the universe is unreal, and that Brahman is the universe. He did not stop with the second. The third statement explains the first two; it signifies that when the universe is perceived apart from Brahman that perception is false and illusory. What it amounts to is that phenomena are real when experienced as the Self and illusory when seen apart from the Self" (Ramana Maharshi).
- 25.1. I don't think, but thinking I's, therefore the 'I' is -- 'I' is the root thought, *pace* Descartes. Awareness beyond thought is I-less.

- 25.2. You aren't selfish, selfishness is you; the selfless is Egoless.
- 26.1. Is it detachment to shed only the objects, not the subject? Detachment is detachment from the Ego; freedom, freedom from the Ego.
- 26.2. Renounce the possessor -- and possession is no more.
- 26.3. True attachment is unmotivated love -- spontaneous, universal and limitless; being unconditional and unpossessive, it is true detachment as well. Possessive love is false attachment; lack of love, spurious detachment. Love is where desire, the doer, is not. Divya Prema is Nishkaama Prema.
27. Gnyaana, beyond hope and fear, desire and passion, yet manifests an amused delight and loving compassion which yield its spontaneous 'karma'. Nishkaama karma: naishkarmya (wei-wu-wei). Truth is all Peace, Joy, Love.
- 28.1. Action willed negates Knowing. When Knowing doesn't act action is ignorance. "Mary has chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her."¹³ Not that Martha is active and Mary contemplative. Martha is self-conscious. Her action should be as good as Mary's contemplation were it as Egoless. Then her action itself (karma yoga) would be contemplation.
- 28.2. Faith is belief without will; unlike belief faith is verbless -- a state in which you are, not by choosing or acting.
29. The sense of being doer is the sense of doing and the want of it doing without the doer. Kartaa is karma, naishkarmya karma without kartaa. Who isn't a subject is no object either: not being doer isn't being done to.

True living involves no doership, to wit, no sense of living.

30. ANAMNESOPANISHAD

30.1. *Essential Socrates*

- (a) An unexamined life is not worth living.
- (b) One must know that one does not know.
- (c) Know thyself.
- (d) Virtue is knowledge.¹⁴ Vice is ignorance.
- (e) None does wrong voluntarily.¹⁵
- (f) Better suffer evil than cause it.
- (g) Return good for evil.
- (h) Let him who would move the world move himself first.
- (i) Society is the individual writ large.
- (j) The philosopher can take no part in politics.
- (k) Liberated Life: *Jeevan Mukti* -- Plato, 519c, 540b.

30.2. The function of Reason, according to Socrates, is to seek, not knowledge, but the *Source* of knowledge.

30.3. What does the Socratic fusion of virtue and knowledge signify? Wisdom is Knowing that is Being where there is no willing. Living is the unfolding of Awareness.

“Socrates: I told you I was born several and that I died one... A multitude of Socrateses were born with me, from whom little by little the Socrates stood out who was destined for the magistrates and the hemlock.”¹⁶

30.4. Socrates knew only too well that Truth brooks no muffling up, no enfeeblement, that Awareness suffers no pusillanimity (*Naayamaatmaa balaheenena labhyaha*).¹⁷ Yet, overwhelmed by his martyrdom Plato sought to organize the world to make it safe for philosophy and in the attempt rather organized philosophy, even academized it (recall by contrast Socrates ‘gadfly’ about in the bazaar?), and made it safe for the world!

30.5. There is enough and more, for the sensitive reader, in Plato’s reflected lunar radiation of Socrates to discern the supreme dissolution of Socrates’s Ego, the grand fusion of Socrates with Truth.

Death is Truth, proclaimed Socrates (*Phaedo*) -- death of the I.

Anamnesis, is the Royal road to Gnyaana, so reiterated Socrates: Recall, *Pratiprasava*, *Nivrtti*, *Epistrophe*, *Periagoge*: Turning the psyche around -- psychic aboutface -- *The Republic*, 518d.

When Socrates passed out into cataleptic *Samaadhi* for full twenty-four hours, even as he was standing, right after a military campaign, Alcibiades fancied Socrates was lost in thought, wrestling with some intellectual problem or other! And Plato reports it in the *Symposium* (220c) -- maybe, endorsing Alcibiades!

Amnesis : Ignorance; *Mimesis* : *Bhaava* : *Maayaa*.

Anamnesis: Knowledge: Being: Sat.

Mimesis, *bhaava*, whatever its sense ramifications, originates in duality: I juxtaposed to the *other*, be it Nature or society.

Phenomena: mime.

Anamnesis: shedding *mimesis*, casting off the shroud of Ego.

- 30.6. Socratic philosophy was meant for those who had the fitness (*adhikaara*) for it but it was yet not *academic*. The philosophy of Socrates was all *unwritten* -- neither did the Buddha write; no writing can claim to represent the core of the philosophy. It was never meant to be written even according to Plato.
- 30.7. According to John W. Dixon, Jr¹⁸ the Spanish philosopher Ortega y Gasset might have taken issue with Socrates on the claim that ‘the unexamined life is not worth living’. *Manas* comments: “Are there not people who live excellent lives without thinking about them?” John W. Dixon, Jr, it would appear, contends: Ortega might raise a different question, ‘what constitutes true examination? The ‘unexamined’ life that is clearly worth living is a life... (that has a manifest) coherence and wholeness (which are not gifts but achievements). The person who achieves them, peasant or prince, does so by decision, by choice, by endurance. He or she may not be able to put it into words, but such decisions are part of our act of examination, often surpassing the verbal critique of the professional philosopher.”

But, what indeed constitutes true examination? Was Socrates a *professional philosopher* (was he in the academy or the market place?) and whoever suggested that Socratic examination is no more than *verbal critique*? Where does Socrates proclaim that real examination is not possible without verbalization or that the peasant or prince is incapable of it? Wasn’t Socratic verbalization but an

earnest endeavour to expose to the people their own ignorance, to talk them out of the infernal cave?

A life of peace and harmony, lived without a necessary Awareness of the *Source*, although it be utter innocence, profound manolaya, is not all that invulnerable in the end, as the *Source* must elude even innocence; it is after all peace that is circumstantial, not essential. Only manonaasa or amanaska (no-mind) can dissolve into the *Source*, merge with Truth, and needless to say, nothing short of manonaasa evidences the true act of *self*-examination.

- 30.8. The way of Socrates is the way of Truth, intransigent -- regardless of consequences either for Socrates himself or for Truth even, *neither being vulnerable*, least of all for aught else. "The judicious conformity with the accepted opinions"¹⁹ -- or the way of Plato -- is itself *opinion*, not the way of Truth, the way of Socrates. The solicitude to 'save' Truth or 'protect' it does not proceed from Truth.

Truth that puts on a mask with a view to success has already defeated itself. The Gnyaani may seem to 'conform', his mind may chance to remain conditioned but he is not his mind even and the 'conformity' is no proof of pragmatic prudence.

- 31.1. Ignorance is vice, volition ignorance.
- 31.2. Awareness is Whole (Samaadhi). Egotism eclipses Awareness, tears it to pieces, distorts it. The Ego is the cockpit of humanity.
- 31.3. Awareness is Ahimsa, volition violence. The dissolution of the will (which alone is Total Surrender) is Non-Violence. Only doing without doership (wei-wu-wei) is being Servant of God.
- 31.4. Why should one at all have an image of oneself? No image is Real. Cast away the image, whatever it is, and for want of image the Ego dies.
- 31.5. What is maayaa but image -- and one's own making?
- 31.6. Why should human consciousness feel being man or woman or -- human? A Gnyaani has no identity -- not even as Gnyaani. Non-identity is no witness either. 'Know Thyself.'

- 31.7. Freedom from even human identity is the true message of impersonality (Apaarusheya). Identity is exclusion, fragmentation. Why serve only man? Why prefer man to moth or moss?
- 31.8. What is the mind but a maze of identities, all of them utterly false? When all the identities are wholly *unlearned*, the mind, to wit, personality, perishes, and out of the ashes of personality emerges Pure Awareness.
32. “The goal of man is Truth. Truth is more than happiness. We have pretended that Truth is happiness, and happiness Truth, and people have believed us. ... But happiness (is only seeking personal gratification) makes you its prisoner as does woe.”²⁰
- 33.1. Time that is is no enemy of freedom. To be really in the present, to *abandon* oneself to it, is -- to be one with time -- to be ‘Timeless’. From time it is but one step to the ‘Timeless’. Only time that is *not* -- the past, the future -- is a veritable prison.
- If the present is all pain, why resist it? (Who is the pain for?) Only yield -- and as you are one with the pain is the Painless.
- 33.2. When the I drops off polarities fuse; sleep and waking, life and death, no longer sundered apart, are at last one. Awake, you are yet asleep; alive, you are yet dead. Fate and will are no more. The trans-fusion of waking, dreaming and sleeping is *Turiya*; the identity of life and death Immortality.
34. Realization is the absorption of one’s awareness into Reality; the part fusing into the Whole, the individual becoming the Universal. But the transformation must occur *intrinsically* in each individual. Realization is the Eternal/Universal, as they call it, but *realizing It* is indeed individual.
35. In likening Buddha and Christ to an ocean and Svaami Ramakrishna to a river, Frithjof Schuon²¹ makes the very grave mistake of judging them purely by the dimensions of their impact. Among themselves truly holy men would see no such difference. The observer’s criteria are foreign to holiness.
36. Michael Polanyi’s philosophy of *tacit knowing*, profound in discrediting scientism and positivism, wouldn’t yet muster awareness enough to pass beyond phenomenal perception. The knowing is

traced to the person and the knowledge as such must be personal; but the *personal* knowledge has yet no *knowledge* of the *person*. (Do you tacitly know that the knowledge is personal? Is the *person* tacit? The moment the person intrudes the tacit is arrested -- personal knowledge begins where tacit knowing ends.) Unlike Socrates (*Know Thyself*) Polanyi must stop short of the *Source* of knowledge. While he refutes the scientific claim of impersonal objectivity he is still blind to True Awareness, which springs from Total Impersonality.

37. **BEYOND MEANING**

Asamveda discounts all reaction including intellection, yet ironically many an intellectual reaction to its exposition has been that it isn't intellectual enough. To expect a systematic treatise on Being is to look for the intellectual satisfaction of an intellectual want. But what is offered is precisely an apparent jumble of musings, scattered and disconnected, which doesn't offer an intellectual or conceptual comprehension of Being or Knowing. Had it been a well-organized, systematic and academic treatise, maybe, it should command an intellectual appeal. But an intellectual understanding of Gnyaana is only a species of agnyaana.

Nevertheless, curiously enough, many of the works of Sankara (including the *bhaashyas*) and of his successors (the logic-chopping *Naishkarmya Siddhi* or *Panchadasi* for example) cater only for this intellectual pursuit. That can't be said, for instance, of the great *Upanishads*, *Ashtaavakra* or *Avadhoota Geetaa*, Ramana's own teaching or to a lesser extent of the *Bhagavad Geetaa*. The intellectual works on Gnyaana have built it into a neat structure and system sustaining a veritable hierarchy of concepts and categories. A lot of dialectical finesse has gone into it indeed and doubtless it abundantly satisfies the intellectual itch to conceive Gnyaana, which is but agnyaana again. (A *concept* of God is no God!)

The diverse musings don't offer a cogent discussion; in fact there hardly seems to be any logical connexion among them at all and they don't seem to hang together even. Yet, they all say one and the same thing (*Ekam Sat*), though in many different ways and together they amount to what may be no more than an ingeminated tautology. But if the intellectual, instead of despising them or being outraged by them, should pause to contemplate the single undercurrent lurking behind them all, it is open to him to sense a tangle of kaleidoscopic multiplicity breathing essential Unity.

The musings, it may be conceded, might not have been so scattered and that they might have retained a reasonable sequence. If the sequence is so

important and the ‘disorder’ has been overdone, it may be urged that the work is essentially zettelistic and even so it isn’t beyond rectification. But why shouldn’t the reader look upon each one of them as discrete and autonomous and contemplate the point posed in itself? Each one of them calls upon the intellect to examine itself and this intellectual self-examination -- which must lead to its self-extinction -- is demanded by each musing in a distinct way. Even the comments on the Mills and Milton (see below items 152-154), which seem extraneous to the question of Being, aren’t that irrelevant; they expose one variety of intellectual Egotism; and the intellect itself is a species of Egotism.

There is no disrespect at all for Bhagavaan Ramana -- either open or implied; and the ‘steepness’ of Ramana’s path (p.2) only alludes to the complaints of some of his own devotees. But it isn’t a question of respect or disrespect for him. ‘Laghu Gnyaana’ points to one style of Realization without denying the possibility of it by sundry yogas, let alone *aatma vichaara* or *Gnyaana yoga*. Yet the burden of ‘Laghu Gnyaana’ is that reactions are self-evident; and by contemplation intensely realizing as much when one emerges on to perfect and immutable non-reaction (which is the same as non-identity), the quest of ‘who am I?’ becomes superfluous. It isn’t exactly what Ramana Maharshi or another Gnyaani says but whether *what* is said can be put to the test. The quest of ‘who am I?’ ends in non-reaction and similarly non-reaction leaves no ‘I’ to query and so no ‘I’ to query about. Thus *the end itself is the means*, and *Gnyaana* is *laghu* in either sense.

The essential message of Krishna to Arjuna is non-reaction, which is the source of Egoless Action or *nishkaama karma*. (It is not that the mind reacts; *reaction is the mind* -- and *nishkaama* is Egolessness. Krishna’s ‘philandering’ is Ego-less but Yudhishtira’s one falsehood isn’t.²² Even the thaumaturgic siddhis don’t harm or hinder you if Egoless.) J. Krishnamurti seems to confound instantaneous or instinctive reaction (such as, say, instantly taking to one’s heels on sighting a snake) with Egoless Action. But it is only the reaction of a blind Ego, as it were; so too is acting beside oneself in the heat of blind passion.

The *Geetaa* has been cited in ‘Laghu Gnyaana’ not by way of argument, only by way of illustration. If the *Geetaa* hasn’t said as much it must amount to a failure on its part; and in a real sense it is immaterial what the *Geetaa* says. There is no *pramaana* for a Gnyaani -- including the Vedas. The Upanishads are so great as to abdicate themselves: *Naayamaatmaa pravachanena labhyaha*.²³ And the *Geetaa* too has much reiterated it.²⁴

On the question of vaasanas the received tradition has pronounced enough and more. It would appear that one needs vaasanas to seek Gnyaana but needs Gnyaana to offset vaasanas: to wit, vaasanas alone conceive -- so they can also 'conceive' -- vaasanas, a circle looming vicious enough owing to the labyrinth of dialectical metaphysicking. A vast array of saadhanas, correlated with the gunas (brought forward in this birth by the vaasanas), have been proliferated to force one towards gunaateeta. But the Ego is the root of all traits and tendencies and if the so-called Gnyaana is sought, *the so-called seeking should suffice*, the vestiges of gunas and vaasanas notwithstanding. In the very process of seeking *the end reverses itself into the means* and one glides on to perfect non-reaction and non-identity. [What are identities but images? -- see item (31.4 - 31.8).]

This is all that can be *said* of what is called Gnyaana; when it becomes both total and immutable that's all to it (linguistically) for Gnyaana as Sahaja. If the Gnyaani too *seems* to react (item 21) it is because the Gnyaani exists here *as if* he too had an ego; and *with no reaction his Awareness is but 'witness' to the phantom figment of this miniscule 'i' (anaham-manas) as well.*

It must be clear that a desire for Gnyaana too is a desire and a reaction -- so an enslavement and disqualification for Gnyaana, which is nishkaama-nishkaama (hence Ashtaavakra Geetaa: "This indeed is your bondage that you practice samaadhi," and "Completely give up even dhyana"²⁵) -- see item 23. But to realize it so then and there is the dawn of Enlightenment. Contrary to the received teaching and general belief again, a Gnyaani has no aversion for birth or rebirth -- and of course no desire for it either. He isn't anxious to live or to die and if, being a Gnyaani, he has no rebirth that is another thing altogether. The great drawback with many of the usual methods (except of course 'who am I?'), whether it is sudden or graduated *satori* or an aggrandized mutation of the mind, is that they all call for vain Egotistic effort -- often very fierce. You take stock of your progress in their application and react positively or negatively to them and to your mastery over them -- which is all a confirmation only of agnyaana. If the means weren't Egotistic one were already at the threshold of the End -- one wouldn't then be reacting to the means; to wit, *non-reaction is both the Means and the End*. To labour for Enlightenment is but aggravated Ignorance, but to realize it as such is to turn Ignorance against itself, as it were. How appropriately has Shirdi Sai Baba said, in another context, "The Guru's instruction is simply a piece of ignorance used to remove the disciple's ignorance, just as we use a thorn to remove another thorn from the foot."

38. REVOLUTIONS, TRADITION, AND KNOWING

The Chairman of Krishnamurti Centre, Madras, in an article published in the *Swarajya* Annual (January 1973) has discussed two of the many interviews²⁶ of some 'traditionalists' with the 'revolutionary', J. Krishnamurti. The article seems to argue that these interviews have demonstrated the superiority of the 'revolutionary' over the 'traditional' approach. From the conspicuous anonymity of the interviewers one can't however conclude that they weren't learned pandits and professors or, at best, ecclesiastical leaders, who, for all we know, may have none of the authentic permanent 'Experience' that Vedaanta, for instance, points to. If the 'revolutionary' really wanted to challenge 'tradition' he should have confronted a Being like Ramana or Ramakrishna. The discussions, therefore, one is afraid, may have been (considering the verbalism demanded of the present critique) no more than an exercise in logomachy on both sides, even intemperate, with possibly a new mystique added from the revolutionary end.

It may be made very clear at the outset that the present writer doesn't propose to canvass the traditional or condemn the revolutionary approach. All that he seeks to submit is that Knowing can't be the bone of contention between any 'tradition' and 'revolution', and that these interviews must satisfy, first and last, the fundamental criterion of fairness, if one can judge it from the Chairman's version.

In so far as the traditionalists have been able to articulate Knowing, Being or Bliss, as it has been variously called, the one thing that they have tenaciously insisted upon is that it is Nirguna. Several appellations, however, like Aananda, Moksha, Mukti, Nirvaana and Kaivalya, have been frequently employed only to convey it in indirect terms at least, particularly in juxtaposition to diurnal human experience, to help the common run of men to have some notional semblance of that Awareness. All thought and expression or communication (Krishnamurti's not excepted) always entails the temporal frame and so what is called the Eternal too can only be conveyed, if at all, by very indirect suggestions and statements that may by no means be literally or dogmatically understood or dialectically debated. Even a Sahaja Gnyani would need exceptional poetic imagination to create a profound imagery that may but verbally suggest the Ineffable 'Experience' to the reader.

Now, any argument (such as the Chairman's) that Sahaja is Freedom even with a capital F or that it is '*final*', 'a point', or '*state of no return*', or that 'the something supposed to be Timeless' must be thought of as a '*fixed point*' or a '*fixed status*' (entire emphasis here added) misses the basic point about Nirguna. If the putative traditionalists who have interviewed Krishnamurti

have employed such terms they can be no more than scholastic theologians and philosophers, since such terms mean nothing to the Sahaja Gnyaani. But when the Chairman adds that many people have “moments of perception of a timeless state” and “thought craves to perpetuate that state, it becomes a concept towards which effort is directed and the quality of that perception is quite lost”, one can’t help suspecting that, since surely he wouldn’t have picked up his ideas from charlatans, he must be describing the sorry plight of so-called seekers who are frustrated in their pursuit. To them ‘Knowing’ may be no more than a *perception* that has to become a *conception* when their *thought craves to perpetuate* it. But the aspirations and endeavours of these minds, however earnest, can’t provide the criteria of True Knowing. (To judge Knowing by such standards would be like judging Krishnamurti by the Chairman of his Centre.) It is these minds that fear death -- death of the fleeting glimpses of awareness they may have off and on. But the Knowing One or Gnyaani doesn’t have to confront the death of this alleged awareness or of anything. There is no life for the Gnyaani, so no death, much less any separation or distinction between them or a craving for one and an aversion for the other. (He has no desire for even Tyaaga, Moksha or Gnyaana; such terms are but linguistic refractions of ‘Reality’ -- even Gnyaana is but a name.) Again, there is no step for him, first or last, and he doesn’t have to “die to the thing that is true”, for he is the Truth -- which is Nirguna. The Gnyaani being totally Egoless and as such mindless has no doubts, no experience of time, no sequence of a before or an after for him to encounter trouble at any point or to free himself of it. He has nothing to perceive, so no perception to die to, no thoughts and so *no gaps of no-thoughts, no mind to renew in the gaps*, no innocence to lose or recover.

This Being of Knowing (that is Bliss) is no doubt beyond all dichotomies; as pure Nirguna it is necessarily beyond thought and language which are always qualifiers without exception. There can be no tradition or revolution about it but nevertheless -- there can be method in this madness and to deny it flatly is as dogmatic as to impose it indiscriminately. To the question as to the need or scope for any ‘guidance’, ‘method’ or ‘path’ pointing to Nirguna the answer is an emphatic *yes* and *no* -- it depends. (You can lead a horse to the water and no more; it wouldn’t drink unless it had *thirst*. Even Socrates claimed to be only a midwife -- though he seemed a gadfly to others, but what a maieutic gadfly! -- not a master.) The absence of method, however, is but a manner, which is method enough; and even to one who may need a method it can be only *ad hoc* and initial. Great Hindu, Buddhist, Christian and Sufi sages have declared unequivocally what has been packed into the cryptic statement: *yena tyajasi tat tyaja* (renounce what you renounce by).²⁷ Quite paradoxically therefore it is in effect renouncing even renunciation (so returning to the

Platonic cave too) and thus the Sahaja Gnyaani is, so to speak, both mystic and mundane at the same time.

Krishnamurti tirelessly extols the ‘unconditioned mind’ -- but it is still a mind (being unconditioned is just another predicament of the mind -- the Gnyaani -- has no mind to be conditioned or unconditioned) and can’t even remotely resemble the Infinite Oneness of Total mindless Knowing.

39. **BEYOND MOMENT TO MOMENT**

All identity or reaction proceeds from duality, a condition in which Truth can be neither approached nor attained. Duality conditions awareness because of the insidious sense of belonging that permeates the mind, all its thought and emotion, perverting it into a mere engine of reaction. Right from birth one spins around oneself, consciously and unconsciously, a vast array of concentric identities, disposed inexorably over the root identity of ‘I’ and its cognate, ‘mine’, which occasion all desire, hope and fear. Unless awareness is free from every shade of ‘I-ness’ and ‘my-ness’ one inevitably gets entangled in the intellectual/emotional maze and the ‘quest for Truth’ turns into a quest of *thought* or goes astray with a spate of hypnotic self-deceptions. The very ‘quest’ for Truth therefore presupposes an unconditioned Awareness -- which is true renunciation -- freeing one from all sense of being and belonging (such as being this or that or belonging to a family or home or having wife, children or property). To uncondition is not to learn but to *unlearn* (the negation of falsity is Truth) and when there is real and complete non-identity, *total unlearning*, the so-called quest ends then and there: in the absence of duality there is no inquiry or pursuit.

Any vichaara or inquiry therefore arises out of duality, but it is no exploration of a ‘beyond’: there is no beyond to explore. It is only an unrelenting probe into all the identities and reactions here and now that obfuscate Awareness. And in the very diagnosis there is the cure as well -- the end of all duality. Once the root ‘I’-identity stands totally exposed, Awareness bounds back, as it were, in utter reversal (nivr̥tti or pratiprasava), snapping the entire tangle of identities and their compulsive cognitive dissipations. When the last dregs of ‘I-ness’ and ‘my-ness’ drop dead, unlearning reaches its end and the stupendous iceberg, called mind, stands outright dissolved. Yet, manonaasa isn’t destruction of the mind (the wrong translation reflects wrong understanding). One doesn’t destroy the mind: *it perishes by itself*, withers away by natural dissolution in the process of vichaara. Awareness liberated (Amanaska) has no identity whatever, even of being itself (self-consciousness is no pure consciousness), and is really untouched by experience (Asamveda).

So-called experience is but a dualist (memory) complex of desire, hope and fear and the resultant joy and sorrow.

But Egotism can be most subtly deceptive and as it is sought to be uncovered it can be sly enough to recede and assume still more elusive forms, even duping one with an apparent *sense* of freedom. If one is not lured by the siddhis (thaumaturgies) to which the Ego may cling for its survival, one may still get stuck in the so-called mahaabhaavas or grand mimetic moods. Ramakrishna Paramahansa preferred such bhaava to Gnyaana lest he lose his supernal joy or bliss. The many species of yoga and tantra or of zen (with its dizzy linguistic mystique and the grinding institutional discipline behind all the alleged immediacy or spontaneity of its manolaya, called satori),²⁸ may, not infrequently, hypnotize the practitioners into what may be no more than ersatz emancipation. Such mystic attitudes, which are legion, obtain because identities are protean and as one is shed another immediately creeps in unperceived to replace it. So one must launch a probe into the root cause of identity, the 'I', to which Ramana Maharshi's 'who am I?' offers an authentic, truly heuristic, key. Or, one may keep a vigilant watch on the 'I', the fountain-head of all reactions, and when the fundamental figment of duality is unmasked to the core, it simply withers away. Or, pre-emptively, *simply ignore the mind OUTRIGHT* -- as if to supersede watching or even inquiry.

When the root 'I'-identity is gone, thought or no thought, should make no difference; such thought, when it is there, is a mere function (*anaham-manas*), like eating or drinking, and doesn't presuppose or leave behind a structured identity, a residual 'I'. Thought must proceed from division; where there is no division there is no thought, feeling or memory, which is no more than a fringe phenomenon, a surface wave that doesn't reflect the span of Awareness and need not therefore occlude it, frustrate its intrinsic infinity; and thus unimpacted by the mental modalities, Awareness remains Whole and Free all the time.

J. Krishnamurti too often talks of the mind renewing itself in the intervals of no-thought²⁹ and learning afresh always in innocence. But only an awareness that can lapse into memory or thought -- lapse into duality -- must wait on the gaps of no-thought and be prompted into meditation again. It is only when awareness subsists on the occurrence of a putative 'moment of perception', said to be true, and there is a slipping back 'to the old state' would thought seek to perpetuate the 'moment'. There can then (and only then) be a real risk of the 'moment' being embalmed in memory and, as a prophylactic, one must 'die to the thing that is true'. This dying, according to Krishnamurti, makes for an interval, a gap of no-thought, and the mind is renewed in innocence *to meet life*.³⁰ But True Awareness is neither a moment nor a perception but the

perennial 'present' (nothing is initial or final about it, nothing new or old) that doesn't have to be perpetuated (see item 40 on Manolaya). There is, again, no process of continual learning because there is nothing for Awareness to learn, and indeed, as we have seen, one becomes Aware only by *unlearning* -- so there is *no more* purgation.³¹ And above all, Awareness has no particular preoccupation with the earth or human life; and relationship,³² which is always bilateral -- unlike Love, Communion -- can have no claim to primacy. Awareness can admit only Nishkaama Karma or Naishkarmya (Wei-wu-Wei), which brooks no duality.

The problem of meeting life or seeking relationship (with humans) arises by virtue of human identity -- the fragmented identity of being human. It is Awareness that is circumscribed by human identity that is sandwiched between thoughts, still thought-bound and time-bound. Krishnamurti asks: "Can you hear a siren, just hear the sound without any image, naming, interpretation? Can there be only sound?"³³ Now, this is, as one may call it, pure poetry, poetry that has learnt to transcend shifting imagery, the whole flux of imagination. It must be pure innocence no doubt, but Pure or Perfect Awareness is beyond this 'innocence' even. A hundred sirens may blare and yet (your) Awareness, already fully merged into Reality, can be beyond the sonic boom, hear nothing, see nothing -- so there need not be even sound; or 'hearing' and 'seeing' it all, Awareness may still not attend to it. Because it may remain *really* so unaffected, an experience, old or new, a perception, stale or fresh, may not be said to have occurred. (The perception and 'innocence' are only bhaavas that can yield rich esthetic experience -- there is no art without bhaava or mimetic mood. Thus inevitably creative imagination is synthetic imitation -- Truth is *inimitable, uncreated*, neither synthesized nor analysed.)

There may be not a trace of selfishness (egoism) in Krishnamurti's human concern, but it is yet a reaction stemming from the desire to help men out of their predicament (as he sees it) and a hope or vision of a different humanity. He has this desire or hope because of his human identity and the subtlest (hence deepest) vestiges of Egotism that go with it. And Krishnamurti, on occasion, may not be wholly free from such counter-vanities as that he has never touched meat³⁴ or that he might have been a millionaire if only he had wanted.³⁵ Surely, this is anything but *innocence*.

Krishnamurti has a communion with the beauties of nature which is indeed poetic -- and no more. (To see God where a bird or blossom is, not to see Him where there is none!) Nature seems to be so crucial to inspiring Krishnaji's awareness, to setting it in motion. Yet True Awareness doesn't rest on trees and brooks, seas and stars. It is not that a bird on the wing, a sweet melody

across space or the auburn evening sky, may not occasion a fresh, non-subjective, perception that can lapse without being arrested in memory or abstracted in thought. Every perception may therefore be new, innocent, pure, occurring from moment to moment; and the vacant intervals of non-perception may be profoundly still, empty, without recall or anticipation. All this need not be discounted. Nevertheless, total non-identity is no flickering flame, flashing on and off, *no concealed duality in alternation*. If one must *refract* it verbally at all, one may yet hesitantly describe it as a fulfilled void of utter serenity, ever empty and still (so it is aptly labelled Eternal), unpre-occupied with even a moment to moment perception or experience. And to call this Awareness perception or experience is to confound the mere occasion with the 'Source' -- which doesn't have to be occasioned.

The phantasmagoria of perceptions must withhold Krishnamurti from the fundamental *vacancy* (Mahaa Soonya) -- the Source -- which is thus reduced to subserving the perceptions as but punctuating intervals, incidental to the business of renewing the mind. Frankly, these vaunted perceptions, which keep on trespassing upon the 'intervals' (where thoughts cease and Awareness is still) must be no more than the subtlest or purest experience (the sound alone of the siren) and as such part of the cunning maze of mental appetency. This merry-go-round of exciting ephemeral empathies chasing fleeting blanks of non-experience (a vortex of psychic flux -- Is this the *unconditioned* mind?) must be far from truly still and peaceful. When it is so clear that the vacant intervals that alternate with the perceptions must also be impermanent, it is quite strange, indeed very significant, that only the perceptions have engaged his presumed attention -- *not the vacancies*, much less the *alternation* of empathies and vacancies. His sensuous empathy is fresh and its freshness is so continually renewed *only because of the recurrent, sandwiched, non-experience*; and yet Krishnamurti has never *unlearned* enough to explore this Infinite Source. If only he didn't *concentrate* on the perceptions but bestowed real *attention*³⁶ on the vacancies, if he but truly *perceived*³⁷ one such vacancy as well, stayed there utterly abandoning himself, without his moods, moments or movements, if only he *contemplated*³⁸ the intriguing process of *alternation* of perceptions and intervals, then that honest choiceless attention would totally merge into the Vacancy -- *without any retrieval*. (This is true meditation or contemplation.) One would then realize that there are no more renewals, that the Vacancy is no passing, instrumental, interval but the Perennial Plenum (Mahaa Soonya), of which the innocent perceptions are but surface occasions. (So even innocence is no non-condition.) As long as these faked-up perceptions loom large the essential impredicability (Nirguna) of Vacant Awareness (which isn't even energy and neither dynamic nor static) would be missed. This Sovereign Purity Krishnamurti consistently tends to

overlook and confound it with a “fixed point of thought”,³⁹ as he miscalls it -- because he so *conceives* it and pandits and sectologists tell him so -- a wholly erroneous, extraneous view. (One who doesn’t have the Awareness has perhaps to *think* of it as a *fixed point*.) The nagging question, ‘what is this Awareness?’ is always only intellectual and Awareness never obliges it with an answer. (Hence the profound ‘I don’t know’ of Buddha.)

Teachers and books can seldom be of any solid help in this profound process of *unlearning* because it is essentially one’s probing oneself and, if it must be authentic, nothing extraneous may be pressed in, since nothing can be taken for granted. Teachers and books are predisposed to pontificate, to regiment and indoctrinate, and belong, by long ascription, to the realm of ‘I-ness’ and ‘my-ness’ (Your Sankara, your *Geetaa*, their Christ, their *Quraan*) If one had no sense of belonging, no identity of any kind, one wouldn’t be hurt by Krishnamurti’s criticism of Sankara or the present criticism of Krishnamurti. Books and teachers can, at best, point to the ‘fringe’ and it is presumptuous of them to dogmatize Reality, to pipe It out by resonant, magical, formulas or formidable logical fabrications. Few can deny that Sankara, for instance, is a veritable system-builder, guilty of heavy-handed intellection in his verbal wranglings like the *bhaashyas*. And the *Bhagavad Geetaa*⁴⁰ can slide into a pedagogic pronouncement, a taxonomic exercise, computing divinity, pigeon-holing piety. Of course, all of them possess the virtue of the curate’s egg. It would seem, however, that *Ashtaavakra* and *Avadhoota Geetaas*, like the genuine *Upanishads*, are exceptionally simple, profound and unpretentious pointers to Truth; they take nothing for granted, prescribe no means, suggest no end. Even the duality of ends and means must end (and that is Nishkaama Yoga) before Truth can be Realized. Such is the Shaanti or Samaadhi of Nirguna, or Kaivalya otherwise called Soonya (Void) or Poorna (Plenum) or Brahman (*Brahmano naama satyam*⁴¹) -- it is neither form nor formless -- or however one may label It,⁴² which are but so many names, all of them pathetic verbal travesties. The Plenary Void of total non-reaction, non-identity, alone can yield True Religion -- of **PREMA, SEVAA, GNYAANA**, of unfragmented Sat-Chit-Aananda, which entails neither tradition nor revolution.⁴³

40. MANOLAYA

Now, why should a communion lapse, why should it flash and fade, function from moment to moment, unless it were shallow? What rhyme or reason is there in insisting that to be *present* it exist from moment to moment? How would a communion that didn’t lapse fail to be in the *present*? And how does the present, the moment to moment, make for the Timeless? Where is the question of being in the *present* at all? To talk of the present, to invoke the

moment, is to be already caught -- caught unawares -- in the web of time. Indeed one moment is no less time than one million...

All communion presupposes division -- duality -- and a communion that has to subsist from moment to moment must be plagued by a duality that crops up every moment. And only a fragmented, meretricious, mind would have to parasite on the tinsel of thought or feeling to shine it up. Without this cursed division, there can be no desire, no thought, no joy or sorrow, and -- no communion. Krishnamurti declares that the mind must be in a state of joy, not sorrow, to qualify for freedom. But it can't be an unconditioned mind which is *conditioned* to taking off only from joy or pleasure.⁴⁴

The entire 'moment to moment' perception and the oft-as-severated discoveries of Krishnamurti amount to no more than what has traditionally been called *manolaya* -- which amounts to no more than the culmination of *bhaava*... True Awareness, on the contrary, is a total communion that doesn't lapse, which dissolves the mind, the Ego, once for all in the Infinite. Such *manonasa* alone truly unconditions Awareness, releasing it from the whole caboodle of time, the past, the future -- and the present no less -- and from the elusive, yawning, psychic, chasm cleaving the conscious and the unconscious as well.

41. "No dynamic pill is ever going to solve our human problems. They can be solved only by bringing about a radical revolution in the mind and heart of man. This demands *hard, constant work*, seeing and listening and thus being highly sensitive."⁴⁵
- 42.1. J. Krishnamurti isn't Egoless enough not to be reacting against or obsessed with the human condition as he sees it. He enjoins his listeners to observe their minds, but when he so vehemently reacts, if he really observed his own mind, his reaction and its vehemence should cease entirely and at once. With unrelenting self-examination if only he asked himself who was it that was reacting and why, he should then become totally Egoless.
- 42.2. What chiefly detracts from Krishnamurti's awareness is his making a new identity of it, exchanging one ignorance for another, and his inability to perceive it as such.
- 42.3. Krishnamurti argues that the mind must have immense, intense, energy to be Aware.

Yet energy doesn't engender Awareness in the least; indeed it must be outright extinct before Awareness is born. It is the Ego, it is

Ignorance (maayaa) that is all energy (shakti). There is no shakti in Knowing, only Soonya -- which is all Shaanti.

- 42.4. What Krishnamurti suggests amounts to giving up all faith with a view to Knowing. But to give up all faith is still to pin faith on oneself, which is to take oneself for granted. Who am I?
- 42.5. Gnyaana yoga recommends concentration on the 'I'. Attention, not concentration, is the Krishnamurti idiom and condemning the latter he wants attention to replace it. And yet concentration means only undivided attention.

43. THE PLACE OF THE GURU

- 43.1 "What is the need of a guru? ... Can anyone teach you that extraordinary state of mind? They may be able to *describe it to you, awaken your interest, your desire to possess it, experience it...* but they cannot give it to you. You have to walk by yourself, you have to take the journey alone, and on that journey you have to be your own teacher and pupil."⁴⁶
- 43.2. "As one enquires for whom is this Realization, one's individuality goes, and the delusion that the Self has yet to be realized leaves him. This alone is the Grace of the Guru. The Guru can only dispel the delusion that the Self has not yet been realized, but to grant Self-Realization is impossible not only for the Guru but even for God."⁴⁷
- 43.3. How can one describe the Truth to another, much less prescribe the way? The answer is of course the usual yes and no. Truth is one for all; It can't vary from person to person, and yet its accessibility may. Who Knows the Truth may therefore choose to describe it and point to the approach. But the description can at best give an *image* of Reality -- not Reality itself.
- 44.1 Q. *What is gone wrong with J. Krishnamurti?*
 - A. A patent guru -- no more and no less. His idiom may be different and he is so overwhelmed by his own methodologism. Krishnamurti indeed is the veritable methodologist; nobody else is so obsessed with the how of Awareness. Who doesn't know that the Sadguru is within (*Aatmaa vai Guruh*), that any other guru is only an accoucheur?

- 44.2 A guru is an authentic spiritual guide, naught else, playing the midwife, as the great Socrates proclaimed himself. A vicious tradition has perverted the term, twisted and hyped it, to project the image of an autocratic superman. Only restoring the true heuristic import of the term can remedy the distortion, not any tirade against ‘Gurudom’ which brings forth only the counter-Guru.
45. Q. *What is choiceless Awareness? How is it choiceless?*
- A. Awareness of course is choiceless, otherwise it would have to be unawareness. If choice were there, one could choose only unawareness - as against Awareness. But really choice or no choice makes no difference. Awareness is choiceless not because I don’t or can’t choose. There is no ‘I’ to choose: it is ‘I’-less, so will-less and choiceless.
46. Q. *How can it be held that Knowledge involves no method, no guidance, no path? Krishnamurti condemns all of them outright.*
- A. It depends upon what you mean by method or path. Method is learning but True Awareness is all *unlearning*. I suppose Krishnamurti implies that there can’t be prescriptions, that you can’t *apply* a means and seek to *achieve* the end (turning Awareness into an ideal that is never *actual*) or between them leave it to the efflux of time. But in an unstructured sense one may talk of a manner or mode. The process or course of JK’s ‘awakening’ is his own path.⁴⁸
47. Q. *How can there be a quest for Truth without freedom? The quest must be authentically one’s own. Don’t you see J.Krishnamurti’s point that the guru is a symbol of tyranny, the very denial of freedom?*
- A. The quest for truth is always one’s own and it must therefore be always free. Yet the competence for the quest, the capacity for freedom, must not be overlooked. Ignorance, as the world goes, is such an insidious handicap. But freedom is not a stern refusal to listen to the next man, to learn from him; that frankly, is anything but freedom; it is regimenting oneself. Dattaatreya was free because he could so freely learn from so many.

Freedom indeed is the one function of a true teacher. A bad or bogus guru doesn’t disprove the case for a true guru, one who is

wholly heuristic. The Sadguru is always one's intrinsic Self, but not a few may need extrinsic, heuristic, prompting or guidance.

If anything, Krishnamurti's remarks, often intemperate, only go to show that he needs to have a guru himself. One may reasonably hope that he may then attain Total Awareness (Pragnyaanaghana/Poorna pragnya), instead of pathetically clinging on to fleeting 'thought-intervals' (manolaya) of partial Awareness.

Is there, during his thought-intervals, the misery, the pettiness, of human life that he usually talks about? Can he perceive it during these thought-intervals or during sleep, dreamless sleep? Is he in one of those lucid intervals when he talks about it? If only one such interval were profound and lasting, if only once he abandoned himself outright to that Source, it would no longer be just an interval. From manolaya he would then move on to manonaasa or amanaska.

48.1. Q. ...*J.Krishnamurti contends that thought creates the 'I', thought creates the thinker, not the other way about.*

A. The 'I' is thought, so-called Ego is only the 'I'-thought and the mind has its origin right there (see item 25). It is not as though one created or was prior to the other. Thought and the 'I' are not different, the Ego or 'I' being only the *root* thought. To inquire 'who or what am I?' is to go back to the Origin or Source, which results in the dissolution of the Ego, the mind.

48.2. Q. ...*Krishnamurti speaks of thought without the thinker...*

A. ...The thinker himself is only thought and thought no more than the thinker. With the dissolution of the thinker, doer, all division ceases; such is thought without the thinker, deed without the doer — Pure Awareness. Thought without the thinker is only the functioning of the mind without the 'I'-sense and it is just like action without the actor. *Such thought or action is but incidental to the occasion of living; not intrinsic to* (nor does it detract from) *the Purity of Awareness*; the apparent circumstantiation, the exterior occasion, conditions only the onlooker.

The question is not whether thought without the thinker or desire without craving is okay but whether it is an essential element of Pure Awareness. Why is it not there in deep sleep? Sleep knows

no thought, no craving; there is no 'naming' or 'forming' in true sleep.

49. Q. According to J. Krishnamurti ⁴⁹ the proper question to be posed is not who but what am I ...

A. Who or what, the pronoun makes no difference -- the search is for the *Source*.

[It ('who am I') means you must concentrate to see where the I-thought arises.⁵⁰]

50. J. Krishnamurti often asks, "can you be that tree, not just see it, but be it? Can you be the song, not just listen to it, but be the song, itself?"

Total empathy is no small thing, but is truth no more? Where there is no 'I' where is the question of the 'I' being this or that? How can non-entity be any entity? Only the 'I' can become bird, song, tree or aught else, when the 'I' is dead there is only Being, not being this or that.

51. We learn from Mary Lutyens's second volume of the life of J.Krishnamurti that he is, according to himself, specially blessed, protected, indeed unique. And he claims he has gone beyond the Vedas and Upanishads.

Now, Krishnaji, please for God's sake, why not die to the protection, to being blessed or unique -- and then die even to dying? Then see *honestly* whether you have gone beyond the great scriptures, Hindu, Buddhist, or others.

52. You devise a vast set-up, found a mammoth organization, seeking to school people in unconditioning. What is it all but striving to *condition* them to the alleged unconditioning -- by the back door as it were? You forge an organization to fight organization and become the foremost prisoner of that very organization! Yet, thanks to the mantra of 'unconditioning' the simple truth is not seen! You don't perceive your own unfreedom, yet castigate others for not being free!

53.1. When you are fast asleep the mind is not unconditioned, the mind is *not*. When there is nothing in the mind, the mind is not unconditioned, the mind is *not*. When there is utter peace the 'I' is not unconditioned, the 'I' is *not*.

- 53.2. The unconditioned mind is the opposite of the conditioned mind -- and conditioned accordingly as the opposite. Awareness as such is neither conditioned nor unconditioned.
54. Q. *If the unconditioned mind is still a mind isn't the absence of experience too still an experience?*
- A. The *unconditioned* mind and the *absence* of experience are by no means alike. Being 'I' is having a mind and if the mind is unconditioned it's just being 'I' without 'I' being conditioned otherwise. The *absence* of experience, on the contrary, isn't *unconditioned* experience; it is clearly the absence of the 'I'. There is no 'I' to experience and it is Nirguna for want of it. *The unconditioned 'I' thus is not the same as the absent 'I'.* So the absence of experience can't be an experience still, but the unconditioned mind is still a mind.
55. A correspondent finds it very interesting that J.K. could by mere contemplation bring forth the quantum model that physicist David Bohm could devise through elaborate mathematics. Yet, is this the nature and function of contemplation? Should meditation become a *surrogate* for mathematics? And how is the model any superior -- or different -- for being *spawned* by contemplation? Shouldn't contemplation rather probe what are quanta and *who* conceived them or what is a model and who devised it? Where are quanta or models when the *person* is not?
56. **What a pity J.K. can't die unto himself for good -- to be no more the conscious person he is! The inexorable witness in him is condemned to being reborn from moment to moment. He can but sense the Infinite but can't merge into it, be lost in It, and so It must elude him time and again. It becomes a fleeting glimpse, he has to die to It -- to the Infinite, mind you -- and when he is thrown back to finitude, It must return to him the next moment - -- but only to reinforce his ever-bouncing mind -- as though the Infinite were there only to play a sort of hide and seek with him! When he gets intimation of the Infinite does it ever occur to him that he who gets it is but too finite and that is why it is just a flash in the pan and no more? If only he could cease once for all to be finite would the so-called dying have to be from moment to moment? Would he just be like a theatre for the Infinite to project evanescent trailers? Won't he go one step beyond his**

putative ‘process’ that has switched on his flickering perceptions? J.K.’s first step surely is no last step.

57. Mind-watching is all right only if it is not motivated, only if it begins with detached observation and ends in *detaching the mind* -- not otherwise. In fact, watching the mind without getting *disengaged* from the mind and its perceptions has landed Krishnamurti in his moment to moment jaunts...

J. Krishnamurti’s interest in the business of observing the mind is only in what is supposed to happen to the mind itself in the process and what the mind is said to gain from it. The whole burden of his teaching is what the mind can draw out of silence and stillness, how the mind can renew itself in the process, become fresh and attain a fresh perception. When the new perception is opened up, the stillness is already gone but it has to invade the mind again and again, so that the mind may keep renewing itself in the recurring process. Krishnamurti’s entire attention is thus exclusively concentrated on the mind and what happens to it and as a result he is simply turned away from the Silence or the Source that rejuvenates the mind and sustains its freshness. The Source has thus only an incidental, instrumental, relevance for him. It never occurs to him to probe how the Source asserts itself, invading the mind time and again, and why. It never bothers him that the mind is under the constant necessity of having to keep renewing itself, while the Source it draws its renewal from is clearly under no such compulsion. And yet he cannot see the wood for the trees, the Source for the mind! He must dismiss the Source, pathetically hang on to the hopping mind!

58. “I never performed any praanaayaama or japa; I know no mantras. I had no rules of meditation or contemplation. Even when I came to hear of such things later, I was never attracted by them. Even now, my mind refuses to pay attention to them. Saadhana implies an object to be gained and the means of gaining it. What is there to be gained which we do not already possess? In meditation, concentration, and contemplation, what we have to do is only, not to think of anything but to be *still*. Then we shall be in our natural state. This natural state is given many names -- Moksha, Gnyaana, Aatma etc -- and these give rise to many controversies. There was a time when I used to remain with my eyes closed. This does not mean that I was practising

any Saadhana then. Even now I sometimes remain with my eyes closed. If people choose to say that I am doing some Saadhana at the moment, let them say so; it makes no difference to me. People seem to think that by practising some elaborate Saadhana the Self would one day descend upon them as something very big and with tremendous glory and they would then have what is called Saakshaatkaara.⁵¹ The Self is saakshaat all right, but there is no kaara or kṛta about it. The word kaara implies one's doing something. But the Self is realized not by one's doing something, but by one's refraining from doing anything, by remaining still and being simply what one really is."⁵²

59. We live in a world of images, the mind is all bhaava, hence maayaa. The basic bhaava is *aham*-bhaava, from which proceed all other identities, relationships -- other bhaavas. When you, for instance, expect another person to play to you the friend, philosopher, physician, in short, a role, it entails a fabric(ation) of relationships: reciprocities, hopes, misgivings, fulfilments, disappointments. All this is our own making, indeed literally a make-believe, that perverts the essential purity of Awareness, which is beyond all bhaava. Can't we cleanse the mind of all this fabrication, free it simply of culture and custom, frustrate bhaava from perverting Being into maayaa? But the only 'saadhana' for Truth is to give up falsity, to shed ignorance, i.e. to abandon the world of 'as if'. And mind you, every one is free of it in *deep* sleep. Only waking projects identities, the entire make-believe of duality, and yet we can't see through the falsity, the fantasy, of waking. Can we be really asleep with eyes awake? Indeed such 'sleep in waking' is non-reaction, which is to live in the world, actively participate in it (no running away from samsaara) without inner identity, intrinsic involvement. Only the utter intelligence to see through the fantasy of waking, its fabric of fiction, can take one to Truth and only honest, unmotivated, watching oneself would yield that intelligence...

Can you 'watch' your mind with total uninvolvedness -- verily as though it were another's, not *your* mind -- watch it, untouched by culture and tradition, without anyway controlling it or reacting to it (neither gloating over its virtues nor brooding over its vices) or *resolving* at all to be different? It is indeed 'watching' the mind, with utter stillness, without *motive*, without will, without the watching creeping to impact or influence the watched, much less grabbing or renegeing (whatever) the consequence. And lo and behold! *right then*,

that very moment, your personality crashes, your will is dissolved and mind snapped -- delinked from the matrix of Awareness irretrievably. It is no longer 'your' mind, the 'you' is already dead and all identity extinct.

Amanaska or manonaasa is the liberation of Awareness from the mind; it is the *delinking* of the mind, not suppressing it or stifling it. The mind continues to function, in a manner of speaking, but without choice or will any more; like a lucid mirror it reflects perfectly now, with no volition to deflect or distort, even as 'your' heart and lungs don't count on your will. This is the *phantom* mind left over, in the wake of True Awareness, which is delinked from it yet. True Awareness, *mrtamanas*, *amanaska* or *anaham-manas*, incidentally, is not the innocent or unconditioned mind either, though, too often, grievously mistaken for it, when one gets stuck at that end and fails to pierce through the veil to merge into the *Source*, which is free from moments and movements, receiving perceptions or dying to them. In Amanaska Being remains untouched by the mind, conditioned or unconditioned.

60. Unconditioning the mind, even as it may open the gateway of Awareness, delinking it from the mind, may have no small role in liberation. But once plenary Awareness is in full swing, it is immaterial whether the mind is conditioned or not. The Gnyaani's total freedom from identity includes freedom from even 'his' mind, which may abide by a culture or tradition. Others may judge him by 'his' mind and think *him* conditioned -- unenlightened. But the Gnyaani is never his mind, conditioned or unconditioned...

Consciousness or mind is a big bunch of identities, spawned by culture, all of them utterly false. When the total falsity is realized, the mind no longer looms large, in fact it becomes a mere shadow, so to speak, with its shadow play of thoughts. The mental veil is no longer drawn, it has no impact whatever, on the Plenum of Awareness, which is asleep to the mental drama -- the passing show of the world and its ramifications. With the mental lid taken off, the person is dead, individuality dissolved, and Awareness redeemed at last. The mind is maayaa -- and mind you maayaa does not survive the mind !

When this Peace of Awareness is attained, the shadow play of the mind may still go on; like a mirror the mind reflects whatever is before it, witnessing perception after perception, without choice,

without will. But it is still the mind that witnesses and the witnessing mind is not the Peace of Plenary Awareness, which has nothing to perceive, nothing to witness. You protest that such Awareness must be insufferably dull. Are you sure? You must reach that Awareness to know it -- before you can speak about it. Your remarks now are only an evaluation by your mind, which has no credentials to judge what is beyond it. And yet, isn't it strange that you should court such 'dullness' daily in your sleep!

There is no trace of the personal or individual in the Gnyaani who is pure Peace (which is the grand end of all love and compassion) and to his Plenary Awareness suffering and service are only the play of the mind (where is misery or suffering in sleep?) and he has no identity with his mind or the succour and service it renders.

61. Awareness is whole, but sealed off by the Ego or mind, sitting atop like a tight, heavy lid. And so, with true Awareness thus repressed, self-consciousness -- the Ego and its constellation of thoughts and perceptions -- passes for all being and knowing. When your mind is *delinked*, shunted out, then with the lid taken off at last, Plenary Awareness comes into full sway, deindividuates you, pervades your entire Being, rendering you an utter *impersonality*. The mind -- the old consciousness -- turns very nebulous, is thrown off to the periphery, where it seems to muster an apparent existence on the shadow plane of the penumbra of Reality as it were. All the universe dwells in the beclouded penumbra and even when 'your' semblance of a mind stands delinked, the rest of the world can still perceive little beyond 'your' mind and seldom pierce through it to sense the glowing Plenum that pervades your Being. The mind and body of the Gnyaani may be there to write home about, yet the Gnyaani himself has no identity with them.
- 62.1. You talk of 'is', 'should be' and what not, but they are all only of the mind and when mentation grinds to a stop where are the verbal subtleties? And where is the observer gone, where his subtle perceptions?
- 62.2. When you sleep you don't -- you can't -- tell yourself you are sleeping -- and that is sleep! The rhetoric has to stop at last. In the end is not the word!

- 62.3. Can you *observe* your sleep? Sleep is when the observer is not. And to die to the observer is to Be -- which alone is to Know.
- 62.4. Sleep forgets the Ego, Gnyaana forgoes it; awake *manolaya* forgets the Ego, Gnyaana forgoes it, asleep or awake. From forgetting to forgoing is *atilaghu* Gnyaana. Forget (your) self utterly ere (your) self is forgone. Inquiry, meditation or prayer, *self-centered*, yields no Self.
- 62.5. Is there Awareness at all in deep sleep (sushupti)?, so a visitor enquires. Mind you, the question doesn't arise in deep sleep. To be asleep or awake makes no difference to Awareness... Waking is but a dream and dream in itself a waking... Sleep is the pause of duality, when there is nothing to wake to, nothing to dream about... Who knows sleep Knows...
- 62.6. Can't Awareness be Awake and yet asleep to the tumult of the mind? When waking is thus asleep the functional ripples of the mental surface leave Awareness untouched.
- 62.7. Swapna and Jaagrata may be inter-related, yet operate on two different, mutually sovereign, planes; one can have no pretence to judge the other, though dreams may be novel recasts of past or sure previsions of future events. Dream experience is as real in dream as waking experience in waking; they are equally unreal in Non-identity.
- If waking would judge dream would waking be judged by dream? 'Judge not, that ye be not judged.'
- Dreaming one thinks oneself awake but awake one does not know one is yet dreaming! Waking, Thomas Hobbes⁵³ could observe the absurdity of dreams -- alas, never the absurdity of waking itself -- but never dream of the absurdities of waking thoughts (ah! Others could!). He was well satisfied (though yet dreaming unasleep) that being awake he knew he dreamed not though in dream he thought himself awake.
- If only Hobbes could wake up from waking (Turiyaateeta), would he have thought being awake (Jaagrata) he dreamed not?
- Jag-at : Jaagr-at.
63. Not the mind, but identity with the mind is Ego. Identity is the root thought, aham-kaara, that makes the 'I'.

64. Q. *What is original sin?*
 A. Ego.
- 64.1 Q. *What is karma / destiny?*
 A. Maayaa.
65. Q. *Isn't a trace of Ego, of being a humble servant, needed for adoring the Divine? How else is piety possible?*
 A. Humility is indispensable as a means to piety (bhakti or prapatti) but the state of piety itself is fusion with the Divine. Devotion is Dissolution.
 A trace of Ego is a trace of evil. A trace of Ego may be retained by 'choice' but the exercise of such choice is an exercise in ignorance. Truth is choiceless. Out of the ashes of *aham* is born *Anaham*.
- 66.1 Q. *I am eager to meet you often and discuss many questions. But then I check myself ... why should I depend on you? Should I not be independent?*
 A. So, depending on your Ego is independence, is it? Honestly, what difference does it make to bondage, whose ignorance you depend on? Is your Ego, your ignorance, the holier for being yours? No, please make no mistake about it, so long as there is the 'I' in you, whether it depends on itself or another 'I', it is bondage, it is enslavement. You are not the freer for your self-dependence. Liberation is not freeing yourself from other Egos to take to your own Ego. And if the other man has no Ego, *to depend on him* is freedom -- not depending on your Ego.
- 66.2 The deepest thralldom, one's Ego, of this fundamental enslavement, so blissfully unaware, we take it for granted, proudly proclaim we are free, independent. We don't depend on the next person -- so it is freedom! We are led by the noose by the Ego -- that is self-dependence, which is independence!! Such is our alienation from Truth, from True Nature. So denatured, the Ego takes us over to the dubious domain of counterfeit freedom. The vicious mask of personality dictates our thoughts, emotions, dreams, actions. The mask indeed makes the criminal, murderer, rapist and what not? Is this freedom, this tyrannical Egodom a value? Civil liberty, however

imperative, is yet of and for the mask and can pass muster only so much as it tempered the self. Only Sattva pointing to **SAT** is the authentic path to True freedom which culminates in *Anaham*, utter freedom *from* oneself.

- 67.1 Q. *How is all knowledge reaction? Standing here if I see a snake over there and say as much is that only expressing a reaction?*
- A. All this 'knowledge' is but dichotomy rooted in the 'I' and there is no 'I' without reaction. If there is no 'I' *here* there is no snake or rope there. Here and now it is all real to you but here and now and you are no more real. Were you asleep where is the snake? What a myth is the witness!
- 67.2 Q. *Do you mean to suggest that all that we see is illusion? Do you deny the existence of things...?*
- A. Now, this debate is premature and pointless ... and don't rush to conclusions as to what is affirmed or denied. Sure, your senses perceive and you assert that what is perceived -- the object -- is real. For one moment, leave the so-called object to itself. You have looked at it far too long and it is time you shifted to the subject instead, took an honest look at it. What is imperative is that you turn to *who* perceives -- the source of perception -- to *yourself*. Nobody suggests that the world is illusory; no, it is as real *as you are*, no less and no more. Its reality, *as you know it*, is in your own mind. Now, what is the reality of the mind? What are you, the subject that perceives? That needs to be determined first and foremost. When all your identities and reactions -- all the falsities, as we have seen -- drop off, what happens to *you*? Leave alone the world, how real are *you*? And if the subject that perceives is *not*, when the perceiver is no more, what is the nature or status of the perceived? Indeed where is perception?
68. Japa *arms* the self but Prayer *disarms* it and Silence *dissolves* it.
- 69.1. Q. *Bondage you say is being mind-bound, so you tell us to ignore the mind to be free. Now, who is it that ignores the mind?*
- A. Ignore the mind and see who it is.
- 69.2. Q. *You have ignored the mind, now what have you seen?*

- A. Nothing. When the *seer* is gone there is none to see. The very question, who sees (or what is seen) doesn't arise. The death of doubt is liberation.
70. Q. *When you talk of 'delinking', 'unlearning' and all that, I seem to understand it Intellectually, but it only strengthens the intellect. And frankly, I feel proud that I can comprehend the hidden meaning, it doesn't help me at all.*
- A. All this happens because you take the mind seriously, you are glued to the mind. Why do you identify yourself with the mind? You look at everything with the mind. Why not look at the mind itself first? Are you sure you are the mind? Find out, or ignore the mind outright and see what happens to it.
71. Q. *If I am not the mind or body, what am I then?*
- A. That's it, find out.
72. Q. *When I look beyond the mind everything becomes quiet and there is a blank -- Nothing.*
- A. Don't you see, when you say there is a blank there is really no blank. You must be there to say it. Blank itself can say nothing. And what do you mean by 'when I look beyond the mind'? When you look beyond, there is none to look, nothing to look at, no you, no beyond.

People have an image of Awareness, presume that on reading books and repeating 'who am I?' something extraordinary must happen to them. Liberation is liberation from images, but we make yet another image of it! We are all prisoners of freedom, that's it. Unless you are absolutely honest and look at yourself (don't you see a movie with rapt attention?) there is no salvation.

Be earnest, earnestness is necessary -- and sufficient. All means are futile if you are not earnest.

Self-inquiry demands only honest intelligence. In the absence of absolute honest understanding all our intelligence is but phoney. We use our intelligence but to fool ourselves, to pervert our cognition. The negation of intelligence is dishonesty. The fruit of folly is the Ego.

Only if we give up vanity can intelligence become free, pure. Don't think some voice from heaven will answer you if you kept on asking, 'who am I?'. It only means you should probe the very depths of your consciousness, search for the *source* of all your doubts and certitudes...

Suppose, we live in a dark cave and have seen nothing beyond it (don't you recall your Plato?). Outside the cave there is the vast open, glorious sunlight, fresh air, lush greenery. None of us can have the ghost of a notion of it all. Yet, inside the cave one may perch oneself on a vantage point, sense a faint glimmer of light or whiff of fresh air, what the other cavemen can't dream of, and may pass for a genius. That's what our scientists are. If you tell them what is outside the cave, beyond their myopic ken, they would only take you for a fool and laugh at your 'hallucinations'.

The trouble with the intellect is its dogmatic certitude that there is nothing beyond it. Look at the idiocy of trying to judge with the mind what is beyond it. The mind has no small weakness for smug self-congratulation and its meanest feats are none too mean for it not to earn its self-congratulation ...Artists are vain not from any fault of art. It is simply that mastery of an art, the skill you command, the talent you display, boosts up your image, your status, and you turn smug. We are such vain creatures that even art is in vain, even art can't elevate us.

73. Q. *My mind harbours many a delusion. As I watch it, not always attentively, there seems to be no end to the rot it can produce.*
- A. Watching the mind is all very well, but all the active probing should effectively end in a trice in Mouna, in non-reaction. Rather than watching, if you could ignore the mind straightaway, not react to it, 'you' get distanced from the mind and eventually get delinked. Thus non-reaction is in a manner of speaking easier than probing one's consciousness. But often enough, non-reaction may not fructify without prior probing of oneself.
- 74.1. Q. *Are there gods? Isn't god a mental concept?*
- A. Yes, gods are concepts just as 'you' are. The gods do exist as you exist. And when 'you' are not, gods are no more. When the 'I' is dead, mind is delinked, gods and God are not, neither the

world nor you, except in the nebulous play of the here and now of self-conscious living.

74.2. God is dead -- to homo mensura.

Theism: I affirming God.

Atheism: I denying God.

Asamveda: No I to affirm or deny: neither reason nor revelation, nor even *agnyeya*, agnosticism.

75. Q. *The Awareness you seem to suggest, where the 'I' is dead, life is without will or motive, looks so dry and insentient...*

A. Are you sure? It is indeed beyond the intellect, the mind and its judgements. Be a good sport! Become that and let us see if you pose the question then, that will be the real test.

76. Q. *What is Gnyaana?*

A. Non-experience awake; sleep non-experience unawake.

77. "Asamveda points to action by non-reaction, does it not? In the present world people do not even have the perception that we can fight injustices and yet be spiritually uplifted. Rather spirituality is the basis on which we revolt against injustices. Gandhi taught only that. What is satyaagraha? It is to use soul-force and undergo enormous suffering, which will be perceived by the mind, and the mind is cleansed on account of the suffering while attaining the goal, i.e., the cause.

Whereas in Asamveda the mind is at rest, and you fight the disease without the mind being disturbed. So egoless action comes as Krishna advised Arjuna. See the difference. There is a subtle difference between satyaagraha and Asamveda. In satyaagraha the Ego is there but functions for a cause, an unselfish cause, undergoes suffering. In Asamveda there is no Ego at all. So your so-called suffering has no impact on you."

78. It is smug to assert that the human mind can go only so far and no further and that's enough. If the mind, according to U.G. Krishnamurti, can go only up to a stage and must keep off, not ken the beyond, *what* then is the mind that must stop short of the beyond, *who* is it that says so?

The question, from first to last, is what is Truth, *not what is truth for the human mind*. And if the human mind can't know the Truth, why hang on to the mind, why be human at all? If the mind is wedded to falsity why not just leave it? You want a secure guarantee that you would attain the Truth if you left the mind. Leave it first and see. And without leaving it don't please talk of Truth or the prospects of reaching it. The point is never whether you can attain the Truth but *whether you must retain the false*. If a thing is false just give it up *whatever the consequences*. And if the consequences too, one after another, are false give them up no less, whether giving up the false takes us to Truth or not. But is Truth anything but not being false? And can the false dog you if you truly gave it up?

79. How are you so certain there is no maayaa? Your very certainty is maayaa! You may stamp your foot, as Johnson did, to proclaim the reality of the world, yet the world is very much in space and time. Do you know what is 'maa-yaa'? 'Maa' is space and 'yaa' is time, so maa-yaa is space-time (yama is its anagram). And what is the mind (Manas) but space-time? 'Ma' is space and here 'na' is time. Mana is Ego (**AHAM**; do note that the reverse suggests 'maha') and its anagram 'nama' represents surrender or humility. Please forget pandits and panditry to be able to get into the intricate, hidden, meaning of occult etymology. Vishnu is space and Shiva time but if you are no prisoner of space-time you would be neither a Vaishnavaita nor a Shaivaite. In 'praa-na', 'praa' is Vishnu and 'na' is Shiva. 'Bhaava' is 'Brahma', but 'bha' is Vishnu and 'va' is Shiva. Even in Brahma, -- 'ma' is duration and 'brah' extension. Brahma is intension (Bhaava-Sankalpa), Vishnu is extension and Shiva duration. Vishnu and Shiva are the warp and woof and Brahma the weaving shuttle of maayaa. In the trinity of creation (**AUM**) each runs into, merges with, the other and complements it. Light is Vishnu and sound Shiva but the invisible, silent, Sat transcends all names, forms and modes. Day is Vishnu, night Shiva but where Truth is the sun beams not nor the moon shines. Music is Vishnu and dance Shiva. Bhaava is Brahma, Raaga is Vishnu and Taala Shiva but the dance and music of Shaanti, Infinite and Eternal, knows no Shiva, Vishnu or Brahma.

(Dawn is Vishnu and dusk Shiva. Sun is Vishnu, moon Shiva; yet Dakshinaayana is Shiva and Uttaraayana Vishnu; full moon is Vishnu; new moon Shiva; Krishna Paksha is Vishnu and Shukla Paksha Shiva and so on. Vishnu and Shiva symbolize phenomenal

polarity; ‘Shiva’ is the transposition of ‘Vish’, to pervade, the root of ‘Vishnu’.)

- 80.1. So long as aham is there you have good and evil; one can’t be without the other; they are the polar components of Maayaa. Thus you find the world as it is, a compound of good and evil, tiny islets of good in a vast desert of evil. But the good too is Maayaa, only it is turned towards Truth, and evil towards the false... Being or Truth is like deep sleep, and when the ‘I’ is not there is neither good nor evil.
- 80.2. As for the deities, people tend to look upon the diverse aspects of the universe as representing so many facets of God or Truth. Nature in all its rich variety would thus represent the infinite range of Godhead and in seeking to traverse it to capture the elusive supernatural, human art perforce endeavours to translate it into emotive, plastic, symbols. Creation is visualised as Brahma, preservation as Vishnu and samhaara as Siva. They are the different facets of one and the same Godhead and have been ascribed distinctive names and forms. One aspect is not superior to another. If you take anything from Poorna, what is taken and what is left are both still Poorna only. Yet, depending on your own bhaava you choose to consider one or the other alone as Poorna. Each man’s bhaava is right for himself. A Vaishnava thinks Vishnu is all and so does a Shaiva think of Shiva. Even so, these are but formal, nominal, differences that appear very real to the respective sects.
- “*Ekam Sat vipraah bahudaa vadanti*,”⁵⁴ proclaim the Vedas. The names and forms are just symbolic and evidently the human mind badly needs such bhaava-based symbols. Islam, which swears by the formless, is no exception. When our psyche abandons identities, when it transcends all relations and reactions, these diversities drop off spontaneously. Then ‘I am That’ (*Soham*). Until then, the differences loom large, seem very real, *to the mind*. It is all the maayaa of the mind and the mind is only bhaava. **Being begins where bhaava ends** -- the end of bhaava is Being. Until then the sway of bhaava-maaya reigns supreme, holding the mind in its vise-like grip. The mind is maayaa, where there is no mind there is no maayaa.
81. The mind is the product of the three gunas; sattva, rajas and tamas, and it gets one mood or another depending on the guna that prevails at any moment. The deities even -- none of them are said to be free

from the three gunas. We are driven to punya and paapa by sattva and tamas, propelled by rajas. The mind or maayaa is a compound of sattva, rajas and tamas. If only one could ignore the mind! It is then cut to size, no longer looms large and finally, the mind is delinked from 'you'. The mind then functions without a structural, Egotistic, base to prop it up.

- 82.1 I am the mind, I am the body, there is no I beyond them. I don't have to search for the I anywhere. The mind and the body are where the I dwells. Beyond them the nameless Nonidentity.
- 82.2 There is no special need to meditate. *The very pursuit of Truth is meditation.*
83. Q. *The point is I want Truth, absolutely and with all my heart. I am ready to pay any price.*
- A. Truth is the death of the 'I' that wants Truth. The death of the 'I' is the price to pay. The moment it is paid Truth is already there. But few want to pay the price really. Once the soul has been stirred up, nothing can stop it. Though it has its own ways, its own pace, its own manner and mode. Be patient, utterly patient. Living in the world, abiding by its quirks and all the annoyance it may cause is itself a grand test of that patience. The world may be crass, even brazen, but Truth is not *running away* from it, in fact, that is anything but Truth. The attempt to escape into Brahman is cowardly. You can't get at Brahman that way. Brahman is courage. Samsaara is Nirvaana.
84. Q. *Sometimes I have this feeling that I am only playing a game and life is utterly joyous then. Other times I forget this and get entangled and react vehemently ...*
- A. That is because of the different gunas taking hold of you at different times. Why not watch the play of the gunas and the Ego that obliges them with a ready arena? That vichaara would revert the mind to its original plane. Even your feeling of playing a game is due to doership. If you ignored the mind, there is no game, none to play or play with -- the easiest way, it would seem, is to journey from satya to sattva, from sattva to shuddha sattva and from shuddha sattva to Sat.

85. Q. *Who is a "witness"? What is it to be a witness?*
- A. One is a witness when one perceives but does not participate. Consciousness moves but is not moved. So there is perception without reaction -- or the mirror-mind. In other words, all identities die except the 'I'-identity. 'Mamakaara' is gone but 'ahamkaara' or a trace of it remains. There is nothing 'mine' except 'myself'; hence, the other is a perception without involvement but the 'I' or 'myself' is an involvement without perception. The witness does not witness the 'I', is indeed witless about himself, and the 'witness' dies when he gets selfwit. Truth alone is, nought else. Where is the witness in deep sleep? In waking, the mind of the Gnyaani, in Shuddhasattva, plays the witness, but the Gnyaani is de-linked with this mind even.
86. In your quest for Truth, don't do anything out of fear; if, for instance, the quest takes you to hell, go ahead, go to hell -- only be fearless.
- 87.1. Q. How is fearless action true?
- A. Where there is no motive there is no fear. If you are honestly desireless you would be fearless as well. Detached action is non-reaction; there is no Ego to falsify it.
- 87.2. Q. *If you do things without fear, there may be dangerous social consequences; it may lead to self-hypnosis...*
- A. Don't you worry about society, self or anything else. Get at Truth, irrespective of the 'consequences'. Be honest, have the courage to attempt it. The very attempt is the understanding. If you saw the falsity and shed it, there could be no hypnosis to pre-empt the self. ... If you were really honest you won't be speculating like this. ...
- 87.3. Q. *Doesn't non-reaction make one irresponsible? What would happen to one's job, family, dependants? Doesn't it destroy yogakshema, happiness, prosperity?*
- A. Really speaking, does it? Need it? Well then, so what? *Naayamaatmaa balaheenena labhyaha.*⁵⁵

88. Q. *You tell us to watch the mind, you also tell us to ignore the mind. Aren't they contradictory?*
- A. Why should they be incompatible or contradictory? When you watch the mind without involvement, you are already detached from it, which is ignoring the mind. If you can ignore the mind there is no need to watch it, but if you can't ignore it, you must watch it and watching it you learn to ignore the mind.
89. Q. *According to some, liberation needs enormous effort, but others insist it is simply effortless...*
- A. It *may* need no small effort to perceive, really perceive, identities and their utter falsity, but once they are truly perceived, they, all of them, simply drop off automatically. There is no effort whatever involved in the process. Perception of falsity may demand effort, *not liberation from it.*
90. Q. *I keep telling my Ego to leave me in peace, still it won't why?*
- A. When you tell the Ego to go, when you tell yourself 'you are not', who is the 'I' that says so? Don't you see the Ego lurking there? If you are not, you won't, you can't tell yourself so. When you are sound asleep do you proclaim you are not? You need effort to perceive the Ego, the identities and reactions, and if you could effectively perceive it all, the Ego is already on the way out, you need no effort to shed it. You don't have to tell the Ego to quit, to leave you; no amount of telling it can drive it off. And out it goes the moment there is no 'you' to tell it to quit!
- 91.1. Q. *I have the full faith I will get my liberation...*
- A. Don't keep invoking faith, please. Faith moves mountains, yes, but only if it is so destined. Most faith people go by is cultural conditioning, often plain wishful thinking... You have faith in the *Geetaa* and, maybe, in multiple deities, a Muslim goes by the *Quraan* and monotheism. Each may have his own faith but *Gnyaana* can't vary from person to person...
- 91.2. Religion is faith; a *Gnyaani* has no faith, no prophet...

92. What you write of the Gnyaani misses the essential point. Your assertion that he is free of evil thoughts and deeds has little bearing on True Awareness. It is not that the Gnyaani has a pure mind, he has no mind, pure or impure, in the sense he has no identity with 'his' mind. Good and evil, right and wrong, virtue and vice, in short all polarities, are of the mind, to wit, on the mental plane. When Awareness is delinked from the mind or maayaa, all polarity is gone. Awareness or Being is neither noble nor ignoble, it has neither virtue nor vice. That is being Quality-less -- Nirguna or Kaivalya.

93.1 On the ultimate journey of Awareness, one may get no succour and one must undertake it all by oneself. Liberation or Moksha is total non-identity (Kaivalya), which is purely the negative process of the death of all identities. It is to step out of the vast prison of human culture and tradition that sustains us on a maze of false identities -- caste, creed, sect, race, nationality, age, sex, religion, philosophy and what not! The outright falsity of culture and custom and the immense ocean of ignorant learning nourished on them, fragment perception, distort it and serve only to frustrate True Love or samadshti, which is boundless, universal and -- unconditional. Samadshti is the explosion of Love that knows no gradation of high and low, no discrimination between male and female, man and animal -- it is downright indiscriminate. When the maayaa of culture is burnt out and its network of rites, rituals, relationships, indeed all the delusion of bhaava and symbolism, withers away, and the Ego -- the root-identity has nothing to prop it up, nothing to react to, none to react, the person is completely dissolved and impersonality throws open the flood-gates of **Poorna Nirvaana**, the fusion of boundless **PREMA**, **SEVAA**, **GNYAANA**.

93.2 Sufi Iskander of Balkh, on his death bed, said to his son:

I taught abstemiousness all my life in the hope that it would still the covetousness, which destroys man, even if he covets goodness.

Son: Then what shall I do?

Isk: You shall desire Truth for its own sake, and nothing for your own sake.

Son: But how shall I know whether I am desiring something for myself and not for itself?

Isk: You shall become aware, through daily practice, that what you imagine to be yourself is concocted from beliefs put into you by others and is not yourself at all.⁵⁶

94. There is no good *except being it*. Talkers get all their ersatz fulfilment from speech and never, never go to the thing -- the deed. The 'logos' seems to afford them all the fulfilment they want and frustrates action. But the deed is the man. Talkers must keep talking, the chicken-hearted must keep reassuring themselves by discourses, resolutions, and proclamations. They seek to know, never to be and little know that they can never know unless be. The worst part of it is they fancy they can talk their way to silence!

95. One hopes hereafter you can distinguish between action and reaction, realize that while reaction is personal and 'subjective', action is actually impersonal and 'objective'. If you had acted impersonally, you would have had no personal resentment or conflict. Even now, one can sense, you hate the concerned persons, though, if you were detached you would have no emotional entanglement whatever.

It is only because you are caught up in the cobweb of social relationships, entailing custom and convention, expectations and fulfillments, attachments and obligations, that you find yourself personally tossed up in the cross-currents of surcharged emotions, almost impossible to brush aside... True action is the fruit of real detachment; the situation dictates the action and 'you' act freely without any *personal* involvement. In fact, 'you' are just an instrument of action, which is to say, you don't choose to act, but *action chooses you*; you are but the predicate; no, not the subject...

96. Q. *What is yagnya? Is it correct to translate it 'sacrifice'?*

A. Yes; yagnya is karma without kartaa -- it is Egoless Action or Deed without Doer. The Ego has been sacrificed ... sacrifice is the psychic foundation of service. But it can't be ritualized!

97. It is a grave error to imagine that being soft and tender, sweet and sentimental is love and compassion, but being stern and critical and even seeming punitive, is not. *Pitiless criticism can be true expression of real love and compassion*. Often enough, it alone may

come to mean honest service. It is really service which demands action on this critical plane that you people need. Otherwise, one can't hope to cure the lurking illness in the psyche...

Action may be as firm as it is not rude and it must proceed from justice, not hatred; it must aim at healing the soul of the person you act 'against'. The cause has to be dispassionately pursued with justice and fairness. The endeavour is impersonal even in the sense that it is irrelevant who the persons involved are. Otherwise you would be bound by convention and sentiment and led by custom and usage, by personal equations, rather than by justice and truth.

98. When the Ego is gone, the mind is no longer split into intellect and emotion. They fuse into One and the pure saatvik mind reflects the Sat within. The intellect as well as emotion is essentially rajasik, yet when the twain meet their fusion becomes saatvik. But when they remain divided, emotion is no surer guide than the intellect -- it is as fallible.
99. You don't have to do anything to hasten your progress. Patience is imperative in the pilgrimage of the spirit. It is enough if it marched unhindered. Even the anxiety to get liberation is needless and can be counter-productive. The 'I' seeking to dissolve itself may instead inflate its own identity. The 'seeker' can become too self-centered for the Self to get the better of him. This is the pathetic irony of not a few 'saadhakas'. The oft-asserted maxim '*Summaa Iru*' (Just Be) means that even seeking liberation is not just Being. When you seek neither bondage nor freedom you are no more and that is Being. Why not lead your ordinary life in the ordinary manner, yet with that total dispassion or detachment which culminates in compassion? That is the shuddha sattva of the Nirguna Sat within. When you are not, yet the other feels 'you are', he draws on the Sat within you which becomes 'your' compassion.
100. Q. *Whatever one's limitations, one's constraints, there is tremendous joy in bhakti ...*
- A. Yes ... even so please understand to be unworldly indeed is true bhakti. To be lost in God is to be lost to the world. And to totally dissolve oneself (not to seek to retain a trace of the Ego!) is Nirvaana.

Love, even love of God, is ignorance ... it entails duality. True Love is where the lover and the loved are not -- thus a Gnyaani is beyond compassion even.

Bhakti and prapatti are no doubt grand, the love of God, surrender to Him, surely takes one to bliss, but the source of bliss is God or Truth. Don't stop with bliss, merge into the Source of bliss. Bhakti may be a means but let not the means masquerade as the End. Don't just love God, don't just adore Truth. Please go beyond adoration. Be Truth Itself -- that is Gnyaana ... Even a Chaitanya could not go beyond his symbolism of Radha-Krishna... If you truly surrendered to God, the twain merge, the polarity ends and -- there is neither you nor -- God. Once you become Truth, there is no loving It -- where then is bhakti or prapatti? ... Providence is the handmaid of Karma and Karma, the handiwork of Kartaa. Samsaara may be divine *leela* but *leela* itself is the play of Karma. You are the plaything of God but there is neither play nor plaything without the original maayaa of kartaa. When there is no 'you' to be acted upon, God is no longer actor. Poorna or Nirguna absorbs both you and God. ...

It is a glib pronouncement that bhakti is *the* path for the present age. It is much less right that love of God or surrender to Him is the easiest or the highest path. Were it so the world wouldn't be such a sorry place. Surrender is no joke ... the moment you surrendered you would be wholly unworldly... Actually the paths are not so distinct or exclusive. Honest to God, let each bhakta examine himself, assess his own bhakti, see how honest, unmotivated, it is. Barring some of the great saint-devotees, how many can answer the question without prevarication? If anything, karma or sevaa, even when it may not be wholly unmotivated, may be a surer, safer path, offering as it does profounder prospects of humility. All men must work even as they eat and when it is inspired by fellow-feeling -- the most spontaneous love -- work is transformed into service. "He prayeth best who loveth best all things, great and small." (Coleridge) The idiom of Love is service. It is idle delusion to talk of serving God as such, as though God had any need and we could supply it; or of loving God when one is purblind to '*eesaavaasyam idam sarvam*'.⁵⁷ The rich potential of sevaa has been eloquently demonstrated by men like Gandhi and Tenko-San. Sevaa calls for no transcendental sanction. Ramakrishna

Paramahansa's occasional remark that one should have the *adhikaara* for service makes little sense. One who earnestly seeks to relieve the suffering of another to the best of his knowledge and ability need not answer such caveats. But all this does by no means imply that one should be a professional 'do-gooder'... The great snag with bhakti, as it obtains, is that even great bhaktas may easily slide into induced self-hypnosis, get stuck in wishful bhaavas, proudly feel they are so near to God, being so near the 'church' and slip into grand *Egotistic sublime*. You take to a bhaava, keep nourishing it, and the feedback from the bhaava gives you all the 'bliss' your Ego craves for. No wonder, votaries of bhakti must uphold the necessity to retain the Ego or a trace of it! With such self-centered 'sublime' one may smugly turn indifferent to the sufferings of others, though too often there may be no such indifference, but abundant self-pity, were suffering visit oneself. The other-orientation of sevaa therefore must prove more authentic for a fiercely competitive, selfish, age and sevaa -- devotion to Daridraanaaraayana -- should be a safer bet.

- 100.1 ...The incomparable grandeur of Prema-bhakti or Mahaa prema, the infinite Love of God! The story goes that the great Kannappa, when he feared Siva was going blind, spontaneously gouged out both his eyes and offered them to the Lord, out of sublime, unmotivated Love of God -- not surrender to God. Sabari offered the fruit to Rama, which was all she had, and she had to partake of it to make sure it was ripe and sweet, before offering it to Him. She had sought nothing of Him. And to what end Aanjaneya would go to serve Rama! Not for his own salvation. It was boundless Love of the Lord -- not surrender to Him. Great saints, as in medieval Maharashtra, are lost in God and lost to the world. Surrender seems glorious to earth-bound, mundane mortals. *Anbe Sivam Anaham*.
101. No doubt there is much intensity and grandeur in the great bhaavas but they must let slip the Soonya of Poorna. Are you sure one doesn't take to bhaavas for their glorified preyas? There is no bhaava where there is no desire. ***Bhaava at best yields a bastard Brahman***.
102. Your query whether intense prayer to a deity can grant you liberation seems to imply that deities are no part of bhaava or maayaa, which is not true. The so-called deity can help in a manner of speaking. But there is no surrogate for searching self-examination. Prayer, be it to

God or even a deity can turn one more and more saatvik and afford a plenitude of harmonic virtue. Yet saatvik is no Sat, virtue is no absence of quality. You plead you want to end your unwisdom and enquire whether prayer would end it. But first let us know whether it is wisdom to pray and there is no unwisdom in the *motive* to pray, please try to find out what your unwisdom is about and whether the passion to end it is itself free of it. Isn't even your search for wisdom really a search for security? In which case, what are you insecure about? If you are turbid off and on, what makes you turbid? Please enquire honestly, intelligently, so that the very inquiry would be true meditation, prayer to Truth, so to speak.

103. Q. *When I read great Gnyaanis like Ramana, Nisargadatta etc., I can't help feeling they often contradict themselves...*
- A. This is the snag when the spoken word is put in writing. Words spoken carry their live context, the speaker is there as well as the listener and the words are addressed *ad hominem*, specifically to the listener. Each person has his individual need and it must be individually met. One has to watch the mind but to know how to watch it, how to handle the process and the problems involved, one may still need a guide. Thus one man needs a Guru and must be told so. Another has no such need and the 'Guru' may hamper his evolution. What is told one person is not told another. But when you read the printed word, the context is not there and you get the impression that each word is addressed to all.
104. Q. *How do you call truth 'abhaava'? Nagarjuna for example would insist it is neither bhaava nor abhaava...*
- A. Yes, it is the end of polarity. All bhaava is polarity and *vice versa*. Where polarity ends is abhaava. What is pointed to is mere absence of bhaava and nothing positive of any kind is implied. Otherwise abhaava would be only another bhaava -- a counter-bhaava. Please note how the word 'abhaava' is used in its context and what it means. There is no suggestion that it is the opposite of bhaava, but only that there is no bhaava, so no mind, no Ego.
105. Q. *How can a Gnyaani, who has indeed undergone manonaasa, have any thoughts? Is he not free of the mind, in fact, is he not mindless?*

- A. Questions like this, one is afraid, will be raised time and again, however much one may seek to answer them. It has been clarified on many occasions that manonaasa is no destruction of the mind or its elimination. What happens in manonaasa is that Awareness gets delinked from the mind and as a result the Gnyaani becomes an impersonality and the mind functions on its own, without any Egotistic identity to motivate it. Non-identity delinks the mind, it delinks the body (mind and body are the two polar ends of the same process; body is the material and mind the energetic end), yet both the mind and the body continue to function. When it is really perceived that the Gnyaani is with a body, but is not of it, how is it difficult to comprehend that there is a mind with the Gnyaani, but he is not of it? The mind is in the Gnyaani, so to speak, but the Gnyaani is not in the mind. Just as he has no identity with 'his' actions, he has no identity with 'his' thoughts either. Non-doership includes actions as well as thoughts. The Gnyaani is like an actor in a play, the actor really knows he is not the character, he is only acting it, but he plays the role all the same. Only, unlike the actor, the Gnyaani has no intrinsic sense of acting even -- not even that doership! The Gnyaani's mind is like anybody's mind (just as his body is like anybody's), only there is no Ego to motivate it. The mind of the Gnyaani is thus the reflection of the Awareness or Sat within and as such pure saatvik. Even so it can assume any mode depending upon the exigencies of context.

Questions like this will keep raising their head when one is bogged down in a pseudo-quest. They won't forward true inquiry even one inch and answers to them can only serve to add to sterile conceptions of Gnyaana and Gnyaani. The one honest question is whether one is free of all identity and if there is whole non-identity, it is simply irrelevant what is a Gnyaani or how he functions, whether the mind is with or in or of the Gnyaani, whether Brahman or Aatman is or is not or whether Truth is Poorna or Soonya.

106. Watching the mind is being witness without any identity with or reaction to anything witnessed. And when the witness is self-witnessed, Awareness is delinked from the witnessing mind even. ...Mind-watching is alright only when it is not motivated, only if it begins with detached observation and ends in detaching the mind -- not otherwise.

107. Truth is total freedom from bhaava -- from the stand point of bhaava it is abhaava, whereas untruth or Ignorance is all bhaava. Only vichaara seeks to pierce through bhaava, to investigate it threadbare... Enlightenment is abhaava if you look upon it as **Enlightenment**. It is abhaava thus for the agnyaani, who conceives it through bhaava as its opposite. To the Gnyaani himself it is neither bhaava nor abhaava. The Gnyaani has no 'I' to have any feeling of being Enlightened. ... But all this talk serves no useful purpose. Bhaava or abhaava, call it what you like, just forget it, *forget all the categories*, not excluding *madhyamika*, which has become another categoric identity. If you are earnest, just look at Ignorance, look through it to shed it once for all and *when Ignorance is gone that is Truth*. Why all this talk of bhaava, maayaa, where it begins or how it ends?
108. Bhakti is entirely bhaava-based, unlike vichaara, which seeks to probe bhaava, to pierce it and tear asunder aham-bhaava. So bhakti and Gnyaana can't be one and the same. Even love of wisdom (philosophy) is no wisdom (sophia). Neither is vichaara by itself Gnyaana, only a possible means to it. Bhakti or loving God is not the same as being God or Truth. Jignyaasa or mumukshutva too is no better ... Why should God be identified as Krishna or Kali? Identity is finite, it limits, confines. Non-identity is unlimited, infinite. If you had no identity and won't 'identify' God or Truth, there is then neither you nor God. **Being begins where bhaava ends**. ... Please don't for a moment think bhaavas should be hounded out. They may have their place in the evolution of the psyche. But each time a bhaava begins, try to look at it, still more, look at the aham-bhaava at the root of it. You don't have to do anything else. This is sweet reason, all honest, that dissolves the subject, which has to be grinding and honing bhaavas all the time. If you could do it, you won't have to haunt the precincts of temples and their presumed deities. Neither would you need a Guru, apart from your inner self. ...
109. We all seem to want liberation so badly, only our daily conduct seems so flatly to negate it and it is a moot point how far we really seek liberation or deserve to get it. Supposing maayaa caused no sorrow or suffering and it was all joy and happiness, would we seek Truth or prize it? Would even the great Buddha have sought it? But for the bug-bear of rebirth, the sorrow of samsaara, would Sankara have sponsored it? This is where the prime *Upanishads*, *Ashtaavakra* and *Avadhoota Geetaas*, Socrates and some of the Sufis, seem to score over the rest. The Truth they uphold has no palpable motive

behind it. Ramakrishna openly canvassed bhaava; the mystic communion was not Truth all right, but it mightily pleased him all the same. What seems to count is aananda ... be it Aandaal, Meera or Chaitanya. If we seek Truth it is because aananda is said to go with it. And if you could somehow pre-empt aananda, why Truth at all?

- 110 Academics can be very comical and when they profess philosophy they can even be absurd. You have only to turn to the bulking tomes on Indian philosophy by the Indian tribe of scribes to see what glib statements they can make and with what smugness. To them the Upanishads mark the dim beginnings of Indian philosophy -- primitive, simple, rudimentary; they nebulously articulate fleeting glimpses of Truth! To these academics the Upanishads are inchoate *intellectual speculations*, callow flights of speculative thought! They can, without batting an eyelid, talk in the same breath of an Upanishad and Spinoza, Vedaanta and Kant, Buddha and Hegel or Fichte, Ramana and Bradley or Berkeley and place them all on par! For, not infrequently, don't the eastern sages and western thinkers seem to talk in the same strain? Maybe, they seem to, but do they talk from the same *plane*? The comparison, mind you, is not with Socrates, the true Gnostics, Meister Eckehart or *The Cloud of Unknowing*, which would be appropriate, articulating as they do, like the eastern sages, what is realized beyond the mental plane. Great souls express or explicate the Truth they have realized, not just speculate with ideas and concepts. Do Spinoza and Berkeley, Hegel and Bradley do so? Do they even claim?
111. The western tradition may be too rationalistic, but some westerners of late, quite disillusioned with it and sporting eastern spiritualism, have chosen to blame it all on Socrates, Plato and Aristotle! The one sovereign end of Socratic dialectic is the steady unfolding of anamnesis. And the role of anamnesis is not to help you to recollect the algebra and geometry you are supposed to have learnt in your previous lives! The real message of anamnesis, on the contrary, is the recall or recovery of Truth, which the psyche has lost in the whirl of illusion, almost beyond hope. Anamnesis is invoked only to enable the psyche to retrace its roots and return to the Source, to Truth. Socratic Reason is thus 'teleologically' anamnetic and if Aristotle's accent seems to be toward analytical reason, he has taken immense care to reiterate the efficacy of logic and analysis but only where they are wholly appropriate. Aristotle's dispassionate reason, his bemused scepticism, is too open-ended to take itself for granted, and the

inexorable self-critical faculty it inspires can't overlook its own fallibility. The vibrant pliancy of his intellect can be rigorous and exact at one place, yet consciously loose, amorphous and imprecise at another, dismissing rigorous analysis and logic-chopping where it is uncalled for. Ethics and politics don't oblige proven mathematical canons and Truth and God can't be trapped in a syllogism. And the purpose of metaphysics is to sensitize human reason to the ultimate, not test the ultimate by the tenets of analytic reason.

Yet, intellectual fashions in the west, it seems, must change as often as even sartorial tastes. After the Vedaantic avalanche which catapulted Vivekananda west personally to purvey Gnyaana abroad, there was the manifest shift towards yoga, sundry species of which seemed to mushroom everywhere. But since the mid-century it has been Zen which must take the cake. The book market has been flooded with garish tomes on Zen and tea to Zen and fisticuffs and Zen and what not, feverishly churning the frenzied intellect of embittered drop-outs, who have to Zen up their motorcycle maintenance now. It may suit them to aim their expedient Zen-archery at Socrates or Aristotle, if only because they can't or won't comprehend the sublime philosophy of the hemlock or the undogmatic, open-minded, liberal, temper of the Stagirite -- except in the ossified idiom of medieval schoolmen or modern scientism. No wonder, they can't be sensitive to the prismatic classical amalgam of reason, experience, insight and imagination -- intimations of the inner daimon.

112. THE SCIENCE OF SCIENCE

Scientific knowledge is essentially knowledge of cause and effect; all knowledge of cause and effect, scientific or otherwise, is power. And to replicate and mobilize the cause is to engineer the effect, which is technology. Knowledge that is power is know-how; science can never pose, much less answer, the real what or why. The know-how, called explanation, is but factual description, tracing the effect descriptively to the cause. When the power of the cause is grasped, its effect can be calculated in advance. And from a configuration of causes a complex of effects may be computed ahead, i.e. predicted; or from a constellation of effects, by a process of inverse deduction, a network of causes can be inferred. Scientific knowledge thus is essentially calculative, mechanical logic, computational at bottom. The putative 'flashes' of so-called scientific 'intuition' or 'imagination' are but the quantum leaps of cumulative mechanical logic. One may as well admire the

computer as it flashes complex calculations in microseconds. And if one scientist making a quantum leap did not accomplish it another would, maybe, later.

Reason, positivist, logical, or mathematical (applied or pure), always proceeds from prior assumptions; it deliberates mechanically, calculates from presumed data, which are at bottom objectified anthropomorphic subjectivations -- of homo mensura. The outgoing forays of the intellect gather exterior learning that can work, in other words learning that is power. Whereas true Intelligence -- the deep innate and inward non-polar faculty -- is never presumptive, neither does it deliberate or calculate; unlike the intellect or emotion, fused Intelligence has no laterality, Yin or Yang, of the brain. The ingrowing drive of Intelligence spontaneously dives in and divines. Intelligence perverted and polarized by Egotistic subjectivation turns into the postured intellect, which is the tumultuous din of external reason. Inner Reason does not have to analyse or learn; imbedded in the very Knowing it needs no syllogism, no cogitation. (Just as you know your language and speak it without learning the grammar; you may well learn the grammar of a language and yet be unable to speak it.) When the blazing fire of Sovereign Intelligence burns out the 'worm of unreason', which is the Ego, outgoes with it the spurious intellect and its emotional counterpart; and out of the ashes of subjectivity alone can sprout even social objectivity.

The scientific revolution having computerized the human mind, the computerized mind has at last fabricated the modern computer, a homuncular super-mechanical extension of the human mind. As the entire logic involved is wholly mechanical, it should not be impossible for the machine, by the aggregate momentum of technological leaps, to overtake and supersede the mechanical faculty of the human mind. No doubt computers and the like are made by man but it is compulsive that the computerized mind brings forth mega-replicas of itself, sophisticated superautomations, and even as the mind gets well-plugged on to them they shall direct, control and determine the human psyche. It may be true that what is fed into the computer decides what the computer does. What the human mind does too depends on its own inputs, to wit, what the computer feeds the mind will decide the mind's feedback to the computer. As the scientific mind is nurtured on cumulative calculation, it is compulsive indeed that it exponentially augments its external extension and as the precipitation progresses man may be hoist with his own petard: *machina ex hominis*.

113. THE LONG SPOON

“The real threat to human values now comes from unprecedented social gigantism and insidious organisation, which are both the result of a total technology, which seems to have become a complete ideology by itself. As instruments of production slavery and the servitude of labour are being replaced now by an increasingly automated technology and, as a corollary, the new social imperative is that instead of a single leisure class, all men must have both freedom and leisure. It is a different question whether this freedom and leisure will also be humane and creative, a question that can’t be handled by technology, even as classical creativity was not occasioned by slavery.

One unmistakable characteristic of the new freedom and leisure is that they are neither of them esthetic or moral categories; in fact, they are not two different objectives but one: it is freedom from production and leisure for consumption; not productive leisure nor consuming freedom; it is the servitude of sated senses. By substituting explanation for justification and divorcing mechanism from teleology, by mistaking the mechanical part for the ultimate whole and by experimentation replicating with no restraint freaks of analogues of the part (to invent immoderate artifices out of them that can turn the whole fatal to mankind), science has radically secularised human thought and emotion and subverted the philosophic vision of traditional cosmology or natural law. And in so doing it has reduced itself *ad absurdum* to the cult of anthropocentrism or the self-centred collectivism of Man as the frame of reference of man. It is a paradox of humanism however that it cannot be anthropocentric. By writing himself large man can never hope to find the moral sovereignty that he necessarily lacks in himself. The negation of natural law would only compel the diabolic alternative of inverting the continuum and running nature on the reverse gear by the counter-process of a bare life with a biological flourish, whose entelechy is Mephistophelean. If man would not be moral, he must perforce be technical; it is a literal *deus ex machina* that must be his ersatz sovereign now. Technolatry may indeed be the new religion and custom, with a new magic and mythology (not to speak of technocratic hieratism) that will threaten to enslave man. The new slavery shall be universal.”⁵⁸ Gotten the long spoon at last!

114. HONEST INTELLIGENCE AND NON-IDENTITY

Many questions are often raised about vichaara, its nature and mode, its efficacy and suitability. Can Inquiry help in realizing the essential falsity of the Ego; is it not just a sort of intellectual exercise? Maybe, it helps us out of the ‘I’ and ‘mine’ at the conscious level, but won’t they still be lurking

tenaciously at the deeper levels? The mind is such a maze of hidden feelings, sensations, drives, complexes and what not? Won't some meditation like, say, *Vipassana*, help us more effectively?

Before we seek to answer these and other questions, so often posed, let us, first and foremost, grasp -- and grasp with earnest passion -- what it is to inquire into the Self. Be sure you take nothing for granted, nothing at all, not yourself too nor indeed the presumed Self. Leave alone the conscious, subconscious and the unconscious and a hundred other categories people talk about. The only thing you seem to know is that 'you' are. And what are 'you'? Please look at it, for the Truth of it, if there is any, not because you have learnt from somebody it could give you liberation, freedom from the cycle of rebirths and all that. Look at yourself *without any motivation* whatever -- with a passion for Truth -- and this is terribly important. Since everything around you and you too are impermanent and whatever happiness you manage to snatch is but fleeting, you seek permanence both for yourself and for your happiness and postulate Truth as Permanent, Eternal Happiness. In any case you will pass away and it gives you great solace that you won't be, only to become *That*. Falsity though must subsume both the transient and the permanent, which are only conceptual polar complements.

Most inquiry would seem to fail because it is so deeply motivated; probing your identities or watching your mind, you react to the inquiry itself, to what you watch and begin to control your mind to change it. You take to inquiry because you happen to be so frustrated, jealous, angry and depressed, because your mind is so agitated, in great agony and anguish. (Arjuna's yoga is *vishaada*.) If your pursuits and activities, ideals and endeavours, made you happy, you may not bother about liberation at all. The real motive of your alleged inquiry is this happiness, not Truth as such. If Truth made you unhappy and untruth happy, you may not go any where near Truth or contemplate inquiry. People around tell you that if you had spiritual freedom you could get out of your sad predicament and you seek freedom accordingly. So it honestly becomes freedom *for* you, not the real freedom *from* yourself, as Nisargadatta Maharaj so happily puts it.

If you took to inquiry, on the contrary, to get at Truth, for the sake, not of yourself but of Truth, because you seek Truth for its own sake you are totally unmotivated and that is freedom -- freedom from all motivation. You are then, that very moment, overtaken by *utter honest intelligence*, which lays bare the entire 'I' -- the *persona* -- the inexorable, opaque, mask of a maze of identity upon identity, all of them unspeakably false and inextricably built around the Ego. When you see this with intense intensity, realize it with utter clarity for what it is, the whole made-up psychic edifice of *bhaava* comes crashing down,

to collapse *unsolicited* -- *without your having to do anything about it*. And all the conscious, subconscious and unconscious of the torture chamber called the mind no longer plagues 'you' once 'you' are dead and personality is burnt out. The probe into identities demands utter honest intelligence to really dive to their very root. Otherwise, it would get bogged down to a wearisome, Sisyphean, process of bringing up one identity after another without end. One may shift the accent from the mind to bodily sensations, but if the sensations pulsate from the deep recesses of the body they are still felt only in the twilight of consciousness. The body and mind are the polar ends of the spectrum of consciousness spanned by the panchakoshas, from the ultra-violet to the infra-red of the psycho-physical complex, from the subtle subliminal to the gross material vectors of the gamut of human sensorium or perception. If the inquiry is unmotivated -- and this can't be overemphasized -- and the 'I' identity is scooped out, not only the mind, its thoughts and feelings, but the body and all its sensations get delinked, set aside. The body may have sensations and the mind thoughts and feelings but they are no longer *your* mind and body. Gnyaana is *unlearning* bhaava, it is purgation -- and the fulfilment of unlearning is *neither theism nor atheism*. It is not the absence of thoughts and feelings or sensations that makes for Gnyaana but only the realization of the falsity of reaction and identity, which gives the freedom from them all. The mere absence of identity that is circumstantial, say, from a handicap or even manolaya, is no Gnyaana. Old age, for instance, may blunt bodily sensations and brain or nervous disorders can obliterate them; old age again may enfeeble the mind and its faculties, resulting in a mere passivity. And in Gnyaana the delinking from the mind and the body comes about not because the mind and body are impermanent but because the identity with them has been snapped. They would not be less false were they more permanent.

When the mind is delinked the true inwardness of the psyche is released from the vise of the senses, from the mind's exterior polarized process of the subjective reaching out to the objective. The inner matrix of Awareness, (Nivrtti/Pratiprasava/Anamnesis), the impersonal Infinite, thus comes into its own, untrammelled by the exterior mind and its sense-driven polarities. Once there is detachment from the mind the whole complex of personality recedes from the matrix of Awareness, which is freed of 'you' when it is snapped, delinked, from the mind. The one detachment is detachment from the mind; 'you' become an impersonality, verily *Non-entity*, as *Yoga Vaasishtha*, the Brhanmahopanishad clinches it. Again, please understand 'your' phenomenal body and mind continue to be there, they are very much in the world, though not of it; they continue to function with *their* reactions, yet much as in a drama in a dream and there is no 'I' in them except in the very nebulous, ascriptive

sense on the diurnal plane. When the consuming fire of epistemic intelligence (Sophia) burns out all reaction, all identity, there is no phenomenal engagement any longer, no relationship, no doership, no *intrinsic* experience, and waking therefore is indeed no different from sushupti or sleep; you are simply untouched by experience, temporal or supernal (Asamveda / Sahajamukti / Turiyaateeta). It is Egolessness, unbroken and interminable, not the sort of feat for the nonce simulated by yogis and taantriks or the exultant manolaya of the J. Krishnamurti kind of a vacant mind waiting to be tenanted when ‘something’ or ‘other’ from the right or left enters it every now and then, causing a lapse into ecstatic, meditative, *experience* sans the observer and the observed. (You need the ‘other’ to sweep you into meditation; you are yourself not the ‘other’, and without ‘that’ the meditation does not take off. When all identity gets ‘nulled’ and the mind is irreparably delinked ‘you’ can’t be a vehicle or underlain abode of a Maitreya or Maitreyi or aught else that takes you over to ‘conduit’ any message from a beyond. Non-duality can’t rest on the meditative crutch of a yonder agency. And how can you fulminate for freedom when you are yourself yoked to the ‘other’?)

The observer and the observed may merge, leaving a trail of ‘non-dual’ experience. But there is no ‘one’ without two (the ‘other’ as against the ‘I’) and if the two are dead there is none, to wit, Non-entity, *non-experience*. Manolaya is ‘non-dual’ experience, manonaasa Non-experience. Everyone is lost in infinite Non-experience everyday in sleep, which motivated quest seems to dismiss without that searching probe which can flood it on to waking, but plump instead for one or other meretricious meditation. Gnyaana again is none of J.K.’s recurring renewal of the mind and brain, flowing out in a cascade of perception upon perception in life, from moment to moment, uninduced by memory and with no past or future to condition it. The brain cells may mutate and the brain may expand and new dimensions of perception and awareness may materialize and a bunch of extraneous high priests of science, physicists, biologists and psychologists, mouthing the right mystic lingo, may rush in, seeking to clinch the irrelevancies. Nevertheless, Gnyaana is none of these or other mutations or dimensions in human consciousness but the unperceived and unexperienced Source of all of them, which is yet out of their range. And it entails uncompromising, unyielding, honest intelligence to tear asunder the unnoticed curtain of human identity, to see through the essential human drag of the perceptual panorama haunting J.K. When the Source has absorbed you there is naught else, neither yourself. All the projected perceptions, new or old, memory-borne or memory-free, are swept aside, *unlearned*. Where pragnya is can bhaava be anywhere around? The ‘intelligence’ yielding perception after perception may be extraordinary, the

brain even rare and precious, but alas, yet not honest. And intelligence dishonest is phoney.

Aatma vichaara or the probe into Being is no intellectual inquiry; it is on the contrary an 'inquiry' into the intellect itself, the veracity of its inevitable polarities, and the entire emotional, subterranean mind, root and branch. It is a consuming search into the lurking identities, and the only means to it is *utter epistemic honesty* that is no conscious or unconscious victim of culture or tradition, custom or convention, or the norms, values, opinions or prejudices of one's own or others. There can be no such probe by poring over scriptures, books or critical comments, not excluding the present one. Nagarjuna's dialectic acrobatics and Sankara's logic and logomachy, with all their gymnastic display, can but whip up intellectual pastime for jaded minds, never take one to or take the place of the unsparing probe into identities -- which drop off as a result. Meditation, be it Heena -- or Mahaayaana, or sundry yogas and tantras, Hindu and non-Hindu, or bhajans and chants, that won't simply pierce bhaava or identity, can at best turn one saatvik, never into Non-entity or Sat. And if you probed bhaava, which is the purest meditation, you would need none of them. All Buddhist and much Hindu meditation is clearly hedonistic on the sly, motivated from beginning to end to freedom from sorrow (duhkha), their concern with Truth being quite incidental. Meditation is the Buddhist cup of tea, not inquiry into the 'I', into the root of identities and reactions. Even the attractive, refracted, Buddhism of J.K.'s, taking off as it does from the human burden of sorrow, can but yield a personate⁵⁹ freedom sub specie humanitatis, a freedom *for*, never the Nirguna, or Kaivalya, Non-entitative freedom *from* oneself. Only when the sway of bhaava, the dross of identity, is *unlearned*, 'purged', can there be the freedom of intelligence, the freedom from oneself.

II

Some people claim to have pursued inquiry for long and are none the better for it, seem nowhere nearer the Truth despite their valiant effort. The clarification so far attempted should suffice to meet the sorry plight of these seekers. Yet, the term 'inquiry' itself may be far from appropriate, suggestive as it is of a process of intellectual deliberation, inherently long drawn out, calling for much patience and no small striving. The secondary literature on it would seem to augment that impression, conjuring up an image of vichaara as an exercise in logic and reasoning, if fortified with a semblance of detachment. It has thus lent itself to become the butt of scores of bhakti enthusiasts, who would rather sob and saltate towards Truth, as though lachrymation were a surer path than ratiocination!

In the putative quest for Truth, no doubt, there is the role, on the questioning side of the threshold, of sweet and mellow elemental reason that is spontaneous and doesn't tarry to deliberate; it instantly switches on indwelling essential intelligence, serene and sublime. And the radiant intelligence (*Anaham*) doesn't have to think or feel to Know; it is Knowing that is Being as such and needs no organum whatever. It doesn't have to compute or contend, intuit or imagine or slide into the dubious depths of egocentric emotions. At the onset of this pure and simple Gnostic Intelligence, without the ploy of deliberative intellect or tripping emotion, entire root subjectivity is clean centrifuged out beyond retrieval. The mask is off at last, no longer there to play the rallying point, the siren voice of cumulating senses.

There is no world, no experience, apart from the mind and the mind, in all its ramifications, is the spectrum of the 'I' and the 'mine'. Only the veracity of this Ego has to be tested and all that is needed to do it is unpolluted intelligence -- no more. Realization is no dialectical feat; it calls for no tortuous intellection to see through the elaborate pantomime on the mental screen to reach the pristine, simple, Truth beyond it. For all the transcendental claims advanced by eager enthusiasts in its behalf Nagarjuna's dogged dialectics is but a grinding *intellectual* exercise -- surely misplaced. Any intellectual contention, even if it can't be countered is beside the point. It is not because every intellectual assertion can be refuted -- as a Nagarjuna has demonstrated -- and thus nothing can be asserted of Truth that the intellect is invalid. (Would he mutely abide by a hypothetical assertion that defied all dialectic?) It is no less invalid even if it is irrefutable. Rational proof is no evidence of Truth: Non-identity does not depend on whether an asseveration can be confuted or not. Indeed there can be no quest for Truth until one is able to steer clear of the intellect, and the entire mental apparatus no less -- not excluding the grand mystic emotions -- which are all the protean, even cryptic, forms of only the Ego, the one stumbling block to Nirvaana. And as Realization is based on no revelation it is tantamount to subverting its sovereignty to seek to clinch it, as Sankara does, by scriptural sanction and the twists and turns of verbal hermeneutics.

What one needs therefore is no pugilistic intellect that can moot in or mute out criticism nor a plangent, hysteric surge fabricating a hypnotic burlesque to pass for Truth but, on the contrary, the rare serene passion of utterly honest intelligence that can suffer no self-delusion, take nothing for granted in unmasking the entire sweep of the 'I' and the imaged identities that sustain it. There is no substitute or surrogate for this catharsis and it can't be tricked in by umpteen saadhanas. The honesty of intelligence, it must however be duly stressed, is by no means the mundane *moral* but sublime epistemic honesty

that is integral to the radiant *Gnostic* Intelligence of Being. The probe into identities must prove futile for want of this epistemic honesty, which may not be very evident or conscious. One tends, nearly always, to take oneself for granted and not many can draw a veritable self-portrait with all the warts. And so we have holy personages who can't cast off their blinkers and cross the confines of their sects, cults or denominations and the dogmas that invariably go with them. Many an identity is none too evident except to tough, profoundly alert, intelligence that can scoop out the psychic mine of images. When the Upanishads proclaim: "this Self is not attained by the pusillanimous," [see (16), *Notes and References*] it must be seen that cowardice and dishonesty go together.

Culture passes for nature and nature for sovereign Truth; anything beyond the surface is so seldom perceived. Custom and convention have so occluded our vision with heavy, if expedient, blinkers. And nature to us is no more than rude instincts and impulses -- *ur-nature* -- of brute dispensation. Most morality, it can't be gainsaid, is a smug swing suspended between unevolved nature and unregenerate culture. From such unevolved nature and unexamined, unfazed, culture we derive the prized canons of vaunted morality. It needs no small *epistemic* honesty, cognitive courage, to rise above the pugnacious push and pull of such a nature and culture. The common run of humans, creatures of circumstance, can hardly muster either the clarity or the courage to ignore or defy received norms and values and the cup of hemlock is ever set to meet a Socrates sticking his neck out. Plato thought the world should be rendered safe for philosophy but in the end it is poor philosophy that has been thoroughly tamed and turned safe for the world. (Saints in India have been venerated from a safe distance, though many of them did not have to return to the Cave -- never having left it!) Yet, need the trite imperatives of mundane living or even the fatal risk to illumine it stifle or negate one's search for Truth, its realization or propagation? One rare example of Nirvaana in Samsaara is Socrates himself, who did not have to jettison his family or city in the name of Truth; that the city however guillotined him is, for Truth no less for Socrates, neither here nor there. The *Apology* of Socrates is no defence of himself, of Socrates the person: unambiguously it is a vindication of Truth; on the surface it may look like Socrates was defending himself but really he is vindicating Truth alone. A thousand pities that much classical scholarship can't sense it.

Nothing external is such a real threat to honest intelligence as recoiling self-hypnosis -- and nothing aggrandizes self-hypnosis perhaps as occult thaumaturgy. Too often what passes for Self-inquiry is no more than a self-assured study of intellectual discourses, buttressed perhaps by some

intellectual self-analysis of one's mental outfit, waiting on cumulative intellection to deliver up the answer. But that surely retards the fruition of honest intelligence. The process of sensing or seeing all the imaged identities for what they are to steer past the 'mine' and the 'I' can never reckon or rest on time, if only there was the consuming passion for Truth, the invulnerable epistemic intelligence not to be fooled by one's own creeping dishonesties. It is as short and quick as *it is deep*, and the moment it sets in *nivrtti* takes a quantum leap to **Sat**. Time is a poor surrogate for the passion for Truth. Instances are not wanting when in the course of 'inquiry' (to return to the infamous word) one keeps taking stock of one's progress towards Truth, not realizing for a moment the shocking dishonesty of it! The moment one has to compute one's presumed progress, can there be any doubt one wants only freedom *for*, not *from*, oneself? The test of Truth is that you don't have to test it when it got you -- you won't be there to test it. It is not as though one progressed towards Truth day by day, inch by inch. One piercing look by tearing Gnostic Intelligence, one unwithholding dive into surging cognitive dissolution, and total Non-reaction, Non-identity, bursts in -- the *vichaara* is over and no predicate survives the dissolution of the subject and object. The death of identity (*cathartic Thanatos*) is the birth of Love: True Love is but the *visage* of Non-entity (*Kaivalya*). Though it can't be reasoned or emotioned, experienced or expressed, Truth is yet no unknowable nor nullity. Truth is *Soonya* only for being *Nirguna*, so *Poorna*. Only honest intelligence Knows and that Knowing is Being. The competence or capacity to make it to Truth can progress over a period of time and one had it for sure one fine day, but until that capacity were there, full-fledged, however nearer you were to the capacity itself, you would be none the closer to Truth. You may take up the great 'Who am 'I'?' quest as a daily chore, but until you had the honest intelligence equal to posing the question *it is not posed at all*, to wit, you can't delude yourself of any progress. And the day you had the veritable honest intelligence *IT* had you!

115. Animals communicate without talking. Can they talk without communicating? How distinctive, man, *Lamina*! Want to know Brahman? Go to the texts, there is your job. You must pore over the Texts and, of course, the *bhaashyas*, which unlock the Texts for you, the quest is there, got it? Make no mistake about it, listen and abide, no textitch, no Truth. *Nayamaatmaa pravachanena* ..., Truth is not attained by poring over the Texts? A clever ruse to put off the unwary! Why then did the Texts come to be? One guy went on arraigning gurus, for half a century and more; I am no teacher, he ranted to no end, yet went on trumpeting his 'non-teaching'

biblioclasm, and, by God, publishing every syllable he mouthed for fifty-odd years. But the end caught him pants down with his naked plea: preserve my teaching exactly as I gave it! Well, that is another story. The Upanishad is different, beyond reproach. The Upanishad may dismiss itself, can you and I do it? Dismiss it? Would your guru? And dismiss himself? Not that he loves Truth less. Every syllable in the Text is vital, how many syllables there are, how they go to make the words, how one word is spun and woven into another. It is no joke, one false step and you are tripped, your philosophy goes awry, maayaa takes over, Bum becomes Brahman! One preceptor read through the Texts and proclaimed that Brahman's eyes -- He had eyes, no imagery, the Text has to be gulped literally -- were like simian's bum, as red as the red-bummed simian's. And why not? *Kapyaasa*, hasn't the Text declared?⁶⁰ What else could it mean but monkey's nates? Can the Upanishad go wrong? Some simians had the reddest bums, he had seen them for sure. So Bum became Brahman, it would seem, well nigh three centuries, until the other preceptor descended (Peace be on him!) and declaimed: Brahman! Monkey's asshole? What hogwash! The drivel had addled his poor guru's head until, duly enlightened by him, the guru saw the shocking blasphemy of it and turned into his sishya. Hasn't the Lord unambiguously declared He is the finest of the best? Is monkey the best, its asshole its finest? Then God could dwell in shit even? So, Bum is Brahman? God, this is taking things too far! Couldn't guess *kapi* isn't *kapi* but *kam + pi*, signifying Lotus, truly divine, no fake, no bum-feigned? Could the Upanishad mean it and still be Upanishad? It contends *sarvam khalvidam ... Etadaatmyam idam...* All is Brahman? And the other text chimes in, *Eesaavaasyam idam* blah blah, God is everywhere? Oh no, not in piss, not in shit, nor where they come through. God is *visishta*!

In the beginning the word and in the end too -- Text, *texttwists*; word is God and Truth ! Silence *word*. Most noble and profitable invention, speech, avers Thomas Hobbes!

116. Q. *How is the desire for Gnyaana inappropriate? How can one attain Gnyaana without the desire for it?*
- A. Any desire arises for want of probing oneself and the desire for Gnyaana is no exception. All desire ceases naturally once it is really observed *who* it is that desires. Any desire can occasion the query, no less than the desire for Gnyaana. Indeed, a self-

conscious desire for Gnyaana may fail to inspire the query and actually promote specious self-hypnotism. Any earthier desire may then prove far superior.

Desire is reaction and reaction to it only further desire; the modality of the Ego alone changes -- even in the desire for Moksha. Mind you, *niraasaa* can be just another *aasaa* -- indeed counter-*aasaa*; it is then like *resolved* non-reaction.

117. Q. *Non-reaction may be all right as means; how can it be the end also?*

A. Why not? Non-reaction is only the *Sthitapragnyata* or *Asamveda* of *Nirguna*

118. Q. *Isn't vignyaana superior to Gnyaana?*

A. Yes, if tweedledum is superior to tweedledee. The proliferation of such categories is neither Gnyaana nor vignyaana. It only goes to prove 'the characteristic Indian love of categories' that Vincent Smith poked fun at in his *Early History of India*. Pure Gnyaana or Pragnyaana in its practical aspects has often been called vignyaana but, seriously speaking, it is a distinction without a difference. According to Svaami Ramakrishna it entails sticking to *Saguna* (why on earth do that?) even after attaining *Nirguna*. The Gnyaani's life, on the mental plane may seem to be *Saguna* but he has really no identity with 'his' mind. From Totapuri, Ramakrishna got his notion that non-duality was a matter of few techniques and rituals, a posture to be attained that could at best last a few weeks. And in picturing the Gnyaani as a rude ascetic, incapable of delight, torturing his soul and shunning humanity, Ramakrishna was smugly mistaken. There is, again, the comic contention that *vignyaana* is to transcend both Gnyaana and agnyaana! Why then stop with that? Why not transcend vignyaana too and happily slide into infinite regress?

119.1 Q. *Aren't many of the formulations even in this book quite intellectual?*

A. The intellection is only apparent. *Asamveda* offers no concepts, no categories, builds no system. Intellection is learning but *asamveda* is all *unlearning*. It may be even said to be counter-intellectual since such self-examination of the intellect must lead

to its self-extinction. The intellect is turned inwards, back to its *Source*.

119.2 Q. *Aren't some passages about asamveda obscure and others contradictory?*

A. Quite so, and why not? If the habit of looking for mechanical consistency is shed and the subtleties of varying context carefully sensed, the obscurities and contradictions would become unreal.

120. Q. *How are One and None one?*

A. Why not? Soonya is Poorna and both are Nirguna. All qualities are finite; the want of quality is Soonya or Kaivalya and the want of it again is the Infinite or Poorna.

121. Q. *Isn't nishkaama karma an impossible figment?*

A. On the contrary; it is to live in the world without being of it; it is total participation with perfect non-involvement and non-identity. In short, it is *active* detachment.

122.1. Q. *Are sacred books like the Upanishads a help or hindrance?*

A. It depends. If you can listen to the truly sacred, say, to an *upanishad*, as it *talks* to you, realize *what actually* it points to, if you can live with it indeed, and *authenticate* your being then it must be no mean help. But if you just venerate it, mechanically memorize it or pedantically analyse it and depend upon the pretentious mediation of tiresome commentaries, it becomes a perverse hindrance. But then *you* make a *book* of it and the perversion is really yours; you can't blame it on the *upanishad*.

122.2. Truth, no doubt, is the essence of the genuine *Upanishads* but not a few of them must often take a pretty long time to articulate it; they must beat about the bush, skirt round the fringes, only to make the most cryptic or elliptic pronouncements, when least expected and in recondite contexts. They virtually seem to meditate in the twilight zone of riddling mythology, of dense mystic symbolism, oblique and obscure legend and allusion,⁶¹ which hypnotize the unwary and tend to masquerade as Truth.

- 122.3. The symbolism of the *Upanishads* has obviously a studied purpose. It is meant to communicate only to those who have the undoubted fitness/ sanction (adhikaara) for the real message and to put off the scent or distract all the rest.⁶² Many an aacharya has dissipated himself by tortured textual hermeneutics, pedantic reification of myth and symbol, missing the hidden message. No wonder they are all barking up the wrong tree. One is enticed by these unaachaaryas and their cults only when one has no adhikaara for the message.
- 122.4. Vedaanta is so-called not because it occurs towards the end of the Vedas; it occurs towards the end of the Vedas because it is the End of the Vedas: Vedaanta.
123. Q. *How can one progress from form to formless?...*
- A. Why seek or attain form or the formless or 'progress' from one to the other? Truth or God is as much both form and formless as neither. It is because you have form firmly in your mind you postulate its opposite, the form-less. Both form and formless exist only for the Ego and without it there is neither. *God as formless is as false or true as God as form.*
- 123.2. Q. *If name-cum-form (naamaroopa) is maayaa, the nameless, formless, must be satya....*
- A. If name and form aren't real does it follow the nameless or formless is? The formless is only the counterfoil of form; it too is just thought, image -- activity of the mind -- no less than form. And as counter-form the formless is as limited, as false -- a linguistic subterfuge.
- 123.3. When a devotee complained to Ramana, "people scoff at me, calling me a superstitious idolator," Maharshi told him, "why don't you retort by calling them worse idolators? For don't they wash, dress embellish, feed and thus worship their body so many times a day? Is not the body the biggest idol? Then who isn't an idol worshipper?"⁶³
124. Q. *Isn't the Ego just a conceptual term? And aatman a mere invention as J. Krishnamurti insists? What is the point of all these terms and categories?*
- A. Of course, 'Ego' is just a term, only the Latin for 'I', but very handy to signify the root 'I' -- thought. If terms like 'I' and 'you'

may be used, why not 'Ego'? Even 'Brahman' and 'Awareness' for that matter are but labels occasioned by communication. Aatman or Self is only another term for Awareness without 'I'. Is Awareness concoction?

125. Q. *Aren't norms and values just man's own invention? Have they any basis at all?*
- A. Life indeed is a profound 'game' but you can play any game only if you observed the rules. "We are the makers of manners" of course. Yet so long as the doer or actor in you is there, you may change the rules -- only to come under new rules. You may respect a rule or choose to violate it, but either way every action has consequences for the actor.
- 126.1. Q. *If Awareness or Knowledge is beyond meaning, isn't it like the existential absurd?*
- A. The absurd is only the reverse of the coin of meaning. The meaningless as absurd becomes counter-meaning. Both are reactions and so agnyaana. All meaning is man-made; when you need meaning and seek to impose it but can't do so you experience the absurd, which is only -- the reverse -- what makes no meaning to you.
- 126.2. Q. *Doesn't existence precede essence?*
- A. All these are sterile, scholastic, dichotomies. Neither precedes the other; only the Ego precedes them both!
127. Q. *What I seek is Moksha, but non-reaction makes no sense to me.*
- A. How can it? Your wanting Moksha is only a reaction. Don't you see that 'I want Moksha' is a total contradiction? So long as there is the 'I', even to want Moksha, there can be no Moksha. When you want Moksha you really want your 'I' -- the 'I' wants to keep the cake and eat it too. Moksha is when there is no 'I' to want Moksha. *Enakku mokshamedu, Mokshattil enakkedu? Naanil meikkadavul.*⁶⁴ Egotism dupes man in the subtlest ways. There is the cryptic Egotism of Jadabharata in the *Bhaagavata* story. He too wanted Moksha, yet his fondness for a deer is said to have frustrated his fond hope of Moksha. But fear of attachment is poor detachment, and the Egotistic itch for Moksha

itself neither he nor the *Bhaagavata* would notice! Mumukshutva is reaction and to realize it so ends it -- the end is Moksha.

128. Q. *Ramana Maharshi didn't find anything contradictory in one's wanting Moksha.*
- A. So what? Please look at the problem direct and judge it yourself. He implied the contradiction, otherwise he wouldn't have insisted on finding out the 'I' that wanted it.
129. Q. *What is the point in quoting? Isn't quoting such a servile practice? Doesn't it betray want of originality, even trying to shine in borrowed feathers?*
- A. Truth has no origin or author. There is no copyright about it and quoting or not makes no difference. Without a sense of authorship how is a statement one's own or another's? You are looking at the mere verbalization. Why not *listen to what* is said without bothering about *who* says it? ...Every Gnyaani is original -- he speaks from the *Source*.
130. Q. *I know I am ignorant but how does it help me to end my ignorance?*
- A. You say you are ignorant; why not probe that ignorance? Not because you *want* Liberation -- there is no volition in intelligence; indeed the *wanting* is the 'you' or ignorance. It is the nature and function of intelligence to Know. *Intensely look at yourself*: your identities, relationships, reactions : your entire behaviour -- external and internal; look at the root of them all -- that is the only tapas or meditation, ekaagrata or concentration, as you may call it. The fruition of this tapas is the dissolution of the Ego (manonaasa), which alone is Samaadhi, Shaanti, or -- Mouna. Then there is no more ignorance to know and so the ignorance and the knowledge as well as the *you* of either cease completely. This is Gnyaana that is Nirguna, which again are appellations.
131. Q. *... It is my misfortune that I find 'who am I?' unanswerable...*
- A. Why should you find it unanswerable? 'Knowledge' is indeed freedom from culture, from *all* the identities learnt from that vast prison house -- culture. All, *all* identities are false and culture builds them all upon the root identity -- the 'I'. Culture which

makes for vyaavahaarika -- is thus part of ignorance or illusion. When culture is *unlearned*, the Liberation lays bare the 'I', the naked 'I', and helps to dissolve it.

In looking upon yourself as unfortunate because you find 'who am I?' unanswerable, you are only reacting to your condition, which may even serve to aggravate it. One is responsible for one's ignorance because one always has the freedom for Knowledge, which is total absence of reaction. Since reaction is ignorance, reaction to ignorance, as a further reaction, is only added ignorance. This further reaction is born of the *anticipatory ideal* of Knowledge that the Ego has set for itself.

132. Q. ... increasingly I am coming to feel some snag also in the process of non-reaction. Freedom from identity might leave you with a negative conclusion, which it has done, for example, in the case of Sartre. In the "Nausea", Roquetin, after putting the same question, 'who am I?', came to the conclusion, 'I am nothing'. I suppose the further step of affirmation must spring from samskaara.

A. Something has gone awry when you write, "Freedom from identity might leave you with a negative conclusion..." Sartre's 'inquiry' is heavy-handed, single-track, intellectualism. The ersatz 'who am I' he flings has no semblance at all to the question posed by Socrates or Ramana, which probes Awareness to the very depths -- to the Source. Secondly, total non-reaction, which is total non-identity, leaves no 'you' much less a 'conclusion', negative or positive: there is no 'I' to proclaim 'I know nothing'. Can 'nothing' say, 'I am nothing'? If not, who or what is the 'I' that says 'I am nothing'? Look at that *Source*. Indeed there is nothing beyond no further step of affirmation: there is nothing further to affirm or negate, no samskaara to wait on. Non-reaction is a singular case of upeya being upaaya as well. The 'I' is the first identity and so long as it remains, non-identity is far from complete. It is this residual 'I' that leaves you with a 'negative conclusion'.

It is only the Ego that has to ask 'who am I?' and when the Ego *perishes* the question of identity doesn't arise at all. '*Aham Brahmaasmi*'⁶⁵ again is only an asseveration of the Ego. So called Brahman doesn't have to seek or assert any identity. If *real total* non-reaction is the 'upaaya', it 'obverses' itself into the

‘upeya’ and no samskaara can delay, defy, frustrate or survive it. If this sounds negative, that is the handicap of all language and communication, which can’t opt out of the reactive frame. If you contend this is ‘nothing’ or ‘nothingness’, once again it is the Ego that protests, which is only a reaction. When the Ego is gone there is no problem (for the Ego is the *one* problem) or solution, no pursuit or conclusion. This alone is Shaanti -- or Mouna, which is no ritual practice of verbal silence. The Upanishads speak only of this Awareness but the Awareness needs no Upanishads.

133. The best of *saadhanas*, methods or techniques can at best take you only to sattva, not to **Sat**, but shuddhasattva can still point to **Sat**.
134. Q. *What is the right path to Truth -- Gnyaana, Bhakti or Karma?*
- A. The negation of falsity is Truth, the dissolution of ignorance Gnosis, thus Truth is the true path to Itself, call It what you like, Gnyaana, Bhakti, Karma or by any other name you have the ingenuity to invent. Reality knows no such distinctions, no such appellations, and so they are all equally unreal.
135. Q. *Ramakrshna Paramahamsa has prescribed Bhakti, since, according to him, nothing is easier than surrendering and becoming servant...*
- A. Call it what you like, whatever you do to end falsity must mean abandoning yourself to Reality, which entails surrender of the Ego, its dissolution. ...Holiness is Whole -- fusion; the Ego is identity, which is fission, fragmentation. Nirvaana is the healing of this fission, this unholiness. Duality proceeds from breach of Truth, the cracked psyche (chidaabhaasa) with its imperative imaging mood (bhaavamaayaa) spawning vain experience on its phoney odyssey. ...Humility is no less an image or mood than vanity, though as dualities go, humility may be the purer for its genuflection. ... Ramakrshna insists that for the pure joy of service⁶⁶ one retains the daasa bhaava, servant Ego, that you must taste sugar to enjoy its sweetness. (Without bhaava -- as if -- there is no esthetic sense) But does tasting sweet make you sweet? Being sweet sugar itself seems to be under no such compulsion, to have no such itch. **Being begins where bhaava ends.**

136. Q. *Why be so critical of Zen?*
- A. No, certainly not, you are quite mistaken ... Only you shouldn't confound Zen with the zen mystique, the zen regimen, zen cult. The Buddha was a big fool ! He knew no Zen martial art, no Zen archery. Did he know one koan? How could he be a Zen Master? Sorry, he would never make it!
- 137.1. "What is the real message of the *Euthyphro*?," a young man reading it was asked. "Why, of course, it exposes conventional certitude, received rectitude," he averred. True enough, but deeper still, reader dear, don't you see that the *Euthyphro* is addressed to the Euthyphro in you?
- 137.2. Q. *Supposing there is a vicious villain -- how should I deal with him?*
- A. **Supposing you were that villain -- how would you deal with yourself?**
- 137.3. Q. *-- There is so much conflict and violence amidst humans; there seems to be no end to human misery and suffering. If God is, won't God intervene to save humanity?*
- A. Everyday millions of ants are savagely warring against millions of termites. Why won't God intervene? And why wouldn't you ask why God doesn't? Humans slaughtered millions of bisons in North America, thousands of elephants, rhinos in Africa and tigers in India and have desertified vast stretches of dense evergreen forests. Did God intervene to save them? Who knows what is happening in all the rest of the infinite universe? Are humans that privileged to be a special concern of God's?
138. Q. *It is my firm belief that Christianity is the only effective answer to all our ills. ... it is the only religion of love. ...*
- A. Boundless and Infinite is Love, Compassion, Grace: unconditional, unmotivated, even unilateral -- indiscriminate. And the message of Love is indeed Eternal; it had to wait for no particular prophet or personage to find its Being. It is the true message of the *Upanishads* and the *Tao Te Ching*, of Buddha, of Jaina *Jeevakarunya*, of the famed Tamil *Anbay Sivam*, of Socrates and of the Sufis no less than Christ. ... And Non-

identity or True Love is that trans-fusion where there is no *other* to be loved. ... How much of your own evangelical service and charity is honestly unmotivated, born of Pure Love? Do probe that question please and search your own heart first. Therein lies the answer to all our ills.

139. Q. *I am afraid you seem quite evasive a little too often... It seems you must answer yes and no to fundamental questions...*
A. Sure; why to this question too whether the answer is yes and no the answer again is yes and no... Non-identity, beyond all dualities, isn't yet negative-identity even. Truth is neither transcendent nor immanent, neither negative nor positive, neither atheistic nor theistic. *Neti Neti Neti*.
- 140.1. Look at the Source of your doubt; that Primeval Awareness is not form or formless, nature or supernature, being or becoming, maayaa, soonya or satya. It is neither transcendent nor immanent.⁶⁷ Hence the utter futility of all mental faculties -- the intellect, emotion, imagination and intuition.
- 140.2. The negation of falsity is Truth, the dissolution of ignorance Gnosis, to Know is but to *unlearn*. **Being begins where bhaava ends.**
- 140.3. Total non-reaction, non-identity, alone can yield True Religion -- of Love, Compassion, Grace, of unfragmented Being, Awareness (and Action) -- which entails neither tradition nor revolution.
- 140.4. Non-identity, or True Love is that trans-fusion where there is no *other* to be loved.
- 141.1. Wisdom is madness to the worldlywise, madness neither worldly nor wise.
- 141.2. Culture and civilization are sandwiched between the savage and the sage, the savage is anterior, sage posterior to them. History is the chiming of Eternity sporting time. "Before Abraham was I am."
- 141.3. Living is the unfolding of Truth. The state and society, intrinsic to the good life, are extraneous to True Living.
142. Speaking the Truth and being honest and upright -- the practice of integrity -- however laudable, may not yet be confounded with the

consuming search for Truth, for the Whole Source of Awareness and the resulting dissolution of me and mine -- the mind -- in the Infinite. That True Living, which is acting without agency, beyond the dualism of good and evil, right and wrong, must elude the conscious practice of conditioned integrity. Verily, it is Virtue -- Wisdom -- without volition, which may not always oblige the do's and don'ts of moral codes. True Integrity knows no *disintegration* into duality; it isn't just the complacent unity of thought, word and deed; satya or sattva is no Sat.⁶⁸

- 143.1. Not only pleasures, pains too are ephemeral.
- 143.2. If birth is possible, why not rebirth?
- 143.3. Joy and sorrow, the stuff of common life, become yoga, union with God; so does death, marana yoga; life and death but differ in style.
- 144.1. Man is a sinning animal. Beware! the best and the worst elements possess you -- be they conscious or unconscious, manifest or latent. The angelic and the diabolic, the poetic and the pedestrian, sublime and ridiculous, noble and mean, beautiful and ugly -- they constitute your very being. You are the sage and the savage, saint and sinner, sane and lunatic, genius and dunderhead -- Jesus and Judas! Of what crime, sin or vice are you incapable? The whole course of history is one's autobiography.
- 144.2. Why are you not Buddha? Because verily you are Maara! Why are you not Socrates? Because you are Anytus and Meletus! And why are you not Jesus? Because you are indeed Judas! Vice's name is *thyself*.
- 145.1. What is the infinity of learning but the infinity of ignorance? Infinite is ignorance, so no limit to learning.
- 145.2. "Empty eyeballs knew
That knowledge increases unreality, that
Mirror on mirror mirrored is all the show."⁶⁹
- 145.3. Art is long, yet no longer than life.
146. The poet manifests a semblance of Nirvaana, the Gnyaani a semblance of ego. When a Gnyaani turns poetic mimesis operates in

the reverse -- as though God imitated man. *Gnyaani kanindu kavi paadugiraan*.⁷⁰ -- True music is the sound of silence.

147. "If it be true that God is a circle whose centre is everywhere, the saint goes to the centre, the poet and the artist to the ring where everything comes round again. The poet must not seek for what is still and fixed, for that has no life for him...but be content to find his pleasure in all that is for ever passing away that it may come again...in whatever is most fleeting, most impassioned, as it were for its own perfection, most eager to return in its glory. Yet perhaps he must endure the impermanent a little, for these things return, but not wholly, for no two faces are alike, and, it may be, had we more learned eyes, no two flowers. Is it that all things are made by the struggle of the individual and the world of the unchanging and returning, and that the saint and the poet are over all, and that the poet has made his home in the serpent's mouth?"⁷¹

148.1. 'How could a great dramatist be identified with his characters?', it is often asked, and the answer is again yes and no. None of his characters is Shakespeare himself and yet he is all of them at once. They all seem to step out of the intense expanse of his psyche -- hero, villain, fool, princes and prelates, courtiers to gravediggers; Othello, Desdemona and Iago; Ariel, Prospero and Caliban; Puck and Bottom, Caesar and Cinna, Lear or Lady Macbeth, Portia as well as Shylock, Hamlet no less than Falstaff. Verily the infinite psyche of Shakespeare is their original theatre. (Can a Tolstoy fathom the Virtue of this colossal Knowledge?)

148.2. REALITY, RHETORIC AND MORALITY

No one can deny that higher rhetoric has been an essential part of poetic apprehension (Plato and Aristotle were not unaware of it) or that it is the more persuasive for being higher. There is enough of it in Shakespeare, though his egoless empathy can dissolve any personal bias. "...the truest poetry is the most feigning..."⁷² This is the mimesis or empathy (catharsis is only a variation of it) one finds in Homer or Chaucer, the poetic faculty of which Keats says: "... it is not itself -- it has no self -- it is everything and nothing -- it has no character... it has as much delight in conceiving an Iago as an Imogen. What shocks the virtuous philosopher, delights theameleon Poet...he has no identity -- he is continually in for -- and filling some other Body." (The narrative mode isn't too obliging in helping the Ego out.) But

with verily a Shakespearean awareness Burke can still be partisan: he is dealing with the pitiless world of fact, not pliant fancy. Every reader knows that Burke is canvassing a cause, and reads him for his stupendous and unfailing Godly vision of man and society, which the heat of passionate contention articulates. It is some grave crisis in politics or civilization that calls forth his searching rhetoric and it is nearly always sublimed by the unyielding divine hold on his grand vision. Burke is a rare example of both reason and rhetoric modestly but acutely waiting on exalted imagination...

All art, of course, is at bottom philosophic in the sense that it points to the ultimate metaphysical Source, but art is not therefore the handmaid of philosophy. In the pursuit of imaginative contemplation the many strands of awareness hold an endless converse, which can add up to a philosophy when rationally comprehended. But the imagination doesn't contemplate to oblige rational comprehension. As the source of esthetic sensibility the veil or kosa of *aanandamaya* enjoys a virtual vantage of haunting -- if fleeting -- images of the Self or Awareness, which may explain the dim, evanescent, mystic intimations of poetic imagination -- *as though* it had attained the *Nirguna* of *Nirvaana* -- and this is the true mimesis of all unmotivated poesy. So poetry can mimic the Ultimate, as they call It, and Beauty, let us at once grant, is but Truth mimicked or *formed*. (The formless isn't therefore Truth but only another mode of imitation.) If art thus represents a yonder wavelength, it must without doubt be morally autonomous, which is to say, it has a morality all its own, sanctioned, so to speak, by the conscience of the imagination. Excellence is esthetic and there can be no morality independent of it; this is the sovereignty of true art and it would be regressive, indeed barbarous, to yoke it to a subesthetic morality. Charles Williams, sensitizing Mathew Arnold's rather myopic perception of poetry as the criticism of life, invokes the poetic application of ideas to life, which "creates something with a new life of its own. The application of that life to ours is something profounder than the deduction of a moral or philosophical idea. It is the entering through the senses and through the mind of another existence."⁷³

- 149.1. Mimesis or empathy is the poetic faculty of allness by which the Ego, as though egoless in the *saguna* state, enters into any experience, not originally its own. Yet mimesis is only the poetic flux of shifting identity -- *ersatz* Ego -- never non-identity. *Bhaava* is never *Being*.
- 149.2. What is genius but shining ignorance -- mere tinsel of the Ego? Can genius attain a semblance of the Knowing-Being or brilliance of mind yield the True Awareness of a *Gnyaani*? ...Artistic or intellectual genius is no more than trivial expertise in the murky cave

of maayaa, a shallow glow worm whose faint flicker can, among the purblind cavemen, pass even for numinous luminosity! The vanity of reason and imagination!

- 150.1. Literature presupposes freedom and inequality -- freedom to write and inequality to write about.
- 150.2. Obscurity is no virtue, yet great literature can be obscure; an anxiety to be understood seldom produces great literature.
- 150.3. Great minds have a plenitude of keen, subtle, niceties of understanding. (Maria Rossetti speaks of the prismatic ambiguity of Dante). But their multitudinous comprehension and versatile clarity is often mistaken for obscurity and inconsistency.
- 150.4. "The old Ionian philosopher, Heraclitus, wrote most obscurely; ancient Indian sages too are not easy to understand. It is the nature of such books and themes to be obscure, dark and riddling. From the earliest times certain kinds of knowledge have remained esoteric because their pursuit was too arduous to be popular. Most people lack the patience to understand and the subtlety to follow a great mind."⁷⁴
151. Can anything individual be defined? Let any definer define himself first. If he can't pack himself up in a definition how dare he assume anything else can be?
152. James Mill had no doubt (so we learn from John Stuart) that were he God he would have created a far better world. (So had said King Alfonso of Castille in a pardonable context and according to an anecdote; so too Vivekananda as young Naren.)⁷⁵ Better of course as he understood it, with which God who isn't James Mill may disagree.
153. Better be a Socrates dissatisfied than a swine satisfied, asserts John Stuart Mill -- how obviously satisfied! Better for whom, man or swine? Sauce for the goose isn't sauce for the gander. Both Socrates and swine may choose to confute the smug anthropomorphism of the 'saint of rationalism'.
154. The Egotism of justifying the ways of God to man!
155. Where does being end and consciousness begin? *Pace* Marx. Is being unconscious or consciousness non-being?

156. Would a psychologist or a sociologist applied his perspectives and methods to himself! He hardly seems to realize that he is purveying them only to others. He knows his fellow men as objects but doesn't know himself so. And in not knowing himself he doesn't know even one subject. What a sight to see one of them in tension or frustration! A student of stress or strain in others, he can't observe himself in that condition!
157. Q. *...Is there no way out of the conflicts and chaos in human life? How can the spirit triumph over matter?...*
- A. ...Matter and spirit and the chasm or conflict between them are all only in the mind. Why adore the spirit alone? Matter is innocent; matter is Eternal -- neither created nor destroyed.

158. SATTVA-PREMA

... All one's living can be very *Saatvik*, indeed it can even reach the rare plane of *Shuddha Sattva*; even sex, the putative source of most sin, can be purely *Saatvik* and one could then learn neither to indulge nor to shun or to suppress it. (It is quite another thing naturally to transcend the plane of sex-inclusive love.) Poor Vaatsyaayana, if one recalls him right, seems none too aware of this dimension of the relationship between man and woman. And Gandhi too missed it by light years when he chose to condemn sex outright, and taking the cue from brute life, underscored its purpose as mere procreation; equally the uninhibited Rajneesh, who sold dazed frenzy for the bliss of ecstasy. And had Freud, the speliologist of lust, ever known Love would he have maneuvered the libido or hawked it? No, the sole burden of conjugal union should be pure, unalloyed Love -- even if Nature's cunning may have designed it for procreation -- and then sex would be wholly incidental, with little lust in it; inspired entirely by *Prema*, sex, to wit sex without *Kaama*, becomes a fringe physical extension of Love, eventuating most naturally when it does. It is ruffian lust⁷⁶ that leaves one sapped and exhausted, enervated, even depressed after sex. 'The expense of spirit in a waste of shame'. Lusty sex by mutual consent is mutual rape: sorry, even procreation cannot legitimize it -- *pace* Gandhi. The truest orgasm, not the lusty counterfeit, but the spontaneous, intense *Saatvik* ecstasy that goes with the imperative, bilateral, peaked-up pinnacle of two-in one fusion is the unmaneuvered fruition of lust-free Love or *maithuna yoga*: and the more *Saatvik* the union the more human and ethereal the communion. It entails no arcane invocations or rituals, no rude, *taantrik* or esoteric initiations or propitiations; neither does it presuppose any hypnotizing inducement or indoctrinated regimen, much less any tenacious or

tricky techniques to whip the *kundalini* up literally. Indeed it precludes all of them, resting as it does indubitably on the transparent esthetic effulgence of sweet, mellow, serene Love, uncalculating and incalculable. Love here is the one sure, unfailing means and the one grand Sublime End. Love and lust are always inversely related, they always exclude each other. It is lust rather than sex that must be conquered and without lust sex would never be the compulsive concomitant of Love. And whatever sex that may incidentally follow Love, union included, would be saturated with *Sattva*, elevating it indeed into a holy communion: when Love is in full bloom, the blossomed awareness fuses a pure, lust-free psycho-physical communion. Inspired by wholesome *Prema*, sex is no longer dominant or compulsive, never the driving motive force of conjugal life. Only that heightened, total communion in Love -- as in Ahalya and Indra in the *Yoga Vaasishtha* / Gopis and Kṛṣṇa in the *Geeta Govindam* and *Sreemad Bhaagavatam* -- can ever render sex sacred, transforming it verily into *anagha*, yes, *aghaghna*. And that communion alone can lead to a truly happy matrimony, with no disharmony in it, *whatever*. Marriage is a golden opportunity to develop the precious faculty of consuming *Saatvik* Love. Such intensely focussed Love can indeed evolve further, broaden, expand to become Universal Love. (Bless thine enemy, O Noble Heart! -- Bharati) This is the burden of *grhasthaashrama* -- none else. True Love always only gives, needs nothing to receive; as in conjugal *Sattva-Prema* either spouse always gives and gives up oneself, is lost in the other, but needs nothing whatever to receive: either gives up oneself to the other and neither is there -- That undividable, incorporate⁷⁷ -- when Love is all, as in the Phoenix and the Turtle. Brute sensual lust is swept off by ethereal sensuous love, by the alchemy of chaste wedlock. Only such marriages are made in heaven; the rest are earthy and turn into hell. How apt is Montaigne: "That so few marriages are successful only proves the excellence of marriage!"

One may earnestly think about all this with what honest intelligence one can muster. It is articulated here as one may not come across this kind of elucidation in the books one may avidly acquire and accumulate (In response to a letter from a couple).

159. Tenko-San, no doubt, is a great soul and his book⁷⁸ is the modern gospel of Karma yoga. Yet, the *sevaa* he enjoins is not wholly unmotivated. The service you do, for all its unrelenting dedication, is propelled by your necessity to cleanse yourself, by your urge to your own salvation.

160.1 Not a few are exercised over the dismal state of man, the bleak future of mankind, and invariably the desperate query is: "Can't there be a

politics of Peace? How can man be cleansed of the pollution of power and wealth?"

Not until the exercise of power is the expression of Truth, the embodiment of Service -- not of domination or exploitation. Really, not power, but man has to be tamed. Power and wealth don't corrupt, they are but the occasion. ("Power shows the man" -- Aristotle.) Power and wealth are corrupted by man, corruption is in the mind, the corruption of Awareness is the Ego. Matter is innocent, materialism is in man, not in matter. Only if mankind could see this honestly, unreservedly, would politics journey on from Egotism to Love.

160.2 POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Justice is the temporal translation, the social metamorphosis of Truth -- Eternity sporting Time. The quest for Truth takes to the search for Justice, the burden of political philosophy. **Socrates founded political philosophy by his life and proved it by his death.** Gnostic philosophy, Know Thyself, transposed, writ large becomes true political philosophy -- which is no exoteric exercise as fond textualists literally understand -- academics who can only read the lines, seldom dwell between them. The Polis Eternal brings forth its essential social extension, the Polis Royal, the just human order, whose end is the Supreme Good Life. Philosophy necessarily turns *political* when it strives to *examine life*, to probe and determine what by heaven is the *right* social order that can translate, extrapolate Truth, convert it into *Justice* and confirm it as the central sustenance of authentic community-living. In the arduous endeavour of adapting society to Truth, without in any way distorting Truth in the process, of motivating *one and all* of human beings to it, philosophy is transformed into Statesmanship.

Justice, to be wrought into the social fabric, *if at all*, demands the Sovereign Intelligence that can inspire Statesmanly vision and imagination, and, no less, a fund of common sense, coupled with the deft accommodative acumen of wholesome statecraft that is, in truth, resolute Soulcraft. Nothing short of such versatile, pragmatic endowment can help to steer clear of all the power-hungry pressures maneuvered by the wolfish appetites of the moment, purge the abysmal 'worm of unreason' in the ur-natural psyche. Only truest Justice can conserve the lasting concerns of human values against surging mushrooms of populism or insidious vested interests lurking to gang up to call the tune. And only a Statesman, who, with utmost caution and tolerant, patient restraint, seeks to evolve enduring conventions, wise and prudent, that keep reinforcing

Eternal Verities, may look forward to a tradition that can grow on with resilience, which yet Time alone can mature, defying the furtive cunning of the arrant whore.⁷⁹ “The true lawgiver ought to have a heart full of sensibility. He ought to love and respect his kind, and to *fear himself*.”⁸⁰

Michael Oakeshott may protest that leading the world is accomplished, not by the arduous of thought, but in the mental fog of practical experience, so what is farthest from our needs is that kings should be philosophers.⁸¹ But *True Ruling is altogether different* -- and it is no condescending paternalism either. True Ruling is the ripeness all of the Sovereign Royal Art, the obverse of wisdom in essence. No doubt it is not born of the arduous of abstract thought but neither is it spawned by just mind-befogging experience. The aim and endeavour of real Ruling is to search for the warp and weft of the permeation of Truth in the fabric of life, individual and communal, to authenticate all living by the mellow embodiment of Truth.

Such authentic living can seek or chase no course of progress, linear or otherwise. Neither can it hark back to a presumed point preceding a perceived downfall, a dreamt-up Golden Age, now lost in the brute march of history. There is therefore no scope for progress or regress, which sure enough, doesn't imply humanity shall take a headlong plunge into a blind alley of civil perdition. It is not that history is arrested or frozen, and it does not mean that it need be rolled back in a comic reversal. When Truth may inform life, history may no longer be predicable of humans, as man can opt out of the very frame of history. At long last Clio's unrelieved jeremiad may, one hopes, reach a grand finale.

The pursuit of *Wisdom* however is no pursuit of *thought*. On the contrary, it entails not only vision and imagination, but that Sovereign Intelligence again whose inner radiance alone can yield Awareness with the Whole Being, not just a part, be it the intellect or emotion. The Statesman must be the acknowledged legislator of the world -- the Gnostic in her/him the unacknowledged⁸² (“Where shall we find such a magician?” -- *Plato*) Wisdom rules without force or power: when sweet, mellow reason can replace coercion and in the lucid ambience people perchance muster all the vision to evolve into Peace and Love, one can hope for the grand inauguration of Transarchy, which is rule without ruler or ruled, **order without organization**.

**The mind is maayaa, where there is no mind there is no maayaa.
Out of the ashes of aham Anaham is born. Gnyaanamanaham.
Naayamaatmaa labhyaha aatmavicharaasya vichaarena.
Om Tat Sat Anaham.**

Here ends *Asamvedopanishad*, Part I

PART II
SHUDDHA SATTVOPANISHAD

PARITYAAGA SATYAAGRAHA

OPTING OUT ONLY WAY OUT

First edition: December 1984

Second edition: January 1990

Third edition: 2006

Fourth edition: 2009

Harikeshganga
(@ lulu.com)

To the Immortal
J. C. Kumarappa
Satish Chandra Dasgupta
Abdul Ghaffar (Badshah) Khan
and
the Mahaa Parityaaga Satyaagrahi
Irom Sharmila^{*}

^{*}Addition to the dedication in 2006

"Let him who would move the world move himself first."

Socrates

"We must become the change that we want to see in the world."

Gandhi

THERE IS AN URGENT NEED to renew and reinforce Gandhism, both the social philosophy and the movement. Yet, it can't be an exact replication of what Gandhi had said and done. There is no such thing as Gandhism, the Mahatma had said; and again he has remarked, even in so far as it may be there, it is evolving all the time. In fact, he has even added that his writings should be cremated with himself -- something only a great soul such as he could say but we common mortals can hardly afford to do.

Much water has flowed since Gandhi's death and the evil in man and government has gone to abysmal depths; the challenges we face today could hardly have been anticipated in the early fifties. Not that prophets were wanting but one never thought that doomsday would forestall us as it were. Man's inhumanity, in all its stupendous variety, which has been the dominant theme of human history, had well nourished itself on the unmitigated sway of barbarous inanities and the countless cruelties that clinched them under the tyrannous grip of brute, irrational custom, to which herds of unthinking humans had but meekly submitted. With the advent of reason the reign of purblind custom may seem to have receded from many areas of social life, but nevertheless inhumanity has surely found its diabolic minions in callous science and schadenfreudean technology, the formidable engines of maverick reason. What should Gandhians do to face the challenge of 1984? In short, what strategy should they adopt to seek to usher in the dawn of a new order of life on earth?

Gandhi challenged tyranny, injustice or exploitation, wherever it was and whatever its dimensions. Nothing could

cow down the phenomenal soul-force that he, and perhaps he alone, could muster. Satyaagraha is the priceless invention he has gifted to humanity. Until the advent of Gandhi, non-violence was looked upon as a virtue, a quality of moral excellence in the individual. It was of course well perceived that the community was only the individual writ large. Gandhi too never misses this point about the individual, the Archimedean base of his philosophy. And yet, even for the individual, as he would see it, non-violence is not just a quality of character, but a weapon to resist, to fight injustice and untruth, which constitutes Satyaagraha. It is a weapon again, not only of the individual but of the community and the nation, of the *mass*, no less than man. It was left to the genius of Gandhi to forge non-violence into such a mass weapon. Yet, Gandhism must spread to the means before the means could spread Gandhism. Satyaagraha presupposes moral elevation of an order that is hardly attainable in the *mass*, though, for all that Satyaagraha with him is a wholesome mass weapon.

Did Gandhi, one wonders, possess the supererogatory soul-force that could compensate for the otherwise insurmountable deficiencies of the mass of men that responded to him as one man? Charisma, one may choose to call it, but the term, hackneyed by modern social science, seems to explain little. It may be an uncommon power born of truth and non-violence, the very foundation of Gandhism. Yet what took him to the Source, I think, was his own intrinsic temperament of *aparigraha* and *lokseva*. It is appropriate thus the accent of Gandhians may not directly be on the metaphysical sanction of Truth or of Non-Violence so much as on the psychologic urge to *give up and serve -- tyagaa and sevaa* -- however feeble, tenuous and limited it may be. The psychology of love and compassion is closer to the human heart ('*Anbay Sivam*' as the Tamils put it), though Truth is the metaphysical Source and End of both, indeed of everything.

Be that as it may, Gandhi represents that elusive or inexplicable element that binds history and Providence and we can't hope for another Gandhi, at least not in the near future. Gandhism without Gandhi, one must confess, is verily like *Hamlet* without the prince of Denmark. As one observes

the scene, one can clearly see that none amidst us now has the singular combination of stature -- social, political, moral and spiritual. The last phase of Jayaprakash Narayan's life took a belated turn towards the historic role, yet snatched by death and no less by *vox populi* as his whetstone of truth he left behind but a hurried and unexamined redaction of Gandhism in the form of total revolution. And by the time one is able once again to get such an uncommon combination, man's inhumanity, particularly political oppression and economic exploitation, will have reached irreversible proportions. Must we then wait on the possible *avataar* of another super-man, remaining idle spectators in the meantime or can we attempt something tangible in our own humble way in an earnest effort to stem the mounting rot? What shape, what direction, must Gandhism take now in the circumstances?

The new Gandhian movement, it occurs to us, must seek not a political confrontation with the Establishment so much as an *opting out* of politics and the political dispensation. A political confrontation against authority, no doubt, can be effective, though not in all contingencies, and may in fact be relatively easier, assuming people had the soul-force, the moral courage it calls for. But the counter-force has to be no less political, perhaps even more and would entail a counter-organization and establishment, which would seek to *replace* that status quo. Gandhi by his *ekaagrata* had built up a stupendous organization in the Congress, which prior to him had not known the middle path between petitionary memorial and militant violence. But once freedom was won, while he had the singular detachment to sense the otiosity of the Congress, the organization itself had become independent of him, what with its own identities and interests, and had no qualms over ignoring his urgent plea that it give up the ghost. So the British raaj could easily be replaced by an Indian raaj that differs from its imperial predecessor only in race and colour.

In fighting injustice, dominance and corruption, what is now proposed is that we seek to evolve an *unstructured movement*, the sole aim and object of which would be the rejection of power and pelf, not so much by confronting or challenging them as by *actually* opting out of the *entire* social and political dispensation of power. It is an

outright, wholesale rejection in the sense that it will be an opting out of not only the evil *but the good* as well in the status quo. And so the votaries of the renewed and reinforced Gandhian movement will not depend on the modern framework in any walk of their life, individual or social, material or moral; they will never look to government or politics or beyond their immediate society for the solution of any problem, great or small. It is a plunge into self-reliance, since they must look to their own initiative and resources; and it is a leap into the transarchic mode of living, by totally de-linking oneself from the status quo. This de-linking by opting out is far superior, both philosophically and pragmatically, to challenging authority and seeking to vanquish it, hoping to usher in an anarchist order in the end -- which may not come off because of the built-in predisposition in the counter-power to become the new authority. This is how all revolutions have failed all along.

In confronting the British regime in India, Gandhi may not have explicitly or directly projected the contours of this opting out or upheld its imperative line of action. Nevertheless, it is without doubt the underlying principle, the fundamental implication, of his *Hind Swaraj*, where he insists on opting out of the colonial imposition and the industrial economy in toto. And he has often declared that if the entire nation refused to accept the foreign rule, by the very refusal freedom would be wrought in a single day. Only he felt it was quite premature to look for such a fused national will and pending that, he found it prudent to adopt the path of laboured, graduated resistance, of course non-violent.

Gandhi had also tried, by and large, in his Phoenix and Tolstoy Farms, to initiate this sort of opting out, in South Africa, an experiment he continued *mutatis mutandis* even in India later. (Thoreau had done it all by himself, going it alone at Walden.) It is clearly again the direction which the endeavours of the redoubtable Gandhian, the late Satish Chandra Dasgupta, even of Shantidas in Europe, point to. Gandhi, it would be seen vis-à-vis British rule was thus operating simultaneously on two planes -- of confrontation and of opting out.

The plane of confrontation needed no small organization, which was, in the nature of things, geared to capturing power but having captured it was in no mood to seek or exercise the moral faculty to disband itself or outgrow the focus of power as the central fact of collective life. So, no wonder, even at the very outset it began to resent the Gandhian voice of truth as something anachronistic and out of tune with the rapidly emerging interests and pressures of the up-and-coming new order. Gandhi himself had been disposed of (none too early?) and there were none with a comparable moral stature, even if they had the conviction, to succeed him. Even so, the Establishment seemed desperately to need somebody who could play the Mahatma and would willingly oblige it with a legitimization that could pass muster. The *Sarkaari Saadhu* readily stepped into the vacuum to play the sainted courtier, as if to the manner born, and neutralized the Gandhian resistance to evil in all possible ways precisely by posing to improve upon it⁸³. He sought to clinch his unchallenged asseveration (1952) that Gandhi's Satyaagraha was gross -- he himself had evolved something superior, subtler! -- by citing the genteel laureate whose silken conscience had been outraged by the wrong coercion that, in his view, Satyaagraha entailed.

Yet, one invokes Satyaagraha to resist the myriad forms of tyranny, of force, fraud, evil and injustice, and the resistance itself knows no malice, rancour or animosity. It is in truth no resistance at all in the gross sense, but an impassioned appeal, even to the opaque conscience of the opponent, an unyielding endeavour to shake him out of his vainglorious slumber. Non-violence is not just the negative fact of non-injury but positive radiation of love. It is the law of life -- the good life, no mere brute living -- which is the law of love. Hate sin, not the sinner and love thine enemy, while yet fighting his injustice, his tyranny, proclaims the Mahatma, and it is no idle exhortation. Is this Satyaagraha gross, and does it resort to 'wrong type of pressure'?

The Saint of Paunar's comic claim (1952) that he would resort to Satyaagraha at a time and in a manner that no one would oppose it, can be no more than a hollow flight of fancy. When nobody would oppose it, pray, where is the scope for Satyaagraha or the need for it? When nobody

would oppose Satyaagraha who would Satyaagraha ‘oppose’? And must the struggle against the mounting evil and misery in human life, destined to be Sisyphean for so long, wait on the dawn of that auspicious moment? Would it not indeed be tantamount to sneaking assistance to evil, even colluding with it, instead of openly resisting it? Philosophy of assistance indeed with a vengeance! “Rama does not shoot his arrow twice” he declaims (1952) but the point is Rama has to shoot it at all. And, without a shadow of doubt, it was only very gross Satyaagraha that the whited mimete so indignantly threatened to launch (1979) in a desperate attempt to coerce legislation against cow-slaughter. The many Vinobite vulgarizations – he had turned fobbing into a fine art - his tabloid formulas, tinsel slogans and windy labels served only to enfeeble the unique Gandhian legacy of resistance and it was rendered even more vacuous by the endless sterile forays of a legion of academics in the barber’s chair that Jayaprakash Narayan seemed to inspire by his queer pitch to dish up Gandhism on academic stilts. And the result is Gandhism today, which is Gandhism literally of the graveyard; it exists and functions nowhere except at Rajghat where they choose to honour the Mahatma, placing wreath upon wreath.

If we steer clear of all the pseudo-Gandhian debris that has accumulated since Gandhi’s death, it would be seen that the form of state or mode of government is by no means relevant to Satyaagraha. The question whether Satyaagraha has any place in a free, democratic society or whether it is possible or effective in an autocracy, *where there is no rule of law*, betrays a certain ignorance of its foundations⁸⁴. Injustice or evil is not the less vicious for being democratic and popular sanction is no criterion of truth⁸⁵. Where self-government is no good government it can claim no special privilege or prerogative and must be resisted no less. But resistance, even non-violent, must always be the last resort, be it democracy or dictatorship.

Those who seek to rest non-violence on the rule of law or discount its efficacy in an autocracy fail to recall that Gandhi has dismissed the sanction of public opinion. “I have drawn a distinction between passive resistance of the weak and active non-violent resistance of the strong. The latter can

and does work *in the teeth of the fiercest opposition*”⁸⁶; “..... a single individual (can) defy the whole might of an unjust empire.”⁸⁷ “I do not believe”, Gandhi affirms, “as some do, that non-violence can only be offered in a civilized or partially civilized society. Non-violence admits of no such limit” And success or failure as commonly understood is no criterion of non-violence; it is the characteristic of truth to function in the manner of *Nishphala Karma*. The Satyaagrahi’s concern is not simply the justice of his own cause, but even more, the urgency to *cure the opponent of his injustice*. So, paradoxical as it may sound, in fighting his opponent he is really turning the opponent against the opponent himself. *Resistance thus becomes the truest assistance*. It is a sacred Socratic duty cast on him as physician of the soul, and there is no intrinsic evil in the soul. So, Gandhi could proclaim, ‘defeat has no place in the dictionary of non-violence’⁸⁸.

Opting out of modernity and the modern power structure, to put it unambiguously, is to go primitive, in the prime sense of the term. It is to negate - and negate completely - the modern mode of life, its economics and politics, its education and culture, and not the least, its malevolent psychology. And as opting out means, not driving out authority from around you, *but driving yourself out* from the precincts of authority, you don’t have to look to other people or seek their approbation or endorsement to do it. It must be an *individual* Satyaagraha from first to last and only statistically speaking can it be collective. One plunges all by oneself without waiting for the next man or the herd to join him. It is the flight of Jonathan Livingstone Seagull; others are welcome to go with you but you keep soaring no less without company. *Athanasius contra mundum*. It demands a total negation of power in all its contours and ramifications; to look to the other man for his assent or support in your renunciation is to seek his power to complement your diffidence or impotence; and it is evidence only of your meek inability to opt out of the smug security of power. The only power of *Svaraaj* is the power of love, the power of service -- power that has not a shade of *force*.

Civilised man’s life has been based on force only because he has been acquisitive and possessive, and his lust

excites jealousy, leading to competition and conflict. It may be lust for power or glory, money or sex, or it may take myriad other forms, but it is the only reason why wants must always outstrip resources and so lust must excite hate, violence and war. As society is the individual writ large it is only the megalomania of man that becomes the morbid hypertrophy of society, the power drive that motivates either being the same.

So, when men negate power, opting out of it, when lust no longer can corrupt them, society is radically cut to size and must in a manner of speaking wither away except, maybe, in a notional sense, and the simple community comes into its own: *Graam Svaram* as Gandhi aptly christened it. *Graam* because when there is neither fevered commerce nor phrenetic technology, the village, self-reliant and autonomous, is the true fountain head of human life and culture. The underlying tenor of such living is *aparigraha*, which expresses itself through the pervasive continuity and harmony, peace and content, and simple and plain living, that mark off pristine village life.

Now, the quality of such a way of living, -- a Buddhist economy as E. F. Schumacher would hail it -- can't be tricked in by a plan, program or method. At bottom it must spring from the *individual* and there can be social *aparigraha* only if and when such individuals become common and can by their individual excellence and numerical preponderance radiate an unmistakable atmosphere of *daama*, *daana*, *dayaa* ⁸⁹, and *Gnyaana*, the charpoy of *aparigraha* or *Parityaaga*, so to speak. Once a climate of common weal comes about and a pantheistic sense (*Eesaavaasyamidam sarvam*) of fulfillment without possession grows into a stable tradition, it is possible for posterity readily to receive it and by evolving in the environment naturally integrate itself with it. But prior to such social evolution the principle and the process must proceed from the individual end only.

It may be opting out and it may be rooted in the individual as such, but it can't still help acquiring a certain political salience, if only by Establishmentarian ascription, or even fatal infamy by earning the wrath of the Establishment,

since the logical end of it is the disruption of the Establishment and dissolution of power and politics. While it is open to one and all to opt out of power-ridden social life, to choose Walden or *Graam Svaraaj*, given the common run of human beings, not many, even left to themselves (discounting the Establishment), may exercise the choice in the foreseeable future. It need not, as we have seen, hold back one or the few, since *Svaraaj* is no statistic polity, but actually a good many may fall between two stools and find themselves in a sort of habitual halfway house nearly all the time. In such cases, when the opting out can't go whole hog, where do we draw the line? Gandhi was an irrepressible optimist, to quote his own words, and if one had faith in one's mission (how can one have a mission without faith?) there could be no ground for the 'fatal vice' of pessimism. The faith and hope that men can and will change and become perfect enough, can never abandon true servants of humanity. So, in spite of cormorant devouring time they must wait on people who can't or won't change now, make many a compromise, if on the fringes, resiliently sticking always to the hard core. "The Hundredth Name of Allah is for the service of all mankind, (why, of other life too — animal as well as plant) all the time"⁹⁰.

One area where such compromise, up to a point, may be foremost is communication and transport, not to speak of money and banking, which seem to symbolize the heart of modern mobility. The essence of compromise is to conserve through a degree of pliability and a sovereign principle can become human only by a certain accommodation to frailty whose name is *homo sapiens*. "Gods will give us some faults to make us men"⁹¹. *Sat* must always refracted as *Satya* on earth; the idiom of truth on earth must be a human idiom and servants of humanity, in so far as they may fail to sympathize with human inadequacies, may verily lapse into inhumanity. Even so compromise must always be the minimum necessary in the circumstances and in the case on hand the choice must be slanted towards the relatively smaller, simpler and slower. One must therefore learn to prefer the post to telegraph or telephone, the roadway and railway to the airway. But one can be none too careful

and vigilant in choosing the lesser evil and keeping it in check.

Compromises of this sort may incidentally serve to aid the cause of the grand Satyaagraha of opting out of force, as the very means of modernity may be used against itself; a compromise in the field of communication and transport may incidentally help in the propagation and diffusion of *aparigraha* more effectively. Compromise, though, may not mean more compromise -- the thin end of the wedge -- and, once again, one must be sure enough when and where to halt it. And whilst it is a concession to human frailty, and may be taken advantage of to promote the cause one may not oneself indulge in it otherwise.

This is but a humble plea for Satyaagraha that is *Parityaaga*, which is no romantic vision or idle dream. Yet, Parityaaga Satyaagraha is nothing short of Vasishtha's veritable *Brahmadanda* -- against Vishwamitra's potent array of missiles -- or the heroic meekness of Christ. 'Resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also'. Love is wisdom's lone weapon against the brute force of ignorance. Men are there on earth right now who possess such wisdom. If they are Thoreaus isolated there would be Waldens, little pellucid ponds scattered in the vast expanse of the arid social desert; but if perchance they make an incidental multitude the surging waters of *Satsvaraaj* can surely flood the desert, turn it green -- for ever. The dawn of *Raajateeta* is in our hands.

Our state is small, its people are few; soldiers and weapons may abound, yet are never used; boats and carts none too few, but none to ride them even so.

The folks have returned to the knotted cords ⁹²; their plain food is sweet, their rough garment fine; content in their homes, they are happy in their simple ways.

The neighbouring state is within earshot; each may hear the barking dogs and crowing cocks across; even so, folks of either grow old, and growing old die, yet have never once exchanged a call.

(*Tao Te Ching*, V.80; free translation.)

(26 April 1984)

APPENDIX I

Dear...

...It, seems to me, we must, first and foremost, seek to plant the philosophy of opting out in people's minds — by no means an easy task. The Gandhian message of opting out is being made *explicit*, maybe, for the first time and people may find it queer enough. On top of it, if we bring in, as you seem to suggest, the idea of concurrently challenging authority, it may be asking for much greater psychological resistance than we could hope to handle and as a result we may fail to get across even the initial idea of opting out to the people.

Secondly, challenging authority would come up anyhow, when authority tries to suppress opting out, but it would perhaps happen at the second stage of the movement. If the challenge precedes the diffusion of the philosophy, it would be no more than asking for a *replacement* of the government in power. The Janata revolution of 1977 did precisely that, but the Janata Government that followed it was little better, though Jayaprakash himself was not to blame. Yet, the replacement of one super-government by another takes us nowhere.

It may seem pragmatic to proceed step by step and look upon such replacement as the first step. But this business of replacement dissipates the revolution and leads to disillusionment. We would stay where we were and all our struggle would go waste. Gandhi's own experience in 1947 clinches the point.

It is better therefore to make the ultimate end doubly clear and tailor our policy and program to that end *right from the beginning*. How to go about it then? We may seek to evolve a dedicated community of kindred souls -- a hundred or even much less would do to begin with -- to go to some god-forsaken place within the country and inaugurate *Graam Svaraaj*, run it wholly on our own initiative and resources, never approach the government or any outside agency for anything. It would be an *actual, concrete*, demonstration of *Graam Svaraaj* in operation, an honest example of an autonomous community, whose autonomy is founded on

aparigraha -- where there is no government, no power, politics or money. The community would need no defense *because it has nothing to defend* except Truth and its one and only defensive weapon is the Satyaagraha of *Ahimsa*.

Once this can be demonstrated, although on a very small scale, and the experience of it diffused and radiated around, it would be the right time to think of confronting the status quo and its authority as it may choose to challenge the community and its autonomy. Because the community in question is wholly autonomous and has nothing to do with the state and its setup, its opting out would come to mean an outright rejection of the state's authority, its laws and administration, and thus *it would be an outright negation of political obligation in every sense*. It would naturally occasion non-cooperation, disobedience and refusal to pay taxes. The campaign should snowball if the community won't yield *come what may*. And the campaign would be entirely non-violent. If the community is truly founded on *aparigraha*, it can't be coerced into obedience and the state too may not find it worthwhile coercing it. So if it can preserve its autonomy with tenacity in the teeth of opposition, the message of *Graam Svaram* must pick up and the time may not be too far off when life without politics, power or pelf may not seem crazy.

Doubtless it wouldn't be near enough to reach soon. Meanwhile to stir up public conscience, to keep the wick of *Parityaaga* burning at least, we may try to infiltrate the idea of opting out by the back door as it were. This could be done, I think, if we launched a campaign of, not boycotting elections, because that may facilitate personation, but deliberately casting *invalid* votes. If the campaign picked up, it must nullify elections, and this is important, as the entire edifice of the so-called democratic state, its power, domination and exploitation, rests squarely on the alleged sanction conferred by elections. It is the dubious popular election that is supposed to legitimate the democratic state and government, its manifold tyranny and callous injustice. And if we seek to pull off the democratic veneer of the state and render it manifestly illegitimate, we must do all we can do to nullify elections. That I think, is the foremost phase of our challenge to the status quo.

APPENDIX II

Trusteeship is the least elaborated and as a result, the least understood, aspect of Gandhism. Although Gandhi traced it to the *Eesopanishad* and the *Bhagavad Geetaa* and knew that the scriptures of other traditions too sanctioned it, what initially opened his eyes to it was Anglo-Saxon equity. Gandhi himself was in no doubt about the tenets of the doctrine or its implications, the means to its attainment or the mode of its operation. Perhaps it was partly because he was most clear and certain about it himself that he did not articulate it at length. Trusteeship is a clear pointer to *aparigraha*, an ideal enjoined by the earliest Indian texts and reiterated by Gandhi. Since *aparigraha* goes with *nishkarktva* (non-doership) trusteeship aims at *karmaphala tyaga* (renouncing the fruits of action) extolled by the *Bhagavad Geetaa*...

As Gandhi passed away, towering Gandhians like Satish Chandra Dasgupta, J. C. Kumarappa, J. B. Kripalani came to be discounted, when the movement destined to be led by the epigone, was shepherded by Vinoba. And Gandhism seemed to recede from active engagement in the struggle for social justice, even sport a certain ersatz religiosity, and turn indifferent to social concern. Appropriately enough about this time it became ideal grist to the academic mills and recondite interpretations and expositions have kept pouring to instruct us how correctly to conceive Gandhism.

Gandhi did not rule out state intervention or government control in the practical evolution of trusteeship but few can, on that ground, plead that he would have countenanced the patent pro-establishmentarian genuflexion of Vinobite philosophy. In his attempt to improve on Gandhism, Vinoba declared Gandhian Satyagraha quite crude and to clinch his statement he chose to invoke Rabindranath Tagore's criticism of the Gandhian boycott of foreign goods in the twenties. Gandhi's *ahimsa* insisted on social justice but Vinoba, in effect, seemed progressively to stress order itself as the ultimate end of social life. It is a far cry from the *Eesopanishad* to the *Leviathan*, but, maybe,

Anusaasanaparva could play the expedient sandwich to glue them together! No wonder the saint became the *sarkari saadhu* and Bhoodaan, which was launched with Establishmentarian endorsement and official fanfare, to counter communist insurgency in Telengana in the fifties, ended up as a tame exercise in vacuous inflation of Gandhian terminology. Vinoba fondly believed that Bhoodaan could be the one sovereign subsuming principle and to that end dismissed time-tested Gandhian institutions, including the impeccable constructive program. And bhoodaan, as though a niche had been earmarked for it -- much like khadi and village industries to date -- freely subsisted on heavy official patronage.

APPENDIX III

THE ACADEMIC AND THE AUTHENTIC

Why are we so critical of the academic and academic 'knowledge'? Indeed, why are we so unacademic? Homo academicus proclaims himself to be detached and objective, qualities that are as rare as they are unexceptionable. Who can deny that to be fair and reasonable demands examining both sides of a question; and often enough a question has more than the proverbial two sides. So to explore an issue, to investigate the truth of it, one must be wholly open-minded and take no sides. Neutrality therefore is the prime prerequisite of the quest for knowledge. Yet -- and this can't be overemphasized -- it can be only an initial or instrumental neutrality, a heuristic imperative, which alone can ensure the sensitivity or openness to truth. And once the end is attained, to wit, knowledge is gained, neutrality has no further function or basis. Knowledge to be objective, must discriminate -- the true from the false, the good from the evil; and it is discrimination not only in theory but in practice.

Now neutrality is no objectivity, but only the means to objectivity, and by no means an end in itself. What is the academic's objectivity that is so much advertised, how far does he stand committed to it or act upon it? Many an academic can discriminate, no doubt, but he can only in word, not in deed. How is his objectivity effective then, how

is it any more than a ritual pose in theory for the nonce? To many an academic objectivity has come to mean a technical tool of the wage-earner's art and the habit of neutrality, which is the gestation of that objectivity, an expedient transposed from an instrumental phase of livelihood to a counter-active end of living. Academic knowledge is not knowing to be and the uninformed living contradicts authentic knowing. In fine, the academic can examine everything except his own life! A serious academic may have earnestly studied the Upanishads or the Tao, Socrates or Jesus and, all the same, his own awareness or being seems no different for the exposure to the great message. He doesn't doubt its authenticity or truth and yet his own life, in thought, word or deed, seldom accords with it. Whence the paradox? What is the worth of his 'knowledge', in what sense is it knowledge at all?

The academic's 'knowledge', it would seem, involves not 'knowing' itself but only 'knowing about'; it is conceptual, not substantive or existent. A concept is not the thing; a concept of truth is no truth. It is, to use the grammatical idiom, intransitive, that is to say, objectless, and queer enough, it still claims to be objective; whereas, a concept which is an intellectual abstraction, is not even subjective because it is not, honestly speaking, integral to the subject. Neither objective nor subjective, a concept is but a phantom. The ego or existent self is no concept, no abstraction, to the subject. And that self, it cannot be overemphasized, is not the intellect, the manufactory of concepts. The intellect is a peripheral detachment of the ego that it unleashes to sally forth in logic chopping; it is a logistic, however, from the periphery to anything outside it, rarely, if at all, from the periphery towards the centre. In fact, the intellect, which can not function except by a process of abstracting the 'other', is in essence alienated from the existent self; the intellect can observe the self too only as the 'other'.

In studying the truth that the Upanishads or the Buddha, Socrates or Gandhi expounded, what the academic attains is not the truth itself but a concept of it, the shadow, not the substance, 'knowledge' that is no virtue. It can engage his intellect without impacting his being, without animating or sustaining his living. Liberal education, much prized as it is,

must prove to be quite vicious, if its knowledge can bear no fruition into virtue. And he is an academic whose knowledge is no virtue — he need be no member of the Academy.

‘We know the good, we apprehend it clearly. But we can’t bring it to achievement’, laments Phaedro (Euripides: Hippolytus). Duryodhana (*Mahabharata*) confesses that he can recognize evil, yet can’t free himself of it. Such minds can conceive of the good without being or becoming good. Plato’s being was authentic in no small way, nevertheless, he could be bitten by the academic bug. With the founding of his Academy, the thin end of the wedge, the Trojan horse had been let in. Hence Kierkegaard’s pronouncement: “Imagine yourself as a contemporary of Socrates. There is no science or scholarship here; this is just what he (Socrates) wants to eliminate. ...But then he dies, in Plato the existential is diminished, then comes science and scholarship. Is Plato greater than Socrates? Yes, perhaps when assistant professors judge, but then they must be consistent and judge that a professor of theology is greater than Christ”. Plato’s Academy is the Turin Shroud of Socrates.

APPENDIX IV

The passion to ‘return to nature’ seems to be gaining momentum. But are we sure we have comprehended the inner meaning of the call? Does the bulk of the so-called ecological movement launched the world over truly represent it? One must pause here to note that many an ecological movement in its origin and accent demonstrates, an overwhelming concern for the future of the human race, which is bleak enough, thanks to the persistent suicidal follies of man. No doubt such concern reflects no small social awareness and moral commitment, qualities that are conspicuously absent in the scientific establishment. Yet it demands keener, deeper, percipience to sense that this interest in nature is more often incidental than intrinsic, seeking as it does to suffer nature only in so far as it serves man’s selfish interest in perpetuating his own species.

Is it impossible to transcend this selfishness, to have instead a truly *ecosophic* perspective, one that is rooted in Nature as

the Plenary Matrix, of which man himself is an integral, but humble, part? Indeed man has so functioned as an integral part in simpler societies much before the onset of the industrial revolution and the propulsion of mechanical progress that is endemic to it.

There can be no real poverty wherever man remains integral to Nature. (Poverty has no place in Walden). The only honest answer to the modern or economic problem is not progressing from a modernized poverty to a fancied horizon of dubious prosperity, equally modernized, but resurrecting nature and reintegrating man to nature's economy. That indeed is the implied philosophy and entailed program behind the articulate accent of Gandhi's *Hind Swaraj*. So reintegrated man would realize once again his humble integral place in nature, human life would cease to be acquisitive or competitive and economics dismal, exploitive and insidious.

The tribal folk today have been reduced to abject indigence only by the vicious intrusion and domination of civilized man, who has mercilessly exploited them, robbing them of their very source of existence. The answer to it however is not a belated expiation by imposing our pet notions of progress and welfare on them, collecting and collectivizing charity and distributing doles to them or fabricating health and employment schemes wholly alien and inimical to their culture, to their very living. One may not question the motive of some of the philanthropic projects, but however well-meant, they smack of civilized arrogance, seldom noticed, and are vicious even in their conception as they are in their execution.

One may, on occasion, not be disposed to discount the descending (not necessarily condescending) humanitarianism from above, be it of the bureaucratic or bhadrakalok variety or the professional samaritanism of voluntary agencies and foundations, particularly when it seeks to meet a felt want of the communities at the receiving end and is progressively operated on local resources. Yet, increasingly one can see the dependants taking to such modernized and institutionalized assistance only because they have no scope for (or hope of) resurrecting their time-tested way of living. Such assistance, when ad hoc, may not be injurious or inappropriate at a

pinch, say, in the wake of any natural calamity. (Yet, China could turn down urgent offers of international aid during her disastrous earthquake in the seventies). But as a regular mode of social regeneration it is bound to be counter-productive and dehumanize the people who have learnt to wait on doles or become passive participants in an eleemosynary welfare, thrust on them by professional humanitarians, that must erode their original vision of well being.

There can be no authentic notion of human well-being prior to a total perception of Nature and man's place in Nature's dispensation. Such a perception need not be literate or articulate. And when Nature is so understood and accepted, human welfare follows, indeed flows out of it. Most social service programs operate on an unexamined plank of presumed welfare, without first probing the plenary, particularly the elusive, hidden, dimensions of Nature and their very intricate bearing on human living, social and individual. Invariably they must all seek to redesign nature (the sinister social forestry, for example) in expedient response to urgent pressures and immediate wants, lording it over nature, playing super-nature to her in smug certitude — which must result, sooner or later, in an egregious travesty of nature, not without the nemesis that may prove fatal to humanity, defeating the myopic vision of human survival. So, can we return to Primeval Plenary Nature (Brhadaaranya) and reestablish our integral well-being in Her? Can we think of an ongoing Brhadaaranya movement that would bring forth an ecoculture, nourish it in action and repair the unspeakable damage to nature by man in this century?

A Brhadaaranya setting that can restore Nature in her Plentitude is the foremost need and to that end the green forests, large and small, must return in their full bloom, unfettered by social demands and technological pressures. If the ecological crisis proves anything it is the imperative of a total reorientation of human life and thought, a radical change in our weltanschauung. Yet it is nothing to be piously professed or noisily propagated, but must inform every facet of our existence, transform our attitudes and habits, not the least of all, food. The sort of agriculture that is both necessary and permissible must thoroughly accord with nature and therefore be conservative, in the sense of conserving Nature.

Let no one doubt that such conservative agriculture can cater for the simple needs of honest nutrition.

Here ends **Shuddhasattvopanishad** /

Parityaaga Satyaagraha, Part II of

ASAMVEDOPANISHAD

I will give you a talisman. Whenever you are in doubt, or when the self becomes too much with you, apply the following test. Recall the face of the poorest and weakest man whom you have seen, and ask yourself, if the step you contemplate is going to be of any use to him. Will he gain anything by it? Will it restore him to a control over his own life and destiny? In other words, will it lead to swaraaj for the hungry and spiritually starving millions? Then you will find your doubts and your self melting away.

Mahatma Gandhi

Notes and References

- ¹ “*The Texts alone I know, not the Self.*” *Chaandogya Upanishad*, 7.1.3. Here *Mantra* stands for the Vedas.
- ² Who: *Maha Yoga*, Ramanashram, Tiruvannamalai, p.232.
- ³ *The Cloud of Unknowing and Other Treatises* by an English Mystic of the Fourteenth Century, ed. Abbot Justin McCann, Westminster, Maryland, 1952. Here: *The Epistle of Privy Counsel*, chapter six, p.116.
- ⁴ *Neti neti* is but unlearning.
- ⁵ This Self is not obtained by inquiry about Self-inquiry, thus avers the *Asamvedopanishad*, 15.2.
- ⁶ Anaham indeed (is) Brahman, thus avers the *Asamvedopanishad* 15.2.
- ⁷ “I am God.”
- ⁸ *The Cloud of Unknowing*: the quote is the second part of the title.
- ⁹ Abiding after passing away.
- ¹⁰ Shakespeare: *Henry the Fifth*, V.2.256.(Yale)
- ¹¹ Shakespeare: *Hamlet*, II.2.259-260.(Yale)
- ¹² *Chaandogya Upanishad*, 3.14.1
- ¹³ *St.Luke*, 10.42
- ¹⁴ Because vice is ignorance, driving one to wrong.
- ¹⁵ So to Know is to Be.

-
- ¹⁶ Paul Valéry: Eupalinos
- ¹⁷ “This Self is not attained by the pusillanimous,”
Mundakopanishad, 3.2.4
- ¹⁸ So reports *Manas*, 14 May 1980, p.4.
- ¹⁹ Leo Strauss: *What is Political Philosophy and Other Essays*,
Greenwood Press, 1973. p.153.
- ²⁰ Idries Shah: *Thinkers of the East*, Penguin, pp. 66-67.
- ²¹ *Understanding Islam*, p.87.
- ²² It is worth exploring how far Yudhishtira’s truth is Egoless,
since his falsehood is so self-conscious.
- ²³ *Mundakopanishad*, 3.2.3 ; also *Kathopanishad*, 2.23.
- ²⁴ Also in Tamil: “Nooleni vinnerna noorkuparutti vaippaar/Polay
karuvi nannoor bodham.” -- Taayumaanavar:
Paraaparakkanni, 186
 (“Learning Scriptures for Salvation! As well plant cotton for
yarn to make a rope-ladder and climb on to heaven!”)
“Nunniya noolpala karpinun marruntan
Unmai arivay migum.” -- *Tirukkural* , 373.
 (“Knowledge of the Self excels the many subtle books one may
learn.”)
- ²⁵ I.15 and XV.20.
- ²⁶ *Tradition and Revolution*, Orient Longman, 1973.
- ²⁷ *Sannyasopanishad*, 2.17. Cf. also *Mahaabhaarata: Saanti Parva*,
12.329.40.
- ²⁸ “For the achievement of zen enlightenment an apprenticeship of
gruelling toil is the indispensable prerequisite.” - R.C. Zaehner:
Zen Drugs and Mysticism, p.125 (The author of *Zen and the Art*

of Motor Cycle Maintenance must restart his odyssey to discover the true Socrates and the Source of his Reason.).

- ²⁹ By implication, the perceptions that precede and succeed the gaps or intervals must be only thoughts.
- ³⁰ *Swarajya* (Annual), January 1973.
- ³¹ “Learning is purgation.” TR, d. 10 (TR: *Tradition and Revolution*; d: dialogue).
- ³² TR, d.19; also *First and Last Freedom*; ques. and ans. 9.
- ³³ TR, d.8.
- ³⁴ *Beyond Violence*.
- ³⁵ *Indian Express*, Madras, 9 December 1976.
- ³⁶ *Vrtti Gnyaana*.
- ³⁷ *Idem*
- ³⁸ *Idem*
- ³⁹ *Swarajya* (Annual), January 1973.
- ⁴⁰ Has the *Bhagavad Geeta* said anything without schematizing it?
- ⁴¹ *Chaandogya Upanishad*, 8.3.4.
- ⁴² Such as God, Truth, Being, *Brahman*, *Aatman* or Self, Infinite, That, Intelligence or Awareness.
- ⁴³ Every tradition was a revolution!
- ⁴⁴ On the place of thought, desire, joy, in Krishnamurti’s system, see Rohit Mehta’s *The Nameless Experience*, Motilal Banarsidass.

-
- ⁴⁵ J. Krishnamurti: *The Only Revolution*, 1970, p.175. Emphasis added.
- ⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 38. Emphasis added.
- ⁴⁷ Ramana Maharshi in *Sri Ramana Reminiscences* by G.V. Subbaramayya, p. 40.
- ⁴⁸ Lutyens, M, *The Years of Awakening*.
- ⁴⁹ *Madras Talks*, 1977-78.
- ⁵⁰ Ramana Maharshi in *Day by Day with Bhagavan* by Devaraja Mudaliar, Ramanaashram, p. 290.
- ⁵¹ *Saakshaat-kaara* = Trans-perception
- ⁵² Ramana Maharshi in *Sri Ramana Reminiscences* by G.V. Subbaramayya, p. 153.
- ⁵³ Hobbes: *Leviathan*, I.2. para 5.
- ⁵⁴ *Rg Veda*, 1:164:16.
- ⁵⁵ See (14) above. “*Abhayam vai Brahma*,” Brh.Up..4.25.
- ⁵⁶ Idries Shah: *Thinkers of the East*, Penguin, p. 36.
- ⁵⁷ All this is God-pervaded; *Eesaavaasyopanishad*, 1.
- ⁵⁸ *Order Change and Democracy*, Madras, 1973, pp.30-31.
- ⁵⁹ ‘*Personate*’ to indicate for the nonce both the simulation of freedom and the personal base involved in the freedom.
- ⁶⁰ *Chaandogya Upanishad*, 1.6.7.
- ⁶¹ *Brhadaraanyaka Upanishad*, 4.2.2.

-
- ⁶² *Mundaka Upanishad*, 3.2.11.
- ⁶³ Ramana Maharshi in *Sri Ramana Reminiscences* by G.V. Subbaramayya, p. 26.
- ⁶⁴ Where is salvation in ‘I’, or ‘I’ in salvation? I-less is True God.
- ⁶⁵ “I am Brahman.”
- ⁶⁶ How motivated is the ‘service’! And is God ever in need that you can indeed serve Him? (When the person dissolves is there *personal* God?) Surrender is giving up oneself, not posing to play the servant.
- ⁶⁷ See item 4.
- ⁶⁸ Sattva and satya are respectively, so to speak, the reflection and refraction of Sat (Reality) in the Platonic cave, i.e., on the common human plane. Sat is *satyasya satyam* (*Brhad. Upan.* 2.1.20).
- ⁶⁹ W.B. Yeats in *Vision*.
- ⁷⁰ The Gnyaani breaks into song out of love and compassion.
- ⁷¹ W.B. Yeats: *The Cutting of an Agate*
- ⁷² Shakespeare: *As You Like It*, III. 3.15-16. (Yale)
- ⁷³ Charles Williams: “Poetry at Present” by Lascelles Abercrombie, in: Douglas Bush, *Science and Poetry -- A Historical Sketch 1590-1950*, OUP 1950, p.159.
- ⁷⁴ R. Bhaskaran in *Kanakavaippu* by Kaarai Siddhar.
- ⁷⁵ Shakespeare: *The Comedy of Errors*, II. 2.124. (Yale)
- ⁷⁶ Ibid.
- ⁷⁷ Shakespeare: *The Comedy of Errors*, II.2.113. (Yale)

-
- ⁷⁸ *A New Road to Ancient Truth*, Allen & Unwin, 1960.
- ⁷⁹ Shakespeare: *King Lear*, II.iv.56. (Yale)
- ⁸⁰ *Reflections on the French Revolution*, Everyman's edition, 1953, p.165. Emphasis added.
- ⁸¹ Oakeshott. M., *Experience and Its Modes*, CUP, 1985, p.320.
- ⁸² "We have no gift to set a statesman right." W.B.Yeats in: 'On Being Asked for a War Poem' from *The Wild Swans at Coole*.
- ⁸³ It must be noted nevertheless that Vinoba was for direct action during the Pehngi-Badakhli agitation in the Mungur district of Bihar in 1955.
- ⁸⁴ "I do not believe, as some do, that non-violence can only be offered in a civilized or partially civilized society. Non-violence admits of no such limit." Gandhi. *Vide*, D.G. Tendulkar: *Abdul Ghaffar Khan*, Popular Prakashan, Bombay, 1967. P. 449.
- ⁸⁵ See *Harijan*, 17.12.1938, where Gandhi declares that non-violence does not need the sanction of public opinion.
- ⁸⁶ *Ibid*. Italics added.
- ⁸⁷ *Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, Vol. 18, P. 1333.
- ⁸⁸ *Harijan*, 20.2.1937
- ⁸⁹ *Brhadaraanyaka Upanishad*, vii.3.
- ⁹⁰ Shah, Idries (quoting a sufi saint) in *Thinkers of the East*, Penguin, U.K., p.22. (The words within brackets have been added).
- "-- the poor beetle, that we tread upon,
In corporal sufferance finds a pang as great
As when a giant dies."
- Shakespeare: *Measure for Measure* -- III. i.77-79.
- ⁹¹ Shakespeare; *Antony and Cleopatra*, V.i.33-34.
- ⁹² An old Chinese method of recording that preceded writing.

GLOSSARY

<i>Aabhaasa:</i>	Image
<i>Aananda:</i>	Bliss
<i>Aanandamaya:</i>	Bliss-filled
<i>Aananda-maya-kosa:</i>	The veil of joy over Awareness
<i>Aasaa:</i>	Desire, hope
<i>Aatma Gnyaana:</i>	Self- Knowledge
<i>Aatman:</i>	Self
<i>Aatma vichaara:</i>	Self- Inquiry
<i>Abhaava:</i>	Absence of <i>bhaava</i> / identity
<i>Abhaya:</i>	Fearlessness
<i>Adhikaara:</i>	Fitness, sanction, eligibility, credentials
<i>Agha :</i>	Sin
<i>Anagha:</i>	Sinless
<i>Aghaghna:</i>	Curing / eliminating sin
<i>Agyeya:</i>	Agnostic
<i>Agnyaana:</i>	Ignorance
<i>Aham:</i>	Ego
<i>Ahambhaava/Ahamkaara:</i>	Egoity / Egotism
<i>Ahimsa:</i>	Non-violence
<i>Amanaska:</i>	No-mind, mind-less (see <i>manonaasa</i> , <i>Mrtmanas</i>)
<i>Anaham:</i>	Egoless
<i>Anaham-manas:</i>	Egoless mind, (<i>Amanaska</i> / <i>Mrtamanas</i>)
<i>Anamnesis:</i>	Recollection; retroversion of intelligence (see <i>nivrtti</i>)
<i>Anbay Sivam:</i>	Love indeed (is) God.
<i>Aparigraha:</i>	Non-possession.
<i>Apaurusheya:</i>	Not involving human agency; 'trans- personate'
<i>Asamveda:</i>	Non-perception, non-cognition, non- experience
<i>Asat:</i>	Non-Being, unreal
<i>A-vyavaaharya:</i>	Non-phenomenal-ity, being culture - free

<i>Bhaashya:</i>	Commentary
<i>Bhaava:</i>	Mental image; <i>quasi</i> ; 'imagize', 'imagization', identity
<i>Bhaava-maaya:</i>	The 'as if real-phenomenate' (see <i>maayaa</i>).
<i>Bhakti:</i>	Devotion, piety
<i>Brahma:</i>	God as creator in the trinity (see <i>Shiva</i> and <i>Vishnu</i>)
<i>Brahmadanda:</i>	Holy sceptre; sacred staff
<i>Brahman:</i>	Being, Reality
<i>Chaarpai:</i>	Cot
<i>Chidaabhaasa:</i>	Mental image
<i>Chit:</i>	Awareness
<i>Daama:</i>	Restraint
<i>Daana:</i>	Gift, charity
<i>Dakshinaayana:</i>	Solar transit from Cancer to Capricorn.
<i>Daridra, naaraayana:</i>	God as penury (<i>Naaraayana</i> , sobriquet of <i>Vishnu</i>)
<i>Dayaa:</i>	Compassion
<i>Dhyaana:</i>	Meditation
<i>Divya:</i>	Divine
<i>Dukkha:</i>	Sorrow (the onus of Buddhist quest)
<i>Ekaagrata:</i>	One-pointedness
<i>Eesaavaasyam idam sarvam:</i>	All this is God-permeated.
<i>Gnyaana:</i>	Gnosis, Realization, Awareness, Enlightenment
<i>Gnyaani:</i>	Gnostic, Realized being
<i>Graam Svaraaj:</i>	Village autonomy; community self-rule
<i>Grhastaashrama:</i>	The station of the house holder
<i>Guna:</i>	Quality, attribute (see <i>nirguna</i>)
<i>Gunaateeta:</i>	Beyond qualities
<i>Jaagrat:</i>	Waking (see <i>svapna</i> and <i>sushupti</i>)
<i>Jagat:</i>	World
<i>Japa:</i>	Chant
<i>Jeevaanmukta:</i>	One liberated in life
<i>Jeevaanmukti:</i>	Liberation in one's life time
<i>Jignyaasa:</i>	Quest for Knowledge
<i>Kaama:</i>	Lust
<i>Kaivalya:</i>	'At-one-ment', 'al-one'

<i>Karma:</i>	Action
<i>Kartaa:</i>	Actor
<i>Kartrtva:</i>	Doership
<i>Kosa:</i>	Sheath
<i>Krshna paksha:</i>	Dark lunar fortnight (see <i>shukla paksha</i>)
<i>Krta:</i>	Done, accomplishment
<i>Laghu:</i>	Easy, simple, elementary
<i>Leela:</i>	Play
<i>Lok sevaa:</i>	Serving people.
<i>Maayaa:</i>	The 'phenomenate'; phenomenation'
<i>Madhyamika:</i>	Middle way.
<i>Mahaabhaava:</i>	Grand <i>bhaava</i> (see <i>bhaava</i>)
<i>Mahaasoonya:</i>	Infinite Void
<i>Maithuna:</i>	Coition, intercourse
<i>Mamakaara:</i>	<i>Meum</i> , mine-identity
<i>Manolaya:</i>	Mental accord
<i>Manonaasa:</i>	Perishing of the mind (see <i>amanaska</i> , <i>Mrtamanas</i>)
<i>Mantra:</i>	Any mystic / occult formula generally used for invocation or meditation
<i>‘Mimete’:</i>	Imitant
<i>Moksha, Mukti:</i>	Salvation, Liberation
<i>Mouna:</i>	Silence
<i>Mrtamanas:</i>	Dead I-less mind (<i>Anaham- manas</i>)
<i>Mumukshu-tva:</i>	Quest for liberation
<i>Naishkarmya:</i>	Non-doing (<i>Nishkartrtva</i> : Non-doership)
<i>Neti:</i>	Not so
<i>Niraasaa:</i>	Absence of desire/ hope.
<i>Nirguna:</i>	Quality-less; non-identity (see <i>guna</i> and <i>saguna</i>)
<i>Nirvaana:</i>	Passing out, cessation; 'transphenomen- ation'
<i>Nishphala karma:</i>	Literally/ fruitless action - i.e., action independent of outcome
<i>Nishkartrtva:</i>	Non-doership
<i>Nivrtti:</i>	In-going, involute, 'immanation' (see <i>pratiprasava</i>)
<i>Paapa:</i>	Sin
<i>Pari-tyaaga:</i>	Grand abdication, supreme renunciation (see <i>tyaaga</i>)

<i>Parityaaga</i>	
<i>Satyaagraha:</i>	Ultimate Satyagraha
<i>Poorna:</i>	Whole, Perfect
<i>Praana:</i>	Life-force
<i>Pragnya:</i>	Awareness
<i>Pragnyaana:</i>	Gnosis
<i>Pragnyaanaghana:</i>	Plenary Awareness
<i>Pramaana:</i>	Authority
<i>Prapatti:</i>	Surrender
<i>Pratiprasava:</i>	'Immersion' (see <i>nivrtti</i>)
<i>Prema:</i>	Love
<i>Preyas:</i>	Pleasant, Pleasurable
<i>Punya:</i>	Merit, meritorious
<i>Raaga:</i>	Desire, craving, pleasing, melody
<i>Rajas:</i>	The plane of activity; 'energy' (see <i>sattva</i> and <i>tamas</i>)
<i>Rajateeta</i>	<i>Metanomy</i>
<i>Saadhana:</i>	Means
<i>Saakshaatkaara:</i>	Trans-perception
<i>Saatvik:</i>	Truthward, harmonious (see <i>sattva</i>)
<i>Sad-guru:</i>	True guru
<i>Saguna:</i>	With attributes, identity (see <i>guna</i> and <i>nirguna</i>)
<i>Sahaja:</i>	Natural
<i>Samaadhi:</i>	Realized Awareness, At-one-ment
<i>Samadrshiti:</i>	Seeing all as equals
<i>Samhaara:</i>	Annihilation, dissolution
<i>Samsaara:</i>	Temporal, mundane, cycle of births and deaths
<i>Samskaara:</i>	Karmas of past births informing the present
<i>Sankalpa:</i>	Resolve, resolution
<i>Sat:</i>	Being, Real
<i>Satori:</i>	Instant illumination (in Zen)
<i>Satsvaraaj</i>	Sanautonomy
<i>Sattva:</i>	pro-verity (<i>Sat</i> : verity), <i>Truthwardness</i> ; inner purity and harmony. <i>Sattvik</i> : adj. of <i>Sattva</i>
<i>Satya:</i>	Truthful, truthfulness (in behaviour)

<i>Satyaagraha:</i>	Upholding truthfulness; Richard B.Gregg happily renders it 'Pacific Resistance'
<i>Sevaa:</i>	Service
<i>Shakti:</i>	Power, energy
<i>Shiva:</i>	God as dissolver in the trinity (see <i>Brahma</i> and <i>Vishnu</i>)
<i>Shuddha:</i>	Pure
<i>Shuddha Sattva:</i>	Pure Sattva, unalloyed with <i>rajas</i> , <i>tamas</i>
<i>Shukla Paksha:</i>	Bright lunar fortnight (see <i>krsna paksha</i>)
<i>Siddhi:</i>	Attainment, fruition, thaumaturgy
<i>Soonya:</i>	Void
<i>Sthita-pragnyata:</i>	Immutable, non-reactive, Awareness
<i>Sushupti:</i>	Deep (dreamless) sleep (see <i>jaagrat</i> and <i>svapna</i>)
<i>Svapna:</i>	Dream (see <i>jaagrat</i> and <i>Sushupti</i>)
<i>Taala :</i>	Rhythm, beat
<i>Taantrik:</i>	Follower of <i>tantra</i> ; adj. of <i>tantra</i>
<i>Tamas:</i>	Darkness, ignorance (see <i>sattva</i> and <i>rajas</i>)
<i>Tantra :</i>	A diversified, extra-vedic, esoteric, tradition that projects reality as a compound of male - female consciousness and aims at such fusion through occult practice of spells, rituals and meditations
<i>Tapas:</i>	Austere meditation
<i>Turiya:</i>	Beyond waking, dreaming, sleeping, planes
<i>Turiyaateeta:</i>	Transcending Turiya; Turiya sans body consciousness; videhamukti.
<i>Tyaaga:</i>	Sacrifice (see <i>parityaaga</i>)
<i>Upaaya:</i>	Means
<i>Upeya:</i>	End
<i>Vaasana:</i>	Intrinsic predisposition; psychic imprint carried over from earlier births
<i>Vai:</i>	Indeed
<i>Vichaara:</i>	Inquiry
<i>Videhamukti:</i>	<i>Turiyaateeta</i> ; transcending <i>Brahma-aakaar</i> – perception of all as <i>Brahman</i> even.
<i>Vignyaana:</i>	Relative knowledge; <i>gnyaana</i> in its empirical dimensions
<i>Vishaada:</i>	Despondency, melancholy

<i>Vishnu:</i>	God as preserver in the trinity (see <i>Brahma</i> and <i>Shiva</i>)
<i>Visishta:</i>	Distinctive
<i>Vyaavahaarika:</i>	Phenomenal, empirical, cultural
<i>Wei-wu-Wei:</i>	Doing -without-doing
<i>Yagnya:</i>	Sacrifice
<i>Zettel:</i>	Scrap of paper