
The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 1

Talks on the Atma Pooja Upanishad
Talks given from 15/02/72 pm to 06/06/72 pm
English Discourse series
18 Chapters
Year published:

Original title was simply "Atma Pooja Upanishad"

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 1

Chapter #1

Chapter title: The Tradition of the Upanishads and the Secrets of Meditation

15 February 1972 pm in Bombay, India

Archive code: 7202155
ShortTitle: ULTAL101
Audio: Yes
Video: No
Length: 111 mins

AUM TASYA NISHCHINTANAM DHYANAM
AUM MEDITATION IS THE CONSTANT CONTEMPLATION OF THAT.

THERE are some points to ponder over before we step into the unknown. The unknown is the message of the Upanishads. The basic, the most foundational, always remains unknown; that which we know is always superficial. So some points must be understood before we can go deep into the realm of the unknown. These three words -- the known, the unknown, and the unknowable -- must be understood first, because the Upanishads are concerned with the unknown only as a beginning. They end into the unknowable. The known realm becomes science, the unknown is philosophy and the unknowable belongs to religion.

Philosophy is the link between the known and the unknown, between science and religion. Philosophy is totally concerned with the unknown. The moment something becomes known, it becomes part of science; it remains no more a part of philosophy. So the more science grows, the more philosophy is pushed ahead. The field that becomes known becomes science, and philosophy is the link between science and religion. So as science progresses philosophy has to be pushed ahead, because it can only be concerned with the unknown. But the more philosophy proceeds ahead, the more religion is pushed ahead, because religion is basically concerned with the unknowable.

The Upanishads begin with the unknown; they end with the unknowable. That's how

misunderstanding arises. Professor Ranade has written a very deep book on the philosophy of the Upanishads, but it remains only a beginning. It cannot penetrate the deeper valleys of the Upanishadic mystery because it remains philosophical. The Upanishads begin with philosophy, but that is only a beginning. They end in religion, in the unknowable. And when I say "unknowable", I mean that which *cannot be known*.

Whatsoever the effort may be, howsoever we may try, the moment we *know* something it becomes part of science; the moment we *feel* something as unknown it is part of philosophy -- the moment we encounter the unknowable, only then is it religion. When I say the unknowable, I mean that which cannot be *known* but which can be *encountered*; it can be felt, it can even be lived. You can be face to face with it. It can be encountered, but still it remains unknowable. Only this much is felt -- that now we are deep in a mystery which cannot be solved. So before we enter this mystery, some points have to be understood; otherwise there will be no entrance.

One is: how to listen, because there are different dimensions of listening. You can listen with your intellect, with your reason. Mm? -- that is one way of listening to a thing: the most common, the most ordinary and the most shallow -- because with reason you are always either in defense or in attack. With reason you are always fighting, so whenever someone tries to understand something through reason he is fighting with the thing. At the most, a very rudimentary understanding is possible, just an acquaintance is possible. The deeper meaning is bound to be missed because the deeper meaning requires a very sympathetic listening.

Reason can never listen with sympathy. It listens with a very argumentative background. It can never listen with love; that is impossible. So listening with reason is good if you are trying to understand mathematics, if you are trying to understand logic, if you are trying to understand any system which is totally rational.

If you listen to poetry with reason, then you will be blind. It is as if one is trying to see with one's ears or hear with one's eyes. You cannot understand poetry through reason. So there is a deeper understanding, the second type of understanding, which is not through reason but through love, through feeling, through emotion, through heart.

Reason is always in conflict; reason will not allow anything to pass in easily. Reason must be defeated; only then can something penetrate. It is an armour around the mind; it is a defense method, a defense measure. It is alert every moment that nothing should pass without it being aware, and that nothing should be allowed -- unless reason is defeated. And even when reason is defeated the thing is not going to your heart, because in defeat you cannot feel sympathetic.

The second dimension of listening is through heart, through feeling. Someone is listening to music; then no analysis is needed. Of course, if you are a critic, then you will not be able to understand music. You may be able to understand the mathematics, the meter, the language, everything *about* music -- but never music itself; because music cannot be analyzed. It is a whole. It is a totality. If you wait for a single second to analyze it, you have missed much. It is a flowing totality. Of course, paper music can be analyzed, but never real music when it is there, playing. So you cannot stand aloof, you cannot be an observer. You have to be a participant. If you participate, only then do you understand.

So with feeling, the way of understanding is through participation. You cannot be an observer, you cannot stand outside. You cannot make music an object. You have to flow with it, you have to be deeply in love with it. There will be moments when you will not be and only music will be there. Those will be the peaks; those moments will be the moments of music. Then something penetrates to your deeper being. This is a deeper way of listening, but

it is still not the deepest.

The first way is through reason -- rational; the second is through feeling -- emotional; and the third is through being -- existential. When you listen through your reason, you are listening through one part of your being. Again, when you listen through your feeling, you are listening through one part of your being. The third, the deepest, the most authentic dimension of listening, is through your totality -- body, mind, spirit -- as a whole, as a oneness. If you understand this third way of listening, only then will you be able to penetrate the mystery of the Upanishad.

The traditional term for this third listening is "faith". So we can divide: through reason the method is doubt; through feeling the method is love, sympathy; through being the method is faith, trust -- because if we are going into the unknown, how can you doubt? You can doubt the known, but that which is not known at all -- how can you doubt it?

Doubt becomes valid if it is concerned with the known. With the unknown, doubt is just impossible. How can you love the unknown? You can love the known. You cannot love the unknown; you cannot create a relationship with the unknown. Relationship is impossible. You cannot relate with it. You can dissolve into it -- that is another thing -- but you cannot relate with it. You can surrender to the unknown, but you cannot relate to it. And surrender is not a relationship. It is not a relationship at all! It is just dissolving the duality.

So with reason the duality remains: you are in conflict with the other. With love the duality remains: you are in sympathy with the other. But with being the duality dissolves: you are neither in conflict nor in love; you are not related at all. This third is known traditionally as faith, trust -- *shraddha*. As far as the unknown is concerned, faith is the key.

If someone says, "How can I believe" then he misunderstands, then he misses the very point. Faith is not belief. Belief is, again, a rational thing. You can believe; you can disbelieve. You can believe because you have arguments for believing; you can disbelieve because you have arguments for disbelieving. Belief is never deeper than reason. So theists, atheists, believers, nonbelievers, they all belong to the most shallow realm. Faith is not belief, because for the unknown there is no reason for or against. You can neither believe nor disbelieve.

So what remains to be done? You can either be open to it or you can be closed to it. It is not a question of believing or not believing. It is a question of being open or being closed to it. If you trust, then you open. If you distrust, then you remain closed. This is just a key. If you want to open to the unknown, then you will have to be in trust, in faith. If you do not want to be open to it, you can remain closed -- but no one is missing except you; no one is at a loss except you. You will remain closed like a seed. When I say it I mean it.

A seed has to break, has to die; only then is the tree born. But the seed has never known the tree. The dying of the seed can happen only in faith. The tree is unknown, and the seed will never meet the tree. The seed can remain closed in fear -- in fear of death. Then the seed will remain a seed *and will die* ultimately, without being reborn. But if the seed can die in faith that the unknown may be born out of its death. only then does it open. In a way it dies, in a way it is reborn -- reborn into greater mysteries, reborn into a richer life. The same is the phenomenon with faith. So it is not belief: never misunderstand it as belief. It is not feeling. It is deeper than both: it is your totality.

So how to listen with one's totality? With neither reason functioning in antagonism nor feeling functioning in sympathy, but with the totality of one's being. How can the totality function? Because we know only functions of the parts, we do not know how the totality functions. We know only parts -- this part functioning, that part functioning, intellect

working, the heart functioning, the legs moving, the eyes seeing. We know only parts functioning. How does the totality function? The totality functions only in a deep passivity. Nothing is active; everything is silent. You are not doing anything. You are just here -- just presence -- and the doors open. Only then will you be able to understand what the Upanishad's message is. So your simple presence is needed -- no doing on your part, no functioning. That is what is meant by total functioning -- just your presence.

I must make it more clear, what I mean by "just presence". If you are in love with someone, then there are moments when you are not doing anything. You are just present by your lover's or beloved's side: just present, totally silent; you are not even loving each other -- just present. A very strange phenomenon happens. Ordinarily, our existence is linear. We exist in a line, in a sequence -- "my past, my present, my future": this is a line. I move on my track, you move on your track. We have our tracks, linear tracks, I moving on mine, you moving on yours. Really, we never meet. We are parallel lines -- no meeting. Even if we are crowded there is no meeting, because you are on your track and I am on my track; you belong to your past, I belong to my past; my present is born out of *my* past, your present is born out of *your* past. Your future will be a causal sequence of your past and present, and mine will be of mine.

So we move on tracks -- linear tracks, one-line tracks., There is no meeting. Only lovers meet because, suddenly, when you are just present with someone, a different time comes into existence. You both meet in a single moment, and this moment neither belongs to you nor to your lover. This is something new. This is neither out of your past nor out of your lover's past. Time moves in a different dimension -- not linear, not from the past to the future, but one present with another present. And there is a meeting between two present moments -- a different dimension. This dimension is known as the dimension of eternity, so lovers have said that one moment of love is eternity unto itself. It never ends. It has no future, it has no past. It is *just* present here and now.

This is what I mean when I say that if you can listen not with your past, not with your future, but with such a totality that in the present moment only your presence remains; if you can listen silently, passively; if you can just be present here and now; if this very moment is enough -- then a different dimension will open. And the Upanishadic message can penetrate only in that dimension.

That is what is meant when it is said that the essence of the Upanishads is eternal. It does not mean permanent. It only means a different dimension of time in which there is no future and no past. So you will have to move in a different way -- in your inner time. And with that inner change, words begin to take a different shape and a different significance is born out of them.

We use similar words. Everyone uses the same words, but with a different mind the words have a different meaning. For example, a doctor asks a patient, "How are you?" and at a casual meeting on the street, you ask someone, "How are you?" and a lover asks a beloved, "How are you?" -- the words are the same, but is the meaning the same? When a doctor asks a patient, "How are you?" does it mean the same as when a lover asks a beloved, "How are you?" A different significance comes into being.

The Upanishads cannot be understood in an ordinary way. That is how scholars miss the whole point, linguists miss the whole point, pundits miss the whole point. They work with language. with grammar, with everything that is pertinent, but still they miss. Why do they miss? The missing happens because their inner time is linear. They are working with their intellect. not with their being. Really, they are working on the Upanishad: they are not

allowing the Upanishad to work upon them. That is what I mean when I say to just be present: then the Upanishad can work upon you -- and that can be a transformation. That can transport you to different planes of existence.

So the first thing to remember is how to listen just by your presence. Absorb through your faith and trust -- drink! Do not fight with reason, do not feel with feeling. Just be one with your being. This is the key -- the first thing.

The second thing is that the Upanishads use words, they have to use them, but they stand for silence. They talk and they talk continuously, but they talk for silence. The effort is absurd, paradoxical, contradictory, inconsistent -- but this is how it is possible, this is the only way. Even if I have to provoke you toward silence, I have to use words. They use words, but they are completely against words and language; they are not for them. This must be remembered continuously; otherwise it is very easy to be lost in words.

Words have their own magic, they have their own magnetism., And each word creates a sequence of its own. Novelists know, poets know. They say sometimes they only begin their novel. When it ends, they cannot say they have ended it. Really, the words have their own sequence. They begin to be alive in their own way, and then they go on.

Tolstoy has said somewhere, "I begin, but I never end, and sometimes my own characters say things that I never wanted to say." They begin to have their own life and they go on their own tracks. They become free from the author, from the novelist, from the poet. They become as free as children become free from their parents. They have their own life.

So words have their own logic. Use a word, and you are on a track. And the word will create many things. The word itself will create many things, and one can be lost. But the Upanishads are not for words. That is why they use as few as possible. Their message is so telegraphic that not a single word is used unnecessarily. The Upanishads are the shortest treatises; not a single word is used unnecessarily because words can create a hypnotic sequence. But words have to be used, so be aware that you are not lost in words.

Meaning is something different. Even more than meaning -- it would be good to use the word "significance". The Upanishads use words as signs, as symbols, as indications. They use words to *show* something, not to say something. You can say something by your words, you can show something by your words. When you show something, then the word must be transcended, must be forgotten. Otherwise words come in the eyes and they distort the whole perception.

We will be using words, but with this caution: go on remembering that not only are meanings meant, but some indications. Symbolically, the words have been used -- just like a finger pointing to the moon. The finger is not the moon, but one can cling to the finger and one can say, "My teacher showed me -- this is the moon!" The finger is not the moon, but the finger can be used to show. The word is never the Truth, but words can be used to show. So always remember that the finger has to be forgotten. If the finger becomes more significant and important than the moon, then the whole thing will be perverted.

Remember this second point: words are just indicators to something else which is wordless -- something which is silent, something which is beyond, something which transcends.

This forgetting that words are not realities has created much confusion. There are thousands and thousands of commentaries, but they are concerned with words, not with the wordless reality. They go on discussing. For centuries, millennia, pundits have discussed what this word means and what that word means. and they have created a large literature. But so much search for meaning -- and totally meaningless! They have missed the point. The

words were never meant to be realities -- only pointers towards something else totally different from words.

Thirdly: I am not going to comment on the Upanishad, because commentary can only be something concerned with intellect. Rather, I am going to respond, not comment. Response is a different thing -- altogether different. You whistle in a valley or you sing a song or you play on a bamboo flute, and the valley echoes. reechoes, reechoes. The valley is not commenting: the valley is responding.

A response is a living thing; a commentary is bound to be dead. A response means that the Upanishad will be read here -- I will not comment on it; I will just become a valley and give an echo. It will be difficult to understand it, because even if the echo is authentic you may not be able to get the same sound back. You may not be able to find out the relevance, because when a valley responds, when it echoes something, that echo is not just a passive echo -- it is creative. The valley adds much. The nature of the valley adds much. A different valley will echo differently. That is how things should be. So when I say something, it is not meant that everyone is bound to say this. This is how my valley echoes it.

I am reminded of Stevens' lines. They look like a Zen poem: "Twenty men crossing a bridge into a village, are, twenty men crossing twenty bridges into twenty villages." When I read something, my valley echoes in a certain way; it is not passive. In that echo I am also present. When your valley reechoes it, it will be a different thing. When I say "a living response", I mean this.

Sometimes it may look absolutely irrelevant, because the valley will give it a shape, a colour of its own. This is natural. So I say that commentaries are criminal; only responses should be there, no commentaries -- because the commentator begins to feel that whatsoever he is saying is absolutely true. A commentator begins to feel that other commentators are wrong, and he begins to feel a self-imposed duty to criticize other commentators, because he feels his commentary can be right only when other's commentaries are wrong. But that is not the case with a response. Multi-responses are possible, and every response is right if it is authentic. If it comes from your depths, then it is right. There is no outward criterion of what is right and what is wrong. If something comes out of you from your depths, if you become one with it, if it vibrates through your whole being, then it is right. Otherwise, howsoever clever and howsoever logical, it is wrong.

This is going to be a response. And when I say "response", I mean it will be more like poetry and less like philosophy. It will not be a system. You cannot create systems through responses. Responses are atomic, fragmentary. They have an inner unity, but to find that inner unity is not so easy. The unity is just like a mainland and an island: between an island and a mainland there is a unity, but deep down; deep down in the depths of the sea. the land is one. If that is understood, then no man is an island. Deep down things are one; the deeper you go, the more you reach to the oneness. So if a response is authentic, then any response, even the opposite response which may look absolutely contradictory to it, cannot be different. Deep down there will be a unity.

But one has to go deep, and commentaries are superficial things. So I am not going to give you a commentary; I will not say what this Upanishad means. I will say only what this Upanishad means *in me*. I cannot claim any authority, and those who claim are really immoral. No one can say what this Upanishad means. All that can be said is what this Upanishad means in me -- how I echo it.

This response can create a responsiveness in you also if you are just present here. Then whatsoever I say will echo in you also. And if it can echo, then only will you be able to

understand it. So just be like a valley, be in a let-go, so that you can echo freely. Be concerned with yourself being a valley rather than with the text of the Upanishad, or with what I am saying. Be concerned with yourself being a valley, and all else will follow. No tension is needed, no strained effort is needed, to understand me. That can become a barrier. Just relax, just be silent and passive, and let whatsoever happens echo in you. Those vibrations will transport you to a different perspective, to a different vision.

Lastly, I am not a Hindu, neither am I Mohammedan nor a Christian -- a homeless wanderer. I do not belong to the tradition of the Upanishads outwardly, so I have no investment in them. When a Hindu comments, or when a Hindu thinks about the Upanishads, he has investments; when a Mohammedan writes about the Upanishads, he has anti-investments: they cannot be true and authentic. If one is a Hindu he cannot be true about the Upanishads; if one is a Mohammedan he cannot be true about the Upanishads. He is bound to lie. But the deception is so subtle that one may not even be aware.

Man is the only animal who can lie to himself and can live in deceptions. If you are a Hindu and are thinking about the Upanishads, or a Mohammedan and thinking about the Koran, or a Christian and thinking about the New Testament, you will never be aware that you cannot be true. Your being a Christian is the barrier. You cannot be true! One must not belong; only then is the response true. Belonging disturbs, perverts the mind, distracts and projects things which are not, or denies things which are.

So to me, that is not a problem, and for you also I would suggest that when you are reading the Koran, listening to the Upanishads or to the Bible, do not be Hindus, Christians and Mohammedans at all -- just being is enough. You will be able to penetrate deeper. With concepts, with dogmas, you are never open. And a closed mind can create deceptions of understanding, but can never understand.

So I belong to no one, and if I am responding to this Upanishad it is simply because I have fallen in love with it. This, one of the shortest Upanishads, "Atma Pooja", is a rare phenomenon. So something about this rare Upanishad. why I have chosen to talk about it.

Firstly, it is the shortest; it is just seedlike -- potent, pregnant, with much in it. Every word is a seed with infinite possibilities. So you can echo it and reecho it infinitely. And the more you ponder over it, the more you allow it to go in, the more newer significances will be revealed. These seedlike words show that they were found in deep silence. Really, this looks strange, but this is a fact. If you have less to say, you will say more. If you really have something to say, you can say it in a very few lines, few words -- even a single word may be enough. The less you have to say, the more words you will have to use. The more you have to say, the less words you can use.

Now it has become a known fact to psychologists that words are used not to say, but to hide. We go on talking because we want to hide something. If you want to hide something you cannot be silent, because your face may say it, your silence may indicate it. The other may become suspicious that you are hiding something. So a person who has to hide something will go on talking continuously. Through words you can deceive; through silence you cannot deceive.

The Upanishads really have something to say, so they say it in seed form -- in sutras, in aphorisms. This Upanishad has only seventeen sutras. They can be written on a half page. On one postcard this whole Upanishad can be written -- on one side! But it has a very potent message, so we will take each seed word and try to penetrate it, to be in a living response with it. Something may begin to vibrate in you. And it can begin because these words are very potential, they have much. If their atoms could be broken. much energy would be

released. So be open, receptive, in a deep trust, and let the Upanishad work.

Now we enter into the "Atma Pooja -- Worship of the Self -- Upanishad":

AUM MEDITATION IS THE CONSTANT CONTEMPLATION OF THAT.

"AUM": this word "AUM" is very significant -- significant as a sign, as a symbol, as a secret key. So first we must decode it.

AUM has five *matras*, five steps. The first step is A, the second is U, the third is M. These are gross steps. When we utter AUM, A-U-M -- these are three words. But utter AUM [long], and in the end the M resounds -- "mmm". That is a half step -- the fourth. Three are gross and can be heard. The fourth is half gross. If you are very aware, only then is it heard; otherwise it is lost. And the fifth is just never heard. When the sound of AUM vibrates and the vibrations go into the cosmic emptiness, when the sound has gone and a soundlessness remains, that is the fifth. You utter the word AUM, then A-U-M is heard very clearly, then a lingering sound of "mmm" -- half a step -- and then soundlessness. That is the fifth. These five steps are just signs towards many things.

First, the Upanishads know that human consciousness has five steps. We know the three gross ones -- the waking, the dreaming and the sleep. These are three gross -- A-U-M. The Upanishads call the fourth *turiya*. They have not named it because it is not gross. The fourth is that in which one becomes aware of deep sleep also. If you have been deep in sleep, in a deep dreamless sleep, if in the morning you can say, "I have been in a deep, deep sleep," then someone in you has been aware and remembers somehow that there has been a very deep, dreamless sleep -- but a witness was there. That witness is known as the fourth. But the Upanishads say that even the fourth is not the ultimate, because to be a witness is still to be separate. So when the witness also dissolves, if only the Existence remains, without a witness, that is the fifth. So this AUM is a sign for many things -- for many things -- for five bodies in man. The Upanishads divide them into *anamaya*, *pranamaya*, *manomaya*, *vigyanamaya* and *anandamaya* -- five sheaths, five bodies.

This AUM is a cosmic sign. This is just a sign, but it is also a symbol. What does it mean when I say it is also a symbol? When someone goes deep into Existence, to the roots, to the very roots, then thoughts are no more there, the thinker is no more there, objectivity is no more there, subjectivity is no more there -- but, still, everything *is*. In that thoughtless, thinkerless moment, a sound is heard. That sound resembles AUM -- just resembles it. It is not AUM; that is why it is a symbol. We cannot reproduce it. This is the approximate resemblance. That is why it has been likened to many sounds, but it is always nearer to AUM.

Christians and Mohammedans have represented it as AMEN. That sound which is heard when everything is lost, and only a sound vibrates, resembles AUM. It can resemble *amen*. In English, there are many words -- omnipresent, omniscient, omnipotent. That OMN is the sound. Really, "omniscient" refers to one who has seen the AUM, and AUM is a symbol for all. "Omnipotent" means one who has become one with AUM, because that is the potentiality of the whole cosmos. "Omnipresent" means one who is present in the sound of AUM, and that sound surrounds all; it overflows all.

The OMN in omniscient, omnipresent, omnipotent, is AUM. AMEN is AUM. Different seekers, different persons, have come with different resemblances, but they always somehow resemble AUM. This is a symbol -- a symbol of a universal sound. Modern science thinks in

terms of electric particles as the foundational units of Existence -- but the Upanishads think not of electrical particles, but of sound particles as the basis.

Science says that sound is a modification of electric vibrations, that sound itself is nothing but electricity. The Upanishads say electricity is nothing but sound modifications. One thing is certain -- that somehow sound and electricity are convertible. Which is basic? Science says electricity is basic, the Upanishads say sound is basic. And I think this difference is simply because of their approaches. The Upanishads reach to the Ultimate Reality through sound, through *mantra*. They use sound to reach soundlessness. By and by, the sound is dropped; by and by, soundlessness is achieved. Ultimately, when they reach to the bottom, they hear a cosmic sound. It is not a thought; it is not a created sound. It is just in the very nature of Existence that it sounds.

That sound they have called AUM. They say that when we say AUM, it is just a resemblance -- a very far, far-off copy. It is not true, it is not that which is known there, because it is created by us. It is created by us! It is just like a photograph of something: it simply resembles. My photograph simply resembles me: it is not me.

I have heard about the Dutch painter, Van Gogh. A sophisticated lady met Van Gogh on the street and said, "I have seen a portrait of you, and it was so lovely and so beautiful that I kissed it."

Van Gogh asked, "Did the portrait reply?"

The lady said, "No! How can the portrait reply?"

So Van Gogh said, "Then it was not me!"

A photograph can resemble: it is not real. Mm? -- nothing is wrong with it: it is enough that it resembles, but one should not mistake it for the real. So AUM is just a symbol -- a symbol of something it resembles -- like a photograph.

AUM is also a secret key. When I say a secret key, I mean that because it resembles the ultimate sound, if you can use it and, by and by, go deep with it, you will reach to the ultimate door -- because it resembles. And it will resemble more if you do certain things with it. For example, if you utter AUM then you have to use your lips; your body mechanism is to be used. Then it will resemble less, because a very gross mechanism has to be used and it perverts. It changes AUM into a gross thing. Do not use your lips. Create the sound of AUM in yourself only through your mind. Do not use your body. Then it will resemble more, because now you will be using a more subtle medium. It will give a finer photograph, more close to the real.

Do not even use mind: first use the gross body, then drop it; then use your mind -- just create the sound of AUM inwardly; then even stop that, and let the sound echo itself. Do not make any effort: it comes. Then it becomes AJAPA -- then you are not creating it; you are just in the flow of it. Then it goes even deeper and it becomes even more real. You can use it as a key. When it becomes effortless -- when it is not with your body, nor with your mind, but when the sound just flows in you -- you are very near.

Now only one thing has still to be dropped -- the one who is feeling this AUM. The "I", the ego, that feels that "AUM is surrounding me." If you drop this also then there is no barrier, and the copy, the photograph, drops into the real, the original. So it is also a secret key.

This AUM is miraculous. It is as foundational to mystics as Einstein's formula of relativity is to physics. That formula is three things: a sign, a symbol and a secret key -- and AUM is also three things. But, basically, it is a secret key. Unless you open the doors, it is useless to go on thinking about it, futile, wasting time and life and energy. Unless you are

ready to open the door, what is the use of talking about the key? Even if you understand all the implications, all the philosophical implications, it is meaningless. So AUM is always put in the beginning, and it is always put in the end. The Upanishads always begin with AUM, they always end with AUM. This is the key!

If you enter the house, the first thing to be used is the key; and again, when you come out, the last thing to be used is the key. So enter! Use the key! But if you begin to contemplate on the key and continue sitting at the door, then the key is not a key for you but a barrier. Throw it! -- because it is not opening anything. Rather, it is closing. And you are constantly thinking about the key.

One can go on thinking about the key without using it. There are many who have pondered, thought and contemplated about what AUM means. They have created structures, big structures on it, but they have never used the key. They have never entered the palace. It is a symbol, it is a sign, BUT basically it is a secret key. It can be used as a method to enter into the Cosmic, as a method to drop into the oceanic. The subtler it becomes, the deeper, the nearer it goes to the real; the grosser, the less.

"Meditation is the constant contemplation of That": this is the first sutra.

We live in a world of three dimensions. One dimension is "I-it" -- the world of things. I and my house, I and my furniture, I and my wealth: this is the realm of I-it. A world of it surrounds me.

Then there is another dimension, I-thou: I and my beloved, I and my friend, I and my family -- a world of persons. This is the second realm.

Then there is a third realm, I-That: I and the universe. The Upanishad says, "Meditation is the constant contemplation of THAT" -- neither of it, nor of thou, but of That. That means the Whole. It is not a thing, not a person: it is a That But why use That? Whenever we say "That", it means something that transcends, something that is beyond, something that is not where we are -- neither in our relationships with things nor in our relationships with persons.... That -- without any name, because if you give it a name -- for example, if you call it "God" -- it becomes an I-thou relationship. If you call it "father" or "mother", then you bring it to the second dimension. If you say there is no God, then you have to live in a one-dimensional world, I-it.

That is not a thing. Theists are ready to say it is not a thing, but they say it is a person. The Upanishads are not even ready to call it a person, because to make it a person is to limit it and to make it a person is to make it finite. They simply use the word "that". They say, "It is *all*, but we cannot name it because it has no form, no limitation. It is the ALLNESS." Then what to call it? They do not call it "God", they do not call it "Divine", they do not call it "Lord" -- they do not call it by any name. There is no form, no name They simply use the word "that", and continuous contemplation of That is meditation.

If you can remember That continuously, then you are in meditation. When you are with things, remember That; when you are with persons, remember That. Wherever you are remember That -- the All. Never see the limited as limited: always look deep and feel the unlimited. Never see the form as the form: always look deep and see the formless in it. Never see the thing as the thing: go deep, feel it, and the That will be revealed. Never see any person cased in his personality. Penetrate deep and feel that which goes beyond -- the within beyond.

The continuous contemplation of That is meditation -- no ritual, no method, no technique, simply continuous contemplation. But it is arduous, because one has to remember continuously, with no gap, no discontinuity, not even a single moment's forgetfulness.

Remembrance continuous -- constant, without any gap. It is the most arduous thing to remember continuously. We cannot remember continuously even for a few seconds. Just begin to count your breath, and remember how many breaths you can count while continuously remembering, constantly remembering the process of breathing -- the incoming, the outgoing breaths. Remember, and count. You have counted three or four, and then you miss. Something else comes in, and you have forgotten. And then you remember, "Oh, I was counting, and I have counted only three and I missed!"

Remembrance is the most difficult thing -- because we are asleep. We are deeply asleep! We are walking in sleep, talking in sleep, moving, living, loving, doing everything in sleep, in a deep somnambulism -- a deep, natural hypnosis. That is why there is so much confusion and so much conflict, so much violence and so much war. It is really a miracle how the human race has survived -- so much sleep, and still we manage somehow!

But we are asleep. Our behaviour is not a behaviour which can be called alert, attentive, aware -- we are not. For a single minute, we cannot be aware of ourselves. Try it, and then you will feel how much asleep you are. If I cannot remember myself continuously for one minute, for sixty seconds, how deeply asleep I must be! Two or three seconds, and then sleep comes and I am not there: I have moved. The consciousness has been dropped, the unconscious has come in. There is a deep darkness, and again I remember that I was trying to be aware.

P. D. Ouspensky was working with Gurdjieff on his method of self-remembering. The first time he met Gurdjieff he said, "What do you mean by self-remembering? I remember myself: I am P. D. Ouspensky."

Gurdjieff said, "Close your eyes and remember that you are P. D. Ouspensky, and when you forget, tell me. Be frank!"

Only three or four seconds passed, and Ouspensky opened his eyes and he said, "I began to dream. I forgot that I am P. D. Ouspensky. I tried three or four times. I said within myself, 'I am P. D. Ouspensky, I am P. D. Ouspensky, I am P. D. Ouspensky,' and then a dream broke in and I was not aware."

So Gurdjieff said, "This is not self-remembering -- that you are P. D. Ouspensky. Firstly, you are not P. D. Ouspensky, and, secondly, this is not remembering. When the remembering comes, you will be the first to deny that you are P. D. Ouspensky."

For three months Ouspensky tried hard, very hard. The more you try, the more you become aware how hard it is. The more you try, the more you begin to feel that "I have been asleep all my life." This is just a mechanical awareness that we have. We can move with it, do the routine, but can never go deep. For three months, when he tried and tried and tried and then became aware, a new pillar of consciousness came into existence. When he could feel and be aware constantly, then Gurdjieff asked him to come with him and to move on the street. So Ouspensky said, "For the first time, on the street of a big City, I became aware that everyone is asleep, everyone is moving in sleep. But I had moved in the same street and was never aware. And I saw every man asleep -- just with open eyes." He became so afraid that he said to his teacher, "I cannot go further; I must go back. Everyone is so asleep that anything can happen here. I cannot move."

Just sit by the side of the street and look at people's eyes moving. Then you will become aware that everyone is closed within himself. He is not aware of what is happening around him. Someone is talking with himself, someone is moving his hands, making gestures; he may be in some dream. Lips are moving, everyone is talking within; no one is aware of what is happening around him. All are moving just automaton-like. They are going to their homes;

they need not even remember where their homes are -- they just move automatically. Their legs move, their hands move their car wheels, they reach their homes, but this whole process is just a sleep -- a mechanical routine. Tracks are there, and on those tracks they go on moving. That is why we are always afraid of the new -- because then we have to create new tracks. We are afraid of the new because for the new the routine will not do, and for some time we will have to be a bit alert. We are always fixed in our dead routines and are, in a way, dead. A sleeping person is really dead. He cannot be said to be alive.

Only for moments, for a few moments in the whole life, do we become aware, and those moments are either in deep moments of love, which are rare.... It happens only to a few people, to very few. And when it happens, everyone else will feel that that man has gone mad -- because he becomes so different, because he comes to see things in a different colour, with a different music, with a different light. He begins to look around, and he sees a different world! Of course, he has gone mad for us, so we can forgive him because "he is mad". He is "in a dream". Really, the contrary is the case: we are asleep, and for a moment he has become aware of a deeper reality. But he is alone, and that awareness cannot continue because it is just an accidental happening.

It is not by his effort that he has attained it. It has just happened. It is an accident. He will go to sleep again, and when he goes to sleep then he will feel that he has been betrayed by his lover or beloved, because that magic is no more there. That magic came because he became aware of a different world. In this world there are different worlds. He became aware and now he is asleep again, so he feels he has been betrayed. Every lover feels that he has been betrayed. No one has betrayed him. Only in a sudden awakening he has seen a different world, with a different beauty, with different sounds, and now he is again asleep. That glimpse is lost and he feels he has been betrayed. No one has betrayed him. It is only that suddenly he became aware.

One becomes aware either with love or with death. If you are suddenly in the grip of death, you will be aware. In sudden accidents -- the car speeding uncontrollably down the hill -- you will become aware, because there is no future and the past has ended. Only the present moment -- this moment of dropping down the hill -- is all. Now a different dimension of time opens. You are here and now for the first time. Dreams are not possible because there is no future. You cannot think about the future. The past is just ending. Between these two, for this moment, in this calamity, you have become aware. So love and death are the only moments when we become aware, but they are not in our hands. They are not!

So when the Upanishad says "the constant contemplation of That", it means that if you can remember continuously, constantly, in everything, in every event, that whatsoever is, is That -- inside, outside; if everything becomes just a symbol for the remembrance of That, then the consciousness will explode, the sleep will not be there, you will become conscious and aware. That consciousness, that awareness, is meditation.

There are two more things. "Continuous" means without any gap -- not a single moment's gap. But this is difficult, because then your life will be impossible. If you go on continuously remembering Him, how can you live, how can you move, how can you eat? That problem arises if you begin to remember His name, if you begin to remember "Ram", "Jesus" or something else. If you begin to remember His name, if you give some name to Him, and begin to repeat "Ram-Ram-Ram", then your life will become impossible, because either you can remember "Ram" or you can move on the street.

One soldier was brought to me, a very sincere man, a very devoted one. He was trying continuously to remember "Ram". Someone, some guru told him to remember "Ram"

continuously. He became so much absorbed with that repetition that outward life became impossible -- impossible! He could not sleep because he had to remember "Ram". So if you are repeating "Ram-Ram-Ram" inside, you cannot go to sleep. This constant activity will not allow it. He could not move on the street because someone may be honking a horn and he could not hear. He was surrounded by his own repetition -- closed. He became insensitive. He was a military soldier, so his captain brought him to me and said. "He cannot even listen. I say, 'Left turn!' and he is standing and he is looking. He is absent. What is he doing?"

The captain told me, "It has become impossible! This man has to be hospitalized." I asked the soldier, "What are you doing?"

He said, "I can tell you but not my captain. My guru has given me a mantra to repeat continuously, so I am repeating 'Ram-Ram-Ram'. And now the repetition has gone so deep -- for three years I have been repeating continuously -- that I have lost sleep. I cannot see what is happening, I cannot hear what is happening around me. A great barrier has come between myself and the world. I am enclosed within my repetition of 'Ram'." He asked me, "How can I do both? If I have to repeat it continuously, then I cannot do anything else. So tell me what to do. If I do anything else, then this repetition breaks. Gaps are bound to come there."

This is not meant here. That is why the Upanishad is not giving any name, any form, but is simply saying "That". It is possible to remember That continuously, because you are not to remember His name. Rather, you have to feel That in everything you are doing -- just carrying water from the well!

One Zen monk, Bokuju, was asked, "What do you do continuously?"

He said, "I don't do anything continuously. Whatever I am doing, I am doing it totally. When I am carrying water from the well, I am carrying water from the well. When I am chopping wood, I am chopping wood. When I am sleeping, I am sleeping."

The questioner asked, "Then what are you DOING?"

Bokuju said, "I am not doing anything. When I am chopping wood, He is chopping wood. When I am carrying the water, He is carrying the water. And He is the water which is being carried, and He is the wood which is being chopped. Now He is and I am not! So everything has become a worship and everything has become a meditation."

This whole Upanishad is concerned with how to make your whole life a worship. This Upanishad is absolutely anti-ritualistic: no ritual is needed; only a different attitude, a remembering of That -- doing, non-doing, but remembering That. And when I say "remembering That," it is not a mental remembering. You are not to remember, "Okay, this stone is That." If you have to remember in this way, that "this stone is THAT," then it is not remembering, because still two exist -- this stone and That. When the Upanishad says, "constant contemplation of That," it means the stone must drop! ONLY THAT IS! That is a deep realization, a constant realization.

Begin to feel. Do not touch a thing without feeling the That; do not love anyone without feeling That; do not move, do not even breathe, without feeling That. It is not that you have to impose That on everything: you have to discover That in everything. Mm? -- the distinction must be clear. You are not to impose That on everything. You can impose; that will be just a trick. You have to discover! Seeing a flower, you can impose and can say, "Oh, that flower is That!"

No, do not impose, do not say anything! Just remain silent near the flower. Look at it, be in deep sympathy with it, in a deep communion with it. Forget yourself. Just be a passive awareness there, and the flower will flower into That. The That will be revealed.

So go on discovering That! That is what is meant by "constant contemplation". And,

constant contemplation of That is meditation.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 1

Chapter #2

Chapter title: Dissolution into the Cosmic

16 February 1972 pm in Bombay, India

Archive code: 7202165

ShortTitle: ULTAL102

Audio: Yes

Video: No

Length: 97 mins

OSHO, YOU SAID LAST NIGHT THAT THOSE WHO HAVE BECOME VOID, VALLEY-LIKE, DO NOT REACT BUT THEY RESPOND, AND THAT THE RESPONSES OF THESE DIFFERENT ENLIGHTENED ONES WILL BE DIFFERENT -- THAT THE VALLEY WILL REECHO IN ITS OWN UNIQUE AND INDIVIDUAL WAY. NOW A QUESTION ARISES WHETHER THOSE WHO BECOME ABSOLUTELY VOID, NOTHINGNESS, STILL HAVE A PERSONALITY AND INDIVIDUALITY. IF SO, THEN PLEASE EXPLAIN HOW THIS BECOMES POSSIBLE.

THIS is one of the paradoxes of spiritual life: the more one dissolves into the Divine, the more unique one becomes. The dissolution is not of the individuality but of the self. The dissolution is not of the uniqueness but of the ego. The more you are an ego, the more you are like others, because everyone is an egoist.

The ego is the most ordinary thing in the world. Everyone is an egoist; even a newborn child is an egoist -- a perfect egoist. So it is not anyone's achievement; it is not extraordinary. Really, it can be said that to be just ordinary is the most extraordinary thing possible because no one feels just ordinary. So to feel oneself extraordinary is just the most ordinary thing. Everyone feels like that! So ego is not something unique.

If you have an ego, it is not something unique. Really, egolessness is the most unique thing, the most uncommon -- rare. It happens only sometimes. Centuries pass and rarely the event happens that someone becomes egoless -- a Buddha, a Jesus. But when we say that someone becomes egoless, it does not mean that he is *not*. Really, for the first time, *now he is* -- authentically grounded into the very Being. He is no more an ego.

So take it from a different root: ego is a false phenomenon -- just an appearance, not a reality. It is not something grounded in the Being -- just a dream, a thought, just a mental construction. So the more you belong to the ego, the less you belong to the Existence. The more you concentrate on your ego, the less and less you are authentic. You become false -- an existential lie.

When we talk about becoming empty, nothing, valley-like, we mean that there is no ego -- but you ARE! Let me say it in this way: I say "I am", but when the ego dissolves there

remains the pure "am-ness". The "I" is no longer there, but "am-ness" is there, and for the first time pure, total, uncontaminated. The ego contaminates it.

The word "personality" and the word "individuality" must not be confused. They are totally different. They do not mean any similar entity: they are not the same at all. Personality belongs to the ego, individuality to the Being. Personality is just a facade. The ego is the center and the personality is the circumference. It is not individuality at all.

This word "personality" is very meaningful. It is derived from the Greek word "persona". "Persona" means a mask. In Greek drama, the characters, the actors, will use masks to hide their faces so the real face is hidden and the masked face becomes the reality. "Personality" means a mask -- that which you are not but only appear to be.

So we have many faces; really, no one has one personality. Mm? -- we have multi-personalities. Everyone has to change faces the whole day. You cannot remain with one face. It will be so difficult because every time you face someone else you have to use another face. Before your servant you cannot have the same face as you have before your master. Before your wife you cannot have the same face as you have before your beloved. So, continuously, we have a flexible system of changing faces.

For the whole day, the whole life, we are continuously changing faces. You can be aware of this. You can feel when you change a face and why you change it and how many faces you have. So, really, a personality means a system of flexible faces, and when you say that someone has a great personality it only means that he has a more flexible system. He is not a fixed man: he has a more flexible system. He can change very easily. He is a big actor.

This is personality; you have to construct it every moment. So no one can be at ease with his personality. It is a constant effort. So if you are tired, your personality will lose its lustre. In the morning your personality has a lustre, in the evening it is lost. The whole day of utility: it is constantly changing. So when I use the word "personality", I mean a false appearance which you have created around yourself.

Individuality is something else. Individuality does not mean something constructed and created by you, but the very nature of your being. Again, the word "individuality" is very meaningful. It means that which cannot be divided, which is indivisible. We have an inherent intrinsic nature which cannot be divided, which is indivisible. Carl Gustav Jung chooses the word "individuation" as one of the deepest phenomena. He said individuation is the way towards Truth, towards the Divine -- individuation: being an individual.

The Indian term "yoga" means the same thing as individuation. The term "yoga" means to conjoin again that which has become divisible, to join again that which has become divided, to come again to the indivisible. So when translating "yoga" into English, it would be better if we call it "the way to individuation". This individuality remains and becomes more penetrating, becomes more sharp. The moment you lose the ego, the moment you discard your personalities, you become individual.

This individuality is a unique phenomenon. This is unrepeatable. A Buddha cannot be repeated; a Gautam Siddharth can be repeated. A Jesus can be repeated, but not Jesus Christ. Jesus means the personality; Jesus Christ means the individuality. Gautam Siddharth is just ordinary; he can be repeated. Anyone can be Gautam Siddharth. But the moment Gautam Siddharth becomes Enlightened and becomes the Buddha, now the phenomenon is unrepeatable. It is unique! It has never been before and it will never be again. This Buddhahood, this peak of realization, is so unique that it cannot be repeated.

So when I said to be just like a valley and when I said that every valley will echo differently, I meant that every valley has its own individuality. Buddha has his own, Jesus

his, Krishna his. So, really, this will be good to understand.

Why do Krishna, Christ and Buddha differ so much? They differ! They differ as much as there is any possibility to differ, but still they are, in a very deep way, one. As far as individuation is concerned they are one; as far as individualities are concerned they are different. They have come to the Undivided. They have realized the Undivided, the basic unity of Existence. But because of this basic unity and its realization, it does not mean that now they are not unique. *now* they are really unique. That's why I say this is one of the paradoxes.

Two ordinary persons can differ, but their difference can never be total, absolute -- never! Even in their difference they have similarities. Really, their difference is always of degrees. Even if they are totally contrary to one another, their difference is of degrees. A person who is a communist and a person who is anticommunist, even they are different only in degrees. The person who is anti-communist is still communist to a lesser degree; and the person who is a communist is still a capitalist to a lesser degree. The difference is always of degrees. And they can change, they can change camps very easily; there is no problem. Ordinarily, they change. The difference is just like that of cold and heat -- only of degrees. But a Buddha and Krishna, a Christ and Mohammed, and a Lao Tzu and Mahavir -- their difference is not of degrees. They can never meet. And this is the paradox: they have come to Oneness, and yet they can never meet. The difference is not of degrees. The difference is of their uniqueness. What do I mean by this uniqueness?

We can conceive of oneness very easily. A drop of water drops into the ocean and becomes one with it, but that oneness is just dead -- a dead oneness. The drop lost itself completely; it is nowhere now. A Buddha is not dropping in that way. His dropping is in a different way. If you put a flame before the sun, the flame becomes one with the sun, but the individuality is not lost; it still remains itself. If we burn fifty flames in this room they will create one light, but every flame will be a flame unique in itself. So this dissolution into the Cosmic is not a simple dissolution. It is very complex. The complexity is this: the one who dissolves, remains. Rather, on the contrary, for the first time, he is.

This individuality echoes differently, and that is the beauty of it. It is beautiful! Otherwise it will be just ugly. Just think: if Buddha responds in the same way as Jesus the world will be poorer for it. very poor. A Buddha responds in his own way, a Jesus in his own way. The world is richer for it and there is beauty. The world is freer and you can be yourself.

But this distinction *must* be remembered: when I say that you can be yourself, I do not mean your ego. When I say you can be yourself, I mean your nature, your Tao, your Existence. But it has an individuality. That individuality is not personality. So I say they belong to the same Existence, yet individually. They respond from the same depth, but individually. No sense of ego is there, but the uniqueness remains.

This world is not just a colourless unity; it is not monotonous. It has multi-colours; it is multi-tonal. You can create music with one note also, but then it will be just monotonous and boring. It cannot be lively; it cannot be beautiful. A more subtle and complex harmony is achieved through many notes -- multi-phonical. A harmony runs through, but it is not a monotonous thing. And each note has its own individuality. It contributes to the total harmony, and it contributes only because it has its own individuality.

A Buddha contributes only because he is a Buddha, and a Jesus contributes only because he is a Jesus. He gives a new note. a new vibration. A new harmony is born because of him. But that is possible only because he has an individuality. And this is not only for deeper things. Even for very trivial and small things, a Buddha and Jesus differ. A Buddha walks in

his own way; no one else can walk like that. A Jesus looks in his own way; no one else can look like that. Even their eyes, the very gestures, the very words they use, are unique. The other cannot even conceive....

This world is a harmony of unique notes, and the music is richer for that -- every valley echoing in its own way.

All those good-wishers who try to impose a dead unity, and who try to wash out individuality from everywhere, who say that the Koran means the same thing as the Gita, who say that Buddha teaches the same thing as Mahavir, are not really aware of what nonsense they are talking. And if they could win, the world would become just a poor world. How can the Koran say the same thing as the Gita? And how can the Gita say the same thing as the Koran? The Koran has its own individuality -- no Gita can say that, and no Koran can repeat the Gita -- because Krishna has his own aura, Mohammed his own. They never meet, and yet, I say, they stand on the same ground. They never meet, and this is the beauty. And they will never meet. They will be just like parallel lines running to infinity.

They will never meet! This is what I mean by uniqueness: they are like peaks. The higher the peak goes, the less is the possibility of meeting with another peak. You can meet when you are on the ground; everything is meeting. But the higher you go, the more of a peak you become, and the less is the possibility of any meeting. So they are like Himalayan peaks, never meeting. And if you try to impose a false unity over them, you will just destroy the peaks.

They *are* different, but their difference need not be inimical, their difference need not be a conflict. The conflict arises only because we are not ready to accept differences. Then we try to find similarities. Either we must have similarities or we will have conflict. Either we must speak the same thing or we must be enemies. We have only two alternatives -- and both are wrong. They belong to one attitude. Why should they not be different? -- altogether different, meeting nowhere? What is the need of conflict? Really, different notes create a beautiful harmony. Then there is a deeper meeting -- no meeting in the notes themselves, but in what the notes create; in the harmony there is a meeting.

But one must begin to *feel* that harmony. If one only knows a jarring note -- a Mohammed, a Jesus, a Buddha, are just notes -- no harmony is felt. And the universe is a harmony. If you can begin to feel the gaps and the underlying unity and the soaring peaks meeting nowhere, and if you can see this whole in a totality, in a comprehensive unity, you then accept both -- the individuality and the common harmony. Then there is no problem. There is not!

CAN THIS ALSO EXPLAIN WHY MAHAVIR AND BUDDHA, WHO WERE CONTEMPORARIES, NEVER MET -- NEVER PHYSICALLY CAME ACROSS ONE ANOTHER?

They cannot meet! -- even physically. They came, so many times, very near meeting. Once they were both staying in one SARAI -- inn -- in one part Mahavir and in another part Buddha. But there was no meeting. They passed through the same villages. Their whole lives they were confined to Bihar, a very small area. They visited the same villages; they remained in the same villages; they talked to the same audiences. Their followers went on coming from Buddha to Mahavir and from Mahavir to Buddha. There was much controversy; there was much conversion. But they never met.

They cannot meet! Their very beings are now such peaks that the meeting is not possible. The meeting has become intrinsically impossible. Even if they just sit side by side, they can never meet. Even if to us they appear to be meeting and embracing each other, they can never meet. Their meeting has become impossible. They are so unique, they are so peak-like, the inner meeting is impossible. What is the use of meeting outwardly? It is useless, it is meaningless!

This seems inconceivable to us. We think that two good persons should meet. For us, the non-meeting attitude is something bad. But really, there is no non-meeting attitude -- there is impossibility! It is not that Buddha would not like to meet Mahavir. It is not that Mahavir is resistant. No -- it is simply impossible; it just cannot happen. There is no attitude about it. So, really, this is miraculous. They remained in one village, they stayed in one *sarai*, but never, neither in Buddhist literature nor in Jain scriptures, is there any reference to anyone suggesting that they should meet -- not a single reference. There is not even a reference that it was suggested that it would have been better if they both met. This is miraculous -- surprising! Neither has denied the other. Neither Buddha nor Mahavir has said, "I will not meet." Why didn't they meet? It is a sheer impossibility! It is not possible!

For us who stand on the ground it looks strange. But if you stand on the peak, then it will not look strange. Why not ask a Himalayan peak to meet another? They are so near -- so near! Why can they not meet? Their very being, their very peak-hood, creates the impossibility. So it is not a question of why they never met -- they cannot, they will never. The very door is closed. And yet I say they are one: howsoever one peak may differ from another, in their very roots they are one. They may both belong to the same part of earth, but only in the roots are they one.

There is another point to be pondered over: because they are so much one in the roots, there is not even any necessity to meet. Only those who are not one in the ground will try to meet, because basically they know there is no meeting.

Many people have asked me why I have not tried a great synthesis of all the religions. Gandhi has tried; many others, including Theosophists, have tried. They have tried for a great synthesis of all the religions. I say that if you try, you show that you know there is no synthesis. The effort shows that you feel that somewhere religions are divided. I do not feel this at all. In the roots they are one, and in the peaks they are divided and they must be divided. Every peak has its own beauty. Why destroy it? Why try to create a false thing which is not there? A peak must be a peak -- an individual. In the earth they are one.

So the Koran must remain purely Koran. Nothing should be imposed, infiltrated from the Gita or the Ramayana or anything else. No interpolation, no mixing! The Koran must remain in its purity the Koran. It is a peak -- a beautiful peak. Why destroy it? This is possible only if you are aware of a deeper unity in the ground, in the roots.

Religions are one in their roots, but never in their expression -- and they should not be. So as the world progresses more, as human consciousness becomes more conscious, more integrated, there will be more religions. Not less -- more! Ultimately, if every human being becomes a peak, there will be as many religions as there are human beings. Why should anyone follow Mohammed if he himself can become a peak? Why should he follow Krishna if he himself can become a peak?

This is unfortunate, that one has to follow anybody. This is just a necessary evil. If you cannot become a peak, only then do you have to follow. But follow in such a way that the sooner you can become a peak the better. We can have a beautiful world, a greater world with a greater humanity, with everyone as a unique peak. But that peak can come only through

individuation, through dissolving the ego and the false personality, and remaining centered in your nature, in your pure being. Then you become like a valley, and then there are echoes.

OSHO, YESTERDAY YOU EXPLAINED ABOUT THREE TYPES OF LISTENING: FIRST, LISTENING THROUGH THE INTELLECT; SECOND, THROUGH EMOTION, SYMPATHY AND LOVE; AND THIRD, THROUGH THE WHOLE BEING, THROUGH FAITH. CONSIDERING THE FIRST TWO TYPES OF LISTENING, HOW DOES ONE ARRIVE AT THE THIRD TYPE OF LISTENING -- THAT IS, THROUGH THE WHOLE BEING, THROUGH FAITH? AND ARE THE INTELLECT AND EMOTIONS INCLUDED AND INVOLVED IN THE THIRD TYPE OF LISTENING?

Intellectual listening means that when you are listening you are simultaneously arguing with it. A constant argument is going on. I am saying something to you, you are listening, and constantly there is an argument inside: whether this is right or wrong. You are comparing with your own concepts, your own ideology, your own system. So constantly, when you are listening to me, you are comparing whether I confirm your ideas or not, whether I am according to you or not; whether you can concede to me or not, whether I am convincing or not. How is listening possible in this way? You are too full of yourself, so it is miraculous that within this constant inner turmoil you are capable of listening to something. And even then, whatsoever you have heard will not be what I have said. It cannot be -- because when the mind is full with its own ideas, it goes on giving colours to everything that comes to it. It hears not what is being said, but what it wants to hear. It chooses, it drops, it interprets, and only then does something penetrate in -- but that has a completely different shape. So this is what is meant by intellectual listening.

If you want to go deep in understanding what is being said, this inner turmoil must stop. It must cease! It must not continue! Otherwise, you *are in your own way*, and constantly destroying the very possibility of something which can happen to you. You can miss, and everyone is missing much.

We live enclosed in our own minds, and we carry that enclosure with us everywhere. So whatsoever we see, whatsoever we hear, whatsoever happens around us, it is never transmitted to the inner consciousness directly. The mind remains in between, always playing tricks.

One must be aware that this is happening. This is the first thing in order to go deep. This is the first thing for the second stage of listening -- to be aware of what your mind is doing to you. It is coming in between. Wherever you move, it moves *before* you. It is not like a shadow which follows. *you* have become a shadow to it. It goes, and you have to move. It moves before you and colours everything. So you are never in contact with the "facticity" of anything. The mind creates a fiction.

You must be aware of this phenomenon of what the mind is doing. But you are not -- because we are identified with the mind, we never think that the mind is doing something. When I say something and it does not tally with your thought, it is not that you will think that your mind is not tallying with the thought. You will think, "No, I am not convinced." You do not have a gap between you and your mind. You are identified -- and that is really the problem. That is how the mind can play tricks with you.

You are identified with a thought or with a thought process. And this is strange, because only two days before this the thought was not yours. You heard it somewhere; now you have

absorbed it and it has become your own. And now this thought will say, "No -- this is not right because this is not according to me." You will not feel the difference that this is mind speaking, memory speaking, the mechanism speaking. You will not feel that "I must remain aloof".

Even if you have to compare, even if you have to judge, you must remain aloof -- aloof from your memory, from your mind, from your past. But there is a subtle identification: "My mind is me." So I say, "I am a Communist" or "I am a Catholic" or "I am a Hindu." I never say, "My mind has been brought up in such a way that my mind is Hindu " This is the fact: you are not Hindu. How can you be a Hindu? It is only the mind. If *you* are the Hindu, then there is no possibility of any transformation.

The mind can be changed, and you must remain capable of changing it. If you become identified with it, then you lose your freedom. The greatest freedom is to be free of one's own mind. The *greatest*, I say -- to be free from one's own mind -- because it is a subtle bondage, so deep that you never feel it as a bondage. The very prison becomes your home.

Be constantly aware that your mind is not your consciousness. And the more you are aware, the more you will feel that consciousness is something totally different. Consciousness is the energy, mind is just the thought content. Be the master of it! Don't allow it to be the master; don't allow it to just go ahead of you everywhere. Let it follow you, use it, but don't be used by it. It is an instrument, but we are identified with this instrument. Mm? So break the identification. Remember that you are not the mind.

But, really, so-called religious persons always remember: "We are not the body." They never remember: "We are not the mind." And body is not a bondage at all. Mind is the bondage! Your body is not a bondage at all! Your mind is. And, really, your body comes from nature, from the Divine, and your mind from the society. So body has a beauty, but never the mind. Mind is always ugly. It is a cultivated thing, a false construct. The body has a very beautiful realm. And if you can drop the mind, then you will not feel any conflict at all with the body. The body becomes just a door to the greater -- to the infinite expanse. There is nothing ugly in the body -- mm? -- it is a natural flowering. But the so-called religious people are always against the body and always for the mind. They have created such a nuisance! They have created such confusion! And they have destroyed all sensitivity, because body is the source of all sensitivity. If once you begin to be *against* your body, you will become insensate.

The mind is just an accumulation of past knowledge, information, experiences. It is just a computer. We are identified with it. One is a Christian, one is a Hindu, one is a Communist, one is a Catholic, one is this and that, but one is never oneself -- always identified somewhere with something. Remember this: be aware, and create a distance between you and your mind. Never create any distance between you and your body. Create a distance between you and your mind! You will be more alive and more childlike and more innocent and more aware.

So the first thing is to create a distance: that is, not to identify. Remember you are not the mind, then the first listening will change into the second.

The second is emotional -- deeply felt, sympathetic. It is a love attitude. You are hearing some music or seeing a dance, so you don't just remember the intellect -- you begin to participate. When you are seeing a dance, your feet begin to participate. When you are listening to music, your hands begin to be participants; you begin to be part of it. This is a sympathetic way of listening, deeper than intellect. That's why, whenever you can listen with your heart and feeling, you feel elated, you feel transported to somewhere else. Then you are not in this world. Really, you are in this world, but you feel that you are not in this world.

Why? Because you are not in the world of the intellect.. A different realm opens -- you begin to be *actively* in it.

Intellect is always an onlooker standing out -- never in. So the more intellect grows in the world, the more we become just passive observers -- in everything. You will not dance, but you will watch others dancing. If this goes on as it is going on, day by day. soon you will not be doing anything. You will just be looking at others doing. This will be possible some day: you will not love -- it has become possible, it is there now -- you will just watch others loving. What are you watching in a film? Others loving! You are just an onlooker -- a dead, passive onlooker. You are watching others playing. You are watching others singing, others dancing.

Somewhere one character of Camus says, "Love is not for me. My servants will do it for me" -- love! A really rich man! -- even love has to be done by his servants. Why should he do it? The logic is the same. If servants can play music for you, if servants can do prayer for you, why not love? A servant is doing worship for you in the temple, so why not love? If a servant can be used in between you and the Divine, why not between you and your lover or beloved? What is wrong in it? The logic is the same. And, really, soon those who are rich will not do their loving themselves. because servants can do it! Only poor ones will do their own loving and will feel very miserable because of it. Everything can be deputed. You can be just an onlooker, because intellect is basically an onlooker -- never a participant. If we create a world around intellect, then it is going to happen.

The second center is more involved. You begin to participate. I say you will understand more if you begin to participate, because the moment you are sympathetic your mind is open -- more open than when you are in a constant fight. It is open, receptive, inviting.

This is how one can listen through feeling. But still there is a depth even deeper than feeling and that depth I call total listening, with your full being -- because feeling is again a part. Intellect is a part, feeling is a part, the source of action is another. There are many parts in your existence, in your being. You can listen with feeling better than with intellect, but still it is only a part. And when you are listening with your feeling, the intellect will just go to sleep; otherwise it will disturb. It will just go to sleep!

The third is to listen totally -- not even participating with it, but being one with it. One way is to watch dance through intellect; another is to feel dance and begin to participate in it. Sitting in your seat, the dancer is dancing. You begin to participate; you begin to keep the beat. And the third is becoming the dance oneself -- not the dancer, but the dance. The total being is involved. You are not even out to feel it: you *are* it!

So remember that the deepest knowledge is possible only when you become one with something. This is by faith.

How to come to it? Be aware of your intellect; be unidentified with the mind. Then come to the second -- feeling. Then be aware that feeling is just a part and your whole being is just Lying dead. The whole is not there, so bring the whole into it. When you bring the whole in. it is not that the intellect is denied or feeling is denied. They *are* in it, but now in a different harmony. Nothing is negated. Everything is there, but now in a different pattern. The whole being is participating -- is in it -- has become it.

So when you listen, just listen as if you have become the listening. When I am saying something, let it go into you not with a fight, not with a sympathy, but with a totality. Be it! Let it go. Vibrate -- with no resistance, with no feeling, but with totality! Experiment with it, and you will begin to experience a new dimension of listening. And that goes not only for listening: it is for everything. You can eat that way, you can walk that way, you can sleep that

way -- you can live that way!

Kabir sends his son, Kamal, to the field one day. Kabir's cows have no food today, so he sends Kamal to cut some grass from the field. Kamal goes and has not returned. The afternoon has come and the evening has come, and Kabir is just waiting and the cows are hungry. Where has Kamal gone? So Kabir goes to find out.

Kamal is standing in a grass field. The sun is setting, the wind is blowing, the grass is moving wavelike, and Kamal is standing there moving wavelike just with the grass. The whole day has passed like that, and Kabir comes and says, "Have you gone mad. Kamal? What are you doing?"

Suddenly Kamal is brought back to a different world and he says, "Oh, I had forgotten that I am Kamal; I became just grass. I was not! I became just grass! I moved with it, I danced with it, and I forgot for what I had come here. Now tell me, for what had I come?" Kabir says, "To cut the grass!"

So Kamal laughs and says, "How can one cut oneself? Today it is not possible. I will come again and try, but I cannot promise because I have known a different realm. A different world has opened before me."

Kabir, on this day, named him Kamal. Kamal means "a miracle".

This is the miracle! If you can be totally in anything, the miracle happens. And this is not only for listening: it is for *everything*. Be total! Move totally! Don't divide yourself. Never divide yourself. Any division is just wasting your energy, any division is just suicidal. Don't divide! If you love, love totally -- don't withhold. If you listen, listen totally -- don't withhold anything. Just move totally.

Only this total movement can bring you to a realization where ego cannot be found. It can be found with intellect. It can be found with feeling -- but never with your total being. It can be found with intellect because intellect has no center of its own. It will not allow the center of the total to come into operation, so the intellect has to create its own center. It becomes the ego. Feeling will not allow the total, so feeling has its own center -- it becomes the ego.

That's why men and women have different types of egos, because man's ego is intellect-centered and woman's ego is feeling-centered. They have different qualities of ego. And that's why a man can never understand a woman, a woman never understands a man. They have different types of centers and different languages.

When intellect says yes, it means yes. When emotion says yes, it does not necessarily mean yes. When emotion says no, it may mean yes; it may just be an invitation to be persuaded more. And if you take a woman at her word, you will be in difficulty because her word is not an intellectual assertion. It has a different way of movement, a different quality. Intellect has a direct, mathematical ego. You can understand it easily. So to understand a man is not very difficult because the logic is straight: two and two make four. To understand a woman is different because the logic is not straight. It moves in circles, so two and two never make four. They can make anything, but never four! The logic moves in a circle. Emotion moves in a circle; logic and intellect move in a straight line.

When something moves in a circle, you can never be certain because it may mean just the contrary. Soon it will move in a circle, and it will be the opposite of its own assertion. So with a woman one has to be aware not of what she has said but of what she *means*. The actual assertion is not to be given much importance -- what she means. And the meaning may be something very different.

So it has always happened that very intellectual persons have never been at ease with their wives -- never! Socrates, a very intelligent person, an intellectual genius, knew every

nook and corner of logic, but was never at ease with his wife, Xanthippe -- never. He could not understand what she was saying! That is, he understood what she was saying, but he never understood what she meant. He was so logical that he always missed the point. He went direct, straight, and she went in circles.

Intellect has its own ego -- direct, straight; emotion has its own ego -- circular. They both have egos. But the totality has no ego. The totality has individuality. So when you reach totality, you are neither man nor woman. You are both and you are neither. You transcend and comprehend both. That is what is meant by ARDHANARISHWAR -- half-man, half-woman: a deep communion inside happens. You have become total, one, with no division.

One thing you must note: this is not a fixed arrangement. When I say that a man has an intellectual ego, it is not a fixed arrangement. In some moments he may just regress to an emotional ego; in some moments a woman may come up to an intellectual ego. Then things are more confused. When a man is in difficulty, he will just regress to an emotional ego. He will begin to weep and begin to talk in ways which are not even comprehensible to him. And he will say later on, "What happens I cannot say! In spite of myself I begin to weep; I begin to act in ways in which I would not like to act." A very strong man, in a particular situation, may begin to behave in a very emotional way. And a very emotional woman, in a particular situation, may begin to behave very manlike. In a different setting the ego may change from one center to another. That creates even more difficulties -- but one has to be aware.

With feeling or with intellect, the ego is bound to be there. Only with totality is there no ego. So this I give you as a criterion: If *you are* and you don't feel any "I", you are total. You are sitting here: listen as if there is no "I" in you. Ears are there, a listening process is there, your consciousness is there, but no "I", then you are total. How can you be divided without an "I"? Without an ego, how can you be divided? The ego is the division.

And just as I said that there are many personalities, there are also many egos. Each center has its own ego. Intellect has its own, emotion has its own, the sex center has its own ego -- its own "I". If you go deep down into the bio-structure of the body, each cell has its own ego. That is the division. If you are without an ego, if just you are, with no "I-feeling" anywhere, then you are total. And in that totalness -- even for a single moment if you are total -- you will be Awakened suddenly. And then anything can Awaken you -- anything!

A Zen nun is carrying an earthen water-pot from the well. For thirty years she has been in this monastery -- working continuously, meditating, making every effort to achieve a tranquillity, a state of stillness where the Truth can reflect. But it has not come.

Suddenly the water-pot falls down and is broken, shattered. She stands there, sees it shatter, and the water flows out -- and she is Awakened. Suddenly she achieves the Enlightenment. She runs, she dances, goes into the temple. Her Master comes and touches her feet and says, "Now you are a Buddha: you have achieved."

But the nun asks, "Tell me, how did this happen? -- because I tried and tried and tried continuously for thirty years, and it was not happening. And *this* morning I decided that this seems just absurd and it will not come, so I left every effort. So why, this day, has this happened?"

The Master says, "Because for the first time you were total and without an ego. Effort creates an ego. The very effort was the barrier. Now, without any effort, without any motive, without any ambition, you were just carrying a water-pot and suddenly the pot falls -- bang! -- the pot has fallen and broken, and suddenly you become aware, with *no* ego. And the very listening the very breaking of the pot, the shattering, the noise, the flowing of the water, *and*

you there without any ego, listening totally -- the thing has happened!"
So when I say listen totally, I mean this.

OSHO, WHAT ARE THE CHARACTERISTICS AND INDICATIONS THAT SHOW WHETHER ONE HAS REACHED THE AUTHENTIC AND REAL COSMIC SOUND AUM?

It is a difficult question -- difficult because the happening is always inside, in a way private. And you cannot know of it or about it from the outside. You can never decide from the outside whether someone has achieved the cosmic sound AUM. The deeper you go, the more private is the happening. The public world from where you can decide is just outside. So how to decide whether one has achieved the cosmic sound, whether one has gone to the deepest ground, has known?

You cannot decide it from the outside; that is one thing. Of course, many things which can be known from the outside will begin to happen through the person who has reached. But still, the feeling that he has reached the cosmic ground will just be an inference -- an inference from his behaviour. And behaviour can be false; behaviour can be imitated. Buddha walks a certain way; Buddha sleeps a certain way; Buddha talks a certain way. You can imitate it without being a Buddha. And sometimes it happens that you can imitate better than Buddha -- mm? -- because Buddha is just unaware. Whatsoever is happening is just happening. So you can imitate it in a better way; you can practise it; you can become an expert. And Buddha may not even be able to compete with you because he may not ever have repeated anything.

So from outside, imitation is possible -- very easily possible. To achieve the authentic is arduous; to imitate is easy -- very easy, because inside you remain the same; just outside you can create. So it is difficult. It is difficult to say from outside what has happened inside. One thing: you cannot decide from outside. But from inside if you ask, "How can I know whether I have achieved the cosmic sound AUM or not?" -- if you ask this, then I will say that when you achieve it you know it. If someone asks, "How can I know whether I am alive or dead? How can I know?" what will we say to him? We will say that even if you can think this much -- whether you are alive or dead -- you are alive.

When you come to the cosmic sound, to the very ground of being; when you hear the AUM -- not uttered by you, not uttered by anyone, but just as a cosmic sound all around -- you know. The phenomenon is so real that, really, the question never arises whether this AUM, this sound, is real. The question arises whether I am real now or not. You fade, you become just unreal. You become just a phantom, a ghost. Now your reality is not like it has ever been. All around, the real is.

But it may even be a dream. You also feel in a dream that everything is real, so how to decide whether this sound that you are hearing is a dream or a reality? The decision comes from a certain source. You will never be the same again -- the before and after. This hearing of the sound will be a discontinuity in your existence. You will never be the same again. You will not even be able to connect yourself with your past; it will just drop. You will only remember it as if it belonged to someone else. Your memory will not be yours now. After this experience you will be reborn, and your rebirth will be the evidence. You will never be the same again. The old has dropped; you cannot find the old man again. It is nowhere now. It was there. It is now not there. For you this will be the evidence that you have heard.

But I think there is a third implication also. One can go on repeating AUM, so how will one find out whether the AUM one is repeating and the AUM one has come upon are different or just the same? You will feel it, because you are the center of the AUM that you utter, and then it vibrates outside. Mm? -- this is the dimension. You create it just as you throw a stone into a silent lake. The stone becomes the center, and then there are waves which go outward towards the banks. When you say AUM, you create a center in yourself: you drop a stone, and then the sound goes out and out and out, far off from you. This is the dimension, the direction.

When you hear the sound AUM, the cosmic sound, it is different. It comes; it never goes. It is not a going away from you: it is a coming to you. And the center is nowhere to be found. It just goes on coming and coming and coming and coming. You are overflowed with it. You see the difference? You are not the center. Rather, you are the bank, and from some unknown center the sound waves come to you. They go on coming, they never stop. So this direction -- the sound center you, and the waves going outward -- is AUM uttered by you. You not as the center, and sound waves coming and coming and coming from somewhere -- the center is never known and will never be known....

Someone asked Jacob Boehme, "Where is the center of God? Where is the center of the universe?" He said, "Either everywhere or nowhere." Both mean the same.

So when you begin to feel that the AUM is coming to you... let me say it in a different way. Ordinarily, seekers go towards the Divine, but until the Divine comes to you, remember, you may just be in a fantasy, just in a dream. If you go to the Divine, to God, to find the center, you will go on searching, but you will never find it.

How can you find the center? The center can only come to you. So it is always a false relationship -- the seeker going towards God. The real relationship is completely different -- God coming to the seeker. When you are ready, He comes. When you are open, He becomes the guest. When your invitation is valid, total, He is there. It is always a coming, never a going. So, really, there is not a phenomenon of man in search of God, but, rather, it is God in search of man.

But you are hiding, escaping, so He cannot find you. Wherever He comes, you escape. You are a closing, never an opening. He goes on knocking, and your doors are shut. So when this AUM begins to come, when it is a coming to you, you are just filled, you are just bathed in it -- and the source is not found. If you can find the source, again it may be that someone is creating the sound from outside -- and it is coming! Someone may be playing AUM on some instrument, and it is coming.

There is no source of it. That's why mystics have always said that God is the sourceless One. There is no source. It comes as if from nowhere -- just out of the blue -- and it is here. When you feel this, then you know that the AUM is now cosmic. It doesn't belong to you.

In Zen they use koans -- puzzles, absurd puzzles -- as meditation objects. Rinzai always gave to his disciples the koan of hearing the sound of one hand clapping. It is impossible! How can you hear the sound of one hand? So whenever seekers would be there he would say, "First go and find out what is the sound of one hand clapping. Hear it! and then come to me and tell me."

It looks absurd, but when a man like Rinzai would say this to someone, the person would go, close the door, sit down in meditation, and he would think. Then he would come within hours and say, "What nonsense you have asked! How can it be?"

Rinzai would say, "I have heard it, so you go and again try. I also said to my Teacher, 'How is this possible?' but he said, 'I have heard, so you try.' And I tried, and now I have

heard. So you try -- and it will come."

The person would go on coming. Every morning he would have a DARSHAN -- go to see his Teacher -- and then the Teacher would ask, "Have you heard?"

He would say, "No, I have not heard yet." The Teacher would tell him to try harder. So he would begin to imagine the sound. because it is very frustrating to go every day with nothing to show to the Teacher. So he would say, "Oh yes, I have heard it. It is just like wind passing through leaves."

But the Teacher would say, "No, it is not, because wind and leaves are two things. It must be of one. Wind passing through leaves is just an ordinary sound. Two things can create friction, so it is still of two hands. You cannot befool me! Wind passing through the trees -- it is of two hands. Never come again unless you hear the sound of one hand!"

And he would come, and again and again he would say, "I have heard this and that, or I have heard the sound of the water-drops falling on the roof." With so many things he would come, and he would be denied. And this would go on for months.

Then suddenly one day Rinzai asked, "Where is that man? He has not come and it has been so long. Go and find out what he is doing."

He was found in his cell or under some tree just lost, and he was brought to the Teacher. And the Teacher said, "Now you have heard. Haven't you heard?" And he said, "I have heard! I have heard!"

What sound has he heard? There is only one sound: that is the sound of the cosmic AUM which is without friction -- not two things, but simply the sound. It is not created by any clapping.

The moment someone says, "I have heard," he will be a different person. You cannot be the same again. Mm? And the difference will always be: sound coming to you from nowhere -- sourceless sound, uncreated. Then it is the cosmic AUM.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 1

Chapter #3

Chapter title: Desirelessness: An Opening to the Unknown

17 February 1972 pm in Bombay, India

Archive code: 7202175

ShortTitle: ULTAL103

Audio: Yes

Video: No

Length: 98 mins

SARVA KARMA NIRAAKARANAM AAWAHANAM
CESSATION OF THE CAUSE OF ALL ACTIONS IS AAWAHANAM -- THE INVOCATION.

RELIGION is not ritual. Really, when a religion dies it becomes ritual: the dead body of a religion becomes the ritual. But everywhere ritual is to be found. If you go to find religion, you will find ritual. All these names -- Hindu, Mohammedan, Christian -- these are not the names of religions, they are names of particular rituals. By "ritual" I mean something done outwardly in order to create the inward revolution. This belief, that something done outwardly can create an inward revolution, creates rituals.

Why does this belief come into existence? It comes because of a very natural phenomenon. Whenever there is inward revolution, whenever there is inner mutation, whenever there is some inner transformation, it is followed by many outward things and sign -- sit is bound to be, because the inward exists in relation to the outward. Nothing can happen inside which will not affect the outside also. It will have effects, consequences, shadows, on the outside behaviour also. If you feel anger inside, your body begins to take certain postures. If you begin to feel silence inside, your body will take certain other postures. When there is silence inside, the body will show it in many ways. The silence, the inner peace, the stillness, will be shown by the body in many ways. But this is always secondary. The inner is basic and the outer is secondary. It is a consequence, not a cause.

Whenever this happens, for example, if a Buddha happens to be here, we cannot see what is happening inside him. But we can see, we will see, what is happening outside. For Buddha himself, the inner is the cause and the outer the consequence. For us, the outer will be the first thing to be noticed and then the inner will be inferred. So for onlookers, the outer, the secondary, becomes the basic, the primary.

How can we know what has happened in Buddha's inner consciousness? But we can observe his body, his movements, his gestures. They *are* related to the inner; they show something -- but they are related not as causes but as consequences. So you cannot go back. The vice versa will not be true. If the inner is there, the outer will follow. But the vice versa is not true: if the outer is there, there is no necessity that the inner should follow -- there is no necessity.

For example, if I am angry, then my body will show anger, but I can show anger in my body without being angry at all. An actor is doing that. He is expressing anger through his eyes, through his hands; he is expressing love -- without feeling anything inside. He is showing fear, his whole body is trembling and shaking, but there is no fear inside.

So the outer can be without the inner. We can impose it. There is no reason, there is no basis, no necessity, no inevitability, that the inner should follow the outer. The outer always follows the inner, but never the vice versa. Ritual is born because of this fallacy.

We see a Buddha sitting in a silent posture -- in *siddhasan*, the most relaxed posture for the body. This posture is a consequence of an inner quietude. It is there because the consciousness has become so still that the body follows it, and the body spontaneously takes the most relaxed posture. But for us the body is the first thing to be noticed. We see the body first so we say that Buddha achieved Liberation in this posture. Really, quite the reverse is the case: because Buddha achieved Liberation, this posture followed! This posture is not a cause. So you can practise the posture, you can become efficient in the posture -- but don't wait for the Liberation to come. The posture will be there, but Liberation will not come.

Someone is praying. His hands are raised or his head is surrendered unto some unknown feet. This is an outward posture. When surrendering really happens inside, this posture follows. When surrendering happens inside, when one begins to feel a nothingness, when one begins to feel just to dissolve into the Infinite, this posture follows. You can imitate the posture, but surrendering will not follow.

And when I say this posture follows, I don't mean that it is bound to follow for everyone. With every individual there will be differences. It will depend on the culture, on the upbringing, on the climate, on many things. There is no intrinsic necessity for the posture to follow. What will follow will depend on many, many things. For example, if Buddha is not born in India but in a culture, in a society, where no one sits on the ground, do you think Enlightenment will not come to him? It will come on a chair! Of course, when he is sitting in a chair, he will sit in a different way. When Enlightenment comes to him, he will totally relax. But that relaxation will be different, outwardly, from a *siddhasan*.

Mahavir achieved Liberation in a very strange posture! It is known as *goduhasan*, the posture of a cowherd milking a cow -- the same posture as a cowherd milking a cow. In that posture Mahavir was Enlightened. Never before and never afterwards has anyone achieved Liberation in that posture. He was not milking a cow! Why did this happen? It must have something to do with Mahavir's own bodily habits; it might be concerned with his past incarnations. Nothing is known about why this happened.

But the basic thing is that outward things follow some inward happenings. They, too, are not fixed laws. From individual to individual they differ. It depends; it depends on many things. But the society begins to feel a necessary connection, a cause-effect connection, between outward things and inward. Then the ritual is born. "Ritual" means that we will do something outward and the inner will follow. This is the most fallacious thing possible. This fallacy destroys every religion, and every religion ultimately becomes just a ritualistic nonsense.

In this Upanishad, this ritualistic understanding is denied totally, but denied in a very positive way. So one thing must be understood very distinctly and clearly.

The Upanishads were born in a very revolutionary period as far as the Indian mind is concerned. There was a great rebellion against the Vedas. And when I say against the Vedas, I mean the ritualistic structure that was built around the Vedas. It was a dead ritual; everything was a ritual. Religion was not something deep, not something concerned with

consciousness and its transformation. Rather, it was just concerned with doing something: "If you do this, then you will get this if you do that, then you will get that." And every ritual was fixed as if it was a science: "Do this prayer and there will be rain; do this prayer and the enemy will be killed; do this prayer and you will be victorious -- do this and this will follow." And this was proposed as if it was a science.

This ritualistic structure killed the very progressive spirit of the Indian mind. A revolution followed: it was bound to follow. It took two shapes. One was negative -- Jain and Buddhist. These two thinking climates took a very negative turn. They said, "Rituals are meaningless, absurd, so all rituals should be abolished." This was an absolutely negative attitude. The Upanishads were also against rituals, but they took a very positive attitude. They said, "Ritual is not absurd, but you misunderstand the meaning of it."

This sutra is concerned with a *yagna* ritual, AAWAHANAM -- invocation. The word AAWAHANAM -- invocation -- means that before you begin any worship, any *yagna*, any prayer, first invoke the deities, first call them. AAWAHANAM means: invite them, invoke them. As far as it goes it is good. How can you pray unless you have invited? How can you surrender unless you have invoked?

So these are the ways. The negative way will be that it is useless because there are no deities -- first. Second: they have no names even if there are. Third: even if they have names they will not respond, because whatsoever you are doing is just bribery, just flattery. Do you think that by your flattery, by your prayers, by your bribes, you will be able to invoke them? And if you think that you can invoke them and call them and invite them, then they are not even worth it -- because if you can bribe them, then they are just like you. The language is the same and the level also, so they are not worth it.

Buddha has said: "There are no deities; and even if there are, they are not higher than human beings. They are not higher! You can persuade them, you can bribe them through your flattery -- *stuti*. You can force them to do something or not to do something, so they are not higher than you. They can be just forgotten."

The Upanishads take a very different attitude. They say that deities are there and invocation is possible, but they give a much deeper meaning to invocation. They say:

CESSATION OF THE CAUSE OF ALL ACTIONS IS INVOCATION.

They don't deny anything. They give a new meaning, and the ritual becomes non-ritualistic. They say: "Of course, invocation is possible, but by invocation is meant CESSATION OF THE CAUSE OF ALL ACTIONS."

They say the same thing the Buddha also says. Buddha denies. He says, "There is no invocation. The only path is to be desireless, so don't ask for any help from anyone. No one can help you. Just be desireless and you will attain the Nirvana, the bliss, the peace, the Ultimate. So don't ask anyone's help; don't invoke anyone. Just be desireless."

And this becomes even more pertinent because a person who is invoking a deity is invoking him because of some desire. He wants something -- money, prestige, victory, anything. He is invoking the deity, praying, for something. So Buddha says, "You are just running from one desire to another, and this running after desires is the *DUKKHA* -- is the misery. And no one can help you unless you become desireless."

"Cessation of the cause of all actions" means to be desireless.

What is the cause of action? Why are you involved in so much action? Why this constant running? What is the cause? Desire is the cause. So in a very poetic way the Upanishad

denies the ritual and yet not the term; denies the ritual, yet not the spirit.

Buddha failed because a negative mind cannot really succeed for long. He can be very appealing because negativity strikes hard. He can be very logical because to say no is the very spirit of logic -- of being logical. Really, whenever you want to say no you need logic. If you want to say yes, logic is not needed, reason is not needed. You can say yes without any reasoning, but you cannot say no without any reasoning. The moment you say no, logic will be required, so no is always logical.

A modern logician, De Bono, says that the purpose of logic is really to say no in a reasonable way, in a rational way. The very purpose of logic is to say no and then to adduce reasons, proofs, for saying no. Buddha said no; it appealed. His approach was logical, rational, everything was perfect -- but yet he couldn't get roots in the Indian soil. He was uprooted soon. And this is a very strange fact: that he could get Found in China, in Japan, in Burma, in Ceylon, everywhere in Asia except India. But the secret is that the Buddhist monks learned their error when they left India. The no was the error, so they never used negative attitudes anywhere else. They became positive. In China they began to say yes: in Ceylon they have said yes. Then everywhere they succeeded because yes has a very magical secret of success.

It may not appeal to reason: it appeals to the heart. And in the end heart wins -- never reason! Really, reason never wins in the end. You can silence someone with logical reasoning, but you can never convert him, you can never change him. Even if he cannot say anything against you, he will still be convinced of his own mind. Unless the yes is evoked, he cannot be converted. So Buddha tried hard, but with a no -- everywhere no. Whatsoever he was saying was the same as the Upanishad is saying. It was not a bit different. Only the methodology he chose was negative, and the reason might be that he was a Kshatriya -- a warrior -- and a warrior lives with a no.

The Upanishads came through Brahmins. They were beggars, and a beggar lives with a yes. Even if you deny him, a real beggar, an authentic beggar, will bless you. He lives with a total yes: that is his secret. He cannot use no. And a warrior, a Kshatriya, can use yes only when he is defeated, and then too from his heart he will never say yes. He will continue to say no. All the Jain *teerthankers* were Kshatriyas. Buddha was a Kshatriya. They both took negative attitudes.

The Upanishads are based on a positive yes. They are yea-sayers. Even if they have to say no, they will say it in such a way that yes is used. Really, this Upanishad is saying there is no AAWAHANAM, no invocation, but no is not used at all. They turn it into a yes. They say, "Cessation of the cause of all actions is the invocation." It is not related at all with the invocation of the Vedas, with the priests. It is not related at all! It is related to the same rebellious teaching which says that being desireless is the ultimate state of purity. And unless you are pure, how can you invite the Divine?

Really, being pure is the invitation. No other invitation is needed. The moment you are pure, the moment the heart is pure, the Divine comes. Just being pure is the invitation; So don't call, don't cry for the Divine. Just be pure and He will come.

How can this purity be achieved and why are we impure? What is the reason? The Indian genius has always been thinking in terms of desire and desirelessness. Really, everything that we are can be reduced to desire; whatsoever we are is because of our desire. If we are miserable, if we are in bondage, if we are ignorant, if we are in darkness, if life is just a long death, it is because of desire.

Why is there misery? Because your desire is frustrated. Unless you have a desire, how

can it be frustrated? So if you want to be frustrated, desire more; then you will be more frustrated. If you want to be in misery, then expect more, desire more, be ambitious for more, and you will get more misery. If you don't want to be miserable, then don't desire.

So this is the mathematics of inner workings: desire creates misery. If desire fails, it necessarily creates misery. But even if desire succeeds, it again creates misery -- because the moment you succeed, your desire has gone ahead, it is asking for more. Really, the desire is always ahead of you. Wherever you reach, it will be ahead of you. And you will never reach the point where you and your desire can meet; that is impossible. Desire means something always in the future, never in the present. You are always in the present and desire is always in the future. And wherever you are, you will be in the present and desire will always be in the future.

It is just like the horizon. You see just a few miles to where the sky is touching the earth, and it looks so real. But go ahead and find the place where the sky touches the earth, and the more you go ahead, the more the horizon goes ahead. The distance remains always the same because, really, it never touches anywhere. The touching, the contact line, is just false. So when you go to seek the horizon, you will never find it. It will always remain there, but you will never meet it. And you can continue to be in the illusion that the horizon is there -- a little distance more to be traversed. You may go around the whole earth and come back to your home never meeting the horizon anywhere, but the illusion can continue.

Desire is just like the horizon. It seems as if it can be fulfilled soon. The distance is not much: "Just a little more effort, just a bit of fast running, and it is just near!" But you never reach it. It is always just near and the distance remains the same. Howsoever you run, the distance remains the same!

Has any desire been fulfilled ever? Don't ask others, ask yourself. Have you realized any desire ever? But we don't even wait to think about it. We have no time to think about the past; the future obsesses us. We are in such a hurry to reach the horizon, who will think that we have missed this horizon so many times? There is no time to think. The hurry is such, and life is so short, and one has to run and go on running! Have you achieved anything through any desire or does frustration always come? Aren't ashes always in the hand and nothing else? But one never sees the ashes in the hand, one never sees the frustration. The eyes are always again fixed on the far-off horizon.

This fixation with the horizon is the cause of all actions. And no action reaches a fulfillment -- because our actions are just mad! If the horizon itself is not there, then your running is mad. So desire is the cause of all actions and of all misery, of all impurity and of all ignorance.

Cessation of the cause -- cessation of desiring -- is the invocation. If you cease to desire, then there will be no running -- no running after anything, no movement inside, no ripples -- just a silent pool of consciousness, a silent pool without waves, without ripples. No movement! The Upanishads say *this* state of consciousness is the invocation.

But does it mean that all actions cease when desire ceases? because we have seen a Krishna moving, doing many things. We have seen a Buddha doing many things even after the Enlightenment. So what does cessation of the cause of all actions mean? It doesn't mean cessation of all actions. It means cessation of the cause. The desire ceases. And when there is no desire, actions begin to take an altogether different quality. When there is no desire, then action becomes just a play -- with no madness in it, with no insanity behind it, with no obsession. It becomes just a play -- a playfulness.

Really, the modern psychiatrists say that this is a criterion as to whether someone is

insane or sane. An insane person cannot play. Even if he plays, he will become so serious about it that the play will become a work. And real sanity consists in transforming even work into play. When there is no desire you can play -- and if nothing comes out of it, there is no frustration because nothing was expected. The play in itself was enough. That is the difference between work and play.

Work is never enough unto itself; it is always meant for some result. The result has a real value, the end, and work is only a means. You work to achieve something; no one works for work's sake. So work is in the present and the result is always in the future, and it all depends on the result. Work in itself is just a burden to be carried somehow, because it is the end that is to be achieved. If you can achieve the end without the work, you will never work.

Play has a different dimension -- altogether different, diametrically opposite. There is really no result to be achieved. Play is for play's sake. But we have become so insane that we cannot even play for play's sake. So even through play we try to achieve some result, to win something -- prestige, medals, anything, but something must be there as an end to be achieved. So, really, grown-ups never play; only children play -- with nothing beyond. That's why the play of children has an innocence and a beauty: the thing is enough unto itself!

When a child is playing, he is absorbed totally in it -- not a single desire *out* of it, running and going somewhere; not a bit of consciousness beyond it; everything is in it. The child has become just the play, totally involved, committed to *this* moment here and now. Nothing exists beyond it. This is action, but without the cause. without desire.

That's why we have called this world not really a creation of the Divine, but a *leela*, a play of the Divine, because "creation" is not a good word, it is ugly. It is ugly because you create something for something. No, the Divine is only playing -- just playing like a child with *no* result in the mind. The play itself is blissful. So to say: "Cessation of the cause of all actions is invocation," means to be just like a child -- innocent, pure, without any desire. Then you have invoked the Divine. Then you have called, invited.

Now your invocation cannot be denied: it is so authentic and so sincere. Really, now you need not even invoke and the Divine will be there, you need not even call and the Divine will be there -- because you have created the situation! The Divine will flow, come down. You have created the situation -- the purity of the heart. This is the only invocation. All else is, again, just desire, action.

Jesus says that unless you are like a child you cannot enter into the Kingdom of the Divine. "Like a child": what does it mean? It means that you are capable of playing, that you are capable of action without desire.

For us it is inconceivable. How can we act without desire? Take the opposite case: can you desire without action? You can desire! You can desire without action, so desire can exist alone without action. Mm? -- everyone is desiring, there are many, many desires without any actions. So desire can be without action: this is our experience. Why not the opposite? Why can't actions be without desire? If desire can be severed from action, why not action from desire? That too is possible. And when desire is not there, action doesn't cease: it becomes different. The flavour is different; the intrinsic quality is different. The madness is not there; and *this* very moment, the present, has become meaningful -- not the future.

So take this to heart: if the future is very meaningful to you, you cannot invoke. If the present is the only significance and the future doesn't exist at all, then you have invoked. The future is the bondage because without the future you cannot desire. Desire needs space in which to move. It cannot move just in the present; the present has no space. It cannot move! How can you desire for just now? You can desire only in the tomorrow. Really, the future is

created because of our desiring -- there is no future, the future doesn't exist.

Ordinarily, we say that time has three divisions -- past, present and future. Really, time has only one, and that is the present. The past is that which is not; the future is that which is not yet. They both are not. Past only means desires that are dead, and future means desires that are still alive -- and the present is untouched by your past and by your future.

So, really, past and future are not divisions of time, but parts of mind. Time is the present; mind is the past and future. Mind has two divisions: past and future; and time has only one: the present. That's why mind and time never meet. They cannot meet because mind has no present, and time has no past and no future. If there were no mind on the earth, would there be any future or past? There would be only the present. Flowers, of course, would flower, but in the present. Trees would, of course, grow, but in the present. There would be;no past and no future. With men, or rather with mind, comes past and future. Really, if you look into a child he has no past. How can he have? That's why he is never burdened -- because the past becomes a burden.

An old man is always burdened. There is a past -- a long past -- so many dead desires, so many frustrations, so many horizons never found, so many rainbows just broken. He has a long past and he is just burdened. An old man is always thinking about the past, remembering, going again and again into the memory. An old man, by and by, begins to forget the future -- because now the future only means death and nothing else. So he never tries to look into the future: he begins to look back. A child is always looking forward, never back, because there is nothing to look back to. For an old man there is only death to look to in the future and nothing else.

A young man is in the present, so a young man cannot understand children and he cannot understand old men. They both look just foolish -- both! Children look foolish because they are unnecessarily wasting their time, unnecessarily playing with toys. An old man just looks dead, just worried unnecessarily. A young man cannot understand really, because he cannot see what has happened to an old man -- that he is now only the past. This happens.

But every young man will become old, and every child will become young, and every old man was once young and once a child -- because the mind moves, it goes on moving. In children it has a vast expanse to move. With an old mind it has no expanse to move further. But this is movement of the mind, not of time.

Really, we think that time is moving. No, we are moving! We just go on moving: time is not moving at all. Time is the present; time is always here and now. It has always been here and now; it will always be here and now. We go on moving. We move from past to future, and for us time is just a bridge to move from the past into the future -- from one desire to another desire, time is just a passage. For us, time is just a passage to move from one desire to another. If desires cease, then your movement will cease. And if your movement ceases, you will meet with time here and now -- and that meeting is the door. That meeting is the door; that meeting is the invocation.

But when the Upanishad says, "Cessation of the cause..." does it mean to say, "Do not desire"? It is very natural for our minds to translate things like that. If the Upanishad says, "Cessation of the cause of all actions..." it means a state of desirelessness. Remember it: a state of desirelessness! But our minds will translate it as: "Do not desire!" You have missed the point if you translate it as "Do not desire!" because even if you do not desire, you will desire. Your "Do not desire" will imply desire. You may desire to invoke the Divine, you may desire to be purified, to be pure, to be innocent, childlike, to reach that realm of play. So your mind can say to you, "If you want to enter the Kingdom of God, do not desire!"

This is a desire. This is how desire works: "If you want to get into the Kingdom of God, if you want Enlightenment, if you want a meeting with the Divine -- do not desire!" So this is the logic of desire. "Do not do this if you want that; do this if you want that." So when I say "a state of desirelessness", I don't mean a commandment which says, "Do not desire!"

Then what do I mean? It becomes difficult, complex to understand. Then what do I mean when I say "a state of desirelessness"? It means: understand desire, understand the fallaciousness of desire, understand the absurdity of desire, the futility of it, the nonsense of it. Just understand what desire has done, what desire can do, what desire is doing. Just understand desire! And if you understand it totally, you will be desireless. That desirelessness will be just an outcome of your understanding. It cannot be anything out of your action. That "do not" is again an action.

This translation of things creates many unnecessary problems. So I have seen people who say, "Do not be greedy if you want to achieve the Divine," but they never feel that this is greed -- and a greater one. This is a most extraordinary greed, rare. One wants to achieve the Divine, so one must not be greedy. What does greed mean? Not to be greedy means not to desire, not to want. But you are wanting the Divine, *moksha*, so: "Don't be greedy. If you want to possess the Divine, then don't possess anything else. Be non-possessive! Renounce if you want to get!" This renouncing becomes just a step to get, so it is just a methodology -- but you are for getting.

Really, unless you cease this craving to get, you will never be mature. So look at it in this way: a child is born and the first state of mind is one of getting. The child is getting everything -- the milk, the food, the love. He is not giving anything: he is just getting. This is the most immature state of mind -- just getting. And when an old man is also trying to get, he has remained just an immature person. It is okay for a child to be in a state of constant getting; he is getting everything. The child cannot even conceive of what giving means. So when you say to a child, "Give your toy to this boy," he cannot even conceive of what you mean. The language is unknown, the language of giving is unknown. He can only get.

You have to train the child according to his language. So you say, "Give this toy to this boy, then I will give you more love." Now you have to translate even giving into getting. "If you don't give, then we will not give you love." So a child begins to learn that if you want to get you will have to give. This giving becomes just a stepping-stone to get more. This is the state of our minds always; then we remain just immature. We are in a state of getting. If sometimes we have to give, it is only to get something else.

This purity of heart means quite the opposite of getting -- just giving. That is the most mature mind. A child, the immature mind, is always concerned with getting. A Buddha, a Jesus, is always giving. That is the other extreme giving not to get something, but giving because giving is a play, a bliss in itself. When I say understand desire, I mean understand getting, understand giving. Understand that your state is just of getting, getting and getting, and you will never be fulfilled -- mm? -- because there is no end.

Understand this: what have you got through this constant, eternal getting? What have you got? You are as poor as ever, as much a beggar as ever -- rather, more. The more you get. the more you become a greater beggar, the more is the desire to get. So you only learn by getting, more getting. Where have you reached? What have you found? What is there which you can say is the achievement of this constant, mad getting? Nothing!

If you can understand *this*, the very understanding becomes a transformation: the getting drops. And the moment getting drops, a new dimension opens: you begin to give. And this is the paradox: you have not got anything through getting -- but when you give, you get. But

that "get" is not concerned with your getting at all. The giving itself is a deep achievement, a deep fulfillment.

But when I am saying this, I am afraid you may again translate it. You may say, "Okay! So to achieve that fulfillment, we must leave this constant desire to get." Understand this; don't translate it. Your mind can distort anything. It has distorted everything. It distorts a Buddha, it distorts a Krishna, it distorts a Jesus, it distorts a Zarathustra -- it goes on distorting. They say something, you translate it, and then it is something else altogether different -- diametrically opposite even.

The understanding of desire becomes desirelessness; the knowing of desire is the cessation of desire. So know deeply, understand deeply. Don't take any hurried step, and then a purity is discovered which is always there, which has always been there. The heart is pure already, but only covered with desires, with smoke, and you cannot look deep.

This is invocation: if you are pure you have invoked. So be pure and the Divine will be invoked. Nothing else is needed; not even a belief in the Divine is needed. You need not believe that there is Divine energy. You need not believe that there is anything -- no need. Just be pure, and you will come to know. The Divine is not a belief -- it is a knowledge, a knowing.

But when I say "purity" you may again misunderstand me, because for "purity" we have very moralistic connotations. We say a man is pure because he is moral, a man is pure because he is not a thief, a man is pure because he is not dishonest, a man is pure because he lives under the rules and regulations of his society. But if the society itself is impure, then by living according to its rules and regulations how can you be pure? And if the society itself is dishonest, then by following it how can you be honest? If the whole foundation and structure is just immoral, then to adjust to it is the most immoral act possible.

So, really, it happens that the more moral a person is, the more he goes against the society -- because he cannot adjust! A Jesus has to be crucified: he becomes "immoral" -- because the whole society is immoral. A Socrates has to be poisoned. Why? Because a really moral man cannot exist in an immoral society.

And whenever an immoral society pays respect to someone and says that he is moral, it means only that he is adjusted and nothing else -- adjusted to the society. Whatsoever the society has said, he follows. Really, he may be just dead. He may have no conscience of his own. He cannot assert anything. He is not -- he just follows. He becomes very moral. So for "purity" we have a very moral connotation.

No, purity means innocence, and all those persons we call moral are very cunning. They are not innocent at all -- because if you think that to be a thief is bad, or to be a thief is not respectable, or to be a thief you will have to suffer in hell, or by not being a thief you are going to gain heaven, then you are very cunning and calculating. You are not a thief because of your calculations and cunningness. And it may be that the person who is a thief and suffering imprisonment is less cunning and less calculating. That's why he is suffering -- he has become a thief. You are more cunning, more calculating, so you are moral and honest -- but not pure.

Purity means innocence; innocence means a non-calculating mind. I don't mean that he will be a thief. How can an innocent person be a thief? If he cannot calculate, how can he be a thief? Mm? -- to be a thief one needs calculation; not to be a thief, one again needs calculation. An innocent person is neither moral nor immoral. He is just innocent. That innocence is purity.

Jesus has been condemned for many things which his society thought immoral -- because

a prostitute invites him to come to her home and he goes. Then the whole village begins to be filled with rumours: "Jesus has gone to a prostitute's house! Why should he go? A moral man can never go to a prostitute's house!" And this is what you would have thought also: "Why should Jesus go there? What is the need? And not only has he gone: he has remained the whole night!" He has slept there, and in the morning, of course, whatever can happen in a "moral" village happens. Everyone is against him. Even his friends are not with him now; even his followers have escaped. And the village encounters him and asks him, "Why did you go to a prostitute's house?" And Jesus says, "Who is not a prostitute, tell me? How do you decide and how do you judge? What are the criteria?"

This is a non-calculating person. He says he cannot judge who is a prostitute and who is not. He cannot judge! How can he judge and who is he to judge? Here is an innocent man, a pure man. But he is to be crucified because you cannot think that he is innocent, you cannot think that he is pure. How can he be pure when he has slept in a prostitute's house? Our minds are really so immoral and so impure that we cannot conceive of a different dimension of purity. And this same prostitute is the only person who remains when Jesus is crucified. Everyone has escaped; no one is there. Only this prostitute, Mary Magdalene, is standing there -- the only person! No apostle is there; no follower is there. They have all escaped because it is dangerous to be there. Even they can be crucified. Only this prostitute is standing there, and this prostitute helped to take Jesus' dead body down from the cross. So it seems pertinent to ask "Who is not a prostitute?" And was it good for Jesus to stay with this prostitute or not? -- because only this poor woman remained with him in the end.

What is moral and what is immoral? As far as religion is concerned, innocence is moral and cunningness is immoral. To be innocent is enough. That childlike innocence is the purity. That purity become AAWAHANAM -- invocation.

We have distorted everything -- every word. Every word has become just ugly. When you say that someone is pure, what do you mean? Just find out the meaning and you will find very ugly things. By "someone is pure", what do you mean? Innocence? Never -- because innocence can be dangerous! Innocence may not fit into your pattern! Really, it will not fit. How can it fit? You cannot persuade it, you cannot force it, you cannot bribe it. And the society depends on force, on bribery, on persuasion, on punishment, on appraisal, on fear, on greed. So we say that if you do this, you will get this.

Many, many have asked Buddha, "If we follow you, what will we get?" And Buddha says, "Nothing." So how can you follow this man? He says, "Nothing." We are always out to get something. Even from a Buddha we want to get something -- promises: "If you promise us this, then we can do this." Then it becomes logical to us, relevant. Buddha says, "Be pure, and you get nothing." Then why be pure? Then it is better to be impure. At least then we are getting something. Buddha says that you have not got anything. You are only in the illusion of getting and you will never get.

So I say just be pure and forget getting, because unless you forget getting you cannot be pure. If you have to get something, you have to be cunning and calculating. You have to be violent, you have to be greedy, and you have to be always in the future -- never here. Then you can never remain at home. You are always abroad, somewhere else, always on a journey.

To be desireless, pure, is to have a deep understanding of the futility of all that we have been doing, of all that we are. The moment this purity is there, invocation happens. Then you have called, then you have asked and invited. Then in the very deepest core of Existence, your invitation has penetrated. Now, suddenly, you feel that you have been taken over: someone has come into you. Now you are possessed by something else which is more than

you. Something infinite, something more vital, has come. You have been taken over; you are flooded. For this flooding is the invocation.

Of course, you have to be open, otherwise this flooding will not happen. And an innocent mind is always open; a cunning mind is always closed. A cunning mind is always in defense. A cunning mind always thinks in terms of enmity, competition, because if you are to get something then you have to be a competitor. Everyone is. Everyone is out to get, and you have to get also. Then you have to be a competitor, and this is a very tough competition. So you have to be violent, cunning, closed, defensive. Then you cannot be flooded by the Divine. You are so narrow, so closed, that the flood cannot come to you.

A pure heart, a desireless heart, is not competitive, not concerned for the future, not against anybody, not for anybody, with no calculations, with no desire to get, with no achieving mind. A pure heart is here and now, open, with no defense. When I say with no defense, I mean that even if death comes, he is open. If you are not open for death, you will never be open for the Divine. If you are afraid of death, you will be afraid of the Divine.

But this is strange, because whenever we are afraid of death we always go to the Divine to pray. So all those who are praying in mosques, in temples, in churches, are really not praying: they are just afraid of death. They are making arrangements with the Divine in order that they should not be afraid. Their prayer is based on fear and their gods are just created out of fear.

If the mind is innocent, you can be like a child playing with a snake. Now he is open for both: death can come and he is open; he can play with death. The Divine can come and he is open; he can play with the Divine. Death and the Divine are, in a subtle way, one. If you are not open to death you will never be open for the Divine, and a person who is concerned with desires is always afraid of death.

You must see the relationship: a person who is concerned with desires -- is desirous, is out to get something -- is always afraid of death. Why? Because desire is in the future and death is also in the future, and it may be that death comes first and desire is not fulfilled. Remember this: desire is never in the present; death is also never in the present. No one has died in the present. Can you be fearful of death here and now? No, because either you are alive or dead. If you are alive here and now, there is no death; and if you are already dead, there is no fear. So you can only fear death in the future. Desires have a planning for the future and death may disturb everything, so we are fearful of death.

No animal is afraid of death because no animal has plannings for the future. There is no other reason than this: no plannings for the future. The future is not, so death is not! Why be afraid of death if there is no planning for the future? Nothing is to be disturbed by death. The more you have planned, the greater the plans, then the greater the fear. Death is not really a fear that you will die, but a fear that you will die unfulfilled. It may not be possible to carry desires to their fulfillment, and death may come any time.

If I am to die unfulfilled, of course, there is fear: "I am as yet unfulfilled. I have not known a moment of fulfillment, and death may come, so I have lived in vain. I have been a futility, just a uselessness. I have lived without any fulfillment, without any peak, without any moment of truth, beauty, peace, silence. I have just lived in futility, meaninglessness, and death may come any moment." Then death becomes a fear.

If I am fulfilled, if I have known that which life can allow one to know, if I have felt what living really is, if I have known a single moment of beauty and love and fulfillment, where is the fear of death? Where is the fear! Death can come. It cannot disturb anything, it cannot destroy anything. Death can only destroy the future. For me the future is now nothing. I am

content this very moment. Then death cannot do anything. I can accept it; it may even prove to be a bliss.

So one who is open to death can be open to the divine. Openness means fearlessness. Innocence gives you openness, fearlessness, a vulnerability with no defense arrangements. That is invocation.

And if you are just in that moment when even death can come to you -- and you receive it, embrace it, welcome it -- then you have invoked the Divine. Now death will never come: only the Divine will come. Even in death, death will not be there now -- only the Divine.

Marpa, a Tibetan mystic, is dying. Everyone is weeping and Marpa shouts, "Stop! On such a moment of celebration, why are you weeping? I am going to meet the Divine -- He is just here and now." And he laughs and he smiles and he sings the last song, and everyone goes on weeping because no one can see the Divine there -- everyone is seeing death.

Marpa says, "The Divine is here and now. Why are you weeping? Such a moment of celebration! Such a moment of festivity! Sing and dance and enjoy! because Marpa is going to meet the Friend. The Divine is here just now. I have waited long and now the moment has come. Why are you weeping?" Marpa cannot understand why they are weeping; they cannot understand why Marpa is singing. Has he gone mad? Of course, for us he has gone mad. Death is there and it seems that he has gone mad. Marpa is seeing something else. Marpa was really one of the most open flowerings of humankind.

When Marpa comes to his teacher, the teacher says, "Faith is the key."

So Marpa says, "Then give me something to try my faith. If faith is the key, then give me something to try my faith."

They are sitting on a hill and the teacher says, "Jump!" and Marpa jumps. Even the teacher thinks he will die. Many, many followers are there, and they think that he is just mad -- that they will not even find a piece of his bones.

They rush down, and Marpa is sitting there singing and dancing. The teacher asks, "What has happened?" It seems like a coincidence. The teacher thinks silently in his mind that it is just a coincidence: "Why? This is impossible! How did this happen? It is a coincidence, so I must try him in some other ways." Then many ways are tried.

The teacher tells Marpa to go into a burning house. He goes, and he comes out without even being touched by the flames. He is ordered to jump into the ocean, and he jumps. There are many, many trials and the teacher cannot say now that this is just a coincidence, so he asks Marpa, "What is your secret?"

"My secret?" says Marpa. "You told me faith is the key, so I took your word for it!"

The teacher says, "Now stop because I am afraid. Anything may happen."

Marpa says, "Now anything can happen because I just took your word. Now if you are yourself wavering, I cannot take it. I thought faith was the key, but now it will not work. So please don't order me again. Next time I will die, so don't order me again!"

This is purity -- childlike purity. In Tibet, Marpa is known as Marpa the Faithful -- just childlike faith.

So the story is told that Marpa became the teacher of his own teacher, and his teacher bowed down and said, "Now give me the key of faith because I don't have any. I was just talking! I have only heard that faith is the key, so I was just talking. Now you give it to me." So Marpa became the teacher of his own teacher.

Marpa's mind is pure, innocent, non-calculating. There is not a single moment of calculation and cunningness. He does not even see how deep is the abyss. He does not ask the teacher, "Am I to take what you say literally, verbally, or is it just a metaphor, or are you just

saying something in mystical language? Am I to jump, really, or do you mean some inner jump?" With no calculation, no cunningness, he jumps. The teacher says, "Jump," and he jumps; there is no gap between the two. A single moment's gap, and there is calculation. A single moment's gap, and you have calculated.

This purity opens you; you become an opening. That is the invocation.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 1

Chapter #4

Chapter title: Desire: The Link with Life

18 February 1972 pm in Bombay, India

Archive code: 7202185

ShortTitle: ULTAL104

Audio: Yes

Video: No

Length: 91 mins

LAST NIGHT YOU SAID THAT DESIRES MOVE BETWEEN THE DEAD PAST AND THE IMAGINARY FUTURE. PLEASE EXPLAIN HOW AND WHY THIS DEAD PAST PROVES SO DYNAMIC AND POWERFUL THAT IT COMPELS A PERSON TO FLOW INTO THE PROCESS OF ENDLESS DESIRE. HOW CAN ONE BE FREE FROM THIS DYNAMIC PAST, THE UNCONSCIOUS AND THE COLLECTIVE UNCONSCIOUS?

THE past is not dynamic at all: it is totally dead. But still it has a weight -- a dead weight. That dead weight works; it is not dynamic at all. Why the dead weight works has to be understood.

The past is so forceful because it is the known, the experienced, and mind always feels fearful of the unknown, the unexperienced. And how can you desire the unknown? You cannot desire the unknown. Only the known can be desired. So desires are always repetitious. They repeat, they are circular. You always move in the same pattern, in the same circle. The mind becomes just a groove of repetitions, and the more you repeat a particular thing, the more weighty it becomes, because the groove goes deep.

So the past is important not because it is dynamic; it forces you to do something and to desire not because it is forceful, powerful, alive -- but only because it is a dead groove. And the past has been repeated so many times that to repeat it has become easy and automatic. The more you repeat a particular thing, the more easy and convenient it becomes. The basic convenience is this: that if you are repeating a thing, you need not be aware.

Awareness is the most inconvenient thing. If you are repeating a particular thing, then you need not be aware. You can be just deep asleep, and the thing can be repeated automatically, mechanically. So it is convenient to repeat the past because you need not be aware. You can go on sleeping, and the mind will repeat itself.

That's why those who say that desirelessness is the state of bliss also say that desirelessness is synonymous with awareness. You cannot be desireless unless you are totally aware. Or, if you *are* aware you will find that you are desireless, because desires can have a repetitive force upon the mind only when you are not aware. So the more asleep the mind is,

the more repetitive and the more mechanical. So the past has the grip only because it is a repetition -- and because it is the known. How can you desire the unknown?

For the unknown there can be no desire. The unknown is inconceivable. That's why, even when we begin to desire God, we are not desiring the unknown. By "God" we must mean something which is known. So go deep: what do you mean by "God"? -- particularly YOUR God. What do you mean by it? You will find under the garb of "God" something known, something experienced.

It may be eternal pleasure. So the so-called religious persons go on saying, "Why are you wasting your life in desires which are momentary? Come to us! Here is the fulfillment; here is the possibility to achieve permanent, eternal pleasure." The language can be understood. You know the momentary pleasure, so you can desire permanent pleasure -- but under the garb of God there is pleasure.

You may be seeking God only because you are fearful of death. Then, under the garb of God, you are really asking for immortality, not to die ever, an eternal life. You know this life -- that is your experience -- now you want to make it eternal. So whenever we talk about God, the Divine, Liberation, *mokhsa*, don't be deceived by the words because the words may be hiding something totally different. And they *are* hiding it -- because how can you desire the unknown? How can you conceive of it? How can you ask for it?

Really, the phenomenon is quite different. When you are *not* in desire, the unknown comes to you -- you cannot desire it. When you are desireless the unknown comes to you. You cannot desire it! The state of desirelessness is the opening for the unknown to come. You cannot desire it because the very desire will become the hindrance.

So mind goes on repeating; it is a mechanical thing. So the dynamism is not in the mind -- mind is just a dead, mechanical thing -- the dynamism is in your consciousness, and if your consciousness is identified with the mind then the dead mind becomes dynamic. The dynamism belongs to your energy, it is not part of your mind. *You* are the dynamism behind it. If you are identified with the mind, if you think that you are the mind, then the mind begins to be dynamic. If you are not identified with the mind, then the mind is just dead -- just a dead weight, just a mechanical accumulation.

It *is* a long accumulation -- millennia of evolution, many, many, many lives are accumulated there. It is not only that your mind belongs to this life -- it belongs to life as such. It has evolved, so it has deep grooves. It is not only that you fall in love: your father and mother have fallen in love before you; their fathers and their mothers and theirs and theirs -- they have all fallen in love. The mind has a deep groove of falling in love, so when you fall in love don't be deceived that you are falling in love. The whole humanity is behind you; the whole humanity has made the groove. It is in your bones, it is in your cells, it is in your very metabolism. Every cell has a sex part in it, and every cell has a groove, and every cell has a mind, memory -- long memories, beginningless memories. So if you are identified with this mind, it becomes a force -- a dynamic force. *You* give the energy, but the dead machine begins to move. *You* pedal it.

So remember: energy belongs to you; dynamism belongs to you. Mind is a mechanical thing produced by millennia of evolution, but it has deep grooves. And if you are identified, then you will have to flow through those grooves. There is no escape then.

So the first thing is how not to identify, how to remember constantly that mind is one thing and you are something else. It is difficult, it is arduous -- but it is possible. It is not impossible. And once, if you have even a moment's glimpse of unidentified Existence, then you will never be the same again. Once you come to know that mind is not the force: "I am

the force, the vitality comes from me," if even for a single moment you have the glimpse of your mastery, then mind will never be master again. And only then can you move into the unknown.

Mind cannot move into the unknown: it is produced by the known. It is a product of the known, so it cannot move into the unknown. That's why mind can never know what Truth is, what God is. Mind can never know what freedom is, mind can never know what life is -- because intrinsically mind is dead. It is dead: dust accumulated through centuries and centuries -- just dust, memory dust.

It seems that mind forces you. It doesn't force you really, it only gives you the easiest grooves. It supplies to you only the repeated routine tracks, and you fall victim to convenience -- because to break a new route and to create a new track and to move in a new groove is very difficult and inconvenient. That is what is meant by TAPA -- austerity. If you begin to move in some new grooves which are created not by the mind but created by consciousness, then you are in TAPASCHARYA -- in austerity. It is arduous.

Gurdjieff had many exercises. One exercise was to deny the mechanism sometimes. You are hungry: just deny and let your body suffer. You be just calm and quiet, and remember that the body is hungry. Don't suppress it; don't force it not to be hungry. It is hungry; you know. But at the same time say to it, "I am not going to fulfill this hunger today. Be hungry, suffer! Now, I am not going to move today in this supplied groove. I will remain aloof."

And, suddenly, if you can do this, you begin to feel a gap. The body is hungry, but somewhere there is a distance between you and it. If you try to occupy your mind, then you have missed the point. If you go to the temple and begin to do *kirtan* and singing just to forget the hunger, then you have missed the point. Let the body be hungry. Don't occupy your mind to escape from hunger. Remain hungry, but just tell the body, "Today I am not going to fall in the trap." You remain hungry, you suffer.

There are persons who are doing fasting, but meaninglessly because whenever they fast they try to occupy the mind so that the hunger should not be known and should not be felt. If the hunger is not felt, the whole point is missed! Then you are playing tricks. Let the hunger be there in its totality, in its intensity. Let it be there; don't escape from it. Let the fact of it be there, present, and remain aloof and tell the body, "Today I am not going to give you anything." There is neither conflict nor suppression nor any escape.

If you can do this, then suddenly you become aware of a gap. Your mind asks for something. For example, someone has become angry. He is angry with you, and the mind begins to react, to be angry. Just tell the mind, "I am not going to fall in the trap this time." Be aloof. Let the anger be there in the mind, but be aloof. Don't cooperate, don't be identified, and you will feel that anger is somewhere else. It surrounds you, but it is not in you, it doesn't belong to you. It is just like smoke around you. It goes on, goes on, and waits for you to come and cooperate.

There will be every temptation. This is what is really meant by temptation. Mm? -- no devil is there to tempt you. Your own mind tempts you, because that's the most convenient way to be and to behave. Convenience is the temptation; convenience is the devil. The mind will say, "Be angry!" The situation is there and the mechanism is just on. Always, whenever this situation was there, you have been angry, so the mind supplies you again with the same reaction.

As far as it goes it is good because mind makes you ready to do something you have always been doing; but sometimes just stand off, off the track, and tell the mind, "Okay, anger is there outside. Someone is angry with me. You are supplying, me with an old

reaction, a stereotyped reaction, but this time I am not going to cooperate. I will just stand here and observe and see what happens." Suddenly the whole situation changes.

If you don't cooperate the mind falls dead, because it is your cooperation which gives it dynamism, energy. It is *your* energy, but you only become aware when it is used by the mind. Don't give it any cooperation, and the mind will just fall down as if without a backbone -- just a dead snake with no life. It will be there, and for the first time you will become aware of a certain energy in you which doesn't belong to the mind but belongs to you.

This energy is pure energy, and with this energy one can move into the unknown. Really, this energy moves into the unknown if it is not associated with the mind. If it is associated with the mind, then it moves into the known. If it moves into the known, then it takes the shape of desire. If it moves into the unknown, then it takes the shape of desirelessness. Then there is sheer movement -- a play of energy, a sheer dance of energy, an overflowing energy moving into the unknown.

Mind can only supply the known. If you can be detached from your mind, the energy will have to move, it cannot remain static. That is what is meant by energy: it has to move! Movement is its very life. Movement is not a quality of energy: movement is the very life! It is not that energy cannot be without movement -- no! It is the very life, intrinsic.

Energy means movement, so it moves. If mind supplies it grooves, then it moves into the grooves. If there is no supply of grooves and if you have just put off the mind, then too it moves, but now the movement is into the uncharted. This movement is the play, the *leela* this movement is creative; this movement is spiritual. And it is desireless. It is not because there is some desire that you move. It is because you cannot do anything else but move: you *are* energy and movement. So see the difference.

When mind works, it works as a dead weight, a mechanical weight, through the past. It pushes you towards the future. Because the past is pushing towards the future, the past again projects its own desires. So first understand the repetitiveness of desires.

There are not so many desires. Really, there are very few. You go on repeating them. Just count how many desires you have. They are not many -- very few! You will not even be able to find enough to count on your fingers. How many desires do you have? Very few! And, really, if you look deeply, you may even find that only one desire is there. There are modifications of it, but really only one desire, and the same desire is being repeated continuously. Life after life it is being repeated. You go on repeating and then it begins to seem, it begins to appear, that you are helpless, that the wheel is moving and you cannot do anything. It is not so. You are helpless only because you have forgotten totally that the energy by which the wheel is moving is given by you.

Because of the past, the future is just a repetition. It is the projected past. You again desire the same thing, and you go on again and again. That's why I said that past and future are parts of mind, not parts of time. Time is just here and now, the present. If mind is not working, then energy will be here and now in the moment. It will move because it is energy, but now the movement will be into the unknown. The known is not there at all. Mind is not, so the known is not.

Someone asked Hui-Hai, "How did you achieve? How did you reach?"

Hui-Hai said, "When I became a no-mind, then I achieved, then I reached."

We are minds. That means: tethered to the past. If we can become no-minds that means untethered to the past -- then the moment is free, fresh, and energy moves -- not for something but because it is energy. Remember the difference exactly: it moves *not for something*; it moves *because it is energy*.

A river is moving; ordinarily we think it is moving for the sea. How can it know? It is not moving for the sea. It is moving because it is energy. Ultimately, the sea happens to be there; that is another thing. So when you move into the unknown, ultimately you reach to the Divine. It happens to be there. If your movement is pure, you reach it.

The river goes on moving without knowing, without any map. The past cannot supply the map because the river is not going to move on the past tracks again, so every step is into the unknown. And where it is going, there is no way to know. It is not moving because of any desire; it is not moving for something. The future is unknown -- just unknown, dark. It moves. Why does it move? It moves because it is energy.

A seed is moving, a tree is growing, stars are moving. Why do they move? Have they to reach somewhere? No! They move because they are energy; pure energy is moving. Because pure energy cannot do anything else, it moves. So when you become just pure energy. not mind but no-mind energy, you move; and then every step is just into the unknown. Then life becomes a bliss, it becomes ecstatic, because the old is never repeated again. Never will the morning be the same again, never again this moment. Now it is a sensation, a thrill every time. This thrill creates Meera's dance; this thrill creates Chaitanya's singing with this thrill, every moment something new is bursting, exploding. A Buddha is never bored. He looks fresh.

Maulingputta came to Buddha. He was a very inquiring young man, a great scholar, one who knew all that can be known from scriptures, a great pundit. When he came to Buddha he began to ask many questions. The second day again he asked many questions. The third day again he asked many questions. Ananda, another disciple of Buddha's, was just bored. He asked Buddha, "Are you not bored? He is repeating the same questions again and again."

Buddha asked Ananda, "Has he repeated? Has he repeated a single question?"

Every moment is so new for a Buddha-conscious mind. For a Buddha-like mind, everything is so new, how can you repeat the old question again? Even the questioner does not remain the same. How can you ask the same question you asked yesterday? The Ganges has flowed so much, so how can you ask the same question again? You will never be the same again yourself.

And Buddha said, "Even if he is asking the same questions, he is not asking the same person. So how can I say he is repeating? He must have asked someone else. Yesterday where was I? The energy has moved."

Someone was very angry, insulted Buddha; then felt sorry, and the next day came to ask Buddha's forgiveness. Buddha was just bewildered, and he said, "You are a strange man! You insult one person and then you ask pardon from somebody else."

The man said, "What are you saying? Am I strange, or are you? I came yesterday and insulted you. I felt very sorry and I couldn't sleep."

Buddha said, "That's why you are still repeating. But I could sleep and now I am a different man. The river has gone on. It is not the same bank again, and I will never be the same so now you are in difficulty, because you cannot ask pardon of a man you will never meet. If I ever meet him I will tell him whatsoever you have said to me."

This energy moves into the unknown. It is fresh, young, so a Buddha can never be old. The body, of course, will become old, but a Buddha can never be old. He will remain young. That's why we have never pictured Ram, Krishna or Buddha as old. They became old, but we have no pictures of Krishna's old age, of Ram's old age, of Buddha's old age, of Mahavir's old age. We have no pictures!

It is not that they never became old -- the body has to follow the common lot -- but by not

creating pictures of their old age we have just meant something more. Really, they were never old because they were so moving -- so moving and so young. For such persons death is not an end. It is again a further movement. It is not an end at all.

So mind is not dynamic: mind is mechanical. It can become dynamic if you cooperate with it. Don't cooperate with it! Remember your aloofness, create a distance. Be aware, and then the mind will be there but *you* will be outside.

The English word "ecstasy" is very beautiful and meaningful. You may not have even conceived of what this word means -- "ecstasy". It means to stand outside; the word means to stand outside. If you can stand outside of yourself, if you can be outside of yourself, you are in ecstasy. Someone has suggested that to translate "Samadhi" as "ecstasy" is not good because the word "Samadhi" doesn't mean to stand outside. Really, Samadhi means to stand *inside*. So someone has suggested a new word, he has coined a new word: instead of ecstasy he says it is better to translate Samadhi as "instasy" -- to stand inside.

Really, these two words mean two different things, but in a certain way they mean the same. If you can stand *out* of your mind, then you will be able to stand in yourself. If you can stand *outside yourself* -- the so-called self -- then you will be, for the first time, inside. So ecstasy IS "instasy". Then you will be in your center.

If you are out of your mind, then you will be centered in yourself. So going out of the mind is going into consciousness. That's why mind has to be understood as mechanical, as a mechanism, as accumulation, as the past. And once you feel it, you are out of it. But we go on, we continue to identify ourselves with it.

Whenever you say, "This is my thought," you are identifying. Change the language, and sometimes it helps very much -- if you can just change the language! Language has such a deep grip. Say, "This belongs to my past mind," and feel the difference. When you say, "This is my thought," you are identified. Say, "This belongs to my mind, my past mind," and feel how only a change of language creates a distance.

For example, we say, "My mind is tense." Then you are identified. We even say, "I am tense." Then there is even more identification. When I say, "I am tense," there is no gap. When I say, "My mind is tense," there is a little gap. If I can say, "I am aware that the mind is tense," then there is a greater gap, and the greater the gap, the less will be the tension.

When we say, "I am tense," it looks as if someone else is responsible. So psychology suggests never to say "I am tense," because subtly it makes someone else responsible. They say that rather than to say "I am tense," one should say, " I am tensing." Then the responsibility is yours.

So break the old habits of language, mind, thoughts, and then your energy will move. And once the mind is not there, you are free for the first time.

OSHO, THERE IS A STORY IN THE LIFE OF PARAMAHANSA RAMAKRISHNA, AND WE HAVE HEARD IT FROM YOU MORE THAN ONCE, ABOUT HIS LUST FOR THE PALATE WHICH SHARADA DEVI TOLD ABOUT. DOESN'T IT INDICATE THAT DESIRE IS INTRINSICALLY RELATED TO LIVING, TO LIFE ITSELF?

Desire is related to life, but life can be desireless also. But then bodily life will become impossible. Really, desire is the link between life and body. If all the desires drop, then the body cannot continue any more because body is just an instrumentality for desires to be fulfilled. Now biologists say that we have developed the senses because of desires, and if you

can desire persistently then your body will develop new senses.

It is only because of desires that we have eyes. Ordinarily, we think that because there are eyes we see. No! Biologists say that because there is a desire to see, eyes develop. If the desire is not there to see, then eyes will just drop. The whole body comes into existence because of desires.

Buddha lived forty years after his Enlightenment, so there was a question: If desires have stopped totally, then Buddha must die -- how is he alive?

The body has a momentum. If you are running and want to stop suddenly, you cannot stop. Your mind has stopped. you have decided to stop, but you will have to run a little more because of the momentum. You have been pedalling a bicycle, and now you have stopped pedalling, but the wheels have accumulated momentum. They will run on, and it will take a little more time for the bicycle to stop completely. That's why I always say that if the bicycle is going uphill, then it will stop soon. If you have stopped pedalling and the bicycle is going uphill, then it will stop soon. It may even stop the same moment you stop pedalling. But if it is going downhill, it may go on much longer.

So if Enlightenment happens before the age of thirty-five. the body may die soon. If it happens after thirty-five then it is downhill, it may continue more. So a Shankara dies soon. He was just thirty-three, and he became Enlightened at the age of twenty -- so it was rare! And he had to die. He couldn't complete the thirty-fifth year, he couldn't reach even to the middle. If the Enlightenment happens after thirty-five, then you are downhill, then the body can continue.

With desires stopping totally, really you have stopped being a body. Now the old momentum will work, and it will depend on many things.

Buddha died because of food poisoning, and he could not be cured; not because the food poisoning was so dangerous -- it was very ordinary -- but he had no bodily link, so he couldn't be helped. So now medicine accepts this: that if you have a lust for life, medicines will be more helpful. If you don't have any lust for life, then medicines may not prove helpful at all.

So now there are many experiments. Two persons are ill, just on their deathbeds. One is more serious, and there is no hope for him -- but *he* is hopeful and he wants to live longer. Medical science is not hopeful, doctors are not hopeful, but he himself is hopeful. Another is not in such a serious state. Everyone is just hopeful: "He will survive; there is no problem." But he himself is hopeless. He doesn't want to survive. Suddenly, inside, something has dropped from the body. Now medicine cannot help. He will die -- and the seriously ill man will survive. Medicine can help him.

Body and consciousness are related by desires. That's why, if a person dies without desire, then he will not be reborn; because now there is no necessity, no causality to create a body again.

I have seen one person who cannot go to sleep because he is fearful of death. Death may occur in sleep, then what can he do? So he is afraid; he cannot sleep. And I think his fear is valid, his fear has a significance -- because he has no desire to live. He is not desireless! He just has no desire to live. Rather, he has a desire to die, and if a person has a desire to die, he can die in sleep very easily.

You can get up in the morning again, not only because the morning has come, but because you have something which forces you to get up. This person has nothing; nothing forces him to get up. So he cannot sleep because of the fear, and in the morning he doesn't feel at all like getting up. There is nothing! Still, I say. he is not desireless. He is just

frustrated; all his desires have become frustrations. When all desires are frustrated, you create a new desire -- a desire to die.

Freud, in his old age, stumbled upon a new thing of which he had never dreamed. For his whole life he worked on "libido" -- the desire to live. He based his whole structure of thinking on this force of libido -- this sex, this desire for life -- and in the end he stumbled upon a second desire. The first desire he calls "Eros" and the second he calls "Thanatos". Thanatos means deathwish, a desire to die. Freud began to feel that if there is no desire to die, how can a man die? There must be hidden somewhere a desire to die; otherwise, biologists say that the body itself can continue -- even forever. There is no necessary reason why a man should die so soon, because the body has a built-in process to renew itself. It can continue renewing -- but there are many things....

The body is born, as we have said always, because of some desire to live. Mm? Really, Freud is right. A second desire is needed to complete the circle. A desire must be hidden there to die. That death-desire helps you to die, and the life-desire helps you to be reborn. That death-desire comes many times to everyone. Many times you become suddenly aware of it. Whenever something is frustrated, such as in the case of someone having lost a lover or beloved, suddenly the death-desire comes up and you want to die -- not because you have become desireless, but because your most longed-for desire is now impossible. So you begin to desire death.

This difference has to be noted, because many religious persons are really not religious -- they are only desiring death, they are suicidal. It is very easy to change the desire from life to death. It is very easy, because life and death are not just two things -- they are two aspects of one phenomenon, so you can change.

So it happens that the persons who commit suicide are really those who are very, very deeply attached to life. Because they are so much attached to life, whenever they are frustrated they cannot do anything else but commit suicide. A person who is not too much attached to life cannot commit suicide. And suicides can be committed in two ways: they can be long-term and they can be short-term. You can take poison just now, or you can go on dying slowly for many years. It depends how much courage you have.

Sometimes it happens that you have no courage to live and you have no courage to die, then you have to die slowly. Then a long-term suicide is chosen. Then one just goes on dropping by and by -- dying, dying, dying. Then death is a long, delayed process -- by degrees.

This deathwish is also there, and there are many things, many implications in it. Bernard Shaw, in his later life, left city life and went to live in a small village. And someone asked him, "Why have you chosen this village?"

He said. "I was just passing by the cemetery and I came upon a stone on which it was written: 'This man died at the age of one hundred and ten -- the death was untimely.' So I thought *this* village is worth living in. If people here think that one hundred and ten is untimely, then it is good to be here." And, really, he lived very long.

Psychologists say it is a fixation. If the whole country thinks that seventy is the maximum, then it becomes a fixed mind-attitude. If the country thinks that one hundred is the maximum, then one hundred will become the maximum. If the country begins to think as a whole, collectively, that there is no need to die so soon and that a man can live three hundred years, if the whole country becomes fixed with three hundred years as the maximum, then the body can live for three hundred years. It is just a collective hypnosis.

We know a person is going to be old at a particular age, everyone knows. The child

becomes aware of when one becomes old. The young man knows when youth will be gone. Everyone knows! And it is so repeatedly known, it is so suggestive, that everyone knows that seventy, or eighty at the maximum, is going to be the limit. We die at eighty because we believe that eighty is the limit. If you can change the limit, there is no need to die so soon. Basically, there is no need for the body to die so soon. It is a self-regenerating process. It goes on regenerating, it can continue.

This collective hypnosis and the deathwish become conjoined, they both become one. But if life needs desires, then death also needs desires. That is why we never say that Krishna died -- never! We say that he entered Samadhi. We never say Buddha died -- mm? -- it was Nirvana, deliverance. We never say that they died because, really, for them, how can death be possible when life has become impossible? Understand the implication: if for Buddha life has become an impossibility, then how can death be possible? A person who cannot desire life, how can he desire death? If he has become so desireless that life is impossible, then death will also be impossible. So we never say that a Buddha dies. We say only that he enters a greater life. We never say that he dies.

How is it that we die? We die because we live, because we are attached to life. We have to be detached from life, broken. When a Buddha lives, he lives as a momentum. He is in the car, and the car is going downhill. Wherever it stops he will not have any grudge -- wherever. At the very moment the car stops, he will get down. Not for a single moment will he feel something wrong. He will not feel anything is wrong: it is as it should be. He can live as if not living; he can die as if not dying. But if you want to continue, then some desire has to be there.

Ramakrishna tried to be alive for some time just to give the message to a right person. He felt that if there was no desire left and no momentum either, then the body would just drop. So he cultivated, he created, he forced a desire to be there. He continuously tried that at least one desire must be alive until the moment he could deliver the message to a right person. It never happened to a Buddha; it never happened to a Mahavir. Why did it happen to Ramakrishna?

Really, it is not a question of why it happened to Ramakrishna. It is a question concerned not with Ramakrishna, but with our age. At Buddha's time it was never impossible to find persons -- never! There were so many, and at any moment the message could be delivered to anyone. But for Ramakrishna it was such an impossibility to find a person. So for the first time, Ramakrishna alone is the man, in the whole history of mankind, who tried forcibly to be alive a little more -- just to get the right man.

And when Vivekananda came to him for the first time, Ramakrishna said, "Where have you been? I have waited so long! I have waited *so* long!" And when Vivekananda, for the first time, achieved the first glimpse of Samadhi, Ramakrishna stopped him; he said, "Now no more, because then you will also have the same difficulty. So just remain here, don't go further. Just remain here until the message is delivered. Now I will take your keys with me so you will not have to suffer the same as I have suffered. First I achieved something, then I had to be rooted in the earth and it was very difficult -- *very* difficult. So now I will take your keys with me, and these keys will be given to you only before your death -- three days before."

And Vivekananda remained without having the glimpse again. Then he couldn't achieve. This happening, what Ramakrishna had said, became the barrier. He couldn't cross the barrier. He crossed only before his death -- three days before.

Life is desire -- mm? -- the life we know is desire. But there is another life which is

desirelessness -- the life we don't know. This life is through body; that life is through pure consciousness -- direct, immediate. This life is through body, through mind, through instruments. That's why it is so dim and faint. It is not an immediate thing.

When something reaches you through many mediums, it is distorted. It is bound to be. You have never seen the light: your eyes see the light. Then the light is transformed into chemicals, into electric waves. You have never seen those electric waves, you have never seen those chemicals. Those chemicals carry the message, then they are decoded in your mind. They are just codes. Then they are decoded, and the mind gives you the message that you have seen the light. And then you begin to say, "I have seen the light; the sun has risen." You have never seen the sun rising. It is just a chemical process that reaches you -- never the sunrise. It is only the picture that is again decoded.

Our whole experience is like this -- indirect. I touch the hand of my beloved, of my lover, of my friend. I have never touched them. I cannot -- because touch remains at my fingertips. And then, just through my system, an electric wave comes to my mind. That wave is decoded and I say, "How beautiful!" This touch can be created if my eyes are closed; this touch can be created by a mechanical device. And if the same wave frequency can be created as is created by my beloved's touch, I will say, "How beautiful!"

No touch is even needed if the message-carrying system in the mind can be stimulated by an electrode. Again I will feel, "How beautiful!" Just an electrode can be put in your skull, and if we know what the frequencies of your experiences are -- when you feel love, what frequency waves you receive -- then we can push the buttons and the same frequency is created by the electrode in the mind and you begin to be in love. What frequency do you receive when you interpret it as anger? The electrode can create the same frequency and you will begin to be angry.

What are you living in life? What have you known? You have known nothing -- because everything is through so many mediums that only an indirect message reaches you.

There is another life without the body, without the mind. Then the experience is immediate, without any medium. It is direct, there is nothing in between. If the light is there, there is nothing in between, then for the first time you are filled with light, not with a coded message. That experience is the experience of the Divine.

I can say it in this way: if you are experiencing Existence through mediums, it is the world. If you are experiencing the Existence without any mediums, it is God. That which is experienced is the *same*: only the experiencer experiencing in different ways.

One way is through something else. I give you a message, then you give it to somebody else, then he to somebody else. Then it reaches to whomever it was to be given -- to whom it may concern. Then it reaches -- and it has changed. Every time it is given to someone, it is changed. With our eyes we don't see alike. We cannot see alike because in a subtle way every instrument is different. So when I see light I feel it in a different way. When you see light you feel it in a different way.

When a Van Gogh sees the sun, certainly he sees it in a different way, because he will become just mad, begin to dance, cry, scream. He will just be mad when he sees the sun. For one year Van Gogh continuously painted only sun pictures. He would not sleep: he was just mad. And in Arles, where the sun is very hot, for one year continuously the sun was beating down on his head, and he was in the field painting -- painting for one year continuously. He went mad. For one year he had to be put in a madhouse, and the only reason was that he couldn't stand so much sun.

But no one goes so mad! He committed suicide and he wrote a letter. And in the letter he

had written, "Because I have painted all the faces of the sun, now there is no need to live. I have painted all the faces possible. I have known the sun in every mood -- now there is no need to live. Now I can drop dead." Certainly he must have seen the sun in a different way. No one goes so mad after the sun. Why this madness?

He must have had a different message system. And now psychologists say he must have had some different chemicals, built-in chemicals. It is possible that soon we will come to a conclusion that poets have a different quantity of certain chemicals, and only because of that do they begin to be mad after flowers, after clouds. For all others it is just nonsense. It is okay that there is a flower, but it is nonsense to go on painting it, creating poetries and living for it. Certainly something like LSD must be a built-in chemical with them. A dancer has a different chemistry. It seems that the bioenergy works in a different way.

So when I say that life *is* bound with desires, I mean this life, not *that*. This life is bound with desires. So the more desires you have, the more you will have the feeling of this life. Mm? That's why those who are after desires, running and running, seem to us to be very much alive; we say they are very much alive. What are you doing? Run! Everyone is running and everyone is so alive! Are you just dead?

But there is another life also -- greater, deeper, more vital, more immediate and direct. We have a word for it, *aparokshanubhuti* -- immediate experiencing. God must be seen, but not by eyes. He must be heard, but not by ears. He must be embraced, but not by hands, not by the body. But how can it happen?

We know only two things -- life of desires and death of desires. We don't know another dimension -- desireless life and desireless Liberation. But if we become aware of the very mechanism of desire, we can create a gap; and the moment the gap is created, life begins to move into another life.

WITH GROWING DESIRELESSNESS, SOMETIMES THE PERSON BECOMES OUTWARDLY INACTIVE. IS IT LETHARGY AND DULLNESS? WHY DOES IT HAPPEN?

Many things are possible, and it will depend. Certainly many desires will drop and many actions also. Those actions which were just caused by desires will drop. If I was running for a particular desire, how can I run if the desire has dropped? My running will stop. At least the same running on the same route will stop. So when a person becomes desireless, at least for an interim period, for an interval -- and how long it will be will depend on the individual -- he will become inactive. The desires will have dropped -- and all the actions that he had been doing were concerned with desires, so how can he continue? They will drop.

But by dropping desires and actions, energy will be accumulated -- and now energy will begin to move. When it moves, how it moves will vary from individual to individual, but *now* it will move. There will be a gap, an interim period, an interval. This I call a pregnancy period. The seed is born, but now it will gestate for at least nine months. And it may seem strange, but it happens. This nine months period is meaningful. Near about this, eight months or ten months, will be the interim period, and you will just become inactive. This inactivity will also vary. Someone may become so inactive that people may think that he has just gone into a coma. Everything stops.

For Meher Baba it happened like that. For one year he was just in a coma. He couldn't even move his limbs. Action was far off, he couldn't stand up because even the desire to

stand had gone. He couldn't eat; he had to be forced. He couldn't do anything! For one year continuously he became just helpless -- a helpless child. This was a pregnancy period, and then, suddenly, a different man was born. The man who became inactive was no more: a new energy -- energy accumulated.

Lives and lives of dissipated energy create this gap -- because you do not have enough energy. When desire is not there to invoke, provoke, stimulate, you just drop. Your energy is not really energy, but just a pushing and pulling. Anyhow you go on running because the goal seems just nearby. A few moments' endeavour more and you will reach! You pull yourself on; somehow you carry yourself and run. But when the goal is dropped, when there is no desire, you will drop. An inactivity will be there. If you can be patient in this inactivity period, after it you will be reborn. Then energy will begin to move without desires.

But I say it depends. It may happen suddenly as it happened for Meher Baba: that was a sudden case. It happened in Bombay. It happened by a kiss from an old lady, Babajan. Meher Baba was just passing, coming back from his school. Babajan was an old Sufi mystic, an old lady who was just sitting under a tree for years and years and years. Meher Baba was just coming, and Babajan called him. He knew this old lady. She was sitting for years under the tree, and he had passed by that street daily on his way towards his school and towards his home. She called and he came near. She kissed him -- and he dropped as if dead just there. Then he had to be carried home.

For one year continuously the kiss remained on him and he was in a coma. It may happen suddenly like this. Mm? This was a great transfer, and Babajan died afterwards because she had just been waiting for this moment to give someone the whole energy. This was her last life, and there was not enough time even to explain what she was giving. And also, she was not the type to have explained. She was a silent mystic. She had not touched anybody for years. She was only waiting for this moment when she was to kiss someone and the whole energy was to be transferred in a single transfer. Before this she had not even touched anyone, so this touch was to be total.

And this child was simply unaware of what was going to happen. He was ready -- otherwise this transfer would not have been possible -- but he was not aware. He had worked through his past lives. He was just coming up. He might have become aware later on, but just now he was completely unaware. This happened so suddenly that he had to go again through a second pregnancy. For one year he was as if not. Many medicines were given; many, many doctors and physicians tried to help, but nothing could be done. And the woman who could do something, she disappeared, she died. After one year he was a different man -- totally different.

If it happens so suddenly, then it will be a deep coma. If it happens through some exercises, then it will never be so deep a coma. If you are doing awareness exercises, meditation, then it will never happen so suddenly. It will come so gradually, so gradually, that you will never even become aware of when it has happened. By and by, inactivity will be there, activity will be there, and very gradually inside everything will have changed. And the desire will drop, the activity will drop, but no one will ever feel that you have been lethargic or that you have become inactive.

This is the gradual process. So those who follow yoga or any method will not feel the suddenness. There are also methods in which sudden happenings become possible, but one can be prepared. Babajan never prepared this boy; she never even asked his permission. It was a one-way affair. She just transferred the energy.

Zen monks also transfer, but before transferring they prepare the ground. A person can be

made ready to receive the energy, then this reaction will not be there. He may feel lethargy for some days, for some months, but no one will feel outside that inside everything has become inactive. But that needs preparation, and that can happen only in schools. And when I say "school", I mean a group working.

Babajan was alone; she never made anyone her disciple. There was no school, there was not a following in which she could have prepared anyone. And, also, she was not the type. She was not the teacher type; she couldn't teach. But she had to give to someone, to whomsoever passed and she felt: "Now is the moment, and this one will be able to carry it," so she could just deliver it.

So it depends. Inactivity is bound to be there -- more or less, but it will be there, a period will be there. And only then can you be reborn, because the whole mechanism has to change completely. The mind drops, old roots drop, the old habits drop, the old association of consciousness and desires, consciousness and mind, drops -- everything old drops and everything has to be new.

A waiting is needed, patience is needed. And if one is patient, one has not to do anything: just to wait is enough. The energy begins to move by itself. You just sow the seed and then wait! Don't be in a hurry; don't go every day to pull the seed out and see what is happening. Just put it inside and wait. The energy will take its own course. The seed will die, and the energy will sprout and will begin to move. But don't be impatient. One has to wait.

And the greater the seed, and the greater the possibility, the potentiality of the tree that is going to be, the more will be the waiting. But it comes. It comes! The deeper the waiting, the sooner it comes.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 1

Chapter #5

Chapter title: A still Mind: The Door to the Divine

19 February 1972 pm in Bombay, India

Archive code: 7202195

ShortTitle: ULTAL105

Audio: Yes

Video: No

Length: 87 mins

NISCHAL GYANAM ASANAM

NON-WAVERING KNOWING IS ASANA -- THE POSTURE

MAN IS neither a body, nor a mind alone -- he is both. Even to say that he is both is wrong in a way because body and mind are separate only as two words. Existence is one. Body is nothing but the outermost core of your consciousness, the grossest expression of consciousness. And consciousness, on the other hand, is nothing more than the subtlest body, the most refined part of the body. You exist in between.

These are not two things, but two ends of one thing. So whenever knowing becomes non-wavering, body is also affected; non-wavering knowing creates a non-wavering body. But the vice versa is not true. You can impose non-wavering on the body, but the knowing will not become non-wavering. It can help -- a very little. It can be helpful, but not much.

Body posture became very important because we are bodyoriented. Even those who say that we are not bodies think in terms of body. Even those who say, "We are *not* bodies," their thinking, their mind, remains tethered to the body. Even they begin with body postures. *Asana* means giving your body a posture in which the body becomes non-wavering, still. It is supposed that if the body is still, then the mind will go into stillness.

This is not true -- the contrary is true! If the mind becomes still, then the body becomes still. And then a very mysterious phenomenon happens: if the mind is still, you can go on dancing but your body will remain still. And if your mind is not still, you can be just dead but still the body will be wavering, because the mind wavering creates subtle vibrations which come to the body and the body goes on wavering inside. Try it. You can sit just like a statue -- dead, stonelike. Close your eyes and feel. Outwardly, no one can say that your body is wavering, but inwardly you will know that it is. A subtle trembling is there. Even if it cannot be detected from the outside, you can feel it from the inside.

If your mind is totally still, then even if you are dancing you will feel from inside that the body is still. A Buddha is still even when he is walking, and a non-Buddha is not still even when he is dead. The vibrations come from your center, they originate from you, and then they spread towards the body. The body is not the originator, it is not the source, so you cannot stop them from the periphery. You can impose, you can practice, but inside there will

be turmoil -- and this imposing will create more conflict than stillness.

So this sutra says that to practise meditation, posture -- a still posture -- is needed. But what do we mean by a posture? This sutra says that "a non-wavering knowing" is the posture. If the mind is non-wavering, then you are in the right posture. In that right posture everything can happen.

So don't deceive yourself by creating bodily imitations. You can create them; that is very easy. On the circumference, on the periphery, to impose stillness is very easy. But that is not your stillness. You remain in turmoil, you remain wavering. From the center the waves must not come.

What is this non-wavering knowledge? It is one of the deepest secrets. To understand it we will have to go deep into the very construction of mind, so let us begin.

Mind has many types of thoughts. Every thought is a wavering, every thought is a wave. If there are *no* thoughts, then the mind will be non-wavering. A single thought, and you have trembled. A single thought, and you are not still. And a single thought is not a single thought: it is a very complex phenomenon. A single thought is created by many waves; a single word even is created by many waves. So only when many waves are there in the mind is a single word created, and a single thought has many words. Thousands and thousands of ripples create one thought.

Thought is the outermost, but waves have preceded. You become aware only when waves become thoughts because your awareness is so gross. You cannot be aware when waves are pure waves still in the formation of becoming a thought. The more you will become aware, the more you will feel that thought has many layers. Thought form is the last. Before thought there are seed waves which create the thought, and before the seed waves there are still deeper roots which create seeds.

Seeds create thought. At least three layers are very easily visible for a conscious mind. But we are not conscious: we are asleep. So we become aware only when waves take the grossest form -- thought. As far as we know, thought seems to be the most subtle thing. It is not. Thought really has become a thing. When there are pure waves you cannot even detect what is going to happen, what thought is going to be created in you. So we become aware only when waves become thought.

A single thought implies thousands of waves, so we can conceive how much we are wavering -- continuous thinking, not a single moment of no thought, one thought followed by another constantly, no gap. So we are really a wavering, a trembling phenomenon. Soren Kierkegaard has said that man is a trembling -- just a trembling and nothing else. And he is right in a way. As far as we are concerned, man is a trembling. A Buddha may not be, but then Buddha is not a man.

This thought process is the process of wavering. So non-wavering means a no-thought state of mind. Really, the sutra says "non-wavering knowing" -- mind is not even mentioned. So first, three layers of mind have to be distinctly understood.

One is the conscious mind, and one type of thought belongs to the conscious level. These thoughts are the least important. They constitute moment-to-moment reactions, reflexes. You are on the road and a snake passes and you jump. The snake gives you a stimulus and you respond. So one type of thought is like this: stimulus outside and a response from the periphery. Really, you don't think: you just act. A snake is there: you act; you become aware and you act. You don't go inside to ask what to do. The house is on fire and you run. This is a peripheral reaction.

So one type of thought is the moment-to-moment reflex type. Even a Buddha has to react

in this way. This is natural; nothing is wrong with it. If you react moment-to-moment, then nothing is wrong with the mind -- but that is not the only layer.

Then there is a second layer. This second layer is the subconscious. Religions call it "conscience". Really, this second layer is created by the society; it is a society in you. Society penetrates everyone, because society cannot control you unless it penetrates you; so it becomes a part of you. The upbringing, the education, the parents, the teachers -- what are they doing? They are doing one thing: they are creating the subconscious mind. They are giving you thoughts, structures, ideals, values. These thoughts belong to the second layer. They are helpful, they have their utility, but they are harmful also. They are instruments to move easily, conveniently in the society, but they are barriers also.

This second layer has to be understood more. This second layer consists of ideas within, fixed ideas, fixations. So whenever your peripheral mind is working moment-to-moment, it is not pure. Only a child is pure, innocent -- he is working moment-to-moment. There is no subconscious to interfere.

You are not working moment-to-moment. The subconscious is constantly interfering. It is giving you choice: what to choose, what not to choose. Every moment it is making you narrow. You become just unaware of many things because of the subconscious. It will not allow you to be aware of everything. And about many things you become too much aware because this subconscious mind forces you constantly to be aware of them.

Every society creates a different type of subconscious, so, really, one's being a Hindu or a Christian or a Jain belongs to the subconscious mind. As far as the peripheral mind is concerned, everyone reacts in the same way; it is natural. But the subconscious mind is not natural; it is a social product. So we behave in different ways. You see a church. A Hindu can pass without even becoming aware that there is a church. He need not be aware. But a Christian cannot pass without becoming aware that there is a church. He may even be anti-Christian -- consciously he may even be like Bertrand Russell who can write a book called WHY I AM NOT A CHRISTIAN -- but he will become aware. The subconscious is working there.

A Brahmin, he can intellectually understand that the problem of untouchability is just violent, cruel, and intellectually he can think that it is not good, but this is the conscious mind. The subconscious is working there. If you ask him to marry a Sudra girl, somewhere deeply he is struck. He cannot conceive of it. Even to eat with an untouchable becomes difficult. Intellectually he understands nothing is wrong in it, but the subconscious goes on projecting and pushing. And he cannot react naturally: the subconscious distorts, perverts.

This subconscious is supplying you constantly with many ideas which you think are your own. They are not. They have been fed to you just like a computer is fed. You can get information out of a computer only if you have previously fed it. The same is the case with man also, with mind also. Whatsoever you are getting out is just because of what has been fed in before. Everything has been fed in. This is what we mean by education, the so-called education: feeding information. So it is ready in the unconscious every moment. It is so ready, really, that even when you don't need it, it comes up. It constantly overflows your mind, and it becomes a constant wavering, a constant trembling. This subconscious mind is the root cause of so many social evils.

Really, the world could be one if there were no subconscious mind. Then there would be no distinction between a Hindu and a Mohammedan. The distinction is of the subconscious feeding, and it goes so deep that you cannot even feel how it works. You cannot go behind it. It goes so deep that you always remain in front and you feel helpless. But the society is also

helpless. It is a substitute -- a poor substitute, but a substitute. Unless man becomes totally aware, the society cannot dispense with the subconscious.

For example, if a man becomes totally aware, he cannot be a thief. But man, as he is, is not aware at all, so society has to create a substitute for awareness: it must put a strong suggestion inside that theft is bad, evil, sin, that you must not be a thief. This idea must be put deep in the subconscious so that when you begin to think of theft the subconscious comes up and says, "No. this is sin," and you are stopped. This is a social substitute for awareness -- and unless man comes to awareness the society cannot dispense with the subconscious, because it has to give you some rules. Unless you are so aware that rules are not needed at all, the subconscious will have to be maintained.

So each society has to create a subconscious. And I call that society good -- remember it -- I call that society good which creates a subconscious that can be dispensed with very easily; and I call a society bad which creates such a subconscious that cannot be dispensed with: because if it cannot be dispensed with, then it becomes a hindrance when you try to be aware. And, really, no such good society exists now which gives you a dispensable substitute, a dispensable subconscious, which gives you a subconscious as a utilitarian instrument so that the moment you become aware, you can throw it.

To me, that society is good and religious which gives you an inherent freedom about the subconscious. But no society gives it. so. no society is religious, really. Every society is totalitarian, and every society takes your mind in such a way that you become just an automaton -- and you go on thinking and deceiving yourself that your thoughts are yours. They are not! Even the very language we use is contaminated, the words we use are contaminated. We cannot use a single word without the subconscious being there. It comes suddenly. Society uses it very cunningly, and then your reactions, your reflexes, are not spontaneous.

You are passing along the road, and you see in the distance a woman coming out of a shop. Your mind begins to feel and say that she is beautiful, and then suddenly you recognize that the woman is your sister. Now, suddenly, she is not a woman at all. What has happened? The word "sister" has come in. Now she is not a woman at all! And with the word "sister" the subconscious has many, many deep associations. Suddenly something has happened. What has happened? The woman is not a woman now. because a sister is not a woman. How can a sister be a woman? Nothing has changed outwardly, but a word has dropped in.

Then you recognize that you were deceived by the dress: she is not your sister. Again something else comes up: she is not your sister! Now she again becomes beautiful. How can a sister be beautiful? And when you say "beautiful", you mean now you are sexually interested. Now she can potentially be a sexual object. The possibility grows.

Even the words we use are loaded with the subconscious. That is why in the hospitals, for nurses we use the word "sister" -- just so that they cannot be made objects for sexual interest. Otherwise it will be difficult for them and more difficult for the patients. Constantly, nurses are moving here and there. If they constantly become sexual objects, then it will be very difficult for the patients also. So we just play a trick: we call them sisters. The moment they are sisters they are not women. The very word is loaded.

This subconscious mind is constantly working, day and night. The mind's working is double. One working belongs to your conscious mind. It is concerned with how to control the subconscious consciously, constantly. Then the subconscious is controlling the conscious mind. It is working to control your reactions, your actions, your reflexes, everything. Whatsoever you are doing must be controlled! This is the society's grip on you. You are just

moving in society's hands. No value is yours. How can it be? How can a value be yours when you are not at all aware? Only awareness can give you authentic, individual values.

All these values are supplied. If the society is vegetarian, then you have vegetarian values. If the society is non-vegetarian, then you have non-vegetarian values. If the society believes in this, then you are a believer in it. If the society doesn't believe, then you are a disbeliever. But *you* are not; only society is there.

This is a double control: one control is on your conscious mind, your behaviour. Another control is more deep and more dangerous, and that is the control on your instinctive nature. The first part is conscious, the second is subconscious. The subconscious is created by society. And the third is the instinctive, which is given by biological nature: that which you really are biologically, that which you are born with. That's a third part, the deepest: the biological instinctive nature.

This second, subconscious mind is controlling outward behaviour and also controlling inward instincts. Nothing should be allowed to come up to the conscious mind from your instinctive nature if the society is against it. Nothing should be allowed to come up -- even up to your consciousness. So this subconscious creates a great barrier for the instinctive nature.

For example, sex is an instinct, the deepest, because without it life cannot exist on earth. So life depends on sex. It is not easily dispensable; obviously, it must not be -- otherwise life will become just impossible. So it has a deep grip. But the society is anti-sex; it is bound to be. The more a society is organized, the more it will be anti-sex -- because if your sex instinct can be controlled then everything can be controlled, and if your sex instinct cannot be controlled then nothing can be controlled. So it becomes a fighting ground.

You must be aware that whenever a society becomes sexually free, that society cannot exist. It is defeated. When Greek culture became sexually free, Greek civilization had to die. When Roman civilization became sexually free, it had to die. Now America cannot exist any more. America has begun to be sexually free. The moment a society becomes sexually free, the individual is not in its grip. You cannot force him.

Really, unless you suppress sex you cannot force your youth to war. It is impossible. You can force your youth into war only if you suppress sex. So the hippie slogan is really meaningful: "Make love, not war!" So society has to suppress the deepest instinct. Once it is suppressed, you can never rebel. Many things have to be understood about it.

Children, when they mature sexually, begin to be rebellious -- never before. The moment a boy is mature he will begin to be rebellious against his parents, never before -- because with sex comes individuality. With sex he really becomes a man, never before. Now he can be independent. Now he has the initial energy with him, because he can propagate, he can reproduce. Now he is complete.

At fourteen, a boy is complete, a girl is complete. They can be independent of their fathers and mothers, so rebellion begins to take shape. If the society has to control them, sex must be suppressed. All instincts have to be suppressed because we have not been able yet to create a society in which freedom is not against all, in which one individual's freedom is not against all. We have not yet been able!

We are still primitive, not yet civilized, because a society can be called civilized and cultured only when each individual grows to his total potentiality, is not suppressed. But politics will not allow it, religions will not allow it, because once you give total freedom to instinctive nature, then churches and temples and the so-called religious business cannot continue. Religion will be there, more authentic, but religions cannot continue: because if you cannot create fear, then no one will come to this religious business.

People come because of fear; and if you suppress their instincts they become fearful -- fearful of themselves. A child feels existential fear for the first time when his sex is suppressed. He feels guilty. He begins to feel that something is wrong, and he begins to feel also that "No one has this evil that I am having inside. I am guilty." You create guilt; then you can control. Then he feels inferior inside, afraid. This fear is then exploited by religious heads, by political leadership, because they all want to dominate.

You can dominate only when people are fearful. And how can you create fear? If you can convince them that something which is constantly within them is sin, they will be fearful. They will be fearful! All the time sex will be there, and they will become afraid -- afraid of themselves and guilty. They cannot enjoy anything then. Then the whole life becomes a frustration. Then they go on seeking somewhere help, guidance, someone to take away their responsibility, someone to lead them to heaven, someone to protect them from hell.

This third, instinctive layer is the unconscious. The subconscious is controlling it every moment -- EVERY MOMENT! And it controls so fanatically that everything is destroyed -- or at least distorted. We never feel from the third layer what real instinct is. We never feel! Everything is distorted. From this subconscious mind -- the most suppressed, the most distorted, the most destroyed -- come all the miseries. All the miseries, all the paranoia, all the schizophrenia, all mental diseases, they come from this third layer.

These three -- conscious, subconscious and unconscious -- these are the three types of thoughts. The deeper the layer from where the thought comes, the more irrelevant it looks. So if you just write down your thoughts as they happen, you will feel that you are just mad. What is going on in your mind? What type of thinking is going on? Most of it looks irrelevant. It is not! It is relevant, only with missing links -- because the subconscious will not allow everything to come up. Something escapes and comes to the mind, and the gaps are there.

That's why you cannot understand your dreams: because even in dreams the subconscious is always alert not to allow everything, and the unconscious has to try symbolic routes. It has to change everything just to escape the censor of the subconscious. So it goes on giving you messages in symbolic, pictorial forms.

Your mind is flooded: first, with outward reactions and reflections which are natural; second, by subconscious thoughts which have been produced by the society; and third, by instinctive nature which has been suppressed totally. These three constantly flood the mind. And because of these you are constantly wavering -- constantly wavering and trembling. You cannot even sleep. Dreams will continue; that means mind will continue wavering. Twenty-four hours a day, the mind is just a mad thing going round and round and round.

In this state of affairs, how can you be still? How can you attain the posture, the non-wavering mind? How can you achieve it? And when the *rishi* says that non-wavering knowing is the posture -- the right posture -- he means that unless these layers are broken and the contents released, you will never be in a state of pure knowing. The mind will not be cleansed; you will not attain the purity of perception. So what to do? What to do to achieve this non-wavering knowing?

Three things: one, whenever you are living moment-to-moment, don't allow your subconscious to interfere constantly. Sometimes, just drop the subconscious and live in the moment. It is not needed. *sometimes* it is needed. When you are driving, the subconscious is needed, because the skill of driving becomes a part of the subconscious. That's why you can talk and you can smoke and you can think and you can drive. The driving is now not a conscious effort. It has been taken over by the subconscious. So it is good to use it whenever

it is needed, but when it is not needed, just drop it -- put it aside! Without any murmur, just put it aside and be in the moment.

There are many moments when the subconscious is not needed, but only because of old habit you go on using it. You have come back from the office and you are sitting in your garden: why should the subconscious come in now? You can listen to the birds just as once you listened when you were a child without a subconscious. Relax in these moments, and just be there near the reality. Don't allow your subconscious mind to come in. Just put it aside! Play with children, put the subconscious aside.

A father who cannot play with his children as their equal cannot really be a right father, because no communication is possible unless you are equal to them. A mother cannot really be a mother unless she can become a child again with her child. Then there is a rapport. Then both become equal. Then there is a friendship. Then a different quality of love comes in. So, really, a child never feels independent, free, at liberty with his parents -- never! He begins to feel freedom for the first time when he goes to his chums -- not with his parents.

So remember constantly that whenever you can relax your subconscious, relax it! It is not needed to be there every moment.

There are many moments, but you will not relax it even in your bed. You have gone to sleep and it is working. You want to sleep and it will not allow you. It says, "I am to do much work." It goes on thinking, it goes on working. You can put off the light -- mm? -- that means you stop the first, the peripheral mind. Now there will be no light; you will not be able to see. You can close the doors. Now there will be no noise, no sound. You have completely closed yourself off from outside stimuli. That means now you need not react, so the first layer of the mind is relaxed.

But what to do with the second layer? You put off the light, close the doors, close your ears, close your eyes, but it goes on working -- because you have never allowed it not to work. And, really, a man is not the master of his mind unless he achieves this: that when he wants to work with the mind he works; when he doesn't want to work the mind he doesn't. And the second capacity is the greater.

I am reminded: Leih Tzu was asked by a Chinese emperor, "I have heard many, many miracles about a particular saint. I have heard that he can walk on water and fly in the sky, that gravitation has no effect on him and he can produce things from out of the blue. So I want to ask, Leih Tzu, can your Master Lao Tzu also do such miracles?"

Leih Tzu said, "Yes, he can do them. He is capable of doing any miracle."

Then the emperor said, "But I have never heard that he has ever done any. Why is he not doing them?"

Leih Tzu said, "He is also capable of a *greater* miracle. That is, he is capable of not doing also. He is capable of doing a miracle, and he is even capable of not doing it."

And the second is greater, because to do a miracle is, of course, a power. But when you have the power, then not to use it is a greater power. And it is really impossible. The second miracle is *really* impossible! And because of that second miracle, Buddha never did any miracle, Mahavir never did any miracle -- because of that second capacity. That is greater!

You think that a miracle is a miracle, but if you can be in a nonthinking state it is a greater one. It needs only the breaking of an old habit. But you have never tried it. You have used your subconscious constantly; your subconscious mind doesn't have any memory of when you have allowed it not to work. So the first thing to do is to allow your subconscious mind sometimes to be put aside. Don't use it, and soon you will have a less wavering mind. You can become capable of this, and it is not difficult. You must only become conscious of

your subconscious workings. Don't allow -- just relax sometimes and tell your subconscious mind: "Stop!"

One thing more to remember: never fight with it; otherwise you will never be capable of this non-wavering. Never fight with it, because when a master begins to fight with his servant he accepts equality. When a master begins to fight with a servant, he has accepted him as the master. So please remember: never fight with the subconscious mind; otherwise you will be defeated. Just order it -- never fight.

And know the difference -- what I mean when I say just order it. Just say to it, "Stop!" and begin to work. Never fight with it! This is a mantra, and the mind begins to follow it. Just say, "Stop!" Nothing more, nothing less. Say, "Stop totally!" and begin to behave as if the mind had stopped. And soon you will become capable, and you will be just wonder-struck at how this mind stops by just saying "Stop!" It is because mind has no will.

You might have seen someone in a hypnotic trance. What happens? In a hypnotic trance, the hypnotist goes on simply giving orders and the mind follows -- the man follows. Absurd orders! and the man begins to follow, the hypnotized subject follows them. Why? Because the conscious mind has only been put to sleep, and the subconscious mind has no will of its own. Just tell it to do something and it will do it.

But we are not aware of our own capacity, so rather than ordering we go on begging, or, at the most, we begin to fight. When you fight, you are divided. Your own will begins to fight with you. The subconscious mind has no will at all. So, if you want to stop smoking, don't try. Just order and stop. Don't try at all. If you fall in the trap of trying you will never win, because you have accepted something which is not there. You just say to the mind, "Now I stop this very moment," and soon you will become aware that things begin to happen. It is natural! Nothing is strange about it: it is just natural. Once you have to be aware of it, that's all. So just put the subconscious mind aside and begin to live in the moment.

And then the second thing you have to do is: when you have become capable of putting the mind aside when something outside is working as a stimulus, then try the other way -- when some instinct is coming up, just put the subconscious mind aside. It will be a bit difficult, but when the first thing is achieved it will not be difficult at all. Just see now that again the sex is coming up, the anger is coming up, and just say to the subconscious mind, "Let me face it directly. Don't come in -- let me face it directly! You are not needed." Just order the mind and face the instinct directly. And once you begin to encounter your own instincts directly, you will be the master without the need of any control.

When you need control, you are really not the master. A master never needs control. If you say, "I can control my anger," you are not the master -- because a controlled thing can erupt any moment, and you will remain constantly in fear of that which you have controlled. There will be a constant fight. In any weak moment you will be defeated. So, please, don't control. Be a master! -- don't control. These are two completely different dimensions.

When I say be a master, this mastery comes only when you encounter your nature, your biological nature as it is, in its purity. I wonder, have you ever seen your sex in its purity without moral teachings coming in, without the gurus and *mahatmas* dropping in, without the scriptures? Have you seen your sex instinct in its purity, in its pure fire? If you have seen it, you will become the master of it. If you have not seen it, you will remain a cripple and you will remain a defeated one. And howsoever you try to control, you will never be able to control it. That is impossible!

Control is impossible: mastery is possible. But mastery has a different root. Mastery means knowledge; control means fear. When you fear something, you begin to control. When

you know something, you become the master: there is *no* need to control. And knowledge means direct encounter. Instincts should be known in their purity. Drop the subconscious, because it is a constantly disturbing factor. It goes on distorting things; it will never allow you to see things as they are. It will always put the society in between, and you will see things through the society as they are not.

And, really, this is the miracle of the subconscious mind -- that if you look through it things begin to be as you see them. The subconscious mind can impose any colour, any shape on things. Just put it aside; face your biological nature directly. It is beautiful! It is wonderful! Just face it directly. It is Divine! Don't allow any moralistic nonsense to distort it. See it as it is.

Science observes things, and the basis of its observation is that the observer must not come in: he must remain just an observer. And whatsoever the thing reveals should be allowed. The observer must not come in to disturb and destroy or distort or give a shape or a colour. A scientist is working in his lab: even if something comes up which destroys his whole concept, his whole philosophy, his whole religion, he must not allow his mind to come in. He must allow the truth to be revealed as it is.

The same goes for inner working, inner research: allow your biological nature to reveal itself in its pure being. And once you know it you will be the master -- because knowledge means mastery, knowledge means power. Only ignorance is weak. And through control there is no knowledge, because the whole concept of control is brought in by the subconscious, by the society.

So if you can do two things with your subconscious: one, allowing the fact of the outside Existence to come to you directly; and then, two, allowing the "facticity" of the inside Existence to be realized in its purity, in its innocence -- then a miracle happens. It is a miracle, and that miracle is this: that subconscious and unconscious drop. Then mind is not divided in three. Then mind becomes one. That oneness of mind, undivided oneness, is what the Upanishads call "the knowing" -- because even the knower is not there. When these three divisions have dropped, when even this division of knower is not there, then only pure knowing, only mirrorlike knowing remains.

With this knowing, you have two centers: one, the outside periphery where you unite with the universe; and another, the inside where again you unite with the universe. And this knowing joins both the inner and the outer -- the *atma* and the *brahma*.

This pure knowing is without any trembling. This pure knowing is the posture, the right posture, in which the Enlightenment happens, the Realization happens, in which you become one with Truth. This is the door -- but how to cleanse? It is not simply a theory, it is not a theoretical statement at all. It is just a scientific procedure, it is a process. Do something to dissolve the divisions of the mind. And if you want to dissolve the mind, concentrate on the subconscious, the middle portion of the mind, which is society. Drop it!

It is, of course, necessary for a child to be brought up in a society. It is necessary! So the subconscious is a necessary evil: the society *has* to teach him many things -- but they should not become fetters. That's why I say that a better society, a real, moral society, will also teach, side by side, how to break this subconscious. A better society will give its children the subconscious with a conscious methodology of how to drop it when it is not needed and how to be free of it.

It is needed up to the point when you become aware, when you achieve an awakened state of mind. Until then it is needed. It is just like a blind man's staff. A staff cannot substitute for eyes: it is just a groping in the dark. But a blind man needs it, and it is helpful -- but a blind

man can become so much attached to his staff that when his eyes are healed and he has begun to see, he still cannot throw away his staff, and goes on groping. Because groping is easier when the eyes are closed, he remains with closed eyes and goes on groping with his staff.

This subconscious is like a blind man's staff. A child is born, but he is not born aware. The society has to give him something so that he can move and grope -- some values, some ideals, some thoughts. But they should not become the eyes. And what I am saying is: if you drop the divisions and create *more* awareness within yourself, you will have eyes, and with those eyes this staff is not needed.

But it is a related thing. If you drop the subconscious you will become aware; if you become aware then the subconscious will drop. So begin from anywhere. You can begin by being more aware, then the subconscious will drop. Mm? This is a *samkhya* process, this is a *samkhya* methodology: just be aware and, by and by, the subconscious will drop. The yoga process is a second way -- the other, the contrary: drop the subconscious, and you will become more aware. Both are related.

So wherever you want to begin, the important thing is to begin. Begin from anywhere, either from being more conscious or from being less obsessed with the subconscious. And when these divisions drop, you will have a pure knowing. That pure knowing is the posture. With that pure knowing, with that non-wavering knowing, your body will achieve a stillness you have not known at all.

We are not aware: that's why we don't know how disturbed we are in our bodies. You cannot sit still, and if you try to sit still then for the first time you will become aware of subtle movements in the body: the leg will begin to say something, the hand will begin to say something, the neck will begin to say something, every part of the body will begin to give you information. Why? It is not that when you sit still the body begins to move; it is moving every moment. It is only because you are otherwise occupied that you are not aware. There are subtle movements continuously: your body is constantly moving and moving. This constant wavering really doesn't belong to your body. It belongs to your mind. The body only reflects. You cannot even sleep in a non-moving posture. The whole night you are moving this way and that, moving and moving and moving.

Now we have pictures from some American "sleep labs". Now they have taken pictures, movies -- movies of sleeping persons. If you could see your own movie -- how much you move in the night -- you will see that the whole night you are disturbed. And by your body movements it can be seen that much is going on inside -- much! There are so many facial gestures, so many gestures of the hands, fingers, the whole body. This shows that much is happening inside. A madman must be inside; otherwise these gestures are impossible. But you are never aware of what is happening to you. No one is aware! Everyone is asleep; no one is aware. So you don't know what you are doing in your sleep with your body. But that doing is because of the mind. A disturbed mind is reflected by the body.

A Buddha sits just like a statue. It is not that he has forced his body to be still. The mind is still, and the body need not reflect because there is nothing to reflect.

Once Buddha stayed outside a big capital with his ten thousand monks. The king became interested. Someone said, "You must come to see this man." The name of the king was Ajata Shatru. The name means "someone whose enemy is not born at all". Mm? Ajata Shatru means one who has no enemies in the world -- no enemy is born, no enemy can be born. But this Ajata Shatru was very fearful of enemies. He became interested because so many people came and said, "You must come! This is something strange, this man is something strange. Come and see!" So he came.

He has reached the grove, the garden. The evening has fallen. He asks his courtiers, "You said that he is staying with ten thousand monks, but no noise is heard -- are you deceiving me?" He pulls out his sword. He thinks that some deception is there, that they have brought him to this forest and now someone is going to kill him. "You say ten thousand monks are staying just beyond these trees? -- and there is not a bit of noise!" The forest is absolutely silent, and Ajata Shatru says, "I have seen this forest many times -- it has never been so silent before. Even when no one was staying here it has never been so silent -- even the birds are silent! What do you mean? Do you want to deceive me?"

They say, "Don't be afraid. *He* is staying here; that's why the forest is so silent and even the birds are so silent. You come!"

But he puts his sword in his hand. He is afraid and trembling. When he reaches the forest, Buddha is sitting under a tree and ten thousand monks are also sitting under trees -- everyone just like a stone statue. He asks Buddha, "What has happened to all these people? Are they dead? I have become afraid. They look like ghosts -- no one moving, not even eyes moving. What has happened to them?"

Buddha says, "Much has happened to them -- they are not mad now."

Unless one can be so silent, one can never feel what Existence means, what life means, what the bliss of it is, the benediction. Only in such silence does life descend. You become aware of the music, of the nectar. You begin to feel it, but only in silence. And that silence comes only when you are non-wavering. If you are wavering, if the mind is just wavering and there is trembling inside, you cannot feel that silence.

You cannot attain silence directly: you have to attain non-wavering, then silence comes as a shadow. If non-wavering comes, then silence comes. So Buddha says, "Much has happened to these fellows. They are not mad now. They have become silent and *now* they are one with these trees, with this earth, with this sky" -- because you can be divided only by noise. Silence never divides: silence joins you.

For example, if we are sitting here and everyone becomes so silent that not a thought has any existence, not a single ripple is there in the mind, everyone silent, totally silent, will you be different from anyone else? Will you be different from your neighbour? How can you be different? The feeling of difference is a thought. Do I mean you will feel one with them? No, because the feeling of oneness is a thought. You will simply be one, not a feeling. Really, there will be no one here -- just silence.

So Buddha says, "They are now one with the trees, with the earth, with the sky. Really, they are not here. Only silence prevails, and that's why even birds have caught the infection." Ten thousand people so silent that even the birds in the trees have become aware! They have felt -- the silence has become infectious. "So you are right, Ajata Shatru," Buddha says, "that you might have passed through this grove many times, and it has been never so silent. It will never again be so silent because, for the first time, in ten thousand minds silence is present here." So silence has become ten thousandfold, and everything is affected. Even trees are afraid to move. Even birds are afraid to tremble, to make noise. It is evening, they are coming back, and when birds come back they create much noise -- but not a single ripple.

When you begin to be silent you begin to be in deep communion with Existence. Thoughts and thoughts are noises. Waves and waves are thoughts and tremblings inside. They create a barrier, they disrupt -- they make you alone. Then you begin to be alone in this whole universe, and that loneliness creates meaninglessness. The more lonely you are, the more you will feel meaningless, futile, useless, and then you will begin to fill yourself with more noise. With radio, television, with anything, you will try to fill yourself, to be occupied.

You run from here to there, from this club to that club. Go on running! Don't leave any gap in which you might become aware of your loneliness! So this whole life just becomes a running from one point to another. This is madness, and the whole earth has become a madhouse.

So attain to this posture -- and don't begin with the body. Begin with the subconscious mind, and then your body will reflect what is happening within. Even now it is reflecting what is happening within. The body is a mirror; it is transparent. Those who have eyes, they know that the body is transparent. You enter here, and I know what is happening inside you -- because you cannot enter without showing it. You look at me, and I know what is happening inside your eyes -- because how can you raise your eyes without expressing that which is within? It is being shown every moment!

Every moment is an indication. It is related; nothing is irrelevant. Your body is showing every moment, but you don't know the body language. The body has a language of its own, and it shows -- everything! You cannot deceive. You can deceive with your language. but not with your body -- *not* with your body! You can smile, but your lips will say that there is no smile within. You can show something by your face, you can try, but still the face will give hints that this is false.

This body is just giving information every moment. You cannot change it. You can try, but you cannot change it. And even if you succeed in changing your body, you can succeed only in deceiving others not yourself, because the inside cannot change by the outside change. It is not basic. You can cut a tree by the roots, but not by the leaves. If you cut the leaves, new leaves will come up again and one leaf will be replaced by two. Cut two, and four leaves will come out of that spot. The tree will take revenge, the roots will take revenge. They will say, "You are cutting one leaf -- we will put two. We are capable of constantly supplying -- infinitely."

So don't be bothered by leaves. And body has only leaves: roots are deep within. Cut the roots, and the leaves will wither away by themselves. When there are no roots to feed, the leaves will drop by themselves. Your body will change. Change the mind and the body will change. Mind is the root!

Attain a non-wavering knowing, and the door will be open and you will be able to have a glimpse into the unknown. The unknown is not far off: only you are closed. The unknown is here, but you are running. The unknown is here, but you are in such a hurry and in such speed that you cannot look at it.

Stand still! I don't mean your body: let your mind stand still, your consciousness, and suddenly you will become aware of something which has always been there. You have been seeking for it, seeking and searching, lives and lives running for it -- and it was here. It is so near, and that's why you have missed it. It is just by the corner, and you have sought it everywhere except this place where you are standing.

Non-wavering reveals to you the here and now. That standing still in consciousness reveals to you the presence which is here.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 1

Chapter #6

Chapter title: Encountering the Unconscious

20 February 1972 pm in Bombay, India

Archive code: 7202205

ShortTitle: ULTAL106

Audio: Yes

Video: No

Length: 119 mins

CONSIDERING THE EXAMPLE OF SENSUAL INSTINCT, KINDLY EXPLAIN WHAT ARE THE PRACTICAL WAYS TO ENCOUNTER THE UNCONSCIOUS MIND, AND HOW CAN ONE KNOW THAT ONE HAS BECOME FREE FROM IT?

THE UNCONSCIOUS is not really unconscious. Rather, it is only *less* conscious. So the difference between conscious and unconscious is not of polar opposites, but of degrees. Unconscious and conscious are related, joined; they are not two. But our ways of thinking are based on a particular false system of logic which divides everything into polar opposites.

Reality is never divided like that; only logic is divided. Our logic says either yes or no; our logic says either light or darkness -- and there is nothing in between as far as logic goes. But life is neither white nor black. It is, rather, a great expanse of grey. One extreme becomes white, another extreme becomes black, and life is a great expanse of grey, degrees of grey. But for logic white and black are realities and there is nothing in between -- but life is always in between these two. So, really, every problem should be understood not as a logical problem, but as a life problem -- only then can you do something with it. If you are too fixed with this false logic, then you will never be able to solve any problem.

Aristotle has proved to be one of the greatest menaces, blocks to the human mind, because he created a system -- which became dominant all over the world -- that divides everything into two opposites. Really, this is a strange fact. We have nothing for the inbetween reality -- not even words.

De Bono, a modern non-Aristotelian logician, has created a new word -- "po". He says that we have only two words, "yes" or "no", and there is no neutral word. "Yes" is one opposite, "no" is another -- there is no neutral word. So he has coined a new word -- "po". "Po" means "I am neither for nor against." If you say something and I say "po" it means, "I have heard you I am neither for nor against. I am not making any judgment." Or, to say "po" means: "Perhaps you are right, perhaps you are wrong. Both are possible." Or, the use of the word "po" means: "This is also one point of view. I need not be on the 'yes' side or the 'no'. It is not a compulsion."

De Bono has derived this word from words like hyPOthesis or POTentiality. This "po" is a

neutral word, not loaded with any judgment, condemnation or appreciation. Just use the word "po" and you will feel the difference. You are not taking any standpoint in the polar opposites.

So when I say "conscious" and "unconscious", I don't mean the Freudian opposition. For Freud, conscious is conscious and unconscious is unconscious. The difference is that of white and black, yes and no, life and death. When I say "unconscious" I mean "less conscious". When I say "conscious" I mean "less unconscious". They overlap each other.

So what to do to encounter the unconscious? As far as Freud is concerned the encounter is impossible. Because it is unconscious, how can you encounter it? The question means the same as if someone says, "How to see in darkness?" Mm? The question is irrelevant, meaningless. If you put it in this way, "How to see in darkness?" and if I say, "With light," then the question has not been answered at all because you ask, "How to see in darkness?" and if there is light then there is no darkness -- you are seeing light.

So, really, in darkness no one can see. When we say "darkness" we mean that now seeing is not possible. What do you mean when you say "darkness"? You mean that now seeing is not possible. What do you mean when you say "light"? You mean that now things can be seen. Really, you have never seen light: you have only seen light reflected in things which you can see. You have never seen light itself -- no one can see it. We see only things, not light, and because things are seen, we assume, infer, that light is there.

You have not seen darkness; no one has seen it. Really, darkness is just an inference. Because nothing is seen, you say there is darkness. So when someone asks, "How to see in darkness?" the words look meaningful, but they are not. Language is very deceptive, and unless one becomes careful in using language one will never be able to solve any problem. Ninety-nine percent of problems are just linguistic problems, but if you don't know how to penetrate the garb of language you will never be able to tackle the real problem.

If you ask Freud how to encounter the unconscious, he will say, "It is nonsense; you cannot encounter it. If you encounter it, it will become conscious, because encountering is a conscious phenomenon." But if you ask me how to encounter the unconscious, I will say, "Yes, there are ways to encounter it" -- because for me, the first thing to be noted is that "unconscious" means simply "less conscious". So if you grow more conscious, you can encounter it -- so it depends.

Secondly, unconscious and conscious are not fixed boundaries. They change every moment -- just like the retina of the eye. It is changing constantly. If there is more light, it is narrowed down. If there is less light, then it widens. It is constantly making an equilibrium with the light outside. So your eye is not really a fixed thing; it is constantly changing. Just like that is your consciousness. Really, to understand the phenomenon of consciousness by the analogy of the eye is very relevant, because consciousness is the inner eye, the eye of the soul. So just like your eye, your consciousness is constantly expanding or shrinking. It depends.

For example, if you are angry, you become more unconscious. The unconscious is now more spread, and only a very minor part of you remains conscious. Sometimes even that part is not there either -- you become completely unconscious. But in a sudden accident: you are on the road and suddenly you feel that an accident is going to be there and you are on the verge of death -- you suddenly become conscious and there is no unconscious at all. The whole mind is conscious. And this change is continuously taking place.

So when I say conscious and unconscious, I don't mean any fixed boundaries. There are none, there are no fixed boundaries. It is a fluctuating phenomenon. It depends on you to be

less conscious or more conscious. You can create consciousness; you can train and discipline yourself for more consciousness or for less consciousness. If you train yourself for less consciousness you will never be able to encounter the unconscious. Really, you will even become incapable of encountering the conscious.

When someone has taken some intoxicant, he is training his mind to be totally unconscious. When you go into sleep, or if you can be hypnotized, or if you can autohypnotize yourself, then you lose consciousness. There are many tricks, and many of those tricks which help you to be more unconscious are even known as religious practices. If you do any monotonous, repetitive thing -- for example, if you go on continuously saying "Ram-Ram-Ram-ram", in a very monotonous tone, you will become less conscious. And this constant repetition of "Ram-Ram-Ram", in a monotonous tone, will be just auto-hypnotic. You will go to sleep: it is good for sleep.

If you can create monotony then you will be less conscious, because a bored mind cannot remain conscious. The boredom is too much, and the mind would like to go to sleep.

We know, every mother knows, how to put a child to sleep. A lullaby does nothing but create boredom. Every mother knows how to put a child to sleep. With a lullaby -- a constant repetition of certain words -- the child is bored, so he goes into sleep. This lullaby can be created by movement, by anything which is monotonous -- by anything! Just move the child monotonously, rotate the child monotonously, and he will go to sleep because he feels bored. Even if you put the child's head near your heart he will go to sleep, because your heartbeat is a very boring thing. So put the child near your heart, and he will feel bored because of the constant repetition of the heartbeat. The child knows it very well because for nine months continuously he has heard it. Even old persons can use the "tick-tick" of a clock for going into sleep, and the reason is only the resemblance to the heartbeat. So if you feel that sleep is not coming, just concentrate on your clock and feel the beat, and soon you will drop into sleep.

You can create unconsciousness by creating boredom. By taking any intoxicant, by taking any drug, any sedative, any tranquillizer, you can create unconsciousness. Consciousness also can be created, but then quite different methods have to be used.

Sufi mystics use whirling dances. With such vigorous whirling you cannot sleep. It is impossible. How can you fall asleep when dancing? Someone seeing your dance may go to sleep; for him it may become a boring thing -- but you cannot go. So Sufis use dance to create more activity inside, more vitality, so that consciousness spreads. And these dances are not really dances. They look like dances. The Sufi who is doing the dance is constantly remembering every movement of the body. No movement should be done unconsciously. Even if a hand is raised, then this hand must be raised with full consciousness that you are raising the hand -- now the hand is raised; now you are dropping it again. No movement should be allowed unconsciously. You are whirling around, dancing vigorously; no movement is to be made unconsciously. Every movement must be done consciously, with full alertness.

Then suddenly the unconscious drops, and with three months of dancing continuously, for hours, you encounter the unconscious. You penetrate deep, deep, deep, and suddenly you become aware of everything that is inside. That is what I mean by encountering the unconscious. Nothing remains which is not in clear vision. Your totality, all your instincts, all your suppressions, your whole biological structure, everything -- not only of this life, but of all lives -- suddenly is revealed. You are thrown into a new world which was hidden or, rather, to which you were not alert. It was there, but you were asleep -- or your consciousness

was so narrowed down that it escaped.

Your consciousness is just like a torch -- narrowed. You enter darkness with a torch; you have a light, but it is a narrow, focused light. You can see something, but all else remains in darkness. When I say that nothing unconscious remains, I mean unfocused consciousness -- unfocused. A focused consciousness will always choose something to see and choose many things not to see; it is a choice. So I use the similarity: just like a torch, narrowed down. One point will become very clear, but everything else will be in darkness. This is what we ordinarily do through concentration.

The more you concentrate, the less you will be able to encounter the unconscious. You will be able to know something very definitely at the cost of not knowing many things. That's why experts, by and by, become just ignorant -- ignorant of the whole world: because they have narrowed down their minds to a particular thing in order to know more about it. So it has been said that an expert is a person who knows more and more about less and less. In the end, only a point remains focused which he knows at the cost of ignoring everything else.

This is how concentration works. So through concentration you can never encounter the unconscious. You can encounter the unconscious only with meditation -- and this is the difference between concentration and meditation. Meditation means your mind working not as a torch but like a flame: everything is enlightened around it -- everything. It is not narrowed down, the light is diffused. It is not moving in one direction -- it is moving in *all* directions simultaneously so the whole is enlightened.

How to do it? I said Sufis use dance as an active meditation and then they can encounter the unconscious. Zen monks in Japan use absurd problems to encounter it. You face some problem which cannot be solved -- which cannot be solved at all! Howsoever you try, the problem is such that it cannot be solved. They call such problems "koans" -- absurd problems.

For example, they will say to some seeker, "Find out what your original face is." And by original face they mean the face you had before you were born, or the face you will have after you die -- the *original* face. They will say, "Find out how your original face looks." How can you find it out? One has to meditate on it. The problem is such that you cannot solve it by intellect, by reason. You have to ponder over it, meditate over it, go on meditating and searching: "What is my original face?" And the teacher will be there with his staff, and he will look around to see if someone is going into sleep. Then the teacher's staff will be on your head. You cannot sleep; sleep is not allowed at all. You have to be constantly awake.

So a Zen teacher is a hard taskmaster. You have to meditate before him, and he will not allow you to drop into sleep -- because the moment when you are dropping into sleep is the moment to encounter the unconscious. If you can remain out of sleep, then the unconscious will be revealed -- because that is the line. The very line from where you drop into sleep is the line where you can enter into the unconscious.

You can try this. You have been sleeping every day, but you have not encountered sleep yet. You have not seen it -- what it is, how it comes, how you drop into it. You have not known anything about it. You have been dropping into it daily, coming out of it, but you have not felt the moment when sleep comes on the mind -- what happens. So try this, and with three months' effort, suddenly, one day, you will enter sleep knowingly: drop on your bed, close your eyes, and then remember, remember that sleep is coming and "I am to remain awake when the sleep comes." It is very arduous, but it happens. One day it will not happen, one week it will not happen. Persist every day, constantly remembering that sleep is coming and, "I am not to allow it without knowing. I must be aware when sleep enters. I must go on

feeling how sleep takes over, what it is."

And one day, suddenly, sleep is there and you are still awake. That very moment you become aware of your unconscious also. And once you become aware of your unconscious you will never be asleep again in the old way. Sleep will be there, but you will be awake simultaneously. A center in you will go on knowing. All around will be sleep, and a center will go on knowing. When this center knows dreams become impossible. And when dreams become impossible, daydreams also become impossible. Then you are asleep in a different sense, and then you will be awake in the morning in a different sense. That different quality comes by the encounter.

But this may look difficult, so I suggest to you a more simple exercise to encounter the unconscious. Close the doors of your room and put a big mirror just in front of you. The room must be dark. And then put a small flame by the side of the mirror in such a way that it is not directly reflected in it. Just your face is reflected in the mirror, not the flame. Then constantly stare into your own eyes in the mirror. Do not blink. This is a forty-minute experiment, and within two or three days you will be able to keep your eyes unblinking.

Even if tears come, let them come, but persist in not blinking and go on staring constantly into your eyes. Do not change the stare. Go on staring into the eyes, your own, and within two or three days you will become aware of a very strange phenomenon. Your face will begin to take new shapes. You may even be scared. The face in the mirror will begin to change. Sometimes a very different face will be there which you have never known as yours.

But, really, all these faces belong to you. Now the subconscious mind is beginning to explode. These faces, these masks, are yours. Sometimes even a face that belongs to a past life may come in. After one week of constant staring for forty minutes, your face will become a flux, just a film-like flux. Many faces will be coming and going constantly. After three weeks, you will not be able to remember which is your face. You will not be able to remember your own face, because you have seen so many faces coming and going.

If you continue, then any day, after three weeks, the most strange thing happens: suddenly there is no face in the mirror. The mirror is vacant, you are staring into emptiness. There is no face at all. *This* is the moment: close your eyes, and encounter the unconscious. When there is no face in the mirror, just close the eyes -- this is the most significant moment -- close the eyes, look inside, and you will face the unconscious. You will be naked -- completely naked, *as you are*. All deceptions will fall.

This is the reality, but the society has created many, many layers in order that you will not be aware of it. Once you know yourself in your nakedness, your total nakedness, you begin to be a different person. Then you cannot deceive yourself. Then you know what you are. And unless you know what you are you can never become transformed, because any transformation becomes possible only in this naked reality: this naked reality is potential for any transformation. No deception can be transformed. Your original face is now here and you can transform it. And, really, just a will to transform it will effect the transformation.

But you cannot become transformed! You cannot transform your false faces. You can change them, but you cannot transform them: by "change" I mean you can replace them with another false face. A thief can become a monk, a criminal can become a saint. It is very easy to change, to replace the masks, the faces. These are not transformations at all. Transformation means becoming that which you really are. So the moment you face the unconscious, encounter the unconscious, you are face to face with your reality, with your authentic being.

The false societal being is not there, your name is not there, your form is not there, your

face is not there. The naked forces of nature are there, and with these naked forces any transformation is possible -- and by just willing it! Nothing is to be done. You just will, and things begin to happen. If you face yourself in this nakedness, just will whatsoever you like and it will be.

In the Bible it is said: "God said, 'Let there be light,' and there was light." In the Koran it is said: "God said, 'Let there be the world,' and there was the world." Really, these are parables -- parables of the willpower which is hidden in you. When you encounter your naked reality, the basic, elemental forces, you become a creator, a god. Just say, utter a word, and it happens. Say, "Let there be light," and there will be light. Before the encounter, if you are trying to transform darkness into light it is not possible. So this encounter is basic, foundational, for any religious happening.

Many, many methods have been invented. There are sudden methods, there are gradual methods. I have told you about a gradual method. There are sudden methods, but with a sudden method it is always very difficult -- because with a sudden method it can happen that you may simply die. With a sudden method it can happen that you may suddenly go mad -- because the phenomenon is so sudden that you cannot conceive of it. You just drop, shattered.

This happened in the Gita. Arjuna is forcing Krishna to reveal his cosmic form. Krishna goes on talking about other things, but Arjuna is persistent and he says, "I must see. I cannot believe unless I see. If you are really a god, then reveal to me your cosmic form!" Krishna reveals it, but it is so sudden, and Arjuna is not prepared at all. He begins to cry and says to Krishna, "Close it! Close it! I am scared to death!"

So if you come to it through some sudden method, it is dangerous. Sudden methods are there, but they can be practised only in a group -- in a group where others can help you. Really, ashrams were created for these sudden methods because they cannot be practised alone. A group is needed, adepts are needed, and a constant vigilance is needed, because sometimes you may drop unconscious for months continuously. Then if there is no one who knows what to do, you may be taken for dead. You may be buried or burnt. Many times Ramakrishna happened to go into deep Samadhi. For six days or for two weeks continuously he had to be forcefully spoon-fed because he was just as if unconscious. A group is needed for sudden methods, and a teacher becomes an absolute necessity.

Sudden methods dropped from Indian practices because of Buddha, Mahavir and Shankaracharya because they insisted that monks should travel continuously. They didn't allow monks to be in ashrams. They were not to remain anywhere for more than three days. There was a need for this because at the time of Mahavir and Buddha, ashrams became just exploitation centers; they became just big businesses. So Mahavir and Buddha both insisted that a sannyasin shouldn't remain anywhere more than three days. And three days is a very psychological limit, because in order to be attuned with some place or with some people you need more than three days.

In a new house, you cannot feel at ease unless three days have passed. This is a psychological attuning time. If you remain in a house for more than three days, then the house begins to look as if it is yours. So a sannyasin must not remain anywhere more than three days. Buddha and Mahavir insisted. But because of their insistence, ashrams were destroyed and school methods dropped out of practice -- because a wandering monk cannot practise sudden methods. He may be in a village, but no one may know anything about it, and if he practises a sudden method and the happening happens, then he will be in danger: he will have to die.

So Mahavir, Buddha and, later on, Shankaracharya, all these three, insisted that monks go on wandering continuously. They must not remain in one place; they should be homeless wanderers. So it was good in one way, and it proved bad in another. It proved good because establishments were destroyed, but it proved bad also because with establishments certain very, very significant practices, methods, just went into oblivion.

Sudden methods require the constant vigilance of a group. A teacher becomes a necessity. So Buddha could say, "You can know even without me," but a Patanjali cannot say that. Krishnamurti can say, "No teacher is needed," but a Gurdjieff cannot say that. And the real reason for these differences is their methods: Gurdjieff has school methods and Krishnamurti belongs to the tradition of wanderers, no school methods, so no teacher is needed.

With gradual methods you can proceed alone because there is no danger. You have to proceed inch by inch, and as far as a one-inch happening is concerned, you can control it yourself. But if you have to take a jump with *no* steps in between, then you will need someone who knows where you are going to fall, who knows what can happen. A teacher is not really needed to show you the methods; he is needed really, afterwards when the method has done something and you have moved into the unknown.

So there are sudden methods, but I will not talk about them. I have given you one gradual method, and there are many. I will not talk about the sudden methods because it is dangerous to talk about them. If someone is interested, then he can be led -- but talking is impossible. That's why school teaching has always insisted that nothing should be written -- because once you write something it becomes public and anyone can do it. Anyone can become just a victim of his own curiosity, and then no help will be coming. So even when something is written about sudden practices, a basic link is always missing.

So those who begin practices through scriptures are always in danger, and many times it happens that they just go mad -- because a missing link is always bound to be there, and that missing link is always supplied by word of mouth from the teacher to the disciple. And it is a private and secret process, the missing link. because that is the key. No scripture is really complete and no scripture can ever be really complete, because those who know can never write a thing completely. Something must remain hidden, as a key, so no one can use it. You can read about it, you can comment on it, you can write a thesis upon it, but you cannot practise it because a certain key is not given in the scripture itself. Or, if it is given, it is given in such a way that you cannot decode it; the technique to decode it is not given in it.

So nothing about sudden practices -- but you can do something gradually. And this mirror meditation is a very powerful method -- very powerful -- to know one's own abyss and to know one's own naked reality. And once you have known it, you become the master. Then just say something, and things begin to take shape. In that encounter, if you say, "I must die this moment," you will die that very moment. If you say, "I must become a Buddha this very moment," you will become a Buddha that very moment. Time is not required at all -- just a will.

You may begin to think that then it is very easy, but it is a difficult problem. First, to reach it is difficult, though not so difficult, but to *will* in that moment is very difficult. Such a vital silence takes you over, you cannot even think. Your mind cannot even move. You are in such awe, everything stops -- even breathing. A very still moment, totally silent, and will becomes impossible. So one has to train oneself how to will in that still moment -- how to will without words, how to will without thoughts. That is possible, but then one has to practise for it.

You are looking at a flower: look at the flower, feel the beauty of it -- but don't use the

word "beautiful", not even in the mind. Look at it, let it be absorbed in you, reach to it, but don't use words. Feel the beauty of it, but don't say, "It is beautiful," not even in the mind. Don't verbalize, and gradually you will become capable of feeling a flower as beautiful without using the word.

Really, it is not difficult: it is natural. You feel first; then the word comes. But we are so habituated with words that there is no gap. The feeling is there, and suddenly, you have not even felt, and the word comes. So create a gap. Just feel the beauty of it, but don't use the word.

If you can dissociate words from feeling, then you can dissociate even feeling from Existence. Then let the flower be there and you be there as two presences, but don't allow the feeling to come in. Don't even feel now that the flower is beautiful. Don't feel! Let the flower be there and you be there arrowed in a deep embrace without any ripple of feeling. Then you will feel beauty without feeling. Really, then you will *be* the beauty of the flower. It will not be a feeling; you will be the flower. Then you have existentially felt something. When you can do this, you can will. When everything is lost -- thought, words, feeling -- then you can will existentially.

To help this will, many things have been used. One is that the seeker must constantly go on thinking, "When the thing comes, when that happening happens, what am I going to be?" The sutras of the Upanishads like "AHAM BRAHMASMI" -- I am the Brahman -- are not meant as literal statements. These sutras are *not* meant as statements, they are not meant as philosophical theories, they are meant to engrave a deep will in the very cells of your being. So when that moment comes, you don't need your mind to tell you, "I am the Brahman." Your body begins to feel it, your cells begin to feel it, your every fibre begins to feel it: "AHAM BRAHMASMI." And this feeling does not need to be created by you. It will have gone deep into your existence. Then suddenly when you encounter the unconscious and the moment of will has come, and you can become a creator -- your whole existence begins to vibrate "AHAM BRAHMASMI." And the moment your existence begins to vibrate "AHAM BRAHMASMI," you become a Brahma -- you become! Whatsoever you can feel, you become.

This should not be known as metaphysics -- it is not! It is an experience. So you can know it only through experiencing. Do not decide whether it is right or wrong; do not think in terms of yes and no. Just say, "Po -- okay," and make some effort. Just say, "Okay! It may be." Don't decide -- because we are very hasty deciders. Someone will say, "No, it is not possible." Really, he is saying, "I am not going to try"; he is not saying it is not possible. He is deceiving himself. He is saying, "I am not going to try," and because of this "I am not going to try", how can it be possible? He is rationalizing for himself.

Someone else says, "Yes, it is possible. It has happened to many. It has happened to my guru, to my teacher, it has happened to this one and that." He is also not going to try because he is making it a trivial fact: "It has happened to many, so it is not such a thing for which one has to try!" He feels, "It can happen to me also." No, don't say yes or no. Just take it as an experiment, a hypothesis, to be worked out. Religion is not a given thing; one has to create it in oneself. It is not something which is given to you or which can be given; it is something which you have to uncover in yourself.

So don't decide unless you experience, don't decide unless you *know*. Never decide beforehand. Otherwise you can go on continuously listening to things, thinking about them, and doing nothing -- because thinking is not doing; thinking is just an escape from doing.

IS YOUR TECHNIQUE OF FAST BREATHING A SUDDEN TECHNIQUE OR A GRADUAL ONE?

It is gradual! It is gradual! Really, sudden techniques cannot be given publicly. They cannot be given! And for sudden techniques one has to bracket the whole life out, because for sudden techniques your totality will be needed. For gradual techniques your totality is not needed. You can do them for one hour and then remain in the world for twenty-three hours. But for sudden techniques your totality will be needed; you cannot be allowed to do anything else. So the whole life has to be just bracketed out, and you have to be totally for the technique. The whole consciousness must be prepared for it because even a single part remaining unprepared will prove dangerous -- and anything can prove dangerous because the moment is so potential. The moment is so potential, you must be purified of all that goes on around you. So you have to bracket -- bracket everything *out*. With gradual methods religion can be one thing among others. For sudden methods religion has to be totalitarian; nothing else can be allowed.

When someone would go to Gurdjieff, he would ask, "Are you ready to die for it? Nothing less will do. Are you ready to die for it?" That means, "Are you ready to leave everything for it?" Total consciousness is needed. It is not necessary to die, but one has to be ready to die for it.

For gradual methods, such is not the requirement. You can go on living and doing something. By and by, the doing will gradually become greater, and without even becoming aware, some day you will become ready to die for it. But this growth is like the growth of a pregnancy: by and by. Even the mother is not aware of what is going on, of what is happening. The child goes on growing and growing and growing. After nine months the child has grown so much that now the mother is not needed at all. That's why he comes out. The mother feels so much pain! The reason is not only physical: deep down it is psychological. It is because her own child has grown so much that it is leaving her. This is the first betrayal. Now many betrayals will follow. This is the first birth pain; now many will follow. When the child becomes sexually mature, he will again leave his mother -- for some other woman.

So birth is a constant process, and a mother has to go through many pains. And if she cannot understand it, then she unnecessarily creates troubles. She creates them! Even when the child is going to be born, the mother creates trouble: she contracts her whole body. That's why the pain is created; otherwise bodily pain is unnecessary. It is really a conflict. The mother is not ready to give up and the child is forcing to come out. That's why many children have to take their birth in the night -- eighty percent, more than eighty percent -- because when the mother is sleepy she resists less.

Now there are scientific methods and psychological ones also. If a mother can be persuaded to cooperate, there is no pain. In Paris, Dr. Lorenzo has worked with many, many methods -- psychological, persuasive methods. He has delivered thousands of births, helped mothers, and there was no pain at all -- not at all! The method is to cooperate with the child coming out -- not to resist, but to cooperate; to help the child; to feel that you have to help the child to come out.

Lorenzo may persuade many mothers, but there is a still greater problem when the child goes to another woman. He will have to persuade the mother not to feel hurt. Rather, she should help the child to go to someone else. She should help, cooperate, because it is a second birth and she is unnecessarily troubled.

With gradual methods you grow like a pregnancy -- by and by. Then suddenly one day you are reborn. With sudden methods it is different -- totally different. One needs to give up everything for sudden methods. Sannyas, in the old days, began with sudden methods. That's why it was necessary to leave everything. Particularly in India, we emphatically pressed the point that no one should leave for sannyas unless he was very old. There is a psychological reason: when you are so old, you can leave life totally. Then total renunciation becomes easy -- because in a subtle way life is renouncing you, so you can renounce life. You have become a dry leaf. Now you can leave the tree without hurting the tree or any hurt to yourself. The tree will not even know when the dry leaf has dropped. Pull out a young leaf that is fresh and green, and the tree is hurt and the leaf also. The wound may remain forever. So for sudden methods, it was decided that a man should leave only when life itself was leaving him. Then he could leave totally. With gradual methods, it was not necessary.

Now in the world, sudden methods have become impossible because there are really no authentic schools, no communities, intimate communities, where you can practise sudden methods. So it is not necessary for someone to renounce the world and go to the hills or the forest. Now you can remain wherever you are and practise gradual methods. The achievement is the same; only more time is needed for gradual methods, less time for sudden methods.

OSHO, WHAT TYPE OF SOCIETY CAN DEVELOP INDIVIDUALS IN WHOM THE SUBCONSCIOUS MIND IS UTILITARIAN AND EASILY DISPENSABLE?

It is a complex problem, multi-dimensional, but some basic points can be understood. One: a good society is possible only if children are not taught the antagonism, the dichotomy, between body and consciousness. The first thing is that they must not be taught this. It must not be said to children, "You are in the body"; it must not be said, "You possess the body." It must be said, "You are the body." And when I say that it must be said, "You are the body," I don't mean a materialist conception. Really, only out of this can a spiritual being be born. The unity must not be disturbed.

The child is born as a unity, but we separate him in two. The first separation comes between body and consciousness. We sow the seeds of schizophrenia. Now he will never be able to regain the lost unity easily. The more he grows, the more the gap will grow, and a person with a gap between himself and his body is a person who is not normal. The greater the gap, the more insane he will be, because, again, body and mind is a linguistic fallacy. We are psychosomatic -- body-mind both, simultaneously. It is not possible to bifurcate the two. They are not two -- one wave.

So for a good society the first thing is not to create schizophrenic minds, not to create divided minds -- because the first division comes between body and mind, then other divisions follow. Then you have taken a route for divisions. Then mind will again be divided and body will again be divided.

This is a strange fact. I wonder whether you feel that you are divided into consciousness and body. Then the body is divided into upper and lower, and the lower is "bad" and the upper is "good". From where does the upper begin and from where does the lower begin? We are never at ease with our lower bodies -- never! That's why there is so much nonsense about clothes -- so much nonsense! We cannot be naked. Why? Because the moment you are naked the body become one. We have two sorts of clothes -- one for the lower part, another for the

upper part. This division of clothes is basically connected with the division of the body. If you are standing naked, which is lower, which is higher? And how do you divide? You are one!

So those who divide man are not ready for man to be at ease with his nakedness. And this is only a beginning because there are more nakednesses inside. If you are not ready to be naked about your body, true, then you cannot ever be true for other, deeper layers. How can you be? If you cannot face even your body's nakedness, how can you face your naked consciousness.

This clothing is not just clothing. It has a philosophy and a very insane one. Then the body is divided, then the mind is divided. then the conscious, unconscious, subconscious -- and divisions go on growing. In the beginning a child is born as a unity, and the same child dies as a crowd -- as a crowd! totally a madhouse! Everywhere he has been divided, and between these divisions there is constant conflict, struggle, and the energy is dissipated. And you really never die; you kill yourself. We are all committing suicide, because this dissipation of energy is suicide. So it is rare that a person dies -- rare! Everyone has killed himself, poisoned himself. Different are the methods, different are the tricks to kill oneself, but the beginning is the division.

So a good society, a moral society, a religious society, will not allow its children to be divided. But how do we create a division? How do we begin? When does the division come in?

Now psychologists are very well aware that the moment the child touches his genitalia, his sex organs, the division begins. The moment the child touches his sex organs, the whole society becomes aware that something wrong is going to happen. The parents, mother and father, brothers, the whole family, everyone begins to be aware of it. In their eyes, in their gestures, by their hands, they all say, "No, do not touch!"

The child cannot conceive of this. He is a unity or she is a unity. He cannot conceive why he cannot touch his body. What is wrong? He doesn't know that man is born in sin. He doesn't know the Bible, he doesn't know any religion, he doesn't know any teachers, moral teachers, he doesn't know any *mahatmas*. He cannot feel how a part of the body is just to be avoided.

The problem becomes greater because sex organs are the most sensitive part of the body and the most pleasant. To touch them is the first experience of pleasure for the child, the first experience of his own body -- that the body can give pleasure, that the body is pleasant, that the body has a value. Now psychologists say that even a three-month-old baby can create orgasm -- the deepest. He can feel his sex organs to their climax, and his whole body begins to vibrate. This is the first experience of his body, but it becomes poisoned because parents will not allow it. Why can they not allow it? Because they were not allowed. There is no reason -- because they were not allowed.

With this the body is divided, and the mind and body are divided. The child becomes afraid, fearful, and guilt is born. He will touch, but now he has to hide it. So we have made a small child a criminal. He will do it because it is natural, but now he will be afraid whether someone is looking or not, whether mother is present or not. If no one is there then he will touch, but now this touch will not give the same pleasure that it could have given -- because guilt is there. He is afraid! He is fearful!

This fear continues for the whole life. No one is at ease with his sex experience. The fear continues. Then he will go many many times into the sex act -- but never will he feel the fulfillment and the deep ecstasy of it. He will never feel it; it has become impossible. You

have poisoned the very root, and he will feel guilty.

We feel guilty because of sex; we are "sinners" because of sex. You have created the division, the basic division that in the body you have to choose: some parts are "good" and some parts are "bad". What nonsense! Either the whole body is good or the whole body is bad; because nothing is separate in the body. The same blood goes through the whole body; the same nervous system is there. Everything is one inside, but for the child now there is a division. And another thing: you have poisoned his first joy. Now he will never feel joyful.

People come daily to me, and I know that their basic problem is not meditation, their basic problem is not religion -- their basic problem is sex. And I feel very helpless as to how to help them -- because if I really want to help them, then they will not come to me again. They will become afraid of me because they are afraid of sex. So sex must not be talked about! Talk about God, talk about something else -- never talk about sex. And their problem is not God at all! If the problem was of God then it could be easily helped, but God is not the problem. Their basic problem remains sex. And they cannot enjoy anything because they cannot enjoy the first gift that was given by nature, by Divine forces. They do not have the first gift of bliss, so they cannot enjoy.

I have felt so many times that a person who cannot enjoy sex cannot go deep in meditation -- because wherever there is happiness he becomes afraid. The association goes deep. So you have created a barrier. Now he will divide the mind also because he cannot accept the sex part in the mind. Sex is both body and mind. Everything is both! In you, everything is both -- remember it constantly. Sex is both body and mind, so the mind part of sex has to be suppressed. That suppressed part will become the unconscious. The forces, the thoughts, the moralistic preachings which will suppress it, will become the subconscious. A very small portion of the mind which is conscious will remain in your hands. It is useful only for the day-today routine, not for anything more. At least it is not useful to *live* deeply. You can exist, that's all. You can vegetate, you can earn, you can build a house, make a living. but you cannot know life because of the whole mind, nine parts out of ten are just denied. You can never be total, and only a whole man is holy. Unless you are whole, you can never be holy.

So the first, elementary thing to be done to create a new society, a better society, a religious society, is not to create division. This is the greatest sin -- to create division. Let the child grow as a *unity*. Let him grow as a oneness, at ease with everything that is inside him, and the sooner he will be able to transcend all: he will be able to transcend sex; he will be able to transcend the instinctive nature. But he will be able to transcend them as a unity, never as a division. That is the point. He will be able to transcend them because he is so whole, so powerful, so undividedly one, that he can transcend anything.

Whatever becomes a disease, he can just throw it. Whatever becomes just an obsession, he can just throw it. He is forceful, one. A great energy is undividedly his -- he can change anything! But a divided child cannot do anything. Really, in a divided child the conscious mind is a minor part, and the unconscious is the major. For his whole life a divided child is fighting a major energy with a minor one. He is bound to be defeated continuously. And then he feels frustrated. And then he says, "Okay, this world is just a misery."

This world is not a misery -- remember well! You are divided, so you create misery out of this world. You are fighting with yourself so you become miserable.

So the first thing: do not create divisions. Let the child grow as a unity. And the second thing: let the child be trained more for flexibility than for fixed attitudes -- flexibility. What do I mean when I say flexibility? Don't train him in solid, watertight compartments. Never

say that this is bad and that is good, because in life it is a flux. The thing which is good this moment may be bad the next moment, and the thing which is bad in this situation may be good in another.

So train the child to be more aware, to find out what is the case. Never fix labels! Don't say a Mohammedan is bad because he is a Mohammedan and a Hindu is good because he is a Hindu. Don't say things like that, because bad and good are not fixed things. Don't give fixed attitudes. Train him to be more aware, to find out who is good and who is bad. But it is difficult, and it is easy to give labels. You live with labels and categorized divisions. You put someone in a category: "Okay, he is a Hindu. He is bad or he is good. He is a Mohammedan, and he is good or he is bad." The matter is decided without looking at the individual. The label decides. Don't give fixed attitudes; give flexible awareness. Don't say this is bad, don't say this is good. Just say that one has to find out constantly what is good, what is bad. Train the mind to find out, to inquire.

This flexibility of attitude has many dimensions. Don't fix the child into "monogamous" attitudes. Don't say to the child, "Love me because I am your mother." It may create an incapacity in the child, and he will not be able to love anyone else. Then it happens that grown-up children -- I call them grown-up children -- continue to be fixed. So you cannot love your wife because deep inside you can love only your mother. But your wife is not your mother and your mother cannot be your wife, so you continue to be fixed -- a mother fixation. You continue to be fixed! You go on expecting things from your wife as if she is your mother -- not consciously. If she does not behave like a mother, then you are not at ease. And the problem becomes more complex. If she begins to behave like a mother, then too you are not at ease because she must behave like your wife.

A mother should never say, "Love me because I am your mother." She must make her child love *more* persons. The more the child is "polygamous", the more abundant his life will be. He will never feel fixed. Wherever he moves he will be able to love. Whomsoever he comes in contact with he will be able to love. Don't tell him that a mother is to be loved or a sister is to be loved or a brother is to be loved. Don't tell him, "He is a stranger, so you need not love him. He doesn't belong to our family, he doesn't belong to our religion, he doesn't belong to our country, so don't love him." You are crippling the child. Tell him, "To love is a bliss! -- so go on loving. The more you love, the more you will grow." A person who can love more is more enriched.

We are all poor. We are all poor because we cannot love. This is a fact -- that if you love more persons, you become capable of loving anyone. If you love only one person, in the end you will not be capable of even loving that one, because your capacity to love will be so narrowed down that it will freeze. It is as if we are telling a tree to cut all the roots and let there be only one root. If you tell the tree, "Let there be only one root for your love. Let this be your only love -- get everything from this root," the tree is going to die.

We have created a monogamous mind, not loving. That's why there are so many wars, so much cruelty, so much violence, in many, many names -- religion, politics, ideology. Any nonsense will do as long as you find something to be violent about. And then see how people become sharp: their eyes look brilliant when there is war, when everyone is just freed from the taboo against killing. Then you can kill anybody. So you feel more joy when you kill some body -- you never feel joy when you love someone.

Go and see in Bangladesh how joyful they are. Go and see anywhere where there is much killing: see the joy. And when there is no killing, see the limpedness, the sluggishness, the lustreless eyes. No one is at ease; life is just meaningless. Create a situation for somebody to

kill someone, and everyone is alive. Why? We have atrophied the capacity to love, and a child is capable of loving anyone. A child is born to love the whole world, a child is born to love everything, a child is born to love the whole universe -- with such a big capacity that if you narrow it down then the child has begun to die from that very moment.

But why this monopoly? Why this possessive attitude? It is a vicious circle. The mother is not fulfilled herself. She has not loved, she has not been loved, so now she becomes possessive of her child. At least she must turn the child's love totally to herself. It must not go anywhere. She must break all the roots possible. The child *must* belong totally to her. This is violence, this is not love. And psychologists say that the beginning seven years are the most basic. Once something has been done, it is next to impossible to undo it again -- really impossible to undo it, because it has become the basic structure, the foundation of the child. Now he will do everything based on this structure: this structure will have come to be the basis of his life. So allow everyone to be non-possessive, loving more -- without any conditions, without any qualifications.

This should not mean that because someone is lovable then love him. Rather, the emphasis should be: you be loving. Love in itself is beautiful and very deeply fulfilling. So love -- whatsoever you feel, wherever you feel, love. This fluidity of love will make you conscious of greater life, and that greater life leads to the Divine.

Love is the foundation of prayer. Unless you have loved and loved abundantly, how can you pray? How can you feel grateful? For what can you feel grateful? What is there to feel grateful about? If you have not loved, what is there to feel grateful to God for? So life is the beginning, love is the peak. And if you have loved, suddenly you become aware of a very love-filled universe. If you have not loved, then everywhere there is hate, jealousy. But up to now our emphasis has always been: you must get love. So everyone feels frustrated when he is not getting love, and no one feels frustrated when he is not giving love. The real emphasis must be: you must give love -- not get love. Everyone is trying to snatch love from somewhere. It cannot be snatched. You can just give. You can just go on giving. And life is not indifferent. If you give, life returns thousandfold. But you must not be concerned with returning; you must go on giving.

So every child should be trained more for love, and less for mathematics and calculations and geography and history. He must be trained more for love, because geography is not going to be the peak, neither is mathematics going to be the peak, nor knowing history, nor technology. *Nothing* is comparable to love. Love is going to be the peak. And if you miss love but everything else is there, you will be just a vacant waste, just emptiness. Then anxiety is created.

So the second thing I say: love must be deeply engrained. No effort should be avoided which can lead a child to be more loving. But our structure will not allow it because we are afraid. If a person begins to love more, then what will happen to marriage? What will happen to this and that? We are concerned. Really, we never think of what is happening to marriage. What is marriage now, or what has it been ever? Just a painful suffering -- a long suffering, with false smiling faces. It has simply proved a misery. At the most it can be just a convenience.

When I say this, I don't mean that if you can love more people you will not go into marriage. As far as I think, a person who can love more will not go into marriage only for love. He will go into marriage for deeper things. Please understand me: if a person loves many people, then there is no reason to marry someone only because of love -- because he can love many people *without* marriage, so there is no reason. We have forced everyone to go

into marriage because of love. Because you cannot love outside it, so we have unnecessarily forced love and marriage to be together -- unnecessarily. Marriage is for deeper things -- even more deep: for intimacy, for a "coherence", to work something which cannot be done alone, which can be done together, which needs a togetherness, a deep togetherness. Because of this love-starved society, we fall into marriage out of romantic love.

Love can never really be a great base for marriage because love is fun and play. If you marry someone for love, you will be frustrated -- because soon the fun is gone, the newness is gone, and boredom sets in. Marriage is for deep friendship, deep intimacy. Love is implied in it, but it is not alone. So marriage is spiritual. It is spiritual! There are many things which you can never develop alone. Even your own growth needs someone to respond -- someone so intimate that you can open yourself totally to him or her.

Marriage is not sexual at all. We have forced it to be sexual. Sex may be there, it may not be there. Marriage is a deep spiritual communion. And if such a marriage happens, then we give birth to very different souls -- very qualitatively different souls. When a child is born out of this intimacy, he can have a spiritual base. But our marriages are just sexual -- just a sexual arrangement. And out of this arrangement, of course, what can be born? Either our marriages are a sexual arrangement or they are for momentary romantic love.

Really, romantic love is ill. Because you cannot love many you go on accumulating the capacity to love. Then you are overflowed with it. Then whenever you find someone and the opportunity, this overflowed love is projected. So an ordinary woman becomes like an angel, an ordinary man becomes divine, looks divine, like a god. But when the flood has gone and you have become normal, then you see that you have been deceived. He is just an ordinary man and she is just an ordinary woman.

This romantic madness is created by our monogamous training. If a person is allowed to love, he never accumulates tensions which can be projected. So romance is possible only in a very diseased society. In a really healthy society there will be no romance: there will be love, but no romance. And if there is no romance, then marriage will be on a deeper level and it will never be frustrating. And if marriage is not only for love but for more intimate togetherness -- for an "I-thou" relationship so that you can both grow not as "I's" but as a "we" -- then marriage is really a training for egolessness. But we don't know about that kind of marriage at all. Whatsoever we know is just ugliness, just painted faces and everything dead within.

And finally: a child must be trained positively, never negatively. A positive emphasis must be there in everything -- only then can a child really grow and become an individual. What do I mean by "positive emphasis"? Our emphasis is always negative. I say, "I can love someone, but I cannot love all." This is a negative training. On the contrary, I should be able to say, "I can love all, only not this one." The loving capacity must go for many. Of course, there are individuals you cannot love, so don't force yourself to love them. But your emphasis now is that "I can love only one." Majnu says, "I only love Laila. I cannot love anyone else." This is negative. The whole world is denied. A positive attitude will be this: "Positively I cannot love this one, but I can love the whole world."

Always think of greater positiveness in *every* realm. If I am negative in my attitudes, then I am surrounded by my own negativities, I see everywhere negations: "This man is not good because he lies" -- but even if he lies, he is not just lies. He is more than that. Why not look to the greater part? Why be emphatically concerned with lies? And we say, "That man is a thief" -- but even if a man is a thief, he is more than that. Even a thief can have positive qualities, and, really, he has them -- because without some positive qualities you cannot even be a thief.

So why not be emphatically concerned with his positive qualities?

A thief is courageous, so why not be concerned with his courage? Why not appreciate courage? Even a person who speaks lies is intelligent, because you cannot speak lies if you are not intelligent. Lies require a deep intelligence which truth never requires. You can be just an idiot and you can speak the truth, but to speak lies you need intelligence, a cleverness and a wider range of consciousness, because if you speak one lie you will have to speak a hundred. and then you will have to remember them all. So why not be concerned with the positive qualities? Why emphasize negatives!

But our society has created negative minds. And you can find negativity in anyone. It is bound to be there because life cannot exist with only positives. Negatives are needed: they balance. So there are negatives, and if you train children for negatives they will live their entire lives in a negative universe. Everyone will be bad, and when everyone is bad you begin to feel egoistic -- only you are good.

So we train our children to find faults with everything. Then they begin to be "good". We force them to be good, and then they feel that everyone is bad. But how can someone be good in a bad world? It is not possible. You can be good only in a good world. A good society can come out only with a positive mind. So bring out the positivity of the mind. And even if there is something negative, always try to see something positive in it -- there is bound to be. And if a child becomes capable of seeing the positive even in the negative, then you have given him something. He will be happy. If you have given him a negative mind and he becomes capable of finding the negative in everything positive, you have created hell for him. His whole life he is going to be in hell.

Heaven is to live in a positive world; hell is to live in a negative world. This whole earth has become a hell because of negative minds. The mother cannot say to her child, "That woman is beautiful." How can she say it? Only she is beautiful; no one else is. A husband cannot say to his wife, "Look! That woman passing on the street -- how beautiful!" He cannot say it! He says it, but inside. And if the wife is with him, he is even afraid to say it inside. A husband moving with his wife is really afraid to look here and there. He cannot look. That's why he is never ready to move with his wife. It is such a hell. But why? If someone is beautiful why not tell it?

A mother cannot listen to her child reporting that someone is beautiful. She will try to make him feel that only she is beautiful and the whole world is ugly. And ultimately the child will find that his mother is the ugliest, because how can you create beauty in an ugly world? So a father goes on training him, a teacher goes on saying, "Only I am the possessor of truth."

Someone was here only two days before and she told me. "I want to listen to you, but my guru says, "This is sin. You belong to me, so how can you go anywhere else? And when I can give you the Truth, what is the need?" " Sooner or later this guru cannot remain a guru, cannot remain a teacher, because he is teaching negativity. And this negativity is bound to rebound on him ultimately.

In Zen, teachers will send their disciples to their opponents. Someone will remain with a teacher for one year, and when he is ready the teacher will say, "Now you go to my opponent -- because something I have said, the remaining he can say, the other part. So you go."

This teacher will always be remembered as a teacher; you can never disrespect him. How can you disrespect him? He sends you to his opponent just so you can find the other part: "I have told something, but this is not the whole." And no one can tell the whole -- mm? -- the whole is so big.

So create a positive attitude, and a better world can come out of it. But this is very

rudimentary. This is a very complex subject, so sometime we will discuss it more.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 1

Chapter #7

Chapter title: The upward Flow of the Mind

21 February 1972 pm in Bombay, India

Archive code: 7202215

ShortTitle: ULTAL107

Audio: Yes

Video: No

Length: 99 mins

UNMANI BHA AVAH PADDYAM

THE UPWARD FLOW OF THE MIND IS PADDYAM -- THE WATER OF DIVINE WORSHIP.

THE MIND is the bridge between matter and consciousness, between without and within, between the gross and the subtle. When I say mind is the bridge, I mean many things. Man comes to the world through mind; man comes to the body through mind; man comes to desires through mind. So wherever you reach, the reaching is always through the mind. If you create a hell for yourself, you create it through mind. If you create a heaven, that also is through mind.

One of the Zen patriarchs, Hui-Hai, has said, "Mind is heaven and mind is hell." So whatsoever you are or whatsoever you can be, it will depend ultimately on how your mind works. This working can create something for you which is not; this working can reveal to you that which is. So a mind can create a very illusionary world around it: it is capable. It can dream, and it can dream so real that you cannot even detect that whatsoever is seen and perceived is not real.

So mind has a projective force; it can project. That which is not, mind can create. And because mind can create that which is not, it can forget that which is. It can just be in such a state that the reality is never in any contact with it; and whatsoever happens, it depends only on the mind. So the mind has to be taken as the root of everything that one can experience. Even if one has to know the Divine, one has to go through mind. Of course, that going is difficult because that going implies dropping of the mind. Even if dropping of the mind is needed, it is through mind -- because unless you drop the mind you will never be able to know the true.

Mind is everywhere, either positively or negatively. Whatsoever you are doing -- creating an illusory world or discovering the real creating a madness for yourself or creating a meditative state -- it is all through mind. Wherever you go, you go through the bridge of the mind. Even if you have to come to yourself, it will be through mind. Of course, the coming will be negative; you will have to negate mind. You will have to come back, and the same steps will have to be taken -- only the direction will be different. If I go from my home, there are steps which lead me away. If I am returning back, the same steps will lead me back --

only the direction will be different. So if you can understand how mind goes out, you know that the same path is to be followed back.

Secondly, in Indian symbology, "upward" is synonymous with "inward", and "downward" is synonymous with "outward". When we say "upward" we mean inward; they both mean the same. The more inward you go, the more upward; the more outward you go, the more downward. These two are different symbols. The Chinese mind has always used "downward" as synonymous with "inward", and "upward" as synonymous with "outward". So whenever Lao Tzu would speak he would never use "upward"; he would say, "Come downward," and by down he means come within. So the within for Lao Tzu is just like an abyss: you fall in.

Indian symbology is different. We use upward for inward. For us the inward is not like an abyss, it is like a peak. Both can be used because symbols are just symbols, they indicate; more than that is meaningless. So it has always been a problem. The Upanishads always talk of upward, and the symbol is fire -- fire constantly running upward. For Lao Tzu and Taoists, water is the symbol -- water running downward, finding the most downward position possible. It can rest only when the deepest abyss has been found. But fire will rest only with the sun. It will go upward, upward, to the invisible upwardness.

But there is no contradiction. Really, whenever persons like Lao Tzu or Zarathustra or Jesus speak, they may use contradictory terms but they are never contradictory. They cannot be, that is impossible. So if their words are contradictory, that only shows their type, their choice, their individuality, their way of saying things -- nothing more. But pundits, scholars, can make much out of these apparent contradictions. And whenever we are talking about the Absolute, the Ultimate, one thing must be understood very clearly: you can use either of the extremes to express it, and each extreme is as valid as the other.

For example, the Upanishads use for the Divine the word "Absolute". This is one extreme, that of positivity -- the Perfect, the Absolute. Buddha uses for that same state and the same realization, "Nothingness" -- the other extreme. Totally opposite as far as words go, but as far as the realization is concerned, they both mean the same. But it created much confusion.

Buddha appeared to be absolutely contradictory to the Hindu mind. He was not. He was one of the purest Hindus possible, but he used a negative word. That was his liking, and it is good not to discuss likings -- because one is as valid or as invalid as the other. Both can be used. Either you say "the infinite" or you say "the zero" -- both are infinite. If you take it in the beginning, it is zero. If you take it in the end, it is infinite. Both mean the same thing.

Just like this, Buddha and Mahavir, both contemporaries, used very contradictory language. Mahavir says, "To know the Self is the ultimate knowledge, the wisdom. To know the Self is the wisdom." And Buddha says, "To believe in the self is the only ignorance." Mahavir says, "Only the Self is," and Buddha says, "Only the self is the deception, the most false thing." Nothing can be more contradictory, so Jains and Buddhists have been fighting constantly for twenty-five centuries. But the whole conflict is based just on linguistic fallacies -- because Mahavir uses the word "Self", negating everything of the ego in it. He says, "You become the Self when there is no ego." So really, "Self" becomes just like "no-self". If there is no ego, the Self becomes just like no-self. And Buddha uses the "self" as the ego and he says the self means the ego, so the most perfect ego means "the self". Then the meaning becomes clear. So both are right. When Buddha says, "To believe in a self is to be ignorant," he is right. And Mahavir is also right when he says, "To know the Self is the ultimate wisdom." The contradiction is just apparent.

Lao Tzu says, "To go down to the last is to reach the basic Existence." He begins from the beginning: "Drop down back to the very beginning, to the original source. The original source is deep down." The Upanishads say, "Go up to the last where the peak is achieved." Lao Tzu says, "Go down to the original source," and the Upanishads say, "Go up to the ultimate possibility, to the very end. Achieve the potentiality to the very end; make the potentiality absolutely actual." The beginning and end are not two separate things. Really, no end can end unless it reaches again to the beginning. And the beginning begins only where the end ends.

Life moves in a circle, so if you begin a circle, the point of beginning will be the point of the ending also. Life moves in a circle, so you can say the same point is the beginning and the end both. So the upward is not contradictory to the downward. The Lao Tzuan downward and the Upanishadic upward -- both mean the same. Only the words differ.

If we can penetrate to the meaning beyond the words, only then can we conceive of and comprehend these minds. These minds are living in such experiences which cannot really be expressed through ordinary words. But they have to use ordinary words, so they can use only ordinary words with a very different meaning, with a very different connotation. So one thing more: when the Upanishads say upward, remember, it is the same as inward. The more you go in, the more up, and vice versa: the more up you go, the more in. What is this upwardness or inwardness? And why should the sutra say that this upward flow of the mind is the only water by which you can worship the feet of the Divine? So many things are implied. One is that it is useless to use just water -- it is useless!

Al-hillaj Mansoor, a Sufi mystic, was killed. When his hands were cut, blood began to flow, and he used that blood as Mohammedans use water for *wazu* -- cleaning the body before going to the worship. They use water, but Mansoor used blood. And when he made the gesture of *wazu*, someone asked from the crowd, "Mansoor, have you gone mad? What are you doing?"

Mansoor said, "For the first time I am doing *wazu*, cleaning myself with my own blood -- because how can you clean yourself with water?"

He gives a deeper significance. Really, he means that unless you die, how can you purify yourself for the prayer? *Wazu* through blood means dying. Only dying can be a real cleansing, a real purity. And when you die, you become able to pray. Unless you die, you cannot pray. So the courage to die becomes a basic requirement for prayer.

This sutra says, "The upward flow of the mind is the water for the Divine feet." No other water will do. It goes even deeper than Mansoor's blood, because blood is not so deep -- it is only skin-deep. You can do *wazu* with your blood; it is not so deep yet. But the upward flowing mind is the deepest possibility, for two reasons: basically, the mind is downward flowing; basically, the trend is to flow downward because it is easy. The downward flow is always easy. The upward needs effort; the upward needs a fight with the gravitation; the upward means austerity. You cannot flow upward -- unless you change your nature completely. It is a transformation! The downward flow is but natural, it is in the very nature of things. So mind has a downward flow naturally.

Think of it in this way: if you want to think and concentrate on the Divine, you will feel much difficulty. The mind will be wavering constantly. You will not be able to concentrate even for a single moment, really. It will be going here and there. Concentration will not be possible, contemplation will not be possible, meditation will not be possible. Mind will not be ready. Even with much effort, you will find it is not coming to the Divine, towards the Divine. But think of sex, and mind is absorbed. No need to concentrate -- it concentrates. No

need to make any effort -- mind flows easily.

Really, we don't know anything else except sex by which we can understand what concentration means. So it happens always that whenever a person can concentrate on any other thing, sex will not be a problem for him -- whenever! Even if he is just a scientist, a research-worker, working in his lab, if he can concentrate on his work then sex will not be a problem in his life at all. But if you cannot concentrate on anything else, then your mind will be flowing through the channel of sex constantly.

One thing must be understood: when you are thinking about sex, you are totally absorbed. There is no wavering. You even forget that you are thinking about sex -- you may remember afterwards. Even this much wavering is not there. You forget that you are different and that this procession of sexual thoughts and images is different. You become one with them. This is what is meant when *bhaktas* say, "the constant remembering of the Divine -- without you, without 'I.'" The same phenomenon occurs, only the object changes. It is not sex now; the object becomes Divine. And unless the Divine becomes as absorbing as sex is naturally, you cannot flow upward.

So the upward flow is an effort: you have to pull yourself together for it. The downward flow is easy. That's why, whenever you feel tense, sex becomes a relaxation, a relief -- because every tension means that you have been pulling yourself together towards something which is not natural. Then if you can relax to the downward flow, you will feel a relief. So in the West particularly, sex has become just a relief -- just a relief from tensions. It is, and it is because when you flow downward no effort is needed. So sex is used by many, really by ninety-nine percent of people, as a tranquillizer. If you move in sex then you can sleep well. Why? Because when the mind is flowing downward your whole body is relaxed. Unless you are relaxed in the same way when your mind is going upward, you are not a religious person at all.

That is the difference between a secular mind and a religious mind. A secular mind is at ease with downward flowing, relaxed. A religious mind is only relaxed when upward flowing. Whenever a religious mind has to flow downward, it becomes tense. Ultimately, when the upward flow is achieved, the same effort will be needed to flow downward -- even more effort, because upwardness, even when arduous, is still upwardness, and downwardness, even with no effort, is downwardness. And when one has to come down with effort, the effort becomes a thousandfold more arduous.

For a person like Ramakrishna, even to eat is an effort. For a person like Buddha, even to move is an effort, even to be in the body is an effort. This effort means that the whole nature has become transformed. That which was downward before has now become upward, and that which was upward before has become downward. A religious mind flows upward as if the upwardness has just become downwardness. Meera is at ease when she is dancing and singing for Krishna, but when her husband Rana is there she is not at ease, because Rana now is a downward flow. This upward flow is bound to be an effort for us. Unless you will it, you will not achieve it.

Now, again, you will find a conflict between Tao and the Upanishads. Lao Tzu says, "Effortlessness is the means," and the Upanishads says, "Effort, total effort, is the means." When Lao Tzu says "effortlessness", he means be so still that not a single movement is there, because any effort is a movement, any effort is a tension, any effort means that you are outside. So when Lao Tzu says "effortlessness", he is using it to mean an absolutely relaxed state of mind -- do not do anything.

It is not so easy. It is as difficult as the upward flow -- rather, even more difficult, because

we can understand terms which imply doing, but we cannot understand terms which imply non-doing. Non-doing for us is more arduous, but both are arduous and both try through different ways to achieve the same point. If you become totally effortless, you achieve your innermost center -- because you cannot move! When there is no movement you will drop down, down, down to the center. Every peripheral event is an effort. When there is no effort, you will be down in your ultimate center.

The Upanishads again use a different way which is, of course, in logical relationship with their concept of upwardness. They say absolute effort is needed. When you make an absolute effort, you will become more tense, more tense, more tense, and there will come a moment when you will be nothing but tension. You will be nothing but tension! Then there is nothing further. The ultimate has been achieved. Now you are just a tension. When this climax comes, suddenly you will fall from the climax. You cannot go further; you have come to the last limit. The tension has come to its ultimate, the maximum; it cannot go further. When tension comes to a total climax, you suddenly relax and you reach the point which is meant by Tao, by Lao Tzu -- effortlessness. You come to the center.

So there are two ways: either relax directly as Tao implies, or relax indirectly as the Upanishads say. Create the tension to its ultimate, and then there will be relaxation. And I think the Upanishads are more helpful, because we are tense and we understand the meaning, the language, the ways of tension. Tell someone suddenly to relax and he cannot. Even relaxation becomes a new tension for him. I have seen a book which is entitled YOU MUST RELAX. The very "must" will create tension. The word is anti-relaxation -- "must". It becomes hard work: you *must* relax. So try now to relax, and your very effort to relax will create more tensions. The title should rather be YOU MUST NOT RELAX, if you want to relax.

Relaxation cannot come directly to us. We are tense, so much tense. Relaxation doesn't mean anything; we have not known it. Lao Tzu is right, but to follow him is very difficult. And he looks simple. Always remember -- whenever something looks very simple it must be very complex, because in this world the most simple is the most complex. And because it looks simple you may deceive yourself. So I can say, "Just relax!" -- it will not happen.

I was working for ten years continuously with Lao Tzuan methods, so I was continuously teaching direct relaxation. It was simple for me so I thought it would be simple for everyone. Then, by and by, I become aware that it is impossible. I was in a fallacy: it was not possible. I would say, "Relax!" to those I was teaching. They would appear to understand the meaning of the word, but they could not relax. Then I had to devise new methods for meditation which create tension first -- more tension. They create such tension that you become just mad. And THEN I say, "Relax."

When you have come up to the climax, your whole body, your whole mind, becomes hungry for relaxation. With so much tension, you want to stop, and I go on pushing you to continue, continue to the very end. Do whatsoever you can do to create tensions, and then, when you stop you just fall down from the peak into a deep abyss. The abyss is the end, the effortlessness is the end, but the Upanishads use tension as the means.

So be effortful to flow upward. Really, to use the word "flow" is not good because flow means downward. How can you flow upward? You have to struggle. To flow upward means a struggle, constant struggle. A moment is missed and you will find you are downward. For a moment you stop the struggle and you will be flowing downward. It is a constant struggle *against* the current. So now understand what the current is and against what current you have to struggle upward.

Your habits are the current, long habits, habits generated by many, many lives; not only human lives -- animal lives, vegetable lives. You are not isolated; you are part of a long succession and every habit is just engrained. You have been flowing downward continuously for millennia, so it has become a deep habit. Really, it has become your nature. You don't know any other nature. You know only one nature which goes down and down and down. This downwardness is the current, and every cell of the body, every atom of the mind is just part of a long, long succession of habits. They are so deep that we don't even remember from where they came.

Now Western psychology has come to discover many, many new things. For example, now they have discovered that whenever you feel violence, your violence is not in the mind alone -- it is deep in your teeth and in your nails. So if you suppress violence, your teeth will absorb it and your jaw will become diseased, because animals, whenever violent, use teeth and nails. Our nails belong to animality. our teeth belong to animality -- a long animal heritage. So when someone is violent and suppresses it, the teeth become loaded.

Now they say that many diseases of the teeth are just because so much violence is suppressed -- many diseases of the teeth! So a violent man has a different type of jaw. Just by seeing his jaw you can say that he is violent. A person who has suppressed many, many violent fevers, upheavals, will begin to have a particular type of jaw -- the violence will be there. One psychologist, Wilhelm Reich, would just push your teeth by his hands, press your teeth by his hands, and suddenly your whole body would become violent.

Wilhelm Reich had to be continuously guarded against his patients because he would push, manipulate and reactivate hidden violences just by touching. He became an expert. Simply by touching a particular part in the jaw and teeth, he would bring many, many violences back to you which even you don't remember. You would begin to scream, attack. He would say, "Now I have touched a built-in program. A built-in program has been touched and reactivated."

Sometimes it happened, when Reich would push particular spots -- and he became aware of them by continuously working for forty years on jaw spots, he became aware that every spot has a particular type of violence hidden in it -- so he would push a particular spot, a particular *chakra* in the jaw, and a particular violence would come out. He became capable of pushing you back so much that you would become just an animal. Sometimes it happened that the patient would again not be a human being at all. He would fall back. be reduced to an animal. He would begin to roar like an animal, attack like an animal.

This is the current. When you are violent, you alone are not violent: your whole history is violent. When you are sexual, you alone are not sexual: the whole history is sexual, the whole succession. That's why it has so much force. You are just a dead leaf in a big current. So what to do so that you can go upward against the current? What to do?

Three things to be done: one, whenever mind begins to flow downward, become aware as early as possible -- *as early as possible!* Someone has insulted you. For you to become angry, a little time is needed because it is a mechanism. You will get angry, but after a gap. Things will happen like a flash. First you will feel insulted. The moment you feel insulted, the second current will begin to flow: you will become angry. At first the anger will not be conscious; first it will be just like a fever. Then it will become conscious. Then you will begin to express or suppress it.

So when I say "the earlier the better", I mean when someone insults you, become aware as soon as you begin to feel that you have been insulted. And whenever you become aware, just make an effort to stop. Don't fall into the automatic track even for a single moment. Even

a single moment's stop will help much. Longer stops will help even more.

When Gurdjieff's father was dying he called his boy. He was just nine, and Gurdjieff remembered the incident all his life. The father called him. He was the youngest child and the father said, "I am so poor, I cannot give you anything, my boy. But one thing which my father gave to me I can give you. You may not even be able to understand what it means now, because I myself was not able to understand what it meant when my father gave it to me. But it proved the most precious thing in my life, so I am just giving it to you. Preserve it! Sometime you may begin to understand it."

So Gurdjieff just listened. The father said, "Whenever you feel angry, never reply before twenty-four hours. Reply, but let there be a gap of twenty-four hours." Gurdjieff followed his dying father's advice. It became deeply impressed in his mind the very day his father died, and Gurdjieff said, "I have practised many, many, many spiritual exercises, but that was the best. I never could be angry in my life, and that changed the whole flow, the whole current, because I had to stick to the promise. Whenever someone would insult me, I would create something, some situation. I would just tell him that I would come back after twenty-four hours to reply, and I have never replied because it proved such nonsense to reply." Only a gap was needed. And the whole life of George Gurdjieff became something different.

So even if you can begin with *one* thing in the current, you will begin to change the whole. Really, this is one of the basic truths of esoteric religion: that you cannot change a part unless you change the whole. And it works both ways. Either you change the whole, then the part will change; or you change even a single part totally and the whole will follow -- because they are so integrately related.

So begin anywhere. Find out your chief characteristic. Find out the chief characteristic for you: that which is most forceful, which you cannot resist, that which tempts you and causes you to go down. It may be sadness, it may be anger, it may be greed, it may be anything. Find out your chief characteristic, your weakness. And begin with the stronger one, then the weaker ones can be won very easily. Begin with the strongest. If anger is the strongest begin with anger. First, when you feel that you have been insulted, you have been rejected, you have been hindered -- anything which creates anger -- just when you feel that "Now the first step has been taken and I am feeling insulted," stop for a moment. Don't breathe: just stop the breath wherever it is. If it is out, let it be out. If it is in, let it be in. Stop breathing for a moment, then release the breath. Go in, and find out whether you have missed the thing or it is still there.

You will have missed it. The connection is missed. You will have given a gap to the automatic working. Somewhere you have disjointed the mechanism, and breathing is wonderful to disjoin anything. Just stop breathing, and there is a disjoining inside. Your feeling insulted and the mechanism of anger will not be joined. And if they are missed even for a single moment, they are missed. Your mechanism will never know that you have been insulted.

The earlier this happens, the better. There are even earlier stages -- they belong to the other, not to you. When the other is insulting you, before feeling insulted look at him and feel that he is angry. Stop your breath and look at him again, and you will not be insulted. He will insult you, but you will not be insulted. You will not feel insulted because again there comes a gap. This gap is between him and you. Now he cannot cross this gap; he cannot insult you. He will insult, but somewhere he has missed you. You are not the target now. For him you are the target, but actually you are not. You can laugh, and if you laugh it is better.

So first create a gap. Second: do something which is ordinarily never done in such

situations. When someone is insulting, no one laughs, no one smiles, no one thanks, no one hugs, embraces. Do something which is never done! Then you are against the current, because the current is always that which is done, that which is usually done. This is what the current means. Be unusual! Someone is beating you: laugh and feel the difference -- not only in those who are beating you, but within yourself. If you can laugh you will feel totally different. Try it -- something absurd. Then you disconnect the whole mechanism, you confuse the whole mechanism, because the mechanism cannot understand what is happening. A mechanism is just a mechanism. It may be very deep-rooted, but it is mechanical; it has no consciousness. So confuse your animal. Don't allow him to push and pull and manipulate. Confuse the animal! The more you confuse him, the less powerful he becomes -- and by "animal" I mean your past.

This is a rare experiment: to do something which is never done. When you are happy, do something which is never done in happiness: be sad, act sad, be angry, act angry. Confuse the mechanism. Just don't allow the mechanism to know everything that is to be done. Don't allow, and within a year your mechanism will be at a loss. Someone will be insulting, and your mechanism will not know at all what to do. You have broken from your past. So try! Every moment can be an experiment, and you will feel a sudden change in your consciousness. When someone is insulting you, laugh and feel what is happening inside -- something new you have never known.

I am reminded of a Zen monk, Rinzai: He is sleeping in his poor hut. A thief comes in at midnight. It is a full-moon night and a thief comes in. The light of the moon is coming in, the doors are open. There is no need to close the doors because he has nothing. He has only one blanket in which he is asleep. So the thief goes around the hut and finds nothing. Rinzai is awake. He feels very sorry for the thief because there is nothing. And he doesn't want to disturb him either, because he can give the blanket -- that is the only thing -- but the thief will be disturbed. He may even run. So he suddenly laughs. The thief is stunned. Rinzai throws the blanket over him and runs away. The thief follows. What has happened? The whole thing has become just a confusion. So the thief follows him, catches him by the hand and asks him, "What are you doing?"

He says, "I am just confusing my mechanism. You are not concerned at all. Don't worry. It was just a coincidence that you came in. I was just experimenting with myself."

What to do? Traditional answers are always ready. Use your fantasy, use your imagination, because your mechanism is the least imaginative thing -- the *least* imaginative! It is very much traditional and orthodox. Understand what I am saying: it is orthodox, traditional. You have been angry the same way always. Innovate something, use your imagination, be creative, and confuse the current. The more you are capable of confusing the current, the more you will transcend it.

So the second thing: use unusual expressions. Don't allow the routine. The more you allow it, the more powerful it goes on becoming.

The thief I was mentioning just fell at the feet of Rinzai, and he said, "If you can use such things, allow me to use myself also. You ran like a thief and you are the master of the house. You confounded me. I have been in many, many situations, but never like this. You have hypnotized me also. You are the first man who has not behaved with me as a thief, who has not thought about me as a thief, so I cannot leave you now. Everyone has tried with me that I should leave this profession, and I had my own reactions. But with you I change. Now initiate me into your path."

Rinzai said, "How can I initiate you? Really, when I laughed, in that moment I became

Enlightened. When I laughed, I became Enlightened! I was trying and trying and trying; I had been meditating for years and nothing happened. But in that moment of laughter, something broke down, something exploded; I became disconnected from myself. So you are my teacher, really -- you have initiated me."

Use something absolutely absurd such as Zen monks have been using. If you go to a Zen teacher, you can never conceive what his answer will be. If you go to a Hindu teacher, a Hindu guru, your question can show you what the answer is going to be. The answer is predictable. And whenever the answer is predictable, it is useless: it is useless because it is routine. So if you go to a teacher, you can know that if you ask "this", he will answer "this". But you can never know with a Zen teacher. Everything is possible, and nothing is impossible. He may answer, he may not answer. He may answer in such a way which is not at all connected with your question -- not at all!

You may have asked, "Is there a God?" and a Zen teacher might answer, "Look! the sun has gone down. The evening is to come" not related at all. Someone may ask, "What is a Buddha?" and a Zen teacher might just beat you or throw you out of the window. Why? Really, they are not answering you. They are just trying to create a gap between your questioning mind and the answer -- a gap!

If you ask, "Is there a God?" and I throw you out of the window, how can you relate these two? -- no relation. If I answer, "There is no God," it is related. If I say, "There is a God," it is related. My theist answer, my atheist answer -- all are related. They don't create the gap. But if I begin to beat you or I just begin to dance, I just begin to laugh, just a mad laugh -- it is not related. And if you can be unrelated, unhitched from your routine track, if you can be derailed from the track, something has happened. And it has happened many times that the seeker is thrown out of the window, and he comes back to touch the feet of the Master and say, "Much has happened, and I never dreamt about it. And my question was not even related, but you have replied to me."

The first Zen teacher from India, Bodhidharma, went to China. He introduced Zen there. ZEN is really the Chinese form of *dhyana* -- meditation. *Dhyana* is Sanskrit, and the equivalent of *dhyana* in Pali, the Buddhist language, is *zhan*. So *zhan* in China became *chan*, then *zen* in Japan. When Bodhidharma reached China, the Emperor Wu came to receive him. When he entered the boundary where he was to be received, many thousands of monks were there. No one could conceive that Bodhidharma would enter in such a way: one foot was naked; on one foot there was a shoe and another shoe was on his head. He entered with a shoe on his head!

The Emperor Wu was just bewildered: "What type of man is this? Is he mad?" Wu became worried, and Bodhidharma laughed. Bodhidharma said, "You must be thinking the man is mad. I can predict you, but you cannot predict me: that is the difference. That is the difference! You must be thinking I am mad. You have not said so, but I can predict. You cannot predict me: that is the difference."

Become unpredictable: this is the second thing. If you are predictable, you are a thing, not a person. The more unpredictable, the more you are not a thing -- not just a thing among things. You become a person. So the second thing against the current: be unpredictable. Sometimes be absurd. Just don't try to be logical because the current is logical. Remember this: the current is very logical -- strictly logical. Everything is related. You insult me: I am angry. You appreciate me: I am happy. You call me good and I am one way; and you call me bad and I am different. Everything is predictable, it is logical.

Really, if you are angry and I don't reply to you with anger, you will feel something strange has happened. You will not be at ease. You will not be at ease because something

illogical has come in. We live in a logical world. This current is very logical, mathematical; everything is fixed. Unfix it! Disturb it! Create a chaos! Create an inner anarchy! Only then can you throw the animal heritage. Animals are predictable and animals are very logical. To transcend them you must have the courage to be illogical, and that is the deepest courage -- to be illogical.

Jesus says, "Those who have will be given more, and those who have not, even that will be taken away." This is illogical. This is absolutely illogical! What does he mean? He is using some Zen words. If you look in the words of Buddha, Krishna, Lao Tzu, you will find that they are not logical. If you ask a Buddha, "I will be good, virtuous, I will follow -- what will I gain?" he will say, "Nothing! You will not gain anything -- nothing!"

This Emperor Wu asked Bodhidharma, "I have donated millions for the purpose of Buddhism; I have opened many monasteries; ten thousand monks are fed daily in my palace -- so what will be the result? What will I gain?"

And Bodhidharma said, "Nothing! And if you insist more, you may even fall down into hell. If you insist more, you may even fall down into the deepest hell!" -- looks illogical.

Even the ten thousand monks were just afraid: "What is he saying? He may destroy the whole business" -- because they were trying to persuade the Emperor that he will get into a high heaven, that he will be just by the side of the divine Emperor, the divine throne. He will be just by the side, and he will have a place there. And ten-thousandfold of whatsoever he is giving here, he will get back. But this man is destroying everything. He says, "Nothing!"

Bodhidharma is illogical; Wu is logical. Wu again asked, "Are you joking? -- because I have done so much. Is it not holy?"

And Bodhidharma said, "There is nothing holy. The word 'holy' is just empty. And if you insist more, you will fall down into a deep hell."

The Emperor Wu said, "We have no communication between us. What you are saying, I cannot understand; and what I am saying, I think you are not hearing."

Bodhidharma said, "Yes! How can there be communication between me and you? Either you come up or I must come down; only then can we meet somewhere. And I am not ready to come down -- you try to come up." But it didn't happen, so Bodhidharma remained outside the Empire and the Emperor went back to his palace.

After ten years, when he was dying, the Emperor remembered. When death came, every logical system was shattered. Then he became afraid of whether anything was going to happen because "I have fed these *bhikkhus*, and I have made so many temples and *viharas* and so many monasteries, but this death is there." Then he remembered the monk, Bodhidharma, and he asked, "Bring him back. If he is found anywhere, bring him back soon, because I am dying and death has shattered all my logic and rationality. Now only that man can help."

But Bodhidharma was dead. He had died one year before, but he had left a message for the Emperor Wu and said to his disciples, "One day when he faces death he will remember me -- because I was just a death to him, to his whole expectation, to all his desires, to his whole fantasy about the other world. I was just a death to him. And when death comes and when death shatters his hopes, he will remember me." So he had left a message for Wu. That message was given. In the message it was written again, "You cannot predict me, but I can predict you. When you die you will remember me. I can even predict what you will remember when you die -- because death is illogical."

Really, if you can understand, life is illogical, death is illogical, love is illogical, God is illogical, and all that is logical is just marketplace. In this life everything that is meaningful,

significant, deep, ultimate, is illogical. So create an illogical-ness inside. Don't be too logical -- then you can break. Logic is the foundation of your old mind, your traditional mind. Illogic should be the beginning of the new mind.

And, thirdly, whenever you feel convenience, comfort, easiness, be alert: the mind is flowing downward. So don't ask for inner comfort, otherwise you will be lost. Don't ask for inner convenience, otherwise you will be lost. Whenever you feel everything is okay, be alert, you are flowing downward -- because nothing is okay really. So whenever you feel that everything is okay, nothing is to be done and everything is just flowing, everything is good, remember, you are flowing downward. Be aware of inner conveniences. And when I say "comfort and convenience", I mean inner ones. Outwardly it makes no difference -- you may be in comfort outwardly -- but inwardly never allow comfort to set in.

That's why no one remembers religion when he feels happy. When you feel sorrow, when you feel sadness, when you feel misery, you begin to think about religion. Inconvenience inside must be used. So two things: first remember always that the downward flow is very convenient. Don't be a victim to it. Always create some inner inconvenience. This is TAP -- inner inconvenience. This is TAP -- this is austerity. What do I mean by inner inconvenience?

You are sleeping, relaxed: create an inner inConvenience. Let the body relax, but don't relax the alertness. Sufis have used vigil, night vigil, as an inner inconvenience. The whole night they will be on vigil. In India, sleep was never used, really -- food and hunger were used as inner inconveniences. The hunger is there: don't take food. The hunger is there: remember it, be aware of it, and yet be away from it. An inner inconvenience is created. The mind has a habit to fall for the convenience, so create any inner inconvenience. And always go on changing, because if you are fixed to one thing it will not be an inconvenience for long.

You can even become fixed to your fasting, then it becomes a convenience rather than an inconvenience, because to take food may begin to appear as an inconvenience. Once you know that the body can run without food -- the body begins to feel more light, the body begins to feel more alive, the body begins to feel more vital; and the body has a built-in process so that for at least three months you can be without food, without *any* food -- after seven or eight days, to take food will be inconvenient. So use fasting as an inconvenience, and when fasting begins to settle, use food.

Gurdjieff was strange in this. He would give you such strange foods -- such strange foods you have never eaten! The whole stomach would be disturbed, and he would create inconvenience. Such strange foods -- Chinese foods, Indian foods, Caucasian foods -- he would use in New York. With him, whenever he was travelling, a whole truck of strange foods would follow. And his followers were very much afraid because he would force them to eat so much that it became a torture. From eight in the night up to twelve -- four hours -- would be for eating, and he would be there. He would go on forcing -- no one could say no, He would force so much alcohol that ordinarily it would just make you deadly unconscious, but he would go on. He would create inner inconvenience and he would say, "Let the inconvenience be there. Remember! Be awake!" He would go on pouring alcohol, and he would say, "Remember! Remember, and be awake!"

Tantrics have used alcohol, and a real tantric can take any amount of it without being affected at all. They say, and they say rightly, that alcohol creates the *deepest* inconvenience inside. To fight with it and remain aware is the most arduous thing. When the alcohol goes in, and every body cell becomes lethargic, and the chemical begins to work, and the mind begins to lose consciousness, *then* to be aware is the most arduous TAP -- austerity -- possible. But it is possible, and once it happens you will never be the same again.

So create any inner inconvenience. The current always helps you to be convenient: that is a trick; then you begin to flow with it. So the third thing for the upward flow of the mind is to create inward inconvenience continuously, and go on changing. You can make anything a habit -- go on changing. When something becomes convenient, leave it; create something new. Then, by these inconveniences, you create a crystallization inside. You become integrated, one. And for this oneness, this integration, this chemical crystallization, alchemists use the word "gold". Now the baser metal has been changed into higher. Now you are gold. This integration is the third point to remember.

So continuously be aware that some integration must take place. No moment should be missed in which you have not tried to integrate yourself. You are walking: a moment comes when your legs give way, and they say, "Now you cannot move." That is the point to move. Now move! Now don't listen to the legs, and you will become aware of a subtle force -- because the body has two force reservoirs. One is just ordinary, for day-to-day use. Another, a deeper one, is infinite. It is not for everyday use: it only comes into operation when some emergency is there.

You are walking: you have walked twenty miles, and now you *know* very well, your logic says, your mind says, every fibre of the body says that now no movement is possible -- you will just drop dead. A single step more, and you will drop dead! This is the moment: now move! Don't listen to the body! Now run! Don't listen to the body, and suddenly there will be an upsurge of energy again. Within moments you will feel a new energy, and now you can walk for miles together. This energy comes from the reservoir, and this reservoir is connected only when the day-to-day energy source is just empty. If you listen to the body then this reservoir is never used.

You are feeling sleepy, and now you cannot even open your eyes. This is the moment. Stand! Open your eyes! Stare! Don't blink! Forget sleep and try to be awake -- and within seconds a sudden upsurge of energy will overflow. There will be no sleep. You will be fresher than you have ever been in the morning. A new morning, an inside morning has happened. A deeper source energy has come. This is how to integrate your mind and how to let it be arrowed upwards continuously.

The *rishi* says, "The upward flow of the mind is the water for Divine worship." Mm? No other water will do. This constant upward flow, by this and only by this can you worship the feet of the Divine.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 1

Chapter #8

Chapter title: The Complementariness of Opposites

22 February 1972 pm in Bombay, India

Archive code: 7202225

ShortTitle: ULTAL108

Audio: Yes

Video: No

Length: 103 mins

OSHO, YOU SAID LAST NIGHT THAT TO HAVE AN UPWARD FLOW OF THE MIND ONE HAS TO MAKE A CONSTANT EFFORT AGAINST PAST ANIMAL HABITS. PLEASE EXPLAIN WHAT THE DIFFERENCE IS BETWEEN EFFORT AGAINST HABITS, AND SUPPRESSION.

TRANSFORMATION of the mind is a positive effort. Suppression of the mind is negative. The difference is that when you are suppressing your mind, you are positively concerned with being against something. When you are transforming your mind, you are not directly concerned with being against something. You are positively concerned *for* something: the effort is for something, not against something.

For example, if you are fighting directly with sex, then it will be suppression. But if your positive effort is for transformation of sex energy, your positive effort is for something else, then it will not be suppression. Suppression means you have blocked the natural door for the energy, you have blocked the natural outflow, and you have not opened anything else. It is just a blockage. You are against anger, so you block anger -- but where will the energy go? The energy that you have suppressed will create inner complexities. It will even be more perverted. So to be natural is better than to be perverted. Perversion is disease; to be natural is healthy.

Of course, just to be healthy is not the end. One can go even beyond health. So these are three things -- suppression, being natural and transcendence. Just being natural is just being healthy. If you suppress and there is no positive outlet, no creative outlet for your suppressed energy, then you will become perverted. You are not healthy: you become diseased, you become a "dis-ease".

Don't be concerned negatively. Change the energy, the door, the path, the outlet, positively, and when there is a creative change, the energy that was flowing into sex will not flow. Whenever you can open a higher passage for it, it will flow through it. Whenever you can create something which is better than nature itself, then there is no suppression. This difference must be understood.

Only man can fall below nature; no animal can fall below nature. There are no abnormal

animals. Sometimes animals also become abnormal, but only when they are with men -- never alone. A dog can go abnormal, a horse can go abnormal, but never alone, never in their natural state. They can go abnormal with man, with man's society. They can go abnormal in a zoo.

Man can fall down below nature. This may seem unfortunate. This is not because this capacity comes with another capacity: man can transcend nature. No animal can transcend nature. The higher you can go than nature, the lower you can go also, in the same proportion. Every possibility is a double possibility. Every possibility opens two doors that are diametrically opposite. Unless you can fall below nature, you cannot transcend above it. And if you have the capacity to transcend nature, you will have the capacity to fall below it also.

Animals are just natural; they are neither perverted nor are they transformed. Never do they become sub-animal and never do they become super-animal. They are just animal. Man is a flexible potentiality. He can fall below nature, can be perverted, can become mad. He can transcend nature, can become superhuman, can become a Buddha.

Another thing: animals are born with their nature. In a way they are born perfect. An animal is born developed. Man is born without any nature and is not developed at the time of birth. He develops later. Then many possibilities open, and there is a great range of possibilities. Man is born undeveloped -- not only mentally, but even bodily he is born undeveloped. No animal child is born with an undeveloped body; the body is complete. That's why, when the animal child is born, he is capable of living even without parents.

Man's child is born undeveloped, and even in the physiological structure many things develop only after he is born -- and it takes years. In the mother's womb he is not completely developed, and because of that, the phenomenon of mother is born -- because mothering continues. If the child is born completely developed, then there will be no mothering. The whole institution of the family developed -- and, consequently, the whole society -- the whole society was born because the child is born undeveloped. He has to be looked after, taken care of. Only after twenty years will he really be out of the womb. In these twenty years, he will need a family, loving care, a society, in which to develop. This will be a greater womb.

Even when he is physically complete, mentally he is not. He will have to develop his mind. And, really, the average mind is never beyond fourteen years of age. The average mind remains below thirteen and a half. The average mental age is thirteen and a half. A person who is physically seventy is mentally thirteen and a half. The mind remains in such a primitive, primary state! Body becomes complete, mind remains incomplete, and spirit is not even touched. Man dies without ever having evolved any spirit.

Whenever someone asked Gurdjieff, "Have we souls?" he would say, "No! Sometimes it happens that a man has a soul. *Sometimes* only does it happen." Gurdjieff would say, "*only* sometimes, rarely does it happen that a man has a soul. You are not even complete minds, so how can you have a soul?"

An incomplete body cannot have a mind, an incomplete mind cannot have a soul, and an incomplete soul cannot realize the Divine. Really, body works as a womb for the mind, and mind works as a womb for the spirit, then spirit works as a womb for God. So man is not born fixed, complete. He is born only as a multi-potentiality, and he can fall down -- below nature. He can be more animalistic than any animal and he can be a superhuman being also, he can be just Divine. This range of possibilities is there.

Now you can do two things. If your mind becomes negative, suppressive, you go on fighting things which are not "good". So you fight sex, you fight anger, you fight greed, you fight jealousy, you fight violence -- you go on fighting. But when a person is fighting

violence he will never be non-violent, because to fight violence one needs to be violent.

You cannot fight violence without being violent, so your so-called non violent saints are all violent -- deeply violent. Of course, their violence is not against others: their violence is against themselves. So no one objects; you can even applaud them. They are against themselves -- very violent! You cannot fight violence. How can you fight violence without being violent? How can you fight anger without being angry? The very attitude to fight anger is a subtle anger. The very fight means you are angry. You are not at ease with your anger.

You can take a negative attitude, and you can go on fighting with things which are there. The more you fight them, the more you become like them. A person fighting sex will become sexual. His every gesture will become sexual. His sitting, his standing, his walking, will become sexual. He will be so much obsessed with fighting it that everything will take the tinge and colour of sex.

When you fight with something, you have to use the techniques of your enemy. If you want to win, you have to use the same techniques that your enemy is using. So even if you win in the end, you will not win because the techniques will be the same. Really, you will have been defeated. Fight with anger, and if you are defeated then anger will be there. If you win, then also there will be anger. Only anger will have won against anger.

This negative fight will narrow down your consciousness more and more, and you will become afraid of everything. A negative mind is always in fear. Everything becomes a sin and everything creates guilt and everything creates fear. You are just in a deep escape from everything. Your consciousness will be narrowed down; it will not expand. You will become so much afraid that you will just hide within yourself, and everywhere around will be all the enemies. You have created them because you became negative.

This is suppression, and you will end in a madhouse. Everything that you have suppressed you will have to suppress continuously. The fight will be so continuous that you will not be able to do anything else. If you are fighting sex, then it will be enough -- your whole life will be just a fight. If you are fighting greed, then it will be enough; even greed itself will not take so much energy as the fight with greed. Sex will not take so much energy, it will not dissipate so much energy, as fighting with sex -- because sex is just natural, and the fight creates negativity: whenever you are negative, you only dissipate energy. Nothing is gained, nothing creative is achieved. You become self-destructive.

So always remember never to be negative; then there will be no suppression. But I have told you that to go against the current is the way for the mind to flow upward. What do I mean by going against the current? The difference is very subtle, but once felt, you can never lose the track.

For example, you are swimming in a river against the current. Two are the possibilities: one, you are just fighting the river, just fearful of being taken away by the river -- taken down, taken in the flow -- just afraid, trembling, fighting against the river. Then you will be defeated because this very attitude of fear of being taken away, of this trembling mind, cannot win. The defeat has set in How long will you be able to fight the current? The whole attitude is negative, and the river is very much positive, lifelike. But you are just fear and trembling. How can you win? Sooner or later you will dissipate energy in the fight, and the current will take you away.

There is a second point, another dimension: you are not fighting the river because you are not fearful of it. The first thing: fight is created because of fear. Remember, fight means fear. Fear comes first, then you begin to fight Your fear creates fight, your fear creates the foe. So basically, fear is at the root. You are not fighting the river because you are not fearful of the

river. You are not fearful of the river because you know that this is just natural that The river flows downward. Even if you flow downward, there is no guilt. It is natural. Even if you flow downward, it is not a defeat. It is a defeat only if you fight -- then it becomes defeat. It is just natural: the river flows downward and you flow with it. You can even enjoy it. You can feel the bliss of the flowing river -- without any effort, just moving with the current, and the current takes you away. You can even conserve energy by flowing down naturally.

So the first thing: don't be fearful of a downward flow don't be fearful! Remember, it is natural, and it is better to flow with the current than to be defeated and taken away -- because then the whole thing will lose the bliss that is possible naturally. So the first thing: to be natural is not a sin. Remember, because only then can whole effort become positive; otherwise, it will be negative.

To be natural is not a sin. Of course, it is not enough -- mm? -- that is another thing. But it is not a sin. If you are flowing naturally, that is okay. As far as it goes, it is okay. It is not a sin, it is not a guilt, it is not immoral -- it is just healthy. But I say it is not enough. It is not enough because your possibilities are still more. They are not just to be healthy. You can be holy also.

So don't be in fear -- first thing. Don't be in condemnation of nature, and then the negative attitude will not be there.

Now: don't fight the current -- play with the current. You are not fighting the river really, you are just training yourself to go upward. Feel the difference: you are not fighting the river -- you are just filled with an abundance, you are just filled with energy and training the energy to go upward. Now the river is not an enemy. Rather, it is a friend, because it gives you the opportunity to go up, to play with it. Now the fight is not a fight at all. It is a game, it is a play. And the river is not your enemy, it is a situation. Life is a situation, it is not an enemy. Nature is a situation, it is not an enemy -- it is an opportunity.

So try to train your inner energy to flow upward. You are *not* really concerned with the river going downward. You are concerned with a different river of energy going upward. Your mind is basically concerned with the inner energy which can go upward.

Feel thankful for the river -- because it gives you a background, it gives you an opportunity, it helps you, it cooperates with you. You can weigh yourself only through its current. You can feel yourself only because the river is going downward. The feeling that you can go upward even when the river is flowing down gives you a very different quality of confidence -- you can go upward. And now, even if you relax and flow with the river, you *know* very well that you can go upward. Now even this downward flow with the river is not a defeat. You have known something -- something different from nature.

If you have glimpsed something different from nature even for a single moment, then you have known your potentiality. You may achieve it, you may not achieve it, but now you are not just part of the downward flow -- the upward flow is possible. Now it will depend on you. You will be the decisive factor, not the downward current. Now there is no enmity! If the river flows downward, it is okay. You need not flow, you need not fight, you need not be in fear. You can go up.

Ultimately, there is another possibility in which tantra has gone very deep. Tantra says there is a possibility when you flow downward with the river and still you flow upward. Then only your body is carried away. How can the river carry *you* away? It can carry only the body. Tantra tried to create many downward rivers. So go into the river, feel the downward flow, flow with it, and remember constantly that you are not flowing.

I was saying that by fighting with sex you may be obsessed with sex totally. There is

another possibility: even going deeply in sex, you may not be sexual at all. But that possibility opens only when your effort becomes positive. This is what I mean by positive effort *against* the current. It is not really against the current; it is for the consciousness. The current is being used just as an opportunity -- just to weigh yourself, just to find yourself out -- just to feel the upward, the downward is needed. The more forceful the current, the more forceful will be the feeling of the upward. So use nature as an opportunity, not as an enemy. Use instincts as friends, not as enemies They *are* friends. Only through your ignorance can you make them enemies. They are friends!

And when someone reaches the original source, the peak of the river from where the river comes down, one is just thankful -- thankful towards the river, grateful towards the river, because it is only through the river that he could achieve the source. So when someone reaches the peak of consciousness, one is thankful to every instinct -- because they all helped, they all created the situation, they all created the opportunity. And they were flowing in the opposite direction. So their opposite flow is not really against you; the river is not against you. You can be against the river, and if you are against the river then you will never win. The greater possibility is that you may become perverted.

So use nature to transcend it. When you see there is anger, don't fight anger directly. Weigh yourself, feel the energy, transcend the anger. Anger is there: remain silent, feel anger and feel yourself and weigh yourself -- begin to flow upward. Take it as a play. Don't be serious! Seriousness is a disease. If you take everything negatively, then you will be serious. Then everything disturbs you: "Why is there anger? Why is there greed? Why this? Why that?" Everything disturbs you and you become serious.

But our so-called saints are very serious. Really, I cannot conceive how a saint can be serious. He can only be playful. The seriousness shows he has been fighting. A soldier, of course, is bound to be serious. A saint need not be, must not be. Really, it disqualifies him from being a saint. A saint *must* be playful because nothing is against him -- everything is for him. He can use everything for himself.

When I say "effort against the current", I mean play against the current -- play! Try! See what you can do. The current is flowing downward. Can you flow upward? The anger is there. someone has insulted you, the button has been pushed. Can you remain non-angry? Just play -- play with the situation; don't be serious. The moment you become serious, you become angry, really. Anger is very serious. Be playful, laugh, and see that the anger has been put on, that the conditioned mind has been put on. The anger is boiling there. Now, swim against the current. Take it as a play, and see whether it is possible that someone has insulted you. the anger has been created in the metabolism. Can you still swim beyond it? *Don't fight it!*

That's why I say the difference is very subtle. Standing on the bank you cannot feel the difference -- unless you have been in the river and experienced both. You are standing on the bank, and someone is fighting the river and someone is just playing with the river, going upward. What difference can you see from the bank? Only one: one will be serious and the other will be playful -- nothing else.

One who is in fear, afraid, fighting, will be serious -- dead serious. How can he laugh? How can he play? If the current pushes him, he will feel defeated. The other one who is playing will not be serious at all. He can laugh: he can laugh with the river, he can laugh with the waves. And if the current pushes him down he will not feel defeated -- he will try again. He will not be serious. Rather, he will begin to love the river because it pushes. He will begin to love the river! The difference will be inner, qualitative.

Suppression is a serious disease. Transforming oneself is a play -- it is not serious at all. It is sincere, but never serious. It is authentic, but never serious. The quality of playfulness always remains there. It is the very spirit. With positivity you are creating something inside. The outward is just an opportunity; the inside creation is the thing. The emphasis is on something else. It is not on fighting the river: the emphasis is on the upward flow.

For example, I am writing something on a blackboard. I use a blackboard but I write with white chalk, because on a blackboard the white chalk becomes clear in contrast. I can write on a white wall also. The writing will be there, but it will be as if it is not because the contrast will not be there. So the blackboard is not against the white chalk. It is not the enemy: it is the friend. Only when they are against it do the white lines become more white. On a white wall they will just lose themselves, they will be nowhere.

So who is the enemy -- the white wall or the blackboard? Who is the enemy? The white wall is the enemy because you lose. The blackboard is not the enemy. Really, it is the friend. On it, the white becomes more white and clear and apparent. But when I am writing on a blackboard my emphasis, my intention is not to destroy the blackboard. Rather, my intention is to make the white lines clear. If you are trying to destroy the blackboard, then the blackboard is the enemy. See the difference: if you are trying to destroy the blackboard by whitewashing it, then you will feel the blackboard as the enemy.

You can whitewash it; then there will be a fight. But when you are writing something on it, your emphasis is not on the blackboard. Really, you never remember it, you need not remember it. It is not even in your awareness; it is only on the fringe. You write: the emphasis is on writing, not on destroying the blackboard. You remember what you are writing, and the blackboard helps. It never obstructs you.

So your emphasis must be on what you are trying to achieve, not on what you are against. If you are trying to achieve love, then be positively concerned with love, not with destroying hate. You can never destroy it! You will not be able to destroy hate. But the moment love is there, the whole energy is transformed. It begins to flow "lovewards".

Don't be negative about your energies, instincts, about anything. Be positive. And when you are positively creating something, be playful. It is *your* nature. Why fight it? *you* have created it. It is your effort. You wanted to create it, so you have created it. You have chosen it; it is your freedom. If you are angry, it is your choice -- so why be against it? It is your choice! For lives and lives you have used anger, so it is there. Why be angry against it? No one has chosen it except you. So whatsoever you are, you are your own creation.

So it is nonsense to think in terms of negativity. Rather, feel that if you can create such a madman inside of you, then, really, you are capable of many things. If you can create such a hell, why not a heaven? But don't be concerned with the hell. Be concerned with heaven *and begin to create it*. When the heaven is created you will not find the hell. It will have disappeared completely because it exists only as a negative, it exists only as an absence.

Because there is no heaven, hell has to be. Because there is no love, hate has to be. Because there is no light, darkness is there. Don't fight with darkness: create the light, be concerned with the creation of light. When the light is there, where will the darkness be then? But you can fight directly. Don't think about the light at all and begin to fight darkness directly. But no matter what you do, the darkness will never be destroyed. On the contrary, you may be destroyed in the fight. How can you fight darkness directly? It is an absence. Darkness only means that the light is not. So, please, create light.

The river is flowing downward, and you are flowing with it because you don't know the upward flow. You have not known it: that is the only thing. Once you know it, all the rivers

may flow downward, but you cannot flow downward. Then go with the river to the very sea, and you will not go downward.

It is difficult to sense the difference. That's why so much suppression is in the world. No one has taught it -- everyone has understood it. No one has taught it -- neither a Buddha nor a Mahavir nor a Jesus nor a Krishna. This is a miracle. No one has taught suppression because *no one can*. It is absolute nonsense! But everyone has suppressed and everyone is suppressing -- because the difference is so subtle that whenever transformation starts, suppression is understood.

Whenever a teacher is born who begins to talk about transformation, followers gather who begin to understand about suppression -- because it is so delicate, *so* delicate that unless you experience it there is every possibility you will misunderstand it. So try to experience it. The primary requirement: Don't be against anything -- be for! Be for something! Don't be against something!

Really, when you are against something your future is not open. Only when you are for something does your future open. When you are against something you are clinging to the past. You can never be against the future. How can you be against the future? You can only be against the past. So let it be understood in this dimension also: when you are against, you are against the past. You are fighting with death. The past is no more, so why fight it? Create the future; be *for* something. Then you become positive.

There are two types of freedom: one is from something and one is for something. A young man is fighting with his parents to be free; he goes hippie. Then for some time the fight continues. The parents cannot do anything, and they forget. Then for the first time the boy begins to feel, "What to do?" because he was only against. The freedom was *from* the parents. It was not leading anywhere; it was not for something. It was just against something.

This not only happens to individuals. It happens to races, to nations. It has happened always. You fight for freedom against the British or against someone else. Ultimately you achieve the freedom, and then you begin to feel vacant, empty. What to do? You were never fighting for something, so your force dies with your enemy.

One young man came to me, very educated. He was madly in love with a girl, but his parents were not for it. They didn't belong to the same religion. He was saying, "Whatsoever the future may be -- even if I may be just begging on the street -- I am going to marry this girl. But my father is determined to disown me if I marry this girl." His father is a rich man, so I asked the boy, "Are you really in love with the girl or just angry with your father? Decide this -- because these are two different things. Are you really in love with this girl or is this love just a by-product and you are really against your father and using this love as a fighting point, as a front?"

He hesitated. He said, "Let me think about it. I have not thought it over. But why do you ask such a question? Really, I am in love!"

I said, "You just go and think it over."

He came and said, "No, I am in love." I just looked into his eyes and he became uneasy. I remained silent and continuously looked in his eyes, stared. He became uneasy and said, "What are you doing? Do you think I am not in love?" I was still silent. He said, "What do you mean? Why are you so silent? Do you think that I am falsifying, or that I am rationalizing?" I remained silent. He said, "It seems you have read my mind. The more I think about it, the more I feel that I am against my father. But still I am going to marry."

So I said, "Okay, marry!"

After five years he committed suicide. He wrote a letter to me: "You were right. The

moment I married, the whole love died because with marriage the fight with my father ended. I was disowned and there was no relationship. Everything ended, and in that very moment the romance was not there. It was really a fight against something; it was not for something." And he said, "Now I am committing suicide because life is so boring."

Life will be a boredom if you are always against and never for. Never be against: be always for. So when I say "against the current". I mean for something, for the peak. Sex is not bad, but the peak is better. So never think in terms of bad and good. Always think in terms of good and better. Mm? The bad must be thrown out; it must not be given any status in the mind. Always think in terms of good and better and better. *Life is that.*

Once you create good and bad, soon the good will drop and bad and worse and worse will follow. So nothing is bad, but better things are possible. Always remember, and struggle for better things. Then you have a positive flow.

HOW CAN ONE KNOW WHEN ONE HAS BECOME COMPLETELY FREE OF ANIMAL INSTINCTS, ESPECIALLY FROM SENSUAL INSTINCTS?

One thing: when you really become free, when you *really* become free, you cannot even feel freedom. It is always felt against slavery. So when you really become free, you neither feel freedom nor slavery. Then you are free. If you feel freedom, it means still some slavery is there. Freedom is felt only against slavery. When you enter the real freedom, you enter an existence which is lived moment-to-moment, neither as unfree nor as free.

But the very formulation of the question carries our mind with it -- the *very* formulation: "When shall we be free?" We are against something: "When shall we be free?" And especially from sensual things. But why? The old mind, the old preachings, the morality, the religions -- they all teach that as long as there is sensuality you will never be free. They say that as long as sensuality is there you can never be free -- sensuality must go; then you will be free. That's why we ask.

Really, as far as I am concerned, sensuality will not be there but you will be more sensuous when you are really free. You will be more sensitive, and your every sense will become so cleansed that you cannot even conceive what these senses can give. But there will be no sensuality. Sensuality is something else: it is not sensuousness. Sensuality means a hankering; it means a constant obsession.

For example, one who is constantly thinking about food, he cannot meditate, he cannot pray, he cannot study. Whatsoever he is doing, the food is an obsession inside. He will go on enjoying food in his imagination. Even if he begins to think about heaven, he will think about food: "What type of food will be available in heaven?"

So such persons have said that in heaven there is a KALP-VRIKSH -- a tree under which you sit and think anything and it is supplied instantaneously, immediately. You think of food and the food is there. You think of a woman and the woman is there. You think of wine and the wine is there. It is a wish-fulfilling tree. Those who imagined this tree must have been very, very deep in sensuality. In the Koran it is said that in heaven there are rivers of wine. So whosoever has thought this must have been deeply sensual -- a hankering, such a hankering, that even in Heaven....

When Islam was developing in Arabian countries, homosexuality was just an accepted norm. So only in the Mohammedan heaven is homosexuality allowed -- in no other heaven. It is said that not only beautiful girls, but beautiful boys will be available. This is sensuality.

You cannot even conceive of heaven without your lusts.

I don't say that there will not be... I am not saying that Maybe! -- but why do you think about it? I am not concerned at all with what is there or not, but why can your mind not conceive anything except that which you are after? You have to make provisions and you have to make pre-arrangements, plannings. This is sensuality.

And this is the paradox: the more sensual you are, the less you will be sensuous, sensitive, because sensitivity is always in the present and sensuality is always in the future. So if a person is constantly thinking of food, when the food is given to him he will not be able to feel the bliss. Really, on the contrary, he will be taking food and thinking of other food. A person who is constantly thinking of sex will not be able to go deep into sex. When he is going into sex he will be thinking of other women, or other men, and then there is a vicious circle.

The less he enjoys, the more he goes after thinking, and everything becomes cerebral, mental. He eats with mind, not with the body. His sex becomes cerebral, his everything becomes cerebral. In everything his mind takes over, and mind cannot do anything except thinking. So mind goes on thinking and thinking. And, really, such a guard is created around the mind that he becomes less and less sensitive. The senses lose life, and the mind exploits everything from the senses. usurps everything. And the mind cannot do anything! It can only think -- and thinking cannot give you contentment.

So the more you feel discontent, the more you think. Then you are in a vicious circle, and ultimately you become absolutely incapable of feeling anything through the senses. This is sensuality: senses prostituted by the mind; or mind having taken all the senses into itself. This is sensuality.

A really free consciousness will not be sensual but will be sensitive -- deeply sensitive and sensuous. Really, when a Buddha sees a flower, he sees the flower in its totality, in its total beauty, in its total aliveness. The colour, the fragrance, everything, Buddha sees in its totality. He will never think again about this flower -- he will never be sensual. He will not hanker again to see it more and more, repeatedly. He will never think again about this flower -- not because he is not sensuous, but because he is totally sensuous, and he has lived this experience so deeply that there is no need to repeat.

The need to repeat comes because you cannot live any moment totally -- so you eat, and again you have to think to repeat it; you love, and you have to think to repeat it. You are less concerned with living than you are concerned with repetition. This repetitive hankering is sensuality.

A Buddha is not sensual in this sense -- he is deeply sensuous. His every sense-door is clear, transparent. He feels everything, he lives every moment totally, he loves every moment totally. And he experiences it so totally that there is no need to repeat, so he never thinks about it. He goes on and on, and every moment is so rich that there is no need to repeat any old moment. There is no need! The need is created because you are incapable of living in moments which are present. You are incapable, so you go on.

If I pass through this city and think, "No -- London is better; I must be there," it means only that I am not capable of experiencing this city. That is why the memory comes. Otherwise, if I can live in this city, there is no need. And remember that this type of mind, when it goes to London, will not be able to live there either, because this type of mind cannot live in the moment that is there. This mind will think about Tokyo, about Calcutta, about other places -- and we go on missing.

Live! So a totally free mind will not even be aware of freedom -- first thing. It will be so free that it cannot be aware of freedom and it will not be aware of any bondage. It will be

aware only of a life which is moving -- moving moment-to-moment. And this movement is unmotivated -- mm? -- that is what is meant by freedom. This movement is unmotivated! If you move with a motivation, then you are bound.

If I am saying something with some motivation, then I am not free. The motivation is my bondage. And if I am just saying it with no motivation -- not even this much: that you may understand or may not understand; not even this much: I *must* make you understand it -- then it has a freedom, unmotivated. Then it is a bliss in itself to have talked, to have said, to have expressed. It is enough! If there is no motivation beyond it, then it is a free movement. So in freedom you will not live through motivation: you will live directly, immediately. That immediate living is freedom. But there is no awareness of it because you cannot feel it. You can feel it only against some bondage.

Sensuality will not be there, but senses will be there -- and more acute, more alive. And this is as it should be. A Jesus can love more. Really, only a Jesus can love -- unmotivated. His very being is love. Senses are there -- really, for the first time, without the disturbance of the mind, they function totally. Eyes see *as* they should see. They see without any thought, they see without any prejudice. They see that which is! Nothing is projected. Ears hear that which is said with no distortion, because the mind is not there. Hands touch that which is with no desire, with no lust, with no motivation, with no longing. Hands just touch -- then touch becomes pure, total. With no disturbance, they simply touch, then touch goes deep. Then even by a hand the soul is touched; the hand becomes a passage.

Senses are there -- more purified, more acute, more authentic -- but sensuality is not there, because such a man lives so deeply that he never wants to repeat. And even if something is repeated, he never feels it is repeated -- because everything is so new!

The less you live, the more you have to substitute for it by your dreaming mind. The less you live, the more the mind has to substitute for it. The more you live, the less is the need of the mind to substitute. When you live totally, mind is not needed. When you are in love, why should the mind be needed? When you are eating, why should the mind be needed? When you are walking, why should the mind be needed?

You can move without the mind. You can eat without mind coming in, with no thought process. You can touch someone, you can kiss someone, you can embrace someone, without the thought process coming in. And then you live totally. And any moment that is lived totally, you will never long for it to be repeated, because you long only for something which has remained incomplete. The mind goes on back again and again to complete it. The mind is a very great perfectionist -- everything must be perfect! So if something is left incomplete, the mind goes back again and again.

It is just like when one of your teeth falls out and then you continuously touch the spot with your tongue to feel the absence -- the whole day long. You will be bored, but again, unaware, you will touch the absence. You know now that the tooth is not there, but why does this tongue go now constantly to the spot and it has never done so before? When the tooth was there, this tongue never touched it. Why, when the tooth was there, was the tongue not concerned at all with touching it? When the tooth is *not* there, the tongue goes on, goes on, goes on -- it becomes mad. Why? Because now the tongue feels something incomplete, some gap, and the gap calls again and again.

So with any experience lived totally, you will never go again to feel it in the mind. If you have really loved someone, there will be no memory -- memory in the sense that the mind is going constantly to it again and again. If you have not loved, then the absence is felt. You feel guilty and you feel that something has been missed, so it must be substituted -- then the

mind goes on thinking.

The freer you are, the less is the need to substitute with mental activity. And sensuality is substituting. You understand me? Sensuality is substituting something that you are missing. So when consciousness is really transformed and becomes free, there is no feeling of freedom. When consciousness is transformed and becomes holy, there is no feeling of holiness. So a real saint is one who doesn't know that he is a saint. Only sinners know that they are saints. Only sinners know!

A really good man never knows that he is good; only bad ones know they are good. How can you feel your health? Only an ill person, a diseased person, begins to think about health. When you are healthy, you are just healthy. Really, you never remember that you are healthy. You begin to feel about the body only when you are ill. So if someone goes on talking about health, be confident that he is ill.

It happens that in persons will go on creating many theories about health. Ill persons will constantly talk about health and will become experts. They will become experts! It happens daily that if you are ill and cannot get beyond your illness, sooner or later you are going to be a naturopath. If medicines are not going to help, what to do? Constant thinking and reading about health will make you a naturopath. So naturopathy is good in one way because every patient becomes a doctor. If you are *really* healthy, then there is no need! And the same applies everywhere. When you are free, you don't feel it; when you are good, you don't feel it; when you are moral you don't feel it.

And, secondly, when you are free you will live moment-to moment totally. In a general way this can be said. We can never be particular because it will depend. It will depend! For example, Mohammed married, and he married nine women. We cannot conceive the same about Mahavir; we cannot conceive the same about Buddha. Buddha was married and he left his home, but Mohammed married nine women. So if you ask a Jain, he cannot say that Mohammed is a Realized soul. How can he be? And the same is the case with Mohammedans: they cannot conceive how these "escapists", Mahavir and Buddha, were Realized souls -- because whenever someone is Realized he is not afraid. He can marry nine women, and this Buddha leaves even one, escapes. Why?

Jains cannot conceive that Krishna was an Enlightened One, because he was just so ordinary, doing such ordinary things! Love is one of the most ordinary things, and he was loving and singing and dancing and fighting and doing everything. So how can he be Enlightened? Jains think that Krishna died and went to the last hell -- the seventh hell. According to them, he is now in the seventh hell. He was the greatest sinner possible, because he seduced Arjuna for the fight, for the war. They say Arjuna was just on the verge of being a mahatma. He was just trying to escape when this fellow Krishna seduced him and forced him to fight. So in Jains' eyes this man Krishna is the most violent person -- and he is suffering in hell.

This happens, this is natural. This is natural because we become obsessed with types. Then we cannot allow another type to have Freedom, Enlightenment. This depends! The type, the individuality, goes to the very end, to the very peak. It becomes purified, but it goes on. So a Buddha may feel that now he need not be attached with any woman. It depends on him. It depends -- and he is free to move in his way. And a Mohammed may think quite differently, and he is free to move in his own way. And everyone moves, when free, in his own way. You cannot force a type.

For example, Mohammed was not at ease with music at all. He could not be; that was his type. But then Mohammedans think that anyone who loves music is just a sinner, so in a

Mohammedan mosque you cannot play music. But Mohammed loved perfume very much, so Mohammedans continue to love perfumes. A very poor Mohammedan, particularly on religious days, will also use perfume sometimes. Perfume is as sensuous as music -- even more. So what is the difference? Perfume is music for the nose and nothing else, and music is perfume for the ears and nothing else. But it depends on the type!

When Mohammed became free, totally free, Enlightened, his "type" began to move freely in his own way, and a sudden burst and a sudden feeling for perfumes came -- unmotivated. But when followers come, they create motivations. They begin to think that some reason must be there. Nothing is there as a reason. It is simply the freedom of a type.

Meera goes on singing and Chaitanya goes on dancing from village to village. Mohammed cannot conceive: "What nonsense are you doing? Dancing -- how is it related with Divine Realization?" And a Chaitanya cannot conceive how you can remain without dancing when that Friend comes. How can you remain without dancing? A Chaitanya cannot conceive how a Buddha likes sitting when the Divine has come to the door: "How can you go on sitting like that when the Light has descended? You must go dancing! You must become mad!" But these are types, and one must be aware to allow every type to be there. Then the world is richer.

So I cannot say what will happen to you when you are free -- what senses will become more purified, what senses will begin to be expressive of your soul. No one can say; it is unpredictable. One thing is certain: sensuality will not be there. Senses will be there -- more perfect, more pure -- and purer will be their experience and deeper. The sensitivity will be there, but no sensuality.

OSHO, SEEING THE DIALECTICAL FACTS OF LIFE, CAN ONE PRACTISE THE PATH OF RELAXATION AND THE PATH OF EFFORT SIMULTANEOUSLY?

No, it is not possible! You cannot practise both simultaneously because both are diametrically opposite. They lead to one point, but they don't pass through the same road, through the same route, through the same realms. They are quite diametrically opposite.

You cannot practise both, just like you cannot go to one place simultaneously following two roads. Two roads may be going. You are going to the station and two roads may be going to the station, but you cannot follow both the roads simultaneously. And if you do follow them, you will not reach the station. Both roads go, but then you will not reach because then you will have to go ten steps on one, then come back, follow the other, then come back, follow the first one. Then you can follow much, but you will reach nowhere.

Every way is a particular way. It has its own route, its own steps, its own milestones, its own symbols, its own philosophy, its own methodology, its own vehicles, its own mediums of movement. It has its own *everything*: every way is a perfect way. So never be in two minds. It will simply create confusion. Follow one! When you reach to the end, you will know that even if you had followed the other you would have reached. When you have reached, you can try just as a play to go on the other -- that's another thing -- just to know whether this road also comes or not. But don't follow two simultaneously, because every path is so scientifically perfect that this will only create disturbance.

Really, in the old days, even to know about the other path was prohibited because even that knowing creates disturbance. And our minds are so childish and so curious, and foolishly curious, that if we hear about something else or read about something else we begin to

amalgamate. And we don't know that anything which is meaningful on a particular path may be just harmful on another. So you cannot amalgamate. Some part in one car may be meaningful, useful -- so useful that the car cannot move without it. But the same part can become a hindrance in another car. Don't use it, because every part is meaningful only in its own pattern, in its own gestalt. The moment you change the whole, the part becomes a hindrance.

So much confusion has come into the religious world because now every religion is known to everybody, every path is known, and you are just confused. Now, to find a Christian is difficult, to find a Hindu is difficult, to find a Mohammedan is difficult, because everyone is just something of a Hindu, something of a Mohammedan, something of a Christian -- and that creates very much danger. It is dangerous. It may prove suicidal.

So purity of path is a basic necessity for one who has to follow. If one has just to think about it, then there is no need for any purity. You can go on thinking. But if you are to travel, then purity of the path is very essential. And you must be aware not to confuse anything and not to bring any alien, foreign element in it.

It doesn't mean that the other is wrong. It only means that the other is right only on the other's path. You need not take the other conclusion that "Only I am right and the other is wrong." The other is right in its own way. And if you have to follow another path, just go to the other's way leaving your way completely.

That is why the old religions -- and there are only two basic religions: Hindu and Jewish -- were never ready to convert anyone. And the only reason was this, that they knew a very old, very deep tradition -- that to convert is to confuse. If someone has been brought up as a Christian and you convert him into a Hindu you will just confuse him because now he *cannot* forget that which he has known. Now you cannot just wash it out. It will remain there, and on that foundation, whatsoever you give him as Hinduism will not mean the same because his old foundation will always be there. You will just confuse him, and that confusion will not make him religious, cannot make him.

So the old religions -- really, there are just two old religions, the Jewish and the Hindu, and all other religions are just branches of those -- have remained very dogmatically non-converting. The Hindu concept was disturbed by Dayananda. Because his mind was working in a political way, not in a religious one, he began to convert. But that concept has a beauty of its own. It doesn't mean that other religions are bad; it doesn't mean that others are not right. It doesn't mean anything like that. It only means that if you have been brought up in a particular concept, it is better to follow that -- follow that! It has gone deep in your bones and blood, so it is better to follow that.

But now it has become impossible, and it will never be possible now again because the old patterns have broken. Now, no one can be a Christian, no one can be a Hindu. That is not possible now, so a *new* categorization is needed. Now I don't categorize as Hindu and Mohammedan and Christian. That categorization is not possible now. It is just dead and must be thrown away. Now we must categorize every path.

For example, there are two basic divisions: the path of relaxation and the path of effort, the path of surrender and the path of will. This is a basic division. Then other divisions will follow, but these two are basic and quite diametrically opposite. The path of relaxation means surrender just here and now with no effort. If you can, you can. If you cannot, you cannot. If you can, you can. If you cannot, you CANNOT -- there is no go. The path of surrender is very simple: Surrender! If you ask how, then you are not for this path, because the "how" belongs to the other path. Mm? "How" means by what effort, by what technique: "How am I

to surrender?" If you ask, "How I am to surrender?" then you are not for the path of surrender. Then go to the other.

If you can just surrender without asking how, only then is it possible. So it seems simple, but it is very difficult, very arduous, because the "how" comes instantaneously. If I say "Surrender!" you have not even heard the word and the "how" comes up: "How?" -- then you are not for this path. Then the other path is of will, effort, endeavour. Then every "how" is supplied -- how to do it. Then there are many ways.

So surrender has only one way, and there are no branches. There cannot be. There cannot be different types of surrender. Surrender is simply surrender. There are no types. Types belong to techniques. There can be different techniques; but because there is no technique surrender remains the purest path, without any division.

Then the second: the path of will. It has many divisions. All the yogas, methods, belong to the second. The second says, "You cannot relax just now, so we will prepare you: a preparation is needed. So follow these methods, and a moment will come when you will drop."

They look difficult -- they are not! They look difficult because they say preparation, methods, years of training and discipline are necessary. So they look difficult, but they are not -- because the more time is given to you, the more simplified the process becomes. And surrender is the most difficult process because no time is allowed. They say, "Just here and now." If you can, you can. If you cannot, you cannot.

Baso, a Zen monk, would say to whosoever would come, "Surrender!" If the person asks, "How?" he would say, "Go elsewhere!" His whole life he used only two statements continuously -- never a third. He would say, "Surrender!" If you would say, "How?" he would say, "Go somewhere else!"

Sometimes some persons came who would not ask, "How?" and would surrender. But rare becomes the phenomenon! As our modern mind progresses, rare will be in what the difference is between surrender, because surrender means an innocence, a trusting mind, an absolute faith. It doesn't need effort; it needs faith. It doesn't ask for the method and the way and the bridge; it takes the jump. It doesn't ask for the steps -- it doesn't ask anything.

But the other path is of effort, tension. And many methods are possible, because to do something there are many techniques. There are many techniques for how to create the ultimate tension so that you explode. But never follow both. You cannot follow! You can just go on thinking about both. And don't confuse. Determine clearly, exactly, which is for you.

Can you trust? Are you ready without any "how" to take the jump? If not, then forget relaxation, then forget surrender, then even forget the very word -- because you cannot understand it. Then effort -- and this Upanishad is talking about effort: upward effort, a continuous arrowing of the mind towards the peak.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 1

Chapter #9

Chapter title: What can Man Offer?

23 February 1972 pm in Bombay, India

Archive code: 7202235

ShortTitle: ULTAL109

Audio: Yes

Video: No

SADAAMANSKAM ARGHYAM

MIND CONSTANTLY ARROWED TOWARDS THAT IS ARGHYAM -- THE OFFERING.

WHAT CAN man offer? What can the offering be? We can offer only that which belongs to us. That which does not belong cannot become an offering, and man has always offered that which does not belong to him at all. Man has sacrificed that which is not his at all.

Religion becomes a ritual if you offer something which is not yours. Religion becomes an authentic experience if you offer something which really belongs to you. Rituals are really methods to escape from authentic religiousness. You can find substitutes, but you are deceiving no one except yourself -- because how can you offer something which is not yours? You can sacrifice a cow, you can sacrifice a horse, you can offer properties of land, but nothing belongs to you. So, really, this is theft in the name of religion. How can you offer to the Divine that which is not yours?

So the first thing is to find out what is yours, what belongs to you. Is there anything which belongs to you? Are you the master of anything of which you can say, "This belongs to man and I offer it to the Divine"? This is one of the most difficult questions: "What belongs to man?" Nothing seems to belong. And when nothing seems to belong to you, then you can say only, "I can offer myself." But even that is not right because do you yourself belong to you? Is your being yours? Are you responsible for your being? Are you responsible to be?

Man comes from somewhere -- some unknown source. He is not responsible for his being here. Kierkegaard has said, "When I look at man, I feel that he has been thrown here." He is not even responsible for his own being; the being is grounded in the Divine. Look at it this way: can a tree say, "I offer myself to the earth"? What does it mean? It is meaningless because the tree is rooted in the earth, the tree is just a part of the earth. The tree is just earth and nothing else, so how can a tree say, "I offer myself to the earth"? It is meaningless. The tree is already a part. It is not different, so offering is not possible. So, first, you can offer something which belongs to you. Second, you can offer if there is a distance, a separateness.

The tree cannot offer itself because it is not different from the earth. Or, think of it this way: a river cannot say, "I offer myself to the sea." The river is not rooted in the sea. It is separate. But, still, the river cannot say, "I offer myself to the sea." Why? It cannot say this because it is not the river's choice. The river *has* to flow to the sea. There is no choice left.

The river is just helpless. Even if the river wants to choose not to offer, she cannot choose it; so offering is inevitable. When the offering has no choice it is meaningless.

The river cannot say, "I offer myself to the sea," because she has to come. This coming is just part of nature. The river is not coming to the sea by choice because there is no choice on the river's part. The river is just helpless, she cannot do otherwise. So a third thing: you can offer something only when you can do otherwise. If you are capable of not offering, only then do you become capable of offering. Then this is your choice.

Man is rooted just like a tree. Man *is* a tree, only with moving roots -- rooted in Being, rooted in Existence. And man is not separate: deep down there is no separation. And man is not responsible for his own being: he has to return helplessly, just like a river falling into the sea. So where is the choice? How can you offer? Your death will be a merging whether you choose it or not. Who are you? Where do you stand and where can the offering become possible?

This sutra is very deep. This sutra says:

MIND CONSTANTLY ARROWED TOWARDS THAT IS THE OFFERING.

You cannot offer yourself, but you can offer your mind. That belongs to you and that is your choice. If you do not offer it, the Divine cannot force it to be offered. You are not helpless. It is not like a river falling into the sea. Mind has a choice. You can go on denying the Divine and the Divine cannot force you. Your being is rooted in the Divine, but not your mind. You cannot deny the Divine as far as Existence is concerned. You are part of it.

You can deny the Divine as far as consciousness is concerned. You can deny so much that you can live in a consciousness in which there is nothing like the Divine. So to say, "God is" or "God is not," can be your choice. Even if there is no God you can create one, you can believe. Even if there is God you can deny, and nothing can be forced upon you. So the only choice is with the mind, the only freedom is with the mind. Your being is rooted, but your mind is free.

Of course, your mind comes out of your being, but still it is free, free in the sense that a tree is rooted in the earth -- the tree is rooted, the branch and the root, every flower is rooted -- but the fragrance of the flower can be free and can move, unrooted. So you are just a tree, but your mind is fragrance. It may be offered, it may not be offered -- it depends on you.

Man's freedom is man's mind. Animals are not free only because they do not have a choice: they are just what they are meant to be. They have no choice! They cannot go against nature. Man's mind is man's freedom. So one thing, the basic one to be understood, is that because the mind is a freedom it can become an offering. You can offer your mind, but you can resist also, you can go against also, and even God cannot force you -- that is the glory, that is the beauty of human existence. So man is the only animal who is in a certain way free. This freedom you can use or you can abuse.

"Mind constantly arrowed towards That is the offering." If your mind can be arrowed constantly, continuously towards That, you have offered yourself. But because mind has a freedom it is very difficult to tether it somewhere. The very nature of it is freedom, so the moment you try to tether it, it rebels, it becomes rebellious.

It may follow you if you are not trying, but if you try then it is bound to rebel because the very nature of mind is freedom. And the moment you try to fix it somewhere, it rebels. This is natural. You can offer the mind, but it is not easy. It is the most difficult thing to offer the mind. And when I say, "Mind means freedom," it becomes more difficult. You are trying to

put your mind against its nature.

Concentration is against mind because you are trying to narrow it down somewhere -- exclusively somewhere. But the mind is freedom, movement, a constant movement. It lives only when it moves. It *is* only when it is in movement. It is a dynamic force, so the moment you try to fix it you are trying something impossible. So what to do? The religious man has always tried to fix the mind towards the Divine; and the more he tries to fix it, the more the mind goes to the Devil.

Jesus comes to meet the Devil. The Devil is nowhere except in the effort of Jesus to be constantly arrowed towards the Divine. The Devil doesn't exist. It is just that when you force your mind to be tethered somewhere, it creates the opposite in order to move. So you must understand the law of reverse effect. With the mind, that law is foundational. Whatsoever you try to do, the reverse will be the result. The reverse, the very reverse, will be the result! So try to arrow your mind towards God, and you will come to face the Devil. The reverse will be the effect. Try to steer your mind and your mind will become anarchic, you will be encountering turmoil.

The more stillness is sought, the more unstill the mind becomes. The more you try to make it silent, the more noise it creates. The more you try to make it good, the more sins become tempting. This is the foundational law for the mind. It is as foundational with the mind as Newton's law is with physics: the law of reverse effect.

So whatsoever you are trying to force you will never achieve. You will achieve the reverse, and then a vicious circle is created. When you achieve the reverse, you begin to think that the reverse is so powerful that "I am to fight more." The more you fight, the more powerful will be the reverse, the opposite. The opposite is not. You create it only because you try to tether your mind. It is a by-product -- a by-product which comes only because you do not know the law. So what to do to offer the mind to the Divine? If you choose the Divine against something you will never be able to offer.

There is only one way: choose the Divine as the All; choose the Divine as the whole; choose the Divine everywhere in everything. Even if the Devil comes to face you, realize the Divine in it. Then you have offered -- and then the offering can be continuous, with no break, with no gap, because now no gap is possible. That's why the Upanishads don't use the word "God". They use "That", because the moment you say "God" the Devil is created. They don't use any word really: they use just a finger. They say "That, and this "That" is comprehending all -- everything everywhere. So if you can conceive of the Divine as the All, then you can offer. Otherwise the contrary will be created: you will offer to God and the offering will go to the Devil.

All the religions have faced the problem, the dichotomy -- Christianity or Judaism or Mohammedanism. All the religions born out of India have accepted the dichotomy. They have accepted the God-and-the-Devil dichotomy. So if you see the history of these religions, you will become aware of a very strange phenomenon. Jesus stands for God, but the Devil goes on tempting him also. And whatsoever Jesus stands for, his Church stands quite against it -- diametrically against. So Christianity is least concerned with Christ. Rather, Christianity is his enemy, because whatsoever the Church has done, it cannot be said that it is God's work. It can be said that it is the Devil's work. But this had to be due to the law of reverse effect.

Once you accept the dichotomy, the opposite will be the result. Christ preaches love and the Church stands for hate. Christ says, "Don't resist even evil," but the whole history of the Church is a long war. So Nietzsche is right when he says, "The first and the last Christian died on the cross" -- the last also! After Jesus there has been no Christian. But, really, St. Paul

and others are not so much responsible as they appear to be. The real responsibility goes to the ignorance concerning the law of reverse effect.

If you choose a part as Divine and a part as non-Divine or anti-Divine, then the mind will move. And the mind has its own tricks for moving. It can justify evil in the name of good; it can rationalize war for peace; it can kill and murder because of love. So the mind is very cunning and clever in moving to the opposite. And when it moves it gives you every reason to believe that "I am not moving." So if you choose God as something apart from the world or anti the world, you will never be able to offer the mind. And a partial offering is no offering: this must also be remembered.

A partial offering is mathematically wrong. It is just like a partial circle -- which is not a circle. A circle is a circle only when it is full, complete. You cannot call a partial circle a circle. It is not! Either offering is total or it is not. How Can you offer partially? That is intrinsically impossible. How can you love partially? Either you love or not. No compromise is possible. No degrees of love are possible. Either it is there or it is not there. All else is just deception.

Offering is a total phenomenon. You give up, you surrender, but you cannot say, "I surrender partly." What do you mean? A partial surrender means that you are Still the master and can even take it back. The part which has remained behind can take it back, can say no tomorrow. So a total surrender is that in which nothing has been left behind, no withholding, so you cannot go back. There is no return possible because then no one remains behind to go back. So offering is total.

But if you divide the world, if you divide the Existence into polar opposites, then you will be in a very deep dichotomy and your mind will move to the opposite. And the more you resist, the more attractive it becomes. Negatives are very attractive. When you insist so much on "don'ts", the attraction becomes unbearable. "No" is a very enchanting invitation. So whenever you try to force your mind towards something, the other -- which you are trying not to go towards -- will become inviting. And sooner or later you will be bored with the part you have chosen, and the mind will move. It always goes on moving.

The Chinese philosophy says that the "yin" goes on moving into the "yang" and the "yang" goes on moving into the "yin", and they make one circle. They are in a constant movement of one into the other. The man goes on moving into the woman and the woman goes on moving into the man, and they make one circle. And the light goes on moving into the darkness and the darkness goes on moving into the light: they make one circle. And when you are bored with the light you are attracted by darkness, and when you are bored by darkness you are attracted by light.

You go on moving between the opposites. So if your God is also a part of the opposite world, part of the logic of opposites, you will move to the other extreme. That is why the Upanishad says "That". In this "That", everything is implied, nothing is denied. The Upanishads have a very life-affirmative concept, a very life-affirmative philosophy.

Really, this is very strange: Albert Schweitzer has said that Indian philosophy is life negating, but he has really misunderstood the whole thing. In his mind, when he says "Hindu philosophy," he must have been referring to Mahavir and Buddha. But they are not really the main current -- they are just rebellious children. Hindu philosophy is not life negating. On the contrary, Albert Schweitzer is a Christian, deeply Christian, and Christian philosophy is life negating! Hindu philosophy is one of the most affirmative.

So it is good to go deep in this life affirmation; only then will you be able to understand the meaning of "That," because this is one of the most affirmative words -- not denying

anything. "Life denying" means that your God is something against life. Jains are life denying. They say that this world is sin. You must leave it, deny it, renounce it! Unless you renounce it totally you cannot achieve the Divine. So the Divine becomes something you can achieve only conditionally -- if you renounce the world.

It is a basic condition. For Buddhists also it is a basic condition: "You must renounce everything; you must choose death! Death must be the goal, not life! You must struggle not to be born again! Life is not of any value: it is of non-value. It exists only because of your sins. It is a punishment, and you must somehow go out of it, not be born again." But this is not the Hindu concept. The Upanishads are not concerned with this at all.

The same life denying attitude is of Christianity also: "Life is sin and man is born in sin." History begins in sin. Adam has been expelled from heaven because he has sinned. He has disobeyed, and now we are born out of the sin. That's why Christians have been insisting that Jesus was not born out of sex, that he was born out of a virgin girl: because if you are born out of sex you are born out of sin, and at least Jesus must not be born out of sin. So everyone is born in sin; mankind lives in sin. So a deep renunciation is needed to reach the Divine.

Christianity is also death-oriented. That's why the cross became so meaningful. Otherwise, the cross should not be so meaningful. It is a symbol of death. Hindus cannot conceive how the cross can become a symbol, and even Jesus became so significant and important because he was crucified. If you don't crucify Jesus and he is just ordinary, Christianity would not be born.

Really, those who were death-oriented became attracted towards Christ because he was crucified. The death of Jesus became the most significant historic moment. So, really, Christianity was born because Jews foolishly crucified Jesus. If he had not been crucified, there would be no Christianity. So Nietzsche is again right. He says Christianity is not really Christianity but is "cross-ianity" -- crossoriented.

Schweitzer says that Hindus are life negating. He is wrong because he is thinking about Buddha. He was as much Hindu as Jesus Christ was Jewish, but just this much. He was born a Hindu as Jesus Christ was born a Jew. But Hindus really have their essence in the Upanishads which precede Buddha, and Buddha has said nothing which is not in the Upanishads. They are of life affirmation, total life affirmation. And what do I mean when I say total life affirmation? You cannot conceive of Jesus dancing, you cannot conceive of Jesus singing, you cannot conceive of Buddha dancing or singing or loving, you cannot conceive of Mahavir fighting. You cannot! Only Krishna can be conceived of as laughing, dancing, loving, even standing in a war, with no denial -- with *no* denial!

The whole life is Divine. So to choose God is not to renounce the world. To choose God means to choose God *through* the world. That is the meaning of That. And when you choose God through the world, not against the world, then there is no opposite. Only then can you escape from the law of reverse effect. When you choose That through this, there is no opposition, there is no polarity. And when there is no polarity, mind has no layer in which to move. It is not that it is tethered, it is not that it is in bondage, it is not that you have forced it here. Now there is no possibility for it to move. The opposite is not.

Understand it clearly: when the opposite is not, the mind is free to move, yet it moves not -- because where can it move? If it can move, it will move, because movement is its nature. And if you create dichotomy, then it will move to the opposite, it will rebel against you. If there is no duality, if the opposite is not and if you have comprehended the opposite also in the Divine, then where can the mind move? Then wheresoever it moves, it moves only to That. So if Krishna is dancing with a girl, he is dancing with the Divine because the girl is not

excluded, the Divine is not against the girl. If the Divine is against the girl, then the girl will become the Devil. Then the girl will tempt, and there is bound to be difficulty.

Christ cannot laugh: he lives in a constant tension. Krishna can laugh because there is no tension at all. When everything is Divine and when through all he has been giving the offering, then where is the tension? Then there is no need. Then Krishna can be at ease anywhere. Even in hell he can be at ease because even hell is That.

I was telling you that Jains have put Krishna into hell because he was responsible for the Mahabharat, the great Indian war. They have put him into the seventh hell -- the deepest hell for the greatest sinners. But when I close my eyes and begin to think of him in hell, I cannot conceive of him except as dancing. He must be dancing there. Even if he is there he must be dancing, because even hell is That. And he will not be in any hurry and he will not pray to be put out of hell. He will make no effort, because the That is present everywhere. You need not go anywhere and you need not think of conditions, that only in certain conditions He is possible.

He is possible in every condition. He is unconditionally present. When you can conceive of the Divine as being unconditionally present, then it becomes the That of the Upanishads. Then even in poison It is; then even in death It is; then even in suffering It is. And you cannot move anywhere. Or, wherever you move, you move to That. So That must be conceived of through this; otherwise the law of reverse effect will begin to work. And every religious person has to fall into this law of reverse effect.

Unless you understand totally, unless you begin to feel that this law is working everywhere, never create any polar opposites in the mind -- otherwise you will be a victim of your own nonsense. the moment you choose something as opposite to something, you have created the ditch where you will fall. You will be hypnotized by the opposite.

We are all hypnotized by the opposite. A society becomes sexual if you say that sex is sin. Then sex becomes romantic; it begins to have a mysterious aura around it. A very simple fact of life, only because it is called sin, becomes the ditch -- only because it is called sin! Call anything sin, and you have created a point by which you will be hypnotized. Auto-hypnosis is now possible. Deny something, and you are in the trap.

Lao Tzu says, "An inch's distinction between earth and heaven, and everything is set apart. An inch's distinction between good and bad, and everything is set apart."

No distinction should be made. That's why religion is not morality. Religion is beyond it because morality cannot exist without distinctions, and religion cannot exist with distinctions. Morality cannot exist without creating the other. It depends on polar divisions -- good and evil, and so on. So God and the Devil are not part of religion but of morality. The concept of God as opposite to evil, the Devil, Satan, is not really a religious concept. It is a moral concept.

When for the first time the Upanishads were translated into Western languages, the scholars were at a loss because they were not anything like the Ten Commandments which say. "Do this, don't do that!" There was nothing like the Ten Commandments, and without the Ten Commandments, how can a religion be? How? The West couldn't conceive of it. So these books were "not really religious", because there was no discussion about what is good and what is bad and what should be done and what should not be done.

They were right in a way. If we conceive of religion as a morality, then the Upanishads are not religious. But if the Upanishads are not religious, then nothing is religious -- because morality is just a convenience, and morality can differ from nation to nation, from race to race, from geography to geography, from history to history. It *will* differ, because every race,

every nation, creates its own conveniences Religion is not a convenience, and it cannot differ from race to race. It is not dependent on geography and not dependent on history. Really, it is not dependent on human thinking. It is dependent on the very nature of Reality. So religion is, in a way, eternal.

Moralities are always temporal. They belong to some age and to some time and to some space -- then they change. When time changes, they change. But religion is eternal because it is the very nature of Reality. It is not dependent on your thinking. This religion belongs to non-polar Reality. But Reality is divided into polarities. As we see it, it is divided, because the very seeing divides it, just like a ray of light, a ray of sun, is divided through a prism.

When the mind looks at things, they are divided into polarities. The moment we look we have divided. We cannot remain in undivided Reality for a single moment. I see you and I have divided: beautiful-ugly, good-bad, white-black, mine-not mine. The moment I see you, division sets in. The mind works as a prism, and the prism divides Reality. And if you go on choosing, then you will be a victim of your mind. The good and bad are divided as such by the mind.

Don't choose the good against the bad; otherwise you will ultimately fall into the bad against the good. Choose good *through* bad; know bad through good. They are one: feel this undivided oneness. See life through death; see death through life: not as opposites, but as one -- as two ends of one thing. This is what is meant by That. And the sutra says, "Mind constantly arrowed towards That is the offering."

Mind must be flowing towards That constantly, continuously, without any gap. How can the mind flow if you make your God separate from the world? You will have to eat and then you will forget: you will forget your God. You will have to sleep, and then you will forget: you will forget your God. You will have to do many, many things, and God will be coming constantly as a conflict. So a religion which lives with a God against the world creates much anguish, and so-called religious persons are not constantly arrowed towards God, but are just constantly arrowed -- tense. They live in anguish. Everything becomes against God, so anguish is bound to be there. How can they laugh? How can they sing? Everything comes in between. Wherever they go to find God, something comes as a hindrance.

The whole world becomes inimical. Friends are not friends. They come in between, they become enemies. Love becomes poison because it comes in between. Everything goes on coming in the way. You are hindered from everywhere How can you live in peace? You cannot. Even a very ordinary man, a worldly man, can live in more peace than you. If your God is something opposite to the world, you cannot live in peace. You will be in a constant torture.

Of course, when the torture is self-imposed, the ego is fulfilled and strengthened so you can enjoy it. And when someone begins to enjoy his own imposed tortures, he is mad, insane. Now he is not in his senses. So you may become a martyr to your own nonsense, and you can even be worshipped by others because there are persons who feel very happy when someone tortures himself. They enjoy it. They are sadists and you begin to be a masochist. You torture yourself. You can torture yourself continuously, and you *will* torture yourself when the whole world is against God. Then the life is bound to be a constant torture. Everything is sin, and everything will create guilt and fear and anxiety, and you will be constantly in a chaos.

You will torture yourself and become a masochist. And whenever there is a masochist, sadists will come around and worship. There are people who feel good when someone is suffering. They would like to make you suffer, but you have even saved them the trouble: you are torturing yourself. They feel very good. So out of one hundred, ninety-nine so-called

saints are just ill, existentially diseased: they are masochists. You can worship them, but they will lead you into a hell. And this is not religion at all. Religion is basically to create an ecstatic life, a life which is a benediction, which is absolute bliss. So how is this anxiety and bliss related? They are poles apart.

The Upanishads say, "Offer your mind to That through this, through everything." Don't create any hindrance, don't create the opposite. Whatsoever is, is That. And, really, a miracle happens. When I say see good through the evil, evil disappears. When I say see That through this, this disappears. It becomes transparent and only That remains. The world is not there, but we are not yet capable of knowing the That which is there.

The world disappears. That's why Shankara could say it is an illusion. By illusion or by *maya* it is not meant that the world is not. Only this much is meant: that the world is not a reality, but only a transparency. If you can look deep, the Brahma is revealed and the world disappears.

If you cannot see That, then the world becomes very much real. This reality comes because you cannot find the Real. The moment you find the Real, the world disappears. That doesn't mean there will not be houses and there will not be nations and there will not be roads; this is not what is meant. When Shankara says that the world is an illusion and it disappears when That is revealed, it is not meant that it will disappear like a dream -- no! It will disappear in a very different sense.

It will disappear when the hidden is revealed, when the Total is revealed. The gestalt changes, the whole gestalt changes. In a new pattern you begin to look differently. The same tree for a woodcutter is one thing, and the pattern, the gestalt for a painter is something else. For a woodcutter it may not be green at all because he is concerned with the wood, with the texture of the wood -- whether the wood can be used in furniture or not. This mind has a gestalt; in that gestalt, in that pattern, the tree may not be green at all. He may not have seen the greenness of it.

A painter is standing nearby. For him the tree is green, and I wonder whether you know or not that when a painter looks at a tree it is not just green, because there are a thousand types of greens. When you look ordinarily, every tree is green, but no two greens resemble each other. Two greens are two colours. Every green has its own greenness. So for a painter, it is not simply green. It is green A, green B, green C -- many shades, many individualities.

A lover who is sad, who has lost his beloved, may not look at the tree at all -- the green may look very sad and will have a different colour and shades. He cannot feel the texture, or it may even be that he will remember the body of his beloved, not the texture of the tree. And a child playing there and an old man dying there -- are they looking at one reality? Their gestalts are different. A different tree evolves, a different tree is there.

Is it not possible for a Shankara not to see the tree at all but only the That? Not the texture of the tree, not the greenness of the tree, not the sadness of the lover, not the play of the child, not the sorrow of the dying man -- nothing? Is it not possible for a Shankara not to see the tree at all, but only the That? Then the tree becomes transparent. In a new gestalt the tree disappears and the Brahma is revealed. This is what is meant when I say look, find out, penetrate everywhere for That. And when you begin to feel That everywhere, your mind cannot move -- the opposite is not.

Then the offering -- only then! Then you have been, then you have given. You cannot give yourself. You can give only your mind because you can take away your mind. You are in That, but your mind is not. It can be! And you are free: the choice is yours. So you will be responsible -- no one else. The responsibility is yours, so to be religious or not is your

decision. Don't go into unnecessary things -- whether God is or not. It is your decision! It is meaningless to go on discussing whether God is or is not: it is your choice. You can say He is not, but by saying that you are denying a greater Reality and the opening towards it. You can say *he is*, and, by saying that, you are open to a greater Reality.

This cannot be proven -- whether He is or not. This cannot be proven as a scientific fact, because if it is proven then there will be no freedom. Then offering will be impossible. If it becomes a fact, as secular as any, if it becomes a fact like the moon or the sun or the earth, if it becomes a common, objective fact, then you will not be free to choose. So God can never become a scientific fact, and it cannot be proven whether He is or not. Only this much can be said: if you choose Him you become different; if you don't choose Him you will be different again. If you don't choose Him you will create a hell for yourself; if you choose Him, then you can create an ecstatic existence.

He is irrelevant. It is your choice that counts. Whether God is or is not is meaningless. It is not even worth discussing. The basic, relevant thing is that if you choose you become different, if you don't choose you are again different. And it depends on you! It depends on you whether you want an existence which is just a trembling and a fear, just an anguish and death, just a long suffering -- or a bliss, a moment-to-moment opening into greater and greater bliss. So it is not a question of whether God is or not. It is a question whether you want to be transformed and transported into another Existence or not. And it will always be your choice.

If the whole world says God is and I deny, I can deny and it cannot be forced on me. That's why it is an offering. It is an offering! You can offer; you can withhold. You are offered already, so that is not the question. But your mind is not offered, and this is the riddle: that you live in That, but you suffer. You are in That, but you suffer. Why? Because your mind is not in That. And, really, your mind suffers -- not you. You have never suffered, you cannot suffer. *You* have never died, you cannot die. But your mind suffers, your mind dies and is born, and it dies and suffers and goes on suffering. This mind is an "overgrowth". Offer it to That and you will come to the point where you have always been. You will come to realize that which is your nature.

Buddha was asked, "What have you achieved?" When he had achieved Nirvana, achieved Enlightenment, he was asked, "What have you achieved?" Buddha said, "I have not achieved anything, only that which was always with me. Rather, on the contrary, I have lost something. I have not achieved anything. I have lost the mind that was with me, and I have achieved That which was always with me, but because of that mind I could not penetrate to it, could not see it."

It is our choice. The screen on Reality is our choice. The covering on Reality is the mind. This life of misery is our decision, and no one else is responsible. And you can continue for lives together. You *have* continued, and you can continue still for lives together. And no one can break through and no one can pull you out, because that is your freedom. Only you can jump out of it, and you can jump the moment you decide. So don't think in the terms that "Because I have lived for so many lives in this ignorance, how can I jump in a moment? When I have lived for so many, many lives in ignorance, how can I?" *You* can jump in a moment because all these lives were your decision. Change the decision and the whole thing changes.

It is just like this: if in this room for years together there has been darkness, will you say: "How can we light a candle this very moment? The darkness has been so long! For years it has been here, so how can a candle burned at this moment dispel it? We will have to struggle

for years and years, and the candle will have to struggle for years and years. Only then can the darkness be dispelled, because the darkness has a past, a history. It is long, deep-rooted."

But put on the flame and the darkness is not there. Darkness really has no time: it has only duration. But by "duration" I mean that it is not piled one upon another, so it cannot become thick. So one moment's darkness is as thick as one year's or one century's. It cannot be any more thick. It cannot be piled one upon another; it is not being piled up every moment. It cannot become thick and dense so that candlelight cannot penetrate it. It remains the same. It has only duration -- a simple duration without any thickness being gathered.

Ignorance is just like darkness -- a duration. You can be in it for centuries, for millennia, and in a single moment's decision it is not there. It is just like light. The moment light is present the darkness is not there. And the darkness cannot say, "This is not as it should be. I have been here for many, many centuries and this is not good. I have a hold on this place and I have the possession; I have been in possession."

Nothing can be said. When the light is there, darkness simply drops. Just like this comes the Enlightenment, comes the offering. You can offer any moment -- you decide. But the offer must be total, and it can be total only if you do not divide Reality. Affirm life as Divine; affirm both the polar opposites as That. Then, if you move or don't move, you cannot go anywhere. Or, anywhere you go you will encounter That. This is a continuously arrowed mind, and this the Upanishads say is the only offering. All else is just false substitutes.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 1

Chapter #10

Chapter title: The Secret of Totality

24 February 1972 pm in Bombay, India

Archive code: 7202245

ShortTitle: ULTAL110

Audio: Yes

Video: No

OSHO, IN REFERENCE TO THE SUBJECT OF OFFERING TO THE DIVINE, PLEASE EXPLAIN WHAT IS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF WILL AND SURRENDER? WHAT ARE THE SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN WILL AND SURRENDER?

THE END is always the same, but the beginning differs, and all the differences belong always to the beginning. The nearer you reach, the less is the difference between paths.

In the beginning will and surrender are diametrically opposed. Surrender means absolute will-lessness. You have no will of your own, you feel helpless, you feel you cannot do anything. You are so totally helpless that you cannot even say that will exists; the very concept of will is illusory. You have no will. Rather, on the contrary, you have destiny, not will, so you can only surrender. It is not that you surrender: rather, it is that you cannot do anything else.

So surrender is not an act. Rather, it is a recognition. It is not an act! How can surrender be an act? How can you surrender? If *you* surrender, then how will you call it surrender when you remain the master? If *you* surrender, then you remain the "willer", the surrender has been willed, and these two things are diametrically opposed. You cannot will surrender. So surrender is not an act; rather, it is a recognition -- the recognition of the phenomenon of will-lessness.

There is no will, so you cannot will. You cannot do anything. Everything is just happening. You have happened, and all else that has followed has just been a happening. To feel this, to know this, is a recognition. Suddenly you become aware of the fact that there is no will in you. With this recognition ego disappears, because the ego can exist only if there is will.

So ego means the totality of willed acts. If there is will, then you can be. If there is no will, you disappear. Then you are just a wave in a great infinite ocean -- and you cannot will anything. You are as a happening; you will not be as a happening. What can a wave do in an infinite ocean? It has been "waved" by the ocean. It is not: it only appears to be.

If you feel this and this feeling is a deep search, digging down deep in yourself -- is there any will? -- then you find you are just a dead leaf blown by the wind. So sometimes you go

north and sometimes you go south, and the dead leaf may begin to think that it is going south -- only the wind is blowing and the dead leaf following. If you go deep down in yourself you will become aware of a total will-lessness. The recognition of it is surrender. It is not an act. And if you surrender, if the surrender happens, there is no need to offer. You cannot!

So on the path of surrender, really, offering is not possible, because offering is really based on will: *you* offer, *you* are there. On the path of surrender offering happens, but the surrenderer never knows. He cannot know; he cannot say, "I have offered my mind to the Divine." Really, he cannot speak in terms of acts; he can only speak in terms of happenings. So at the most he can say. "The offering has happened."

Without a will you cannot have an ego and without an ego you cannot talk of anything as an act. So "happening" is the phenomenon on the path of surrender. Surrender itself is a happening.

But on the path of will there is a different process. The moment I say "the path of will", the will is taken for granted. You do something. This is a fact on the path of will, taken for granted. It is never questioned, because those who follow the path of will say that even to question a thing is to accept will. Even to question a thing means the will is there. To question is an act, to answer is an act, to doubt is an act, to say no is an act. So the will cannot be questioned. On the path of will, the will cannot be questioned. That is a basic hypothesis.

On the path of surrender, will-lessness is the basic hypothesis. You cannot question that. So this must be understood: on every path something is a hypothesis. It is bound to be, because you have to begin somewhere and you have to begin in ignorance. Because of these two factors a hypothesis is needed. So even in science you begin with a hypothesis -- something assumed which cannot be questioned -- and if you question it the whole edifice falls down.

For example, one of the most accurate, scientific dimensions is geometry, but you begin with a hypothesis. You begin with something taken as an assumption which can neither be proved nor disproved, because only that thing can be disproved which can be proved. So to begin with, you take something in ignorance, in faith. So, really, science is not as scientific as it looks. If you go back to the beginning every science begins with a hypothesis, and if you question the hypothesis no answer is possible. And this is as it should be because you cannot begin from nowhere.

Look at it in this way: if I come to a strange city and I ask someone where the person A lives, he may say, "A is a neighbour of B." But I say, "This is not an answer at all because I do not know B either. So where does B live?" Then he says, "B is a neighbour of C." But I say, "I am in a strange land. I don't know anything about C or D or E, so please tell me in such a way that I can understand. Everything is unknown to me, so from where to begin?"

If he says, "D, E, F, G," they are all hypothetical. So from where to begin? A beginning can only be possible if I assume one thing as known which is not really known; otherwise no answer is possible. And this is the situation, this is how we are in this world: everything is unknown, so from where to begin? If you say we *must* begin with knowledge, then how can you begin? When everything is unknown, how can you begin with something as a known fact? Then you cannot begin. And if you begin with an unknown fact, then too you cannot begin.

A hypothesis means an unknown fact taken in faith as known. A hypothesis means an unknown fact knowingly taken as known. Then you can begin. So a hypothesis cannot be questioned -- nowhere, not even in mathematics.

So on the path of will, will is the hypothesis, and on the path of surrender, will-lessness is

the hypothesis. So if one path appeals to you, you will not be able to comprehend the other, because both have opposite hypotheses. If will-lessness appeals to you, then will does not have any appeal. Then it is absurd. And if will appeals to you, then surrender is meaningless.

With will, it is taken for granted that you can do, so now the question is -- what to do? You can do something which leads you away from the Divine and you can do something which leads you nearer to Him. And *you* are responsible -- I have discussed that yesterday. How can you will, by and by, to be near and, ultimately, totally with That? But remember this fact: that will is taken as a hypothesis. Once you take it as a hypothesis, you go on willing, ultimately you will totally -- that is, your mind is arrowed *totally* towards That -- in that total tension, on that climax and peak, will dissolves, because perfection is death. The moment anything is perfect it dies.

That is why Lao Tzu says, "Never be perfect. Stop half way -- never go to the end!" If you go to the end, success will become failure and life will become death. If you go to the very end, love will turn into hate, friendship will be reduced to enmity -- because perfection means death. And when something dies, it dies into the polar opposite.

When will is perfect, when mind is wholly arrowed, will dies, the will disappears -- because perfection is the point of evaporation, just like water evaporates at a hundred degrees heat. The hundred-degree limit is the perfection. As far as water is concerned, the heat has come to the peak. Now if heat continues to be, water will not be there. And if water wants to be there, then heat must not come up to the peak. So when you are a hundred percent will, you are on the verge of explosion, you will die, your will will die. The very phenomenon of will disappears. And when will disappears, you come to the same point where one who begins with will-lessness comes. Now it is will-lessness.

So either zero or perfection: both go to the same end. It will depend on you, on your type of mind. If you can conceive of will-lessness, then there is no question. But that is difficult -- not only difficult: in a certain way it is impossible. It is inconceivable. It happens, sometimes it happens. But that happening also has a long, long effort of will. Many, many lives lived according to the will give you the experience that you have been dreaming of. One who has willed for a long time and yet reaches nowhere may come to a point where suddenly he becomes aware that he is working with something which is not.

A Buddha, for example: he reaches the Ultimate through will-lessness. But he worked very arduously on the path of will for six years in this life. He went to every teacher, inquired about every path, endeavoured his best, tried everything that was taught and said. He did everything that a human being can do, and with every teacher he worked hard. No teacher was able to say, "You are not achieving because you are not working," because he was working even more than the teacher. So every teacher had to say to him, "I cannot say that you are not working -- you are working hard, impossibly hard -- but now this is all I can teach you. You must go somewhere else."

So he went around to every teacher, worked on every method. And Bihar was a very potential place in those times. Only twice have such great peaks happened. Once it was in Athens, in the Greek civilization. Athens was a very potential city, and a very potential situation happened in Athens. And another time was in Bihar: it happened that Bihar became the peak of all that mind can do. And in Bihar, in Buddha's time, every method had been evolved and every method had its own teacher, its own Master And Buddha worked with every one. He worked so hard and so sincerely that every teacher had to ask him to leave, because he had worked totally and nothing was coming out.

Really, he was not the man meant for the path of will. Mahavir, a contemporary of

Buddha, reached through the path of will and achieved. But Buddha could not achieve. After working hard in every way, in a sudden moment of helplessness he became frustrated. He felt helpless. He had done everything and nothing was achieved, and he remained the same with no transformation. A total frustration set in, and one day he left everything.

Previously, he had left the world: that was the first renunciation. But the second one, which is not mentioned in the scriptures, was greater. The Buddhists don't talk about it. A second, greater renunciation happened: after six years of tortuous effort, Buddha left the path of will. He said, "I feel helpless -- and it seems that nothing is possible, nothing can be done, so I leave all efforts."

That was a full-moon night and he was sitting under a tree. The world he had left; now all religions, all philosophies, all techniques, he left on that evening. He relaxed under the tree. For the first time he could relax after lives and lives -- because somehow or other we are always working, doing, achieving. But on that evening there was no achieving mind in him. He was so totally helpless that time ceased, future dropped, desires became meaningless. Effort was not possible; will was not found at all.

So he was really dead -- psychologically dead. He was alive only in the sense that a tree is alive -- with no desires, with no future, with no possibility. He was just like the tree he was lying under. Conceive of it. Try to conceive of it! If there are no desires and no future and no morning to follow, and nothing is to be achieved and everything has been just absurd, and the thought that "I cannot do" penetrates deep, then what is the difference between you and the tree? No difference! He was as relaxed as the tree. He was as relaxed as the river flowing by.

He slept. This sleep was strange. There was not even a dream, because dreams belong to desires, effort, will. He slept as trees sleep. The sleep was total. It was just like death -- no movement of the mind, no motivation inside. Everything stopped. Time stopped.

In the morning at five o'clock he opened his eyes. Rather, it would be good to say that eyes opened, because there was no motivation. As the eyes dropped in the evening, in the morning they opened. Refreshed by the night, refreshed by relaxation, refreshed by a deep desirelessness, Buddha opened his eyes. The last star was disappearing in the sky, and it is said that just by seeing the last star disappear Buddha became Awakened. He Realized!

What happened? It was because there was no effort; effort had ceased. There was not even desire. Now there was not even frustration -- because frustration is part of desire and expectation. If *really* expectations cease, there is no frustration. He was not asking, he was not praying, he was not meditating, he was *not doing* at all. He was just there -- empty. When the last star disappeared, something disappeared in him also. He became just space, he became just nothingness. This is surrender, with no feeling of surrender -- because who is to surrender to whom? But this also happened as a culminating peak of long efforts.

This is what I mean to say: one has to begin with will. Begin with will! If you are the type who can reach to perfect will, you will just disappear from that peak. If you are *not* the type then you will reach a perfection of frustration, and from that peace of frustration you will disappear. If the first is the case, will will be known as the path; if the second is the case, then surrender.

But begin with will. You cannot begin with surrender, because surrender cannot have any beginning. Action can have a beginning -- but how can a happening have a beginning? You can begin with action; you cannot begin with happening -- that is the difference. You can begin with something to do, but how can you begin with surrender?

So begin with will and put your whole being into it. Only then will you be able to know whether this path can work for you or not. If it can work, then it is okay. Then you reach to

the most perfect ego. And when the ego is perfect the bubble bursts. Or, if you are not of that type, then you will go round and round and round and round... and frustration and frustration. Then you reach another peak -- the peak of frustration -- and surrender happens.

So even for surrender don't think that you have not to do any thing -- remember this! Don't think -- because mind is very cunning and the mind can say. "Surrender is our way. That means I am not going to do anything. Surrender is my way!" This is a cunning deception. If surrender is your way, then surrender can happen this very moment -- because surrender needs no time. There is no tomorrow necessary for it. If you say, "Surrender is my way," then don't wait for tomorrow, because surrender can come just here and now. No effort is needed in surrender so no time is necessary.

If it is not coming just this moment, then know very well surrender is not your way. Mind is deceiving; mind is just trying to postpone effort. And mind can do everything. Mind can rationalize: "There is no need to will because there is no will, so I am ready to be on the path of will lessness." But remember well that your "readiness" will not do. Your readiness is not really a readiness: your preparedness is not really a qualification for surrender. Your total helplessness is the qualification. Really, are you totally helpless? Have you felt it, that nothing can be done, if you feel it, then surrender can happen this very moment.

Surrender cannot be postponed; will can be postponed. So with will you can take time, lives, and you can go on working slowly. But with surrender there is no go, and you cannot think of the future -- future is not allowed. So if you say, "Surrender is my way and someday it will happen," you are deceiving yourself. If surrender is your way, then surrender would have happened already.

Someone asked Mozart, "Who is your teacher? From whom have you learned your music?"

Mozart said, "No one is my teacher. I have learned it myself, alone."

So the questioner said, "Then tell me, can I also learn it myself?"

Mozart said, "But I never asked this question to anybody. Even to know this you have come to ask me, so it will be difficult for you to learn music by yourself. Even *this* you have to ask someone else -- whether you can learn music without any teacher. A teacher is even needed to decide this! So you will not be able."

The man persisted. He said, "Why? When you are able, why am I not?"

Mozart said, "If you were capable of it you would have done it already."

So if surrender can happen and if you are really ready for it, it would have happened. You cannot choose it. Choose will, because with choice will has an affinity. With surrender choice has no affinity. Choice needs will. So choose will, work hard. And there are only two types. Either you succeed or you fail; but work so hard that if you succeed you succeed totally, or if you fail you fail totally, and that totality will decide.

Mild efforts and mediocre efforts lead nowhere, because you can never decide what your type is with mediocre efforts. With mild, lukewarm efforts you can never decide what your type is. You can never know. Work hard! Either succeed *totally* or fail totally. Both the ways you will reach the same point. If you succeed totally, then will disappears. Being perfect, it dies. If you totally fail, then will-lessness becomes a recognition and surrender follows.

All efforts are on paths of the will. When someone tries with his whole heart and fails, then the other path opens. It is a sudden path! It is like an emergency door. In any air crash you have emergency doors. You may not even be aware of them. You need not be. Ordinarily, you open, you enter and you come out of the common, usual door. The emergency door opens only when there is an emergency and total failure. Now the usual door

will not do.

Surrender is an emergency door. You begin with the usual -- the will. When will fails totally, the emergency door opens and you are out of it. And if you succeed, then there is no need for the emergency door to be opened. You may not even become aware of it. You may reach your destination without the awareness that there was a door, an emergency door, which could have opened any moment.

So you cannot begin with surrender -- no one can. Everyone has to begin with will. The only point to remember is: be total in it so that you can decide either way.

OSHO, YOU HAVE OFTEN DESCRIBED MIND AS A COLLECTION OF PAST EXPERIENCES AND MEMORIES WHICH ARE ALL DEAD. EVEN ITS APPARENT VITALITY IS NOT ITS OWN; IT IS SUPPLIED FROM THE SOURCE OF THE BEING. LAST NIGHT YOU SAID THAT MIND WAS THE ONLY THING WHICH ONE CAN OFFER TO GOD. BUT IS IT WORTH OFFERING?

Three points to be understood. First, mind has two meanings: one -- the content; another -- the container. When I say "content", I mean thoughts, memories, the dead past, the accumulation of it. But that is only the content. If the whole content is thrown out, then the container remains. That container you can offer. These thoughts, memories, the past, are really worthless, not worth offering -- but the container is. Mind has two meanings, so whenever mind is written with a capital M it means "the container". That container you can offer, and that is the meaning of the sutra: "The mind constantly arrowed towards That" -- -the container.

"Constantly arrowed towards That" means *now the container has no other contents than that* -- no thought, no memory, no past, no desires, no future, nothing. Now the mind as container has only one content -- That. This is the offering.

These contents are really dead, because your mind absorbs them only when they are dead. For example, your mind either moves in the past or in the future. When it moves in the past, it moves among the dead -- everything has died, nothing is alive. The past is nowhere except in your memory.

Where is the past? It is nowhere! You cannot find it anywhere. It is only in your memory. If I have some memory that is private, secret to me, and if it is just *my* memory and no one knows about it, then if I die, where will that memory be? It will not be anywhere. What will be the difference? Whether it ever was or not -- what will be the difference? Whether it ever existed or not, there will be no difference.

The dead past is only in the memory. It is nowhere else. And because of this past, future becomes projected. Future is there only because of past. I loved you yesterday, so I want to love you tomorrow. I want to repeat the experience. I heard your song, so I want to hear it again, I want to repeat. The past wants to repeat itself, the dead wants to be born again, so the future is created.

These are the contents of the mind -- past and future. If both these contents drop and your mind becomes just vacant, thoughtless, contentless, then you are just here and now, in the present, with no past, with no future. And here and now, That is present. In everything, simultaneously, That is present. When your mind is not, I mean when your past and future are not, you become aware of That. And in that awareness the experience of the That is the only content. This is what is meant by "Mind constantly arrowed is the offering": nothing should

be a content of the mind except the universal Existence.

When I say "offer the mind", I mean the container -- because you can offer the contents, but they are meaningless, they are dead. When you offer the container -- the *living* mind, the living capacity to know, the living capacity to be -- when you offer that, it *is* an offering. And it is not ordinary: it is rare because it is arduous. And it is worth offering. And whenever there is a happening, whenever a Buddha or a Krishna or a Christ offers himself, offers the mind to the Divine, it is not only that a Buddha or a Jesus is enriched: the Divine is also enriched.

This will be very difficult to understand. When a Buddha is offered to the Divine, the Divine is enriched also -- because even in Buddha the Divine flowers, even in Buddha the Divine reaches to a peak. So the Divine is not something set apart. It is not something which is not in us. So offering is not something made to someone else. It is to the common pool of consciousness, it is to the common Existence, the common Being. So when a Buddha is offered, Buddha is enriched because Buddha becomes the Total. But the Total is also enriched, because through Buddha a peak has been touched.

The Divine lives through you, so when *you* fall the Divine falls, when you rise the Divine rises, when you laugh the Divine laughs, when you weep the Divine weeps -- because He is *not* something set apart. He is not an observer sitting far off in heaven just looking. He is in you. So every act, every gesture is His. So whatsoever is done, is done with Him, through Him, by Him, to Him.

Stories are there. They are beautiful, they are poetic, and they show much. It is said that when Buddha achieved Enlightenment the whole universe became blissful: flowers were showered from the sky, deities began to dance around Him, Indra himself -- the king of all the DEVAS -- came down with folded palms. He surrendered at Buddha's feet. Trees began to flower out of season; birds began to sing out of season. The whole Existence became a celebration.

This is poetic. It has never happened like that, but in a deep sense it *has* happened. And it is symbolic -- because it is how it should be. When somewhere someone achieves Buddhahood, how is it possible that the whole Existence is not enriched? And it will feel the vibrations; the whole universe will become happy. So through poetic symbols a fact has been shown.

But there are foolish, stupid minds who go on thinking that either this should be a historic fact; otherwise it must be a lie -- they have only two alternatives. They say, "This must be a historic fact, so where is the proof that flowers came upon the trees out of season? Where is the proof? Historic proof is needed, and if it is not there, then it is a lie!" They don't know that there is a realm beyond fact and beyond lies -- the realm of poetry that expresses many things which cannot be expressed otherwise. It is just an indication that the whole world became a celebration. It must be so, it has to be so, it has been so!

So when this mind is offered, the contentless mind, simply the container -- purified, pure, empty -- when this container is offered, it is worth offering. Even the Divine is enriched, because the Divine becomes more divine. So another thing: God is not a static entity. He is a creative force, a dynamic force. So it is not only that man is evolving: God is evolving also. For those of us who are confined to ordinary logic, God cannot evolve, because to us, if he evolves, then He is not perfect. How can perfection evolve? Ordinary logic cannot conceive that something can be more perfect than perfect. It cannot conceive -- it looks illogical!

But life is not confined to your logic, and there are possibilities that a perfection can be more perfect, more enriched. A perfection can evolve. It is perfection at every moment; still,

it is not static. For example, a dancer: every gesture is perfect. Every moment, every gesture, is perfect. Still, there is a dynamic movement, and the total is more perfect than the parts. Each dance is perfect; still, another dance can be more perfect.

Mahavir has a very beautiful concept. He says that there are infinite perfections, multi-perfections, so God is evolving. To me, God is an evolving force; otherwise there can be no evolution. If He is not evolving, then there is no evolution, because through evolution He evolves. This is the concept of That: if there is a flower, then He is flowering there; if there is a man, then He is "manning" there. So whatsoever happens, it happens to Him; and nothing can happen without Him, outside of Him. So when Buddha happens, the Total becomes more.

Buddha says, "Do not go to any deity to worship. Be Enlightened, and they will come to worship you." And he shows and he says it not as a theory -- he *knows* it! Deities have come to worship him. This has been an experience. So this is something to be pondered over. Only Buddhists and Jains have said this: that when you are Enlightened, the deities will come and worship you -- because, they say, deities are not without desires, and when yoU are Enlightened you are desireless.

Even an Indra is not without desires. Deities may be living in heaven, but they are with desires. So with Buddha and Mahavir, human dignity was raised to its ultimate. If you can become desireless then everything will worship you, because the desireless consciousness is one with That. That contentless mind is not only worth offering: the Divine needs it, the Divine waits for it. When a child returns Enlightened, the father is enriched, the home is enriched.

Really, when a child returns Enlightened, when the father sees his child Enlightened, the father cannot be the same. So when a Buddha flowers, the whole universe flowers with him. He shows the potentiality, the peak possibility. Now you may not attain it, but you may rest assured that you *can* attain it. The whole universe becomes confident with a Buddha happening. The whole universe becomes a promise, a certainty. The same can happen to each particle, to each "monad", to each mind -- and now it is up to you.

When Buddha is dying, Ananda says to Buddha, "When will you be back?"

Buddha says, "It is impossible. I will not be back again." Ananda begins to weep. Buddha asks him, "Why are you weeping? You have been with me for forty years continuously. If you are yet not profited by me, why do you ask for my next coming?"

Ananda says, "It is not for me that I am asking. Even if we have not attained to That, you have attained, and we have become certain. And it is more than enough. We have become certain! Now this certainty cannot be lost. I am asking for others who have not seen you. So when will you be coming back? Because if they get a glimpse of such a certainty as you, only then can they proceed on the path.

"I am not asking for myself. For lives together I may wander, but this certainty cannot be lost. I have seen you, and I have seen the peak possibility. So it is not for me but for others. When will you be coming back? Because you are the only certainty -- we look at you and doubts drop. We look at you -- we may not be capable of doing the same, so we follow you -- but in that moment of looking at you, we are you in a sense. So when will you be coming back?"

So the offering is not only worthwhile; it is being awaited. The Divine waits, the Total waits, for you to come enriched, to come back home with your potentiality actualized, for the seed to come not as a seed but as a full manifestation. But with a "content-full" mind, offering is worthless -- you are offering rubbish.

SOMETHING MORE ABOUT THE FIRST QUESTION: IN REFERENCE TO THE EFFORTS REGARDING MEDITATION, WHAT IS MEANT BY THE STATE OF TOTAL WILL? WHAT STATE OF MEDITATION WILL BE CALLED THE TOTAL WILL STAGE OF THE FINAL SUCCESS?

The first meaning of "total" is that you are in it without any part outside -- with no withholding, with no division. So any method of meditation will do. If you are totally in it, absorbed, not a part standing outside, if you can just cry "Ram" totally with not a part as an observer in you, if you become the cry and not even a part is observing that you are crying "Ram", if you become the cry -- then it is total, and then a single cry is enough. There is no need to go on repeating "Ram-Ram-Ram" -- there is no need. One total cry in which nothing is left is enough. So only you can decide whether you are total in something or not.

The second meaning of totality is that whatsoever you are doing, whatever technique of meditation, your doing must be without any doubt. A very minute doubt will make it partial; a very small doubt will not allow it to be total. But that also you can decide -- whether there is any doubt. We go on doing things with doubts inside. Those doubts kill every effort. It is not so much that you are not reaching because of not enough effort. It is more because of your doubts standing behind. So whatsoever you do, that sceptical part of the mind goes on denying, goes on waiting to be sceptical. Even if you achieve something, the doubting mind will create doubts. Totality means there is no doubt. Effort becomes total.

And, thirdly, we have many layers of energy, so you may be making a total effort on the first layer and you may not be aware of the second layer at all. All the layers should become committed, involved, then it becomes total. So when you are doing with one layer and you feel you are doing, totally, don't be deceived so soon. Go on doing -- and when you feel that "Now nothing can be done; I have done everything and there is no energy left," continue! This is the moment: continue! And soon you will become aware that a sudden rush of energy is coming to you from the second layer. A new earth has been broken. Then go on doing this. And when you are *totally* involved with all the layers, how will you know?

There are signs. One sign is that when all the layers have been broken and your total energy is involved, *total* energy is involved, you will never feel exhausted. You will never feel that the point has come when "I cannot do more." That feeling always comes when one layer is exhausted. When the second layer is exhausted, that feeling will come again. And there are seven layers. When the seventh is broken, that feeling will never come again -- never! You will not feel that "Now I cannot do more." You will go on doing more and more and more, and you will feel that still more is left. Then you are total in it.

The total is never exhausted, remember. Only the part is exhausted. The total is never exhausted! You cannot empty it: the more you empty it, the more it is filled. So whatsoever happens with your totality cannot be exhausted. If love happens with your totality, then love cannot be exhausted. If meditation-happens with your totality, then meditation cannot be exhausted.

I am reminded of Bokuju, a Zen patriarch who Realized, who became Enlightened, when he was twenty years of age. But he continued meditating. His teacher came and said, "Bokuju what are you doing? Now there is no need. I see you have become Enlightened."

But Bokuju said, "But how can I end meditation? No end-is coming. I go on and on and on, and I am not exhausted. So how can I end it? How can I come out of it? I see no end to

it!"

The teacher said, "When one falls into the Infinite, there is only a beginning: there is no end. Come out of it. Come out and move! Of course, I know now you cannot come out of it. Move! It will be with you. Don't go on sitting!"

He was sitting for seven weeks continuously after his Enlightenment. He was just sitting. For his teacher, for the monastery, there were seven weeks. He became Enlightened: there was light all around; he was transformed. Everyone became aware that something had happened. His teacher came and went, came and went every day. He waited for when he would open his eyes and he would talk about it, but he was not opening his eyes. Then ultimately the teacher had to stop him and ask him to come out.

Bokuju said, "But how can I come out? It is not ending at all. There is no end to it. And they say, 'You have been sitting here for seven weeks continuously. It is so long!' But I don't remember. I feel as if not a single moment has passed. There has been no time for me."

So when the total energy is there working, there will be no end to it and time will drop. You cannot feel time. You will feel time only with partial energy because it is exhausted. Time is felt only with something limited; otherwise time cannot be felt. Time is really a feeling of limitations. So whatsoever has a limit, you will feel time around it. It is relative.

So this strange phenomenon happens: if your whole day has been vacant without any events, just empty, nothing of any note, nothing worthwhile, the whole day just passed by, then time will seem to be more when it is passing. Unoccupied time will look very long. You will feel that the day is not going to end at all, that it has become so lengthy. But that is only when it is passing. If you remember afterwards, then the day will look very small -- because later on you cannot feel the time without events, so the day will look very small.

We feel time around certain things. So when you are on a holiday and many things are happening, on that day the day will look small. Because it was so filled, it becomes comparatively small. But if you remember your holiday when you are back home, it looks very long -- because each event spread in a sequence becomes very long.

Bokuju said, "I don't know about time. What has happened to time? It stopped." Mahavir says that the basic element that changes totally when one enters Samadhi is time -- there is a stopping of time.

Someone asked Jesus, "What will happen in your Kingdom of God?" and he said, "There will be time no longer." This is a basic indication that time will stop, because time can be felt only with partial energies.

That's why a child feels time less, because he is more full. An old man feels time more, because he is now empty, emptying. So with an old man time becomes a problem. With a child time is not a problem at all; he lives in a timelessness. And the same happens with civilization: whenever a civilization becomes over-conscious of time, it means the civilization is going, by and by, towards death. Whenever a civilization is absolutely unaware of time, it means it is in its childhood -- innocent. It is not old. Time consciousness means death is coming near. So the more death you feel, the more time you will feel.

In India we have not felt time so much because we have a conception of a circle of continuous births. So each time you die, it is not death -- again you are reborn. So, really, India destroyed the concept of death totally. It is not a death at all if you are reborn again. That's why India never became time conscious. We are so lethargic, and we can waste time so easily. The reason is that death is not there in the Indian mind; after death there is birth. So time is infinite, and there is no hurry.

But the American mind, the Western mind, has become very time conscious, and the

reason is Christianity -- because once you say that there is only one life and that this death is going to be the final one, that there is no rebirth, then death becomes very meaningful. And everything has to be taken in reference. If death is so final and occurs only once, time becomes very valuable. It cannot be lost. And a strange phenomenon happens: the more you become conscious of time, the less you can use it. You can only hurry and run. The less you can use it, because you are in such a hurry. And to use time you need a very, very patient attitude, a very slow-moving attitude; then only can you use it.

So when your mind is in a total effort of will, there will be no time and there will be no end to the energy coming. But these are all inner subjective feelings. You can ask, "Can we be deceived?" Yes, deception is possible. But whenever deception is there, you will become aware. The awareness will come in this form: in any inner feeling, any inner realization, if you become doubtful whether it is true or imaginary, then it is certainly imaginary -- because the Truth is so self-evident that you cannot doubt it. The doubting mind just disappears.

So sometimes someone comes to me and says, "Tell me whether my kundalini has risen or not. My teacher says my kundalini has risen, so tell me." So I tell them that unless it becomes self-evident to you, do not believe anyone. When that phenomenon happens, you will not go to ask anyone whether it has happened or not. If someone comes and asks you, "Tell me whether I am alive or not," what will you say to him? Certainly he is dead! Even if this has to be asked, then certainly he is dead.

Life is a self-evident fact; no proof is needed. How do you feel your life? Do you have any proof of it? Is there any proof? How do you feel your life? How do you know you are alive? Is there ever a doubt whether "I am alive or not"?

Descartes began in that way. He began to seek some indubitable fact which cannot be doubted, so he went on: God can be doubted, heaven and hell can be doubted, everything can be doubted. Then ultimately he stumbled upon himself. and he began to think. "Can I doubt myself? Can I doubt about myself? Can I say I am or I am not?" Then he stumbled upon a self-evident truth, and he said, "Even if I say I am not, I am; so I cannot doubt *this* fact." This fact begins to be his foundation. So he says, "COGITO ERGO SUM -- I think, therefore I am. Even if I doubt, I think therefore I am. So I cannot deny it."

Life is a self-evident fact; you cannot doubt it. The same happens when more life happens to you. When you enter more life, when you enter total life, it is self-evident, no proof is needed, no witness is needed, Even if the whole world denies it, you can laugh. The whole world may think you are mad, but you can laugh.

These are self-evident realizations. so I can describe them. But when they happen, you know; when they are there, you know. And the knowing is evident in itself: it needs *no* outer proof, *no* outer witness. Your knowing becomes the only evidence.

That's why sometimes mystics seem to be arrogant. They are not. They are the most humble people possible. But they look arrogant, and the arrogance is felt by us because they are so self-evidently true. They won't give you any proofs, they won't give you any arguments, they won't give you any reasons. They say, "I know!"

This looks to us like arrogance, but the same is so if I ask you, "How do you know you are alive?" What can you say? You can say only, "I know!" Is that arrogance? It is a simple fact. How can you express it except by saying, "I know and I KNOW IT SELF-EVIDENTLY. Even for me there are no reasons why I am. I simply am."

These Upanishads are such self-evident statements. They won't argue with you. They go on telling, "This is this." You cannot ask why. You can only ask how. They can tell you how you can achieve this. You cannot ask, "Why? Why is this this?"

So the moment you happen to be in totality, in that totality\ you will know it. And it is such a phenomenon that you can doubt everything except it. You can doubt the whole world -- except it. If the whole world stands against it as a witness, even then your feeling of its being true cannot be shaken.

That's how a Jesus can die, a Mansoor can be killed. They can be killed, but they cannot be changed, converted. They cannot be converted! You can kill a Mansoor: you cannot convert him. He will go on saying the same thing. Mansoor was saying, "I am the God." In Mohammedan eyes, that is KUFRA -- heresy, egoism. It is not a religious expression. A religious person must be humble, and this Mansoor goes on telling, "I am the God -- ANAL HAK, AHAM BRAHMASMI -- I am the Brahma." So they killed him. They thought that when they began to kill him he would come back to his senses. But he went on laughing, and someone asked, "Mansoor, why are you laughing?" Mansoor said, "I am laughing because you cannot kill a God. You cannot kill a God! AHAM BRAHMASMI! ANAL HAK! I am the God!"

Jesus says as his last words, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." He asked the Divine to forgive all those who were crucifying him because, "They do not know what they are doing."

But Mansoor and Jesus, they are very arrogantly certain. That certainty comes from the self-evidentness of Truth. And everything can be doubted, but never a feeling that comes in your totality.

If you are a total will, then you will come to know something self-evident. If you are total surrender, then also you will come to know something self-evident. Even if you are a total doubter, then also you can come to something which is self-evident. But totality is everywhere a basic condition. You must be total in it, whole in it.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 1

Chapter #11

Chapter title: Light, Life and Love

25 February 1972 pm in Bombay, India

Archive code: 7202255

ShortTitle: ULTAL111

Audio: Yes

Video: No

SADAADEEPTIH APAAR AMRIT VRITTIH SNAANAM
TO BE CENTERED CONSTANTLY IN THE INNER ILLUMINATION AND IN THE INFINITE INNER
NECTAR IS THE PREPARATORY BATH FOR THE WORSHIP.

LIGHT IS the most mysterious thing in the universe -- for many reasons. You may not have felt it like that, but the first thing about light is that light is the purest energy. Physics says that everything material is not really matter. Only energy is real. Matter is dead; matter exists no more. It never existed except in our conceptions. Matter appears to be, but it is not. Only light is -- or energy, or electricity. The deeper we penetrate into matter, the less material is found. At the very deepest there is no matter, and matter itself becomes non-material. But light remains, or energy.

Light is the purest energy. Light is not matter, and wherever we feel matter it is only light condensed. So matter means light condensed. This is the first mystery about light, because it is the substratum of all Existence. So in a new way, the oldest concept of religions -- that in the beginning God said, "Let there be light," and there was light -- becomes very significant, because Existence in its purity is light. So if Existence begins, it has to begin with light.

Another thing: light can exist without life, but life cannot exist without light. So life also becomes secondary. Matter simply disappears. It is not. It is only condensed light. Then light can exist without life. Life is not a necessity for light to exist, but life cannot exist without light. So life becomes secondary and light becomes primary. In this context, one thing more: just as light can exist without life but life cannot exist without light, just the same, life can exist without love but love cannot exist without life. So these three I's have to be remembered -- light, life, love.

Light is the substratum, the ground, and love is the peak. Life is only an opportunity for light to reach love. Life is just a passage. So if you are only alive, you are just in the passage. Unless you reach love, you have not reached. Light is the potentiality, love is the actuality, and life is only a passage. So when it is said that God is love, this is the love that is meant. Unless you become love, you are just in between, you have not reached the end. Light is the beginning, love is the end, and life is just a passage.

So remember this: light can exist without life. Matter is just an appearance, a "condensity", an intensity of light, and life is a manifestation. That which is hidden in light is

manifested. Life is not an appearance: life is a manifestation. Matter is just light condensed. So when light remains light and becomes condensed, it is matter. When light evolves, manifests its potentiality, it becomes life. If it simply remains life, then death is the end. If it evolves more, then it becomes love -- and love is deathless. You may call it God, you may call it anything. These are basic points. If you remember them, then we can proceed into the sutra.

Thirdly, in this whole world everything is relative except light. Only light has a constant velocity. That's why physics takes light as the measurement of time. Everything is relative; only light is, in a certain way, absolute. Light travels with a constant velocity. Nothing else is constant. So only light is absolute. There is no change: the velocity is absolute, the speed is absolute. So light becomes a mystery. It is not relative to anything, and everything else is relative to light. So nothing can travel with more speed than light, because if anything takes the speed just equivalent to light, it will turn into light.

If we can throw a stone with the speed of light, the stone will become light. Anything moving with the speed of light will become light. So nothing reaches the velocity of light, and nothing transcends the velocity of light. The speed of light is 186,000 miles per second. Anything travelling with that speed will become light. That's why scientists say we cannot travel with the speed of light: because anything -- we or aircraft, rockets -- anything travelling with that speed will become light itself.

Fourthly, light travels without any vehicle; everything else can travel only with a vehicle. Only light travels without vehicles. That is mysterious. And also, light travels without any medium. Everything else has to travel through a medium. A fish can travel in water, a man can travel in air, but light travels in nothing, in nothingness.

In the beginning of this century, physicists just imagined something like ether. They imagined something *must* be there; otherwise, how can light travel? So that was a basic question: light comes to the earth from the sun or from some star, it travels, so there must be some medium through which it travels. So just because nothing can travel without a medium, in the beginning of this century scientists hypothetically assumed that there must be some X -- they named it ether -- through which light travels.

But now they have found that there is no medium. The whole universe is just a vast space, and light travels in nothingness. That means even nothingness cannot destroy it, even emptiness cannot affect it. That means even non-being cannot affect light's being. And it can travel without any medium, without any vehicle. That means the energy is not derived from somewhere else. Light itself is the energy. If you have some derived energy, then you will have to travel through mediums, through vehicles; you cannot go yourself. Light goes by itself.

Fifthly, light is neither being pushed nor being pulled. It simply travels! If I throw a stone, then there is a push. I put *my* energy in the stone, and the stone will only go to the limit, to the extent, up to where it can be forced by my energy. When my energy fails or is exhausted, the stone will fall down. The stone is not travelling with its own energy. The energy has been given to it, it is foreign.

Everything in the world has foreign energy in it -- except light. Everything moving is moving with some energy derived from somewhere else. A tree is growing, but the energy has been derived. A flower is flowering, but the energy has been derived. You are breathing and living, but the energy is derived. You have *no* energy of your own. Nothing has except light.

In this reference, the saying of Mohammed in the Koran becomes very significant. He

says, "God is light," and he means there that only God is His own source of energy. Everything else is just derived.

So we really live a borrowed life. It is borrowed from many, many sources. That's why our lives are conditional. If one source just refuse to give us energy, we are dead. Light lives with its own energy -- unborrowed, self-originating. It is neither pushed nor pulled, and it moves. That's the most mysterious thing possible. It is a miracle!

Sixthly, if only light has its own energy and everything else lives with borrowed energy, certainly it must be that everywhere, ultimately, the energy is borrowed from light -- because if everything lives with borrowed energy except light, then ultimately light is the donor. Wherever you get your energy, ultimately the source must be light.

You are eating food and you are getting energy, but the food itself gets it through light, through sunrays, so you are not getting it from food. Food does not have its own energy source: food is deriving it from somewhere else. The food is doing only an in-between work, the work of a medium. Because you cannot absorb light directly, trees are absorbing it, and then they transform it in such a way, they compose it in such a way, that you can take that energy directly. So they work as mediums -- then light becomes the only source of energy.

So if everything drops in the universe, light will not be affected. If everything just goes off, if the whole universe is dead, light will not be affected. The universe will still be filled with light. But if light goes off, then everything will die. Nothing can exist.

This basicness of light is not only basic for science, it is basic for religion also. So now the second part: if you penetrate matter you stumble upon light. If you penetrate life you again stumble upon light. So religious mystics have always said, "We experience Light, we realize light -- the light within, the flame within." All the mystics have talked this way, and it is not only symbolic. Only in this century has it become possible to say that it is not only symbolic. If matter dissolves into light, comes out of light, why not life itself? And when a mystic goes deep, he is going deep in life, he stumbles upon light. This going deep in oneself means going more and more to the original source of light.

So the outer light is not the only light. You have inner light also, because you cannot exist without it. It is the base. To be means to be grounded in light; there is no other being. So when you go in you are bound to come to and realize a dimension, a realm, of light -- inner light. This inner light and your life make just two layers. Your life is the outermost layer; light is a deeper layer.

Your life will end in death. Unless you realize the inner light you cannot know the deathless, because your life is just a phenomenon; it is not the base. It is just a phenomenon, a wave -- a wave on the ocean of light. It will go! If you can penetrate through it to the deeper realm of light, you will know that which is immortal, which cannot die -- because only light cannot die, only light is immortal. Everything will have to die, because everything lives on derived life, borrowed life. Only light has its *own* life. Everything else has life borrowed from somewhere else. So one has to return it, one has to give it back.

So unless you realize the inner light, you will not know that which is beyond death. In a sense it is beyond death and beyond life also. Only then does it become immortal. That which is born will have to die; that which is alive will be dead. So only that can be beyond death which is beyond life itself. Light is beyond life and beyond death. Whenever mystics have been talking about light, they always talk about deathlessness, because the moment you enter the inner light, the source of life, you enter deathlessness.

In this sutra, both terms have been used. This sutra says:

TO BE CENTERED CONSTANTLY IN THE INNER ILLUMINATION, in the inner light, AND IN THE INFINITE INNER NECTAR, IS THE PREPARATORY BATH FOR THE WORSHIP.

So unless you are bathed in your own inner light, and in the nectar, in the immortality which belongs to that light, you are not ready to enter the Divine temple. This is a preparatory bath. Water will not do: light has to be used. Pure light has to be used. Unless you are bathed in pure light, you are not ready to enter the Divine temple.

When Krishna showed his infiniteness to Arjuna, Arjuna said, "I don't see you, Krishna, I see only light. Where have you gone? I see only thousands and thousands of suns -- and I am scared. You come back!" When one enters into the inner light... it is there, because without it you cannot be. nothing can be. It is a scientific fact, because without light nothing can be. If there is anything, then in its ground light is bound to be. You may know it, you may not know it, but light is the ground of all. You *are*, so you have a deep realm of light. The moment you enter it, you are bathed. and this bath means many things.

Ordinarily, when you enter a temple, outwardly you take a bath. You take a bath because dirt can be washed from the body, and you can enter into the temple with a purer body -- fresh, undirty, clean. But when you are really entering into the Divine temple. your body is not entering: your consciousness is entering. And you cannot bathe your consciousness with water. But consciousness can have a deep cleansing in inner light, and that deep cleansing means cleansing the dirt of all karma -- all actions.

Whatever you have done, whatever you have been, whatever your past has been. it dings to you -- just like dirt, just like dust, it clings to you. When you enter inner light, it disappears. Why? Because the moment you enter that inner light, everything takes the velocity of light and nothing can remain. The dirt, the dirt of karmas, dissolves -- all that you have done in all your lives. When you enter that realm, everything becomes light, because with light, in that velocity, nothing can remain anything else. So it is not simply a bath. All the karmas, just disappear, they become light, and the consciousness is cleaned. It becomes fresh and young as it should be, as it is meant to be.

And when all the karmas disappear -- by "karmas" I mean the material dust that one accumulates through actions and desires and passions -- when it disappears, the entity, the nucleus of ego disappears also, because ego exists only as a collectivity of all the dust, of all the dirtiness, of all the impurities. It exists as a center. When everything disappears, ego disappears. And when ego disappears, you are pure, clean, you are born anew. So to enter this inner light is to enter the inner fire.

Another thing: the light that is outside is constant, but it cannot be constant for you. The sun will rise and set. The sun itself never rises and never sets, but for the earth it rises and it sets; the night comes. So with outer light you cannot remain constantly in light. Only with inner light is there no rising and no setting. That's why the sutra says, "To be centered constantly..." continuously. There is no night, there is no setting, because there is no rising. The light is there as your Being, as your very Existence. So to be constantly centered in this light is the bath. And by "bath" is meant that everything to which one was clinging is just destroyed -- not only destroyed, but transformed also. It becomes light itself.

This entry has three parts: first you will realize light, then you will realize a deep cleansing of your soul, of your being, and, thirdly, you will realize the elixir, the nectar -- the AMRIT -- the immortality, the deathlessness of it, because once the ego dies you are deathless, once the karmas are washed away you are deathless, once you have entered deeper

than life you are deathless.

Deeper than life, death cannot exist. Death exists parallel to life. It means the end of life. So life has two dimensions. One is just horizontal. You go from one moment of life to another moment of life, then another -- A-B-C -- in a sequence. Then ultimately, the Z is going to be the death. You move from A to B, from B to C, then to X-Y-Z. A is birth, Z is death, and you move from A-B-C-D horizontally. This is one movement -- birth to death. Buddha says, "One who is born will have to die, because he is moving horizontally." So death is a necessity on a horizontal plane.

But you can move vertically. From A, instead of going to B, drop below the A or go above the A. Don't move to B. So from any life movement, you can move in two ways. You can move to another life movement; then death will be the end. Then you are progressing towards death automatically, unknowingly. You can move down or up -- not horizontally but vertically. So move down or up from A, and then you move from life to light. If you move down, then you move to light. If you move up, then you move to love. This is the vertical plane.

If you move down from life, then you move to light. If you move up, then you move to love. And both give you the door to the deathless, because death only means horizontal moving. Now you are not moving horizontally. And move either way. If you can consciously go down to light, your life will become love -- because once you have known the deathless you can be nothing but love.

Really, death is the enemy of love. You cannot love because there is death; you cannot love because you are fearful of death; you cannot love because you are afraid of everyone else, of the other. And all fears are basically fear of death. They all can be reduced to the fear of death. Once you know the deathless, the fear has gone. And when the mind is fearless, it is love. When the mind is fearful, it is never love. You may put on a show, you may pretend, but it is never love. With fear hate can exist, with fear jealousy can exist, with fear anything can exist, but not love. That's why we pretend love, and love is not found. In the end jealousy is found, hate is found, fear is found -- love is not found. Why? Because you cannot love really. How can you love when there is death? How can you love unconditionally when every moment death is coming near?

Look at it in this way: you are here, your beloved or your lover is here. You are just in the ecstasy of love, and then someone says that within five minutes you are going to die. The moment this is said, that within five minutes you are going to die, love will disappear. You will forget the beloved, the lover and the poetry, and everything will just disappear. Why does it disappear? It has never been there. It was only that you were unaware of death, so you were pretending love.

Deathlessness known becomes love. Then you cannot do anything else. Then it is not that you love; rather, you become love. Love becomes your quality -- not your act -- your very being. So either drop down from A; from the horizontal line drop down vertically to light: that is one way. Yoga is concerned with this dropping down. Or, from A, rise vertically to love. BHAKTI -- the path of devotion -- is concerned with rising up. Either way you go vertically. The same will be the result.

If you can go up from A, again you find the deathless. Vertically, there is no death; only horizontally is there death. So if you find love by going up, you will find light, because entering the deathless one is bound to find light, entering the light one is bound to find the deathless. They are one! So, really, life and death are two aspects of one coin, and death is not opposite to life. It is a part. Light is opposed to death, not life, because light is

immortality. Love is also opposed to death because again it is deathless.

So the problem is either to enter light by going down or by going up to enter love. This vertical journey is the journey of religion. And this sutra says, "To be centered constantly in the inner illumination and in the infinite inner nectar is the preparatory bath for the worship." So how to enter and how to be centered? How to enter? How to find this light?

Two or three things: one, whenever you say light is, what do you mean? I say, "The room is lighted." What do I mean? I mean that I can see. Light is never seen; only something lighted is seen. You see the walls, not the light; you see me, not the light. Something lighted is seen, never the light itself, because light is so subtle that it cannot be seen. It is not a gross phenomenon. So we only infer that light is. It is an inference, not a knowing. It is just an inference! Because I can see you, I infer, assume, that light is. How can I see you without light?

No one has ever seen light -- no one! And no one can ever see light. But we use the words, "I see light," and by that we mean, "I see things which cannot be seen without light." When you say it is dark, there is no light, what do you mean? You only mean, "Now I cannot see things." When you cannot see things, you infer that light is not. When you can see things, you infer that light is. So light is an inference even in the outer, the outside world. So when one has to enter, when one is ready to enter inside, what do we mean by light?

If you can feel yourself, if you can see yourself, that means the light is there. This is strange, but we never think about it. The whole room is dark; you cannot say anything is there, but one thing you can say: "I am." Why? You cannot see yourself either. The room is totally dark, nothing can be seen, but about one thing you are certain and that is your own being. No need of any proof, no need of any light. You know that you are, you feel that you are. A subtle, inner illumination must be there. We may not be aware of it, we may be unconscious of it or very dimly conscious, but it is there.

So turn your gaze inwards. Close all your senses so that there is no feeling of the outside light. Go into darkness, close your eyes, and now try to penetrate, to see inwards. First you may feel simple darkness; that is because you are not accustomed to it. Go on penetrating. Just try to look into the darkness which is within. Penetrate it, and by and by you will begin to feel many things inside. An inner illumination begins to work. It may be dim in the beginning. You will begin to see your thoughts because thoughts are inside things. They *are* things! You will begin to stumble upon the furniture of your mind.

Much furniture is there -- many memories, many desires, many unfulfilled passions, many frustrations, many thoughts, many seed thoughts, many, many things are there. When you begin to feel them, first try to penetrate the darkness. Then a dim light begins to be there, and you begin to be aware of many things. It is like when you enter a dark room suddenly -- you can't see anything. But remain there. Be adjusted to the darkness, let your eyes be adjusted to the darkness. Eyes have to adjust, they take time. When you come from without, from a sunlit garden to your room, your eye will have to readjust themselves. Your eyes will take a little time, but it happens.

If one is constantly using his eyes only to see things which are very near -- for example, if one is constantly reading -- then he will become shortsighted, because so much use of short sight will fix the mechanism of the eyes. So when he wants to see a far-off star, he cannot see it because the mechanism has become fixed. Now it is not flexible. The same happens inside: because we have been looking outside continuously, for lives, the mechanism has become fixed and we cannot look inside.

But try, make an effort -- look into the darkness. Don't be in a hurry, because the

mechanism has been fixed for many lives. Eyes have forgotten completely how to look inside. You have never used them for that purpose. So look into the darkness, see the darkness, and don't be impatient. Penetrate the darkness, go on penetrating, and within three months you will be able to see many things inside which you never thought were there. And now, for the first time, you will become aware that thoughts are just things. And when you become aware, then you can put a thought anywhere you want. If you want to throw it out, you can throw it out.

But now you cannot throw it. Just now you cannot throw out any thought, because you cannot catch it. You don't even know that it is a thing, that it can be caught and it can be thrown. You don't know where thoughts are located; you don't know from where they come. Everyone says, "I don't want to be fearful; I don't want to be angry." But they cannot do anything because they don't know even from where this anger comes, what the root is, where this anger has its reservoir, where this anger is accumulated. You don't know the roots.

Every thought is a thing. It has an accumulated reservoir. So when one thought comes, it is just a leaf on a big tree. You cannot cut it and throw it -- another leaf will come out. Roots are there, the tree is there. When you begin to be aware even dimly that thoughts are there, desires are there -- anger, passion, lust -- everything is there, don't begin to fight. Just watch, because by watching you will become more aware, and by fighting you will never become aware. So don't fight -- watch! "Watch" is the word, the mantra. Watch constantly, and the more you watch, the more you will begin to feel that more light is there. Light is there; only your eyes have to be adjusted. So watch! By watching, eyes will become adjusted. And when more light is there and everything becomes clear, when there is no dark spot, then you become master of your mind. You can put anything out; you can rearrange everything. And once you become master of your mind, then you will become aware from where this light is coming, what the source is. The sun is not there; it is without. You have not even brought in a candle, but everything has become illuminated. From where is this light coming? First you will become aware of things which are lighted, then you will become master of the things of your mind, and then you will begin to be aware of where this light is coming from, of what the source is. You will begin to be aware of a flower blooming. Then you will begin to be aware of where this light is coming from. Then you can know the sun.

Only secondarily will you have to proceed from a lighted object towards the source of the light. Again light is not seen; again you will see the sun. So first you will begin to feel the content of the mind. Then, more and more, the mind will become clear. Then you will be aware of where this light is coming from. Just in the center of the mind is the source. Then enter the source! Now you can forget the mind -- you are the master. You can just say to the mind, "Stop!" and the mind will stop.

Awareness is needed for the mastery. Never try the reverse: never try to be the master first and then to be aware. That never happens, that cannot happen. That is not possible. Be aware, and the mastery happens. You become the master. Then go to the source, then enter the source, from where this light is coming. Go! Enter the illumination! That entering into the illumination is the "bath". You have become master of the mind. Now you will become master of life itself; now you will become master of consciousness itself. And once bathed in this illumination, in this source of light, you will be able to see yourself in your eternity. In *this* moment, all the past and all the future will be there. This moment is eternal. You are so pure that the whole time gathers in you. The past purified creates a purified future -- and this moment becomes eternal.

Watch, be aware, observe deeply the contents of the mind. Then you will become aware

of the source; then enter the source. It is fearful, because whatsoever you have known as yourself will die. This bath is a death -- a death of all that you have known yourself to be. The identity, the ego, the persONALity, everything will die. because the personality, the identity, the ego, they are the dirt -- the accumulated dirt around your being. Only being will remain without name and form. And this sutra says this is the preparatory bath. Only now can you enter, and only up to here do you have to make efforts. The moment you are purified, the moment you have gone through this bath, the moment the karmas have dissolved. now you need not make any effort.

From *this* point, God becomes a gravitation. Now you enter the field of grace. It is the same like the gravitation on the earth, but you have to enter the field. So for spaceships we have to make one basic arrangement: they must be thrown out of the grip of the earth, out of the gravitation field. Two hundred miles above the earth, all around, is the field. If you are under the field you will be pulled back. If you go beyond two hundred miles, then the earth cannot do anything.

The Divine cannot pull you unless you are totally pure, unless you yourself become light. Then with the same velocity, you enter the Divine. So this entering the light is the last effort. Once you are purified you begin to gravitate. Now you need not go: you are being pulled. This gravitation is known as grace: the gravitation to the Divine is grace. Grace is not really a help -- it is not! It is just a law. God is not grace-ful only to some, it is not so, He is not partial; the earth is not gravitational only for some -- the moment you enter the field, the law begins to work.

So don't say that God is grace-ful, don't say that God is helpful, don't say that He has compassion. It is not right. God means "the Law of Grace". The law begins to work. Once you enter the field, the law begins to work. Once you begin to be light yourself, the law begins to work -- and you begin to gravitate.

I said that light is the foundation of life. With this statement even science can agree. Science ends on this point; there is no beyond for science. Religion still has a beyond because religion says that even beyond light there is Existence.

Now another thing: light exists, so light has two qualities -- being the light and also existence. Still, light is not the ultimate one because it has two qualities -- light and existence. Religion says that existence can be without light, but light cannot be without existence. So one step more: religion says, "God is pure Existence." So, really, for religious people, this word or this sentence that "God is", is fallacious, because "God" and "is" both mean the same thing. A table is, but to say "God is" is not good. Man is because man may not be, so man and is-ness are two things conjoined. They can be disjoined. But "God is" is not right because God means is-ness. So it is tautological, repetitive. To say "God is" is as absurd as someone saying "Is is" or "God God". "God is" means the same as "God God" or "Is is". They are meaningless, absurd! Is-ness is God. So religion reduces it still more and says that when you enter light, then you will enter the Is-ness, Existence, That. So light is just the aura of That. When you enter light, you enter the aura. But the moment you enter the aura you will be pulled. and there will be no time gap. There is no time gap!

Now another thing: I said that light moves with the highest velocity -- 186,000 miles in one second. in one second. in one minute, in one hour, in one year, how much light moves! The unit with which physics measures its movement is the light year. A light year means the movement of light in one year at this velocity. This is still a time movement. It is very fast, but yet light takes time to move. So as I said, light needs no medium, light needs no vehicle, light needs no borrowed energy -- but still light needs time. So for religion, light still needs

something without which it cannot move. So light is still dependent on time.

Religion says we have to go even deeper in order to find something which need not have even this dependence -- time. So for us it looks meaningless. How can light move without any medium? But now science says it moves. It is so. Religion says, "Don't be disturbed. How can God be without time?" He is, and God moves without time, consciousness moves without time.

Light has the highest velocity as far as science has measured, but in a way it is the highest because Existence cannot be said to have more velocity. Really, it moves without time. So there is no question of velocity. We cannot say how much it moves in one second. The movement is absolutely absolute. There is no time gap. So when one enters this illumination, one is pulled. Even the word "pulled" takes time to be asserted, but the very phenomenon of being pulled takes no time.

When I say "pulled", it takes time, time is lost. But, really, when one enters the illumination, even this much time is not needed. There is no time gap. You are pulled, and beyond this light is God, the temple. This light only bathes you, purifies you, just like a fire. You become purified. And the moment you are purified -- the entrance, the explosion.

With light you become deathless, but you still feel. You feel that now you have entered immortality. But when entering into That, the Is-ness, you are not even aware of deathlessness. Life and death are meaningless now -- only Being is. *You are*, without any conditions. That Being is the Ultimate for religion.

Light is the field, mind is around the field, and we are around the mind, we live outside the mind. So one has to enter the mind, then light, and then the Divine. But we just go on round and round, outside the mind. This state of always being outside the home has become a fixed habit. We have forgotten that we are living on the verandah. It is easy: the verandah is easy for moving outside. That's why we have become fixed there -- it is easy. We can move outside anytime. and because our mind and our desires are moving outside, we live on the verandah. So at any moment, at any opportunity to move, we can run. We have forgotten that there is a home, and this running outside is just being a beggar. Entering the house means you will have to turn your eyes around completely, and you will have to use your eyes in a new way, and you will have to pass a dark night -- only because of a fixed habit.

Christian mystics have talked much about "the dark night of the soul". This is the dark night -- because your eyes are so fixed. As I said, someone becomes shortsighted, someone else becomes farsighted. If he goes on looking far, then he cannot look near. If he goes on looking near, then he cannot look far. Eyes become fixed. They are mechanical; they lose the flexibility. Just as someone becomes nearsighted and someone farsighted, we have become "outsighted". "Insightedness" will have to be developed.

You must have heard the word "insight", but you might not have heard the word "outsighted". You know the word "insight", but it is meaningless unless you understand the word "outsight". We have become outsighted, fixed; the insight has to be developed. So whenever you find time, close your eyes, close your mind to the outside, and try to penetrate in. At first you will be in a deep dark night. Nothing will be there except darkness. Don't be impatient. Wait and watch, and by and by darkness will become less, and you will be able to feel many inner phenomena. And only when you become aware of the inner world, then only can you become aware of the source from where this light is coming. Then enter the source. This the Upanishads call "the bath".

How stupid the human mind is! We ritualize everything, and the significance is lost. Then only stupid rituals remain. So we take a bath when we go to the temple. Neither the temple is

there nor the bath. The temple is inside and the bath also. And this bath, the Upanishads say, is the bath in inner illumination.

Light is really the bridge between the Divine and the world. The Divine creates the world through creating light. Light is the first creation, and then light condenses and matter happens; then light grows, I say light grows, and life happens; then life grows and love happens.

Light, life, love -- these are the three layers. Don't remain in the second layer. Either go back down to the roots, or go up to the seeds again, to the flowers. Go down to light or go up to flowers. And there are two paths. One is the path of knowledge. "Knowing" means going down to light. By "Gyana Yoga" the real secret that is meant is this: going down to light. And then there is "Bhakti Yoga", the path of devotion; that means going to love.

A Buddha goes down, a Meera goes up. A Mahavir goes down, a Chaitanya goes up. They speak very contradictory languages. They are bound to, because one speaks about going to the roots, the source, and the other speaks about going to the flowering, to the end, to the climax, to the peak. In a way, Buddha, Mahavir, Patanjali -- their language is dry. It has to be because they are turning back to the source. There is no poetry, there cannot be because they are not moving toward the flowering. They speak in a scientific way. A Patanjali speaks as a scientist -- of laws. Buddha always says, "Do this, and this will happen. Doing this, this follows. This is the cause, this is the effect."

They speak scientifically; they speak in terms of mathematics -- very dry. They speak in prose, never in poetry. They cannot -- how can a physicist speak in poetry? He is digging deep to the source. He is not concerned with the flowers at all. He is digging down to the roots. How can he speak in poetry? Chaitanya, Meera, they speak a different language. They dance, they sing, because they are going up to the flowering. And a flowering cannot happen without dancing and singing, without celebrating life itself. That's why Buddha and Mahavir appear to be anti-life -- because they go to the roots. And Chaitanya and Meera look very affirmative. They love life because they go up.

Both paths reach to the same end. Which one you take depends on you. If you have a very scientific mind, mathematical, with no poetry in it, it is better to follow going down towards light. If you have a prose-oriented mind, then go down. But if you have a poetic, aesthetic attitude, if you can sing and dance and celebrate then don't move to the source; move to the flowering. You will reach to the same, because once you reach to the flower you reach to the seed -- the flower is the seed again come back.

If you go down to the roots you again move. From life, you must move. Life is only a bridge. It is just a stop-over. It is not the end. Move to this bank or to that, but life must not be static. It must be a movement beyond itself -- to either bank, this or that.

Basically, these are the two dimensions of movement. Choose any! There is no question of which is better. It depends on you -- which can be better for you. Both are equal. But for you both cannot be equal. For you one must be preferable. That depends on you. So explore what your type is.

The type I call poetic is illogical, sensitive, a feeling type who can love deeply, totally. A knowing type is not emotional, is not a feeling type. He is logical down to the bare bones. So some persons are logical, intellectual, knowledge-oriented. Feel the difference. Whenever you are knowledge-oriented, your type is for knowing, to know. When you are emotion-oriented, heart-oriented, your search is not for knowing -- your search is to be, to feel. And both are different in the beginning. In the end everything becomes one, but in the beginning they are different. If you go to Meera and say to her that this is the way to know

the Truth, Meera will say, "What will I do by knowing the Truth? What will I do? I want to love the Truth."

But how can you love the Truth? That's why *bhaktas* never talk about Truth. They talk about the Beloved; they talk about the Friend. They talk in terms of feeling! To say "God is Truth" locks mathematical to them. Vinoba says that God must be a mathematician. It is not that God is, but that Vinoba's mind is mathematical. His own love of mathematics makes God a mathematician. For a Pythagoras, God is a mathematician. So it depends on you. If you feel God as a beloved, as a friend, as a lover, if you cannot conceive of God as Truth, then go up, move vertically towards flowering. Then your meditation will be more creative. Create poetry, create painting, create dance, create singing -- and through all these you will come to the illumination.

But if your type is a knowing type, to call God a lover is just absurd. What do you mean? How can Truth be a lover? To call God a father is meaningless. How can God be a father? He can be Truth. So if your type is a knowing type, move vertically -- down. Move in the depth, not in the height -- to the roots, to the source. When you come to your knowing, and when a *bhakta* comes to his feeling, you come to the same center. But a *bhakta* moves upward, and a *gyani* moves downward.

This sutra is for those whose search is for knowing, because the Upanishads belong to the knowing type; they are not for devotees But I mention this only so that you may be aware, because sometimes something may appeal to you very much, but it may not belong to your type. Then don't be deceived. Appeal means nothing, attraction means nothing -- unless there is an inner attuning. You may be attracted, but that will not do. You must begin to feel that "This is my type; this is how I am." Then don't listen to anyone. We are creating many confusions for each other because no one knows what he is talking about.

If you are a heart-oriented person. then don't listen to intellect, then don't listen to arguments, don't argue. Just tell that "I am a heart-oriented person; I am not concerned with arguments at all." Don't listen to arguments because they will confuse you. And sometimes you may even be attracted, because the opposite has a sexual attraction. So it happens that an emotional person may be very much influenced by some intellectual because he lacks this dimension, and one begins to feel that whatsoever one lacks is important. And you cannot convince an intellectual, but he can convince you. You cannot argue for yourself, but he can argue for himself. So your ego feels hurt and you begin to imitate. You miss your type, and it may be for lives that you may not regain it. because once a process begins it is very difficult to come back.

And never mislead anyone. If you feel that someone is a heart type, then don't discuss with him even if it doesn't appeal to you. Don't discuss, don't argue, don't say anything. Let him remain himself.

We are so violent that no one allows anyone to remain himself. Everyone is after everyone, everyone is trying to convert everyone to his own way -- without knowing that he may be just destroying a very great possibility. Insist on being yourself. There is no arrogance in it. This is a simple law that "I must be allowed to be myself." But when you begin to talk in others' terms, sooner or later you will be pulled in. So if you are an emotional type, then say directly, "I am not concerned with logic at all or with argument." Don't argue, don't use the same terms or the same language. Just say, "I am irrational. I have faith without any proofs with me -- but the faith is working and I don't need any proofs."

One very fatal thing has happened to the human mind, and that is that intellectuals have forcibly posed themselves as the only right type. They have forced all over the world the

view that they are the only right type and that everyone else is wrong. Education belongs to them, schools belong to them, universities belong to them. They create literature, they create argument, they create proofs, disproofs, they create philosophies. So they have become over-dominant, and the emotional type is just feeling inferior: he feels that he is nowhere. Really, there is no emotional education, only intellectual education. So he doesn't even know the language of emotion, he doesn't know the argumentation of emotion, he doesn't know the logic of the heart. He doesn't know at all, so he feels guilty. If he has faith, if he develops towards the Divine in love, he feels guilty, he feels he is wrong. Never feel that way. Always feel your own pulse -- what you are, what your nature is -- and then decide. Or, rather, let your nature decide.

So these are the two paths: either be bathed in inner light or be bathed in inner love. And then you will be on the threshold -- the boundary from where grace begins to work. Move in and find the source, or move out and find the beloved.

Remember this also: if you have to find the source, move in. If you have to find the beloved, move out. For things you have also to move out, for the beloved you have also to move out. The attitude is different, but the movement is the same. To find the beloved means to find the That in everything you encounter. Move out and go on finding, and let a moment come when everywhere nothing remains except your beloved. Then you are bathed in love, and the same will be the result.

Or, move in. If you are moving in, then you may even discard the very word "God". In old yoga texts, God is not mentioned at all. And even in later yoga texts, God is mentioned only as a means. In order to achieve That, God is mentioned as a means. And you can discard it; it is dispensable.

So a Buddha can reach without any concept of God, a Mahavir can reach without any concept of God -- but a Meera cannot reach without a concept of God. A Chaitanya cannot reach, because God is not dispensable if your way is that of love -- because then where will you find the Beloved?

But move! Don't remain static in life. Move towards light or towards love!

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 1

Chapter #12

Chapter title: You are responsible

26 February 1972 am in

Archive code: 7202260

ShortTitle: ULTAL112

Audio: Yes

Video: No

OSHO, WHEN ONE EXPERIENCES DIFFERENT FORMS OF LIGHT AND COLOURS IN MEDITATION -- SUCH AS RED, YELLOW, BLUE, OCHRE, ETC. -- HOW CAN ONE KNOW TO WHICH LAYERS OF BEING THEY BELONG? IS THERE ANY GRADUAL SEQUENCE OF COLOUR AND LIGHT EXPERIENCES BEFORE REACHING THE ULTIMATE LIGHT EXPERIENCE?

LIGHT itself is colourless. All colours belong to light, but light is not a colour. Light is just the absence of colors. Light is white; white is not a color. When light is divided, analyzed or passed through a prism, then it is divided into seven colors.

Mind also works as a prism -- an inner prism. The outer light, if passed through a prism, is divided into seven colors; the inner light, if passed through mind, is divided into seven colors. So the experience of colors in the inward journey means that you are still in mind. The experience of light is beyond mind, but the experience of colors is within mind. So if you are still seeing colors, then you are still within mind. The mind has not been transcended.

So the first thing to remember is that the experience of colors is within mind, because mind works as a prism through which the inner light is divided. So first one begins to experience colors; then colors dissolve and only light remains.

Light is white; white is not a color. When all the colors are one, white is created. When all the colors are one, then you feel white. When all the colors are there undivided, then you experience white. When no color is there, then you experience black. Black and white are both not colors. When no color is present, then there is black. When all colors are present, undivided, then there is white. All the colors are just divided light.

If you are feeling colors inside, then one thing: you are within mind. So the experience of colors is mental; it is not spiritual. The experience of light is spiritual, but not of colors -- because when mind is no more you cannot experience colors. Then only light is experienced.

Secondly, there is no fixed sequence of colors. There cannot be because each mind differs. But the experience of light is exactly the same. Buddha experiencing light or Jesus experiencing light the experience is the same. It cannot be otherwise because that which creates differences is no more. Mind creates differences.

We are here -- we are different because of our minds. If mind is no more, then the factor

which divides, which differentiates, is not there. So the experience of light is similar, but the experiences of colors are different and the sequence differs. That's why, in each religion, a different sequence has been given. Some believe that this color comes first and that comes in the end; others believe quite differently. That difference is really the difference of minds. For example, a person who is fearful, deeply rooted in fear, will experience yellow as the first color. The first color coming in will be yellow, because yellow is the color of death -- not only symbolically, but actually also.

If you take three bottles -- one red, one yellow, one just white, plain white -- and just put into these three bottles the same water, the yellow bottle will deteriorate first. Then the others will deteriorate. The red bottle of water will deteriorate in the end, last. Yellow is a death color. That's why Buddha chose yellow as the robe for his *bhikkus* -- because Buddha says that to die from this existence absolutely is Nirvana. So yellow was chosen as a death color.

Hindus have chosen ochre, a shade of red, as the color for their sannyasins, because red or ochre is the color of life -- just the opposite of yellow. It helps you to be more alive, more radiant. It creates more energy -- not only symbolically, but actually, physically, chemically. So a person who is very energetic, alive, deeply rooted in the love of life, will experience red as the first color, because his mind is more open to red. A fear-oriented person is more open to yellow, so the sequence will differ. A very silent person, one who is very still, will experience blue as the first. So it will depend.

There is no fixed sequence because there is no fixed sequence of your mind. Each mind differs in orientation in tendencies, in structure, in character. Each mind differs! Because of this difference the sequence will be different. But one thing is certain: each color has a fixed meaning. The sequence is not fixed, it cannot be, but the meaning of the color is fixed.

For example, yellow is a death color. So whenever it happens first, it means you are fear-oriented -- that your mind's first opening is for fear. So wherever you move, the first thing you will notice will be fear, or the first reaction of your mind in any new situation will be fear. Whenever something strange is there, the first response will be fear-filled. If red is the first color in your inner journey, then you are more rooted in the love of life, and your reactions will be different. You will feel more alive, and your reactions will be more life affirmative.

A person whose first experience is yellow will always interpret everything in terms of death, and a person whose first experience is red will always interpret his experiences in terms of life. Even if someone is just dying, he will begin to think that he must be reborn somewhere else. Even in death he will interpret rebirth. But for the person whose first experience is yellow, even if someone is born he will begin to think that he is going to die some day. These will be the attitudes. So a red-oriented person can be happy even in death, but a yellow-oriented person cannot be happy even in birth. He will be negative. Fear is a negative emotion. Everywhere he will find something to be sad and negative about.

For example, I said that a very silent person will feel blue, but this means a silent person who is inactive at the same time. A silent person who is active at the same time will feel green as the first experience. Mohammed chose green as the color for his fakirs. Islam has green as the symbolic color. That is the color of their flag. Green is both -- silent, still, but also active. Blue is just silent and inactive. So a person like Lao Tzu will first begin to feel blue; a person like Mohammed will begin to feel green first. So the symbolic system of colors is a fixed thing, but the sequence is not fixed.

Another thing has to be noted, and that is that seven colors are pure colors. But you can mix two, you can mix three, and a new color comes out. So it may be that you never

experience pure color in the beginning. You may experience three colors, their combination, or two colors or four colors. Then again it depends on your mind. If you have a very confused mind, then your confusion will be shown in the colors.

Now they have evolved in the West a color test in psychology. and it has been proving very meaningful. Just giving you many colors and allowing you to choose the first preference, then the second, then the third, then the fourth, decides much, shows much. If you are sincere and honest, then it shows much about your mind, because you cannot choose without any inner cause. If you choose yellow first, the logic of it is that then red will be the last. It has its own logic. If death is your first choice, then life is going to be your last, you will put red as the last. And one who chooses red first will automatically choose yellow as the last. The sequence will also show the structure of the mind.

But once, twice, thrice -- the cards are given to you again and again -- and the strange thing is that the first time you choose yellow, your first preference, then the second time you are given the same cards but you don't choose yellow as your first preference. The third time you choose something else, and the whole sequence changes. So the cards are given seven times. If a person goes on choosing yellow as the first color continuously for seven times, then it shows a very fixed mind -- very much fixed -- a fixation. This man is constantly rooted in fear. He must be living in many phobias, because everything will take the shape of fear. But if he is given the cards another seven times and now he changes -- once blue and once green and once something else -- then there is a double sequence. One sequence in one series and another sequence in the second series -- that also shows much. In the second series, if he never repeats one color as his first preference, that shows he is very fluctuating and nothing can be decisively said about him. He will be unpredictable. And the sequence also changes because the mind is changing constantly.

Recently, because of LSD, marijuana and other drugs, many things have come up from the unconscious mind. When Aldous Huxley told about his experiences with LSD, he talked as if he had entered heaven. Everything was beautiful, utopian, colorful, poetic. Nothing was bad in it. There was nothing like a nightmare -- nothing of fear or death. Everything was alive, abundantly alive, rich. But when Zaehner took it, he entered hell. With the same LSD he entered hell, and it was a long nightmare -- horrorfilled,

Both misinterpreted their experiences. Aldous Huxley thought that this was a quality of LSD and that because of LSD this heaven experience had come up. Zaehner interpreted quite diametrically opposite from Huxley and he said, "It is just a nightmare, a deep horror. One must not go into it -- it can create madness." But the interpretation is on the same lines: he also thought that it was LSD which had created this experience.

The reality is different. It was LSD working only as a catalytic agent. LSD cannot create heaven, cannot create hell. LSD can only open you, and whatsoever is in you is projected. So if Zaehner's experience is absolutely colorless it is because of Zaehner's mind, and if Huxley's experience is colorful it is because of Huxley's mind. LSD can only give you a glimpse into your own mind. It can open your own deeper layers. So if you have a suppressed unconscious inside, then you may enter hell; or if you have nothing suppressed, if you have a relaxed unconscious, a natural one, then you may enter heaven -- but that will depend on what type of mind you have. The same happens when one goes deep into an inner journey: whatsoever you encounter is your own mind. Remember this -- whatsoever you encounter, it is your own mind.

The color sequence is also your own mind's sequence, but one has to go beyond colors. Whatsoever the sequence, one has to go beyond colors. So one must continuously remember

that colors are mental. They cannot exist without mind -- the mind working as a prism. When you go beyond mind, there is light -- colorless, absolutely white. And when this whiteness begins to be there, only then have you gone beyond mind.

Jains have chosen white as the color for their monks and for their nuns, and the choice is meaningful. As Buddhists have chosen yellow and Hindus ochre, Jains have chosen white, because they say only when white begins does spirituality really begin. Mohammed has chosen green because he says if silence is dead, then it is meaningless. Silence must be active, it must participate in the world, so a saint must also be a soldier. He has chosen green. All colors are meaningful.

There is a Sufi sect which uses black -- black clothes for their fakirs. Black is also very, very meaningful. It shows absence of color, everything absent. It is just the contrary of white. Sufis say that unless we become totally absent, the God cannot be present to us. So one must be like black -- absolutely absent, a nonentity, a nonbeing, just a nothingness. They have chosen black.

Colors are meaningful. So with whatsoever you choose you show much. Even your clothes indicate much. Nothing is just accidental. If you have chosen a particular color for your clothes, it is not accidental. You may not be aware why you have chosen it, but science is aware -- and it shows much. Your clothes show much because they belong to your mind, and your mind chooses. You cannot choose without your mind having certain leanings, certain tendencies.

So the sequence will be different, but all sequences and all colors belong to your mind. Don't be bothered much about them. Whatsoever color is felt, just go on passing it; don't stick to it. Sticking to it is the natural tendency. If some beautiful color is there, one becomes stuck to it -- don't. Move! Remember that colors belong to mind. And if some color is fearful, one goes back so that it is not felt. That too is not good, because if you go back no transformation is possible. Pass through it! Don't go back. It is your mind: pass through it! Even if a color is fearful, even if ugly, even if chaotic or beautiful or harmonious, whatsoever, go through it.

You must reach a point where colors are not, but only light remains. That entry into light is spiritual. Everything before that is mental.

WHAT ARE THE PHYSICAL AND PSYCHIC FACTORS THAT ARE NECESSARY FOR THE ENCOUNTER OF THE INNER LIGHT IN MEDITATION? AND HOW CAN ONE GROW IN THEM?

Three things to be remembered: one, you must be consciously frustrated about the life outside -- consciously frustrated! We are all frustrated but unconsciously. And whenever we are frustrated unconsciously, we only change objects of desire. But one object changed for another will not help you to go in. You remain outside. You change one thing for another, then for another. Because you are frustrated by object A, you substitute your desire by object B. Then you are frustrated by object B, so you go on to C. You go on changing objects because you are only unconsciously frustrated. If you become conscious, then you will not change objects -- you will change direction.

I can change. I can love one woman, then another, then another. I can love one man, then another, then another. This is unconscious frustration. So I think that A is not good and B might be, so I choose B. Then B is not good and -- who knows? -- C may be, so I choose C. This is unconscious frustration. If you become conscious, then it is not a question of A, B or

C. It is a question of the very relationship, of the very expectation, of the very desire. This desire to get happiness through someone else is the root. You go on changing persons, but this direction is never changed.

When I say become consciously frustrated, I mean know well that persons are irrelevant. Unless you change your direction in the search for happiness nothing is going to happen. So there are two ways: either change A for object B or change direction A for direction B. A is outward-going, B is inward-going -- so change the direction. By changing the direction you begin to change yourself; by changing objects you remain the same.

I can go on changing objects for years and years, and lives and lives. I will remain the same. And with every object, since I am the same, the same is going to be the result, the same suffering is going to follow. When I say be consciously frustrated, I mean don't be frustrated by others -- be frustrated by yourself, be frustrated about yourself. Then only does the direction change.

We are all frustrated by everyone else. The husband is frustrated by the wife, and the wife is frustrated by the husband; and the son is frustrated by the father, and the father is frustrated by the son. Everyone is frustrated by others. This is the outgoing mind. Be frustrated with yourself, and then the direction changes: you begin to be ingoing. And unless you are frustrated with yourself there is no possibility for transformation.

A Buddha is not really frustrated by the world. If he is frustrated by the world, he must try to change it for another world, he must try to get another world. He is really frustrated with himself, so he begins to change himself. The object of frustration becomes the object of transformation.

So the inward journey begins, the search for inner life begins. only when you begin to feel that outside is nothing but darkness. And unless you turn your eyes inwards, light is not to be found. So the first thing: be consciously frustrated. But this much is not enough. It is necessary, but not enough, because you can be frustrated with yourself and can go on living in frustration. Then you will be just a living corpse. You will be just dead -- a burden to yourself. This is necessary, but not enough.

The second thing to realize is that whatsoever you are it is because of you yourself. We say, "I am like this because of my destiny, because of the Divine Creator, because of the forces of nature, because of heredity, because of environment, because of society." Whatsoever I am, I am always because of something or someone else. It may be the God in heaven, or it may be the heredity in the books of biology, or it may be just the society of the communists, or it may be just the childhood trauma of Freudians -- but something else. You are not responsible.

The society has gone on changing causes. Sometimes it is God: then you are at ease. Then whatsoever you are, you cannot help it. Then sometimes it is karma: it is past actions which have produced you as you are, and nothing can be done. Then communism says it is the society. Communism says that it is not consciousness which determines the society; on the contrary. it is the society which determines consciousness. You are just a cog in the wheel. You have been determined. You have been manipulated. You are a by-product, so you are not responsible.

Then Freudians say that it is not economics as Marx says. Really, it is the childhood which determines you. So whatsoever you are, your seven years of childhood have made you that way. Now you cannot be a child again, and those seven years cannot be changed. So whatsoever you are, you are. At the most, through psychoanalysis, you can come to an adjustment with yourself. You can begin to feel: "Okay, now nothing can be done. and I am

as I am." Again you begin to deteriorate.

You can be frustrated with yourself: this is a negative part. The positive, the second thing, is to remember that whatsoever you are, you are responsible. Society may have played a part, and even destiny may have played a part, and childhood also may have played a part, but ultimately you are responsible. This feeling is the base of all religion. So if Freudians win and Marxists win, religion will disappear -- because the base of religion is the possibility that you can transform, the possibility that you can change yourself. And this possibility depends on the feeling of whether you are responsible for yourself or not.

If I am just determined by my cells, by heredity, then what can I do? I cannot change my bio-cells. That is not possible. And if my bio-cells have a built-in program, they will go on unfolding. What can I do? And if God has determined everything, then what can I do? And it makes no difference whether it is God or biocells or heredity or childhood -- it makes no difference! The basic thing is that if you are putting your responsibility on something else, X-Y-Z, you cannot go in.

So the second thing: remember, whatsoever you are -- if you are sexual -- *you are responsible*. If you are angry, anger-filled, if you are afraid, if fear is your chief characteristic, then you are responsible. Everything else may have played a part, but only a part, and that part also can be played only because you cooperated. And if you destroy your cooperation this very moment, you will be different. So the second positive thing is to be constantly aware that whatsoever you are, you are responsible.

It is difficult. To feel frustrated is very easy. Even to feel frustrated with oneself is not very difficult, but to feel that "whatsoever I am, I am responsible" is very difficult -- very difficult, because then there is no excuse. This is one thing. And, secondly, if whatsoever I am, I am responsible for it, then if I am not changing, I am responsible even for that. If I am not transforming, then no one else but I am guilty. That's why we create many theories -- to escape from one's own responsibility.

Responsibility is the basis of all religious transformation. You may have heard someone say that to believe in God is the base of religion. It is not! One can be religious without any god, and one can be very irreligious with all the gods. Someone else says it is rebirth, reincarnation, that is the base. It is not, because you can believe in reincarnation and your life's duration becomes longer, but how, by just a longer duration, can you become religious? Time is not the factor to make you religious. You may be eternal: how does it help you to be religious?

No, the real thing, the base of all religiousness, is the feeling of responsibility -- you are responsible for yourself. Then suddenly something opens in you. If you are responsible, then you can change. With this you can enter inwards. So feel frustrated with yourself.

Nietzsche has said somewhere, very beautifully, that that day will be the doomsday when no one feels frustrated with oneself, because then there is no possibility for further evolution. But I must add hurriedly that even if everyone feels frustrated, but no one feels responsible for it, that will be an even greater doomsday.

Frustration is negative. Feel responsible positively, and you gain much power. The moment you know that if you are bad it is because of you, then you can be good. Then it is in your hands. You gain power, you become powerful. You release much energy, and only this releasing of energy can be used for the inner journey, just as when an atom is split, much energy is released. That is what is meant by atomic energy. Just like that, if in your mind this thing goes deep that "I am responsible for whatsoever I am, and whatsoever I like to be I can be," this concept will release much energy. And only with that energy can you go to the inner

light.

And, thirdly, remain continuously in discontent unless the light is achieved -- continuously in discontent! Again, that is one of the most basic qualities of a religious mind. Ordinarily we think that a religious man is a contented man. That is nonsense. He looks contented because he has the discontent of another dimension. He looks contented. He can live in a poor house, he can live in ordinary clothes, he can live naked, he can live under a tree. He can look contented, not because he is contented with these things, but because, really, his discontent has gone towards other things, and now he cannot be bothered with these things.

He is so discontented with the inner revolution, so discontented hoping for inner light, that he cannot bother about these things. These things have just become peripheral. Really, they don't mean anything to him. It is not that he is contented -- they don't mean anything, they are irrelevant! They are somewhere on the periphery; he is not concerned. But he lives in a deep discontent, in a fiery discontent, and only that discontent can lead you inwards.

Remember, it is discontent which leads you outside. If you are discontented with your house, then you can make a bigger one. If you are discontented with your financial position, you can change it. In the outward journey, it is discontent which leads you on and on. The same is the factor in the inward journey also. Be discontented! Unless you achieve light, unless you transcend mind, be discontent, remain discontented -- this is the third point.

These three points: frustration with oneself, not with others; responsibility on oneself, not on others; and a new discontent for something which is inner -- these will help. Even in a single moment it is possible to reach the ultimate goal. But then you must be absolutely discontented. Then lukewarm discontents will not do. Then you must be uncompromising. Then nothing should deter you, nothing should come in your way. Whatsoever happens outside, you must be unconcerned about it, because you have no energy to move that way. All the energy is moving inwards. These three things can help you.

These are just helps. The central thing is meditation. Meditate, and with these helps the inner light can be achieved. It is there, it is not far off -- only you have no discontent, only you have no longing for it, or your longing is just dissipated outside. Accumulate it, collect it, and turn the direction. The arrow must not move from you towards the world. The arrow must move from you towards yourself, to the center. So meditation has to be done! These three are just helps. Without meditation these three will not do anything, but meditation can do even without them. They are just helps.

But when I say meditation can do even without them, don't misunderstand me, don't think that they are not needed. For ninety-nine percent of people those helps are a must, because unless these three things are there you are not going to meditate at all. Only for one percent these three are not needed -- not because they are inessential, but because meditation is such a whole-hearted effort in itself that nothing is needed as a side help.

I remember a Sufi mystic, Hassan. He went to his teacher and he asked the teacher, "Tell me, what am I to do?"

The teacher began to explain to him; he was going to deliver a long lecture. This Hassan was just new to him, he didn't know him. He simply said, "Meditation.." This was just the beginning word. He was going to tell many things, but first he simply said, "Meditation..." Hassan closed his eyes. The teacher looked at him and said, "Are you feeling sleepy?" but he had gone.

The teacher had to wait for hours. When he came back, the teacher said, "What were you

doing here? I just began to explain, and you closed your eyes. For what have you come to me?"

Hassan said, "But you said the key word to me. You said 'meditation'. It is more than enough. What more is needed now? I went in, and I am thankful that you gave me the key."

But this one percent type is rare. To find a Hassan is rare. It is rare: just a word can click something. He was just on the verge -- just a push: "meditation", he hears a word and takes the jump.

Even this may not have been necessary. Many times it has happened that a bird flies in the sky, and someone achieves Enlightenment. Not even the word "meditation" is uttered. Just a bird flies in the sky against the sun, and someone achieves meditation. A dry leaf falls down from the tree, and someone sees it and achieves -- and achieves! These people are just on the verge. Anything absolutely irrelevant-looking can do it. How does it make sense?

Lao Tzu achieved his Enlightenment. He was just sitting under a tree and a dry leaf fell down. He looked at the fallen leaf, and he began to dance. And if anyone would ask him he would say, "How can I teach you? It is very difficult. Sit under a tree, let a dry leaf fall down, look at it, and it happens -- and one begins to dance!" And he was really not joking. This had happened to him.

But such a simple, innocent mind is rare. He was meditating and meditating, upon life, upon death -- and then a sudden dry leaf drops down, and everything opens. Life disappears, death becomes the reality. And in the dropping of the leaf he sees his own death, and everything is finished. But this is rare. For ninety-nine percent of people helps are musts, so don't misunderstand me.

OSHO, AS ONE USUALLY FLUCTUATES BETWEEN BOTH TYPES -- EMOTIONAL AND INTELLECTUAL -- HOW CAN ONE COME TO A FINAL DECISION AS TO WHICH TYPE ONE BELONGS?

It is difficult. First thing: three are the basic types -- intellectual (cognitive), emotional (emotive), and, thirdly, active. These are the three basic types.

"Intellectual" means one whose authentic urge is to know. He can stake his life for knowing. Someone working on poison can take poison just to know what happens. We cannot conceive of it. He looks stupid -- because he will die! And what is the meaning of knowing a thing if you are going to die? What will you do by this knowledge? But then the intellectual type puts knowing above living, above life. To know is life for him, not to know is death for him. To know is his love, not to know is just to be useless.

A Socrates, a Buddha, a Nietzsche, they are in search of knowing what being is, what we are -- to them this is basic. Socrates says an uncomprehended life is not worth living. If you don't know what life is, then it is meaningless. For us it may not look at all meaningful, the statement may not look meaningful at all, because we go on living and we don't feel the need to know what life is. This is the type who lives to know. Knowledge is his love. This type developed philosophy. Philosophy means love of knowledge, to know.

The second type is emotive. To feel! Knowledge is meaningless unless one feels it. Something becomes meaningful to them only when one feels it -- one must feel it! Feeling is through a deeper center -- the heart. Knowing is through the first center -- intellect. One must feel! Poets belong to this category: painters, dancers, musicians. Knowing is not enough. It is just dry, it is without heart, heartless. Feeling! So an intellectual type can dissect a flower in

order to know what it is, but a poet cannot dissect it. He can love it, and how can love dissect? He can feel it, and he knows that only through feeling is the real knowing.

So it may be that a scientist knows more about a flower, but still, a poet cannot be convinced that he knows more. A poet knows that *he* knows more, and he knows deeply. A scientist is only acquainted -- the poet knows from heart to heart, he has a talk with the flower heart to heart. He has not dissected it. He doesn't know what the chemistry of it is. He doesn't know! He may not even know the name, to what species this flower belongs, but he says, "I know the very spirit."

Hui-Hai, a Zen painter, was ordered by the Chinese Emperor to paint some flowers for his palace. Hui-Hai said, "Then I will have to live with flowers."

But the Emperor said, "There is no need. In my garden every flower is there. You go and paint!"

Hui Hai said, "Unless I feel the flowers, how can I paint? I must know the spirit. And by eyes how can the spirit be known, and by hands how can the spirit be touched? So I will have to live in intimacy with them.

"Sometimes with closed eyes, just sitting by their side, just feeling the breeze that communicates, just feeling the scent that comes, I can be just in a silent communion with them. Sometimes the flower is just a bud, sometimes the flower flowers. Sometimes the flower is young and the mood is different, and sometimes the flower becomes old and death lingers. And sometimes the flower is happy and celebrating, and sometimes the flower is sad. So how can I just go and paint? I will have to live with the flowers. And the flower that was born, one day will die! I must know the whole biography. I must live with it from its birth to death, and I must feel it in its so many multi-multi moods.

"I must know how it feels in the night when darkness is there, and how it feels in the morning when the sun has come up, and how, when a bird flies and a bird sings, how the flower feels then. How, when storm winds come, and how when everything is silent... I *must* know it in its multiplicity of being -- intimately -- as a friend, as a participant, as a witness, as a lover. I must be related to it! Only then can I paint it, and then too I cannot promise, because the flower may prove such a vastness that I may not be capable of painting it. So I cannot promise, I can only try."

Six months passed, and the Emperor became impatient. Then he said, "Where is that Hui-hai? Is he still trying to commune?"

The gardener said, "We cannot disturb him. He has become so intimate with the trees that sometimes we pass just nearby and we cannot feel that a man is there! -- he has become just a tree. He goes on contemplating."

Six months had passed. The Emperor came and he said, "What are you doing? When will you paint?"

Hui-Hai said, "Don't disturb me. If I am to paint, I must forget about painting completely. So don't let me remember again! Don't disturb me! How can I live intimately if there is some purpose? How is intimacy possible if I am just here as a painter and just trying to be intimate because I have to paint? What nonsense! No business is possible here -- and don't come again. When the right time comes I will come myself, but I cannot promise. The right time may come or it may not come."

And for three years the Emperor waited. Then Hui-Hai came. He came into his royal court, and the Emperor said, "Now don't paint it because you have become just like a flower. I see in you all the flowers I have seen! In your eyes, in your gestures, in your moving, in your walking, you have become just a flower."

Hui-Hai said, "I have come just to say that I cannot paint, because the man who was thinking to paint is no more."

This is a different way, that of the emotive type who knows by feeling. For the intellectual type, even to feel he has to know first. He *knows* first, and only then can he feel. His feeling is also through knowing. Then there is a third type: active -- a creative type. He cannot remain with knowing or feeling. He has to *create*. He can know only through creation. Unless he creates something, he cannot know it. Only through being a creator does he become a knower.

This third type lives in action. Now what do I mean by "action"? Many dimensions are possible, but this third type is always action-oriented. He will not ask what life means, what life is, He will ask, "What is life to *do*? What it for? What to create?" If he can create, then he is at ease. His creations may differ: he may be a creator of human beings, he may be a creator of a society, he may be a creator of a painting -- but creativity is there. For example, this Hui-Hai: he was not an active type, so he dissolved himself into feeling totally. Had he been an active type, he would have painted. Only through painting would he have been fulfilled. So these are three types.

Many things have to be understood: one, I said that Buddha and Nietzsche both belong to the first type -- but Buddha belongs rightly and Nietzsche belongs wrongly. If an intellectual type really develops, then he will become a Buddha; but if he goes on a wrong path, if he goes berserk and misses the point, he will become a Nietzsche, he will go mad. Through knowing he will not be a Realized soul; through knowing he will become mad! Through knowing he will not come to a deep trust. Through knowing he will go on creating doubts, doubts, doubts, and ultimately, webbed in his own doubts, he will just be insane. Buddha and Nietzsche both belong to the same type, but they are two extremes. Nietzsche can become a Buddha, Buddha can become a Nietzsche. If a Buddha goes wrong, he will be mad. If a Nietzsche goes right, he will be a Realized soul.

In the feeling type I will name Meera and De Sade. Meera belongs to the right kind. If feeling goes right, it develops into a love of the Divine -- but if it goes wrong, then it becomes sexual perversity. De Sade belongs to the same type, but his feeling goes on wrongly, and then he becomes just a perverted man, just abnormally insane. If the feeling type goes wrong, he becomes sexually perverted. If the intellectual type goes wrong, he becomes sceptically mad.

And, thirdly, action: Hitler and Gandhi both belong to the third type. If it goes right, then a Gandhi is there. If it goes wrong, then a Hitler. Both belong to action. They cannot live without doing something. But doing can be just insane, and a Hitler is insane. He was doing, but the doing became destructive. If the active type goes right, then he is creative; if wrong, then he becomes destructive.

These are three basic pure types. But no one is a pure type: that is the difficulty. These are just types! No one is a pure type; everyone is just mixed. And all the three are in everyone. So, really, it is not a question of to which type you belong; the real question is which type is predominant. Just to explain it to you I divided. No one is a pure type, no one can be -- because all the three are in you. If all three are in a balance, then you have a harmony; if all the three are unbalanced, then you go berserk, insane. That is the difficulty in deciding. So decide which is predominant -- that is your type.

How to decide which is predominant? How to know to what type I belong or what type is more significant to me, primary to me? All the three will be there, but one will be secondary. So there are two criteria to be remembered: one, if you are a knowing type, then all your

experiences basically will begin with knowing, never with anything else. For example, if a knowing type falls in love with someone, he cannot fall at first sight. He cannot! Impossible! First he must know, be acquainted, and it will be a long procedure. Decision can come only through a long knowing process. That's why this type of person will always miss many opportunities -- because a moment's decision is needed, and this type cannot decide in the moment.

That's why this type is ordinarily never active. He cannot be, because by the time he can conclude, the moment has passed. When he is thinking, the moment is passing. When he comes to a conclusion, the conclusion is meaningless. When the moment was there to conclude, he could not. So active he cannot be. And this is one of the calamities in the world -- that those who can think cannot be active, and those who can be active cannot think. This is one of the basic calamities, but it is so.

And always remember, the knowing type consists of very few. The percentage is very small -- two or three percent at the most. For them everything will begin by knowing. Only then will feeling follow and only then action. This will be the sequence with this type -- knowing, feeling, action. He may miss, but he cannot do otherwise. He will think first.

The second thing to remember is that this knowing type will begin with knowing, will never conclude before knowing, and will not take any prejudice unless pro and con have been known. This type becomes a scientist. This type can become an absolutely impartial philosopher, scientist, observer.

So whatsoever your reaction, action, always find out where it begins. The beginning point will decide the predominance. One who belongs to emotion will begin to feel first, and then he will gather all the reasons. Reasoning will be secondary. He will begin to feel first. He sees you, and he decides in his heart that you are good or you are bad. This decision is a feeling decision. He doesn't know about you, but at first sight he will decide. He will feel whether you are good or you are bad, and then he will go on accumulating reasons for whatsoever he has decided beforehand.

The feeling type decides first. Then reasoning follows, then he rationalizes. So see in yourself whether you decide first, upon just seeing a person, whether you become convinced that he is good, bad, loving, non-loving, and *then you* create reasons, then you try to convince yourself about your own feeling: "Yes, I was right, he is good, and these are the reasons. I have known. I have found out. I have talked with others. Now I can say he is good." But "he is good" was a conclusion first.

So with a feeling type the syllogism of logic is just the reverse: the conclusion comes first, then the process. With the reasoning type, the conclusion is never first. First the process, then he concludes in the end. So go on finding out about yourself. What is your way of deciding things? With the active type, action is first. He decides in the moment to act, then he begins to feel, then in the end he creates reasons.

I told you that Gandhi is an active type. He decides first. That's why he will say, "This is not my decision. God decided in me." Really, action comes to him so immediately, with no process, that how can he say, "I have decided"? A thinking type will always say, "I have decided." A feeling type will always say, "I feel like that." But an active type -- a Mohammed, a Gandhi -- they will always say, "Neither have I felt, nor have I thought. This decision has come to me." From where? From nowhere! If he doesn't believe in God, then he will say, "From nowhere! This decision has bubbled up in me. I don't know from where."

If he believes in God, then God becomes the decision-maker. Then He says everything, and Gandhi goes on doing. So Gandhi can say only, "I erred, but the decision was not mine."

He can say, "I may not have followed rightly, I may not have understood the message rightly, I may not have gone as far as I should, but the decision was Divine. I had just to fall in. I had just to surrender and follow." For Mohammed, for Gandhi, that is the way.

I said that Hitler is a wrong type, but he also talks in these terms. He also says, "This is not Adolph Hitler who is speaking. This is the very spirit of history. This is the whole Aryan mind! This is a race mind speaking through me." And, really, many have felt this in him. Those who have heard Hitler, they have felt that when he was speaking he was not Adolph Hitler at all. It was as if he was just a vehicle of a greater force. The active man always looks like that. Because he acts so immediately, you cannot say that he decides, he thinks, he feels -- no! He acts! And the action is so spontaneous that how can you conceive from where the action comes? So either it comes from God or it comes from the Devil, but it comes from somewhere else. And *then* Hitler and Gandhi will both go on reasoning about it; but they will decide first.

For example, Gandhi decided about a long fast. At midnight he awoke, then he decided. Then in the morning he told his friends, "Now I am going for a long fast."

Everyone just couldn't understand what he was saying. They said to him, "We were here -- you never informed us, you never talked about it. In the evening we were talking about many things, and you never even mentioned anything about it."

But Gandhi said, "It was not on my part, the decision was not on my part. Just in the night, sleep was not there -- suddenly I found myself awakened and there was a Divine message that I must go on a long fast." But for what? Then Gandhi finds out all the reasons. Those reasons are added later.

These are the three types. If action comes to you first and then feeling and then thinking, then you can determine your predominant factor. And to determine that predominant factor is very helpful, because then you can proceed straight; otherwise your progress will always be zigzag. When you don't know what type you are, you go on unnecessarily in dimensions, directions. where you should not go. When you know your type, you know what is to be done with yourself, how to do it, from where to begin. The first point: remember what comes first and what second. And the second will look very strange.

For example, the active type can do the opposite very easily; that is, he can relax very easily. The active type can relax very easily! Gandhi's relaxation was miraculous. He could relax anywhere. So it seems very paradoxical. An active type must be so tense that he cannot relax. But this is not the case. Only an active type can relax very easily. A thinking type cannot relax so easily, a feeling type finds it even more difficult to relax, but an active can relax very easily.

So the second criterion is that whatsoever the type to which you belong, you can move to the opposite very easily. So remember, if you can move to the opposite, that is your predominant type. If you can relax very easily, you belong to the active type. If you can go into non-thinking, no-thought, very easily, then you belong to the thinking type. If you can go into no-feeling very easily, you belong to the feeling type.

And this is strange because ordinarily we think, "A feeling type -- how can he go into non-feeling? A thinking type, how can he go into non-thinking? An active type, how can he go into nonaction?" But it only appears paradoxical -- it is not. It is one of the basic laws that opposites belong together, two extremes belong together, just like the pendulum of a big clock -- just like the pendulum it goes to the extreme left, then to the extreme right. And when it has reached to the peak at the right, it begins to move towards the left. When it is going right, it is accumulating momentum for going left. When it is going left, when it looks

as if it is going left, it is getting ready to go right. So the opposite is easy.

Remember, if you can relax easily, you belong to the active type. If you can meditate easily, you belong to the thinking type. That's why a Buddha can go into meditation so easily. That's why a Gandhi can relax so easily -- even in a car accident.

There is a car accident, and it is time for Gandhi to relax for his afternoon nap. But the car cannot reach the place where he is going, so those in the car have to wait. It is a deadly accident; everyone has become so fearful and afraid. But just by the side of the road he goes to sleep. He cannot wait! This is the time for his afternoon sleep, so he sleeps. When another car comes to find him, he is in deep sleep.

The active type can move so easily to relaxation. A Nehru cannot conceive how this miracle happens -- it becomes miraculous for him. He is not the active type; he cannot relax. Gandhi could relax many times in a day. He was sleeping many times. Whenever he would find time, he would sleep. Sleep was so easy.

A Buddha can go into non-thinking, a Socrates can go into non-thinking, very easily. Ordinarily, it looks difficult. A person who can think so much, how can he just dissolve thinking? How can he just go into no-thought? Buddha's whole message is of no-thought, and he was a thinking type. He has thought so much, really, that he is still new.

Twenty-five centuries have passed, but Buddha still belongs to the contemporary mind. No one belongs to the contemporary mind so much. Even a present-day thinker cannot say that Buddha is old. He has thought much -- centuries ahead -- and he still has appeal. So whosoever thinks anywhere, Buddha has an appeal for him because he is the purest type. But his message is: Go into non-thinking. Those who have thought deeply, they have always said, "Go into non-thinking." Why is it so easy for them? They can just move.

And the feeling type can go into non-feeling. For example, Meera, she is a feeling type; Chaitanya, he is a feeling type. Their feeling is so much that they cannot remain loving just towards a few persons or a few things. They must love the whole world. This is their type. They cannot be satisfied with limited love, love must be unlimited, it must spread to the infinite.

One day Chaitanya went to a teacher. He had become Enlightened in his own right. His name was known all over Bengal, and then one day he went to a teacher, a teacher of Vedanta; he put his head at his feet. The teacher became afraid, scared, because he respected Chaitanya so much. And he said, "Why have you come to me? What do you want? You have Realized yourself. I cannot teach you anything." Chaitanya said, "Now I want to move into vairagya -- non-attachment. I have lived the life of feeling, now I want to move into no-feeling. So help me."

A feeling type can move, and Chaitanya moved. Ramakrishna was the feeling type. In the end he moved to Vedanta. The whole life he was a worshipper, a devotee, of the Mother, and then in the end he became a disciple of a Vedanta teacher, Totapuri, and was initiated into a non-feeling world. And many people said to Totapuri, "How can you initiate this man, Ramakrishna? He is a feeling type! For him love is the only thing. He can pray, he can worship, he can dance, he can go into ecstasy. He cannot move to non-attachment, he cannot move to the realm beyond feelings."

Totapuri said, "That's why he can move, and I will initiate him. You cannot move; he will move."

So the second criterion to decide: if you can move to the opposite, you belong. See what the beginning is, and then the movement towards the opposite: these are two things. And search within constantly. Only for twenty-one days, continuously note these two things: first

how you react -- what the beginning is, the seed, the start -- and then to what opposite you can move easily. To nonthinking? To non-feeling? To non-action? And within twenty-one days you can come to an understanding of your type -- the predominant one, of course.

The other two will be there like shadows -- mm? -- because pure types never exist. They cannot. All the three are parts; only one is more significant than the others. And once you know what type you are, your path becomes very easy and smooth. Then you don't waste your energy. Then you don't dissipate your energy unnecessarily on paths which don't belong to you. So, really, to find out one's type is a basic requirement for spiritual search. Otherwise you can go on doing many things, and you create only confusion, you create only a disintegration. This is what Krishna means in the Gita by *swabhav* -- the type, that which is your nature. So he says it is better to die unsuccessful in one's own type than to succeed in another's type. It is better to be a failure -- even to be a failure -- according to one's own type than to be a success according to someone else's type, because that success will become a burden, just a weight, a dead weight. And even to fail according to your own nature is good, because even that failure will enrich you. You will be matured through it, you will know much through it, you will become much through it. So even failure is good if it is according to one's own type.

Find out to which type you belong or which type is predominant. Then according to that type begin to work. The work will be easy and the goal nearer.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 1

Chapter #13

Chapter title: Transcendence Through Being

1 June 1972 pm in Bombay, India

Archive code: 7206015

ShortTitle: ULTAL113

Audio: Yes

Video: No

SARVATRA BHAVANA GANDHAH

THE FEELING OF THAT EVERYWHERE IS GANDHA -- THE ONLY FRAGRANCE.

THE INDIAN metaphysics divides Existence into two realms. One is "this" -- that which can be pointed out; and another is "That" -- that which is beyond this, which cannot be pointed out. The Sanskrit word for Truth is SATYA. This Sanskrit word is very meaningful and very beautiful. It is a combination of two words: *sat* and *tat*. *Sat* means "this" and *tat* means "That", *satya* means "this plus That is Truth". So first we should understand what "this" is and what "That" is.

That which can be perceived, that which can be understood, that which can be comprehended, that which can be pointed out, fingered out, that which can be shown, that which can be seen -- all belong to "this". That which cannot be seen but yet is, that which cannot be comprehended but yet is, that which cannot be contemplated but yet is, belongs to "That". So "this" means the known and the knowable, and "That" means the unknown and the unknowable. The known plus the unknown is the Truth: this plus That is *satya*.

So this division is very meaningful, significant. Without giving it any name, we simply call it "this" and "That". Whatsoever science can know is this, and whatsoever science cannot know is That. Science is concerned with this, and religion is concerned with That. That's why between science and religion there is no meeting, and there cannot be really. That meeting is in a way impossible. This cannot become That. That means all which transcends -- that which is always beyond. The very beyondness is That. So they cannot have a meeting, and yet they are not separate, yet there is no gap, there is no gulf. So how to understand it?

It is like this: darkness and light never meet, yet they are not separate. Where light ends, darkness begins. There is no gap -- yet they never meet, yet they never overlap. They cannot. Where light ends, darkness begins. Where light is, darkness is not. Where darkness is, light is not. They never overlap, they never meet -- and yet there is no gap, there is no distance. They never meet, yet they are very near. The boundary of one is the boundary of the other also. There is really no gap at all.

The same is the phenomenon with this and That -- the world, this; and the Truth, That -- they never meet, they never overlap, yet there is no gap. In a way they are always meeting somewhere, because where one ends the other begins -- yet there is no overlapping. Light can

grow more, then the darkness will go further away, Science can know more, but whatsoever it knows becomes this. The That goes further away; it can never touch it -- yet is just on the boundary. It is there just by the corner where it ends. To call it "That" means it is far away -- beyond, transcending.

The this is very near; That is far away. This is known by our senses, intellect, mind. We already know it. Our knowledge, our mind, has a focus. The realm upon which this focus falls is this; the beyond is That. The Indian yogis have not even called it God, because once you use such words -- God, Soul, Nirvana, MOKSHA -- it seems as if that unknown has become known to you. The word "That" shows that the unknown is still unknown. You feel it, but yet you cannot express it. Somewhere it penetrates you, but still you cannot say, "It has become my knowledge, my experience."

Whenever someone says, "God has become my experience," it means that he has transcended God, because that which you know has become smaller than you. Your experience can never be greater than you. Your experience is in your hand. It is something you have; it is your possession. But God can never be possessed, Truth can never be possessed -- it is never in your hand. It is not something which has become a memory, it is not something you are finished with, so it is not something you can define.

You can only define a thing when you have known it totally. Then you can define and believe it. Then you can say, "This is this." But God remains indefinable. The moment never comes when you can say, "I have known." God never becomes an experience in this sense. It is an explosion. but it is not an experience. It is a knowing, but it is never knowledge. Remember the difference. A knowing is a growing thing; it goes on growing. Knowledge is a dead stop. When you say, "I know," you have stopped. Now there will be no growth, now there will be no flow, now there will be no unknown dimensions, now you will not be a riverlike living experience.

Knowing means flowing -- a riverlike existence. You know, but not as knowledge; not as something finished, complete, dead in your hand. You know as an opening -- a constant opening to the greater, a constant opening to the sea, a constant opening to the transcending. Knowing is a constant opening, knowledge is a closing. So those who have felt that knowledge becomes dead have not called that experience "God". They have not given any name to it. Any name means knowledge. When you can give a name to a certain experience, it means you have known it totally, completely. Now you can encircle it. Now you can give it a word. A word means a limitation. So the Indian wisdom says: He is That. "That" is not a word -- it is an indication.

Ludwig Wittgenstein has said somewhere that there are certain things which cannot be said but which can be shown. You cannot say, but you can show, you can indicate. This word "That" is an indication. It is just a finger pointing to the beyond. It is not a word; it gives no negation. It doesn't show that you have known -- it shows that you have felt.

Knowledge has a limitation, but feeling is unlimited. And when we say "That", we say many things more. One: it is far away. "This" means near, here. We know it: it is in our capacity to know it. "That" means far away -- very far away. In one sense, That is very far away; in another sense it is nearer than the near -- but it depends from where you start. We are sitting here. The nearest point is just where you are sitting: anything compared to it is away from you. But you can go and travel the whole earth and can come back to your own point -- then it will be the most distant point. So it depends.

I have heard: Mulla Nasrudin was sitting just outside his village, and someone, a stranger, was asking the way to Mulla's village and how far it was. So Mulla said, "It depends."

The stranger couldn't understand. He said, "What do you mean 'it depends'?"

The Mulla said, "If you keep on going the way you are going, if you keep on following the direction you have taken, then my village is very far away. You will have to go around the whole earth, because you have left the village just behind. But if you can turn back, if you are ready to have an about-turn, then the village is just the nearest thing."

So it depends on where we are -- on the very point where we are, on the very point of consciousness where we are just now. If we can see that point and penetrate that point, then this is very far away and That is the nearest thing. But if we cannot look at the center where we are and we follow the direction of the eyes and the senses, then this is near and That is the most faraway thing. It depends. But in both the ways That transcends this. If you go in, if you reach to the center of your being, then again you transcend this that surrounds you, and That is achieved. Or, if you go out, then you will have to go on a very long journey, an infinite journey, and you can touch That only when this ends.

That's why science is a long journey, very long. Eddington, only in his last days, and Einstein also in his last days, could feel that they had come to a very mysterious glimpse of the universe. Eddington is reported to have said, "When I started my probe into Existence, I thought this whole Existence to be a big mechanical thing -- a big mechanical existence, a big machine. But the more I penetrated it, the less it looked like a machine. And now that I have gone deeper and further away from my starting point, I can say it looks more like a thought than like a machine -- more like a thought."

This glimpse is through science: science is a probe into this. When you go on probing, a moment comes when the probe is exhausted -- but it is a very long journey. Only a mind like Eddington can have this glimpse. Ordinary scientists will never be able to come to this glimpse. Only a mind like Einstein can come to this -- the ending of this and the glimpse of That.

Einstein has said, "The universe now is a mystery to me, not a mathematical problem." But this conclusion through mathematics is a very long journey -- a very long journey! Through mathematical calculations he has come to a point where everything drops. Your mathematics becomes just absurd; your calculations are of no use. Your reason itself in this encounter just drops; you cannot think any more. Thinking becomes impossible because thought has a field. It can work only in a particular scheme, in a particular pattern.

For example, why could Einstein come to feel mystery through mathematics? Mathematics is a logical dimension. It works through a particular logical pattern. For example, in mathematics A is A and B is B, and A can never be B. Mm? This is a logical pattern. If A can be B and B can be A, then it will be a poetry, not mathematics. Mathematics needs clear lines, divisions -- no fluidity. If A can flow and become B, then mathematics is impossible. A must be A and must remain A; B must be B and must remain B. Only then can mathematics work. Divisions must be clear-cut. There should be no mixing and no confusion.

Einstein worked with mathematics, but beyond a certain point difficulties were felt. And for these fifty years, physics has felt such deep difficulties as never before. For example, fifty years ago, matter was matter, A was A; energy was energy, B was B. But during these fifty years, the more physics penetrated, the divisions began to be a confusing thing -- and suddenly matter disappeared completely. It was found nowhere. Rather, on the contrary, it was found that this division between energy and matter was just false. Matter is energy. Then the whole mathematics, the whole logic which depended on the division, just dropped.

What to do with this non-mathematical penetration of Existence? Now matter is no more! And remember, when matter is no more, your definitions of energy cannot remain the same,

because in the old days energy meant that which is not matter. Now matter is no more, so what is energy? You might have heard the definition: "Mind is not matter, matter is not mind". But now there is no matter, so what is the definition of mind?

When matter dropped, suddenly mind dropped also. There was only energy, manifestations of the same energy, with no division. And a fluidity entered into physics. Now A is not certainly A. The deeper you go into A, you find B there. The deeper you go into matter, There is energy. And many other things, many strange things, exploded.

We know that a particle is a particle and never a wave, that a wave is a wave and never a particle. But Einstein had to face a new, strange mystery. In the deeper realms of Existence, a particle can behave like a wave sometimes -- very unpredictable -- and a wave can behave like a particle. It may be difficult, so it is good to understand it through geometry.

We know that a point is never a line. How can a point be a line? A line needs many points in succession. A point can never be a line! A line means many points in succession, so a single point cannot behave like a line, and a line cannot behave like a point -- but they do! They do -- not in geometry because geometry is manmade, but in Existence they do. Sometimes a point behaves like a line and a line behaves like a point, so what to do? Then how to define what a point is and what a line is? Then definition becomes impossible, because a point *can* behave like a line. And when definition becomes impossible, the two things then are not two. Rather, Einstein says, "It is better to say 'X'. Don't say 'line', don't say 'point', because they are irrelevant and meaningless. Say X exists. X sometimes behaves like a point and sometimes behaves like a line." This X is again That. X means now you are not using a word: X means That.

If you say "point", it means "this; if you say "line", it means "this". If you say X, the unknown has penetrated. When you use X, you are saying it is a mystery not a mathematics. So if you go deep you will come to That, but this happens only with a rare mind like Einstein. Mm? It is a very long journey In millennia, one or two persons can come to That through this, because you are going around the earth to come to your own point.

Religion says that there is no journey. There is no journey -- you can find it just here and now. You can be That without going anywhere. That is here. If you miss the inside center, then you are in the this. If you can transcend this, then you will be again in That. So That is beyond this -- either in or out. The beyond means the That, and not using any particular name means it is a mystery.

Metaphysics is not mathematics, it is not logic. It is a mystery. So it will be good to understand what is meant by "mystery". It means your categories, your ordinary categories of thinking, will not do. If you go on thinking in your ordinary categories, you will go on moving around and around and around, but you will never reach the point. About and about you will move, but you will never reach the point. Logical categories are circular. You go on, you do much, you walk much, but you never reach.

The center is not on the periphery, otherwise you would have reached. If you go on round and round in a circle, you can never reach the center. If you are walking slowly, you may think, "Because I am walking slowly, that's why I am not reaching." You can run; still you will not reach. You can go on using any speed, but speed is irrelevant -- you will not reach. The more speed, the more dizzy you will become, but you will not reach because the center is not on the circle. It is in the circle, not on the circle. You will have to leave the circle completely. You will have to drop from the periphery to the center.

Logical categories are circular. Through logic you never reach a new truth -- never! Whatsoever is implied in the premises becomes apparent, but you never reach a truth.

Through logic you can never come to a new experience. It is circular. The conclusion is always there. It becomes apparent, it was latent -- that is the difference. But through logic you never come to realize a new phenomenon, and through logic you never come to the unknowable. The mystery can never be reached through logic because logic is anti-mystery. Logic divides and logic depends on clear-cut, solid divisions -- and reality is fluid.

For example, you say a certain man is a very kind person; but this is a statement. And in the meantime, while you have been making this statement, the person who was kind may now not have been so, he may have changed. You say, "I love someone." This is a statement. But in the very statement your love may have disappeared. In this moment you are loving, in the next moment you are angry. In this moment you are kind, in the next moment you are cruel.

In the dictionary kindness never becomes cruelty -- never. But in reality it goes on moving: kindness becomes cruelty, cruelty becomes kindness; love becomes hate, hate becomes love. In reality, things move; in dictionaries they are static. Reality is dynamic and moving. You cannot fix it. You cannot say, "Stay here!" And not only do things change -- they go on to touch their very contradictions, they move to the very extreme, the other extreme. Love can become hate. It is not a simple change -- it is a dialectical change. The diametrically opposite has come into existence. A friend can become a foe, but the word "friend" can never become the word "foe". How can it become? Words are fixed.

Reason works with fixed entities and life is never fixed. You say, "This is God," but the God may have changed into the Devil. You cannot label. In reality, labelling is futile, because while you are labelling a thing it is changing; that time is enough to change it. But logic, reason, mind, cannot work without labelling.

We can understand how love can become hate, but even more fixed categories can change. You say, "This person is man, male; that person is female, woman." Again, these are categories, labellings. In reality this is not so. When I say that in reality this is not so, I mean you may be male in the morning and female in the evening. It depends. There are moods when you are female and there are moods when you are male. And now modern psychology says man is bisexual. Logic will never believe it. No one is man and no one is woman -- everyone is both. The difference is only of degrees; it is never of quality, it is only of quantity. And degrees go on changing.

Reality cannot be labelled, nothing can be labelled. But we have to label. It is a necessity; mind cannot function without it. Without labelling mind cannot function, so mind goes on labelling things. This labelled world is known as "this" -- the world that is created by labelling. And the world that exists beyond these labels is That -- the unlabelled, the undefined, the uncharted.

You have a name -- mm? -- this is a labelling, so your name belongs to "this". You are a man or a woman. This is labelling, so your being a man or a woman belongs to "this". If you are finished with your labelling, then there is no That. But if you feel that you exist beyond the label; if you feel that your labelling is just on the periphery and there is a center which remains unlabelled, untouched; if you feel that even this being male or female is a labelling, this being young or old is a labelling, this being beautiful or ugly is a labelling, this being healthy or ill is a labelling -- if you can feel something within you which is unlabelled, you have touched the realm of That.

So "this" is the labelled world and That is the unlabelled. "This" is the realm of the mind -- categories, thinking, logic, mathematics, calculation -- That is a mystery. If you try to reach it through logic you cannot reach, because logic is anti-mystery. When I say logic is anti-mystery I mean that logic cannot function in a mysterious world. It can function only in a

fixed, dead, labelled world.

Alice went to Wonderland, and she was just confused. A horse was coming and suddenly the horse changed into a cow, just as it happens in dream. You never object in dream. Have you ever objected? You see something, and suddenly it changes without any cause. The causality doesn't exist in the dreamworld. A horse can become a cow, and you never ask why or how this has happened. No one asks in dreams; you cannot ask. If you ask, you will come out of the dream, the sleep will be broken. But the doubt never arises.

Why? If you pass through the street and suddenly a horse becomes a cow, a dog becomes a man, your wife or your husband suddenly becomes a dog, you will not be able to take it. It will be impossible for the mind. But in the dream you take it with no hesitation at all, with no doubt, with no questioning. Why? In the dream the logical categories are not functioning. The "why" is absent, the doubt is absent, the labelled world is absent. So, really, a horse can become a cow and there is no questioning. The horse can flow and become a cow. It is a fluid world.

So in that Wonderland, Alice was just confused. Everything flows into everything else -- anything. So she asked the Queen, "What is this? Why are things changing? And how can I function here? -- because nothing can be taken for granted, nothing! Anything can be anything, and in any moment it can change. Nothing can be taken for granted, so how am I to function here?"

The Queen said, "This is an alive world. It is not dead. You are coming from a dead world; that's why you feel the difficulty. Things are alive here, A can become B. There are no fixed categories, no categories at all. Everything is just fluid and flows into everything else. This is an alive world -- you are coming from a dead world."

We live in a dead world. That dead world is the "this". If you can feel the live current beyond this dead world, then you have felt That. But the *rishis* have not given any name to it -- mm? because to give it a name is again to label it. If you call it "God" you have labelled it, so God becomes part of "this".

Shankara has said that even God is part of MAYA -- illusion. Mm? This is inconceivable for a Christian or a Jewish mind, because God means the Supreme Reality. But for the Hindu, God has never been the Supreme Reality -- because the Supreme cannot be named! The moment you name it, it is not the Supreme. You name it, and it becomes part of "this". Hindus have struggled and tried to *indicate*, but never to define.

"That" is an indication. If you say it is God, you have defined it. It has come within the categories. That's why Buddha remained silent. He would not even use the word "That", because he said that if you use "That" it refers to "this". Even to use "That" means a reference to "this", and the Ultimate Reality cannot be in reference to anything. If we say it is light, it refers to darkness, It may not be darkness, but it refers to darkness, it is related to darkness. It has meaning only in reference to darkness, so it is not beyond. So Buddha remained silent. He would not even say "That".

"That" is the last word to be used. But Buddha felt that even to use "That" is not good, so he would deny "this", he would destroy "this", but never assert the word "That". He would insist, "Destroy this, and then..." And then what? But he would remain silent. Beyond "then", he would remain silent. He would say, "Destroy this, and then..." Then something happens. But then no one knows what happens. Then even a Buddha doesn't know. He used to say: "Then even a Buddha doesn't know what happens, because there is no Buddha to know. Destroy this; don't ask about That."

He would come into a new place, and his *bhikkhus* would go around the village to

declare: "There are eleven questions Buddha is not going to answer, so please don't ask them." The first was, "Don't ask about 'That'. Ask about 'this', because this is answerable. Ask about this and he will answer. Don't ask about That."

I remember one sufi mystic, Bayazid. He was saying one day that nothing can be said about That. His Master, his Guru, hearing this just went out of the room. His Master was a very old man, illiterate -- mm? -- Bayazid was a very literate man. So, many disciples who were sitting there thought that the old man had gone out because he could not understand such deep things. Bayazid stopped that very moment, ran after the Teacher and asked him, "Have I done something wrong? Have I said something wrong?"

The Teacher said, "Yes! Even to say that nothing can be said about That is to say something. You have said something -- I cannot tolerate it."

There is a story about Marpa, the Tibetan mystic. Someone had come to ask him, "Tell me something about That. But I have heard," the questioner said, "that nothing can be said, words cannot be used, language is futile. So tell me something about That in such a way that it is without words."

Marpa laughed and he said, "I will tell you -- but ask without words. Ask something about That without words, and I will answer you."

So the questioner said, "How can I ask without words?"

So Marpa said, "That is your problem, not mine. You go and find out! That is *your* problem, not mine. Mine begins when I am to answer, so first go and find out."

It was serious; it was not a joke. The person who had come to ask was serious about it. He went and he thought and he tried. In every way he meditated: "How to ask without words? Really, Marpa is right! If you demand an answer without words you must ask without words." He meditated, he contemplated, he thought about it, but it is impossible. How to ask it without words? Years passed, and because of this constant inquiry -- how to ask without words? -- thoughts dropped. The man became empty.

Suddenly, one day, Marpa is at his door, knocking. The man opens the door. Marpa is there laughing, smiling. Marpa says, "You have asked and I have answered." And they both laugh. And from that day on, that person, the inquirer, follows Marpa as a shadow, laughing continuously. From village to village Marpa moves, and the man follows him like a shadow, laughing. So everybody who meets them asks, "Why is this man laughing?"

Marpa says, "He has asked without words and I have answered without words -- hence, the laughter."

Logical categories will not do because logic exists in thinking and mystery exists in non-thinking. You come in contact with mystery when there is no thought. You come in contact with mystery, all the bridges are destroyed, all the gaps are destroyed, when there is no thought. So from another dimension, "this" means the world of thinking and "That" means the world of no-thought. If you can be in a state of no-thought, you are in That. If you are in thinking, you are in this. When you are in thinking you are not in Being. When you are in thinking you are on a journey away from yourself. The deeper you go in thought, the further away you are from yourself. So a thinker is never a knower -- never! A thinker is just dreaming.

You might have seen Rodin's sculpture known as "The Thinker". The man is sitting and brooding. His hand is on his head; the head is lowered. This is one concept, the Western concept, of a thinker. The man is very anxious, tense, worried; his every nerve is tense. He is *thinking*; a very arduous effort is being made somewhere inside. He is thinking! His every muscle, his every nerve is tense. He has gone far away.

There is another picture -- a Zen picture, a Chinese picture -- of the thinker. It is good to put them side by side and then meditate. The Chinese picture of the thinker is relaxed; nothing is going on. And the caption in Chinese reads: "He is a thinker because he is not thinking at all." There are no thoughts. Simply the consciousness has remained -- no problem, no struggle inside. He is not thinking -- he is the thinker! Only the thinker has remained, not thinking. In Rodin's sculpture, there are thoughts, there is thinking. but the thinker is not, the center is not -- only the circumference. Much is there as work, effort, but the center is clouded.

In the Chinese picture of the thinker, only the center is -- centered, relaxed in itself, no journey. The consciousness has not gone anywhere. It is relaxing in itself. In Rodin's concept of thinking you will touch the this, and in the Chinese Zen painting of the thinker you will touch the That. If *you* are thinking, then knowing is not possible because you can do either thinking or knowing. The mind cannot do both simultaneously. Either you can think or you can know. It is just like you can either run or you can stand; you cannot do both. If someone says, "I am standing while running," he is saying the same absurd thing as we go on thinking and saying: "I am knowing while thinking."

You cannot *know*, because knowing is a standing and thinking is a running from one thought to another. It is a process. You go on running and jumping and running and jumping. If you stand still inside, no running... a *centering*, just sitting. In Japan they call it "Za-zen". It means just sitting. The Japanese word for meditation is "Za-zen". It means just sitting, doing nothing -- not even meditation, because if you are meditating you are doing something. The Japanese say that even if you are doing meditation you are still doing something, you are running. Don't even meditate -- just be. Don't do anything. Just be! If you can be without any doing, you drop into That, because thinking is this -- the thought process, the labelling, the logic.

Thinking is a process of ignorance. You think because you don't know. If you know, there is no need to think. You think because you don't know -- it is a groping in the dark. But thinking is a very tense process -- most tense! And the more you are tense inside, the less you are in contact with the center. Relaxed, fall into yourself. Relaxed, just be. Relaxed, don't go anywhere. Remain in yourself -- suddenly you are in That.

This sutra says:

THE FEELING OF THAT EVERYWHERE IS THE ONLY FRAGRANCE.

The only Divine fragrance -- the feeling of That everywhere! But how can you feel it everywhere if you have not felt it inside? If you have not felt it in yourself, how can you feel it everywhere? The feeling must come first in your center; then it goes out in waves all around you, everywhere. Once you have known that fragrance inside, you suddenly become aware it is everywhere. Then this this is just an appearance and That is hidden everywhere. So this is to be understood: unless you know it inside, you cannot know it outside; unless you come to That within, you cannot come to it without. *You* have to drop into That inside first, otherwise you can create a very illusory phenomenon.

Many religious persons are doing that. Without knowing the inside you can go on thinking that That is everywhere -- in the trees, in the houses, in the sky, in the stars, in the sun -- everywhere. You can go on thinking -- I insist, thinking -- you can go on thinking That is everywhere, and you can come to a false feeling through constantly thinking that it is there

everywhere. This is an imposition, a projection, and mind is capable of it. It can project. But projection will not lead to you That. Mm? -- you are dreaming about that -- not knowing it, not feeling it, not living it. So you can, by constant repetition, autohypnotize yourself that That is everywhere. You can go on repeating that you are feeling it in every stone.

Try it! It is a good experiment. Try for twenty-one days continuously to feel That, the Divine, the God, everywhere -- in every leaf, in every stone, everywhere. Whatsoever comes to your mind, remember it is That continuously for three weeks, and you will be able to create a certain illusion around you. You will be in a very high euphoria just like with LSD or mescaline or marijuana. By constant repetition of a certain feeling, you can project it without any chemical drugs. The mind creates its own chemical drugs.

But it is arduous; through drugs it is very easy. But the same is the process. When you take a pill and instant heaven comes to you, what does it mean? It means only that the chemical drug lowers down all your defense measures, breaks down your logic, your rational thinking. You are in a waking dream. The logic has stopped -- not as an achievement, but just as a chemical enforcement. You are in a waking dream; with LSD you are in a waking dream.

Timothy Leary has written a book comparing Tibetan mystics with LSD-takers, and he says the same is the experience. He says about Marpa and Milarepa, or you could say Kabir and Eckhardt, Huang Po or Hui-Hai, or Bayazid and Rabiya, that whatsoever they have known or have come to know is just similar to LSD experiences. And Timothy Leary is right in a way -- but still fundamentally wrong. He is right in a way because the experiences are similar, but not the same.

When you take some chemical drug which lowers down the defense mechanism of the mind, the logic, the reason, you are in the same state as in a dream in the night. The difference is only that now you are in a waking dream. You are awake and still dreaming, so if a horse becomes a cow there is no problem. And this waking dream gives the whole reality a new rainbow colour. Everything becomes fresh. All the labels have dropped; your dream has spread all over. Now, whatsoever is happening inside chemically is being projected outside.

The colours that you see outside are a projection of your inside mind. Now your dreams are projected everywhere. The whole world has become a screen and you are a projector now: you project everything. So whatsoever is inside you will now be projected. So LSD will not give the same experiences to all. A poet will have a very poetic experience, but a murderer cannot have the same experience. Someone can have heaven instantly, and someone may drop into hell. So whatsoever is inside will now be projected outside.

The same can be done through constant repetition. If you go on constantly repeating a certain feeling, you can project it. You can begin to live in this world as if this world has become dead. But unless you have known it inside, it is a false phenomenon. Any day you stop your repetition, and the hypnosis will go down. You can go on in this process for lives together. It is self-perpetuated because it is so pleasant.

So remember this: you are not to project. You are to know it inside, not to project it outside. For projection thinking will be needed, and for realization no-thinking will be needed. For projection you will need a certain concept to be enforced on reality. It is a rape of reality. And you can autohypnotize yourself, but this is a dream existence. The real thing to be done is to come to a stop of inside brooding and thinking. The clouds must be thrown. Your inner center must come to a very uncloudy sky. Your inner center must be there without any action, and thinking is the action.

If every thought stops... but that you can do even by becoming totally unconscious. If you

become unconscious, then it is of no use. You have fallen into deep sleep. In projecting outside you have fallen into a waking dream. You can stop every thought inside and be unconscious -- you have fallen into deep sleep. It will not do.

A third thing has to be done -- no thinking and no unconsciousness. This is the basic formula: no thinking and no unconsciousness. Conscious totally with no thoughts, and you come not only to know That but to be That. You are one with it. And once tasted, the taste never leaves you. Once felt, it never leaves you because you are transformed, you are not the same. And when you have *known* it, felt it inside, then open your eyes and it is everywhere. Now everything becomes just a mirror. You need not think about it; there is no need. You need not remember that it is there -- *it is there!* That felt inside is felt everywhere.

Really, the inside and outside drop. Then your inside is the outside. Then the whole distinction between the within and without is meaningless. Once you have known That, the infinite inside, then it is the same outside. Then a very different feeling comes. Then it is not that you are inside and you are not outside -- then you are everywhere. The inside and the outside are just two poles of one reality. You are spread between the two. You are the reality -- the That. One pole was known as inside previously; another pole was known as outside. Now you are spread between the two. They are both your poles.

This knowing inside is authentic religion. And this sutra says: "The feeling of That everywhere is *gandha*, the only fragrance." If one is to know, if one is to live in that divine fragrance, in that bliss, this is the path. Why does the *rishi* say that the feeling of That everywhere is the fragrance? If you go to worship, you take some flowers with you. This is a symbolic expression. Ordinary flowers will not do for worship. Take *this* fragrance with you -- this feeling of That everywhere. Then only will your worship be authentic; otherwise it is just a false show. Ordinary flowers will not do.

Take this fragrance with you when you are going to worship. But then there is no going because then there is no temple. Then everything has become a temple. If you feel That everywhere, then where is the temple? Then where is the Mecca and where is Kashi? Then He is everywhere. Then the whole Existence becomes a temple. If you feel That everywhere, then this becomes a temple. Take this fragrance with you.

But, really, the *rishi* is very deep, even in his symbology. He will not say "flowers", he says "fragrance" -- because flowers again are part of this fragrance, part of That. A flower is born and it dies; a fragrance is forever. You may know, you may not know it. A flower is a material manifestation; a fragrance is a spiritual part. A flower you can have in your hand, but you cannot have fragrance in your hand. A flower can be purchased, but never the fragrance. A flower is a limitation, but a fragrance is simply the unlimited. A flower is somewhere, but the fragrance goes everywhere. You cannot say it is here; you cannot say it is there. It is everywhere. It goes on, it goes on.

So that's why the *rishi* says not "flowers", but "fragrance". Take this fragrance with you, and only then will you enter the real temple -- because the reality of the temple doesn't depend on the temple, it depends on you. If *you* are authentic, the temple becomes authentic. Then any temple or any place will do; it makes no difference.

I have heard about Hassan. He worshipped in a mosque for seventy years continuously. The whole village became so acquainted with Hassan worshipping in the mosque for seventy years. Virtually, the mosque and the worshipper became one. No one could conceive of Hassan without the mosque; no one could conceive of the mosque without Hassan. He was there five times every day. He didn't move from his village, never -- because if he had moved anywhere and there was no mosque, where would he do his prayer? And five times, the

whole day, he was engaged in prayer. Even if sometimes he was ill, he would not miss -- he would come.

One morning when he was not found in the mosque, all the worshippers thought that the only thing possible was that Hassan was dead; there was no other possibility. He had never missed! For years and years, for five prayers the whole day Hassan was there in the mosque. So the whole congregation went to Hassan's hut. They thought it was certain he was dead; otherwise nothing could prevent him. But Hassan was not dead. That old man was sitting under a tree.

The people just couldn't understand. They said, "What are you doing? Have you become a heretic in your old age? Have you stopped worshipping? Why didn't you come? We thought you were dead, but you are alive. It would not have been so strange if we had found you dead, but you are alive. This is strange, and we are unable to understand."

Hassan said, "I was coming continuously to the mosque because I didn't know where His temple is. But now I have come to know. Now His temple is everywhere, and I need not go now. His temple has come here. See! He is here -- everywhere."

But the villagers couldn't see. They thought he might have gone mad.

The authenticity of the temple, the reality of the temple, depends on you. A false worshipper cannot find a real temple. Wheresoever he moves, he moves in his own falsity. All these temples have become false because of false worshippers. Wherever they move, they move with their falsity.

The *rishi* says, "The feeling of That everywhere is the only fragrance." Go to Him, go to His feet, with this fragrance. But then there is no going. Then wherever you are, you are in His presence. If the fragrance is inside, then the presence is outside. If you are filled with the feeling of That, then there is no seeking.

Bokuju, a Zen Master, has said that *sansar* is Nirvana -- this world is the Ultimate. When he said this for the first time, his own disciples became disturbed and they said, "What are you saying? This world, *sansar*, is Nirvana! This world is the Ultimate! This world is Brahma! What are you saying?"

Bokuju said, "When I didn't know, when I was ignorant, there was a division. But when I came to realize That, the division disappeared -- now everything is That."

So the last thing: this and That is a division for the ignorant and of the ignorant. You know only this, and That is just a concept. When you come to know That, this becomes only a day-to-day concept, a utility. If you only know this, then That is just a concept, a metaphysical concept. If you come to know That, then this disappears. Knowing That does not mean that the world disappears; it will remain. But for you it will not be this -- it will become That.

Mohammed's disciple Ali was beaten by someone; he became unconscious. He was beaten so much that he became unconscious. The person who had attacked him escaped. When others came, the attacker was not found there. Ali was found Lying unconscious on the street. So they served him; someone brought water and they all did something to help him. Then Ali became conscious. Someone was fanning him, someone was sitting just by his side stroking his head. The person who was sitting by his side asked, "Have you become conscious? Can you recognize this man who is fanning you?" He was asking to know whether Ali had become conscious or not.

Ali said, "How can I not recognize Him? I know He is the same who was beating me."

The man who asked felt that he was still unconscious, because that man had escaped. And how can that man who was beating him serve him now to make him conscious? He was

fanning him, the man said, "Ali, you seem to be still unconscious, confused. This is not that man."

Ali said, "How can He not be That? I cannot see anything except That. So when He was beating me I knew who He was, and now that He is serving me I know who He is -- but they are both the same!"

This is a non-dualistic concept, feeling. When you know That, this disappears; when you know this, That remains just a concept somewhere. But start from yourself Don't go to find it out anywhere else; otherwise the journey will be very long. And you may reach, you may not reach. Take a total about-turn -- seek it in your own center.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 1

Chapter #14

Chapter title: Facing the Reality

2 June 1972 pm in

Archive code: 7206025

ShortTitle: ULTAL114

Audio: Yes

Video: No

OSHO, YOU SAID LAST NIGHT THAT TO REALIZE THE THAT, THE TRANSCENDENTAL TRUTH EVERYWHERE, ONE MUST FIRST REALIZE IT AT ONE'S OWN CENTER OF BEING. THEN YOU SAID THAT A CENTERING FOR THIS IS NEEDED. IS THIS CENTERING THE SAME AS THAT OF GURDJIEFF'S CRYSTALLIZATION?

PLEASE TELL US HOW THIS CENTERING OR CRYSTALLIZATION IS DIFFERENT FROM STRENGTHENING ONE'S OWN EGO, AND HOW DOES IT LEAD TO THE TRANSCENDENTAL TRUTH, THE THAT?

MAN IS born with a Self, but not with an ego. Ego is a social construct, a later growth. Ego cannot exist without relationship. You can exist, the Self can exist, but the ego cannot exist in itself. It is a by-product of being related to others. So ego exists between "I and thou". It is a *relata*.

The child is born with a Self but not with an ego. The child develops the ego. As he becomes more and more social and related, ego develops. This ego is just on your periphery where you are related with others -- just on the boundary of your being. So ego is the periphery of your being, and Self is the center. The child is born with a Self, but unaware. He is a Self, but he is not conscious of the Self.

The first awareness of the child comes with his ego. He becomes aware of the "I", not of the Self. Really, he becomes aware first of the "thou". The child becomes aware first of his mother. Then, reflectively, he becomes aware of himself. First he becomes aware of objects around him. Then, by and by, he begins to feel that he is separate. This feeling of separation gives the feeling of ego, and because the child first becomes aware of the ego, ego becomes a covering on the Self.

Then ego goes on growing, because the society needs you as an ego, not as a Self. The Self is irrelevant for the society; your periphery is meaningful. And there are many problems. The ego can be taught and the ego can be made docile and the ego can be forced to be obedient. The ego can be made to adjust, but not the Self. The Self cannot be taught, the Self cannot be forced. The Self is intrinsically rebellious, individual. It cannot be made a part of

society.

So the society is not interested in your Self. The society is interested in your ego -- because something can be done with the ego, and nothing can be done with the Self. So the society helps to strengthen the ego, and you go on living around your ego. The more you grow, the more you become social, educated, cultured, civilized, the more polished an ego you have. Then you begin to function from the ego, not from the Self, because you are not aware of it at all.

So your essence goes on into the unconscious, into inner darkness, and a false construct, a social construct -- the ego -- becomes your center. Now you identify yourself with your ego -- with your name, with your education, with your family, with your religion, with your country. These are all just part of your ego, not of your Self, because the Self doesn't belong to your parents, the Self doesn't belong to your country, the Self doesn't belong to any religion, the Self doesn't even belong to your self. It doesn't belong! The Self is a freedom. It is *total* freedom! It exists in its own right. It doesn't belong to anything else, it doesn't depend on anything else. It is!

But the ego belongs. It exists in a pattern. So if you are left alone for a long period, your ego will, by and by, subside. By and by, you will feel that your ego is being starved -- because the ego needs constant help from others. It needs a constant energy, food from others. That's why love gives you a very heightened feeling of ego -- because in love the other gives you significance, meaning. You become, for the first time, important. And in love, lovers help each other mutually. Love is a very subtle food for ego. The ultimate vitamin for the ego is love.

That's why Mahavir and Buddha and Mohammed and Christ, they all escaped from society. It was not really escaping from society: they all escaped into loneliness. It was not against society. Basically, it was to know whether their egos could exist outside society. And Mahavir, continuously for twelve years, was in loneliness just to dissolve this ego, this social construct. He chose to be without a center for the time being so that a real center, the authentic center, could come up.

One has to be in a gap. Mm? That gap is bound to be a chaos, because you are centered in the ego and the real center is hidden behind. Unless you dissolve this false center you cannot reach to the real center -- because there is no need. The ego goes on substituting for it.

The ego is enough as far as the world is concerned, society is concerned, relationship is concerned -- the ego is enough. If you go on a lonely retreat in non-relationship, this ego cannot exist because it is a bridge between I and thou. If the thou is not there, the bridge cannot exist on one bank. It needs two banks to be there. That's why this retreating into loneliness became a deep *sadhana*.

But you can deceive yourself. If you go into loneliness and then begin to talk with God, then again you will create your ego. You have created the thou, the other, again. So if you retreat into loneliness and then pray to God and begin to talk with God, then you have created an imaginary thou. Now the ego can exist again. So to be in loneliness means to be without thou -- no thou -- to be totally alone. Then this ego cannot exist. It will wither away, and you will be thrown into chaos because you will be, for a certain period, without any center. This chaos has to be faced. Unless you face it you cannot be centered in your Self. You have to pass through this.

Christian mystics have called this "The Dark Night of the Soul". Really, one just becomes mad, because when you have no center you are mad. You have nowhere to function from; you have no unity now. You are just fragments with no energy in them, with no center, with

no focus. You are a crowd. You will be mad. This madness has to be faced. This is the only courage the religious revolution needs: to be mad, to be without a center. This is the real austerity: to pass through it without creating any false center again, to be so honest that unless the real center comes up you are not going to create any center any more. You will wait. This waiting may take any length of time. Nothing can be said.

Mahavir had to be in loneliness for twelve years; Mohammed was in it only for thirty days. It depends on many things. I feel Mahavir had to wait for twelve years because he was the son of a great king. He must have been deeply rooted in a false ego -- more than Mohammed. He was no ordinary man. His ego was greater than Mohammed's. Mohammed was just a poor man with no developed ego, uneducated, really nobody. He was nobody! But Mahavir was somebody. He belonged to a great family. He had a great heritage, a very polished ego, well educated, cultured. In every way he had a very crystallized ego. Twelve years were needed to dissolve it.

Jesus was in loneliness for only forty days. He was also a poor man with nothing to help his ego. The more civilization progresses, the more difficult it is -- because every progressive civilization is bound to have a solidifying effect on the egos that constitute that civilization.

This passing through a chaos without any center, being a chaos, ultimately throws you down to the center, the real center, to the Self. There are many methods for how to go through this chaos and how to destroy this ego. But this is a foundational thing: to have the courage to be without a center for a certain period of time.

You can do it by surrender. You can surrender yourself to someone, to the teacher. If the surrendering is total, then you will be without ego. You can be a Self, but not an ego; that's why surrender is so difficult. And the more egoistic an age, the more difficult surrender becomes. In surrender you give up yourself, you become a shadow, you just follow the instructions. You don't think about them -- you are no more.

But whenever surrender is to be contemplated, one begins to think: "If I surrender, then I will not be an individual."

This is absolutely incorrect. If you surrender, only then can you be an individual, because the ego is not your individuality. It is false, it is just a facade. If you surrender the false, then you are bound to explode into the real. And this is the beauty of surrender: you cannot surrender the Self -- mm? -- that is impossible; you can only surrender the ego. You can give up only that which has been given to you. You *cannot* give up your Self; that is impossible. There is no possibility. How can you give up your Self? You can give up something which has been put into you, which is a social penetration. Really, you can give only that which doesn't belong to you, which you are not.

This will look contradictory, paradoxical. You can give only that which you are not. That which you are you cannot give. So in surrender you give up whatsoever you know yourself to be. Then only the Self remains, which you really are and you cannot give up. When the false is thrown, the real is encountered.

So there are two ways, two basic ways: one is surrender. Mm? There are many methods of surrender, but the foundation is always to surrender to someone. It is *not* significant to whom. It is absolutely insignificant to whom you surrender. The real thing is surrendering. So sometimes it happens that the teacher himself may not be a real one -- but if you surrender, you may come to the real Self.

Even a false teacher can be a help, even a dead teacher can be a help -- because the real thing is not to whom you are surrendering; the real thing is that you are surrendering. The happening is *in you*. To whom it is addressed is absolutely irrelevant. Krishna may be there

or he may not be there; Buddha may be a historical person or he may not be; Jesus may just be a myth -- it makes no difference. If you can surrender to Jesus, whether Jesus was ever there or not, the thing will happen to you. It is the surrendering that is meaningful.

So one way, one basic way, is surrender. Another is absolute will. Don't surrender, but then be absolutely yourself. I said that when you surrender, the Self cannot be surrendered. Whatsoever you surrender is bound to be the ego, the false, the PERSONA -- not the essence. Another basic path is to be yourself totally, don't surrender -- but then be a will.

Again, the ego has no will; it cannot have. The ego is absolutely will-less because a false entity cannot have the quality of will. Will belongs to the real. You are absolutely will-less. In the morning you decide something; in the afternoon you yourself cancel it. When you are deciding, at that very moment some part of you is cancelling it. You say, "I love." Go deep, and somewhere in the corner hate is hiding -- in that very moment. You decide, "I am going to do this," and in that very moment the contrary is there.

Will means nothing contrary in the mind. Will means one -- no duality. Ego cannot have any will. Ego means many contradictory wills simultaneously. You are a crowd as far as ego is concerned, and it is bound to be. It is natural, because as I said, ego is created by relationships. It is a by-product. You have many relationships, so your ego is a construct of many relationships. It cannot be one; it is a crowd.

Really, look at it in this way: you have a part of your ego which was created with your mother -- a fragment of your ego was created by you in relationship with your mother. Another part of your ego was created by you in relationship with your father; another was created in relationship with your wife. Now the fragment that was created by your wife cannot be the same as that which was created by your mother. They will be antagonistic. They will fight inside you. It is not only that your wife and your mother will fight outside. The ego part which is in you will also fight. It is not only that your father and your mother will fight outside. They have created fragments of your ego and they will fight inside. So you have many fragments, you have a crowd in the name of the ego -- a crowd. A constant fight, a conflict, is going on. You cannot will anything.

Gurdjieff used to say, "You cannot will because you are not." Man is not because man is not one. You are a crowd, and a crowd without any real unity. You have many faces, you have many wills. In a certain moment, in a certain situation, one fragment is the master. Then you say something, then you decide to do something. In that moment you feel that you have a will, but in the next moment that fragment has gone down. Another fragment has come up -- and this fragment is not even aware of your decisions.

You are angry and then you decide, "I will not be angry again." The part that was angry has not decided this. This is another part, and they both may not meet at any time in your life. The second part which says, "I decide now not to be angry," is not the part which was angry. And there is no meeting. The part which was angry will again be angry tomorrow, and when that part is angry you will forget completely what you had decided. Again you will repent. The other part has come up again -- and this goes on.

Gurdjieff used to say that we are like a house, the master of which is either asleep or has gone somewhere else. For years together the house has not known its master. There are many servants. The servants have forgotten completely that there was ever any master. Either he is asleep or he has gone away. For years together the servants have lived in the house without the master. Someone passes by the house; some servant is outside and he asks the servant, "Who is the master?"

The servant says, "I am the master."

Another day the same man passes by the house and finds someone else there. He asks, "Who is the master?"

The second servant says, "I am the master."

Every servant claims that he is the master, and nothing can be decided because the master is asleep or has gone somewhere else. These servant-masters can decide something, but they cannot complete it. They can Promise something, but they cannot fulfill it. They are not the masters at all.

This is the situation of the ego. It cannot will. So the second path is to create a will. If you create a will, then the ego will disappear -- because only the Self can will. So if you begin to will, if you insist on willing, then by and by you will go in. The ego cannot will; and if you insist on willing, the ego will disappear.

Surrender is one basic path -- the path of the *bhaktas*. *tap*, will, is the second basic path -- the path of the warriors, fighters. Each path has many techniques, but the essential thing is this.

Gurdjieff used the second path -- the path of will. He called it crystallization. He said, "If you will, then by and by you will crystallize into your center." The ego cannot exist with a willing consciousness -- it cannot exist. So Gurdjieff used very deep methods for inner integration. He would say, for example, "Don't sleep for seven days. Whatsoever happens, don't sleep." You can remain without food for seven days; it is not so difficult. But to be without sleep for seven days is very difficult. To be without food for seven days is not so difficult; a man can be alive without food for at least ninety days without any danger. But with sleep it is difficult.

Food is a voluntary thing. You may eat, you may not eat. Sleep is not a voluntary thing: it is non-voluntary. Either it comes or it doesn't. You cannot bring it; you cannot force yourself into sleep. You can force yourself not to take food or to take more food; that is a voluntary thing. But sleep is a non-voluntary phenomenon. You cannot force yourself. And when sleep comes you will not be able, with your ego, to be awake. But you can insist. You can say, "Whatsoever happens, I will not sleep. I am ready to die, but not to sleep."

Gurdjieff's chief disciple, Ouspensky, was dying, but he would not lie down. He continued walking. He was dying, and he was aware that death was just about to come -- but he would not lie down. Physicians insisted, persuaded, but he would not lie down. He said, "No, I am going to die walking. I am going to die consciously." He used even death to create will, and he died walking. He was the first man in the whole history of humanity who died walking -- consciously.

Consider, contemplate, what was happening inside of him. It is not simply sleep -- it is death. And he was not ready to surrender even to death. Mm? This is an anti-surrender path. He was not ready even to surrender to death. He continued to fight. He went on walking for three days and three nights. The body was very ill, old. Those who were keeping watch over him couldn't follow him -- they had to sleep. So someone would sleep and someone else would watch him. A group of twelve persons continued watching him, but for three days continuously, night and day, he continued walking. He would not sit. He would not allow any terms, any compromise with death. He died a crystallized man. He used death to create will.

You can fight with sleep, you can fight with food, you can fight with sex, you can fight with anything -- but then *no* compromise! Then *no* surrender! Then be *absolute* in it! But ego cannot be absolute in anything. And if you insist on being absolute, ego will disappear and suddenly you will become aware of a different center in yourself. The ego cannot will, so if you will the ego cannot exist.

So either surrender totally or win totally. Then you will understand that these seemingly contradictory parts are not really contradictory, not so contradictory, because one thing is common: totality -- total surrender or total will. The ego can *never* be total in anything. It is always fragmentary, divided. So be total, in any way, and the ego evaporates. And when there is no ego, for the first time you become aware of your real center.

I call it centering; Gurdjieff calls it crystallization. Words don't mean much. Through this centering you become a being through this centering you are in Existence. Before this you are in society, not in Existence. Before this you are part of a civilization, of a culture, of a language, of a religion, but not a part of Existence. Before this you lived in a man-created world. Before this you belonged to "this". And once you are centered, you belong to That which is beyond, which is not created, which is eternal. Then you come to the source. You may call it God, you may call it soul, you may call it whatsoever you like. The Upanishads call it "That" -- that which is unborn, that which is deathless, that which is.

This centering is possible, it is not impossible. It looks impossible, it appears impossible; it is impossible for the ego -- not for you. It is impossible for the ego because ego cannot attain it. Rather, in attaining it ego will die.

The old yoga scriptures say, "Hear whatsoever the Teacher says and follow it -- because he is your Self. Whatsoever he is saying, it is your own inner voice." So they say the real Teacher, the real Guru, exists *in you*. Outside you the Teacher is just a help to awaken the inner Teacher. So, really, surrendering to a Teacher is surrendering to the Self. It is just like this: you come to a mirror, and for the first time you become aware of your face -- through the mirror. The Teacher is just a mirror. If you surrender you become aware of your own Self.

This is one way. The other is to find out your own will. And decide which is your way, because, as I know, there are many people who just go on thinking: sometimes they think of surrender; sometimes they think of will -- rather, this is their way. Whenever you talk to them about surrender, they think about will. If you talk to them about will, they will think about surrender. This is how the fragments of the ego work.

If I say to you, "Surrender," then you will think, "How can I surrender? What will happen to my individuality, my freedom?" And you have none really -- no individuality, no freedom. But then you become afraid of losing something which you don't have. "How can I surrender?" Then if I say to you, "Don't surrender! Create a will!" then you say, "I am so weak, how can I create a will? It is so difficult." And both these teachings can have counterparts in your ego. And then you can go on wavering. That wavering will never help you to come to your center.

Decide either this or that, and then follow it -- and then follow it absolutely, totally, because that totality ultimately helps to destroy the false structure of the ego. And when the false center is no more, you will come to know the real center. There will be a gap -- a gap of chaos. One has to face it. It is painful, but it is a birth pain. One has to pass through it; it is a necessity. But when you come to the center, then you know that you have paid nothing. What you have gained is invaluable, and whatsoever you have done is just nothing. But before you attain it, your effort is very valuable.

And, lastly, you can be in a confusion and you can go on thinking that you have become centered or that you are crystallized -- only because you have a crystallized ego. So what is the difference? How can you judge whether you are centered in the ego or centered in the Self?

Three things to be remembered: one, if you are existing in the ego you can never be in

silence -- never. Then you are in a crowd, in the marketplace. Your ego is a market production. You can never be in silence.

Secondly, you can never find even an iota of happiness, because happiness happens only to the real center, silence happens only to the real center. They are qualities of the real center. You need not make any effort for them; they are just there. So if you are in the ego, your happiness will always be in the future -- never attained. always to be attained.

And, thirdly, your life motivation will be fear when you are in the ego. Whatsoever you do, your motivation will be fear-oriented, you will be fear-oriented. If you love, you will love because of fear. If you pray, you will pray because of fear. If you think of God, you will think because of fear. If you accumulate wealth, you will accumulate because of fear. If you make friends... whatsoever you do, your basic motive will be fear-oriented.

These three things. No silence will be possible because there is a crowd, a conflicting crowd of tensions and tensions and conflicts. anxiety and anguish, but no silence, no happiness -- because happiness belongs to the center, not to the ego. And there will be fearorientation because ego is constantly afraid of death -- because ego is just a construct. It is not a reality, so it is afraid of death. The Self is never afraid of death, the Self has never known death. Death is impossible to the center -- to the real center. Deathlessness is the very quality of it, its nature. So remember these three things.

Mind will be a constant tension, anguish, a longing for happiness, but no experience; and everything will be trembling, fear-oriented. Your religion will be just a fear, your beliefs, your philosophies, just fear -- existing only to hide the fear, to escape the fear, to deceive yourself.

If you are in the real center, silence will be your nature -- not dependent on any situation. It is not that the situation is such that you are silent. Whatsoever the situation, you will be silent. You cannot be otherwise. Nothing can disturb you. Disturbance will be there but you will remain unaffected, untouched. Nothing penetrates to your center, it cannot.

Silence, then, is not situational. It is not that the day is good, not that you are successful, not that you are surrounded by friends -- no. It is not anything situational. Silence is there. Whatsoever the situation, silence is there and happiness -- not in the future but here and now. And this happiness is not a happening. It is a state. It is not that today you are happy -- you cannot be otherwise. You *are* happiness, and fear dissolves. And with the dissolution of fear, the whole world that we have created around fear dissolves. You enter into a world of no-fear. And when there is no fear, only then is freedom possible. Fear and freedom cannot exist together. It is because of fear that we have created all our slaveries, all our bondages. Our imprisonment is because of our fear.

So remember these three things. And once you have known your real center, you are not the same. The old man has died and a new one is born. It is a new birth! When the child is born, only a body is born. Then the ego is given by the society. You go on living with an ego and a body -- with no Self. Unless you dissolve this ego and find the Self, your life is wasted. The body is given by your parents and the ego is given by your society. Who are you? The body belongs to your parents, to heredity, to a long series, and the ego belongs to the society. Who are you?

Gurdjieff used to say that you are not. You are just a construct. Unless you find out something which has not come through the parents, not come through the society, not come at all to you; which you have always been -- before your birth, after your death; that which you will be, which you have been, which you are; unless you find that, you are not a centered being, you go on living on the periphery. This peripheral existence has been called SANSAR

-- the world, the this. This centered existence is called the Nirvana -- the That.

OSHO, HOW CAN ONE DIFFERENTIATE BETWEEN A PROJECTED EXPERIENCE AND AN AUTHENTIC FEELING?

"How can one differentiate between a projected experience and an authentic one?" It is difficult. Because we have to speculate, that's why it is difficult. For example, how can you feel that you are touching a real fire or just an imagined one? If you have not touched a real fire, it is very difficult to think about it, to make any theoretical distinction. If you have touched a real fire, then it is not so difficult, then you know. A projected experience is just a dream experience.

But we can think certain things. If you have projected something, you have to go on projecting it; otherwise it will disappear. For example, if I project God and I say, "I see Him in the trees, I see Him in the sky, I see Him everywhere," if it is a projected experience, just my projection, my thought imposed on things, not a realization, but an idea, a theory imposed on things; if I project that I can see a tree as Divine -- then I have to help this projection constantly. If I drop repeating, if I forget even for a single moment, the Divine will disappear and there will only be a tree.

In a projected experience you have to work for it continuously. You cannot have any leave, you cannot be on any holiday. The so-called saints cannot go on any holiday. They are continuously at work. They are working and working day and night. If you stop them for a single moment, the projected experience will disappear.

Some friends brought to me a Sufi mystic. He was an old man, and he said that for thirty years he had been experiencing God in everything. And it looked so, it appeared so! He was just ecstatic, dancing, his eyes aflame with some unknown experience. So I asked that man, that mystic, "For thirty years you have been experiencing -- is there any effort you still have to make?"

He said, "I have to constantly remember. Continuously, I have to remember. If I forget, then the whole thing disappears." So I asked him to stop all effort for three days and be with me.

He was with me only one night. The next morning he said, "What have you done? You have destroyed it! My thirty years' effort, and you have destroyed everything!" He began to weep. The same eyes which had been aflame with something unknown, became ugly. Thirty years' effort -- and he said, "How, in what unfortunate moment, did I come to you? What have you done? Why did you say to me to stop for three days. Now how can I get into it again?"

This is the projected experience. So I told him, "It is better not to get into it again, because you have wasted thirty years in a dream. You can waste thirty lives, but what are you gaining out of it?"

Authentic experience needs no effort. You need not maintain it. When it happens, it has happened. Now you can forget everything. You need not go on maintaining it; there is no constant maintenance. It remains. You forget it -- it is there. You don't look at it -- it is there. You sleep -- it is there. Now the tree cannot become a tree again; now it can never again be a mere tree. Whether I remember or not, it is Divine.

So one thing: you need effort before the happening. Mm? -- remember, you need effort *before* the happening. In both, in the authentic and the projected, effort is needed before the

happening. In the authentic experience there is no need after the happening, but in the projected experience there is a continuous need, you have to go on making effort. It is just like in a cinema hall. The projector is running continuously so that the screen is filled. If for a single moment the film is broken or the projector stops, the whole thing disappears, the whole dream disappears, and there is just a plain screen and nothing else. You have to run the projector continuously; then there is no screen, but a different world.

The same is the case if you have to run your mind continuously as a projector, or if you have to remember that you are Divine, that everything is Divine, that all around is God: you have to project continuously, with no gap. And if there is a gap, the whole thing disappears. Then it is a projection. It is not authentic, it is not real.

If there is no need of this constant effort, then it is authentic, it is real. Then you can forget. The day you can forget God, only then have you realized. If you still have to remember Him, it is a projection. The day you can stop your meditation and there is no difference -- whether you meditate or not it is the same -- then it is authentic. If you stop your meditation, if you stop your prayer, if you stop your effort and everything changes and you feel that something is missing, then it is a projection, a projected feeling. Then it is an addiction. Then someone is a drug addict and you are a prayer addict -- but it makes no difference.

One of the rarest and deepest treatises on yoga in India is the "Gherand Samhita" -- the most foundational one. It says: "Unless you go beyond meditation, your meditations are of no use. Unless you go beyond prayer, your prayers have not been heard. Unless you forget God completely, you are not one with Him."

A Buddha will not talk about God; there is no need. Someone has said, "There has never been such a godless man as Gautam the Buddha -- and yet such a godlike one." But he could be godless because he was so godlike.

So remember one thing: no constant projecting. There is only one thing you can do. and that is to make your mind thoughtless -- because thoughts are the projections. If you have thoughts, then they will be projected. If you have no thoughts, it is just as if a projector machine is there without film. If no film is there, it cannot project. Your mind is a projecting machine, and thoughts are the film. If thoughts run and the machine is working then they will be projected, then the whole world is a screen. You go on projecting.

When you love someone, the person is just a screen: you project. When you hate someone, the person is just a screen: you project. It is your thoughts that you go on projecting. The same face is beautiful today, and the next day it becomes ugly -- the *same* face -- because your beauty, your ugliness, your feeling of beauty, your feeling of ugliness, is not concerned with the face at all. The face is just a screen with your thoughts projected on it.

No thoughts, no projections! That's why my insistence is that you come to a point of thoughtlessness, of thoughtless awareness -- so that there will be no projection. Then you will see the world as it is, not as your thoughts make it. If you can see the world as it is, you have come to the Divine.

Now you can feel the difference. The world is there: you project the Divine on it: it is a thought. You say, "The world is Divine" -- it is a thought. You don't know. You have heard it, you have read it, someone has said it to you. You wish it should be so, you want, you long that it should be so -- but you have not known it. You don't *know* the world is Divine. You know the world as the world.

This concept that "the world is Divine" is a thought. Now you can project. Repeat it constantly, let it remain in the mind constantly, let it be a constant thing between the world

and you, then your mind will project through this thought, and some day the world will begin to look Divine. Man? This is a projection: you have thought of it as Divine, and now you feel it

The authentic realization is totally different. You don't know what the world is. You don't say that it is Divine or not. You say, "I don't know." That's how a real, authentic seeker begins. He says, "I don't know." The false, the projecting one, always says, "I know! The world is Divine. Everywhere there is God." The real seeker will say, "I don't know. I know the tree, I know the stone -- I don't know what the inside of Existence is. I am ignorant."

This feeling gives you a humility, a deep humbleness. And when you don't know, you cannot project -- because now you will not cooperate with any thought. Then drop all the thoughts and say, "I don't know." Drop all the thoughts. Don't be attached to knowledge. By and by, be aware that no thoughts should be there between you and the world. This is what meditation means -- a no-thought relationship. You are here; I look at you with no thought, with no prejudice, with no image, with nothing in between. You are there, I am here, and there is space -- unfilled. vacant.

If this can happen between you and the world, then the world is revealed to you in its totality, in its reality, in its essence. Then you know that which is, and that is Divine. But now it is not a thought. There is no thought at all. You are vacant, empty, silent. It is a revelation, not a projection. So a meditative mind reaches to a state of thoughtlessness, and then only is revelation possible; otherwise you will go on projecting, you will go on projecting. Thought cannot do otherwise -- it will project.

Go deep in meditation, and remain with reality without thoughts. Sit under a tree without thoughts, look at the tree with no thought in the mind, with no preconception. Let the tree be there, encountered by your consciousness. Be a mirror -- silent, with no thought waves -- and let the tree be mirrored in it. And then suddenly you will know that the tree never existed as a tree. That was only an appearance, a face, a *persona*. It was Divine -- just clothed as a tree. The tree was just a clothing; now you have known the inside. No need to remember it! Wherever you move with this meditative state, God will be there, the Divine will be there.

I would like to say it in this way: the Divine is not an object; you cannot find the Divine as an object somewhere. It is a state of mind. When you have that state of mind, it is everywhere. And if you don't have that state of mind, you can create a false, thinking state. But that has to be continuously maintained -- and you cannot maintain anything continuously.

So you will find saints weeping and repenting and feeling they have sinned because they haven't maintained continuously. How can you maintain continuously? If you are maintaining anything, you will have to relax. Any effort has to be relaxed. If you have tried to remember that the tree is not a tree but God, after a certain period you will have so much tensed the mind that you will need rest. When you rest, the tree will just be a mere tree, and the God will have disappeared. Then try again, and go on trying. With effort, relaxation is bound to come, it will follow.

You can do anything with effort, but it cannot become your nature. You will go on losing it again and again. So if you go on losing a certain feeling, know that it is a projection. When you cannot lose it, do whatsoever you want to do or don't want to do, be whatsoever....

I would like to tell you a story: A Chinese Zen monk was living under a tree for thirty years, and he was known to be a very realized man. A woman of the village was serving that monk continuously for thirty years. The monk was known as absolutely pure. Now he was old, and that woman was also old. That woman was on her deathbed, so she called a prostitute from the village and asked her to go to the monk in the night, at midnight: "Just go

and embrace him, and come back and tell me how he reacted."

The prostitute asked, "What is the purpose of it?"

The old woman said, "I have served him for thirty years, but still I feel that his purity is a maintained purity. It is not yet effortless. So before dying I want to know whether I was serving a right man or whether I was just deluded as he is deluded -- because I have been a part in this. So just before my death, let me know it. I want to know."

So the prostitute went. It was midnight and the monk was meditating -- the last meditation of the night. The moment he saw that the prostitute was coming... he knew her, and he knew well. She belonged to the same village. And he knew well, moreover, because he had been attracted to her so many times before. Really, he was fighting against this prostitute for years. He was bewildered. He just ran out of the hut and cried, "Why have you come here? Don't touch me!" And he was trembling and perspiring. The prostitute laughed, went back, and told the old woman that this had happened.

The old woman said, "Then I was deceived. He is still the same. Nothing has changed -- he reacts very ordinarily. He is afraid. His mind is still attached; his mind is still sexual."

Sex can have just the reverse aspect also. You can be attracted in two ways -- positively or negatively. Negative attraction may not look like attraction, but it is.

The same happened to Buddha. Buddha was staying under a tree in a forest. Some young men had come for a picnic, to enjoy themselves. They had brought a prostitute with them. They were eating and they were drinking, and they became so intoxicated that the prostitute escaped. They were intoxicated so much that the prostitute escaped! When they became conscious that the prostitute had escaped, they followed her.

There was only one path. The prostitute must have passed where Buddha was sitting. So they came and asked the Buddha, "*bhikkhu*, have you seen a naked beautiful girl passing by here? -- because this is the only path."

Buddha opened his eyes and he said, "It is difficult to say whether she was a woman or a man; it is difficult to say whether she was beautiful or not; it is difficult to say whether she was naked or clothed. But someone has passed -- to this much I can be a witness. Someone has passed.

"I cannot say whether that one was a woman or a man because I am not interested -- not interested at all, not even negatively. Whether she was beautiful or ugly, I am not interested. Whether she was clothed or naked, I am not interested. For this much I can vouch: someone has passed.

"And one thing more. The night is so silent -- is it good, young men, to go after the one who has passed, to find that person? Or is it better to come and sit beside me and to find yourself? The night is very silent, so what do you think? Is it better to find yourself or to go in search of someone else?"

This is a very different mind -- no negative, no positive attachment -- as if it is meaningless. Meaning can exist even when you are antagonistic. It exists more, rather. Any maintenance for any state of mind, any effort to maintain it, shows that you are still fighting. It is not a realization; it is still an effort to impose something.

So be silent, thoughtless -- and *then* know what is. Don't think about it and don't preformulate anything about it. Don't be concerned with philosophies and metaphysical theories, don't be concerned with ideas -- only then is the reality revealed. If you are concerned with ideas, then you will project something onto the reality and the reality will just serve as a screen. And this is the danger: you can come to know anything you want, you can project anything you want.

Mind has two capacities: one is that it can project *anything*, and the other is that it can be totally vacant. These are the two possibilities. If the mind is used as a positive projection, then you can realize anything you like, but it is not a realization -- you are living in a dream. Vacate the mind, and face reality with a vacant mind, with no thought -- then you know what is.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 1

Chapter #15

Chapter title: Witnessing: The Base of all Techniques

3 June 1972 pm in Bombay, India

Archive code: 7206035

ShortTitle: ULTAL115

Audio: Yes

Video: No

DRIK SWAROOP AWASTHANAM AKSHATAHA
TO BE ESTABLISHED IN ONE'S OWN WITNESSING NATURE IS AKSHAT -- THE UNPOLISHED
AND UNBROKEN RICE USED FOR THE WORSHIP.

WITNESSING is the technique for centering. We discussed centering. A man can live in two ways: he can live from his periphery or he can live from his center. The periphery belongs to the ego and the center belongs to the being. If you live from the ego, you are always related with the other. The periphery is related with the other.

Whatever you do is not an action, it is always a reaction. You do it in response to something done to you. From the periphery there is no action -- everything is a reaction; nothing comes from your center. In a way, you are just a slave of the circumstances. You are not doing anything; rather, you are being forced to do. From the center the situation changes diametrically: from the center you begin to act. For the first time you begin to exist not as a *relata* but in your own right.

Buddha is passing a village. Some people are very angry, very much against his teachings. They abuse him, they insult him. The Buddha listens silently and then he says, "If you are finished then allow me to move. I am to reach to the other village and they will be waiting for me. If something is still remaining in your mind, then when I am passing back by this route you can finish it."

They say, "We have abused you, insulted you. Are you not going to answer?"

Buddha says, "I never react now. What you do is up to you -- I never react now. You cannot force me to do something. You can abuse me; that is up to you. I am not a slave. I have become a free man. I act from my center, not from my periphery, and your abuse can touch only the periphery, not my center. My center remains untouched."

You are so much touched, not because your center is touched. but only because you have no center. You are just the periphery, identified with the periphery. The periphery is bound to be touched by everything -- everything that happens. It is just your boundary, so whatever happens is bound to touch it.

And you don't have any center. The moment you have a center. then you have a distance from yourself, you have a distance from your periphery. Someone can abuse the periphery,

but not you. You can remain aloof, detached. There is a distance between you and yourself. Between you as your periphery and you as the center there is a distance, and that distance cannot be broken by anyone else -- because no one can penetrate to the center. The outside world can touch you only as the periphery.

So Buddha says, "Now I am centered. Ten years before it would have been different. If you had abused me, then I would have reacted -- but now I only act."

Understand clearly the distinction between reaction and action. You love someone because someone loves you. Buddha also loves you -- not because you love him; that is irrelevant. Whether you love him or hate him is irrelevant. He loves you because it is an act, not a reaction. The act comes from you, and the reaction is forced upon you. Centering means now you have begun to act.

Another point to be remembered: when you act, the act is always total. When you react, it can never be total. It is always partial, fragmentary, because when I act from my periphery -- that is, when I react -- it cannot be total because I am not involved in it really. Only my periphery is involved, so it cannot be total.

So if you love from your periphery, your love can never be total -- it is always partial. And that means much, because if love is partial then the remaining space will be filled by hate. If your kindness is partial, the remaining space will be filled by cruelty. If your goodness is partial, then who will fill the remaining space? If your God is partial, then you will need a Devil to fill the remaining space.

That means a partial act is bound to be contradictory, in conflict with itself. Modern psychology says you both love and you hate simultaneously. Amphibian is your mind -- contradictory. To the same object you are related with love and with hate. And if love and hate are both there, then there is going to be a confusion -- and a poisonous confusion. Your kindness is mixed with cruelty. and your charity is theft, and your prayer becomes a violence. And even if you try to be a saint, on the periphery, your sainthood is bound to be tinged with sin. On the periphery, everything is going to be self-contradictory.

Only when you act from the center is your act total. And when that act is total, it has a beauty of its own. When the act is total, it is moment-to-moment. When the act is total, you don't carry the memory -- you need not! When the act is partial, it is a suspended thing. You eat something: if the eating is partial, then when the actual eating is finished you will continue eating in the mind. It will remain suspended. Only a total thing can have an end and can have a beginning. A partial thing is just a continuous series with no beginning and with no end. You are in your home. and you have carried your shop and market with you. You are in your shop, and you have carried your house and household affairs. You are never, you can never be, at any single moment. totally in it. Much is being carried continuously. This is the heaviness, the tense heaviness on the mind, on the heart.

A total act has a beginning and an end. It is atomic; it is not a series. It is there, and then it is not there. You are completely free from it to move into the unknown. Otherwise one goes on in grooves, the mind becomes just groovy. You go on moving in the same circular way, in a vicious circle. You go on continuously in it.

Because the past is never finished, it comes into the present: it goes on and penetrates into the future. So, really, a partial mind. a peripheral mind, carries its past, and the past is a big thing. Even if you don't consider past lives, even then the past is a big thing. Fifty years' experiences, beautiful and ugly, but unfinished, everything unfinished -- so you go on carrying a fifty-year-long past which is dead.

This dead past will fall upon a single moment of the present. It is bound to kill it. So you

cannot live, it is impossible. With this past on you, upon you, you cannot live. Every single moment is so fresh and so delicate, this whole dead weight will kill it. It is killing! Your past goes on killing your present, and when the present is dead it becomes a part. When it is alive, it is not part of you. When it becomes dead, when it has been killed by your dead past, then it becomes yours, then it is part of you. This is the situation.

The moment you begin to act from the center, every act is total, atomic. It is there and then it is not there. You are completely free from it. Then you can move with no burden, unburdened. And only then can you live in the new moment that is always there -- by coming to it fresh.

But you can come to it fresh only when there is no past to be carried. And you will have to carry the past if it is unfinished. The mind has a tendency to finish everything. If it is unfinished, then it has to be carried. If something has remained unfinished during the day, then you will dream about it in the night -- because the mind has a tendency to finish everything. The moment it is finished, the mind is unburdened from it. Unless it is finished, the mind is bound to come to it again and again.

Whatsoever you are doing -- your love, your sex, your friendship -- everything is unfinished. And you cannot make it total if you remain on the periphery. So how to be centered in oneself? How to attain this centering so that you are not on the periphery? Witnessing is the technique.

This word "witnessing" is a most significant word. There are hundreds of techniques to achieve centering, but witnessing is bound to be a part, a basic part, in every technique. Whatsoever the technique may be, witnessing will be the essential part in it. So it will be better to call it "the technique of all techniques". It is not simply a technique. The process of witnessing is the essential part of *all* the techniques.

One can talk about witnessing as a pure technique also. For example, J. Krishnamurti: he is talking about witnessing as a pure technique. But that talk is just like talking about the spirit without the body. You cannot feel it, you cannot see it. Everywhere the spirit is embodied; you can feel the spirit through the body. Of course, the spirit is not the body, but you can feel it through the body.

Every technique is just a body, and witnessing is the soul. You can talk about witnessing independent of any body, any matter; then it becomes abstract, totally abstract. So Krishnamurti has been talking continuously for half a century, but whatsoever he is saying is so pure, unembodied, that one thinks that one is understanding, but that understanding remains just a concept.

In this world nothing exists as pure spirit. Everything exists embodied. So witnessing is the spirit of all spiritual techniques, and all the techniques are bodies, different bodies. So first we must understand what witnessing is, and then we can understand witnessing through some bodies, some techniques.

We know thinking, and one has to start from thinking to know what witnessing means because one has to start from what one knows. We know thinking. Thinking means judgement: you see something and you judge. You see a flower and you say it is beautiful or not beautiful. You hear a song and you appreciate it or you don't appreciate it. You appreciate something or you condemn something.

Thinking is judgement. The moment you think, you have begun to judge. Thinking is evaluation. You cannot think without evaluation. How can you think about a flower without evaluating it? The moment you start thinking you will say it is beautiful. not beautiful. You will have to use some category because thinking is categorizing. The moment you have

categorized a thing -- labelled it, named it -- you have thought about it. Thinking is impossible if you are not going to judge. If you are not going to judge, then you can just remain aware -- but you cannot think.

A flower is here, and I say to you, "See it, but don't think. Look at the flower, but don't think." So what can you do? If thinking is not allowed, what can you do? You can only witness; you can only be aware. You can only be conscious of the flower. You can face the fact. The flower is here -- now you can encounter it. If thinking is not allowed you cannot say, "It is beautiful. It is not beautiful. I know about it," or, "It is strange -- I have never seen it." You cannot say anything. Words cannot be used because every word has a value in it. Every word is a judgement.

Language is burdened with judgement; language can never be impartial. The moment you use a word, you have judged. So you cannot use language, you cannot verbalize. If I say, "This is a flower -- *look* at it, but don't think!" then verbalization is not allowed. So what can you do? You can only be a witness. If you are there without thinking, just facing something, it is witnessing. Then witnessing means a *passive* awareness. Remember -- passive. Thinking is active. You are doing something. Whatsoever you are seeing, you are doing something with it. You are not just passive, you are not like a mirror -- you are doing something. And the moment you do something, you have changed the thing.

I see a flower and I say, "It is beautiful!" I have changed it. Now I have imposed something on the flower. Now, whatsoever the flower is, to me it is a flower plus my feeling of its being beautiful. Now the flower is far away. In between the flower and me is my sense of judgement, my evaluation of its being beautiful. Now the flower is not the same to me. The quality has changed. I have come into it. Now my judgement has penetrated into the fact. Now it is more like a fiction and less like a fact.

This feeling that the flower is beautiful doesn't belong to the flower, it belongs to me. I have entered the fact. Now the fact is not virgin. I have corrupted it. Now my mind has become part of it. Really, to say that my mind has become part of it means: my *past* has become part, because when I say, "This flower is beautiful," it means I have judged it through my past knowledge. How can you say that this flower is beautiful? Your experiences of the past, your conceptions of the past, that something like this is beautiful -- you have judged it according to your past.

Mind means your past, your memories. The past has come upon the present. You have destroyed a virgin fact; now it is distorted. Now there is no flower. The flower as a reality in itself is no more there. It is corrupted by you, destroyed by you. Your past has come in between. You have interpreted. This is thinking. Thinking means bringing the past to a present fact. That's why thinking can never lead you to the Truth -- because Truth is virgin and has to be faced in its total virginity. The moment you bring your past in you are destroying it. Then it is an interpretation, not a realization of the fact. You have disrupted it. The purity is lost.

Thinking means bringing your past to the present. Witnessing means no past, just the present; no bringing in of the past. Witnessing is passive. You are not doing anything -- you are! Simply, you are there. Only you are present. The flower is present, you are present -- then there is a relationship of witnessing. When the flower is present and your whole past is present, not you, then it is a relationship of thinking.

So start from thinking. What is thinking? It is the bringing of the mind into the present. You have missed the present then you have missed it totally! The moment past penetrates into the present, you have missed it. When you say, "This flower is beautiful," really, it has

become the past. When you say, "This flower is beautiful," it is a past experience. You have known, you have judged. When the flower is there and you are there, even to say that this flower is beautiful is not possible. You cannot assert any judgement in the present. Any judgement, any assertion, belongs to the past. If I say, "I love you," it has become a thing that is past. If I say, "This flower is beautiful." I have felt, I have judged -- it has become past.

Witnessing is always present, never the past. Thinking is always the past. Thinking is dead, witnessing is alive. So the next distinction: first, thinking is active -- doing something; witnessing is passive -- non-doing, just being. Thinking is always the past, the dead which has gone away, which is no more; witnessing is always the present -- that which is. So if you go on thinking, you can never know what witnessing is.

To stop, end thinking, becomes a start in witnessing. Cessation of thinking is witnessing. So what to do? -- because thinking is a long habit with us. It has become just a robotlike, mechanical thing. It is not that you think; it is not your decision now. It is a mechanical habit -- you cannot do anything else. The moment a flower is there, the thinking has started. We have no non-verbal experiences; only small children have. Non-verbal experience is really experience. Verbalization is escaping from the experience.

When I say, "The flower is beautiful," the flower has vanished from me. Now it is my mind, not the flower I am concerned with. Now it is the image of the flower in my mind, not the flower itself. Now the flower itself is a picture in the mind, a thought in the mind, and now I can compare with my past experiences and judge. But the flower is no more there. When you verbalize, you are closed to experience.

When you are non-verbally aware, you are open, vulnerable. Witnessing means a constant opening to experience, no closing. What to do? This mechanical habit of so-called thinking has to be broken somewhere. So whatsoever you are doing, try to do it nonverbally. It is difficult, arduous, and in the beginning it seems absolutely impossible, but it is not. It is not impossible -- it is difficult. You are walking on the street: walk non-verbally, just walk, even if just for a few seconds, and you will have a glimpse of a different world -- a non-verbal world, the real world, not the world of the mind man has created in himself.

You are eating: eat non-verbally. Someone asked Bokuju -- Bokuju was a great Zen Master -- "What's your SADHANA?"

So Bokuju said, "My *sadhana* is very simple: when I am hungry, I eat; when I am sleepy, I sleep -- and this is all."

The man was just bewildered. He said, "What are you saying? I also eat and I also sleep, and everyone is doing the same. So what is in that that you call it SADHANA?"

Bokuju said, "When you are eating you are doing many things, not only eating. And when you are sleeping, you are doing everything else except sleeping. But when I eat, I simply eat; when I sleep, I simply sleep. Every act is total!"

Every act becomes total if you are non-verbal. So try to eat without any verbalization in the mind, with no thinking in the mind. Just eat, and then eating becomes meditation -- because if you are non-verbal you will become a witness. If you are verbal you will become a thinker. If you are non-verbal you cannot do anything about it, you cannot help it -- you *will* be a witness, automatically. So try to do anything non-verbally: walk, eat, take a bath or just sit silently. Then just sit -- then be a "sitting"! Don't think. Then even just sitting can become meditation, just walking can become meditation.

Someone else was asking Bokuju, "Give me some technique of meditation."

Bokuju said, "I can give you a technique, but you will not be able to meditate -- because you can practise a technique with a verbalizing mind."

Your fingers can move on a rosary, and you can go on thinking. If your fingers just move on the rosary with no thinking, it becomes a meditation. Then, really, no technique is needed. The whole life is a technique. So Bokuju said, "It would be better if you be with me and watch me. Don't ask for a method. Just watch me -- and you will come to know."

The poor fellow watched for seven days. He began to be more confused. After seven days he said, "When I came, I was less confused. Now I am more confused. I have watched you for seven days continuously -- what is there to be watched?"

Bokuju said, "Then you have not watched. When I walk, have you seen? -- I simply walk. When you bring tea in the morning for me, have you watched? -- I simply take the tea and drink it: just drinking There is NO Bokuju -- just drinking. No Bokuju -- just drinking of the tea. Have you watched? If you have watched, then you must have felt that Bokuju is no more."

This is a very subtle point -- because if the thinker is there, then there is ego; then you are a Bokuju or somebody else. But if only action is there with no verbalization, no thinking, there is no ego. So Bokuju says, "Have you really watched? Then there was no Bokuju -- just drinking of the tea, walking in the garden, digging a hole in the earth."

Buddha, because of this, has said, "There is no soul" -- because you have not watched, you go on continuously thinking that you have a soul. You are not! If you are a witness, then you are not. The "I" forms itself through thoughts. So one thing more: accumulated thoughts, piled-up memories, create the feeling of ego -- that you are.

Try this experiment: cut your whole past away from you -- no memory. You don't know who your parents are; you don't know to whom you belong -- to which country, to which religion, to which race. You don't know where you were educated, whether you were educated or not. Just cut the whole past -- and remember *who* you are. You cannot remember who you are. You are, obviously. You are, but who are you? In this moment, you cannot feel an "I". The ego is just accumulated past. The ego is your thought condensed, crystallized.

So Bokuju says, "If you have watched me, I was not. There was drinking of the tea, but no drinker. Walking was there in the garden, but no walker. Action was there, but no actor."

In witnessing, there is no sense of I; in thinking there is. So if the so-called thinkers are so deeply rooted in their egos. it is not just a coincidence. Artists, thinkers, philosophers, literary persons. if they are so egoistic, it is not just a coincidence. The more thoughts you have, the greater the ego you have. In witnessing there is no ego, but this comes only if you can transcend language. Language is the barrier. Language is needed to communicate with others; it is not needed to communicate with oneself. It is a useful instrument -- rather, the *most* useful instrument. Man could create a society, a world, only because of language -- but because of language, man has forgotten himself.

Language is our world. If for a single moment man forgets his language, then what remains? Culture, society, Hinduism, Christianity, communism -- what remains? Nothing remains. If only language is taken out of existence, the whole humanity with its culture, civilization, science, religion, philosophy, disappears.

Language is a communication with others; it is the only communication. It is useful, but it is dangerous -- and whenever some instrument is useful, it is in the same proportion dangerous a!so. The danger is this: that the more mind moves into language. the farther away it goes from the center. So one needs a subtle balance and a subtle mastery to be capable of moving into language, and also to be capable of leaving language, of going out of language. of moving out of language.

Witnessing means moving out of language, verbalization. mind. Witnessing means a state

of no-mind, no-thinking. So try it! It is a long effort, and nothing is predictable -- but try, and the effort will give you some moments when suddenly language disappears. And then a new dimension opens. You become aware of a different world -- the world of simultaneity, the world of here and now, the world of no-mind, the world of reality.

Language must evaporate. So try to do ordinary acts, bodily movements, without language. Buddha used this technique to watch the breath. He would say to his *bhikkhus*, "Go on watching your breath. Don't do anything: just watch the breath coming in, the breath going out, the breath coming in, the breath going out." It is not to be said like this -- it is to be felt. Mm? The breath coming in, with no words. Feel the breath coming in, move with the breath, let your consciousness go deep with the breath. Then let it move out. Go on moving with your breath. Be alert!

Buddha is reported to have said, "Don't miss even a single breath. If a single breath is missed physiologically, you will be dead; and if a single breath is missed in awareness, you will be missing the center, you will be dead inside." So Buddha said, "Breath is essential for the life of the body, and awareness of the breath is essential for the life of the inner center."

Breathe, be aware. And if you are trying to be aware of your breathing, you cannot think, because the mind cannot do two things simultaneously -- thinking and witnessing. The very phenomenon of witnessing is absolutely, diametrically opposite to thinking, so you cannot do both. Just as you cannot be both alive and dead, as you cannot be both asleep and awake, you cannot be both thinking and witnessing. Witness anything, and thinking will stop. Thinking comes in, and witnessing disappears. Witnessing is a passive awareness with no action inside. Awareness itself is not an action.

One day Mulla Nasrudin was very much worried, in deep brooding. Anyone could look at his face and feel that he was lost somewhere in thoughts, very tense, in anguish. His wife became alarmed. She asked, "What are you doing, Nasrudin? What are you thinking? What is the problem? Why are you so worried?"

The Mulla opened his eyes and said, "This is the ultimate problem. I am thinking about how one knows when one is dead. How does one know that one is dead? If I am to die, how will I recognize that I am dead? -- because I have not known death. Recognition means you have known something before.

"I see you and recognize that you are A, or B or C, because I have known you. Death I have not known," said the Mulla. "And when it comes, how am I to recognize it? That is the problem, and I am very much worried. And when I am dead I cannot ask anyone else, so that door is also closed. I cannot refer to some scripture, no teacher can be of any help."

The wife laughed and said, "You are unnecessarily worrying. When death comes, one knows immediately. When death comes to you, you will know because you will become just cold, ice-cold." Mulla was relieved. A certain sign, the key, was in his hand.

After two or three months he was cutting wood in the forest. It was a winter morning and everything was cold. Suddenly he remembered, and he felt his hands -- they were cold. He said, "Okay! Now death is coming, and I am so far from my house that I cannot even inform anyone. Now what am I to do? I forgot to ask my wife. She told me how one will feel, but what is one to do when death comes? Now no one is here, and everything is going just cold."

Then he remembered. He had seen many persons dead, so he thought, "It is good to lie down." That is all that he has seen dead persons do, so he lies down. Of course, he becomes more cold, he feels more cold -- death is upon him. His donkey is just resting by his side under the tree. Two wolves, thinking that Mulla is dead, attack his donkey. Mulla opens his eyes and sees, and he thinks, "Dead men cannot do anything. Had I been alive, wolves, you

couldn't have taken such liberties with my donkey. But now I cannot do anything. Dead men are never reported to have done anything. I can only witness."

If you become dead to your past, totally dead, then you can only witness. What else can you do? Witnessing means becoming dead to your past, memory, thought, everything. Then in the present moment, what can you do? You can only witness. No judgement is possible. Judgement is possible only against past experiences. No evaluation is possible; evaluation is possible only against past evaluations. No thinking is possible; thinking is possible only if the past is there, brought into the present. So what can you do? You can witness.

In the old Sanskrit literature, the Teacher is defined as the death *acharya mrityuh*. The Teacher is defined as death! In the Katha Upanishad, Nachiketa is sent to Yama, the god of death, to be taught. And when Yama, the death god, offers many, many allurements to Nachiketa -- "Take this, take the kingdom, take so much wealth, so many horses, so many elephants, this and this," a long list of things -- Nachiketa says, "I have come to learn what death is, because unless I know what death is I cannot know what life is."

So a Teacher was known in the old days as a person who can become a death to the disciple -- who can give death, who can help you to die so that you can be reborn.

Nicodemus asked Jesus, "How can I attain to the Kingdom of God?"

Jesus said, "Unless you die first, nothing can be attained. Unless you are reborn, nothing can be attained."

And this being reborn is not an event, it is a continuous process. One has to be reborn every moment. It is not that you are reborn once and then it is okay and finished. Life is a continuous birth, and death is also continuous. You have to die once because you have not lived at all. If you live, then you will have to die every moment. Die every moment to the past whatsoever it has been, a heaven or a hell. Whatsoever -- die to it, and be fresh and young and reborn into the moment. Witness now! You can only witness now if you are fresh. This sutra says:

TO BE ESTABLISHED IN ONE'S OWN WITNESSING NATURE IS *akshat* -- THE UNPOLISHED AND UNBROKEN RICE USED FOR THE WORSHIP.

This Upanishad is giving deeper meaning to every symbol of worship. *akshat* -- unpolished rice -- is used in worship. What is *akshat*? The word is very meaningful. But translated into English it becomes just an ordinary thing. *akshat* means "that which has not been penetrated". *akshat* means "virgin". We say *akshatkanya* -- virgin. *akshat* means virgin, unpenetrated, and the unpolished rice is used just as a symbol -- virgin, fresh, raw. But the word *akshat* means unpenetrated.

What is *akshat* in you, what has not been penetrated ever? That is your witnessing nature. Everything has been corrupted; only one thing in you remains uncorrupted. Your body is corrupted, your mind is corrupted, your thinking, your emotions, everything is corrupted. Everything has been influenced, impressed, by the outside. Only one thing remains in you totally uncorrupted, untouched *akshat* -- and that is your witnessing nature. The world cannot touch it. Your thoughts can be influenced, manipulated, but not your witnessing consciousness.

Your thoughts can be changed, you can be converted; you are being converted every moment. Every influence is a converting influence, because either for or against you react. And even if you react against a particular influence, you have been converted, you have been manipulated. Every moment you are being manipulated by outside situations, impressions,

influences. But one thing remains untouched, and that is your witnessing nature.

The sutra says, "It is your nature, it is you." It is not something taught, it is not something constructed, it is not something given. It is you! When we say nature, it means it is you. You and it cannot be separated. So the last thing: witnessing nature, witnessing consciousness, is not something which has to be achieved. You have it already; otherwise it cannot be said to be your nature.

A child is born. If no language is taught, then the child will not be able to know any language. It is not nature -- it is nurture. If the child is taught nothing, he will know nothing; if he is taught Hinduism, he will be Hindu; if he is taught communism, he will be a communist. Whatsoever he is taught he will be. It is not his nature. So no one is born as a Hindu, no one is born as a Mohammedan. These are not natures -- these are conditionings. You are forced to be conditioned into a particular pattern. So Hinduism is a habit, not nature. Mohammedanism is again a habit, not nature. By "habit" I mean something taught, something learned. You are not born with it.

Witnessing is not like that. You are born with it. Of course, it is hidden. In the deepest depths of your being is the seed. Everything is taught except the witnessing nature. Knowledge is taught, but not knowing. A child is born with *knowing*, not with knowledge. He has the capacity to know -- that's why you can teach him -- but that capacity belongs to him. You will go on conditioning. Many things will be taught, and he will learn many things -- languages, religions, ideologies. He will be burdened; and the more burdened, the more experienced, the more he will have a mind. And the society will value it, respect it.

Mind is respected in the society because it is a social product. So whenever there is a brilliant mind -- that means one who is efficient in accumulating -- society appreciates, respects it. This mind created by society will be there, and this mind will go on growing. And you can die with this mind, burdened with this mind, without knowing the inner nature that you were born with.

Witnessing, the effort towards it, means breaking this mind, creating a crack in this mind, to have a peek, a probe into nature -- into *your* nature. You are born as an unknown witnessing energy. Then the society encrusts you, clothes you all around. That clothing is your mind, and if you are identified with this clothing then you will never be able to know that which you are, that which you always have been. And one can die without knowing oneself. That capacity is there. But in a way it has a beauty of its own also.

One has to throw the society from inside; one has to be free from society. And when I say that one has to be free from society, I don't mean to be free from the outside society. You cannot be. Wherever you move, the outside society will be there. Even if you move to a forest, the trees and the animals will become your society. And when a monk, a hermit, moves to a forest and begins to live with animals, you say, "What beauty!" But he is again creating a society. When a hermit lives in the forest and begins to talk with trees, you say, "What a religious man!" But, really, he is again creating a society.

You cannot live without society as far as your outside world is concerned. You exist in society! But you can throw the society from inside, you can be free from society inside. And those who try to free themselves from the society which exists outside are just in a futile effort. They are in a futile effort -- they cannot succeed, and they are deceiving themselves, because the real problem is not how to get away from the society which exists outside; the real problem is how not to be burdened inside by the society.

If there are no thoughts, if there are no memories, if there are no past burdens of experience, you are freed from society inside. You become virgin, pure, innocent. You are

reborn. And then you know what your nature is, what your Tao is, what your *dharma* is. *Dharma* is translated again and again as "religion". It is not; it is not religion. *dharma* means nature; *dharma* means that which you are already -- your essence.

Two words will be useful to understand: Gurdjieff uses these two words -- "essence" and "personality". Essence is your nature and personality is the construct, the social structure given to you. We are all personalities, unaware, completely unaware of the essence. This sutra saying "witnessing nature" means essence -- the essential you. So witnessing is not something which you achieve; it is not something like an attainment. Rather, it is a discovery, an uncovering. Something is there which you have forgotten -- you uncover it. So Gurdjieff never uses the word "witnessing"; rather, he uses "remembering".

Kabir, Nanak, they also use "remembering" -- *surati*. *surati* means remembering. *surati* is *smriti* -- remembering. Nanak, Kabir or Gurdjieff, they use the word "remembering" only because, really, your essence is not a new thing to be achieved -- it is already there. You have only to remember it; you have only to become aware of something which is already present. But you cannot be aware of it if you are crowded by thoughts, if you are lost in the crowd of thoughts.

The sky is there -- but when there are clouds, dark clouds all over, you cannot see the sky. Clouds are just incidental. They are now, they were not before, and they will not be again. They come and go, and the sky remains always. And the sky is *akshat*; no cloud can corrupt it. The sky remains virgin, pure, innocent. *No* cloud can corrupt it. Clouds come and go, but the sky is that which is always -- unperturbed, untouched, just an inner space, an inner sky is there. That is called your nature.

Societies will come and go. You will take birth and you will die and many lives will come and go, and many, many clouds will pass through you. But the inner sky -- AKSHAT -- remains uncorrupted, virgin. But you can become identified with clouds. You can begin to feel that "I am the clouds".

Everyone is identified with his own thoughts which are nothing more than clouds. You say, "*my* thought," and if someone attacks your thought, you never feel that your thought is being attacked -- *you* are being attacked. The sky is fighting -- fighting for clouds because some cloud has been attacked. The sky feels, "I am attacked!" The sky was there when there was no cloud, the sky will be there when there is no cloud. Clouds add nothing to the sky. And when clouds are no more, nothing is lost. The sky remains itself totally.

This is the nature -- the inner sky, the inner space. One uncovers it, discovers it, through witnessing. Witnessing is the basic, essential thing. It can be used in many, many techniques.

In the Chinese Taoist tradition, they have a method known as "Tai-Chi". It is a method of centering, a method of witnessing. They say do whatsoever, but remain conscious of the center at the navel. Walking, be conscious of the center at the navel. Eating, be conscious of the center at the navel. Fighting, be conscious of the center at the navel. Do whatsoever you are doing, but remain conscious of one thing: that you are centered in the navel. Again, if you are conscious of the navel, you cannot think. The moment you begin to think, you will not be conscious of the navel.

This is a body technique. Buddha uses breathing, breath; Taoists use *hara*. They call the center at the navel *hara*. That's why Japanese suicide is known as *hara-kiri*. It means committing suicide remaining centered in the *hara* so it is not suicide, it is not just suicide. They call it *hara-kiri* only if a person commits suicide remaining continuously aware of the center at the *hara*. Then it is not suicide at all -- he is doing it so consciously. You cannot commit suicide so consciously. With you, suicide is committed only when you are so much

disturbed that you have become absolutely unconscious.

Whether you use the hara or you use breathing, you must remain conscious. Krishnamurti says, "Remain conscious of your thought process." Whether it is the process of breathing or the palpitation of the *hara* or the thought process, it makes no difference. The basic thing remains the same.

Remain conscious of your thought process. A thought arises: know that it has arisen. A thought is there: know that the thought is there. When the thought moves and goes out of existence, then know, witness that it has disappeared. Whenever a thought goes and another thought comes, there is a gap in between. Be conscious of the gap. Remain conscious of the thought process -- a thought moving, a gap, again a thought. Be conscious!

Use thought as an object for your witnessing. It makes no difference: you can use breathing, you can use thought, you can use the HARA -- you can use anything. There are many methods and each country has developed its own. And sometimes there is very much conflict about methods -- but if you go deep, one thing is essential and that is witnessing -- whatsoever the method may be. The difference is only of the body.

And Krishnamurti says, "I have no method," but he has. This witnessing of the thought process is as much a method as the witnessing of breathing. You can witness breathing, you can witness the thought process. And then, then you can appreciate that if someone is using a rosary, he can witness it. Then there is no difference between witnessing the movement of the rosary or witnessing breathing or the thought process.

Sufis use dancing, dervish dancing. They use dancing as the method. You might have heard the name "whirling dervishes". They move on their heels just like children move sometimes. If you move like that you will get dizzy -- just moving on your heels, whirling. And they say, "Go on whirling, know that the body is whirling, and remain conscious. Inside, remain aware! Don't get identified with the whirling body. The body is whirling -- don't get identified, remain conscious. Then the witnessing will happen."

And I think that the Sufi method is more sudden than any, because to witness thought process is difficult, it is very subtle. To witness breathing is again difficult because breathing is a non-voluntary process. But whirling you are doing voluntarily. Dancing, whirling round and round and round, the mind gets dizzy. If you remain aware, suddenly you find a center. Then the body becomes a wheel and you become the hub, and the body goes on whirling and the center stands alone, untouched -- akshat -- uncorrupted. So there are hundreds and hundreds of methods, but the soul, the significant, the essential, the foundational thing in all of them, is witnessing.

This sutra says that unless you go to worship with a witnessing nature inside, your going is futile. Unpolished, raw rice will not do. That can be purchased, that is only a symbol, a symbolic thing. Unless you bring something unpolished, untouched by society, uncreated, from your own nature, your worship is just stupid, it is foolish. And you can go on worshipping and you can go on using symbols without knowing what they mean.

Remember this word AKSHAT -- uncorrupted, fresh, virgin. What is virgin in you? Find it out and bring it to the Divine feet. Only that virginity can be used -- only that virginity, that freshness, that constant youngness, can be used for worship.

This witnessing you can understand intellectually. It is not difficult. But that is the difficulty! If you understand it intellectually and think that the work is done -- that is the difficulty. You can understand it. Then again it becomes a theory in the mind; then again it becomes a thought in the mind; then again you have made it a part of the accumulation. Then you can discuss it, you can philosophize about it, but then it is still a part of the mind -- it is

not virgin.

If I say something about witnessing, it goes into your mind, becomes part of yoUr mind, but it is not from you; it has come from the outside. If you read this Upanishad and then you are impressed, convinced, and you say inside yourself, "Right, this is the thing," it becomes a theory. It is not from you, it has come from outside. It is not *akshat*; it is not virgin. No theory can be virgin. No thought can be virgin. Every thought is borrowed. Thought can never be original -- never! The very nature of it is borrowed. No one's thought is original. It cannot be because language is not original, concepts are not original. You learn them.

Akshat means "the original" -- that which you have not learned, the discovery within yourself of something which belongs to you, which is unique to you, individual to you, which has not been given to you.

So intellectual understanding won't do. Practise it! Only then, some day, something explodes in you and you become aware of a different realm of purity, innocence, bliss.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 1

Chapter #16

Chapter title: Will or Surrender

6 June 1972 am in Bombay, India

Archive code: 7206060

ShortTitle: ULTAL116

Audio: Yes

Video: No

OSHO, LAST NIGHT YOU SAID THAT THE MIND CANNOT DO TWO THINGS TOGETHER -- THAT IS, THINKING AND WITNESSING. IT SEEMS THEN THAT WITNESSING IS A MENTAL FACULTY AND AN ACT OF THE MIND. IS IT SO? PLEASE EXPLAIN. IS THERE ANYTHING LIKE PARTIAL WITNESSING AND TOTAL WITNESSING?

WITNESSING is not a mental activity; thinking is a mental activity. Rather, it would be better to say that thinking is mind. When the mind is not, when the mind is absent, when the mind has disappeared, only then do you have witnessing. It is something behind the mind.

Zen Buddhism uses mind in two ways: the ordinary mind means thinking; then Mind with a capital "M" means the Mind behind thinking. Consciousness is behind the mind; consciousness comes through the mind. If mind is in a state of thinking, it becomes opaque, non-transparent, just like a clouded sky -- you cannot see the sky. When the clouds are not, you can see the sky. When thinking is not there, then you can feel the witnessing. It is the pure sky behind.

So when I said that you cannot do two things, I meant either you can think or you can witness. If you are thinking, then you lose witnessing. Then the mind becomes a cloud on your consciousness. If you are witnessing, you cannot think simultaneously; then the mind is not there. Thinking is an acquired process; witnessing is your nature. So when I say that you cannot do both or mind cannot do both, I don't mean that mind is the faculty to witness. Mind is the faculty to think, mind is for "minding".

Really, many problems are created just by language. There is nothing like mind. There is only a process. not a thing. It is better to call it minding than mind. It is a process of continuous thought, one thought being followed by another. Only in the gaps, only in the intervals between two thoughts, can you have something of the witnessing nature. But thoughts are so speedy that you cannot even feel the gap. If you begin to witness your thoughts, then the thought process is slowed down and then you begin to feel gaps. One thought passes, another has not come yet, and there is an interval. In that interval you have witnessing. And thoughts cannot exist without gaps; otherwise they will begin to overlap

each other. They cannot exist! Just like my fingers are there -- with gaps in between.

If your thought process is slowed down -- and *any* method of meditation is nothing but a slowing down of the thought process -- if the thought process is slowed down, you begin to feel the gaps. Through these gaps is witnessing. Thought is mind; a thoughtless consciousness is witnessing. Thought is acquired from the outside; witnessing is inside. Consciousness is born with you: thought is acquired, cultivated. So you can have a Hindu thought, you can have a Mohammedan thought, you can have a Christian thought, but you cannot have a Christian soul, you cannot have a Hindu soul. Soul is just soul -- consciousness is consciousness.

Minds have types. You have a particular mind. That particular mind is your upbringing, conditioning, education, culture. Mind means whatsoever has been put into you from the outside, and witnessing means whatsoever has *not* been put from the outside but is your inside -- intrinsically, naturally. It is your nature. Mind is a by-product, a habit. Witnessing, consciousness, awareness, whatsoever you call it, is your nature. But you can acquire so many habits, and the nature can go just underneath. You can forget it completely. So, really, religion is a fight *for* nature against habits. It is to uncover that which is natural -- the original, the real you.

So remember the first thing: witnessing and thinking are different states. Thinking belongs to your mind; witnessing belongs to your nature. And you cannot do both simultaneously. Mind must cease for your consciousness to be; thought must cease for your real nature to be. So a thinker is one thing, and an Enlightened person is totally different.

A Buddha is not a thinker. Hegel or Kant are thinkers. They use their minds to reach particular conclusions. Buddha is not using his mind to reach any conclusions. Buddha is not using his mind at all. He is really a no-mind. He has stopped using mind. He is using himself, not the mind, to reach any conclusions. So with the mind you can reach conclusions, but all conclusions will be hypothetical, theoretical, because one thought can beget another thought. But thought cannot beget reality, thought cannot beget Truth.

Through witnessing you reach reality -- not conclusions, not theories, but direct, immediate facts. For example, I am saying something to you. You can think about it -- then you have missed the point. You can think about it, what witnessing is, what mind is -- you can think about it. This is one way, this is the mind's way. But you can experiment with it and not think. And by "experiment" is meant that you have to know how to stop the mind and feel the witnessing. Then again you reach to something, but then it is not a conclusion; it is not something achieved through the thought process. Then it is something you realize.

Someone was asking Aurobindo, "Do you believe in God?"

Aurobindo said, "No, I don't believe in God at all." The questioner was perplexed because he had come a long way just because he thought Aurobindo was capable of showing him the path towards God. And now Aurobindo says, "I don't believe."

He couldn't believe his ears, so he asked again. He said, "I am perplexed. I have come a long way just to ask you how to achieve God. And if you don't believe, then the problem, the question, doesn't arise."

Aurobindo said, "Who says that the question doesn't arise? I don't believe because I know that God *is*. But that is not my belief, that is not a conclusion reached by thought. It is not my belief. I know! That is my knowing."

Mind can, at the most, believe. It can never know. It can believe either that there is God or there is no God, but both are beliefs. God. These both are beliefs. Both have reached to these conclusions through "minding", through thinking. They have thought, they have tried to

probe logically, and then they have come to certain conclusions.

A Buddha is not a believer -- HE KNOWS! And when I say he knows, knowing is possible only in one way. It is not through mind. It is through throwing mind completely. It is difficult to conceive because we have to conceive through the mind; that is the difficulty. I have to talk to you through the medium of the mind, and you have to listen to me through the medium of the mind. So when I say it is not to be achieved through mind, your mind takes it -- but it is inconceivable for the mind. It can even create a theory about it. You may begin to believe that the Truth cannot be achieved through mind. If you begin to believe, you are in mind again. You can say, "I am not convinced. I don't believe that there is anything beyond the mind." Then again you are within the mind.

You can never go beyond the mind if you go on using it. You have to take a jump, and meditation means that jump. That's why meditation is illogical, irrational. And it cannot be made logical; it cannot be reduced to reason. You have to experience it. If you experience, only then do you know.

So try this: don't think about it, try -- try to be a witness to your own thoughts. Sit down, relaxed, close your eyes, let your thoughts run just like on a screen pictures run. See them, look at them, make them your objects. One thought arises: look at it deeply. Don't think about it, just look at it. If you begin to think about it then you are not a witness -- you have fallen in the trap.

There is a horn outside; a thought arises -- some car is passing; or a dog barks or something happens. Don't think about it; just look at the thought. The thought has arisen, taken form. Now it is before you. Soon it will pass. Another thought will replace it. Go on looking at this thought process. Even for a single moment, if you are capable of looking at this thought process without thinking about it, you will have gained something in witnessing and you will have known something in witnessing. This is a taste, a different taste than thinking -- totally different. But one has to experiment with it.

Religion and science are poles apart, but in one thing they are similar and their emphasis is the same: science depends on experiment, and religion also. Only philosophy is non-experimental. Philosophy depends just on thinking. Religion and science both depend on experiment: science on objects, religion on your subjectivity. Science depends on experimenting with other things than you, and Religion depends on experimenting directly with you.

It is difficult, because in science the experimenter is there, the experiment is there and the object to be experimented upon is there. There are three things: the object, the subject and the experiment. In religion you are all the three simultaneously. You are to experiment upon yourself. You are the subject and you are the object and you are the lab.

Don't go on thinking. Begin, start somewhere, to experiment. Then you will have a direct feeling of what thinking is and what witnessing is. And then you will come to know that you cannot do both simultaneously, just as you cannot run and sit simultaneously. If you run, then you cannot sit, then you are not sitting. And if you are sitting, then you cannot run. But sitting is not a function of the legs. Running is a function of the legs; sitting is not a function of legs. Rather, sitting is a non-function of the legs. When the legs are functioning, then you are not sitting. Sitting is a nonfunction of the legs; running is the function.

The same is with the mind: thinking is a function of the mind; witnessing a non-function of the mind. When the mind is not functioning, you have the witnessing, then you have the awareness. That's why I said you cannot do both with your mind. You cannot both sit and run with your legs. But that doesn't mean that sitting is a function of your legs. It is not a function

at all; it is a nonfunctioning of your legs.

And you ask, "Is there anything like partial witnessing and total witnessing?" No -- there is nothing like partial witnessing and total witnessing. Witnessing is total. It may be for a single moment and then it may go, but when it is there it is total. Can you sit partially or totally? What can we understand by sitting partially? Witnessing is a total thing. Really, in life, nothing is partial -- in life. Only with mind everything is partial. Understand this: with mind, nothing is total and never can be total. And when mind is not there, everything is total, nothing can be partial. So mind is the faculty to bring partialness and fragmentariness in life.

For example, watch a child in anger. The child is yet raw, uncultured. Look at his anger: the anger is total; it is not partial. Nothing is suppressed, it is a full flowering. That's why children in anger are so beautiful. Every totality has a beauty of its own.

When *you* are in anger, your anger is never total. The mind has come in -- it is going to be partial. Something is bound to be suppressed, and that something suppressed will become a poison. Then your love also cannot be total. It is going to be partial. Neither can you hate nor can you love. Whatsoever you do will be partial because the mind is functioning.

A child can be angry this moment, and the second moment he can be in love. And when he is in anger it is a total thing, and when he is in love it is again a total thing. Every moment is total! The mind is still undeveloped. Again, a sage is just like a child. There are many, many differences, but the childhood comes again -- he is total again. But he cannot be in anger. The child is without a mind as far as *this* life is concerned, but past lives and many minds accumulated in the unconscious, they go on working. So a child appears total, but he cannot be really total. This life's mind is still growing, but he has many, many minds hidden in the subconscious, in the unconscious, in the deeper realms of the mind.

A sage is totally without mind -- of this life or of past lives -- so he can be only total in anything. He cannot be angry, he cannot be in hate, and the reason is again that no one can be totally in anger. Anger is painful and you cannot be totally in anything which gives pain to you. He cannot be in hate because now he cannot be in anything in which he cannot be total. It is not a question of good and evil; it is not a moral question. Really, for a sage, it is a question of being total. He cannot be otherwise.

Lao Tzu says, "I call that good in which you can be total and that bad in which you can never be total." Partiality is sin. If you look at it in this way, then mind becomes sin -- mind is the faculty of being partial. Witnessing is total, but in our lives nothing is total -- nothing. We are partial in everything. That's why there is no bliss, no ecstasy -- because only when you are total in something do you have a blissful moment and never otherwise. Bliss means being total in something, and we are never total in anything. Only a part of us goes into something and a part of us remains outside. This creates a tension: one part somewhere and another part somewhere else. So whatsoever we do, even if we love, it is a tension, it is an anguish.

Psychologists say that if you study someone in love, then love appears just like any disease. Even love is not a blissful thing. It is anguish, a heavy burden. And that's why one gets bored even with love, fed up -- because the mind is not in bliss, it is in anguish. In whatsoever we are partial we are bound to be tense, in anguish. "Partial" means we are divided, and mind is bound to be partial. Why? Because mind is not one thing. Mind means many things. Mind is a collection; it is not a unity.

Your nature is a unity. Your mind is a collection; it is not a unity at all. It has been collected by the way. So many persons have influenced your mind, so many influences have made it. Nothing goes by which is not impressing your mind. Everything that passes you impresses itself upon you: your friends impress you, your enemies also; your attractions

impress you, your repulsions also; what you like impresses you and what you don't like also impresses you. You go on collecting in multi-dimensional ways. So mind is just a junkyard. It is not unitary. It is a "multiverse", it is not a universe, so it can never be total. How can it be total? It is a crowd with many, many contradictory, self-contradictory openings.

Old psychology believed in one mind, but new psychology says this is a false concept. Mind is a multiplicity, it is not one. You don't have one mind. It is only a linguistic habit that we go on talking about one mind. We go on saying "my mind", but this is wrong, factually wrong. It is better to say "my minds".

Mahavir came upon this fact two thousand years ago. He is reported to have said: "Man is not unipsychic, man is polypsychic -- many minds." That's why you cannot be total with the mind. Either the majority of your minds is with you or the minority. Any mind decision is bound to be a parliamentary decision and nothing more. At the most you can hope for a majority decision.

And then a second thing comes in: it is not a fixed crowd -- it is a changing crowd. It is *not* a fixed crowd! Every moment something is being added and something is being lost, so every moment you have new minds.

Buddha is passing through a city and someone comes to him and says, "I want to serve humanity. Show me the path!" Buddha closes his eyes and remains silent. The man feels bewildered. He asks again: "I am saying that I want to serve humanity, Why have you become silent? Is there something wrong in my asking this?"

Buddha opens his eyes and says, "You want to serve humanity, but where *are* you? First BE! You are not! You are a crowd. This moment you want to serve humanity, the second moment you may want to murder humanity. First be! You cannot do anything unless *you are*. So don't think of doings -- first contemplate about your being."

This "being" can happen only through witnessing, never through thinking. Witnessing is total because your nature is one. You are born as one, then you accumulate many minds. Then you begin to feel these many minds as you -- then you are identified, This identification is to be broken.

OSHO, LAST NIGHT YOU SPOKE ABOUT WITNESSING AS A METHOD; OTHER TIMES I HAVE HEARD YOU SPEAK ABOUT BECOMING A THING TOTALLY, BEING TOTALLY INVOLVED IN ANY GIVEN SITUATION. USUALLY I AM AT A LOSS AS TO WHICH OF THESE TWO TO FOLLOW: WHETHER TO STAND BACK AND WITNESS IN A DETACHED WHY OR TO BECOME SOMETHING TOTALLY -- FOR EXAMPLE, WHEN THERE IS ANGER OR LOVE OR SADNESS. ARE THESE NOT TWO OPPOSITE PATHS? ARE THEY BOTH FOR DIFFERENT KINDS OF SITUATIONS OR FOR DIFFERENT TYPES OF PEOPLE? WHEN SHOULD ONE DO WHICH?

There are two basic paths -- only two. One is of surrendering and another is of willing: the path of surrender and the path of will. They are diametrically opposite as far as going through them is concerned. But they reach to the same goal, they reach to the same realization. So we have to understand a little more in detail.

The path of will starts with your witnessing Self. It is not concerned with your ego directly -- only indirectly. To start witnessing, to be aware of your acts, is directly concerned with awakening your inner Self. If the inner Self is awakened, the ego disappears as a

consequence. You are not to do anything with the ego directly. They cannot both exist simultaneously. If your Self is awakened, the ego will disappear. The path of will tries to awaken the inner center directly. Many, many methods are used. How to awaken the Self? We will discuss that.

The path of surrender is directly concerned with the ego, not with the Self. When the ego disappears, the inner Self is awakened automatically. The path of surrender is concerned with the ego immediately, directly. You are not to do anything to awaken your inner Self. You are just to surrender your ego. The moment ego is surrendered, you are left with your inner Self awakened. Of course, these both will work in opposite directions, because one will be concerned with ego and one will be concerned with Self. Their methods, their techniques, will be opposite -- and no one can follow both. There is no need to and that is impossible also. Everyone has to choose.

If you choose the path of will, then you are left alone to work upon yourself. It is an arduous thing. One has to struggle -- to fight -- to fight with old habits which create sleep. Then the only fight is against sleep, and the only ambition is for a deep awakening inside. Those who follow will, they know only one sin, and that sin is spiritual sleepiness.

Many are the techniques. I have discussed some. For example, Gurdjieff used a Sufi exercise. Sufis call it "halt". For example, you are sitting here, and if you are practising the exercise of "halt" it means total halt. Whenever the teacher says "Stop!" or "Halt!" then you have to stop totally whatsoever you are doing. If your eyes are open, then stop them there and then. Now you cannot close them. If your hand is raised, let it be there. Whatsoever your position and gesture, just be frozen in it. No movements! Halt totally! Try this, and suddenly you will have an inner awakening -- a feeling. Suddenly you will become aware of your own frozenness.

The whole body is frozen, you have become a solid stone, you are like a statue. But if you go on deceiving yourself, then you have fallen into sleep. You can deceive yourself. You can say, "Who is seeing me? I can close my eyes. They are becoming painful." You can deceive yourself -- then you have fallen into sleep. No -- deception is sleep. Don't deceive yourself, because no one else is concerned. It is up to you. If you can be frozen for a single moment you will begin to see yourself as different, and your center will become aware of your frozen body.

There are other ways. For example, Mahavir and his tradition have used fasting as a method to awaken the Self. If you fast, the body begins to demand, the body begins to overpower you. Mahavir has said, "Just witness -- don't do anything. You feel hungry, so feel hungry. The body asks for food -- be a witness to it, don't do anything. Just be a witness to whatsoever is happening." And it is a deep thing.

There are only two deep things in the body -- sex and food. Nothing is more than these two, because food is needed for individual survival and sex is needed for race survival. Both are survival mechanisms. The individual cannot survive without food and the race cannot survive without sex. So sex is food for the race and food is sex for the individual. These are the deepest things because they are concerned with your survival -- the most basic things. You will die without them.

So if you are fasting and just witnessing, then you have touched the deepest sleep. And if you can witness without being identified or bothered -- the body is suffering, the body is hungry, the body is demanding and you are just witnessing -- suddenly the body will be different. There will be a discontinuity between you and the body; there will be a gap.

Fasting has been used by Mahavir. Mohammedans have used vigilance in the night -- no

sleep! Don't sleep for a week and then you will know how sleepy the whole being becomes, how difficult it is to maintain this vigilance. But if one persists, suddenly a moment comes when the body and you are torn apart. Then you can see that the *body* needs sleep -- it is not *your* need.

Many are the methods to work directly to create more awareness in yourself, to bring yourself above your so-called sleepy existence. No surrender is needed. Rather, one has to fight against surrender. No surrender is needed, because this is a path of struggle not of surrender. Because of this path, Mahavir was given the name "Mahavir". "Mahavir" means "the great warrior". This was not his name. His name was Vardhaman. He was called Mahavir because he was a great warrior as far as this inner struggle is concerned. He had no Guru, no Master, because it is a lonely path. Even to take somebody's help is not good -- it may become your sleep.

There is a story: Mahavir was fasting and remaining silent for years together. In a certain village some mischievous people were disturbing him, harassing him, and he was on a vow of silence. He was beaten so many times because he would not speak and he remained naked -- completely naked. So the villagers were at a loss to understand who he was. And he would not speak! And moreover he was naked! So from one village to another village he would be thrown out, made to leave the village.

The story says Indra, the King of gods, came to him and said to Mahavir, "I can defend you. It has become so painful. You are being beaten unnecessarily, so just allow me to defend you."

Mahavir rejected the help. Later on, when he was asked why he rejected the help, he said, "This path of will is a lonely path. You cannot even have a helper with you because then the struggle loosens. Then the struggle becomes partial. Then you can depend on someone else, and wherever there is dependence sleep comes in. One has to be *totally* independent; only then can one be awake.

This is one path, one basic attitude. All these methods of witnessing belong to this path. So when I say, "Be a witness." it is meant for those who are travellers on the path of will.

Quite the opposite is the method of surrender. Surrender is concerned with your ego, not with your Self. In surrender you have to give up yourself. Of course, you cannot give the Self; that is impossible. Whatever you can give is bound to be your ego. Only the ego can be given -- because it is just incidental to you. It is not even a part of your being, just something added. It is a possession. Of course, the possessor has also become possessed by it. But it is a possession, it is a property -- it is not you.

The path of surrender says, "Surrender your ego to the Teacher, to the Divine, to a Buddha." When someone comes to Buddha and says, "BUDDHAM SHARANAM GAUCHHAMI" -- I take shelter at your feet. I surrender myself at Buddha's feet," what is he doing? The Self cannot be surrendered, so leave it out. Whatever you can surrender is your ego. That is your possession; you can surrender it. If you can surrender your ego to someone, it makes no difference to whom -- X, Y or Z. The person to be surrendered to is irrelevant in a way. The real thing is surrendering. So you can surrender to a God in the sky. Whether He is there or not is irrelevant. If a concept of the Divine in the sky can help you to surrender your ego, then it is a good device.

Really, yoga *shastras* say that God is a device to be surrendered to -- just a device! So you need not bother whether God is or not. He is just a device, because it will be difficult for you to surrender in a vacuum. So let there be a God, and you surrender. Even a false device can help. For example, you see a rope on the street and you think that it is a snake. It moves

like a snake. You are afraid, you are trembling, you are running. You begin to perspire, and your perspiration is real. And there is no snake -- there is just a rope mistaken for a snake.

The yoga sutras say that God is a just a device to be surrendered to. Whether God is or is not is not meaningful; you need not bother about it. If He is, you will come to know through surrender. You need not be bothered about it before surrender. If He is, then you will know; if He is not, then you will know. So no discussion, no argument, no proof is needed. And it is very beautiful: they say He is a device, just a hypothetical thing to which you can surrender yourself, to help you surrender. So a Teacher can become a god; a Teacher is a god. Unless you feel a Teacher as a god, you cannot surrender. Surrendering becomes possible if you feel that Mahavir is a god, Buddha is a god. Then you can surrender easily. Whether a Buddha is a god or not is irrelevant. Again, it is a device, it helps.

Buddha is known to have said that every truth is a device to help, every truth is just a utility. If it works, it is true. And there is no other basis for calling it true or untrue -- if it works, it is true!

On the path of surrender, surrendering is the only technique. There are many techniques on the path of will, because you can make many efforts to awaken yourself. But when one is just to surrender, there are no methods.

One day a man came to Ramakrishna. He wanted to donate one thousand gold coins to Ramakrishna. Ramakrishna said, "I don't need them, but when you have taken such a big burden from your house to Dakshineswar, to my hut, it will not be good to carry it back again. Mm? -- it will be unnecessary. So just go to the Ganges and throw it in."

The man, of course, was in a very deep difficulty, great difficulty. What to do? He hesitated, so Ramakrishna said, "You have donated them to me, now they do not belong to you. I order you! Go to the Ganges and throw them!" So he had to.

He went to the Ganges but did not return. One hour passed. Ramakrishna asked someone, "Where has that man gone? Go and find out!" So some disciples went and he was brought back. Ramakrishna asked, "Such a long time? What were you doing?"

So the persons who had gone to find him said, "He was counting them and throwing one piece at a time -- one, two, three -- one thousand pieces. He would look at a gold coin, count it and then he would throw it." So Ramakrishna said, "What nonsense! When one is to throw, there is no need to count. When one accumulates, there is a need to count; you have to know how many coins you have. But when you have gone to throw them, why waste time in counting? You can just throw!"

Surrendering is throwing the ego. There is no counting and there are no methods. You just throw it. It itself is the technique. On the path of surrender, surrender is the path and surrender is the technique. On the path of will, will is the path and there are *many* techniques to work it out. But surrender is simple in a way. You throw it! The moment you throw your ego -- and only the ego can be thrown -- suddenly you become aware, aware of your inner center. You reach the same point, but through a very diverse path.

One thing more to be understood, and that has been asked: whether to be aware or to be lost in something. Whenever I talk of surrender, I talk of being lost in something. A Meera dancing: she is not aware that she is dancing -- she has become the dance. There is no gap. She has surrendered her ego completely. There is dancing -- she is not aware; she is completely lost in it. When you are absorbed totally then you are in surrender -- absorbed totally. But only the ego can be absorbed -- only the ego! And when the ego is absorbed, the Self is there in its total purity.

But that is not the concern. On the path of surrender that is not the concern! Meera is not

concerned with awareness, with consciousness -- no. She is concerned with being completely unconscious in the Divine dance or in the Divine song -- with being lost totally in it. To lose oneself totally.... That which cannot be lost will be there, of course, but it is not the concern.

On the path of will, ego is not the concern -- the Self is. On the path of surrender, the Self is not the concern. Remember this difference of emphasis, this difference of focusing. That's why there is so much controversy, *so* much controversy, between a devotee and a yogi, a *bhakta* and a yogi. The yogi is on the path of will and the *bhakta* is on the path of surrender, so they speak totally different languages. There is no bridge. The yogi is trying to be, and the *bhakta* is trying not to be. The yogi is trying to be aware and the *bhakta* is trying to be totally lost.

Of course, they are bound to speak diametrically opposite languages, and there is much controversy, much argument. But those arguments and those controversies do not really belong to a real devotee or to a real yogi: they belong to scholars. to academicians. Those who think about devotion and about yoga, they go on discussing problems -- and then there is no meeting point because that meeting point is reached only through experience. If you stick to the terms and the jargon used, then you will be confused.

A Chaitanya, a *bhakta*, cannot speak the language of Mahavir. They don't belong to the same path. They reach to the same point ultimately, but they never travel the same path. So their experiences of the path are bound to be different. The ultimate ecstasy will be the same, but that cannot be said; that is the problem. The ultimate experience will be the same, but that is inexpressible. And whatsoever is expressible is just experiences on the path, and they are found to be difficult and opposite.

A Mahavir will become more and more centered on the path, more and more one Self. and Chaitanya will be less and less oneself on the path. He will go on throwing himself unto the Divine feet. To Mahavir it will look like suicide, and to Chaitanya, Mahavir's path will look a very egoistic thing.

Mahavir says there is no God, so don't surrender. Really, Mahavir denies God only to make surrender impossible. If yoga proposes God as a device, Mahavir proposes no God, again as a device -- a device on the path of will. If there is God, then you cannot proceed on the path of will. It is difficult, because if there is a God then something is more potent than you, more powerful than you. Then something is more high than you, so how can you be authentically your Self?

Mahavir says, "If there is a God, then I am bound to be always in bondage, because something is always above me. And if you say God has created the world and God has created me, then what can I do? Then I am just a puppet in his hands. Then where is the will? Then there is no possibility of will. There is only a deep determinism. Then nothing can be done." So Mahavir dethrones God just as a device on the path of will. "There is no God," Mahavir says. "You are the God and no one else is the God, so there is no need to surrender."

Chaitanya uses going to the Divine feet -- *sharanam* -- as the basic religious effort. But Mahavir says *asharanam* -- never to go anybody's feet. Of course, *sharanam* and *asharanam* -- to go and surrender to the Divine feet, and never to go to anybody's feet because no feet except your own are Divine -- these are completely, diametrically opposite standpoints. But just in the beginning and while on the path -- they reach to the same thing. Either surrender your ego -- then you have not to do anything. You have to do only one thing: surrender your ego. Then you have *not* to do anything. Then everything will begin to happen. If you cannot surrender then you will have to do much, because then you are on your own to fight, struggle.

Both paths are valid, and there is no question of which is better. It depends on the person

who is following. It depends on your type. Every path is valid, and there are many subpaths, branches. Some branches belong to the path of will, some to the path of surrender. Paths, subpaths -- everything is valid. But for you not everything can be valid; only one thing can be valid -- mm? -- for you individually. So don't get into confusion that: "Everything is valid so I can follow everything." You cannot follow! You have to follow one path. There is no Truth; there are truths. But for you, one truth has to be chosen.

So the first thing for the seeker is to determine to what type he belongs, what he is, what will be good for him, and what his inner inclination is. Can he surrender? Can you surrender? Can you efface your ego? If that is possible, then simple surrender can do. But it is not so simple -- very difficult. To efface the ego is not so simple. To put someone higher than you, to put someone as a God and then surrender -- very difficult! Nietzsche has said: "I would like to be in hell if I can be the first there. I would not like to be in heaven if I am put second to anyone there. To be in hell is good if one can be the first."

Bayazid was a great Sufi mystic. He had a big monastery and many seekers from many parts of the world would come to him. One day a person came and he said, "I want to be here in your monastery. I want to be one of your inmates."

Bayazid said to the man, "We have two types of inmates: one type who are disciples, another type who are teachers. To which would you like to belong?"

The person had come to find Truth. He said, "Give me a little time to think about it."

So Bayazid said, "There is no need -- you have thought about it. Tell me!"

So he said, "It will be better if I can belong to the group of teachers."

He had come to seek, but he wanted to belong to the group of teachers, not to the disciples. So Bayazid said, "That second group -- of teachers -- doesn't exist in my monastery Mm? -- that was just a trick. So you can go. Your path is of the disciples, those who can surrender. So you are not for us and we are not for you."

The man said, "If that is the case, then I can belong to the disciples."

So Bayazid said, "No, there is no possibility. You will have to go."

If you can surrender, you can be a disciple. On the path of will, you are the teacher and you are the disciple. On the path of surrender, you are the disciple. And sometimes this is really arduous.

Ebrahim, a king of Balkh, came to a Sufi Teacher and said, "I have renounced my kingdom -- now accept me as your disciple!"

The Teacher said, "Before I accept you, you will have to pass through a certain test."

Ebrahim said, "I am ready -- but I cannot wait, so test me."

The Teacher said, "Go naked and make a round of your capital. And take one of my sandals and go on beating on your head with it."

Those who were sitting there were just aghast. An old man said to the Teacher, "What are you doing to that poor man? He has renounced his kingdom. What more do you demand? What are you saying? And I have never seen such things before! Not even you have demanded such things before!"

But the Teacher said, "This has to be fulfilled. Come back, and only then will I think about making you my disciple."

Ebrahim undressed, took a sandal, began to beat on his head, and passed through the city. He came back, and the Teacher bowed down to Ebrahim and touched his feet. He said, "You are already Enlightened."

And Ebrahim said, "I myself feel a sudden change. I am a different person. But how, miraculously, have you changed me? The whole city was laughing -- I was just mad."

This is surrender. Then surrendering is enough. It is a sudden method, it can work in a *moment*, it can explode you in a moment.

On the surface it looks easy -- that one has not to do anything, just to surrender. Then you do not know what surrendering means. It can mean anything. If the Teacher says, "Jump into the sea!" then there should be no hesitation. Surrendering means, "Now I am not -- now you are. Do whatsoever you like."

In Egypt there was a mystic, Dhun-Nun. When he was with his Teacher, he came to ask a certain question. The Teacher said, "Unless I say to you, 'Ask,' don't ask, and wait." For twelve years Dhun-Nun was waiting. He would come daily in the morning -- the first man to enter the hut of the Teacher. He would sit there. Many, many others would come to ask and they would be answered. And the Teacher didn't say to anyone again, "Wait!" It was too much. And that man Dhun-Nun was waiting -- for twelve years. He was not allowed to ask. So that was the first thing he uttered, "I want to ask a certain question," and the Teacher said, "You wait -- unless I tell you to ask, you cannot ask. Wait!"

For twelve years he waited. The Teacher wouldn't even look at him; the Teacher wouldn't even give any hint that he was going to let him ask. He completely forgot that Dhun-Nun exists. And Dhun-Nun waited day and night for twelve years. Then one day the Teacher moved to him and said, "Dhun-Nun -- but now you need not ask. You had come to ask a certain question. Now I allow you, but I think now you need not ask."

Dhun-Nun bowed, touched the Teacher's feet and said, "You have given me answer enough."

What had happened to Dhun-Nun? You cannot wait twelve years unless you have surrendered totally. Then doubts are bound to arise -- whether you have become a madman, whether he has forgotten you completely. And to no one else was the Teacher saying "Wait!" For twelve years, thousands and thousands of people would come and ask and he would answer. And this would go on continuously, day after day, and the man waited. It was a total trust. The Teacher said, "Now you need not ask."

And Dhun-Nun said, "There is no question left. These twelve years, what a miracle you did with me! You did not even look at me. What a miracle! You did not even give a hint!"

Surrender means total trust. Then you are not needed. If you cannot give total trust, if you cannot surrender, then the only way is the path of will. But don't be confused. I know so many people going around and around confused. They would like something to happen to them just like what happens on the path of surrender, but they are not ready to surrender. They would like to behave like a man of will and would like something to happen as it happens on the path of surrender.

Only yesterday I received a letter, and I receive many letters like that. The letter-writer says, "I want to learn much from you. but I cannot accept you as my Guru. I want to come and live with you, but I cannot become your disciple." What is he saying? He wants to gain something just like one gains in surrender, but he wants to be intact as far as his will is concerned. This is impossible! One has to choose -- and everything is just a device.

Two or three days ago, some friends came and they said to me, "People call you God -- why do you accept it?"

I told them, "It may be helpful to them. It is not your concern." They couldn't understand because for them everything is a fact. Either it is or it is not. To me, everything is a device.

If someone has come to me to surrender, then a certain device is needed for him. And if someone has come not to surrender, then that device is useless for him, it is meaningless. But be clear about what you are and what you are trying to find out and how you want to find it

out. Can you give up your ego? Then no need of awareness. Then you need a deep absorption. Be absorbed -- dissolve! Don't be. Forget! Rather than remembering, forgetting. Mm? -- I told you that Gurdjieff said remembering is the method. For Meera, for Chaitanya, forgetting is the method: not SMRITI -- not remembering; but VISMRITI -- forgetting. Forget yourself completely, efface yourself completely! And if that is not possible for you, then make every effort to be awake. Then don't lose yourself in anything -- not even in music.

Mohammed was totally against music only because of this: on the path of will, music is a hindrance because you can forget yourself in it. So don't forget yourself in anything, don't lose yourself. But then use techniques to be more and more awake, more and more alert, more and more attentive, more and more conscious.

And remember one thing: you cannot do both. If you are doing both, then you will be very much confused -- and your effort will be wasted, and your energy will be unnecessarily dissipated. Choose, and then stick to it. Only then can something happen. It is a long process and arduous. And there are no shortcuts. All the shortcuts are deceptions. But because everyone is lethargic and everyone wants something without doing anything, many shortcuts are invented. There is no shortcut!

It is reported that Euclid, who invented geometry, was also a teacher of Alexander. Euclid was teaching Alexander mathematics. particularly geometry. Alexander said to Euclid, "Don't go on with this long process. I am not an ordinary student. Find some shortcut!" Euclid didn't return again. One day passed, two days, three, one week. Alexander inquired.

Euclid wrote a note saying: "There are no shortcuts. Whether you are an emperor or a beggar, there are no shortcuts. And if you desire some shortcut, then I am not your teacher. Then you need someone who can deceive you. I am not your teacher. So find someone else. Someone will come up who will say, 'No, I know the shortcut.' But in knowledge there are no shortcuts. One has to go the long way."

So don't be deceived, and don't think that if you combine both paths then it will be good for you -- no. Every system is perfect in itself, and the moment you combine it with something else, you destroy the organic unity in it.

There are many, many persons who go on talking about a synthesis of religions -- which is nonsense! Every religion is a perfect, organic whole. It need not be combined with anything else. If you combine, you destroy everything. There may be similarities in the Bible and the Koran and the Vedas, but these are superficial similarities. Deep down they each have a different organic unity of their own.

So then if one is a Christian, one should be one hundred percent a Christian. And if one is a Hindu, one should be one hundred percent a Hindu. A fifty percent Hindu and a fifty percent Christian is just insane. It is just like fifty percent ayurvedic medicine and fifty percent allopathic medicine. The person will go insane. There is no synthesis between "pathies", and every religion is like a "pathy". It is a medicine. it is a science -- every technique!

Because I have mentioned medicine, it will be good to finish, to conclude, that the path of will is just like naturopathy -- you have to depend upon yourself. No help! The path of surrender is more like allopathy -- you can use medicines.

Think of it in this way: when someone is ill, he has two things -- an inner, positive possibility of health and an accidental or incidental phenomenon of disease, illness. Naturopathy is not concerned with illness directly. Naturopathy is directly concerned with a positive growth of health. So grow in health! Naturopathy means growing in health positively. When you grow in health, the disease will disappear by itself. You need not be

concerned with disease directly. Allopathy is not concerned with positive health at all. It is concerned with the illness: destroy the illness and you will be healthy automatically.

The path of will is concerned with growing in positive awareness. If you grow, the ego will disappear -- that is the disease. The path of surrender is concerned with the disease itself, not with positive growth in health. Destroy the disease -- surrender the ego -- and you will grow in health.

The path of surrender is allopathic and the path of will is naturopathic. But don't mix both, otherwise you will be more ill. Then your effort to be healthy will create more problems for you. And everyone is just confused. One goes on thinking that if you use many, many "pathies", of course, mathematically, you should gain health sooner. Mathematically, logically, it may seem so, but it is not so really. You may even become an impossible case.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 1

Chapter #17

Chapter title: Towards a Total Flowering of Consciousness

6 June 1972 om in Bombay, India

Archive code: 7206063

ShortTitle: ULTAL117

Audio: Yes

Video: No

CHIDAAPTIIH PUSHPAM

WHAT ARE THE FLOWERS FOR THE WORSHIP? -- TO BE FILLED WITH CONSCIOUSNESS.

Man is a seed, a possibility, a potentiality. Man is not only what he is -- he is also what he can be. Whatsoever man is, it is just a situation, just an opening, just a becoming. Much is hidden, and the hidden part is more than the manifested part. That's why I say man is a seed. He can grow, and man can be only if he grows.

If a seed remains a seed, that means death. If a seed is not growing, then it is dying. And you cannot remain in between. Either you have to grow or you have to die. There is no midpoint. Grow or die! There is no other alternative. The seed is just a situation to grow. And to grow means to transcend, to grow means to die on a particular level and to be reborn on another. what is growth for a seed? The seed must die as a seed -- only then is the tree born. The possibility begins to become actual.

A seed can die in two ways. It can just die without growing; then it is negative death. Or, a seed can die to grow; then it is positive death, and positive death is the door to more life. Positive death means dying for something -- dying to grow, disappearing from one plane to appear on another. Man can remain a seed, and many men die negative deaths without growing, without transcending themselves, without disappearing from one plane to appear on another.

Nietzsche has said somewhere that man *is* only when he transcends himself: you *are* only when you are disappearing from below and appearing above. It is a continuous process of dying to the material and being born more conscious. But a seed can be satisfied and can remain satisfied to be a seed. It is even difficult for a seed to conceive of what he can be. Even to dream about it seems impossible. How can a seed dream of what he can be? Even to conceive of the possibility of being a tree will look just absurd. How can a seed be a tree? Even if the tree is there just by the seed, the seed cannot conceive that this tree was once a seed, and that "I also can be a tree."

Buddha has said, "I cannot give you Truth, but I can give you a dream. Look at me, and your potentialities, your possibilities, will begin to stir. Something will begin to throb for the future; something within you will begin to long for that which can be." A Buddha is a tree -- not only a tree, but a tree which has come to flower. We are seeds. Think of man as a seed.

Then what can be the flowering? For man's tree, what can be the flowering? Flowers of consciousness, of course.

This sutra says:

WHAT ARE THE FLOWERS FOR WORSHIP? -- TO BE FILLED WITH CONSCIOUSNESS.

To be conscious totally -- to be conscious! To use the symbol of flower for consciousness is multi-meaningful. It is not only a symbol -- because consciousness is factually a flowering in man. When man flowers, comes to his omega point, suddenly there is a burst of flowering. That flowering is of consciousness.

But man as he is is just a seed. He is not conscious, he is not a consciousness. This will be difficult and very humiliating, because we go on thinking that we are conscious. And this is the most fatal belief -- dangerous, poisonous -- because if you think that you are already conscious, then there is no possibility for you to flower. If a seed thinks and believes that it is already a tree, already flowering, then there is no possibility for the seed to grow. It has deceived itself completely.

Gurdjieff has said that you are in a prison, but you can come to believe that you are not in a prison -- that this is your home. You can decorate your prison in such a way that it begins to look like your home. You can even be proud of it, you can boast of it, your chains can become your ornaments. It depends on you. You can interpret, and this interpreting is, in a way, very satisfying, because then there is no need to fight against this imprisonment. Then you can be at ease. It is very convenient.

All human beliefs are conveniences, but dangerous. Because of them the possibility to evolve is nullified completely, negated completely. The prisoner can think that he is not a prisoner, but already a free man. This is convenient to believe because then there is no burden. But then this prisoner can never be free. So Gurdjieff says that the first necessary step towards freedom is to recognize the humiliating fact that you are a prisoner -- only then does growth become possible.

The first thing about this sutra that I would like to say to you is: Be completely aware that you are not conscious. This is the first step towards awareness. You are not conscious at all; you live an unconscious life. Whatsoever you are doing is a robot-like thing, mechanical. For example, you are listening to me. You are listening to me but you are not aware of the fact that you are listening. Now you can become aware after I have said it, but you were not previously. For a moment you can become aware that you are listening to me, but only for a moment and then you will slip again into unconsciousness. And then you will listen to me, but not as a conscious being; you will listen to me like a mechanical thing.

What is the difference? If you are listening to me, you are conscious of me, the speaker; you are not conscious of the listener. Your consciousness is one-arrowed. The arrow is towards the speaker, and you are just in the shadow. The light is focused towards the speaker and you are in darkness. For a moment, if I say something about it, you can become conscious. But the moment you become conscious of the listener you will become unconscious of the speaker. If you can become conscious of both, if you can have a double-arrowed consciousness -- simultaneously aware of the speaker *and* the listener -- then you are conscious.

When I say you are not conscious, I don't mean that sometimes there are not moments when you are not conscious. Sometimes there are moments, but very few. And they show only the possibility, not the actuality. It is just like if you jump and then again you are on the

ground. You can defy the gravitation for a single moment, and again you are under it. It is just like this. Sometimes, in particular situations, we jump out of unconsciousness. For a single moment we are out of the pull of gravitation, but not really out of it because the gravitation is working all the time and will bring you down again. But you can have a feeling of freedom for a single moment; then again you are back on the ground.

In certain dangerous situations you become conscious. Someone has come to murder you: suddenly you are conscious -- *not* only of the murderer, but also of yourself, the one who is to be murdered. Then the consciousness is double-arrowed, but only for a single moment and again you are on the ground. Sometimes in deep love you jump out of your unconsciousness. Then you are not only aware of your lover or beloved: you are also aware of yourself -- but only for a single moment, then again you are back.

Suddenly, in some accident, in some deep, touching experience, one becomes aware. But there are very few such moments. You can count them on your fingers. In a long life of one hundred years you can have certain experiences which can be counted on your fingers. They show only a possibility that you can be conscious.

Ordinarily we exist as automata. And, really, we find it convenient to exist as automata: it is very comfortable to exist as automata. You are more efficient when you work on mechanical lines. You need not worry. Your body, your mind, works as a machine; it is efficient. And it is convenient not to be aware, because to be aware will bring such a sensitivity about things around you that it is going to be painful.

To be a Buddha is not only blissful. It is blissful as far as Buddha himself is concerned. He comes to a peak experience of bliss. But at the same time he has to pay very dearly, because he becomes so sensitive that everything around him gives him pain. He suffers because of others' suffering. A beggar meets you: you pass him unconsciously; there is no problem, it is very convenient. If you become conscious, then it is not so convenient. Then you are bound to come to realize that you have a hand in it, you are part of this ugly world. You are responsible for all that is, whether it is a Vietnam war or a Hindu-Mohammedan riot or poverty. Whatsoever is there, if you become conscious you become responsible. It is difficult now to escape. This is the cost to be paid.

So never think that Buddha is just bliss. No one can be. Everyone has to pay a cost, and the greater the experience, the greater the cost is going to be. A Buddha is peaceful, blissful in himself. He comes to this bliss because of being so conscious. But simultaneously, because of so much consciousness, he becomes sensitive to everything that goes on around him -- he suffers for it.

So it is convenient to exist as unconscious beings. We go on, we prolong, being sleepy. It is a deep somnambulism. We go on walking, doing things profoundly asleep. Nothing touches us; we are absolutely insensitive. Sensitivity depends on consciousness. The more conscious you are, the more sensitive; the less conscious, the less sensitive. And to be sensitive is dangerous. To be non-sensitive is convenient -- so you can move like a dead block, you need not be concerned.

Because of this convenience, we remain seeds. To me, to lose this convenience, to throw this convenience, is the only renunciation. Really, *this* is the comfort to be thrown -- not a house, not a family; they are nothing. This convenience-oriented mind is to be thrown. One has to be sensitive and vulnerable to whatsoever there is; only then can you become conscious.

So the first thing to be understood is why we go on remaining unconscious. There is a reason for it; it has a rationale -- because it is convenient. To live a dead life is convenient, to

move like a dead corpse is convenient, because then you are not affected, you are not concerned. You have a routine to work and to do from morning to evening. You move in a circle; throughout your life you go on moving in your old pattern. The older the pattern, the less the inconvenience. Ultimately, you are settled in it.

Look at this attitude! If this attitude persists you are not going to transcend the seed. When a seed is transcended it is calling for dangers. A seed is protected, but a plant is not so protected. A plant is always in danger; a seed is never in danger. A seed lives a dead life, but a plant becomes alive, delicate, unprotected. It is dangerous!

A child in his mother's womb is totally protected. The womb is the most comfortable place to be found anywhere -- no worry, no struggle for survival; a completely relaxed state. Psychologists say, and they say rightly, that this hankering after peace, equilibrium, harmony, is really a remembering of the womb state -- because a child in the womb is just in heaven.

Hindus have a myth of a wish-fulfilling tree -- *kalptaru* -- in heaven. Under that tree, *kalptaru*, the wish-fulfilling tree, there is no gap between demand and supply. You demand, and there is supply -- no time gap. You desire, and it is fulfilled.

The womb is a wish-fulfilling tree. There is no gap between wish and fulfillment. The child has not even to desire. whatsoever is needed is fulfilled -- no effort, no desire, no tension. The child is in perfect *moksha*. And if we were to ask a child to leave the womb and come out, if it were up to him, no child would be born. It is dangerous! It is taking a very dangerous step! Going out of the womb is going out of heaven. It is being thrown out of the Garden of Eden. Now everything is going to be a struggle. Now demand and supply are not going to meet so easily and desires cannot be fulfilled so easily. Now there will always be a gap between the desire and its fulfillment. And even when it is fulfilled, it is not going to be a fulfillment -- because through its fulfillment many other desires will have been born meanwhile. So it is going to be a constant struggle.

So if it is up to a child to decide whether to leave the womb or not, no child will leave. It is very comfortable -- absolutely comfortable. But it is a dead existence. No growth is possible. Growth is possible only when you choose dangers consciously. When you move on unknown paths, you grow. when you take risks, you grow. Just like this, man is again in a womb -- the womb of the unconscious. Mm? Try to understand this: the womb of the unconscious. To leave it is a second birth.

In India we call the person who was born again "twice-born" -- *dwij*. The Brahmins were called twice-born only because of this: that the first birth is the birth out of the womb of the mother, and the second is the birth out of the womb of your own unconscious. And unless you are born out of your unconscious and become conscious, you are not a Brahmin. If you are not conscious, you are not a Brahmin. "Brahmin" means one who knows the Brahma, the Ultimate. If you are perfectly conscious, you come in contact with the Ultimate: you become a Brahmin. This second birth is out of your own unconscious.

What is this unconscious? Freud has said that a man is just like an iceberg: ninety percent under water and only ten percent above it -- nine parts hidden under water and only one part, one tenth, above it. Man is an iceberg! Only one part is conscious, nine parts are unconscious, and that one part, one tenth, is impotent against the other nine. The greater part is unconscious; only a very small fraction is conscious. That's why you are always pulled by the unconscious, manipulated, maneuvered. You may go on thinking that you are the deciding factor -- you are not! The unconscious, hidden mind always decides.

You fall in love. Is it your decision? Is it your conscious decision? Are you in love consciously? You say, "It happened." What does it mean: "It happened"? It means some

unconscious forces within you are pulling you. You are just a puppet. That's why, if it has happened, suddenly one day it disappears again. What can you do? You were just a victim; you were never asked. And not only with love: penetrate deep into whatsoever you think, you do, you feel, and you will come to the conclusion that some unknown force goes on manipulating you. You are not. You may deceive yourself that these are *your* decisions -- they are not.

You decide not to be angry, and then there is anger. everyone has felt the impotence of his own decisions. Every moment you feel it. You decide not to do this, and in spite of yourself, you have to do it. Then you go on creating rationalizations. Those rationalizations are again conveniences. You decide not to be angry and you are angry. Then one possibility is that you will go deep, dig deep within yourself and come to a conclusion that you are not capable of deciding anything -- you don't have the power to decide, you have no power, you are absolutely impotent.

But this is humiliating, so one never goes to the root -- one begins to rationalize. One says, "I had to be angry because it is going to help the person. I had to be angry to change the person. I had to be angry for righteous reasons." Then you create a myth that this is your decision. You are deceiving yourself! find out whether you have really ever decided anything. Has anything ever been your decision? The conscious part of the mind is absolutely impotent. The unconscious is so much -- nine times more. Your conscious is nothing but an instrument in the hands of the unconscious. So go on deciding whatsoever you like in the conscious. The unconscious is not a bit worried. Whatsoever is to be done is to be done by the unconscious, and when it needs to do it, the conscious is just impotent.

But one has to dig into oneself. This unconsciousness is your womb. You have to grow out of it, transcend it. Otherwise, you are bound to be a slave, you can never be a master; and you are bound to remain just an egg -- a seed. You cannot be a tree which can flower. Then the flowering can never be for you.

First begin to feel what this unconscious is, where it is. This is a good start -- to be conscious of the unconscious, to be conscious of one's own imprisonment, of one's being a seed. Don't deceive yourself! Don't go on thinking that you are this and that. find out what you really are. Don't create an image.

Gurdjieff has reported a story. He said there was a magician who had many sheep. Every day a sheep was to be murdered, killed for his food. And there were many sheep. They would see that every day a sheep is killed, but they would never rebel, they would never go against him. Some visitor was staying with the magician, so the visitor said, "This is a miracle! Every day a sheep is chosen, killed before other sheep, and they have not yet become aware that their day is also to come soon. They can escape! They can revolt!"

The magician laughed and he said, "there is a trick. I have hypnotized all the h`sheep. All the sheep are hypnotized, and I have told them in their hypnosis: 'You are not a sheep. You are not a sheep at all. All the others are sheep, but you are not. You are a lion!' So every sheep believes that he is a lion and that every other sheep is just a sheep. So when a sheep is killed no one is bothered, because they are all lions in their own images."

This is a good story. This is the story of the human mind. You go on thinking about what you are not and you go on deceiving yourself about what you are. To recognize the "facticity" of what one is, is the beginning. And that is the only right beginning. So recognize first that your working is unconscious, not conscious. Your love, your hate, your anger, your friends, your foes, they are all part of your unconscious. You are not a conscious being. You have only a very minute part of consciousness. That's why this can be understood: that you are not

a conscious being.

If a madman can be taught that he is mad, that means that a part of his mind is still not insane. If a madman can realize that he is mad, that means a part of the mind is not yet mad. But you cannot convince any madman that he is mad. And if you can convince a madman that he is mad, it means you are wrong. He is not mad. At least a part of the mind is still sane. So if you can come to realize that you are an unconscious being, this is good news. It shows that a part is conscious -- a very minute part, a very small fragment. But that fragment can be used now.

You can use it in two ways: either in rationalizing that you are already conscious; that's what we are doing. Or, in digging deep and realizing that we are unconscious. That minute part of consciousness, that one-tenth part of the human iceberg, can be used in two ways: one is to go on rationalizing, thinking, imagining, dreaming, that you are a conscious human being; this is what we are doing. Or, you can use it in digging within and recognizing that you are not conscious at all. This is what a seeker is expected to do.

And *once* you begin to feel that you are not conscious, consciousness has dawned on you. You are on the path. Now much can be done! Once you realize that you are imprisoned and that "this is not my home but a prison", now something can be done so that you can break out, escape. Now devices can be used, now something can be arranged. Now some contact can be made outside the prison. Now the guard can be bribed or something can be done. But nothing can be done if you go on thinking that you are not in the prison, that it is your house, that the prison guard is your watchman and he is in your service. And if you were really born into a prison, it would look like that -- as if everyone is in your service. The whole prison establishment seems to be in your service if you were born into the prison. How can you think that this is a prison?

To realize this, that this is a prison, is the first basic step for going out, because then something can be done. So you are unconscious. And this is not a theory -- mm? -- this is a simple fact. And this is not a theology: this is simple science. It is not concerned with religions and their hypothetical mythologies. Now it is a fact of science. That was the reason Freud was despised so much, condemned so much.

They say there have been three revolutions. One was the Copernican. Copernicus said that the earth is not the center of the universe and the sun is not going around the earth, but the earth is moving around the sun. The earth was deposed, the earth was dethroned. It was very humiliating to man's mind, because when the earth was the center, man was the center of the universe. Everything was moving around man and man's earth. Suddenly earth was not in the center at all -- not only not in the center, but it was even not a very significant star. It was negligible, as if not. The earth was found to be moving around the sun, and the sun -- our sun itself -- was found to be moving around some greater sun, so we were not the center.

Then came Darwin, and he said man is related not to the Divine but to the animals. He is not a descendant of God, but linked with apes, baboons, chimpanzees. He is a link in a long animal process. This was the second revolution -- a very humiliating one, very ego-destroying. The earth was not the center, and man was not just below the angels -- he was just a bit above the animals and nothing more, and even that "above" was not certain. Man was dethroned, deposed. He was just an animal.

And then came the third revolution, that of Freud, who said you are not a conscious being -- you are just in the hands of unconscious forces. So Aristotle was absolutely wrong according to Freud, because he said man is a rational being. Man is not! Man is the most irrational animal. Dogs are more rational. All other animals are more rational in the sense that

they are predictable. Man is unpredictable -- most irrational! You cannot depend on him, because reason is a mathematical thing. If a dog has behaved in a certain way you can predict he will go on behaving this way. You cannot predict man.

And, moreover, he is not rational, because his whole working of the mind is unconscious. He falls in love, he fights, he goes to war, he goes on accumulating money, he goes on being worried without any rationality in it. He is the most mad animal. Only one thing is certain about him which is exceptional, and that is that he believes certain things about himself which are not. That is the only exceptional thing about man.

Animals are down to earth. They don't have any fictions; they are what they are. Man is a dreaming animal; he can dream, and he can believe in his dreams. He can auto-hypnotize himself, and he can be convinced that whatsoever he is imagining is true. So now it is not simply a religious matter to say that man is unconscious. It is now founded on scientific facts.

Indian psychology is very much older than the Western. In the West, psychology is just a child. Really, Freud is the father, so only this century has given birth to psychology. But with India, it is a long-standing science. Patanjali is a psychologist and Buddha is a psychologist and Kapil is a psychologist. And it will be good to look at them as psychologists rather than as religious persons, because then different dimensions become clear and then you can really understand what they are saying.

Buddha says that only awareness can make you a man; otherwise you are just an animal. The very word "Buddha" means the "Awakened One". That was not his name. His name was Gautam Siddharth, but Gautam Siddharth was an unconscious being. When Gautam Siddharth became conscious, then he was called the Buddha, the awakened One. Buddha, when he became totally conscious, said -- not anything about God, not anything about *moksha*, not anything about Nirvana -- he is reported to have said, "Now I am awake. I was asleep; hitherto, I was asleep. Now I am awake!"

Mahavir's name is "Jin". From that word "Jin" the name of "Jain" is derived. "Jin" means "the conqueror". Mahavir said, "I was asleep. Then I was a slave of the unconscious. Now I have become a conqueror, a Jin, because now there is no unconscious to enslave me." All the sutras of Patanjali are just a technology, techniques, to produce more consciousness. The whole of yoga is concerned with how to produce more consciousness in man.

For the East this has been a long-standing fact, a recognized fact, that man is asleep. But now Western science recognizes the fact also. So what to do? If man is unconscious? How to make him conscious? How to make him awake? The first thing is to recognize the fact of unconsciousness in yourself. It is not difficult to recognize that man is unconscious. That is not difficult, because then you are not included. Then "man" is unconscious, not you. But when I say "man is unconscious", I mean *you*, not humanity.

There exists no humanity, only man -- man A, man B, man C. There exists no humanity -- only individuals. "Humanity" is just a collective name. *you are unconscious*. Listen to this fact with a double-arrowed consciousness. I repeat: *you are unconscious*! Don't rationalize it and don't deceive yourself. Whatsoever you are doing, remember that this is the unconscious working.

Suddenly you have become sexual; remember, this is the unconscious. Now the unconscious is forcing you towards certain acts. don't fight because the fight is also unconscious. Because the society has said, "Sex is bad, evil, sin," that has gone deep into the unconscious. So the unconscious has two parts: one is biological; another is sociological. Instincts are there *and* social taboos. The society has put many things into your unconscious. They call it "conscience". Certain things are "bad"; certain things are "good". They have

forced them into your unconscious.

That's why, if you teach any morality to a child before seven years of age, only then can your teaching succeed. After seven years of age you cannot succeed. That's why every religion is much concerned with children, and every religion has an establishment. Through parents, through family, they condition the mind -- when the mind is totally unconscious. Not even a single part is conscious, so there is no resistance. Whatsoever you say to the child, it goes deep into the unconscious. There is no resistance. Once a child is grown, then it is difficult to penetrate into the unconscious.

So whatsoever one learns in the first seven years becomes the background. Then whatsoever you do in your life, even if you go against the society which has trained you and given you your conscience, you will not really be able to go against it. Even in going against it, you will follow the instructions put into the unconscious. Even to rebel against a certain thing is to remain attached to it.

If humanity is to be saved from so-called religious dogmas, it must be made criminal to teach them to children. Don't teach children any creeds, dogmas, fanatic beliefs -- don't teach them! Let them grow first. When they become adult, only then -- but then it is very difficult. Then the conscious mind has come into existence. It begins to choose and think.

One part is biological, hereditary; another is sociological. There is sex: become aware that the unconscious instinct is forcing your body mechanism towards a particular object, towards a particular act. But don't fight it because that fight is again, from the sociological part of the unconscious which says that sex is sin. Be aware of both, be conscious of both: there is sex, and there is the concept that sex is sin. Both are coming from some place you don't know -- from a deep darkness within. Be conscious -- don't do anything! Just remain conscious. Try to be in an alert state. Don't fight with the sex, don't condemn it -- don't go to indulge in it. Simply remain conscious of the fact that something is happening inside. If you can remain conscious of the fact that something is happening inside. If you can remain with the fact without doing anything, you will feel that your consciousness is growing and penetrating the dark realm of the unconscious.

Anger has come to you: don't do anything for or against it. Don't indulge in it, don't suppress it -- meditate on it. Close your eyes and meditate on the fact of anger. When I say meditate, many things have to be understood. Don't judge. Don't say anger is bad; don't say it is good. don't do anything. Anger is there just like when a snake has come in the room -- just be aware. Is the snake a god to be worshipped? No! Is the snake an enemy to be killed? No! Just be aware that the snake has come. Use this snake as an object for being aware.

Just like this anger has flashed within you -- be aware, be conscious, remain alert, and don't do anything! Just remain alert, because the moment you begin to do anything you cannot remain alert. You have such a small quantity of energy that if you begin to act that energy moves into action. Don't do anything. Be silent and quiet -- alert. Use your total energy capacity to be just alert to the fact that the anger is there. And suddenly you will become aware that the focus of your consciousness is growing -- you are penetrating into the unconscious. Your light of the conscious is going deep into darkness. And the more you penetrate into the darkness of the unconscious, the more conscious you are.

This is a long effort, arduous; arduous because it will create very deep inconvenience. You will feel very uneasy. Try, and you will come to know. You can do two things. either you can act out your anger -- it is easy, you are relieved. whatsoever the consequence may be, for the moment you are relieved; you are relieved of an inner unconscious tension. Or you can fight with your anger. If you fight with it, then again you are relieved because in fighting

anger the same energy is being used which is used in being angry.

Remember this, that one who is fighting with his anger is really changing only the object. I am angry with you. I was going to fight with you, but I turn this whole fight against my own anger, I invert it. I was going to fight with you, but I am a moral man, I am a saint, I am a religious man, so I cannot fight with you. But I have to fight with someone, so I fight with myself, I fight against my anger. The same energy and the same release will happen. I have fought, and there will be a deep satisfaction.

The so-called satisfaction seen on so-called saints' faces is nothing but a deep satisfaction from fighting *and winning*. And really, it is more cunning, because to fight with someone is to create a long series of consequences. If you become both, if you divide yourself in two -- the good one who never becomes angry, and the bad one, the unconscious one, who gets angry -- if you divide yourself in two, you can fight forever. Outwardly you will become a saint, but inwardly you are just a volcano, just a deep turmoil and nothing else -- a disease inside, a constant conflict.

Those who fight with sex will have to fight continuously with sex; those who fight with anger will have to fight with anger continuously. It is a constant fight. There is no silence within -- there cannot be. That's why we divide ourselves into two: the bad one and the good one. You have two parts within you. Remember, the bad one is the unconscious and the good one is the conscious. And once you take your unconscious as the enemy, you can *never* change and transform it. Then there can be no mutation -- because the unconscious is not the enemy. That is your energy, your source, your biological source of energy. You can never be healthy divided in yourself -- you will become a disease.

Don't fight, don't indulge. Both are easy. *Both* are easy! The only thing which is very uncomfortable and uneasy, is to remain alert. The whole mechanism of habit will force you to do something: "What are you doing? Do something! Anything will do, but do something!" This habit has to be broken. So the first thing is to recognize and realize that you are unconscious. The second thing is that whenever the conscious begins to manipulate you, be aware, and remain aware and alert. A very simple, passive alertness is needed.

If you are alert, two things happen: the energy that was going to be used as indulgence or as suppression will become part of your alertness. Your alertness will be strengthened through that energy. That energy will move to your alertness; you will become more alert. That energy will become a fuel to your consciousness. You will be more conscious, and for the first time the unconscious will not be able to force you. For the first time unconsciousness will be incapable of manipulating you. And once you know the feeling of *this* freedom, that the unconscious cannot manipulate you -- without any fight, without any struggle, without any conflict -- then your consciousness has become stronger.

And, by and by, the field of consciousness will grow and the field of unconsciousness will shrink. your human iceberg will have gained one part more: you will be two parts conscious, eight parts unconscious. This is a long journey, and by and by you will become three parts conscious, seven parts unconscious. As you gain more it is just like reclaiming land from the ocean. The unconscious is a vast ocean; you have to reclaim land inch by inch. But the moment you reclaim land, the ocean shrinks back. A day comes, just like it came to a Buddha or to a Jesus, when you are conscious all the ten parts and the unconscious has disappeared. You are just light inside and no darkness.

This is the flowering. And for the first time you become aware of your immortality. for the first time you are not now a seed. For the first time now for you there is no becoming -- you have become a being. If this expression can be allowed: You have become a being! Now

you are a being!

In this enlightened state of being, there is no suffering, no conflict, no misery. You are filled with bliss. Inside you are bliss, outside you are compassion. You have become sensitive to everything. Because of that sensitivity, a Buddha is compassion outside; inside a deep silent pool of bliss and outside a compassion. Buddha's lips are smiling with a deep bliss, and his eyes are filled with tears -- in a deep compassion.

That's why you can work both ways. If you grow in consciousness, you will grow in compassion; if you grow in compassion, you will grow in consciousness. But to grow in compassion is very difficult -- because you can again deceive. So the only right path is to grow in consciousness, then compassion comes as a shadow. Otherwise you can deceive and your compassion can just be a facade, a deception. Your compassion can again be an unconscious act. Then it is sentimental, emotional -- not existential. Then you can weep, you can sympathize and you can serve. But this is going to be again an unconscious thing. The surest and most certain path is to grow in consciousness.

This sutra says, "What are the flowers for the worship? -- to be filled with consciousness." And when you have flowered into consciousness, only then can you be accepted. Then and only then do you enter the temple of the divine -- not with flowers, but with your own flowering. Then you have become a flower.

Every one of you must have seen Buddha sitting on a flower, Vishnu sitting on a flower, Ram standing on a flower, but you might not have understood the symbol. Those flowers simply say, "These are flowered human beings. They have come to a deep flowering."

You might have heard that the seventh chakra in yoga is *sahasrardal kamal* -- the one-thousand-petalled lotus on the seventh chakra in your head. That seventh chakra is the last stage, the peak, the Everest of consciousness. The first chakra is *muladhar* -- the sex center, and the last chakra is *sahasrar*. Sex is the most unconscious thing in you, and the *sahasrar* is the most conscious. These are the two poles.

We live around the sex center, move around it. Whatsoever we do is related with sex, howsoever distant it may look. Your earning money, your accumulating wealth, may not look at all related with sex, but they are related. The more wealth you have, the more sex you can have; it becomes more possible. The more power you have, the more sex you can have; it becomes more possible.

You may forget completely, and ends may become means and means may become ends; that's another thing. One person can go on accumulating wealth for his whole life, and he may completely forget for what he is doing it. But every power search is for sex. We move around the center of sex, we are bound to because unless we grow in consciousness we cannot go beyond it. That is the most unconscious-rooted center, the lowest, and for that reason the deepest and the most unconscious.

The higher you move in consciousness, the further you go from sex. And then there is a flowering of a different type. The whole energy moves to the seventh -- *sahasrar*. And when the whole energy comes to the seventh chakra, it becomes a flower -- one-thousand-petalled. Mm? -- this is a beautiful imagery. It means with unlimited, infinite petals, the flower opens.

This sutra is not just a symbol -- really, no symbol is just a symbol -- it indicates a reality. And whenever you come to the state of Samadhi, to the seventh chakra state of consciousness, you have a subtle sense of flowering inside, as if something has burst open. Now you are not a bud -- you are a flower. Come with this flower to the Divine temple: this is the meaning of this sutra. Flowers purchased from the market will not do. I say "purchased from the market", because now even to grow them has become impossible. It seems that

flowers grow in shops, they are produced.

Purchased flowers will not do; outside flowers will not do. Your own flowering is needed, and only that can be accepted. This is arduous, long, but not impossible. It is the only challenge for man; all else is just childish stupidity. To be fully conscious is the only challenge! To go to the moon, to move to some further star, is all childish -- because you can go to the moon but you remain the same, you remain the seed. Unless you become a flower, you have not moved. With an inner flowering, you mutate, you change, you are born anew.

Effort is needed, much effort is needed. And if -- and this is a big IF -- IF *you* are ready to take the first step, the last is not very far. But the IF is concerned with the first. If you have taken the first step, half the journey is completed. The first is the most difficult. To recognize that you are unconscious is very ego-destroying; it is very shattering, shocking. But if one is ready to take this shock and welcome it, the last step is not very far.

Really, Krishnamurti has said that the first step is the last. Mm? It is in a way, because one who takes the first will take the last. Mahavir has said that if you have taken the first you have reached, because for one who is ready to take the first there is no problem. The journey has started.

To start is always difficult. To reach is not so difficult because one has to move only one step at a time. A thousand-mile journey is completed only by taking one step at a time. No one needs to take two steps simultaneously; no one is required to. If you have taken the first step you have taken one step, and only one step is the needed thing. Now go on taking one and one added to one, and you can complete a thousand-mile journey. We are all sitting only thinking and brooding about the first step. Some are just brooding, some are dreaming that they have taken the first step already.

Someone was here to meet me a few days before. He said, "I am very much advanced, so don't start with me from A-B-C." { This is the mad type of man.

So I asked, "First relate to me how much you have advanced. What have you gained?"

So he said, "I see visions of Krishna. Sometimes I dance with him in my visions. I have visions of very beautiful places -- lakes, hills."

Whatsoever he said was just dreaming, so I said, "If this is what you mean when you say that you have advanced very much, then it is very difficult to even proceed because you are simply dreaming. You have not even taken the first step."

The first is the most difficult: to recognize this, let this fact penetrate deep. Howsoever painful, welcome it -- only then can something be done. If you recognize it you will become humble, if you recognize it you will become simple, if you recognize it you will become childlike -- then there is much possibility, then much opens.

And then the second step: be conscious. Whatsoever happens in the inner mind, be conscious about it. Don't act! Don't be in a hurry to act. Remain with the fact -- alert. And see that this alertness works miraculously. It is a miracle. Observe the unconscious, and there is a sudden change. The quality, the very quality of the mind changes the moment you become an observer inside, a consciousness inside. The very quality of mind changes! The seed is broken asunder and the plant is born.

Of course, it is delicate, very delicate. And one has to protect it continuously for many, many days, for many, many years and sometimes for many, many lives. ut once begun, once the seed is broken, the plant will become a tree -- and one day there is flowering.

That flowering is the concern of religion. To make man a flower is the whole concern of religion.

The Ultimate Alchemy, Vol 1

Chapter #18

Chapter title: The Light of Awareness

6 June 1972 pm in

Archive code: 7206065

ShortTitle: ULTAL118

Audio: Yes

Video: No

OSHO, WE FEEL THAT TO PENETRATE AND TRANSFORM THE DEEPER LAYERS OF THE UNCONSCIOUS ONLY THROUGH AWARENESS IS DIFFICULT AND NOT ENOUGH. WHAT ELSE SHOULD ONE DO OTHER THAN THE PRACTICE OF AWARENESS? PLEASE EXPLAIN MORE ABOUT THE PRACTICAL DIMENSIONS ON THIS MATTER.

THE UNCONSCIOUS can be transformed *only* through awareness. It is difficult, but there is no other way. There are many methods for being aware, but awareness is necessary. You can use methods to be aware, but you will have to be aware.

If someone asks whether there is any method to dispel darkness except by light, howsoever difficult it may be that is the only way -- because darkness is simply the absence of light. So you have to create the presence of light, and then darkness is not there.

Unconsciousness is nothing but an absence -- the absence of consciousness. It is not something positive in itself, so you cannot do anything except be aware. If unconsciousness were something in its own right, then it would be a different matter -- but it is not. Unconsciousness doesn't mean something; it only means not consciousness. It is just an absence. It has no existence in itself; in itself it is not. The word "unconscious" simply shows the absence of consciousness and nothing else. When we say "darkness" the word is misleading, because the moment we say "darkness" it appears that darkness is something that is there. It is not, so you cannot do anything with darkness directly -- or can you?

You may not have observed the fact, but with darkness you cannot do anything directly. Whatsoever you want to do with darkness you will have to do with light, not with darkness. If you want darkness, then put off light. If you don't want darkness, then put on light. But you cannot do anything directly with darkness; you will have to go via light.

Why? Why can you not go directly? You cannot go directly because there is nothing like darkness, so you cannot touch it directly. You have to do something with light, and then you have done something with darkness.

If light is there, then darkness is not there. If light is not there, then darkness is there. You can bring light into this room, but you cannot bring darkness. You can take light out from this room, but you cannot take darkness out from this room. There exists no connection between

you and darkness. Why? If darkness were there then man could be related somehow, but darkness is not there.

Language gives you a fallacy that darkness is something. Darkness is a negative term. It exists not. It connotes only that light is not there -- nothing more -- and the same is with unconsciousness. So when you ask what to do other than to be aware, you ask an irrelevant question. You will have to be aware; you cannot do anything else.

Of course, there are many methods for being aware -- mm? -- that is a different thing. There are many ways to create light -- but light will have to be created. You can create a fire and there will be no darkness. And you can use a kerosene lamp and there will be no darkness, and you can use electricity and there will be no darkness. But whatsoever the case, whatsoever the method of producing light, light has to be produced.

So light is a must, and whatsoever I will say in reference to this question will be about methods to produce awareness. They are not alternatives, remember. They are not alternatives to awareness -- nothing can be. Awareness is the only possibility for dispelling darkness, for dispelling unconsciousness. But how to create awareness? I talked about one method which is the purest: to be aware inside of whatsoever happens on the boundary line of the unconscious and to the conscious -- to be aware there.

Anger is there. Anger is produced in darkness; anger has roots in the unconscious. Only branches and leaves come into the conscious. Roots, seeds, the energy source, are in the unconscious. You become aware only of faraway branches. Be conscious of these branches. The more conscious you are, the more you will be capable of looking into darkness.

Have you observed at any time that if you look deeply in darkness for a certain time, a certain dim light begins to be there? If you concentrate in darkness, you begin to feel and you begin to see. You can train yourself, and then in darkness itself there is a certain amount of light -- because, really, in this world nothing can be absolute and nothing is. Everything is relative. When we say "darkness", it doesn't mean absolute darkness. It only means that there is less light. If you practise to see in it, you will be capable of seeing. Look! Focus yourself in the darkness! And then, by and by, your eyes are strengthened and you begin to see.

Inner darkness, unconsciousness, is the same. Look into it. But you can look only if you are not active. If you begin to act, your mind is distracted. Don't act inside. Anger is there -- don't act, don't condemn, don't appreciate, don't indulge in it, and don't suppress it. Don't do anything -- just look at it! observe it! Understand the distinction.

What happens ordinarily is quite the reverse. If you are angry, then your mind is focused on the cause of anger outside -- always! Someone has insulted you -- you are angry. Now there are three things: the cause of anger outside, the source of anger inside, and in between these two *you* are. Anger is your energy inside, the cause which has provoked your energy to come up is outside, and you are in between. The natural way of the mind is not to be aware of the source, but to be focused on the cause outside. Whenever you are angry you are in deep concentration on the cause outside.

Mahavir has called KRODHA -- anger -- a sort of meditation. He has named it ROUDRA DHYAN -- meditation on negative attitudes. It is! -- because you are concentrated. Really, when you are in deep anger you are so concentrated that the whole world disappears. Only the cause of anger is focused. Your total energy is on the cause of anger, and you are so much focused on the cause that you forget yourself completely. That's why in anger you can do things about which, later on, you can say, "I did them in spite of myself." You were not.

For awareness you have to take an about-turn. You have to concentrate not on the cause outside, but on the source inside. Forget the cause. Close your eyes, and go deep and dig into

the source. Then you can use the same energy which was to be wasted on someone outside -- the energy moves inwards. Anger has much energy. Anger is energy -- the purest of fires inside. Don't waste it outside.

Take another example. You are feeling sexual: sex is again energy, fire. But whenever you feel sexual, again you are focused on someone outside, not on the source. you begin to think of someone -- of the lover, of the beloved, A-B-C-D -- but when you are filled with sex your focus is always on the other. You are dissipating energy.

Not only in the sexual act do you dissipate energy, but in sexual thinking you dissipate it even more because a sexual act is a momentary thing. It comes to a peak, the energy is released, and you are thrown back. But sexual thinking can continuously be there. You can continue it in sexual thinking, you can dissipate energy. And everyone is dissipating energy. Ninety percent of our thinking is sexual. Whatsoever you are doing outside, inside sex is a constant concern -- you may not even be aware of it.

You are sitting in a room and a woman enters: your posture changes suddenly. Your spine is moire erect, your breathing changes, your blood pressure is different. You may not be aware at all of what has happened, but your whole body has reacted sexually. you were a different person when the woman was not there; now again you are a different person.

An all-male group is a different group, and all-female group is a different group. Let one male come in or one female, and the whole group, the whole energy pattern, changes suddenly. You may not be conscious of it, but when your mind is focused on someone, your energy begins to flow. when you feel sexual, *look at the source*, not at the cause -- remember this.

Science is more concerned with the cause and religion is more concerned with the source. The source is always inside; the cause is always outside. With cause you are in a chain reaction. With cause you are connected with your environment. With source you are connected with yourself. So remember this. This is the purest method to change unconscious energy into conscious energy. Take an about-turn -- look inside! It is going to be difficult because our look has become fixed. We are like a person whose neck is paralyzed, and who cannot move and look back. Our eyes have become fixed. We have been looking outside for lives together -- for millennia -- so we don't know how to look inside.

Do this: whenever something happens in your mind, follow it to the source. Anger is there -- a sudden flash has come to you -- close your eyes, meditate on it. From where is this anger arising? Never ask the question: *who* has made it possible? *who* has made you angry? That is a wrong question. Ask which energy in you is transforming into anger -- from where is this anger coming up, bubbling up, what is the source inside from where this energy is coming?

Are you aware that in anger you can do something which you cannot do when you are not in anger? A person in anger can throw a big stone easily. When he is not angry he cannot even lift it. He has much energy when he is angry. A hidden source is now with him. So if a man is mad, he becomes very strong. Why? From where is this energy coming? It is not coming from anything outside. Now all his sources are burning simultaneously -- anger, sex, everything, is burning simultaneously. Every source is available.

Be concerned with from where anger is bubbling up, from where the sex desire has come in. Follow it, take steps backwards. Meditate silently and go with anger to the roots. It is difficult but it is not impossible. It is not easy. It is not going to be easy because it is a fight against a long, rooted habit. The whole past has to be broken, and you have to do something new which you have never done before. It is just the weight of sheer habit which will create

the difficulty. But try it, and then you are creating a new direction for energy to move. You are beginning to be a circle, and in a circle energy is never dissipated.

My energy comes up and moves outside -- it can never become a circle now; it is simply dissipated. If my movement inwards is there, then the same energy which was going out turns upon itself. My meditation leads this energy back to the same source from where the anger was coming. It becomes a circle. This inner circle is the strength of a Mahavir. The sex energy, not moving to someone else, moves back to its own source. This circle of sex energy is the strength of a Buddha.

We are weaklings, not because we have less energy than a Buddha: we have the same quanta of energy, everyone is born with the same energy quanta, but we are accustomed to dissipating it. It simply moves away from us and never comes back. It cannot come back! Once it is out of you, it can never come back -- it is beyond you.

A word arises in me: I speak it out; it has flown away. It is not going to come back to me, and the energy that was used in producing it, that was used in throwing it away, is dissipated. A word arises in me: I don't throw it out; I remain silent. Then the word moves and moves and moves, and falls into the original source again. The energy has been reconsumed.

Silence is energy. *Brahmacharya* is energy. Not to be angry is energy. But this is not suppression. If you suppress anger, you have used energy again. Don't suppress -- observe and follow. don't fight -- just move backwards with the anger. This is the purest method of awareness.

But certain other things can be used. For beginners certain devices are possible. So I will talk about three devices. One type of device is based on body awareness. Forget anger, forget sex -- they are difficult problems. And when you are in them, you become so mad that you cannot meditate. When you are angry you cannot meditate; you cannot even think about meditation. You are just mad. So forget it; it is difficult. Then use your own body as a device for awareness.

Buddha has said that when you walk, walk consciously. When you breathe, breathe consciously. The Buddhist method is known as ANAPANASATI YOGA -- the yoga of the incoming and outgoing breath, incoming and outgoing breath awareness. The breath comes in: move with the breath; know, be aware, that the breath is moving in. When the breath has gone out again, move with it. Be in, be out, with the breath.

Anger is difficult, sex is difficult -- breath is not so difficult. Move with the breath. Don't allow any breath to be in or out without consciousness. This is a meditation. Now you will be focused on breathing, and when you are focused on breathing thoughts stop automatically. you cannot think, because the moment you think your consciousness moves from breath to thought. you have missed breathing.

Try this and you will know. When you are aware of breathing, thoughts cease. The same energy which is used for thoughts is being used in being aware of breath. If you start thinking, you will lose track of the breath, you will forget, and you will think. You cannot do both simultaneously.

If you are following breathing, it is a long process. One has to go into it deeply. It takes a minimum of three months and a maximum of three years. If it is done continuously twenty-four hours a day... it is a method for monks, those who have given up everything; only they can watch their breathing twenty-four hours a day. That's why Buddhist monks and other traditions of monks, they reduce their living to the minimum so that no disturbance is there. They will beg for their food and they will sleep under a tree -- that's all. Their whole time is devoted to some inner practice of being aware -- mm? -- for example, of breath.

A Buddhist monk moves. He has to be continuously aware of his breath. The silence that you see on a Buddhist monk's face is the silence of the awareness of breathing and nothing else. If you become aware your face will become silent, because if thoughts are not there your face cannot show anxiety, thinking. Your face becomes relaxed. Continuous awareness of breathing will stop the mind. The continuously troubled mind will stop. And if the mind stops and you are simply aware of breathing, if the mind is not functioning, you cannot be angry, you cannot be sexual.

Sex or anger or greed or jealousy or envy -- anything needs the mechanism of mind. And if the mechanism stops, you cannot do anything. This again leads to the same thing. Now the energy that is used in sex, in anger, in greed, in ambition, has no outlet. And you go on continuously being concerned with breathing, day and night. Buddha has said, "Even in sleep try to be aware of breathing." It will be difficult in the beginning, but if you can be aware in the day, then by and by this will penetrate into your sleep.

Anything penetrates into sleep if it has gone deep in the mind in the day. If you have been worried about a certain thing in the day, it gets into the sleep. If you were thinking continuously about sex, it gets into the sleep. If you were angry the whole day, anger gets into the sleep. So Buddha says there is no difficulty. If a person is continuously concerned with breathing and awareness of the breathing, ultimately it penetrates into the sleep. You cannot dream then. If your awareness is there of incoming breath and outgoing breath, then in sleep you cannot dream.

The moment you dream, this awareness will not be there. If awareness is there, dreams are impossible. So a Buddhist monk asleep is not just like you. His sleep has a different quality. It has a different depth and a certain awareness in it is there.

Ananda said to Buddha, "I have observed you for years and years together. It seems like a miracle: you sleep as if you are awake. You are in the same posture the whole night." The hand would not move from the place where it had been put; the leg would remain in the same posture. Buddha would sleep in the same posture the whole night. Not a single movement! For nights together ananda would sit and watch and wonder, "What type of sleep is this!" Buddha would not move. He would be as if a dead body, and he would wake up in the *same* posture in which he went to sleep. Ananda asked, "What are you doing? Were you asleep or not? You never move!"

Buddha said, "A day will come, Ananda, when you will know. This shows that you are not practising anapanasati yoga rightly; it shows only this. Otherwise this question would not have arisen. You are not practising anapanasati yoga -- if you are continuously aware of your breath in the day, it is impossible not to be conscious of it in the night. And if the mind is concerned with awareness, dreams cannot penetrate. And if there are no dreams, mind is clear, transparent. Your body is asleep, but you are not. Your body is relaxing, you are aware -- the flame is there inside. So, Ananda," Buddha is reported to have said, "I am not asleep -- only the body is sleep. I am aware! and not only in sleep. Ananda -- when I die, you will see: I will be aware, only the body will die."

Practise awareness with breathing; then you will be capable of penetrating. Or practise awareness with body movements. Buddha has a word for it: he calls it "mindfulness". He says, "Walk mindfully." We walk without any mind in it.

A certain man was sitting before Buddha when he was talking one day. He was moving his leg and a toe unnecessarily. There was no reason for it. Buddha stopped talking and asked that man, "Why are you moving your leg? Why are you moving your toe?" Suddenly, as the Buddha asked, the man stopped. Then Buddha asked, "Why have you stopped so suddenly?"

The man said, "Why, I was not even aware that I was moving my toe or my leg! I was not aware! The moment you asked, I became aware."

Buddha said, "What nonsense! Your leg is moving and you are not aware? So what are you doing with your body? Are you an alive man or dead? This is *your* leg, this is *your* toe, and it goes on moving and you are not even aware? Then of what are you aware? You can kill a man and you can say, "I was not aware." And, really, those who kill are not aware. It is difficult to kill someone when you are aware.

Buddha would say, "Move, walk, but be filled with consciousness. Know inwardly you are walking." You are not to use any words; you are not to use any thoughts. You are not to say inside, "I am walking," because if you say it then you are not aware of walking -- you have become aware of your thought, and you have missed walking. Just be somatically aware -- not mentally. Just *feel* that you are walking. Create a somatic awareness, a sensitivity, so that you can feel directly without mind coming in.

The wind is blowing -- you are feeling it. Don't use words. Just feel, and *be mindful* of the feeling. You are lying down on the beach, and the sand is cool, deeply cool. Feel it! -- don't use words. Just feel it -- the coolness of it, the penetrating coolness of it. Just feel! Be conscious of it; don't use words. Don't say, "The sand is very cool." The moment you say it you have missed an existential moment. You have become intellectual about it.

You are with your lover or with your beloved: feel the presence; don't use words. Just feel the warmth, the love flowing. Just feel the oneness that has happened. don't use words. don't say, "I love you," you will have destroyed it. The mind has come in. And the moment you say, "I love you," it has become a past memory. Just feel without words. Anything felt without words, felt totally without the mind coming in, will give you a *mindfulness*.

You are eating: eat mindfully; taste everything mindfully. Don't use words. The taste is itself such a great and penetrating thing. Don't use words and don't destroy it. Feel it to the core. You are drinking water: feel it passing through the throat; don't use words. Just feel it; be mindful about it. The movement of the water, the coolness, the disappearing thirst, the satisfaction that follows -- feel it!

You are sitting in the sun: feel the warmth; don't use words. The sun is touching you. There is a deep communion. Feel it! In this way, somatic awareness, bodily awareness, is developed. If you develop a bodily awareness, again mind comes to a stop. Mind is not needed. And if mind stops, you are again thrown into the deep unconscious. With a very, very deep alertness you can penetrate, Now you have a light with you, and the darkness disappears.

Those who are bodily oriented, for them it is good to be somatically mindful. For those who are not bodily oriented it is better to be conscious of breathing. Those who feel it difficult, they can use some artificial devices. For example, mantra -- mm? -- it is an artificial device for being aware. You use a mantra such as "Ram-Ram-Ram" continuously. Inside you create a circle of "Ram-Ram-Ram" or "Aum" or "Allah" or anything. Go on repeating it. But simple repetition is of no use. Side by side, be aware. when you are chanting "Ram-Ram-Ram", be aware of the chanting. Listen to it -- "Ram-Ram-Ram" -- be aware.

It will be difficult to be aware of anger because anger comes suddenly and you cannot plan it. And when it comes you are so overwhelmed that you may forget it. So create a device like "Ram-Ram-Ram". You can create it, and it will not be a sudden method. And if used for a long time, it becomes an inner sound. Whatsoever you are doing, there will be "Ram-Ram" as a silent sequence. Be aware of it. Then the mantra is complete, the *japa* is complete, the chanting is complete, when you are not only the creator of the sound but also the listener. It is

not only that you are saying "Ram" -- *you* are also listening to it. The circle is complete. I say something. You listen; the energy is dissipated. If you yourself say "Ram" and you yourself listen to it, the energy comes back. You are the speaker, you are the listener.

But be aware of it. It should not become a dead routine. Otherwise you can go on saying "Ram-Ram-Ram" just like a parrot, without any awareness behind it. Then it is of no use. It may create a deep sleep even. It may become a hypnosis. You may become dull. Mm? -- Krishnamurti says that those who chant mantras, they become dull, they become stupid. And he is right in a way, but only in a way. If you use any chanting just as a mechanical repetition, you will become dull. Look at the so-called religious people: they are just dull and stupid. No intelligence, no flame in their eyes of life, of aliveness. They just look dead, like lead, heavy. They have not given anything to the world, they have not created anything. They have just repeated mantras.

Of course, if you go on repeating a particular mantra without awareness, you will be bored by it yourself, and boredom will create stupidity. You will become dull, you will lose interest. A certain sound repeated continuously can even create madness. But Krishnamurti is right only in a sense; otherwise he is completely totally wrong. And whenever one judges something by those who are not following it, really, that judgement is not good. Anything must be judged by the perfect example.

The science of *japa* is not just to repeat. Repetition is secondary. It is just a device to create something of which to be aware. The *real* thing is to be aware. The basic thing is to be aware. If you build a house, the house is secondary. You build it to live in. And if there is no living, and you create a house and live outside, then you are foolish.

Repetition of a certain name or sound is creating a house to live in. It is creating a certain milieu inside. And if *you* have created it, you can manipulate it more easily than sudden happenings. And by and by you can become accustomed to it, related to it in a deep consciousness -- but the real thing, the basic thing, is to be conscious of it.

The science of *japa* says that when you become a hearer of your own sound, then you have reached. Then you have completed the *japa*. And there is much in it. When you see a sound, for example, "Ram", your peripheral apparatus is used in creating it, your vocal apparatus. Or if you create a mental sound, then your mind is used to create it. But when you become alert about it, that alertness is of the center, not of the periphery. If I say "Ram", this is on the periphery of my being. When I *listen* to this sound "Ram" inside, that is from my center -- because awareness belongs to the center. If you become aware in the center, now you have the light with you. you can dispel unconsciousness.

Mantra can be used as a technique; there are many, many methods. But any method is just an effort towards awareness. You cannot escape awareness. You can start from wherever you like, but awareness is the goal.

These are all methods of will. It would be better if I talk of at least one method of surrender, of the path of surrender. These are all methods of will: you will have to do something.

Hui-Hai was a Zen Master. When he had come to his Teacher, the Teacher said, "Choose! Would you like methods of will? Then I will suggest something to you. Or, are you ready to surrender? If you choose the path of will, then you will have to do something. I can only be a guide."

On the path of will, there are only guides. There are not really Gurus, Masters. There are simply guides. They instruct you; you have to do everything. They cannot do.

So the Teacher said, "If you want to proceed on the path of will, then I will be your guide."

I will give you instructions and techniques; then you will have to do everything. If you choose surrender, then you have not to do anything. I will do it all. Then you have just to be a shadow to me, just follow me. Then no doubts, no questioning; then no inquiry. Whatsoever I say you do."

Hui-Hai chose the path of surrender. He surrendered himself to his Teacher. Three years passed. He would sit by his Teacher's side. Sometimes the Teacher would look at him and would go on looking at him, continuously looking at him. The look was so penetrating and so deep that it would haunt Hui-Hai. When he was not even with his Teacher, the look would follow him. He would sleep, but the eyes would be with him, the Teacher would be looking at him. He couldn't even dream because the Teacher was there.

For three years continuously he would sit by his Teacher's side, and suddenly the Teacher would look at him and penetrate, and his eyes would go deep. Those eyes became a part of his being. He could not be angry, he could not be sexual -- those eyes would be present there. He would be haunted. The Guru was there. He was always in his presence. Then after three years, the Guru, for the first time, laughed. He looked at him and laughed, and then a new haunting began. Then he would hear the laughter. And even in sleep, suddenly he would hear the laughter and he would begin to tremble. For the three years again, the Guru would suddenly look at him and laugh, and that was all.

This continued for three years, that is for six years altogether. Then suddenly one day, after six years the Guru touched his hand. He would look in his eyes, take his hand in his hands, and Hui-Hai would feel the Guru's energy flowing in him. He became just a vehicle, a vessel. He would feel the warmth, the energy, the electricity, everything flowing in him. It was impossible to sleep because the Teacher was there. And every time, every moment, something was flowing.

Then, after another three years -- that is, after nine years altogether -- the Guru embraced him. And Hui-Hai has written that with that day the haunting ceased. There was no Hui-Hai: there was only the Teacher. That's why the haunting ceased.

Three more years passed -- that is, twelve years -- and one day the Teacher touched Hui-Hai's feet. That day the Teacher also disappeared, but Hui-Hai became an Enlightened man. Many would ask him later on, "How did you gain it?" He would say, "I cannot say. I only surrendered. Then everything was done by him, and I do not know what happened!"

When you surrender yourself, you can surrender only the conscious mind, not the unconscious. You don't know about it, so how can you surrender it? If I tell you to surrender your money, you can only surrender that money which you know you have. How can you surrender that money that is hidden in a treasure which you don't know that you have? So only the conscious part of the mind can be surrendered, and the conscious mind is the barrier.

If I say something to you, the conscious mind begins to think whether it is right or wrong, true or false. And even if it is true, it begins to wonder, "What is the purpose of this man saying it? What does he want from me?" Many things, many questions, many doubts will come, and the conscious mind creates a resistance.

If you know anything about hypnosis, then you must have come to know and feel that in hypnosis the person who is hypnotized will do anything if ordered -- anything, any absurd thing. Why? In the hypnotic state the conscious mind is asleep. Only the unconscious is there. The barrier has been broken. In hypnosis your conscious mind has gone to sleep it is not there. So in hypnosis, if you are a man and I say, "You are a woman," you will behave like a woman. You will walk like a woman; you will be shy; your movement will become more graceful, more womanly; your voice will change.

What happens? The conscious mind which can create doubt -- which will say, "What nonsense you are telling me! I am a man, not a woman" -- is asleep. And the unconscious has no doubts. The unconscious is absolutely faithful. It has absolute faith, trust. There is no logic in the unconscious. It cannot resist, so whatsoever is said is believed. There is no problem. That's why so much emphasis is placed on faith -- *shraddha*. Faith is of the path of surrender; it belongs to the path of surrender.

Whatsoever is said is believed on the path of surrender. It is day, and the Teacher says it is night -- believe it! Why? Because this believing will break the habit of questioning, resistance. Ultimately it will destroy the so-called barrier of your conscious mind. And when the conscious mind is not there, the Teacher and you become one. Then you can work -- not before that. Then it is a telepathic relationship. You are in a deep communion. So whatsoever the Guru thinks becomes a part of you. Now, whatsoever he wants to do, he can do it. You have become just totally receptive to him. Now there is not a fight between the Teacher and the disciple; otherwise it is a fight. There is a communion, a deep meeting.

So Hui-Hai said, "I do not know. I simply surrendered; that is what I did. The only thing I did was this. I said to myself that I have tried and I have struggled, and I have not found any bliss. It may be that I am the cause of all my misery. If I choose the path of will, again I will be choosing, again I will be practising, again I will be there. Whatsoever the result may be, I will be present in it. And if I am the misery -- and I have tried everywhere and I have done everything -- it is better to drop myself and see what happens. So I told my Teacher that I would surrender, and after that I simply waited for twelve years. I don't know what he was doing, but many things were happening. I was transforming -- I was being transformed and changed."

Our unconscious minds are related. They are one. We are islands only as far as our conscious minds are concerned. Otherwise we are not separate: the deeper mind is one. If I am talking to you, then there are two ways to convey my message to you. One is through your conscious mind. It is a method of struggle because your conscious mind will go on thinking about it. It cannot accept. First it has to negate.

The first thing the conscious mind says is "no", and "yes" comes only in a very faltering way. Yes comes only as a helplessness. you cannot say no, you cannot find any way to say no, you are unable to say no, you have no argument for saying no, so you say yes. your yes is impotent, weak, just out of helplessness. The moment you find another reason to say no, you again feel to be vibrating with energy. Your no is very potent. Yes is just dead; no is alive with the conscious mind.

The conscious mind is a conflict continuously -- defending, afraid, looking around with fear. It cannot trust; it cannot say yes wholeheartedly. Even if it says it, it is always a temporary thing. It is waiting for the real no to come, and then it will say it. So you can convince a man, but you cannot convert him. you can argue with a man, you can silence him with argument, but you cannot convert him.

He may feel that he cannot say anything more, but inside, deep down, he knows that something must be found somewhere, which will prove that you are wrong and he is right. It is only that at this moment he is unable to say no, so he accepts. But this acceptance is not a conversion. It is just a temporary defeat, and he feels hurt and he will take revenge. This is one way which has become prominent in this age. If you have to convey something, you have to convey it through the conscious mind.

In ancient days, quite the contrary was the method. Drop this conscious mind and convey directly through the unconscious. Time is saved, energy is saved and unnecessary struggle is

saved. That's what is meant by surrender. Surrender means now you say, "I am no one any more. Now, whatsoever you say I will follow. I will not decide to follow again and again. Now there will be no question with the very decision. I decide, finally, ultimately."

With the conscious mind you have to decide again and again every moment⁶. With the surrendering mind, you have decided once, you have chosen, then you drop. And when you don't doubt, when you don't question, then by and by the conscious mind loses its grip because it is a mechanical thing. If you don't use it, it becomes non-functional. If you don't use your legs for twelve years, they will become non-functional. Then you won't be able to walk.

So Hui-Hai continuously waited in a surrendering mood for twelve years. He could not think, he could not argue, he could not say no. Yes became the mood, yes became potent, yes became strong, alive. No was just not there. In this state direct transformation is possible. Then the Teacher can do much. Then he penetrates into you. Then he begins to transform you. And the more you are transformed from inside, the more conscious you become, but that is not *your* work.

In Indonesia there is now a modern method: they call it LATIHAN (from subud methods). It works miraculously. One has not even to surrender to the Teacher -- one simply surrenders to the Divine. But the surrender must be total. One surrenders to the Divine and says to the Divine, "Now, finally, I say whatsoever you want to do with me, do! I will not resist. Now, whatsoever happens I will follow it as if it is your instructions." And if a man begins to feel trembling, he trembles. If he begins to feel screaming, he screams. If he feels to run, he runs. He begins to behave in mad ways. But no resistance must be there. Whatsoever happens, he accepts it and flows with it, and within days he is a transformed being, a different being.

When you are totally receptive to the universal, the cosmic force, it transforms you. Then you need not transform yourself. Then you are carried in a very strong current. If you are not fighting, you are just carried. The Cosmic is present here, but you resist. You stand against it. Everyone is fighting against the Cosmic. Everyone feels himself more wise.

Leave it to the Cosmic. Surrender to the Cosmic, or surrender to the Teacher -- it makes no difference. The real thing is surrender. But it is a very mad path -- a *very* mad path -- because what will happen is unpredictable. It may happen, it may not happen. You cannot know beforehand. You proceed in an unknown, uncharted sea, and you are not the master. You have surrendered. This surrendering breaks down your resistance, your ego. And when the surrendering is complete, there is light, there is awareness, there is flowering. You have flowered suddenly.

So when I say there is a possibility of surrendering, sometimes it looks as if it will be easy -- as if the path of will must be arduous and the path of surrender must be easy. It is not so. To some the path of will is easy, to some the path of surrender is easy. It depends on you; it does not depend on the path. No path is easy, no path is difficult. It depends on you! If the path suits you, it is easy.

Hui-Hai was not doing anything, so it was easy in a way. But you know what he did? He surrendered. It was done in a single moment. But can you do it, this waiting for twelve years? Distrust and many things will come in. Someone will say, "Why are you wasting time with this man? He is a fraud. he has deceived many. many have come and gone. What you are doing here?"

Hui-Hai would listen and would not react. And this is not the end: the Teacher would even create many, many things which would bring doubt. Suddenly Hui-Hai would think,

"What am I doing here? Am I mad with this man? And what is he doing? If he just proves to be a fraud after twelve years, then my life is wasted." And this man, this Teacher, would create many situations in which doubt would arise, and the mind would begin to function. But Hui-Hai would not listen to the mind. He would say, "I have surrendered. I have surrendered and now there is no going back." It is not easy. Nothing is easy, but things become more difficult if you choose wrongly.

And lastly, I would like to say that it is natural that we always choose wrongly. There is a reason for it. Because the opposite is always attractive, it is natural that we choose wrongly. All choice is basically sexual -- so a man chooses a woman, a woman chooses a man, and the same goes on and on in every dimension. If you are a man of surrender, it is more possible that you will choose the path of will because will will be more attractive: it is the opposite. If you are a man of will, you may choose the path of surrender because the other, the opposite, is more attractive. It happens in many ways.

Mahavir is a man of will, but his followers, his authentic followers, will be men of surrender because he will attract the opposite. He is a man of will but he will attract those who are men of surrender. So if followers decide by themselves they will begin to follow Mahavir's ways, and this will be a wrong thing because Mahavir is a man of will and his path is the path of will. If they just begin to follow whatsoever Mahavir is doing, they will be wrong and ultimately frustrated. If they leave it to Mahavir, then Mahavir will always suggest to them the path of surrender. This is the problem.

So when the Teacher is dead and a long time has passed, it becomes a deep cause of confusion for the followers -- because now the Teacher cannot decide: you have to decide. So someone becomes attracted to Buddha and he begins to follow Buddha's path as Buddha did. This is going to be wrong. If Buddha could have been asked, he would have suggested a different thing.

The last dying words of Buddha to Ananda are, "Ananda, be a lamp unto yourself. Don't follow me: *appa DEEPO BHAVA* -- Be a lamp unto yourself! Don't follow me." Ananda was following Buddha continuously for forty years. It was not a small period. For his whole life Ananda had followed devotedly, and no one could say that his devotion was imperfect in any way or incomplete. It was total. But Ananda, the most devoted follower, could not achieve Enlightenment, and the death of Buddha was nearing.

One day Buddha said, "Now, today I am going to leave this body."

So Ananda began to weep and said, "What will I do now? For forty years I have been following you in every single detail."

Even Buddha could not say, "You have not followed and that's why you have not reached." He had followed and he was sincere, but he was still an ignorant man.

Buddha said, "Unless I die, Ananda, it seems you will not reach."

"Why?" Ananda asked.

Buddha said, "Unless I die, you cannot return to yourself. You are too much attached to me, and I have become the barrier. You have followed me, but you have forgotten yourself completely."

You can follow a Teacher blindly and still reach nowhere -- *if* you are just following the Teacher according to you. Remember these words: "according to you." Then you have not surrendered. Surrender means now you are no more there to decide. The Teacher decides. Even if the Teacher is not there, surrender to the cosmic energy. Then the cosmic energy decides. The moment you surrender, your gates are thrown open and the cosmic flood enters you from everywhere and transforms you.

Look at it this way: my house is filled with darkness. I can do two things. Either I have to create light in my house -- then I will have to create it; or, I can open my doors and the sun is outside. I just open my doors, and my house becomes a host to the Divine guest, to the sun, to the rays. Then I become receptive and the darkness disappears.

On the path of will, you have to create the light. On the path of surrender, light is there -- you have just to be open. But when the house is dark and when everywhere there is darkness, one fears to open doors -- one fears even more. Who knows whether light will enter or whether thieves will come in? So you lock up. You close every possibility so that nothing enters in. That is the situation.

Either create light by yourself: then the darkness disappears. Or, use the cosmic light: that is always there. Then open yourself! Be vulnerable! Then don't depend on anyone. Then be ready, whatsoever happens. If you are ready no matter what may happen, then darkness itself becomes light. With that readiness, nothing can remain dark. That very readiness transforms you totally.

OSHO, LAST NIGHT YOU MENTIONED THE CASE OF A MAN WHO SAW VISIONS OF KRISHNA AND THOUGHT HE WAS ADVANCED, WHILE YOU SAID HE HAD NOT YET TAKEN THE FIRST STEP. HOW DOES ONE KNOW HOW FAR ALONG ONE IS? ARE NOT VISIONS AND OTHER PSYCHIC PHENOMENA SUPPOSED TO BE INDICATIONS OF HIGH SPIRITUAL DEVELOPMENT? IF NOT, THEN WHAT ARE SOME OF THE INDICATIONS?

There can be visions, and they can be indicative of advanced states. But with one condition: the more advanced you are, the less you feel that you are advanced. The more you move towards being Enlightened, the less there is the ego which says, "I am enlightened." Spiritual advancement is a very humble progress.

So one thing: visions can be indicative of higher states, but only if you feel more humble. If you begin to feel that you are advanced, that shows another thing: that those visions are not spiritual but simply projections of the mind. So this is the criterion. If you have really seen Krishna in visions, *you* will be no more if this is authentic. If really this is a realization, you will be effaced completely. You will say, "Krishna is and I am not."

But if you are strengthened by this vision, you are not effaced. If, on the contrary, you become stronger and now you say, "I am an adept, an advanced soul -- I am no ordinary man," that shows that it was not an authentic vision but only a projection of the ego.

The ego is strengthened by its own projections. Otherwise, it is destroyed. A spiritual vision destroys the ego completely. A projected vision, your own imagination, your own dream, strengthens you. It becomes a food; your ego is more vitalized.

The Upanishads say, "Those who say they know, they know not. Those who claim that they have realized, they are far from it." So when I said that a certain man came to me and said, "I am a very advanced soul, I am an adept. I have this vision and that," when he related his vision it was as if someone was relating his riches or degrees, his academic degrees, as if someone was carrying his diplomas.

This is impossible. His visions were just created visions, created with his own mind. If your mind is creating your visions, your mind will be strengthened. If visions are coming from beyond, your mind will be destroyed. The visions are not of the same sort.

But in the beginning you cannot decide this difference in the visions. You cannot decide whether you have really seen Krishna or whether it was just your dream. you cannot make out any difference -- because if you have seen the real, you will not see the dream; if you have seen the dream, you will not see the real. So how can you compare? You cannot compare. But one thing is certain: you will show what type of thing you have seen. If this vision strengthens your ego, then it was a projection. If it effaces you completely, destroys you completely and you are no more, then it was authentic and real. Only this is the criterion.

So with a religious person, if he becomes more egoistic as he advances in his religiousness, it shows that he is on a false path -- he is imagining things. And if the more he advances, the more he withers away, feels himself no more, if he feels to be a non-entity and ultimately a nothingness, if he becomes just a void, that shows that he is progressing.

Visions can show, but they always show something only in reference to you, not independently. If you ask whether a vision of Krishna is real or not, I cannot say anything. I will ask, "Real to whom?" To Meera it was real: it effaced her completely; she was no more. Someone was asking me, "When Meera was poisoned, why did the poison not affect her?" I said to him, "Because she was no more."

Even poison needs someone to be effective. It killed Socrates -- Socrates was not Meera. Socrates was a philosopher, not a sage; Socrates was a thinker, not a Buddha. Socrates thought, contemplated, argued. He was a great intellect, but not an enlightened One. If he should argue with Buddha he would win; Buddha would be defeated. He was a rare genius. So when you think about Socrates, intellectually he is incomparable, but existentially he is nothing before a Buddha. A Buddha will laugh about this argument and a Buddha will say, "You go around and around, and you will never reach the center. And whatsoever you are talking is just talk. You argue. you are a logical man and you argue better than me," a Buddha will say, "but you are wasting your life in arguments."

Socrates is not a person who has gone beyond his ego. He is a rare man with a rare, penetrating mind. Even if he talks about ego, that understanding is intellectual. He is not an existential, experienced man. So because of Socrates, the whole West has come to an intellectual climax -- because of three men: Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. The originator is Socrates. Socrates was the teacher of Plato and Plato was the teacher of Aristotle. These three have created the whole Western mind. This whole science, logic, philosophy of the West, belongs to these three men. They are the creators.

Buddha belongs to a totally different dimension. Socrates is an intellectual giant, but Buddha would have just laughed at him. He would have said, "You are a giant amidst children. You have reached a climax in intellect, but intellect is a barrier. You have touched the ultimate in intellect, but intellect leads nowhere."

Socrates is different, Meera is different. Meera is a surrendered soul -- totally surrendered, totally effaced. When the poison is given to her, *she* is not drinking it. Krishna himself is drinking it. There is no difference now, no distinction. And if this trust is there, poison will become useless. This seems miraculous, but it is not so miraculous. In hypnosis, if a deeply hypnotized person is there and you give him poison telling him that this is not poison, it will not affect him. What happens? If you give him ordinary water and say, "This is poison," he will die. This is total acceptance. Even in hypnosis this can happen.

In 1952 they had to make a law in America -- an anti-hypnosis law. you cannot hypnotize anybody now in America. It is illegal, because one student died in a university. Four students were hypnotizing him. They were just students of psychology, so they stumbled upon books on hypnotism. They just tried it as a game. They hypnotized one boy -- their partner -- in a

room, and they suggested many things and he followed them. They said, "Weep! Your mother is dead!" and he wept. They said, "Laugh and dance! Your mother has arisen again!" and he laughed and danced. And then one boy said, with no ulterior motive, "You are dead." and the boy fell down dead. Then they tried in every way to tell him, "Now awaken! Now you are alive!" But then there was no one to listen. He was already dead.

This is total acceptance, and they had to make a law against hypnosis because of it. Only a practitioner -- a psychologist, a psychiatrist, or someone who is doing research, a doctor -- only these can now practise hypnosis.

If in hypnosis this can happen, why not with a Meera? A Meera has surrendered her conscious mind -- the same which is surrendered in hypnosis. She has surrendered it totally. Now she is no more; only Krishna is. If there is not a single doubt when she is taking the poison and her hands are not trembling, if she is not thinking that "This is poison and I may die," if even this thought is not there, she will not die. She takes it as a gift from her beloved, from her Krishna. That is also a gift. Everything is from him, so she takes it as a gift. She drinks it, feels good, begins to dance. The poison has disappeared.

Even to work, the poison needs your mind. If there is no mind, it is very difficult for it to have any effect. A Meera can escape; Socrates cannot escape. He was a logical man. He *knows* that poison will kill him. Meera was illogical -- absolutely illogical.

I will relate to you the death scene of Socrates. The poison is being made outside. Socrates is lying on his bed and his disciples are there. He says to one disciple, "Now it is time. At six the poison must be given." He is a very mathematical man, so he says, "It seems they have not prepared it yet. Go and ask them why it is so late. The time has come and I am ready."

Then the poison comes. He takes the poison. Then he says, "My legs are feeling numb. It seems the poison has begun to work. Now the poison is coming up." He goes on relating. He is a keen intellect. Even in death he is experimenting. He is a scientific thinker. He says, "Now the poison is coming up. Now half of my body is dead." He is a rare man. He is not ordinary.

The disciples are weeping, so he says, "Stop! You can weep later on. Look at this phenomenon, this progressing poisoning. Soon. I think, my heart will be affected. And I wonder if, after my heart is affected, my mind will work. So now it will be decided whether the heart is the main center or the mind." He is a very keen mind, and he is observing, relating.

When his heart is affected, he says, "I feel that my heart is sinking, going down. Soon I think I will feel, but I will not be able to relate anything because my tongue is getting numb, dead. Friends, now there will be an experience which I will be able to experience but which I will not be able to relate. It will be inexpressible because my tongue is going dead."

Even up to the last, his eyes were saying something, relating something. In the last moment someone asks him, "Socrates are you not afraid of death?" He doesn't say, "I am not afraid because I am immortal" -- no! He doesn't say, "I am not afraid because I am going to meet the Divine" -- no! He doesn't know any Divine and his mind cannot believe in any Divine.

He says, "I am not afraid for two reasons." This is a logical mind. He says, "For two reasons I am not afraid. One: either Socrates is going to die completely; then there will be no one to be afraid. Or, Socrates is not going to die at all and the soul will live, so why be afraid? These are the two reasons why I am not afraid. Either I will die, really, as atheists say. Materialists say that there is no soul, and they may be right. If they are right, then why be

afraid? I will be dead completely, and no one will be there to suffer death, no one will be there to be afraid of anything. Socrates will be no more, so why be afraid?

"Or, it may be that religious persons are right" -- this is the "or"; this is logic -- "they may be right! Then only the body will die and Socrates will live, so why be afraid? If only my body is going to die and I will be there, why waste time in fear? Let me go and see."

But he is not in an experience of what is going to happen. He is a perfectly logical mind. His fearlessness is not that of a Buddha or that of a Mahavir or that of a Meera or even that of a Charvak. His fearlessness is not like that of a Charvak because Charvak said, "It is decidedly so that I am going to die totally, so I am not afraid." this is a decisive conclusion. A Mahavir knows, "I am not going to die, so there is no question of fear." But this again is a decision, a concluded thing. Mahavir knows.

Socrates is different from both. He says that either a Charvak will be true or a Mahavir will be true. But whether one is true or the other is true, in both the cases it seems meaningless to be afraid. So he is a very different mind, and he has created the very quality of Western thinking. He was not religious. He was down to earth, scientific.